PG&E DIABLO CANYON DECOMMISSIONING ENGAGEMENT PANEL

PUBLIC MEETING

ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 2021

6:02 P.M. - 9:08 P.M.

REPORTED BY MELISSA PLOOY, CSR NO. 13068

MR. ANDERS: Welcome, everyone. My name is Chuck Anders and I'm the facilitator for the Diablo Canyon Decommissioning Engagement Panel. I want to thank you everybody for participating in this meeting. Tonight we will -- go to the next slide, please, Zeek. Did we get our slides going? Okay. So tonight we're going to have two major agenda items. Before we get into them, we will have a safety briefing and then we have some new panel members to introduce.

Our first major topic of the evening is spent nuclear fuel management and our other topic that we have tonight is the coastal development permit that was submitted by PG&E recently and how that interacts with the California Environmental Quality Act process. We'll have PG&E update on any other items of concern, and around 8:20 tonight, we will have public comment period and we look forward to hearing from members of the public during that time. So next slide, please.

So, Tim would -- Dr. Timothy Auran, panel member, has agreed to provide a safety briefing. We start all of our meetings with a safety reminder or safety tip. So go ahead, Tim.

MR. AURAN: All right. I think, again, probably one of the biggest safety issues we're all still dealing with is COVID. The vaccination rollout

has gone quite well, but I think we need to remind everybody to make sure that you have gotten your vaccines. We have statistics out that came today from the CDC saying about 50 percent of the U.S. population is now fully vaccinated, California slightly above that. Unfortunately, the demand is dropping. Most of the models predict that we're not going to reach herd immunity. So there will be some continued restrictions that go on potentially in perpetuity if we can't get complete herd immunity in place. If anybody's concerned about side effects or anything like that, we've given almost 300 million vaccines in the country and there have been very few, if any, significant severe reactions to them. So we really do have extensive good data to show it's safe and effective. Children 12 and older can now get the Pfizer vaccine and the Moderna vaccine should be approved very shortly for kids, as well. Everybody needs to remember if you haven't gotten your vaccine, that this is still the same coronavirus that has killed almost 600,000 Americans. So if you haven't been vaccinated, it's still the same virus. It can still cause sever illness for you. If that alone isn't enough to persuade people to get the vaccine, it appears that a lot of large events run by private organizations like sporting events, concerts, outdoor festivals are

still going to require either proof of a negative COVID test or proof of vaccination. So as everybody feels relief in a sense of opening society to speed your own return to society, it's probably a good idea to get the vaccine so you don't have to go through multiple somewhat unpleasant COVID tests to prove that you're not infected prior to that event. Anybody who hasn't gotten the vaccine, you can go to vaccines.gov to find a location. All CVS, Rite-Aids or Vons pharmacies still have vaccines in stock and many are not requiring appointments. You can walk in and get a vaccine at any time. That's about it for me.

MR. ANDERS: Great. Thank you, Tim.

Before we get into introducing our new panel members, I'd like to remind members of the public that you have the opportunity to offer questions or comments using the chat feature of Zoom. The panel members are monitoring that chat feature, and during the presentations or during the question and answer sessions, they may take a look at your comments or questions and follow up with those with the speakers and so on. All of the substantive comments and questions that are offered in the chat feature during the meeting will become part of the public record and will be included in the list of comments and public perspectives

in the panel official record.

So there's -- also, I want to remind everyone that there will be a written transcript of this meeting and that that will be available about ten days after the meeting and I thank Melissa Plooy, who is our court reporter that's reporting this meeting.

I also want to recognize Linda Seeley and Trevor Keith who have taken the lead for the major panel topics for this meeting. For those in the public that don't know, panel members take the lead to put together these topics that are discussed at the panel meeting and Linda and Trevor are providing that leadership tonight. This is the 18th panel meeting since its inception in 2018 and the panel on -- the panel members serve three-year terms that are staggered terms and so each year three panel members or three positions are up for renewal and this year we'd like to welcome two new panel members to the panel and two panel members that have been reappointed. Dena Bellman and David Baldwin were reappointed to the panel and Bill Almas and Miriam Shah are new members to the panel and I would just like to introduce Miriam.

Miriam has two terms as council member on the Grover Beach City Council. She served on executive committees of the Homeless Services Oversight Committee,

the Air Pollution Control District and California League of Cities. She also sits on the board of the Grover Beach Library, Five Cities Homeless Coalition and has been active with Grover Heights PTA for several years, serving three years as president.

Miriam, do you have any comments or thoughts as a new member of the panel?

MS. SHAH: Thank you. I'm just really happy to be here and there's already been a lot to learn and I'll just hope to be able to represent the community well. So thank you and thank you for trusting me with this position.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Miriam.

Our second new member is Bill Almas. Bill is retired from Chevron as a senior real estate manager in 2015. Bill held many various positions with Chevron and Unocal, including environmental and regulatory manager, manager of governmental affairs, area manager and environmental and regulatory manager for Molycorp, which is a subsidiary of Unocal. He was the lead for the Unocal property purchase and settlements associated with the Avila Beach remediation and managed the preparation of the San Luis Obispo Chevron Tank Farm Environmental Impact Report and various property sales.

So, Bill, sounds like you're qualified to look

at the decommissioning process. Bill, do you have any thoughts that you would like to offer?

MR. ALMAS: Thank you, Chuck. Just that I am -- I feel honored that I was selected for this position. I will try and do the best that I can to gather public input and that's about it. I do think I am able to contribute to the panel, and so with that, I'll sign off.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Bill. We did have over 50 applications for the four positions that were filled this year. Sadly, we are losing two panel members, Alex Karlin and Lauren Brown, and Lauren is with us tonight and I just want to say and thank Lauren for his extraordinary leadership and statesmanship over the past three years as the panel has initiated its activities and really matured as a collaborative body.

Lauren, do you have any thoughts? As this is your last meeting with the panel, at least until a new term, should you choose to apply.

MR. BROWN: All right. Yes, I would like to comment just a little bit.

Yesterday I received a package that included -- I don't know if you can see this. It's a plaque that PG&E has sent me and the sentiment on this plaque I think has become something of a motto for the

decommissioning panel. I'd just like to read this one section. "The decisions I make are not for me, but for generations to come." That's what the panel will do, is to try to determine what is best for future generations and that motto, I think, really captured what my motivation was for being part of this panel and it's one the panel should keep foremost in your minds. I've been honored very much to be part of it. I've enjoyed it. I intend to keep in touch in watching what's going on and I'd also like to say hello, Dr. Peter Lam. All right. Well, I'll be muting myself and stopping the video because...

MS. ROSALES: Thank you for your service, Lauren. We're going to miss you.

DR. LAM: Thank you. I just unmute my mic.

MR. ANDERS: Any other panel members have any other thoughts or suggestions or advice to the new panel members or departing sentiments to Lauren and Alice?

MR. JONES: This is Tom. I'd like to thank both Alex Karlin and Lauren for getting us off the ground. Lauren's statesmanship and his engagement in the community brought great outreach and advocacy to the project and, frankly, Alex Karlin's regulatory expertise and his experience in other environmental nuclear issues really helped raise everyone's knowledge on the panel,

as well. So both will be missed and both have made significant contributions to make this, I think, one of the best engagement panels in the United States. So thank you both, gentlemen, for your contributions.

MR. ANDERS: Great. Thank you, Tom.

Any other comments or thoughts before we move on to the next agenda item?

Okay. The next item is spent nuclear fuel management update and Linda is going to introduce this topic.

So, Linda, please go ahead.

And I think we need the next slide, please, Zeek.

MS. SEELEY: I don't think this is right. I think we're introducing -- whoops, Chuck. You're muted.

MR. ANDERS: Zeek, go ahead to Agenda Item Number 5, please.

MS. SEELEY: Okay. Thank you. I very much appreciate this opportunity to be able to look at this new spent fuel system that PG&E is going to be buying. As you can see on this slide, this is the spent fuel pad that we have right now. There are 58 casks of highly radioactive spent nuclear fuel sitting there and we have an opportunity now to help -- oh, gee. I just got a message that my PC -- or my computer is going to run out

of juice. I have to -- excuse me for a second. I have to plug it in.

MR. ANDERS: While Linda is gone -- this is Chuck -- I just want to mention that we're pleased to have during this particular segment Tom Jones of PG&E that is going to do an overview and introduction of the cask RFP process, along with Dr. Justin Cochran of the California Energy Commission, and we also have Rodney McCullum, who is from the Nuclear Energy Institute, is going to give us an overview of the interim storage activities, and we're very fortunate to have Peter Lam with the Diablo Canyon Independent Safety Committee here with us tonight to answer any questions the panel or others might have with regard to the spent fuel system or the intermediate storage facility.

So go ahead, Linda. Are you plugged in?

MS. SEELEY: I'm plugged in. So I am doing this first before Tom and Justin and Rod, right?

MR. ANDERS: You're doing the overview and the introduction.

MR. JONES: And just one correction, team. Philippe Soenen is presenting for PG&E and Tom Jones will be presenting on the coastal development section.

MS. SEELEY: Okay. Perfect. So anyway, we see here on the side 58 casks that are there right now and

when the plant shuts down -- and right now we have fuel in the spent fuel pools. The spent fuel is there. When the plant shuts down, PG&E is going to move all of these -- all of the spent fuel out to this pad that's there and it's going to be -- and they are -- right now, they have submitted a request for proposal from several different cask makers and they are going to fill up this pad with casks and our job as the panel is to help them decide what to get and so we made recommendations in 2019 what we would like to see to fill up the rest of this pad with spent fuel.

And can you go on to the next slide? This. In our strategic vision, we asked that PG&E -- we wanted them to begin the -- anyway, we're going to skip A. Okay? Because this has already happened. The RFP, the request for proposal process, happened. We want PG&E to thoroughly investigate and research all potential dry cask storage systems so that we can get the very best site-specific system that takes into consideration all of the seismic risks at the Diablo Canyon plant and the fact that the length of time that the spent nuclear fuel and the greater than Class C waste, that's GTCC waste, which is radioactive waste that's not spent fuel, but highly radioactive, which will have to be stored on site too. So that we want -- we don't know how long it will

be there and so we want to be able to have the best possible system for storage.

We recommended that their selection use the advances and the materials, the manufacturing and engineering of dry cask storage systems so that we can improve the shielding and confinement of spent nuclear fuel and the heat capacity of the canisters. What we're looking for is the very, very best -- the very best system that is available on the planet. We also want to -- them to do 24-hour-a-day radiation monitoring to have casks that are capable of being inspected, that the casks can be retrievable, and meaning if there is a problem with them, that they can be removed and fixed, have the capacity to either repackage or repair a damaged cask and that they be licensed for transportation so that they don't have to be moved and we recommend that the new dry cask system minimize -- of course minimize the dose rates of radiation to workers to the greatest extent possible.

I have one more slide. We also recommend that all PG&E staff and any outside contractors involved with the cask loading receive excellent preoperational training and testing based on lessons learned in other dry cask storage systems before the implementation of any new dry cask storage system. We know that they are

going to be bringing in outside contractors and we also recommend strongly that any outside contractors involved with cask loading have experience with the system and be fully trained, vetted and adequately supervised.

Okay. So those are our recommendations from our strategic vision and we will be adding to those as time goes on because new facts are emerging as we go on. Okay?

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Linda. Do you want me to introduce Philippe?

MS. SEELEY: Yeah, please.

MR. ANDERS: Okay. Our next speaker is Philippe Soenen and Philippe is going to discuss the cask RFP process that Linda just mentioned.

So, Philippe, go ahead and I think we need to see some slides.

Zeek, do you have some slides for us? Next slide. Next slide. Next slide. We apparently had recommendations that Linda summarized. Next slide.

Okay. Philippe, it's all yours.

MR. SOENEN: Good evening. Like Chuck and Linda mentioned, my name is Philippe Soenen. I'm the decommissioning environmental and licensing manager. So I just want to provide the panel and the public an update on our request for proposal.

Can you go to the next slide? This slide has been presented in the past, but I wanted to cover it again for information for everyone. So some of the key aspects on this request for proposal, we received inputs from the panel through their strategic vision documents. So as Linda walked through those, we've provided references back to specific items that we've incorporated and consider as part of the creations of the request for proposal for a modified or a new design dry cask system. So some of the aspects that we were looking at are consistent with the proposed settlement agreement for our nuclear decommissioning trust proceedings is that we have a dry cask storage system that can be -- offload all of our fuel from wet to dry storage within four years of each unit's shutdown. Also, the aspects that the request for proposal contain are for a robust design meeting the Diablo Canyon site-specific requirements in hazards, so including the seismic -- a marine environment that we are in and also considering the burn-up and loading requirements for our site-specific fuel that we've had throughout operations, also including the minimizing of dose to workers in the public, and one point, we are going through processes that will require licensing and also regulatory approvals. So getting acceptance, going through these,

going through evaluations and there will be regulatory approvals required for the implementation of this new system. Next slide, please.

So one of the other aspects that Linda mentioned is sort of the long-term monitoring. So part of this new design or modified design that we would implement, we would take into consideration the long-term monitoring and what we're trying to display through this graph here is through spent fuel heat and dose, they both decrease in the same manner. So over time, they reach sort of a rapid decline so they have exponential decay to them. So what we're providing here is a reference for the specifics on the durations of the offloads. So we have -- our system now, our current system is up to ten years for an offload capability that's shown on the right there and our proposals, we're looking at four years. So you can see the temperatures are low, between 4 and 10, but when you consider the loading that you put into a single canister of -- which our current system has 32 assemblies in the canister, you look at the heat accumulation that's associated with that. So there is a significant difference between our current system and what we're asking for in this request for proposal. So that's just for awareness going through this process.

Also, for what we have communicated to the Engagement Panel in the past is that PG&E is including in our next filing for funding for decommissioning is to have a real-time monitoring system for radiation and we envision that to be something for the entire dry cask storage and not system-specific. So we have a current system and we know we're looking at implementing a new system. So we want to make sure that it goes in for a system that can monitor anything, unexpected dose increases, for the entire ISFSI site. Next slide, please.

So this is the way we've presented our time line for request for proposal in the past. This is just for reference and indication of where we are with the red indicator there. Actually, we've now -- because of where we are in the process, we've actually modified this to make more sense. So if we go to the next slide, I'll walk through the actual status on our new presentation. There you go.

So I want to point out where we are with the request for proposal, the whole process. So we gathered up our public inputs for roughly two years. We use this strategic vision document for the Engagement Panel. We had the workshops indicated there with the brown indicator for the CPUC spent fuel workshops and we also

had the Engagement Panel workshops. We had a risk assessment performed by UCLA for the offload options consideration and also the California Energy Commission, the CEC, we've been collaborating with them and they had opportunities to look at the RFP, provide comments and we resolved any comments from them before the RFP went out. So then in the yellow boxes here, as we've -- we've submitted that in 2020. We are going through the evaluation process and we're continuing to work with the CEC collaborating on the evaluations. The CEC has been involved along the way and Dr. Cochran will talk to that a little bit later.

So once we have a recommendation to our senior leadership, we'll get the approval for issuing a contract to the winning bidder and we're targeting that to be executed contract sometime first quarter of next year is what we're targeting right now, and then shortly after that, we would start on the design and licensing process, all of the requirements for our site-specific needs and that will then be submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for their review and approval and that's looking at in the 2023 time period. And indicated here in green is that because it's a Nuclear Regulatory Commissioning licensing activity, there is a public process that can be -- process with that, so

public involvement with the licensing action just with any other activity we have with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and then we're targeting a review and approval for a license to implement a new design or a modified design in the 2025 period by the time that our unit two would be out of -- shut down for the last time.

That's the presentation I have for the RFP. Quick, but we have a lot of speakers. So I want to make sure we have access to those individuals who are not readily available at all times.

Chuck, I'll hand it back to you.

MR. ANDERS: Okay. Dr. Cochran, do you have any comments with regard to this collaborative process that PG&E has gone through with you? And please introduce yourself, also, for the panel and the public. I think you need to unmute your mic.

DR. COCHRAN: Sorry. Double mute. Thank you, Chuck.

My name is Justin Cochran. I'm the senior nuclear advisor to the California Energy Commission, I work for Chara Hokesholt, I also service the agency's emergency coordinator. I'm going to give some brief overview of our engagement on this process, but first of all, I want to say good evening to everyone and I also want to highlight we really value and appreciate all of

your engagement on these important issues. I think it is essential for the local community to engage on these critical factors and our agency supports and advocates for the public engagement on these critical issues.

As I indicated earlier, I'm here tonight to provide a brief update on the Energy Commission's engagement in the spent fuel system request for proposal process. I will not get into details or specifics of the RFP process. It's still ongoing and we are still under a non-disclosure agreement. Any of the technical questions I will just defer to Philippe.

Throughout the RFP process, Energy Commission staff have engaged via in-person meetings and conference call with the PG&E team. Now, this engagement has consisted of multiple in-depth discussions with PG&E technical staff during the different phases of the RFP process. Furthermore, our staff has determined that finding a safe storage solution was a core component of the UCLA study and the RFP discussions. This engagement was essential in drafting our questions and key issues that were deemed important by the Energy Commission and various cores. Moreover, the PG&E team was responsive in addressing the various topics raised during these discussions. These needs and continued engagement meet the Energy Commission's expectations of coordination,

collaboration and consultation requirements outlined in the settlement agreement. It is our expectation that PG&E will continue to incorporate feedback from the local community and stakeholders into their decommissioning plan. Thank you for your time and consideration. I'm here if you have any questions and I return the mic back to you, Chuck.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Dr. Cochran.

We have scheduled this session to provide the opportunity for the panel to ask any questions of the presenters after each topic. So do the -- any of the panel members have any questions of Philippe or Justin?

DR. LAM: I just want to say hi to Dr. Cochran. Good to see you again.

DR. COCHRAN: Good to see you, Dr. Lam.

MR. ANDERS: No questions from the panel members on this topic? Okay. If not, we will move on to the next agenda item.

ZEEK: Excuse me, Chuck. I see a couple people with their hands up. Scott Lathrop and Lindsay -- or Linda.

MR. ANDERS: I apologize. I didn't see that. You guys are following the protocol and I didn't recognize it. So Linda first and then Scott.

MS. SEELEY: I'm interested in -- Justin, I

don't see you, but, anyway --

DR. COCHRAN: I'm right here.

MS. SEELEY: Oh, there you are. Okay. You changed places somehow on my screen.

Were you -- when you were reviewing the RFP, did you review the -- did you feel that what PG&E was asking for in terms of the thickness of the canisters, the -- all the attributes of durability, that they had requested those in their proposal to a standard that you would think is the best that could be given, the best that could be asked for?

DR. COCHRAN: Well, I can't speak to the technical nuances, but I will speak more of a general assessment. When we reviewed the initial proposal question and the topics that PG&E were requesting of vendors to address, we thought there were some good components and some components that needed some modifications. We engaged PG&E on these components and they did make those modifications and adjustments, but we know from a technical standpoint there's some limitations as to who is ultimately the regulatory authority and what is practical and available to meet the requirements.

Our general assessment is that the canisters did meet the safety requirements highlighted for the

loads, but we're in a situation where there's the ideal and then there's the functional practical and it is our consideration that dry storage systems are a superior option than long-term storage in the cooling pools and that all of the systems that were bid on did meet safety requirements that would pass NRC mustard and in some instances exceed NRC requirements. Does that address your question?

MS. SEELEY: Not exactly because I asked if they were -- in your -- if, in your opinion, they were the best that could possibly be purchased and I'm not talking -- because when we talk about money, and I know you mentioned practical, but, you know, I've been thinking about this in terms of money, the fact that this is at least a 350-million-dollar project for these canisters and say if it would cost 400 million for the canisters if they were really, really, really durable, wouldn't it make sense in the long run -- it's like are you going to buy a cheap tire for your car or the best tire for your car if you're going to go on a trip over the Rockies, you know, and I'm not saying this is the cheap alternative, but wouldn't you want to buy the very, very best tire for your car and wouldn't that be the thing that the California Energy Commission would want PG&E to do because we're going to have this nuclear

waste for we don't know how long?

DR. COCHRAN: We do advocate and prioritize safety protection of the environment and protection of the public. That is our core mission and our goal. Let me just this. The sun is starting to come through my window. I can't really place an opinion because I'm not here to discuss my opinions. I'm here to discuss the information that was reviewed by the agency and met the scientific and technical and regulatory standards. So I can't conjecture on an opinion. What I can say is that the proposal process was constrained by a lot of factors, right? We had the time window that we had to meet, right? So that limits what cask could come on the market because they had to have already met a certain level of NRC processes to be deployed within the time window we were targeting. So it's not like we can wait for an entity to design a whole new system and bring it to market and deploy it in a time window that met the requirement.

So the limitations were defined by the goals and objectives we were trying to achieve and it is our technical assessment that the proposal process did at its core meet the safety requirements and advocate and prioritize safety over other factors.

MS. SEELEY: Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Linda. Thank you, Justin. I'm going to press us on. We have two other questions on this topic and we should try to keep those focused. We'd appreciate it. Scott and Patrick.

MR. LATHROP: Thanks. This is probably just a general question for Philippe, just for the new panel members and probably the public that's listening in. I think it's important to understand that I think with the whole issue of new canisters or going out for proposals, the idea of trying to accommodate the shortness of time that we have in the pool and bringing items out hotter, meaning it's requiring a new design on that canister that will go into the existing site. So I just thought maybe, Philippe, you can kind of clarify that for the general public that the main reason for doing the proposal or having a new canister is to design something that will fit on the existing site. So maybe you can talk to that a little bit.

MR. SOENEN: Yeah, Scott. So thank you for pointing that out. For general awareness, we do have the restrictions of that the spent nuclear fuel has to be stored within the current storage facilities. So within that area. Also, in comparison, as I mentioned slightly or tangentially on our current system, we required cooling time before it can be transferred from

wet to dry storage. Our current system is ten years approximately. So we're asking for something that accelerates or shortens that cooling time, wet cooling time, down to no greater than four years. It's a significant increase in capability that a new system has to have versus what the current one has. So we need to have -- maintain the safety margins, a system that can handle the heat loads and heat loads are significantly higher because of the shorter cooling time.

MR. LATHROP: That sits on the current site?

MR. SOENEN: Yes, it sits on the current site.

MR. LATHROP: Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Okay. Thank you, Scott and Philippe.

Patrick, quick question and, Sherri, if you've got a quick question, we can go ahead with that, then we need to move on.

MR. LEMIEUX: Yeah. My question is relatively quick here. It's about the last deck of these new caskets. My understanding is that the current ones don't have in situ monitoring of, for example, the temperature and pressure inside the casket, and I haven't seen the details of the new RFP, but are there plans for these new caskets that we're getting to provide that kind of real-time monitoring so that

somebody doesn't have to go there with a probe and check the temperature of each casket, that we can actually, you know, maybe we could all look at it on the Internet if we wanted to so we're constantly monitoring these caskets?

MR. SOENEN: So I'll take a shot at that one. So I can't go into the details of the contents of the request for proposal because this is confidential, but what's -- what I did mention as far as the monitoring of heat or radiation, so we will be looking at -- as we mentioned, we are going to be requesting the funding for implementation of a radiation monitoring system and that's really where you drive toward the capability of identifying something as unexpected as ongoing is the concern through increase in radiation. The fuel continues to cool. You expect decay of radiation to occur throughout the same thing. So any increase in radiation will be indication of something not going as expected. Our current system does not have thermal monitoring because of the way that it's licensed and designed. There are other challenges with having those types of monitoring systems. So we do have monitoring making sure that the vent pads are clear. So every day they are walked down and made sure that the flow paths for the convective cooling is clear, but, yeah, there's

no active monitoring now, but as we state, we will be looking for doing the real-time monitoring and that's how we would capture the capability of monitoring both old or current system if and when we implement a new system.

MR. ANDERS: Okay. Thank you, Philippe. Thank you, Patrick.

Sherri, you had your hand up? You need to unmute your mic, please.

MS. DANOFF: Thank you. Yes, I have a question for Philippe and also Justin.

Philippe, we're going to have superior storage units for future spent fuel storage. Is there any consideration of using those also for the existing ones, to replace the existing ones?

MR. SOENEN: So there is no plan to, I would say, retroactively go and change out the systems. The systems are there, they are safe, they meet all the requirements. Essentially, we're looking for capability to shorten that life -- excuse me -- decay time or cooling time needed to transition. So, no, we aren't planning -- they meet the requirements, they will be meeting their safety requirements going forward and there's risk involved, obviously, with trying to do transitions to another system. So that type of a risk

would not be appropriate, safe. We're just having a different objective with the new system.

MS. DANOFF: Thank you.

And then, Justin, are you satisfied with NRC requirements for storage safety?

DR. COCHRAN: I'll be honest that has been a contentious issue between the NRC and state. The states have historically always had the perspective that the NRC requirements could be increased and that the NRC could better take into perspective each state's situation. For example, California has higher requirements with regards to the decommissioning and trust fund than the NRC does and many states have passed regulations to require their plant to help defer more money into their decommissioning trust fund than the NRC mandatory minimum. So does that answer your question?

MS. DANOFF: It does in part. Any -- any concerns about the technical requirements in terms of canisters and casks?

DR. COCHRAN: Honestly, the NRC staff on the technical side are pretty good. I've always found their technical staff to be very professional, very knowledgeable and prioritize key issues over say more of the political side of the house. So I don't have significant concerns on the technical aspects of NRC

processes or reviews.

And, I mean, I just want to point out a key factor of, you know, if you ever read the Fukushima report and you look at the section about what happened to the cooling pools and what happened to their storage facility, there's chapters of the damage that the cooling pool absorbed and all the risks and factors that came into that, then there's one little section on the cask facility where had to remove debris, had to clean out some mud, had to wash the canisters, had to inspect for damage and that was it.

So it is our opinion that all of the NRC-approved dry storage facilities offer superior protection and long-term storage capability than any of the cooling pool systems. I'm not saying the cooling pool systems are not safe. It's just dry storage is a better solution for long-term storage.

MS. DANOFF: Thank you very much.

DR. COCHRAN: You're welcome.

MS. SEELEY: This is Linda and I'd like to make one comment, which is that at Fukushima, those dry casks that they had that survived the earthquake and tsunami were the kind that were made of thick -- not stainless steel, but cast iron and those -- those lived through that process without leaking and they are still there

and the kind of spent fuel casks that we have at Diablo Canyon are a half-inch-thick stainless steel canister that is put inside a two-foot thick concrete casing. It's an absolutely different design and my personal concern is that there is -- that the new spent fuel system is going to be too much like the old spent fuel system in this highly earthquake-prone environment and that if PG&E has this incredible opportunity at this moment right now in history to be able to put in a kind of spent fuel cask, dry cask that would be comparable to the one at -- the ones at Fukushima that survived, that they would be doing right by our community and by California and by the whole nation because we could set an example for this country and so that's my biggest concern here tonight with this spent fuel system. That's all.

ZEEK: Chuck, you're not -- you're muted.

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

Let's go on to the next agenda item with regard to spent fuel and I just was advised by the AGP and meeting administrator that for whatever reason, the chat feature is not working on the meeting right now and so I really want to apologize to the public and to the participants because we were hoping to have real-time chat input from the attendees. I do want to

recognize -- remind the attendees that there's a public comment period at the end. So there will be an opportunity at the end to provide public comment at around 8:20 tonight and so hopefully you will have the opportunity to offer your comments or questions at that time. So I think this is a technical glitch that we didn't anticipate, but we'll make sure it doesn't happen in the future.

So with that, our next item is the ISFSI, license renewal process. And, Philippe, are you going to handle this portion, also?

MR. SOENEN: That's correct.

MR. ANDERS: All right. Go ahead.

MR. SOENEN: So on the Diablo Canyon independent spent fuel storage installation, ISFSI most likely referred to it, the licensing activities are ongoing for that.

So next slide. Some overview items, we have a site-specific Part 72 license for our ISFSI that was issued in March of 2004. The initial licensing period was for 20 years. So it will expire in March of 2024. The license includes the Holtec HI-STORM 100 system. We have a site-specific anchored system that makes it unique for our site and elicits some other items there that are under license specific to us. So we've

completed seven loading campaigns and loaded 58 canisters and casks up at the ISFSI, 32 fuel assemblies per canister. So the total fuel assembly is listed on the slide there.

Next slide. So part of the regulation for renewing a license under Part 72 for site-specific is the regulation was modified to allow 40 years of license period. So when you go for a license renewal, we're going to be asking for a 40-year extension to that and a site-specific license is required to be submitted two years prior to its expiration. So we are required to submit that by March of 2022 and we are on track for making sure to do that. We have had a public meeting with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission presubmittal meeting that was held in January of this year and we discussed the general layout of our application that we're planning and also our preapplication inspection activities it will be going through.

Next slide. So on the license activities, there are also permitting activities associated with ISFSIs. So for our ISFSI, they were fully permitted and mitigated in perpetuity with both the state and local agencies. So the California Coastal Commission and the San Luis Obispo County. Because of the location of our ISFSI, it is in the coastal zone. So the Coastal Zone

Management Act is applicable to this and I'll cover on the next slide. We'll go there. Next slide, please.

So part of that is we have consulted with the California Coastal Commission, and similar to what we did with Humboldt, we are planning to submit a letter for the Coastal -- or certification for the Coastal Zone Management Act and the Coastal Commission stated that that would be fine. Same process that was done for Humboldt Bay and a copy of the letter received back from the Coastal Commission stating that the Coastal Zone Management Act for Humboldt was satisfied. We're planning to do the same for Diablo Canyon. Next slide.

So part of the process where we are, in purple, these are Nuclear Regulatory Commission activities that occurred. So the Nuclear Regulatory Commission developed guidance documents for ISFSI license renewal. During that process of the development, those guidance documents, there were opportunities for public comments. Those comments were received, evaluated and resolved. Then in the middle portion here, the yellow activities for PG&E, we received input from the panel on license renewal and what to consider for aging management of our canisters and casks. So that's been taken into consideration as we're developing our license renewal application. We had the preapplication meeting, which

was public, and there was opportunity for public comments, and then as you can see, we have the red arrow there. We are preparing to do our preapplication inspections at the ISFSI for license renewal and I'll go into more detail on that and then we'll be updating license renewal application with the results of those -- with those inspection results and then we'll be submitting prior to March of 2022. We are targeting fourth quarter of this year for that application going in. Then it goes into the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for review and, again, it's the license activities. So there is opportunity for public comment and participation in that and then we are expecting the review process to take two to three years for the application with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, then as I mentioned, in blue top there in dark blue, there is a Coastal Commission portion for this Coastal Zone Management Act and that will be in parallel with the NRC review. Next slide.

So an overview of license renewal application for the ISFSI. So we do evaluate every component of the system, we determine which aging effects are applicable for the material and environment that that material sees and then we follow the Regulatory Commission's guidance documents for recommendation of the aging management

program, then those programs are recommended for frequency and scope to make sure that we're identifying any degradation aging related prior to any loss of intended function. I want to be clear with some of these inspections, what they are set up per the guidance documents to be looking for the leading components. So we don't want to inspect everything for these aging management programs, but we are looking at the leading components, so the items that are most susceptible to identify that aging degradation, then we would place any items that don't meet acceptance criteria within our corrective action program for evaluation and correction as part of the process for license renewal and then we also take into consideration the environmental effects of the four years additional of operations. Next slide.

So these preapplication inspections, the intent of those is they are a recommendation by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The purpose is to demonstrate that we don't have anything unique as far as material and environment combination at our site and that our guidance documents are binding and applicable to the site at Diablo Canyon that provides the confidence that the proposal for aging management programs is adequate for identifying aging-related degradation prior to loss of intended functions.

Part of our process, too, we have established a -- an advisory board with independent nuclear experts to make sure that we're -- they can challenge us for our vendor assumptions, making sure we have a robust and accurate license renewal application going in. We also have invited independent nuclear experts. We've notified the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the resident inspectors and also the region of the activities that we're going to be performing for these inspections, invited them to come in and observe, along with the California Energy Commission and the Diablo Canyon Independent Safety Committee to observe these inspections that we have ongoing.

I'd like to take this opportunity to invite the Engagement Panel members to observe these inspections, as well. There's inspections going on in June and in September. So I'm inviting the panel for those activities. Next slide, please.

So part of the preapplication inspection, we look at the scope considerations and we look specifically at the material types. We do have three different types of materials, stainless steels that our canisters are built out of. We've implemented design changes for more scratch, corrosion, cracking-resistant materials. So we are going to be looking at all three

material types that are in service currently. Looking at heat loads, the lower the heat loads, the more susceptible it is to scratch, corrosion, cracking. So that is a parameter we're looking at. In the amount of time that the canisters and casks have been out on the pad, so more opportunity for aging-related degradation. Burn-up, we don't believe -- that's just an aspect to make sure we've bounded everything, that there's nothing shown different between high burn-up versus moderate burn-up fuel being stored there and take into consideration any manufacturing defects or deviations that have been repaired or -- repaired before they were implemented, making sure there's nothing as far as that's out there that would have an impact to the susceptibility for the canister and we will be looking at the two canisters that were previously inspected through the EPRI activities. So for trending information, we'll look at those two that were previously looked at, and we'll go to the next slide.

So I won't go into details here. This slide will be available for individuals, but we've selected eight canisters and overpacks that we'll be looking at through these inspections, and in the table here, it's showing the wide range of heat loads that we considered, the years that they've been out in service, and then the

material types. As I mentioned, there's three different certificates of materials that are being considered from 304, 304-L and 316, increasing in scratch, corrosion and cracking resistance to those activities. And that's just for awareness and I believe that's -- that's what I have for the license renewal aspect.

MR. ANDERS: Great. Thank you, Philippe. We have one question, one hand up. So let's take one question and then move on, and if you have any additional questions, we can address those at the end of this segment so we have adequate time for the next topic. Kara, go ahead.

MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you. Thanks, Philippe. I had a couple questions about your presentation. You mentioned that when PG&E received their permits to build the ISFSI, that those permits issued by the Coastal Commission and SLO County were deemed to be in perpetuity, not only that, but the mitigation that went along with that. I'm just wondering, is that also the view of SLO County and the Coastal Commission or is that just PG&E's view?

MR. SOENEN: You're asking my view for the county?

MS. WOODRUFF: Well, you had said that the permit conditions were in perpetuity and I didn't know

if that was something that everybody had agreed to, all three parties, or if that's just PG&E's interpretation of the permits.

MR. SOENEN: The permits stay specifically in perpetuity. Tom can chime in, too, if I misspoke there.

MR. JONES: It's that clear.

MS. WOODRUFF: When they entered into those permits, was there an assumption at that time that the casks would only be there X number of years when we had the different expectation of where they could be sent beyond Diablo Canyon, like to a consolidated storage facility for long-term or did we not know then either?

MR. JONES: I'll take that question. This is Tom Jones. At the time, this is in the early 2000s when we started planning for this in the late 1990s, which even predates my employment with the company, we -- the interim storage wasn't even an option or discussed in the United States. At the time, the law of the land is that there shall be a national repository. So while it's mitigated in perpetuity and there's finite licensing periods, our ultimate goal is still to put the fuel where it belongs in a national repository for long-term and permanent storage.

MS. WOODRUFF: So at that time when they entered the permits, was there an expectation that the

waste would end up in the Yucca Mountain?

I guess what I'm trying to get at is when they said the licenses were issued in perpetuity, did they realize at that time how long these casks would end up being stored on site?

MR. JONES: Yes. And the reason is it was already over a decade late for the National Policy Act and the reason we were developing the ISFSI entirely was because there was no repository on the horizon. Remember, this is an interim storage facility. So there was also ample discussion about what the federal government deliver on its promise and follow the law or not, but in the meantime, we have the stewardship and the responsibility to safely manage the fuel. That's why we constructed the dry cask storage facility.

MS. WOODRUFF: Okay. Thank you. And then I guess the next question is, for the last couple years, we had assumed that the greater than Class C waste would also be put at the ISFSI and it looks like there's been a change in plans there and now there's a separate facility being anticipated to store that waste, which is also highly toxic. Can you comment on what the reason behind that change was?

MR. SOENEN: Yes. So part of it is for our current license and the permitting for the ISFSI is

specifically for spent fuel. Also, we have low level RAD waste facilities currently back further for our steam generator replacements -- excuse me -- our old steam generators and our reactor heads are stored there. So we're building a greater than Class C waste facility in that same area where we have the other low level RAD waste up in that area, and then for decommissioning, that allows for a reduction in the owner-controlled area to be more limiting in that area.

MS. WOODRUFF: So I guess I'm still kind of confused. So what made you decide to not put the greater than Class C waste at the ISFSI? Because I realize there was a space consideration, that you're aware of then, but something changed. So what was the change, do you think?

MR. SOENEN: Part is for allowing the acceleration in or reduction in offloads. You want to have as much space available for your fuel on the current ISFSI site. So that is more limiting. When we went into 2018, we were looking for a seven-year cooling time, and with the proposed settlement agreement, we went into a four-year. So it did have a significant impact on storage space.

MS. WOODRUFF: Okay. Thanks. And then you also mentioned that panel members might be invited to

attend the inspections either in June or the fall and I think I'd be interested in attending. I think a lot of us would be. So thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Kara.

Bill, quick answer and answer.

MR. ALMAS: Actually, Kara asked. It was regarding the greater than Class C. I don't see -- I probably missed it in my reading, but I don't see it in the project description and to the county for the EIR. It's probably there, but I didn't -- I didn't catch it the first time through, and then I'm unclear on permitting through NRC for that particular item. So Kara has asked that question and so I guess I'm -- there's more to be said about that, but I'm satisfied for now.

MR. ANDERS: Great. Thank you very much, and thank you, Philippe, for your presentation.

Our next and last topic on spent nuclear fuel update is the interim storage activities and we're very fortunate to have Rodney McCullum with the Nuclear Energy Institute here to give us an update on the status of interim storage activities in the U.S. So, Rodney, please go ahead.

MR. MCCULLUM: Thank you, Chuck. Can everybody hear me and see me out there?

MR. ANDERS: Yep.

MR. MCCULLUM: Okay. Good. I realize my time is already gone. I have a number of slides here. I will pass them on to you for your information. I will be able to entertain questions or also any follow-up you'd like to do at any time in your deliberations. I'm very honored to be in front of this panel. I really respect what you put on that plaque about future generations. I work for the Nuclear Energy Institute. We are the trade association of the nuclear energy industry. PG&E is a member company. I'm a nuclear engineer for 35 years' experience, last 22 working on spent fuel for the Nuclear Energy Institute. What I'm here to talk about are opportunities to move the fuel off the Diablo Canyon site to consolidated interim storage in advance of a permanent repository. As you're all aware, the permanent repository program installed and it may take a while to get there, but I would not give up hope for near-term movement. And, again, I'm not going to go through all of these slides, but I think it is important to know that the secretary of energy has committed to the development of a consent-based interim storage facility and I think that's particularly important in light of this administration's commitment to decarbonization which includes support for nuclear

energy. The administration just released a funding announcement for advanced technology, used fuel for nuclear energy. That's quite remarkable for a democratic administration to be in that space. So I think against that backdrop, this administration will really move on the interim storage things that have in play the whole time.

Going back to the Obama administration, there was a Blue Ribbon Commission that looked at this. They recommended a consent-based interim storage facility. If you're not familiar with the Blue Ribbon Commission recommendation, it will be the playbook for at least the next three and a half years. What is consent-based? Well, it's not one size fits all. It's something we're currently defining at a couple facilities. So I believe there are near-term opportunities to move the fuel off site, which is why the transportability of these systems is so important. They talk about adaptive and phased managements. This is something the scientific community is focused on. You make decisions as you go along and you change things as you go along. So we go to interim storage while we work our way through the adaptive-based process of getting to a repository.

Why consolidated interim storage? It's the most efficient means of managing the inventory. We've

talked about aging management. Philippe just talked about that. A lot of infrastructure's going into this first at Diablo. If you centralize all of the infrastructure common location, a location in a site where the degradation mechanisms are less likely to occur and where you can have all the security in one place. Tremendous efficiency. You're creating economic opportunity in your community by getting the fuel out of there, you're creating economic opportunity in the receiving facility by bringing in highly sophisticated interim storage facility to play with a lot of technology, a lot of infrastructure, a lot of investment, a lot of jobs. These systems have been licensed for 40 years. The NRC has and it's continued storage rule-making. They said they're good for at least 100. So this gives us plenty of time to work our way through the long, delayed repository conundrum.

As you can see, we're currently storing this at 73 sites. We've loaded over 3,000 of these systems. I heard talk about the best available systems. Well, this is a highly competitive industry. There's four supplier companies vying for that RFP, or maybe not that one, but vying for the market and they have innovated with a lot of technology over the 30 or so years we've been doing this because, you know, it's the competition that's

driven the innovation. So if you're looking for the best available, there's plenty to choose from out there. I will say that, you know, you should be looking at more parameters than the thickness of the casks at Fukushima. They were designed to exactly the same standards as every one of these systems you see on this map here. Yes, you know, stainless steel half-inch or five-eighths inch thick stainless, that's a lot for stainless steel. Think about your refrigerator, think about your DeLorean. I'd much rather have that much stainless steel particularly inside all that concrete particularly with the structures. I'll have a slide on the defense in depth in a minute here. You're just getting different engineering challenges if you go thicker, transportability, inspectability, structural challenges. So you're always meeting the same standards. The reason we've gravitated to these stainless steel inside concrete Silo systems is because they are the most effective way to protect. It's been a competitive marketplace that's gotten us there.

We talked about aging management already. Tremendous infrastructure here. You see we've got robotic inspection technology. Really, the inspection and the repair plan that was approved by the California Coastal Commission down in San Onofre is the state of

the art. It's the gold standard for this. When you see a cask here that's in the north site on Dominion in Virginia and that one is taking data, real-time data on the fuel inside. That one is being used as a surrogate for the entire industry so we can refine our models so that we can have precise understanding what's going inside these casks. This is the second experiment we've done to look at this.

Again, looking at the decommission sites, all of these dots on the map are going to be in the same boat as Diablo. Do we want to develop this aging management infrastructure, the security infrastructure, the repair infrastructure, do we want to develop that at all these sites or do we want to develop it in a few consolidated sites? The industry very strongly believes that you consolidate sites. We have two of them underway. One, the Holtec Eddy-Lea Alliance project in Southeast New Mexico, the other, the interim storage project non-existing low level waste site in Andrews, Texas. Both projects have license applications under NRC review with decisions expected this year. Interim storage partners may be within months. Holtec Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance, they have had additional questions for the NRC. They could still come in this year, but both near term. They're both part of integrated decommission

business models, meaning these companies are also purchasing decommission sites with intent to move the fuel because they get reimbursed by DOE because the government's acceptance because they have the decommission trust funds. These companies are heavily incentivized to move the fuel off the decommission sites they own. So while Diablo may not be one of the sites that gets transitioned to these sorts of companies, the business incentive to develop these sites is strong. They both have work to do to earn consent in these communities. Again, I gave you some background in consents in places to look for more so you can develop your own informed opinion whether you think this will work. They both had legislative efforts in the state legislatures to negatively impact them. Both bills stalled in committee. They've got some work to do before their next legislative sessions. That will be an interesting thing to see. They get their license this year. Do they have some mode of consent before they get to the next legislative session? You'll know that. There was a site license in Utah. It was blocked by the Department of Interior in a political action spurred by state opposition and, frankly, the business cases you have for these facilities in terms of the integrated models didn't exist at that time in Utah. Could that

facility be back in play? I simply don't know, but I'll simply say that is out there and DOE could pursue additional options. You might find out more about that tomorrow. The Department of Energy should release its budget tomorrow and the secretary of energy did say in that confirmation hearing that there would be forthcomings and DPLs on what she intends to do with consolidated interim storage. I would encourage this panel to follow that closely, as well as these two private projects.

Transportation, that's again when you're choosing the system, the transportability is the key consideration. There's a strong record here. People tend to think because we don't have that ultimate destination, we haven't been moving it and, therefore, moving it is something new and maybe scary. Nothing can be further from the truth. Here's the types of conveyances we use and here's some information on the strong record we have, both in the United States and overseas because countries that reprocess and a number of countries already have consolidated interim storage. So this stuff is on the roads and on the rails routinely. As far as hazardous cargo goes, it's some of the best understood and best managed out there. A lot of defense in depth in these systems. You can talk

about the number of inches or less than an inch stainless steel or you can look at the whole system and, again, that's a lot of stainless steel and there's a number of things. I won't belabor this, but I'd be happy to discuss it if the panel wants to further. You can also google the Holtec missile test and you'll see that a missile was fired into one of these. You'll notice not the concrete, just the cask and there was no loss of integrity after a 600-mile-an-hour missile.

What are we waiting for? We're doing interim storage because we don't have a repository program in the United States currently. Other countries have made progress on this adaptive phased approach. Finland is licensed and under construction, France is going into a pilot phase with collaboration from the host region, Switzerland and Canada are narrowing sites and Sweden is slowly working its way through the licensing process. They've all been consent-based and you can see a number of them have consolidated interim storage while they're waiting.

In conclusion, I think that this issue is going to be an important part of how we decarbonize the U.S. economy. I don't think this administration will move forward with nuclear without action on this issue and I

do believe they will absolutely move forward with nuclear. They've already put their money where their mouth is there.

So I think this is a good near-term solution and we could start to see options here. We saw Philippe's time frame for loading the cask. It could very well be. I'm being a little optimistic, but you look at his time frame and you look at the time frame consolidated storage is on and they may not be here for that long of a time. You know, at least that's my goal. That's what NEI is working towards and a lot of us are working towards. I would hope to engage with you again in the future and report further progress on the interim storage.

So with that, I'll open myself up to questions. I hope I haven't gotten us too far behind schedule.

MR. JONES: That's okay, Rod. Appreciate that. This is Tom Jones. Chuck just got dropped off. So we're going to rejoin him. I'm going to be an interim facilitator, and after this topic, we'll head to our break. So we do have a couple moments for questions from the panel and I'll ask AGP to let us know whose hands up and we'll go from there. Questions for Rodney.

ZEEK: So you want to know whose hands are up in the panel?

MR. JONES: That would be great.

ZEEK: Okay. Bill is up.

MR. JONES: Bill, you have the floor.

MR. ALMAS: Okay. This is a question for Rodney. It all gets down to risk, right? So -- or not all, but most of it is. Is the Regulatory Commission or some regulatory body -- will there be a risk assessment performed that looks at the comparative risk of storing the spent fuel on site versus the extra shipping that -- I mean, there's an extra leg that takes place to go to the interim storage facility. The interim storage facility has a lot of attraction; however, it's all in the -- it's all the risk. I mean, you have to just run through those numbers, and from what you're saying, transport is so minimal that that risk assessment will come out favorable, but can you address that, Rodney?

MR. MCCULLUM: Yeah. And that has been addressed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in a number of ways. In the continued storage rulemaking, there was environmental impact statement that looked at the scenarios of consolidated interim storage, 100-year storage and indefinite storage on existing sites. It identified those risks and found it acceptable that NRC has done a number of specific transportation risk assessments. They have a brochure that I can get to

this panel that indexes all of those, a number of sophisticated analyses, and as you said, the transportation risk is small, but most importantly, there are environmental impact statements on both of the consolidated interim storage facilities. Those compare the no action alternative, which would be leaving it a year site and those other sites I showed to moving it to the consolidated interim storage. They show the risks and the costs of moving it to the consolidated interim storage to be less than those of the no action alternative. They recommend that the consolidated interim storage or in draft they do. If that's the way it comes out in final, they will get a license, but the NRC is going three ways, in the continued storage rulemaking, the specific transportation risk studies, which there are a number of those, and in the site-specific environmental impact statements for the two consolidated interim storage, as well as for the PFS facility that was licensed.

So there's a lot of information out there. I'd encourage this panel to, you know, take their own look at it, take a deep dive if you want to because there's plenty of information to get to your question.

MR. ANDERS: This is Chuck Anders. I am back. I don't know what happened. I got knocked off. We

have -- and thank you, Tom, for stepping in.

We have Scott, Linda and Kara, but before we get to those questions, I'm wondering -- we've asked Dr. Lam to be available for questions, also, and I'm wondering, Dr. Lam, if you have any comments or observations with regard to interim storage before we move on with the questions. We do have a very limited amount of time for this segment. We are over time, but this is an important topic. So go ahead, Dr. Lam.

DR. LAM: Yes, indeed. I think Mr. McCollum presented to you an exceptionally insightful and informative presentation where the current status is. I happen to be the fellow judge on the NRC bench that adjudicates existing Diablo Canyon independent storage facility. I wrote the consensus technical opinion for approval on the Diablo Canyon independent storage and I also happen to sit on the licensing board that adjudicates the private fuel storage way back 10, 15 years ago for eight long years. Okay? So what you had heard is exactly on the proponent's viewpoint. You know, you now are well-informed about all the advantageous issues that one could possibly think of.

The only comment I have is in our business, the process is the punishment. In licensing, the environmental impact statement developed by the fellow

agency co-NRC staff will be extensively litigated and then there will be a period of admissible contentions to be examined and litigated. Everything is formal. It's a formal adjudicated process. So I think what you had heard is a very, very detailed proponents I would say of technical well in the form positions. They are very technical in form, but as I say, since I know a little bit about the licensing process, I would say let us wait and see if the five-year schedule as expected by NEI is realizable and my reaction is it's probably a little bit on the optimistic side, right, because in the state of Utah, Governor Huntsman made a statement that -- let me quote him. Governor Huntsman of the state of Utah was a strenuous and capable opponent to the spent fuel storage. So he made a political statement saying only over his dead body would he allow a centralized spent fuel storage on the Indian reservation owned by the Goshute Tribe called Skull Valley and the licensing board voted two to one for approval, and as you well said, Mr. McCullum, a license was granted, but the facility was not built, but there was a long story why it wasn't built.

MR. MCCULLUM: Yeah. Those are all very fair point and I'll admit I'm giving an optimistic scenario, but I just think the energy aboard on this one can give

impetus to these scenarios and I will point out that litigation is well underway and almost complete. I believe there's only one late-filed contention appeal still alive in the ISP process. So those processes are moving a little bit faster.

MR. LAM: Time has changed. It's been a good 20 years. As you indicated, a lot of advances has been made.

MR. MCCULLUM: Yeah. NRC has done a very good job with these two and is doing a good job. We look forward to the conclusion of these processes.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, very much, Dr. Lam and Rodney.

We are over our allotted time for this segment. So I'm going to ask, unless somebody has a burning question they have to ask, that we move on.

I just realized that, Rodney, it's quite late on the East Coast right now. So you're staying up quite late.

MR. MCCULLUM: I've got my energy drink here. So I'm ready for it.

MS. WOODRUFF: I have a burning question and now Rodney is leaving because I know this is something people ask a lot about.

In theory, consolidated interim storage seems

like a great idea, particularly for Diablo Canyon waste because we're right next to the coastline and we're on top of earthquake fault. So I think generally there's a consensus that getting it off site is a really good idea, but the argument that I'm hearing against it is that the sites that have been selected in New Mexico and Texas are very unfair from an environmental justice perspective and that they're being placed in communities that are disadvantaged lower income, have less political power to stop such a facility from being built.

So I was wondering if you could specifically address whether those claims of environmental justice are accurate or not and really make the case that the environmental justice isn't a concern because that's what I keep hearing as a reason why consolidated storage is a bad idea, at least the way it's currently being contemplated.

MR. MCCULLUM: NEI is a very strong believer in environmental justice and we would not want to see the sites developed in environmentally unjust ways and where you get there is how those organizations become part of that community, how that community interacts with them. If you're simply providing economic opportunity and take something dangerous, well, yeah, that's environmental injustice, but if you're giving the communities and the

states opportunities to oversee the facilities, to be involved as partners, and that's what will have to be negotiated between now and the next session, is those two state legislatures. They will not be politically powerless. This will be decided in the state legislatures in Texas and New Mexico and we look forward to a solution that fully comports with environmental justice principles. That's our stand at NEI, and whether or not they can get there, that's -- time will tell.

MR. LAM: And the issue is a little bit more new ones, you know. The devil is -- it's in the details. We did the private fuel storage eight long years of litigation. The tribal leader insisted that this is environmental justice because if you go down to the Goshute tribal land, they are really in a very difficult economic situation. So they had taken the view, as Mr. McCullum has said, the technology is safe, the tremendous economic benefits. So the tribal leader was a proponent of the facility to be in store in the tribal sovereign nations land, but the state of the Utah was adamant that this was within the state's territorial boundary. So they would not permit and allow a central national storage facility within the state boundary. So how would you weigh and balance the two sides' different

viewpoints? Ultimately, one would need to make a determination as to if you store a huge number of spent fuel with tremendous inventory, are you able and willing to safeguard that material for a long, long time? I mean, that is a societal question that everybody would be struggling with. It's not as simple as, well, you know, we have to make every tribal member a millionaire or we are now having a tremendous amount of radioactive material, some of them at half life as long as 250,000 years. How would you weigh and balance that process?

You know, to address one of your earlier questions about seismic safety, I wrote a consensus technical opinion to approve the current Diablo Canyon storage because on first principle, the casks are relatively safe during a seismic event. On first principle, first I make the licensee, which is PG&E, to demonstrate during an earthquake the cask will not fall over. If I am wrong and if they are wrong, I make them to demonstrate once it falls over, it will not crack open. Thirdly, let's say everybody's wrong there, I make them to demonstrate the third level, one level the off-site boundary would not exceed the NRC licensing limit and then there's a fourth level of safety margins that I insist on before I approve the facility is demonstrate to my satisfaction the need for the earth

opens up, the cask is buried, then it will not thermally become unstable and releases radioactive material. After this four-level safety demonstration, then I approve the Diablo Canyon dry cask independent safety storage facility license for 20 years, but, therefore, therefore, that in my mind would answer one particular safety issue that's paramount in everybody's mind 20 years ago within the San Luis Obispo communities.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Dr. Lam and Mr. McCullum.

Linda, do you have any closing comments on this topic? And for anyone that has any remaining questions, we'll follow up with those questions and get them back to the panel. Go ahead, Linda.

MS. SEELEY: Okay. I'm a little bit confused here.

MR. ANDERS: We're way over time on this segment. So it's time to close this topic out so we don't shortcut the others and we promised the public that we would conclude at a reasonable time. So if you have any closing comments on this topic and we'll take our break and go on to the next topic.

MS. SEELEY: I do. First of all, I would like -- I, unfortunately, never got the opportunity to introduce Dr. Lam, who is the chair of our -- of the

Diablo Canyon Independent Safety Committee and he -- their next meeting is June 23rd and 24th in Avila Beach, I'm sure, and so I would encourage the panel members to attend that meeting and we'll get the information out to the panel members about how to attend that. This meeting illustrates to me how important it is to -- that we have a follow-up workshop because we haven't even asked -- we have 11 questions for Dr. Lam and we did not ask one of him of the prepared questions that we have this evening and I feel very sad about that because they're terrific questions.

So -- and, Dr. Lam, I hope that you would come to our workshop and answer the questions. These questions aren't going to last forever. So I hope we can have that workshop in the very near future and I want to thank everybody else for coming to help us understand this incredibly complex problem that we're facing and I'm so appreciative, Chuck, that we had this little bit of time that we had tonight. So I'll sign off from there.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Linda and thank you to all our presenters on this topic.

Let's take a five-minute break. It is 5:37[sic] right now. So let's get back together at 7:42. So we'll reconvene at 7:42.

(Recess.)

MR. ANDERS: Welcome back, everyone. I want to remind the meeting attendees that while we don't have the chat feature tonight, you do have the opportunity to submit public comments on the panel's website. That is DiabloCanyonPanel.Org, and if you go to the menu item get involved, you'll see a dropdown menu that says submit comments. Just fill out that form and your comments or your observations, suggestions will become part of the public record for the panel.

So let's move on to our next agenda item, and that is the coastal development permit and the CEQA process. PG&E recently submitted a coastal development permit for the decommissioning process and Trevor Keith, who is director of the planning and building department with SLO County, is also a panel member and an ex officio panel member and Trevor -- I've asked Trevor to introduce this topic.

So, Trevor, why don't you go ahead and I think we can bring up the slide presentation, also, and go to the next slide. There we go. Trevor, I think you've got to take your mic off mute.

Okay. Zeek, we're having a technical problem.

ZEEK: It looks like Trevor is having technical issues. His mic is unmuted in the panelist list, but

he's not talking.

MR. ANDERS: Okay. Well, let's -- let's be flexible here and Trevor is hopefully going to work out his issues and the first item on this agenda topic is an overview of the PG&E coastal development permit application package and Tom Jones is going to present that information. So why don't we go ahead with that presentation and then come back. Hopefully Trevor will be -- oh, are you back, Trevor?

MR. KEITH: Yes. Can you hear me now, Chuck?

MR. ANDERS: Yes, we can. Great. Go ahead.

MR. KEITH: All right. Sorry about that. Thanks so much for having us back, panel members. Nice to meet the new folks on the panel. Before I begin, I just want to give a thanks from the county. I think Mr. Guy Savage is still on as assistant CIO. I just want to say thanks for all your work with the decommissioning on behalf of the county in working with PG&E and the rest of the staff here at the county. We will miss you as you go into retirement next month. I just want to say thank you so much.

MR. SAVAGE: Thanks, Trevor. I appreciate it.

MR. KEITH: Yeah. Thanks, Guy. We're going to miss you, man.

So I'll transition now. So introducing Tom

Jones from PG&E. So as Chuck said, PG&E has submitted their application. So we appreciate coming in at this point to kind of talk about the process since they've submitted the application, kind of from PG&E's side, working through kind of the content and then Susan Strachan from SLO County team, the project lead, she will kind of go through our process as the lead agency.

So with that, Tom, I think if we can get the next slide and have you jump in.

MR. JONES: Thanks. And, Zeek, we can go to the next slide, as well.

So we talked about this project and the component to it. There's three main drivers. There's licensing through the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, there's permitting through the County of San Luis Obispo and California Coastal Commission and then there's also the funding from the Public Utilities Commission. What this map shows here is the different jurisdictions of the site.

So the red outline in the boundary is the project site with additional locations of potentially in Pismo Beach and Santa Maria and that red outline is our 750-acre, roughly, Part 50 license with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. So that striping you see in that image, that's the exclusive jurisdiction for the Nuclear

Regulatory Commission for the health and safety of the public related to radiological items.

The yellow line that bifurcates it in the upper third of that polygon, that's the coastal zone. So everything you see to the north and east or to the upper right or northwest -- east -- excuse me. The -- that's the exclusive jurisdiction of the County of San Luis Obispo.

The green area is the area that is overseen first by the County of San Luis Obispo through their local coastal program and then is subject to appeal to the California Coastal Commission.

And then, lastly, there's a little area in the marina. You can see there's some striping over the water. That area is called original jurisdiction and anything from that meeting high tideline out is only subject to the approval of the California Coastal Commission. The county had a meeting at Diablo Canyon, along with the California Coastal Commission and California State Lands Commission agreed to enter an MOU where they developed the request for proposal for the consultant together and had comment and that they'll work together through the development of the environmental impact report process so that that document will support the different jurisdictional needs

when we go through approval. We can go to the next slide, please.

So here's a simplified chart we've shared with the public and our Engagement Panel for these swim lanes, these multiple concurrent regulatory paths that we're pursuing to have all of our discretionary approvals in hand by 2024 and this is for the coastal development permit process and the county's process both in and out of the coastal zone. So we've had a couple years of application development on this left third of the slide and our public participation was through the workshops that we've conducted, different stakeholder engagement and in working with the Engagement Panel for all of that extensive public comment that you helped generate over a thousand unique public comments, then we've prepared the coastal development permit what I call the application suite. There's also some applications for that county unique jurisdiction and an overall development plan. All three were submitted concurrently to the county and their functioning is the lead CEQA agency. They have the pin to develop this environmental document and review in coordination with the other agencies.

And so we have that little red arrow there after that second yellow box. So as an applicant, we've

taken our first major step or second major step, right. We've submitted to the agency application for review. We have received a notice of incomplete or hold letters the county calls it and this 3,000-page application. We've got some questions from the county that we'll need to resolve and we're also providing some supplemental information between now and in early summer like expansion on our traffic analysis.

So once the -- once we satisfy the county, and that's our burden as the applicant, right, you have to give a thorough and complete application, the agency has to concur, then it goes into this process and I'm going to go light on this because I know Susan will talk about it, but next will be a public scoping meeting and after that the county takes it and works with their consultant and the other agencies to develop this document and then there will be multiple public processes along the way indicated on this chart and this chart's available on our website and also there's a YouTube video if you just type in Diablo Canyon coastal permit. There's a couple-minute video that takes you through this process.

One nuance here, because we have these overlapping jurisdictions, is the Coastal Commission when working together with the county and statelands said we want PG&E to submit that application for

original jurisdiction once the draft environmental impact report is out. So we won't, as an applicant, have line of sight until that's in public document about what's in it, but their needs will be addressed in that document, as well. So this schedule here assumes this line at the top is the original jurisdiction path, and as an applicant, we just assume will be appealed to Coastal Commission, and if that occurs, those processes will merge at the final stage of approval or review for the Coastal Commission and it could be a rejection as well, right? And so sometimes, you know, it's our, again, burden as an applicant to have a thorough, robust application and work with the agencies to address any deficiencies they might deem that need to be addressed so they can make a deliberation, further decision-makers. So we'll go to the next slide, pick up the pace here a little bit.

So we talked about this info hold letter or request for additional information from the county. This is where we are today. We'll be submitting on May 27th. I guess it's tomorrow at the end of the day. A lot of the questions, but not all of them. So we have 41 that are in management review. That's with me and other team members. 42 percent, I mentioned the traffic study still with subject matter experts that PG&E

doesn't have the staff or we don't have traffic engineers. So it's not something utility does. We consult out for that work. 10 percent are under technical review for the rest of the team and we haven't started on seven percent, but that's our backlog curve and we'll be working that down as quickly as we can and we want to be sure we provide thorough answers to the county's questions. Next slide.

We've seen this slide before and I'm just going to go through. What the application does embody are a lot of the input from the Engagement Panel and so this slide denotes key components of the application and where it links to your strategic vision and the input that you gained on behalf of our community and your own unique product. Of note, especially with the recent announcements about wind energy and the potential for additional generation in the community, as item two, we are retaining both switch charts for a couple of different reasons.

One, once Diablo Canyon stops making power, we become a very large energy customer, an enormous energy customer. We'll be the largest energy customer in the county, single energy customer in the county.

The second is our 500,000 volt system. We call it 500KV. It interconnects from Diablo Canyon northeast

to Fresno and due east to Bakersfield and those are interconnected. So as long as we have that triangle interconnected, we can lose one leg of that for maintenance or other reasons and still support these three areas. So that's essential nervous system, if you will, of California and our largest transmission lying capacity that we have. And then, lastly, we'll be taking energy in on the 230KV line, 230,000 volts. So we'll retain that system, as well, and it's still used and useful for our customers, in addition to Diablo Canyon.

The other one, item three, we want to retain the breakwaters, our marina. We want to find a successor entity for that, and I know the panel's very familiar with this, but those new to the discussion, there is more volume and material in the breakwater are jetties than there is in the entire nuclear facility. So by repurposing that, one of our first moves to reduce impacts, costs to our customers and retain something now as functioning as habitat is to retain that breakwater structure. Recent analyses and field work has shown that the black abalone have taken home up into that breakwater and so we have federally endangered species living inside the crevices of that structure. Next slide, please.

Additional things, transportation, that's going to be one of the key drivers and then also reduction of radioactivity at the site. This project, while there's interesting tantalizing things about repurposing and future generation and the transmission, at its core, it's a radiological remediation project and that's our essential mission. We're going to fold in other things because it's the right thing to do, but the core mission is to satisfy the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and other agencies that we've fully remediated the site and we're looking for clean leased criteria, unrestricted use at the site. Next slide, please.

Again, the panel was right on -- early on this and correct in conservation of the breakwaters. We talked about that already and the cultural resources. We want to have a light footprint when we do this work and not just environmental impacts, but there is rich cultural resources in this area that need to be protected as part of the project. Next slide.

That's where I'll pause and I'll hand it over to Ms. Strachan for the county.

MR. ANDERS: Trevor, this is an opportunity for you to introduce your county team and discuss the county staffing for this whole process.

MR. KEITH: Yeah. Thank you, Chuck.

So Trevor Keith again. So our staffing right now, Susan Strachan is our Diablo Canyon decommissioning manager in the planning and building department and we're in the process of hiring two more staff to help her in the, kind of, planning and building side and then we have, kind of, our internal county team that includes public works and a few other departments that will be -- as we kind of process through this permit application will be along our side, as well, as the county team make-up.

So with that, if we can get the PowerPoint back up and I will turn it over to Susan to run through the county processing side where we are today and where we're going to go.

MS. STRACHAN: Thank you, Trevor. I just first want to say thank you and tell you how happy I am to be here. I think I'm literally San Luis Obispo's newest resident. Moving truck arrives on Monday. So we just got here, we're thrilled to be here. I am thrilled to do this job.

Just for two seconds, my background is in both local government and in managing the permitting of utility scale energy project and I love working on projects in the coastal zone. So it doesn't get better than this for me from a job standpoint.

And I also quickly want to say thank you to the panel. I have watched numerous panel videos and it has been incredibly helpful to help me get up to speed on the project. Could I get the next slide, please?

So I'm going to talk today about the permitting process and California Environmental Quality Act compliance. Next slide.

So this is just a quick overview of where we are now and Tom covered a lot of that, but I'm going to get into a little more detail. So PG&E's application filed on March 29th has two components, the coastal development permit application for the project area within the coastal zone and then outside the coastal zone a conditional use permit application.

When the county received the application, the first thing we do is we make a referral with the application to numerous agencies, state, local federal level, tribes, school districts, other organization -- and I'll get into more detail on that in a minute -- to get their input. The -- at the staff level, then we begin what we refer to as a 30-day completeness review and it's to look at the application and to determine is there additional information that's needed for the EIR consultant to then begin preparing the environmental impact report.

So that review went from March 30th to April 28th, and as Tom said, on April 28th we issued a letter of incompleteness or otherwise known from the county's standpoint as information hold letter and then we anticipate June 30th that we're going to get an application supplement package responding to -- excuse me -- the information needs. Once we get that package, then that 30-day application completeness review will begin on that new information. Next slide, please.

So this is a high level figure of the process from beginning to end and so, again, PG&E files the application. The application is posted to the county website. So it's available to anyone for anyone to look at. Again, we make -- county staff make the referrals to the various county departments, state, local federal agencies, community advisory council, and staff review is basically where we are right now. We're at this point where we're doing the completeness review and the back and forth with PG&E to get the information needed to make the application deemed complete.

The next step is then the beginning of the California Environmental Quality Act process where the consultant prepares the EIR. This is a key portion in the process of public participation and I'll get into details of what -- what events in the CEQA process

trigger public participation, and then, lastly, it culminates in public hearing with the decision-maker and Planning Commission for certification of the EIR and a decision on the project. Next slide, please.

So this is just a list of the -- not a complete list, but a list of agencies, et cetera, who receive the application. On the left column, a lot of it is state agencies. We have U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service at the bottom, other -- which is a federal agency. Other federal agencies included Army Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Land Management. On the right-hand column, Avila Valley Advisory Committee, tribes, numerous county departments, community services, districts, affected cities, school districts, Santa Barbara County, Santa Maria, and I'll explain in a minute why those two entities were included, Air Pollution Control District and the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments. Next slide, please.

So the current application status, as I said, an informational letter was sent to PG&E on April 28th. Some of the main items that will be -- that were asked for will be included and they were things that PG&E acknowledged in their application was they were going to provide transportation details on truck, truck rail and barge transportation. The application speaks of a Santa

Maria rail facility and there are two sites that are being evaluated, one in unincorporated Santa Barbara County and then one of the City of Santa Maria. That is why those two entities receive the information -- excuse me. I apologize -- the application referral is that to give them a heads-up that there is information that will be forthcoming that affect their jurisdictions.

Also, they will be providing information on waste types and volumes, water use information, waste chart -- wastewater discharge information. So those are just some of the items that were included in that information hold letter. Again, the responses in the application supplement will be provided on June 30th and will again begin to get another application for completeness review at that time. Next slide, please.

So now we move on to what happens after the application is deemed complete. Once it's deemed complete, then the CEQA process begins. So -- and for this project, we'll be preparing an environmental impact report. San Luis Obispo County will be the lead agency, meaning that we have that responsibility for preparing that document. We have an environmental consultant whose contract will go to the board in late June or early July. A big component of this project is coordination with responsible agencies. So these are

agencies, and Tom mentioned several, California Coastal Commission, State Lands Commission, who have permanent jurisdiction over the project. Additional agency -- or jurisdictions would be Santa Maria, but if that's where that rail facilities is, there's Santa Barbara County. There's also an off-site facility in Pismo Beach. So they would all be responsible agencies since they have some permitting authority over the project.

And then I want to point out that one of the absolute major tenants of California Environmental Quality Act is public participation and so that's where that activity is a focal point of the CEQA process and I'll get into that in a minute.

And I also want to add that during the CEQA process, we're in this information back and forth with PG&E right now for application completeness; however, there still -- there could be occasion even during the development of the EIR that the environmental consultant may need additional information. So there will be -- you know, that would also be a time where we would involve PG&E to provide additional information. Next slide.

So this is an overview of the EIR process focusing on the major components of it and also touch on the public involvement for these components. So, again,

application's complete, we start the EIR process. First activity, issuing a notice of preparation. This is a notice that goes out to everyone, agencies, saying we're preparing an EIR, what do you need to have us cover in that document.

So we've had a lot of discussion already with the Coastal Commission and the State Lands Commission for things that they need, but this could be for other agencies the things that they want us to address. We'll also be holding public scoping meetings. So, again, key point for public involvement. This is an opportunity for the public to get involved and to talk about what they would like to see in the environmental document.

So then the draft EIR is prepared. Once that comes out, the notice of availability is issued and then there's a public review period again that happens. So, again, another opportunity for public involvement. The review period is a minimum of 45 days, but this is an opportunity for the public to go through the document and make comments on documents, things they may not agree with, things they think should be corrected. That is that opportunity to do that.

Then after the draft EIR comes out, comments are received. By the close of that comment period, the final EIR is prepared. The final EIR is basically

composed of responses to the comments on the draft EIR and revisions to the draft EIR. Those two pieces together comprise the final EIR. Once the final EIR is out, then that's where that public hearing process happens. It's for certification of the document. The decision-making body, Planning Commission in this case, adopts findings or a statement of consideration if that's required. Again, another opportunity for public involvement. This is a public hearing. So the public can weigh in on that decision and their opinion on the decision on the project. If the project is approved, the Planning Commission also adopts a mitigation monitoring reporting program. Once that county process is done, if the county approves the project, then it goes on to the responsible agencies for them to make their permitting decisions on the project. Next slide.

So just some information opportunities for public participation. We do on the county planning and building website have information on Diablo decommissioning. That's where there's links to access the application. There's also a place to sign up on the email list.

So, for example, at the time when we're going to schedule the scoping meetings, we will send a blast out to that email list for a notification of when those

meetings will be and where they will be, and, again, in terms of EIR process opportunities, it's the scoping meetings, draft EIR comment period and then at that point where the EIR goes before the Planning Commission for certification and project decision. Next slide, please.

So I want to just touch a little bit on the content of EIR. So from an EIR standpoint and going along with information from PG&E, there's two phases for the decommissioning. Phase one, 2024 to 2034 where the focus is the removal of plant components, and then when you get into phase two, 2035 to 2042, that is when it's finishing and doing site remediation and restoration. So that will be analyzed as a project DIR, basically meaning that it's an EIR prepared for the development project. Although, in this case, development is the removal of the plant.

Now, phase three is where we're going to touch on future sites and for this we will evaluate up to nine alternative scenarios and they will be analyzed on a programmatic basis. So with a program EIR, it's a series of actions that characterize one large project and it's that program is evaluated in the EIR. It's referred to as a first tier document. So in the case of a reuse option, you evaluate the reuse alternatives and

then later activities could include an actual application for a permit to do something on the site after the plant has been decommissioned and removed. Next slide, please.

And then some more details on the content of the EIR. These are some main areas that are included. It has a project description, environmental setting and analysis, and I'll get into in a minute the environmental estuaries that are analyzed, discussion on environmental impacts, mitigation measures to minimize significant impacts, alternatives and cumulative impacts. So you're looking at the project combined with other projects in the area and cumulatively could there be any impacts. Next slide.

So these are the environmental estuaries that will be evaluated in the EIR. Something that's a little bit different in this EIR, if you look in the left column at the bottom where it's hazardous and radiological materials, obviously most EIRs don't include a discussion on radiological materials. This one would. And then over on the right column, recreation is in the EIR topic, but we will be including public access since that's a focal coastal plan, coastal act policy. Next slide, please.

Other considerations that will be included in

the EIR and these come directly from the Coastal Commission and the State Lands Commission. So these are all items that are important to them and required to be included in the EIR for their permitting purposes. So, again, this is where that early coordination with those agencies comes into play. Next slide.

And cannot have a discussion on CEQA without talking about CEQA mitigation. So mitigation can take different forms. This slide just defines what a mitigation measure can be. It can consist of avoiding the impact all together, minimizing the impact or limiting its magnitude, could be restoration, rehabilitation, illuminating it over time or providing substitute resources.

So, for example, a project that could impact a wetland could, you know, buy credits and mitigation bank for wetlands is one it's commonly used for to replace substitute resources, and then I always have to point out with mitigation, it has to have an essential nexus to the impact and roughly proportional to the impact. Next slide, please.

And so I do not have a specific schedule for decommissioning. Once the application is complete, one of the first things that will be done is to develop that site-specific schedule. What I did hear was just put

together a generic schedule. The EIR can be done within a year. It can also take longer than a year. So some of the things that -- well, let me walk through this and I'll talk about some of the things that can change the schedule.

So, again, month one, application received after deemed complete, then you get into the scoping, but the EIR preparation can begin even before the scoping because things like the environmental setting can start to be prepared. So that work can begin immediately. Draft EIR is issued, then you have your comment period for 45 days, and then after the comment period, it's the time required to prepare the final EIR.

So in terms of what can extend this schedule, before I came here, I worked for Yolo County and we did a program EIR on the county's cannabis land use ordinance. We received over 900 individual comments on that EIR. It took a long time to respond to 900 comments. So that's an example of where a schedule can get extended.

Another one is where it can get extended if there's changes to the project description. If the consulting firm is far along in its analysis for the project description changes, they have to go back and make modifications to the work they've already done. I

always have this example of one EIR that we worked on that the -- it was for a client. They changed their project name right at the 11th hour, and it may seem like a minor change, but when that project name is throughout a voluminous document, it takes a while to make all of those corrections. So little things like that can serve as a reason to delay the time period of the EIR. Next slide, please.

So that concludes my presentation, but I'm more than open for any questions.

MR. JONES: I had one while the panel gears up, which is just on the phase three, we've always talked about it as a two phase, and that for the repurposing, PG&E is not an applicant for a repurposing project. That will be successor entity. I just wanted to bring a little clarity to that.

MS. STRACHAN: Thank you, Tom. That's a good point.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Susan.

Any questions of Susan or Tom? Panel members, raise your hands if you have any questions. Okay. We've got Kara and then Dena.

MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you, Susan. So it was really more of a comment more than a question. The application, I just want to say I encourage the public

to try to take a look at it. It is a huge document. It's, I think, ten inches tall, very extensive and I think overall really well-done and I thought it was really particularly helpful to read Section 2 because it gives you a great overview of all the issues surrounding decommissioning. So if you want to get a great succinct refresher on what's happening here, I really recommend that people take a moment and check that out.

And in reading through the application myself, I thought, overall, it was very informative and very thorough, but I thought there were two sections in particular that PG&E presented to the county that I thought were really insufficient. The first section was on the recreation and public access. As you recall from Susan's list, this is one of the environmental issues that is being considered by this process, and in that section, there was no reflection of all the work that has been done by the Engagement Panel. So I know earlier Tom had described the many ways that the application reflected the strategic vision prepared by the Engagement Panel, but that didn't happen in this section.

So, for example, we have had multiple meetings and workshops talking about the future of the Diablo Canyon lands, which are the 12,000 acres that surround

the plant, and we received hundreds of comments from people saying that they wanted to see those lands conserved, they wanted to see them protected in perpetuity and ensure that there's some kind of public access, including a coastal trail, and, yet, none of those comments from the strategic vision were really in the application itself. There's also no mention of the dream initiative, which the County of San Luis Obispo voters approved by 75 percent back in 2000 and that called for the county and PG&E to conserve the Diablo Canyon lands when the plant closed and, again, that wasn't included in PG&E's application.

And there's also a whole history of conservation attempts on Wild Cherry Canyon, which is 2,500 acres of the 12,000 acres of Diablo Canyon lands. Again, that wasn't in the application. It should have been because a lot of other issues regarding land use were included in the application, but weren't nearly as relevant as all the extensive history of public access and conservation attempts on this land. So I really am going to ask the county to take a look at that section in particular and really augment it because there's so much history there that just wasn't incorporated.

The second issue that I thought was really inadequate as a layperson regards traffic. We know that

the decommissioning of Diablo is going to be an enormous task to take apart all the structures and all the facilities, put them on trucks or barges and get them off site to their ultimate disposal, and when I looked at that traffic section, I thought it was really confusing. I didn't understand much of what the report said, and at the end, the kind of conclusion is that there wouldn't be much of an impact to the communities of Avila Beach from all these trucks being transported away from the site and I just -- my common sense tells me that can't be the case.

So I'm really hoping that the county can take some time and work with PG&E really augmenting that traffic section so it's understandable to a layperson reading it and that the conclusions just seem to reflect what we all feel is common sense when you're taking tens of thousands of trucks and driving them past Avila, a town that's already challenged by traffic.

And then the last thing I wanted to mention only because Susan brought it up is under CEQA when you have a permit to do a project, there is mitigation and there are limits to what kind of mitigation you require, but on the PG&E site, there is so much history regarding land conservation and mitigation. The Pecho Coast Trail, the Buchon Trail, the 1,200-acre deed restriction

at Point San Luis, those are all protected as by way of mitigation that PG&E provided for permits that were much less significant than the permits needed here for the this much larger project and so I'm going to really hope and ask the county to think about this mitigation issue, think about the history we have with the Diablo Canyon lands with mitigation and really look at this project, the biggest decommissioning -- the biggest EIR project the county has ever faced and to really consider seriously what mitigation is precedential here on the land and really what the community has been asking for for two decades now.

So that's it. Other than that, I really do think it was a very quite useful document and I just want to encourage the public to take a look at it, and if nothing else, Section 2, which is the project description. That's all. Thanks.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Kara.

I just want to remind everyone that the application is on the county planning and building website and there's a link to the application on the Engagement Panel website, the DiabloCanyonPanel.org. Under the resources tab, it's the second one down, Diablo Canyon decommissioning land use application, and that will take anyone right to the application on the

county's site.

So thank you, Kara, for your comments.

Dena, you had your hand up. Do you have a question or comment?

MS. BELLMAN: I have a question and actually Kara touched on some of what I was going to inquire about, but this is actually for Trevor Keith.

In the past when you've talked about or described mitigation, you've been really specific about what the county wants to see or the limits to which lesion will be allowed or considered and I don't know if you can just refresh that -- that comment or the phrase that you used to detail it, I think that would be really helpful.

MR. KEITH: Sure. Yeah. Thanks. So we look at as through the environmental process when we get into kind of the impact sections, when we're looking at mitigation to offset the impacts, it's really kind of there's the nexus and that's kind of the impact and then the mitigation needs to be directly to the impact. So you've got to have the nexus between the mitigation and the impact to show that you're going to reduce the impact, and then I think it's also kind of what they call the rough portionality. So based on an impact, you can't ask for something much greater than you would need

to actually, you know, reduce that impact. So those are kind of the confines that we look at and so, you know, as the areas in the impact section, you know, as we review the information with a consultant when the application's deemed complete, you know, and start drawing up the mitigation to reduce any impacts that kind of bubble out, those are kind of the confines that we look in.

MS. BELLMAN: Thank you.

MR. KEITH: Yeah. You bet.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Dena.

I don't see any other questions. Trevor, do you have any closing comments with regard to the coastal development permit process?

MR. KEITH: I just want to say, you know, again, thanks to the panel for having us back. We're happy to come at each milestone to update you guys and, yeah, I just would encourage folks to take a look at the application and get on the list so you stay in touch. Yeah. And thank you again to the panel and Chuck. I think that's all that I have.

MR. ANDERS: Great. Thank you. Our next agenda item is the PG&E update. Before we begin that item, I would ask any of the meeting attendees from the public to raise your hand now if you would like to make

public comment. The public comment period is after the next agenda item. So let us know how many people would like to make public comments. So if you would like to say something to the panel and also be part of the public record for this meeting, please raise your hand now so we have an idea how many people would like to speak.

So next item, PG&E update. Tom, Maureen, who is going to do this one?

MS. ZAWALICK: Thank you, Chuck. I'm going to kick it off. It's Maureen. Can you hear me okay, Chuck?

MR. ANDERS: Yes, we can. Thank you.

MS. ZAWALICK: All right. And then I'll turn it over to Tom and I know that we're -- next is the very important public comments. So I'll be succinct and then turn it over to Tom.

First and foremost, good evening, everyone. It's great to be here. I want to start off with welcoming our new members of the panel. It's great to have you as part of this panel and also thank Lauren and Alex for their service, their contribution to this excellent panel. I'm so excited and very appreciative of this panel. I think it's the best in the U.S. and it's a very effective and collaborative, you know, panel

that provides important and significant input into a lot of these topics we've been discussing tonight and other meetings and venues.

You know, especially, I want to just tap into the input that the panel has provided on the decommissioning project in used fuel in areas such as the request for proposal we talked about tonight on the new spent fuel system and that impacts the timing of our offload that has been invaluable and also the input on personal development and permit. Kara, I appreciate your comments and all that and in this forum that we can embrace that feedback and make adjustments where we need to, but that was a very comprehensive effort and we factored in all the input and so forth from the Engagement Panel.

The project itself, the decommissioning project, is just going outstanding. Our preplanning efforts to ensure a safe and smooth transition to decommissioning and avoiding SAFSTOR is, you know, ahead of schedule in many areas, ahead of schedule in all of them. It's under budget and the team has been working and is very committed to diligently making sure we meet that objective of that smooth transition from operations to decommissioning.

And then I'll turn it over to Tom in a second,

but I do want to make a public safety announcement here on an unrelated topic, but from a PG&E perspective. You know, we're facing another very hot, dry year, and with fire season coming here, already the temperatures we've seen in the Central Coast so far this week. So please check out the public safety power shut-off website at PG&E. It has tips on how to get notified and updating your email and phone number and then also there's great resources on the PG&E wildfire safety site on securing your home and the perimeter and making sure you're ready for fire season in these very dry, hot conditions. So just wanted to put that plug in too because we're always -- safety's our top propriety and wanted to add that to everyone that's listening in tonight.

So with that, Tom, I'm going to turn it over to you. There's a couple topics I know you wanted to touch upon that we haven't tonight and then we can get to the public comment section.

MR. ANDERS: Tom, before you start, I'd just like to remind everyone that please turn your mic on mute if you're not speaking. We do have some background noise. That would be appreciated. Go ahead, Tom.

MR. JONES: Thanks, Chuck. And I'll confess I think that was me getting ready for my big time on stage here.

I'll give you a couple quick updates for the public and one of them is on our funding decision, our pending funding decision from Public Utilities Commission. We have this five-letter acronym, the NDCTP, the Nuclear Decommissioning Cost Triennial Proceeding, and as the name suggests, every three years, we submit a budget for what we think it takes to remediate the site and then the CPUC adjudicates that with public intervenors. It's a very formal rigorous process and then there's a decision made about funds that should be allocated for the project or not. So we submitted what I would say is a nearly all parties summary -- settlement to that that reduced our initial request by almost a billion dollars, a little over 900 million, and with these diverse parties that are agreeing, we thought we'd give the Utilities Commission something that was quickly actionable. We don't have an action yet. They've extended three times. So ours is still slated for decision by September and I'll just remind the panel and the public that the Utility Commission issues what's called a proposed decision at least 30 days in advance of that decision. So while they talk about a mid-September decision time frame, that means we should see something at the latest by mid-August. I know we've talked about that before, but

you might recall when we didn't see that in February, then a year after, the commission extended from March to September. So August is when we really get good clarity. Hopefully sooner. They don't have to go to September, but if we don't hear something by mid-August, then we could be in for a potentially realignment of that schedule.

That did just happen last week to Southern California Edison's pending decision. Theirs was a little bit in front of us and theirs was extended for the third time now out till late October. So, again, over a year from when we would have estimated to have a decision, but hopefully that settlement that PG&E and the other parties came to is adopted by the Utilities Commission.

Secondly, that can impact when we submit the 2021 NDCTP. So we're planning as though the settlement is adopted because it's broad and it's diverse and I think it took into account a lot of despaired interest to better align the project. However, if that decision -- let's say it comes out in late September and it's a radical departure from what the parties to the proceeding expect, we might have to adjust our application to do that. Our team is starting to write testimony now and line things up from your strategic

vision, from other input we've received from contractors, what's going on in the coastal permit and we have to align those things.

It's just the lay explanation is really simple. Budget informs how much work you're going to do and the work you're going to do is captured either in the NRC licensing space or in the CEQA process for that permitting and analysis. So those things are inextricably linked. So we really hope that that is adopted soon and that's how those things connect. Dollars do impact the work that impacts the regulatory requirements at the county, the Coastal Commission and before the NRC.

And, lastly, we have a continued update on this 1,200-acre deed restriction and other things that are to be recorded, including a lighthouse road easement, and that is before the Coastal Commission now at the staff level for adoption. They gave us some feedback at the end of the year, a couple years ago actually, and we revised and met all their criteria. The Port Harbor District, which is independent and they have rights to that Lighthouse Road, they have adopted the revision and they've adopted -- they adopted it previously. The Coastal asked for a change and so that independent elected body is approved. We approved, all the

signatures are complete. Coastal has to concur that the executed documents and they saw the drafts, we're not surprising them, are in alignment with their expectation and then they will be recorded into county.

The reason the road has to be recorded before the conservation easement is that they're reflected in one another. The conservation easement has a carve-out for the road alignment and references that other easement by incorporation. So we have to have the roads recorded first. We're going to do them the same day. We'll literally handwrite in the number from the county assessor's office in the subordinate document.

So that's where those processes are in process now and everything in our control are on time or a little early and on or under budget. So we try to navigate those swim lanes as best we can and happy to answer any questions that the panel might have.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Maureen and Tom.

Does the panel members have any questions? I don't see any hands going up. So let's go on to the next topic. We are running a little late. So we had a break scheduled right now, but we're nearing the end of the meeting time. So I suggest we forego the break and go directly into public comment, unless I hear an objection. All right. Let's do that.

So right now we have four hands up from the public and let's have two-minute comments from the public if that makes sense to the panel members and our first participant or member from the public comment is Kalene Walker, followed by L. Swanson. I would like to ask that the participants that want to make public comment to state your name, please spell your name for the benefit of our court reporter and the transcript and also indicate where your residence is located.

So, Zeek, can we set that up?

ZEEK: I'm sorry, Chuck. Would you like me to -- are you at the public comment?

MR. ANDERS: Yes, please. Our first speaker would be -- oh, somebody disappeared, took their hand down, would be L. Swanson and Neil Havlik.

Zeek: Okay.

MR. ANDERS: And Kalene put her hand back up. I apologize for -- L. Swanson and Neil Havlik.

MS. SWANSON: This is L. Swanson. Do you hear me?

MR. ANDERS: Yes, we do.

MS. SWANSON: Okay. Sorry I'm hiding. I didn't mean to do that, but that's a nice rose. So I go by my middle name. So Jane Swanson. Am I okay? Am I being heard?

MR. ANDERS: Yes, you are.

MR. JONES: We can hear you, Jane.

MS. SWANSON: Okay. So I'm Jane Swanson. I live in San Luis Obispo. I hope that is all I'm supposed to say about myself. So I'll keep it brief.

First of all, I really want to compliment and thank very much the members of the Engagement Panel. This is volunteer work and the number of hours they put in are beyond my comprehension. I've attended almost all of the meetings over the years. I'm very impressed with them. So I want to thank the current, past and future members of the panel.

Secondly, I really want to second the suggestion of Linda Seeley that a workshop be held that includes Dr. Lam because we didn't get a chance to hear as much from him as he has to offer. Not just Dr. Lam, but also, you know, I would want PG&E and the county to be present at that meeting. So that would be very valuable. I very much appreciated the workshops held in February of 2019 on the spent fuel storage. That was very hopefully, also.

And then a question, which might be answered at some other time, of Rod McCollum of the Nuclear Energy Institute. He was very optimistic and advocating of consolidated interim storage, but I am aware that that

project violates federal law because federal law states that interim storage may not happen until and unless there is a permanent repository. So I'm quite mystified why there's this brouhaha about consolidated interim storage because I don't see any permanent repository on the horizon. So I just want to make sure everybody listening to this meeting is aware of the fact that consolidated interim storage in New Mexico and Texas is not a legal proposition. So I don't understand why that's even being put out there. So I'll let it go at that and let other people have their turn. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Jane. Our next speaker is Neil Havlik, followed by Neil Pulido and Kalene Walker.

MR. HAVLIK: Thank you, Mr. Anders. That's spelled N-E-I-L, H-A-V, like in Victor, L-I-K, and I am speaking to you tonight in my capacity as president of the Board of Directors of the Coastal San Luis Resource Conservation District. We are one of nearly 100 such agencies throughout the State of California. Our district covers the area of San Luis Obispo County from Highway 41 in the north to the Santa Barbara County line on the south and from the coastline of the Pacific Ocean inland to the Los Padres National Forest, which, of course, includes the Diablo Canyon 12,000 acres. We

offer engineering and natural resource advisory and management services to our interested publics. This includes civil engineering, not nuclear engineering, which we've been hearing about tonight, but civil engineering such as dealing with roads, water and stormwater conveyance, and water impoundments, including, but not limited to, stock water impoundments and containment structures. We also provide natural resource management and agricultural resource management. These include things such as water quality, water conservation, erosion control and soil conservation, but very importantly, resource conservation districts are one of the natural conduits for the use of public money on private lands where those public monies have a public benefit and water quality and erosion control come immediately to mind and are common in the nexi. Is that the right word? Are common nexuses for the use of those funds. We just want to apprise the panel of this information and the services that our organization can provide. We do have engineering expertise and natural resource expertise available to us and these can be applied to, really, any suitable portion of the Diablo Canyon lands, including the power plant site itself and the surrounding lands, and we would be delighted to be a participant in that.

So I just ask that you keep us in mind as you move forward and we will be and will continue to be participants in this process as it moves forward. Thank you.

MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you, Neil. That's great.

MR. ANDER: Thank you, Neil.

Our next speaker is Neil Pulido, followed by Kalene Walker.

MR. PULIDO: Thank you very much. I just have a couple questions and thank you so much for letting me participate. They're basic questions. Maybe you can help direct where they should be addressed, but I hear 250,000 years as far as a half life for the radiation and I'm hearing 80 years for the casks. I guess my question is is that what provisions are being made for future contractors years and years down the road if they go bankrupt? And I'm speaking from the reference of oil facilities and oil wells where they're abandoned and bankrupt oil companies just walk away. I'd like to know is that something that's going to be addressed?

And the second question I have is the current location, I understand additional casks are going to be put at that same pad, if you will, but what is the sea level of that and what studies have been done as far as a potential tsunami? I know there's been earthquake

studies. Thank you very much.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Neil.

Our next speaker is Kalene Walker.

MS. WALKER: Hello. Can you hear me?

MR. ANDERS: Yes, we can, Kalene.

MS. WALKER: Great. This is Kalene Walker. I'm down in -- near San Onofre. I wish I had done the research or had the time and known about canister choices before I was made aware of the issue. I became aware of the issue when the canister of the whole system had already been purchased and so it's been an uphill battle ever since, if you followed any of the drama that unfolded there.

I'm curious why you have a four-year -- why the -- those recommendations for a four-year cooling time to get the fuel out of the pools. I think that's really an arbitrary requirement that really limits a very serious important option as far as your canister cask choice.

Donna Gilmore of San Onofre Safety came and spoke to your panel a couple years ago or whenever it was when some industry representatives presented to you and I think she outlined some fundamental differences and there's two different types of containers globally. Only two types of containers. There's thin wall

canisters and thick wall casks. The thin wall canisters is what the industry is using and what the NRC is allowing. They're extremely substandard. They vent air. They cannot be stored in a building. The thick wall casks can be stored in a building away from all of the environmental hazards. It can be a harding building. They are much more protected. It's like not having a containment dome on a power plant. These things are sitting out in the open. There's all sorts of other things. These canisters, the NRC knows they are prone to corrosion and cracking. There's no way to inspect for corrosion cracking. Mr. McCollum from the NEI stated that the San Onofre had the gold standard of inspection repair because the Coastal Commission approved our supposed inspection repair plan to rationalize that the fuel was maintained in the transportable condition, but the --

ZEEK: The two-minute time has passed.

MS. WALKER: Okay. Simply, the inspection is only a visual assessment. I would highly recommend you look up SanOnofreSafety.org and just do some research. This is like the -- in perpetuity is the operative word, and regardless of what happens with decommissioning, this fuel and how it's stored, and there's the need for repackaging, has not been factored in. I could go on

and on. Thank you so much.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Kalene.

Any other members of the public that want to make any comments? Yes, Debbie Kinsinger.

MS. KINSINGER: Hi. My name is Debbie Kinsinger. I'm a CEQA consultant from the San Diego area, most of my experience with forest service, fish and wildlife service and things like that.

I have a lot of questions about the interim consolidated storage idea. First of all, the one that's already been brought up about that there's no long-term site, and as far as I understood, that this wasn't an option until we had that that somebody else explained better.

So, second, when -- I think it was Rodney was explaining about the safety of the casks and about their transportability, and just from what I've been learning in San Diego with the casks that we have here, they're too long to be put on -- on a rail car and they're also too heavy for a rail to support. So when he talked about, you know, transporting these all the time, we've been doing it for years, to my knowledge, nothing like the type of casks that are going to be storing these fuels has ever been transported. And he talked about being able to demonstrate that they could be repackaged.

To my knowledge, we don't know that they can be repackaged. We have an example of a cask that -- and how it could be used, but it's an example that doesn't have fuel in it and so many questions that when -- I've heard a couple of times people talk about this whole idea about interim storage and how we are going to move this material off site and I think that there's been some misrepresentation about what is possible to do based on what has been done. That's not consistent to what we're going to try and do.

So what has been done is low level transportation of low level, not high burn-up type of fuels, and in containers that are not heavy casks. Somebody said -- I thought there was something like 72,000 pounds per cask and I'm not sure that that's accurate. That's just something I remember off the top of my head, but anyway, there's so many questions and when I listen to Rodney speak, it sounds so great, wow, here's a great solution, but just what I have learned about this in the past is, one, that interim consolidated storage is not feasible and, two -- or it's not legal, and, two, that a lot of the things he said we've been doing and that it's -- that we're able to do is not -- we're not able to do those things with the type of casks that we have and the type of fuel that

they are enclosing. So --

ZEEK: Excuse me. Your two-minute time is up.

MS. KINSINGER: Thank you. I'm looking forward to scoping meetings where we can bring this up and hopefully make better choices.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Debbie. Janine Rands has also raised her hand and would like to speak. Janine?

MS. RANDS: Good evening. This is Janine Rands, J-A-N-I-N-E, R-A-N-D-S. I live in San Luis Obispo. We frequently drive out to Avila and my concern is the whole driving and transportation.

MR. ANDERS: Janine, we're not hearing you, I don't think. I don't about others, but I can't.

MS. RANDS: Let me go into a different room. I'll have to go into a different room.

MR. ANDERS: That's better. Thank you.

MS. RANDS: This is Janine Rands from San Luis Obispo and I'm concerned -- I'm making a call about the transportation of anything related to the -- anything toxic or anything related to withdrawal from the Diablo plant, that it's a two-lane highway and it's also a huge recreational site and that there are at least five blind corners for even cars and bicycle riders. How are we going to mitigate safety for all of the above and then

we add in trucks.

The other thing that I'm really concerned about is the whole social justice issue of where these materials might be transported, that the litigation for keeping people that are -- the marginalized communities where these materials are destined for, it's not just and I hope the community and the communities where this stuff is going, what get to be consulted. So thanks a lot for this conversation.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Janine.

That's all the hands I have up right now from the public attendees.

So panel members, any final discussion on --

ZEEK: Excuse me, Chuck. There is one more in the queue.

MR. ANDERS: Oh, okay. Marty Brown. Sorry, Marty.

ZEEK: Looks like we just lost him.

MR. ANDERS: Okay. It does look that way.

So let's go ahead, Panel, and any final comments or discussion before we adjourn?

MR. LATHROP: It looks like Marty Brown is back.

ZEEK: Let's try it.

MR. ANDERS: Marty, go ahead with your comment.

Two minutes. Marty, looks like you have your microphone muted. Can you unmute your microphone, please?

ZEEK: It appears Marty's having technical issues.

MR. JONES: Chuck, I think it's time to move to the panel. We do want to hear from the panel for future topics.

MR. ANDERS: Okay. Let's go ahead with discussion. Any thoughts? Any final comments?

MS. SEELEY: I have something. This is Linda. First of all, I want to thank all of the people who made public comment and I can't wait till we can meet in public again so the people can be present. Maybe next time, I hope.

The other thing is that I just want to make one clarification. Both -- this is for the information of the panel. Both the governor of Texas and the governor of New Mexico have written very strong letters in opposition to consolidated interim storage and those letters are important. I think that Rodney deemphasized any opposition and emphasized how easy it will be and the environmental justice issues are extremely important for us to take into consideration. So let's not -- let's go ahead and have another -- have a good workshop.

And my other comment that I wanted to make is

that Dr. Lam was not really able to answer any questions tonight. So it was quite disappointing to me and I don't know how to -- we just tried to pack too much into one meeting. That's all.

So, anyway, I just -- I'm very glad we had this meeting. I think it was a good opening to all of the incredibly important questions that we have about the nuclear waste and, of course, the land use issues, but if we don't take care of the nuclear waste, the land use issues will be totally irrelevant because we won't have any land to use. So that's all. Thank you very much.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Linda. Kara and then David and then Dena.

MS. WOODRUFF: Well, I agree with Linda. I just want to say thanks to everyone for participating tonight and for your patience. I really can't wait until we do this in person again.

I just wanted to make a quick announcement, too. Just in the last couple days, a major announcement was made by the Biden administration and Governor Newsom and that is that it looks like the Central Coast and specifically the waters offshore Morro Bay may be the site of a future offshore wind turbine facility, which would have the potential to bring in three gigawatts of power and that's pretty significant. That would make up

for the power that is lost when Diablo closes, as well as the power that was at one time created or generated by the Morro Bay Power Plant. It's a really interesting and very exciting opportunity. It is the opportunity for us to move towards green clean renewable energy and so I think it's an exciting issue and I hope the panel will be spending some time in the future talking about offshore wind energy. Very intriguing.

And then, finally, I just wanted to mention PG&E had made a very brief update about the 1,200-acre deed restriction near Point San Luis. I would like to mention that the reason that restriction on the land that will prevent development there is in place is that in 2009, PG&E replaced its steam generator, and in so doing, they received a permit to do that and the mitigation required was to restrict these 1,200 acres. That was 12 years ago and right now I guess the project is in the hands of the Coastal Commission, and with a short amount of time, they should be able to finalize it and get that deed restriction on the books so that land is forever protected, but I think 12 years is long enough for us to wait on a permit condition, and if the Coastal Commission is listening, I'm really asking you to expedite this and get this done once and for all and just put in place a permanent protection of that land,

which should have happened 12 years ago.

Again, thanks everyone for participating. See you next time.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Kara. David and then Dena.

MR. BALDWIN: Clearly, this is a discussion that needs more time. Linda, I think, laid it out pretty nice that maybe we had too big of an agenda on a night like this. So I don't know if that should be in a form of a workshop or how we do that, but I would certainly be in favor of that. I, too, would have liked to hear or at least have some time to ask questions or heard questions bounced off Dr. Lam. I had several questions myself, but I didn't ask them because I was trying to be -- you know, keep the thing moving along. I know we seemed -- our periods for discussion seemed to be way too short tonight. We always run up against deadlines when we have these discussions, but tonight seemed more difficult than most. So I hope we can take that on, and, clearly, these are issues that are really -- have a lot of deep importance to the community, as they should.

The other thing I wanted to mention is it's not really the aim of this board, but I've been getting more and more comment from folks about all kinds of things

along the lines of, well, Diablo is going to continue to operate and Diablo is going to be sold to someone else who will operate it, you know, certain metrics are not being met by the state and the grid and those are going to cause Diablo to continue to operate for some years after '24, '25 and, of course, you know, sometimes I'm asked, you know, is that what you guys are discussing over there at the Engagement Panel and, of course, I tell them, no, that's not been our discussion, that's not been anything I've heard, but it sure seems like this large amount of kind of chatter. Maybe some of my fellow panelists are hearing the same thing, I don't know, but I think we should address that or PG&E should maybe and we should have --

MS. DANOFF: A good topic.

MR. BALDWIN: -- some way to reply to those comments in a way that's across the board for this panel so that we have a similar understanding.

MR. JONES: David, I think we made numerous and what I would characterize as definitive statements that the current license life is the operational period for the Diablo Canyon. We've done so at every public venue and there's been numerous media coverage. I do think there's still hope from some in the community that that's not the case, but that is the case in the future

for the Diablo Canyon. So with that finite date for operations, our goal is to transition into decommissioning and I'll remind the panel and those participating that not only did the Public Utilities Commission weigh in on that as the retirement strategy through the joint proposal, but with Senate Bill 1090, the California legislature also codified that that was the retirement plan and Governor Brown signed that into law.

So it doesn't get much more clear than that, but the message isn't received by some that would like to see it run longer, but that's where we're at.

MR. BALDWIN: Thanks, Tom.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, David.

MS. ROSALES: Yeah, and I think it's a valid point, David, in terms of retraining and programs that Diablo Canyon has in terms of getting employees into other careers. So I think there's a lot of value in that. I think we move forward in that.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

Dena, looks like you're the last person standing, so to speak. So final comments.

MS. BELLMAN: I think I have a little different perspective, Linda. I think for me, while I know you were really excited about getting these questions

answered, I think the different perspectives on the topic was a really good set-up for a workshop or some type of more in-depth conversation. I know especially at this time of night, sometimes it's difficult to absorb a lot of that technical information. So I was really grateful to have the variety of speakers on the topics. So I'm really looking forward to the future when we are able to have a better -- you know, more in-depth conversation and I feel like this really set us up for that. So I'm very grateful for that opportunity.

And I think I just want to say thank you to everyone and welcome again to our new panel members and you're off with a bang. This was a big one and I really do hope that we get to meet in person in the future even if it's just the panel because I think there's a lot of conversation that can't always happen over Zoom. So thank you everyone and thank you for everyone who is listening in and who has asked questions. We really appreciate it. Thanks.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Dena.

And speaking of upcoming panel meetings, I just want to go over the scheduled panel meetings for this year, but first I want to remind everyone that on June 23rd and 24th, we have the Diablo Canyon Independent Safety Committee meeting, and based on what Dr. Lam

indicated, that meeting may be an in-person meeting usually held at Avila Beach. So June 23, 24, Diablo Canyon Independent Safety Committee meeting.

The next scheduled Diablo Canyon Decommissioning Engagement Panel meeting is August 25th where we will talk about facility repurposing and Diablo Canyon lands update. You may choose to hold a workshop before or after that on spent fuel management.

And then we also have kind of an unscheduled meeting and that would be -- and this could happen sooner or it could happen later, but it's -- the panel has agreed to hold a public panel meeting within ten days of the CPUC's announcement on their preliminary ruling on the 2018 NDCTP. So as soon as the CPUC makes that preliminary ruling, the panel will hold a public meeting within, essentially, two weeks, announcements that will provide the opportunities to discuss what the ruling is and the implications of that ruling and provide the opportunity for the public to make comments back to CPUC before they make their final ruling.

So those are the upcoming meetings and I would just like to also thank everyone for attending and a reminder that recording of this meeting will be posted on the Engagement Panel website and a transcript will also be available in approximately ten days to two weeks

and we'll also post the presentation slides that you saw tonight on the panel website.

So with that, I don't hear any further comments. Let's consider this meeting adjourned and everyone have a good what's left of this evening. Thank you all for attending and I guess we don't have to say travel safely, but good night, everyone.

(The proceedings adjourned at 9:08 p.m.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA) SS.

I, MELISSA PLOOY, Certified Shorthand Reporter, licensed in the State of California, holding CSR License No. 13068, do hereby certify:

That said proceedings was verbatim-reported by me by the use of computer shorthand at the time and place therein stated and thereafter transcribed into writing under my direction.

In compliance with Section 8016 of the Business and Professions Code, I certify under penalty of perjury that I am a Certified Shorthand Reporter with License No. 13068 in full force and effect.

WITNESS my hand this 8th day of June 2021.

Melissa Plooy

MELISSA PLOOY, CSR#13068

E

Q

R