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MR. ANDERS: Hi. My name is Chuck Anders and I am the facilitator for the Diable Canyon Decommissioning Engagement Panel. First, we want to apologize to the public attendees this evening for starting the meeting late. Right before we were going to start, our monitor who is managing this web system crashed. So we were scrambling and we may still have some technical issues. So I hope you will bear with us.

To begin the meeting, I want to introduce Bill Almas, one of our newer panel members to welcome you and discuss the meeting. Bill.

MR. ALMAS: Thank you, Chuck I want to welcome all the participants on the panel, PG&E and the public to the Diablo Canyon Decommissioning Panel meeting. Tonight the meeting will focus on the most recent California Public Utilities proposed decision on the NDCTP, or what's called the Nuclear Decommissioning Cost Triennial Proceeding. That sounds dry, but this is a very important decision. If it is approved, it will allow PG&E to move directly into decommissioning in 2025 and this will greatly accelerate the decommissioning process.

We'll also focus on update process and ideas associated with repurposing of Parcel P. That is only a portion of the PG&E held lands. We are not intending on
talking about the other portions of the PG&E holdings out there, just Parcel P, which is where the site -- where the plant and site is currently.

Additionally, PG&E representatives will give an update on various ongoing tasks leading to decommissioning. We wanted to particularly recognize four experts that will be talking with us today and supporting the discussions. Megan Somogyi, who is outside counsel for the County of San Luis Obispo, will be talking; Eli Harland, who is advisor to Commissioner Karen Douglas of the California Energy Commission, will also speak; Richard Gollis, who is a real estate consultant for PG&E; and Larry Kramer, who is director of public infrastructure at Cannon Associates, talking about aiding with background on desal, but, lastly, I want to give special thanks to the public participants. You're the reason we have these meetings and your involvement and comments are critical to the decommissioning process. So we do appreciate you being here. Chuck.

MR. ANDERS: Great. Thank you, Bill.

Next to -- consistent with PG&E's safety culture, the panel has always started their meetings with a safety briefing and we're very fortunate to have a panel member, Dr. Timothy Auran, who is going to
provide a safety briefing this evening. So Tim.

MR. AURAN: Thanks, Chuck. I'd again like to start with our continuing public health crisis with the coronavirus and particularly the Delta variant. I'm sure everybody's seen the news and heard about the recent spikes. The Delta virus in particular is a more transmissible version of the coronavirus. It is also talked about as a more severe disease. There's a current spike in cases across the entire country. San Luis Obispo historically has been late to the party in these spikes, which is also the case that we have seen recently. There have been a significant increase in cases in the past week or two in town, but has significantly affected the hospitals. These spikes, especially for viral illnesses, do follow characteristic patterns and the viruses that are more easily transmitted tend to have a higher upstroke and a quicker downstroke, meaning that people get sick more quickly and a tighter cluster of people get sick at the same time, which continues to strain all of the health care facilities in an area. The primary way that we need to prevent this is vaccination. It obviously is the best way to prevent severe illness, as well as reduce transmission. However, there is always a possibility, especially with Delta virus, to have an asymptomatic
carrier that can actually be infected and transmit the
virus. The best thing for everyone to do is to wear
masks when you're indoors. This is not currently a
requirement. It is a recommendation by many health
authorities, but I believe that given the recent
upstroke, we may actually have a recommendation from the
Public Health Agency for people to continue wearing
masks if not a mandate. This will prevent spread among
vaccinated individuals, as well even spread among
vaccinated individuals will continue to prolong the
spike that make more and more cases occur. I've heard
some people be reticent to wear a mask indoors because
many times the presumption is the only reason you're
wearing the mask is you didn't get vaccinated. We don't
want to have people think that they didn't get
vaccinated, but I would hope that more and more people
do take the time and effort and think about others
around them who may not be adequately vaccinated for
reasons beyond their control to go ahead and wear masks
inside. That is the best thing that we can do on top of
vaccinations to help reduce the current spike that we
have and get through it without having any more
unnecessary deaths. Chuck.

MR. ANDERS: Great. Thank you, Tim.

Real quickly, Bill introduced many of our panel
members. Let me see if this works. I need to -- I want to share a screen here real quick. Anyway, let me just go on. I just want to provide a quick overview of tonight's meeting and that is that we're going to first talk about the CPUC proposed decision on the 2018 NDCTP, then we're going to talk about some repurposing alternatives, wind energy, and also some real estate alternatives and desalinization, and then after that, we'll take a quick break and then we will have the opportunity for public comment, and after that, later an update from PG&E. The public comments is going to take place around 8:30 p.m. So hopefully people will have the opportunity to provide comment.

This is a webinar format. So only people -- you can view the presentations, provide public comment by voice. The agenda and resource documents are available on the panel's website at DiabloCanyonPanel.org and the public can also submit written comments at the panel website and that will become part of the public record. This meeting is also being recorded and a written transcript will also be provided and will be available on the website after the meeting.

So with that, let's go ahead and move into our next agenda item and that is the information with regard
to the CPUC preliminary decision on the 2018 NDCTP.

And, Tom, hopefully I will be able to share this presentation and I'll bring it up.

MR. JONES: Thanks, Chuck. So I'm Tom Jones. I'm the director of strategic initiatives of PG&E and I work on our decommissioning process. The slides tonight I'm going to share with you are identical to the slides that we shared in the public workshops in San Luis Obispo in 2019. Chuck, I think the slides are done. Stay there, please. And we had two days of workshops that the CPUC hosted and so this was talking about the updated 2018 Nuclear Decommissioning Cost Triennial Proceeding filing by PG&E, and while this filing is required every three years, 2018 was very different. Before we had been using a generic industry estimate because remember, in context, the company was talking about relicensing. So we thought decommissioning might be a 2045 discussion, not a 2016 discussion, but once we announced that we weren't relicensing Diablo Canyon, we switched from a generic estimate to our first site-specific estimate. So that far more detail, we brought in expert third parties for different portions of the work, whether it was analyzing the further security plan or how to take apart the reactor vessel, how you can segment that thick vessel. So we had a lot
of third-party reviews and then an overall construction firm called High Bridge did a review our project as well and they found gaps that they thought we can do things faster and more efficiently.

So with that, we also had one major decision as a company. We elected to go and pursue our funding and our regulatory strategies directly into decommissioning rather than to go to something called SAFSTOR, which is what we did at our Humboldt Bay facility. And the reason that's important is under the NRC regulatory framework, utilities have up to 60 years to decommission a nuclear facility. And so at Humboldt Bay, we didn't start in earnest for about 30 years and we're continuing that work this year, and keep in mind that plant stopped running in 1976. So here we are wrapping up in 2020. So that was the second major issue in our NDCTP.

If we can go to the next slide, please, Chuck. And so that amount that we submitted to do all of these things was prior to receiving a lot of feedback from this engagement panel and our community and so the total you see in the bottom circle there was approximately 4.8 billion dollars in 2017 dollars. So escalate that up by a several percentage point since then. So it's a massive project. I always use the simple phrase multi-decade multi-billion-dollar project, but then if
we look at some of these line items like Line Item 17, just the breakwater specifically was nearly 300 million dollars and now we seek to retain that and have that serve the public for some future access rather than removal and sending it to a landfill. It's items like that that the engagement panel help us and community input help us frame. So you'll see above the settlement that Ms. Somogyi and Ms. Zawalick will talk about a little bit how the curve-down reduced time and impacts with those settlements.

So we can go to the next slide, please. And so in 2015, we also had an unfavorable decision from the Public Utilities Commission. They were -- they gave us a lot of homework, which we ended up having to do and it was for the better for our consumers, our customers for PG&E. So, for instance, in our 2015 estimate, our current dry cask storage system takes ten years to receive fuel from the spent fuel pool. The CPUC, California Public Utilities Commission, found it reasonable that we look to seven years and so that moving it three years sooner saves literally hundreds of millions of dollars and we've made progress since then that Maureen will talk about in her slides in just a few minutes.

Next slide, please. So we can see we had one
other really major important thing that made us
different from other nuclear power plants. Most nuclear
power plants when they start decommissioning or planning
for decommissioning, it's because either the economics
changed and they elected to shut down the plant or there
was an operational issue like either San Onofre or
Crystal River in Florida where they no longer run the
plant and then they find themselves in a space to start
decommissioning, but because we had a nine-year planning
horizon, the allocation from funds from the Nuclear
Regulatory Commission was not adequate and so we did a
request to both the Utilities Commission and the Nuclear
Regulatory Commission to fund that nine-year planning
limit, which no other power plant's ever had, and the
Nuclear Regulatory Commission agreed and then it seen
the proposed decision. The CPUC also found it wise to
plan early and really detail to go directly in that
decommissioning because no other nuclear power plant has
done that other. So there's a number of firsts here,
but again we're taking advantage of this long planning
horizon from history input and from our community input
through our engagement panel decommissioning focus.

So if we can go to the next slide, please.

That was a good recap -- quick recap of what we turned
in in 2018 December and that was the basis for the rate
case, which is like a legal proceeding that Ms. Somogyi will now dispense.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Tom. I hope everybody will bear with me. Because of the technical issues, I am doing double duty here. So before we introduce Megan, I am going to see if I can bring up the next slide presentation.

Okay. Thank you and really pleased to introduce Megan Somogyi. Megan is a partner with Goodin, MacBride, Squeri & Day and she is outside counsel to San Luis Obispo County for CPUC matters.

So we're really pleased to have you here tonight, Megan. Please go ahead.

MS. SOMOGYI: Thank you, Chuck and I'm pleased to be here, as well. Thank you to the panel for having me come and speak. I am going to address a lot of the CPUC process that led to the current proposed decision to approve the settlement agreement on the 2018 decommissioning cost proceeding application and my slides don't contain a detailed breakdown of the terms of the settlement agreement. The bulk of the agreement addresses technical utility rate-making and a lot of issues that don't necessarily lend themselves to interesting presentations or brevity for that matter, but the highlights are that the settling parties agreed
that PG&E would receive approximately 3.9 billion dollars to fund the work of actually beginning the decommissioning and undertaking the decommissioning planning work that was the brand new proposal in the 2018 application. That was a roughly 1-billion-dollar reduction over the original dollar amount that PG&E had requested in its application. The settlement agreement also asks the commission to approve PG&E's withdrawal of that 187 million dollars from its decommissioning trust that the NRC also approved because it was very important to the settling parties that PG&E be able to undertake the planning work now in these years while the plant is still operating so that PG&E can proceed straight to decon when Unit 2 shuts down in 2025. The settlement agreement did also adopt that shortened seven-year transfer period for the spent fuel from the cooling pools to the dry cask storage. So those are the big headline settlement items.

So the CPUC's decision itself, which -- in which the CPU proposes to approve the settlement agreement, it was issued on August 6th. So very recently. That was approximately 18 months after the settling parties submitted the settlement agreement to the CPUC. The proposed decision adopts the settlement agreement almost entirely without change. The decision
does propose to change the time period in which PG&E will collect the decommissioning funds from its customers. The proposed decision shifts that 7-year collection cycle back about two years. The settlement agreement contemplated a 2020 start date and the proposed decision is currently looking at about a 2022 start date. That change was likely a function of the fact that it took the CPUC so long to actually approve the settlement agreement.

And in terms of the substantive issues presented in the settlement, the commission found that the agreement was reasonable in light of the whole record, it was consistent with the law and it was in the public interest and we'll talk a little bit more about what that actually looks like in a few slides and the earliest that the CPUC can approve the proposed decision and the settlement agreement is at its upcoming September 9th voting meeting.

So if we go to the next slide, we can see and Tom also previewed some of the work that the parties did during the course of the proceeding. How the commission and the parties got to the settlement agreement and to this decision involved a robust proceeding that had a number of active parties and it really spanned the entirety of 2019, and, you know, in the process of
examining PG&E's application and addressing the issues that were raised putting forth their own issues, you can see that there were a number of procedural milestones along the way over the course of that year and that included extensive written testimony from PG&E and the other parties, significant discovery whereby the parties really expanded the factual record and evidentiary hearings where witnesses were cross-examined. So this proceeding was about as close as one gets to a trial or, you know, a regular court proceeding for CPUC matters. And after all of that, the settlement agreement was submitted to the commission for its consideration and approval in January of 2020 and the CPUC subsequently issued three consecutive decisions extending the statutory deadline by which the CPUC had to conclude the proceeding. It's not unusual for the CPUC to extend proceeding deadlines in general. There are a lot of proceedings where the commission just needs a little bit longer than the 12 or the 18 months the statute provides, but in this proceeding, the delay was a bit unusual because this involved a settlement agreement that was not hotly contested and the settlement involved most of the active parties. So the delay here was noticeable.

If we can go to the next slide. So when we
think about what CPUC approval actually entails, the commission's Rule 12.1 sets out the requirements for what the commission has to find in order to approve a settlement agreement and there's three things. It has to be reasonable in light of the whole record, so not just the evidentiary case put on by the utility, but by the evidence proves by all the other parties, as well, it has to be consistent with the law and it has to be in the public interest.

And so if we go to the next slide, we can see what that looks like in practice. These are excerpts from the proposed decision that show how the commission was thinking about those three elements. The commission found that the settlement agreement presented a reasonable decommissioning cost estimate to be collected from the customers and the commission reached that decision by looking at the dollar amount, as well as the potential for reuse at the Diablo Canyon site and other issues that were raised by the parties. The commission also found that the settlement struck an appropriate balance between all of the parties' interests while still allowing sufficient funds to allow PG&E to undertake the decommissioning work and the commission did also find that the settlement didn't contravene any statutory provisions or commission decisions. So it was
lawful. And generally when you have reasonable facts and a lawful decision, it is also found to be in the public interest, as was the case here.

So if we can go to the next slide. And so when parties of the CPUC decide a proceeding by settling instead of waiting for the CPUC to issue its own decisions on the issues that the parties raised, that doesn't actually reduce the CPUC's authority over the utility, the issues or, you know, the actions that are going to be undertaken under the agreement and the proposed decision addressed the CPUC's sort of retention of its jurisdiction and authorities. This is a very common thing you see with settlement agreements and reiterated two points of well-established precedence, one of which is that the settlement agreement does not create precedence for the CPUC and that means that when PG&E files its next nuclear decommissioning cost application, which I understand is going to be in the next few months, and any application on the three-year cycle thereafter, the facts and the issues and the thinking that went into the settlement agreement and went into the CPUC's approval of that agreement are not going to bind the commission's examination, analysis or ruling in the next decommissioning proceeding or any one thereafter. So the commission, as well as the parties,
are going to come to the next application with a blank slate, and then, of course, the CPUC also noted that the settlement agreement does preserve the agency's jurisdiction over the actual issues that were presented in the proceeding, as well as over the parties with respect to how the settlement agreement is interpreted, implemented and enforced.

So if we can go to the next slide. So where we go from here, I expect that the commission is going to approve the proposed decision and thereby the settlement agreement during the September 9th voting meeting. I imagine that there are not going to be substantive changes to the proposed decision with the potential exception of the commission may decide to reinstate the original cost recovery time line that was contemplated in the settlement agreement. So instead of having PG&E's cost recovery for those 3.9-billion-dollar start in 2022, it will be backdated through some rate-making mechanism that will be decided through an advice letter starting in 2020. So that is, I think, one potential likely change that we may see, but it's doubtful that the commission will make any other substantive changes to the decision and, of course, the public can access the voting meeting agenda, the decisions that the CPUC is going to be voting on and the web cast link so you
can watch the voting meeting all through the CPUC's
website and that concludes my presentation and I'll turn
it back over to PG&E.

MS. ZAWALICK: All right. Thank you, Megan.

This is --

MR. ANDERS: Thank you. Give me just a minute,

Maureen.

The next speaker is Maureen Zawalick and
Maureen invites us to business technical services. She
is also a panel member.

So, Maureen, why don't you go ahead and open up
the discussion and response to PG&E's response to the
preliminary decision and I will see if I can pull up
your PowerPoint presentation.

MS. ZAWALICK: Appreciate that. Thank you very
much and good evening, everyone.

So Tom and Megan have covered a lot of very
good information and background and details. I'll try
not to repeat any of that and just add on some
additional information regarding the proposed
settlement. So while Chuck is bringing that up on the
second page, which is one advance to that, I did want to
call up the very diverse partners -- or parties, I'm
sorry, that participated in the settlement that was
filed January 10th of 2020 about a year after the
December 13th, 2018, filing and Tom gave a lot of that history, I won't repeat it, but here's a list here if you can go one more slide, Chuck. There, yeah. Here is the list of the active parties. So you've got the Utility Reform Network and Alliance For Nuclear Responsibility, Public Advocate's Office, the County of San Luis Obispo, Women's Energy Matters and ytt Northern Chumash and of course PG&E. So a very diverse group, which is what we want, right, and everyone that is providing input and participation in this very important process.

Just to dive down and go to the next slide, dive down into a high level what is the cost estimate savings in this settlement agreement. We can call it a 4, 3, 2. I'll go from the bottom up. And each of them are subject to regulatory approvals either on a state or federal level. 400 million cost savings related to the breakwater repurposing, Tom mentioned that line item and showed that on his presentation. He added some transportation and so forth and you get that number close to 400 million. 300 million to reduce the spent fuel cooling period. Tom talked about how federal regulations and our requirements to operate right now are ten years for that spent fuel cooling period, then the commission came back and asked for seven years and
then what we've done in this proposed settlement is move it even more to four years or less, and so moving it to that four years or less is another 300 million dollars in savings, and then, finally, leveraging and tapping into the possibility opportunities for general repurposing allows for another approximately 200 million dollars in savings. So you get that 900 million and that's where you see the 4.8 billion dollar from December 2018 filing to the settlement.

Go to the next slide. A couple more highlights and then we can wrap it up here. So some additional highlights to talk about and Megan talked a bit about cost recovery and time lines and so forth, but the settlement also provided a revenue requirement recovery over eight years that created about 112.5 million dollars there and then also they have created or provided an opportunity for nine qualified trust use, meaning that we can be using the money that Tom talked about that had been pre-approved to spend from the trust fund prior to shutting down. So we can do all this at very important preplanning work to mitigate the risk of SAFSTOR. So we can go right into decommissioning and not have to do a lot of regulatory or site characterization work or we can move forward with that procurement of the used fuel system while we're
operating and not have to wait until November 2024 and then start doing all these activities. So this was really key and a great strategy and it took all parties working together to help with that smooth and efficient and timely immediate transition to decommissioning and avoiding SAFSTOR risks.

One thing I do want to call out has been a very big interest of many people is the contracting strategy. Another way to say that is how are we going to decommission Diablo Canyon -- and you can see it behind me there. How are we going to do it and there's many different models out there in the industry that folks are well aware of and so but this proposed settlement does not talk about the proposed contracting strategy. That will be part of the 2021 filing that we make later in this year. So just we get a lot of questions on that. I wanted to make sure we highlighted that and just want to touch upon that we are fully vetting and evaluating the various vendors for the spent fuel storage that have new cask designs for the spent four-year offload I talked about. So we're on track for that. You know, Tom will talk about that a little bit later in the evening, but just wanted to mention that, as well, and this settlement agreement proposed decision and an eventual voter approval that Megan talked about.
is critical to setting that budget and all of the funding and scoping that is needed for this preplanning.

Then on to the next slide is the high level time line focusing on that contracting strategy piece of it, how we will decommission it. We started the process last summer. We did a lot of outreach regarding request for information on the industry and key operating experience and what other nuclear facilities are experiencing. We've gotten a lot of that internal and external input and that has helped inform our internal decision process. We have not made a decision yet. We expect to make a decision, meaning a PG&E recommendation to the California Public Utility Commission in October, November -- October time frame. The commission ultimately would be the decision-makers on how we will decommission and we will be engaging with key stakeholders like the Engagement Panel and the county and other parties to the joint proposal and the Nuclear Decommissioning Cost Triennial Proceedings settlement, as well as our unions that we have at Diablo Canyon and so that will occur in October and November time frame and then we will make it public, and the process in which we make it public will be through the 2021 December of this year Nuclear Decommissioning Cost Triennial Proceedings application where we will describe
what PG&E's putting forward as our recommendation on how to decommission Diablo Canyon.

And then, finally, the last slide is just a repeat of what Megan has already stated, key dates August 6 when we got the proposed decision and then the earliest that the commission can vote is the 9th. She shared at great length about it being publicly available to watch and we're working with the commission on just providing comments and so forth. Nothing other than the what Megan talked about, as well as the start date for cost recovery time just because it took about 18 months for them to issue this proposed decision.

So that wraps up my remarks and additional details. I hope I didn't repeat too much from Tom and Megan. So I'll turn it back to you, Chuck.

MR. ANDERS: Great. Thank you, Maureen. We have a few minutes now for some questions and answers. Any members of the panel have any questions of Maureen, Megan or Tom? Any questions on the settlement agreement? Please raise your hand and I'll call on you in order. Okay. We have Dena, Scott and then Kara. Go ahead, Dena.

MS. BELLMAN: Thank you. Thank you, everyone, for your descriptions and information about the settlement and the ruling and I think that's the crux of
my question. I just want to make sure that folks understand how -- I think it sounds odd to say there was a settlement and then the CPUC made a ruling on it. So can one of you clarify what those two different terms mean and how we got there and if that's usual?

MS. SOMOGYI: Sure. I can jump in for a start. That is very usual at the CPUC. That is, in fact, the only way that a CPUC-regulated utility can settle anything to do with its operations or its funding. The idea is that because the utilities are fully regulated by the commission, the commission has to make sure that their rates are reasonable, that their operations are also reasonable and safe and, you know, the CPUC has to, essentially, look at, think about and sign off on just about everything that PG&E or any of the other utilities do and that includes any matters that the utility and the interested stakeholders may want to settle. So that's why there's the two-step process with the CPUC having to sign off.

The settlement agreement itself is also a relatively common occurrence in CPUC proceedings. The utilities will file applications to do a wide variety of things and the stakeholders who view matters differently or would like to see the utilities change things will engage in the process and will raise concerns.
Sometimes there's testimony, sometimes it goes to hearings, but just the way parties can settle their differences between themselves in civil trials, that's also a way that the parties at CPUC proceedings can settle their differences and the CPUC does encourage settlement agreements where possible because it saves the parties time and resources, it saves the CPUC's time and resources, and so notwithstanding the fact that the commission will ultimately have to review and approve the settlement agreement, it's still very much a favored process because it's just best for everybody involved if the parties can reach agreement amicably. Does that answer the question?

MS. BELLMAN: It does. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Great. Okay. Scott and then Kara.

MR. LATHROP: Thank you. My question relates to the savings, the 900-million-dollar savings, and just for clarification, I think I understand the breakwater issue and also the savings for a new cap, but as you relate to the 200 million repurposing savings, I think what you're saying or for the public's purposes, like, for example, I believe the training facility or training building would be tentatively scheduling to be removed, but if for some purpose -- for some reason we find a
user for that building where it does not come down, is
that part of that 200-million-dollar projected savings?

MR. JONES: This is Tom Jones. I'll take that.

Yes, Mr. Lathrop, that's correct. In addition to those
avoided costs, we would also sell that asset and that
process is also regulated by the Public Utilities
Commission called 851 Filing. If something is
encumbered by utility rates on behalf of customers, the
commission needs to approve the disposition of that
asset once a tentative deal is reached. So two parties
at A and PG&E agreed that they want the building used in
your example, we would come to terms and take that
before the Public Utilities Commission. If it's above 5
million dollars, it's a full hearing. If it's below 5
million dollars, they issue a letter for the
transaction.

MR. LATHROP: Understood. Also, just kind of a
follow-up, as far as the estimate, though, of the 200
million, that has taken into consideration not tearing
down the building, plus a potential sale or it would be
proceeds of a potential sale improve that estimate?

MR. JONES: Yes and yes. It's how we think we
can get there for deals yet to be discussed, right? We
don't have those offers. It's our best estimate.

MR. LATHROP: Like a placeholder. Okay. Thank
you.

MR. JONES: And Ms. Somogyi highlighted something very important in this decision, does not preclude parties for new information in the subsequent NDCTPs. So come to resolution for the savings are greater if we adjust that in the future filings.

MR. LATHROP: Understood. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Okay. Kara, you had a question.

MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you, Chuck. Thank you, everyone.

So the CPUC's proposed decision allocated 3.9 billion dollars and that's ratepayer money for all costs of decommissioning and one of the questions I've received and just wanted to clarify, does that number include all the costs of getting the spent nuclear fuel out of the reactors, into the pools, into dry cask storage including the cost of those casks itself, as well as long-term security and storage means for several decades to come or where does -- what is covered in the form of spent nuclear fuel? Is it entirely covered by that 3.9 billion?

MR. JONES: The answer is yes, it is covered and then we go on to recover those costs from the Department of Energy because they are a breach of contract. So then we recollect those costs and put them
back into the general funding of PG&E to offset ongoing costs.

MS. WOODRUFF: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Great. Any other questions before we move on to our next -- Bill, I see you have your hand up. Go ahead. Bill Almas?

MR. ALMAS: I didn't have a question until I listened to Kara's question and now I have a follow-up. So, Tom, does the estimate, the 3.9 billion, include the -- what's your assumption for the time period for storage of the nuclear fuel?

MR. JONES: There's something called the Waste Policy Act and the NCR and the Department of Energy offer guidance to utilities. It assumes an approximate pickup time -- I don't have the document in front of me -- concluding in the 2060s era. What the assumption also makes is that they don't come pick it all up at once, right. If we can continue storing the 32 fuel assemblies per cask, we would have 138 casks. This assumes they start picking up in the 2040s and they take five casks a year. Then we have an empty dry cask storage facility and then we would decommission that facility because it's a separate licensed facility from Diablo Canyon.

MR. ALMAS: And just to follow then, if the
transfer was not possible in the 19 -- in the 2040 time
period, then you would still have recourse against the
federal government for those additional costs?
MR. JONES: We do. It's ongoing and there's
usually -- we're coming up on a renewed settlement
period, but we do that on a regular basis and we also do
these proceedings with the Utilities Commission on that
three-year basis. So there's a constant drum beat for
funding to assure that we have the resources we need to
safely operate and protect the used fuel and conduct a
thoughtful decommissioning.
MR. ALMAS: Thank you.
MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Bill. And with that,
I'd like to thank Megan and Tom and Maureen for your
presentation and let's go on to the next agenda item and
the next item is the update of the repurposing for
Diablo Canyon, and as Bill mentioned in his
introduction, we were focusing on the repurposing	onight of Parcel P. The panel will address the
surrounding lands at a later time, and to kick things
off, to kind of introduce the topic of repurposing
Parcel P, I'm going to introduce Tom Jones. And Tom --
MR. JONES: Chuck, I'll take care --
MR. ANDERS: -- I'll see if I can bring up your
slide.
MR. JONES: Chuck, I'd like to share my screen because I need to do some Zoom features with my slides.

So what we have on this slide is the repurposing outreach plan and how PG&E intends to evaluate potential offers for consideration and this was filed with the Public Utilities Commission by our now senior vice president Robert Kenny on June 30th of 2020 and part of that recreated a web page and email accounts that people can contact utility and we basically made a free -- I call it a mini due diligence page. You can go to the page, you can have a third-person view of the assets, you can see square footage of the buildings, you can see the layout and then you can request additional information. We've had a number of site requests that were actually delayed during COVID and we'll continue that outreach at least until 2023, but what I'm going to do is zoom in on the screen here and use my mouse and hopefully you can see to show what we're doing.

So in this top oval, this is the outreach through at least 2021 and we work with this diagram here, which is difficult to see. This is our Engagement Panel model where utility does things like tours, runs the website and then the Engagement Panel does its own outreach and hosts things like tonight. We also deal directly with, to the left, conservation groups. We've
done outreach to different government entities, have the 
Engagement Panel website itself, we've done tribal 
outreach. We're starting now on the real estate 
channels and you'll hear from some of these experts 
tonight and then we'll be following up with the trade 
press releases. Basically, anyone in the energy 
business that might be interested in a substation or 
things like offshore wind, it was big news when Diablo 
Canyon was closing not just because it was California's 
last nuclear power plant and such a sizeable asset, but 
that meant that that transmission corridor was going to 
be in play for some future source of generation energy 
storage or combinations thereof. So that got a lot of 
people's attention.

So once we had all that information up and 
running on these websites here, the criteria that the 
utility will look at includes some of the CPUC, the 
California Public Utilities Commission guidance, this 
Engagement Panel's strategic vision, and advisory 
measure in the year 2000 called the Dream Initiative, it 
has a land and map with assessment parcel numbers on it 
so people can look independently to see what 
encumbrances are on the parcels. For instance, one of 
the parcels has a cell tower. If you were interested in 
purchasing it, you should know that. It has other
zoning information so people can understand the regulatory construct. Interested parties then reach out to PG&E. We can exchange information with them, which is that diamond-shaped square in the center. If they're no longer interested, they exit the process. If they're still interested, they ask PG&E for more information or express an interest. We then evaluate against that criteria, the regulatory construct, and then if it's not consistent with those goals or viable in PG&E's determination, they exit the process if we can't come to terms. If they are consistent with those goals, we can include it in a subsequent CPUC proceeding for further action.

So that's the long story short. This information is available on the Engagement Panel website and on the PG&E website and the California Utility's website. There's a four-page narrative that goes with this, but it's a pretty simple process, actually. People express interest and we react to that.

So, Chuck, that concludes my remarks and I will stop sharing and give you back the screen.

MS. WOODRUFF: Hey, Tom, real quickly, could you please provide the website address and email address so if people want to provide the input you described, they can easily do that?
MR. JONES: Yeah. I'll have Chuck say the panel website, but the email address is Diablo Canyon repurposing, all one word, @PG&E.com. So again, that's DiabloCanyonRepurposing@PG&E.com.

MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you.

MR. JONES: And a simple oversearch of the Diablo Canyon Decommissioning Engagement Panel brings up both websites one PG&E maintains and one the panel maintains. Those are your first two hits.

MR. ANDERS: Great. Thank you, Tom. Our next speaker is going to talk about offshore wind energy opportunities and status and originally California Energy Commission Commissioner Karen Douglas was going to speak, but, unfortunately, her schedule and itinerary changed, but we are very fortunate to have Eli Harland. Eli is the advisor to Commissioner Douglas and will provide an overview of what's going on with offshore wind energy. Harland, are you on?

MR. HARLAND: Yeah. Hopefully you can hear me.

MR. ANDERS: Do you want PowerPoint?

MR. HARLAND: That would be good, Chuck.

Good evening, everybody, and thank you for inviting me to present to the panel. As Chuck mentioned, my name is Eli Harland and I do work at the California Energy Commission, currently an advisor to
Commissioner Karen Douglas, who had hoped to make a presentation tonight, but was unable to adjust her schedule, but I will do my best to fill in for her tonight and definitely be sure that I share my key takeaways from the meeting tonight with her and the purpose of the presentation tonight is to provide an update on offshore wind energy planning. Commissioner Douglas is the point person for the State of California for offshore wind, which means that she helps coordinate state agency activities and she's also the interface with the Federal Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, and so before I jump into offshore wind, I just wanted to establish some context for why planning for offshore wind.

So next slide. So California Energy Commission is kind of a quick overview. I think that this group has a good understanding of state agencies involved with energy and especially the CPUC, but for those not familiar with the Energy Commission, or the CEC, as we call ourselves, we have a pretty broad portfolio of activities. The CEC is ran by five governor-appointed commissioners who all work full time and responsible for providing policy oversight to the work of the CEC. My boss, Commissioner Douglas, is currently in her third term and is the longest standing person on the
commission right now. So some of you have probably worked with her in her career in that capacity. Some of the keys functions CEC does in addition to planning for renewable energy development is we establish the state energy building code, or Title 24, as you might know it by. The CEC administers 100 million dollar annual ratepayer research and development program called the electric program investment charge. We are responsible for licensing thermal power plants larger than 50 megawatts in the state and we also are responsible for developing the statewide demand forecast that's used as a key input into the state and utility resource planning processes. So I'll touch on some of the renewable energy planning and offshore wind in a bit.

So next slide please. So California climate energy goals, I also think this is something many of you are familiar with on the panel. I just wanted to share these as sort of -- kind of a key driver of why we're talking about offshore wind and a lot of that has to do with the 2045 policy for 100 percent clean energy in California and all of that is -- is -- main driver is to reduce greenhouse gasses and mitigate climate change. So next slide please, Chuck. And then over -- so over the years, so to grow the renewable industry,
the states had many longstanding policies that have really been drivers of that. One of the most important is the renewable portfolio standard, or RPS, which requires specific percentage targets for California Utilities to include renewable technologies and the portfolios they have that deliver energy. The RPS requirement was first established almost 20 years ago, and as you can see in the graph, you ramp up around 2010, which wasn't in response to the RPS being increased and also in response to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which really stimulated a lot of renewable energy growth in California and one way that the state has really helped facilitate these policies, especially the CEC has been through landscape -- what we call landscape level planning processes in areas that have high valuable -- highly valuable renewable energy. So this is included planning in the California Desert, the San Joaquin Valley and then also offshore wind energy. So that's what's really gotten the CEC involved in doing a lot of this planning.

So next slide. So a bit about SB 100. SB 100 was passed in 2018. This is the policy that establishes a 60 percent renewable portfolio standard by 2030, as well as establishing a zero carbon policy for the electric sector by 2045. So this policy is going to be
a major driver of zero carbon technologies and renewable technologies. SB 100 requires the CEC, the CPUC and the Air Resources Board to complete a joint agency report every four years that analyzes the SB 100 policy. The first report for -- the first joint agency report was completed earlier this year and some of the major findings are that it shows that SB 100 is technically achievable, but there are lots of opportunities and challenges. Technology diversity and geographic diversity are really important within the resource mix and the portfolio that's used to achieve that policy. One of the major findings of the report was that there is a -- sort of a record setting resource build rate. So the amount of new resources that need to be added to the grid is unprecedented in 2045 to achieve that. The SB 100 report is a directional report and informs planning work. So it doesn't set out -- it doesn't set out procurement, but it does -- it does inform the long-range planning, and one thing that the report did find in some of the computer modeling that was done for the report is that key technology is offshore wind as an opportunity because it really adds diversity to the portfolio mix and the resource profile of offshore wind can complement California's solar energy production. So doesn't mean that offshore wind energy is a given, but
it does confirm a lot of what we believe are the values of the resource.

So next slide. So a bit about the technology itself and following kind of this overview of the technology, I'll get into an update on kind of the status of planning for it and there are -- there are many experts that work on this, especially the National Renewable Energy Laboratory more inrealm that could spend hours and hours describing and discussing the technology. So I think I'll kind of touch on some of the key attributes of it, but there are some great resources from inrealm that I would suggest checking out if you wanted to go into more depth about the technology itself.

The photo shown on the slide here is a prototype of an offshore wind floating platform. This is about a two-megawatt scale wind turbine on a floating platform off of Portugal. And so, you know, why floating platforms? And, really, it comes down to the fact that the Pacific OCS is very deep and the waters off California are very deep and so if you're going to have wind energy production in the ocean off of the California coast, you're going to -- it's going to require floating platforms. The floating platform concept is not unique to California. So there are
countries in Europe and Asia that have piloted projects and are also actively planning to deploy the technology and have some pretty hard commitments and a development pipeline for the floating technology, and also in the Gulf of Main in Hawaii and even recently in Oregon, the technology is being considered. So it's not really -- so it's an emerging technology, but not just emerging in California.

Also on this slide, there's an image of two of some of the ocean wind technology. So the first two that you see there are what are called fixed bottom technology. These are technologies used in shallower waters and their foundations are driven directly into the seabed. If you've seen offshore wind and you're up near the one project off of the East Coast of the west, you'll have seen these projects, which are on these fixed platforms. So pretty prevalent in Europe. The technology has been around at scale for well over a decade and on the East Coast it's really starting to ramp up, as well. There's many projects that have been contracted on the East Coast by utilities and under state directives and a lot of them are in the environmental review stage, two that have completed their environmental reviews and several others that are in environmental reviews.
Also in this image are three floating platform technologies and so these are the technologies that could be deployed in California. These floating platforms really borrow their design and engineering from other floating ocean infrastructure technologies such as floating oil and gas platforms and this is really where the technology is evolving and a lot of competition is happening. I also wanted to add a stat on this slide or reference because it's hard to get a sense of scale when you look at an image like these, but it has created a reference floating wind turbine and at a scale of a 15-megawatt turbine, which California is and sort of the rest of the globe is sort of planning around it, expecting will exist, and that's a very large wind turbine, 15 megawatts. The height from the water to the top of the blade is close to 900 feet and that's taller than the towers of, like, the Golden Gate Bridge from the top of the ocean. So when thinking about scale, these are -- these are very large projects and the scale of technology and, really, the uniqueness of the ocean and importance of coastal communities, you know, that means there's a lot of work to do and that's why the Energy Commission and the states started working with BOEM in 2016.

So next slide. So we really started assessing
offshore wind in 2016 in response to an unsolicited lease request at that time from a developer for an area off of Morro Bay. Following that, the state and the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, or BOEM, established what's called an intergovernmental task force because there was a finding that the company who submitted the unsolicited lease request wasn't the only company interested. So there was confirmed commercial interest to develop this technology in federal waters off California. The task force that was established first met in 2016 and since that first meeting has convened three times. The purpose of the task force is to coordinate federal, state, local and travel governments. It's non-regulatory and serves as a -- as a forum and sort of a place to communicate, but like I said, it's not a decision-making body, but it does bring together decision-makers and BOEM has set these task forces up in many coastal states where there's confirmed interest in offshore wind. So following that first task force meeting, BOEM and the state worked together to hold a lot of meetings with stakeholders along the entire coast. The purpose of those meetings was to educate folks on the BOEM process, as well as to begin gathering information and data to help inform where potential areas could be for consideration. The spatial
information was gathered and added to an Internet web portal that we call the California Offshore Wind Energy Gateway. There are over 700 data sets on that gateway that cover everything from environmental information, existing ocean uses and other important data that's used in the planning process. So the data and gathering -- the outreach and data gathering led BOEM in October 2018 to identify what are three call areas in federal waters off the California coast and so the map on the slide shows those three areas. One area is off of Humboldt Bay on the north coast of California and two of them are off of the Central Coast. One is called the Morro Bay and one's called the Diablo Canyon call area. Following the 2018 call and collection of public comments, BOEM and the state identified a pretty significant -- with the Department of Defense and their operations and their mission to test and train and carry out their readiness activities and the -- and sort of through leadership on the Central Coast. So representatives of office and other federal and state during 2018-2019 began to work on negotiating a path forward for the Central Coast and identified some potential areas kind of in and around that Morro Bay call area that could reduce the DOD conflicts. There was a public process around that. The outcome was really to continue negotiations and get to a
path forward for the Central Coast and the north coast.

So next slide. So the continuing negotiation resulted in an agreement that was announced on May 25th of this year between the Biden administration and the Newsom administration to move forward with leasing off the Central Coast. On the Central Coast and east and west extension to the Morro Bay call area was identified. This has been called the Morro Bay 399 area and you can see that in the map on the slide.

Additionally, the existing Humboldt call area was advanced as what's called a wind energy area, which is sort of the next step in BOEM's process to go from a call to a wind energy area. And then on July 13th of this year, the task force met for -- this was the fourth meeting, fourth time it convened, and the purpose was to describe to the task force and get input on the next steps for implementing the agreement that was reached on May 25th, and shortly after, the task force meeting, BOEM initiated a new call for information for the 399 area for those two extensions on extension on the east and extension on the west and BOEM initiated a scoping for the environmental assessment for the Humboldt wind energy area. Those two processes are currently in public comment period and the public comment period for those closes on September 13th, 2021.
Next slide. So BOEM has some pretty great graphics on their timeline. So I borrowed from their graphics here, but this is an overview of the authorization process of BOEM's authorization process. So for projects in federal waters. It shows at a high level the phases of planning and permitting that lead up to construction. The box around the planning and analysis is the phase that we're currently in and have been in since 2016 and it's the phase that we're hoping the recent agreement will have unstuck so that we can begin working with BOEM and federal colleagues to move this forward and I think and I just want to emphasize here a lot needs to happen to get to deployment. Following the issuance of a lease, there's a site assessment and a survey by a leaseholder and that leads up to submittal of a construction plan and BOEM has estimated that from the time a lease is issued, it could take up to -- so not necessarily seven years, but up to seven years to approve construction.

So next slide. So in order to even get to that leasing phase, this slide is a little bit more detailed about the box that I just described in the process. Before this -- before this slide and what it does show is the immediate next steps. So we're currently -- or BOEM is currently in the public comment process for the
call on the east and west extensions for the Morro Bay area. Following the call, BOEM will go through the area ID process and that will look more to what's currently happening for the Humboldt call area. So the Morro Bay area is going to catch up with where the Humboldt call area is and then there's a process to do an area ID and there's an environmental review of the area. The focus of that environmental review will be on the leasing activities in the area and not like a citing level review. That occurs later in the process when there's an actual project proposed. So that's when BOEM will initiate that, and I just want to also point out that the proposed sale notice point in time on this timeline is a period of time where there will be a state -- a request by BOEM for a state action. So this is where the Coastal Commission will -- where BOEM will request a consistency determination from the Coastal Commission with the Coastal Zone Management Act and of the coastal policies. So this is an important step where the state has an opportunity to be part of the federal BOEM process outside of -- outside of just collaborating and working with BOEM, there will be an actual action that the state will have soon, and then if the process follows these steps in this time line, there will be a lease sale option for off the California coast in 2022.
and that would most likely be in the fall looking at, kind of, the current dates.

So next slide. This is my last slide. I just wanted to also highlight the recent state budget allocates about 20 million dollars to support state agencies and an inner agency approach to offshore wind energy. This is the first real investment by the state in the offshore wind energy at this level. I think it's really an indication of the administration's and the legislature's priorities around moving forward in a way that advances offshore winds and protects the environment and coastal and ocean users. So there's a couple bullets summarizing where some of that spending will happen and I want to make sure I leave time for Q and A. So I think that's the last slide and, Chuck, I'll turn it back over to you.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Eli. So now is the opportunity for the panel members to ask any questions and please raise your hand. So first Patrick and then Kara.

MR. LEMIEUX: First, thank you so much, Eli, for this presentation. It's very informative and great to see the whole process on how this whole thing works. So it's clear that there's very tight hand-shaking that takes place between the Bureau of Ocean Energy
Management on the federal level and California Energy Commission, which you're representing here, and your nine slides there sort of outline this whole thing all the way through installation and one question that comes to my mind is I don't see the role of the local representatives on this. In other words, I see a lot of interaction and a lot of negotiation and work on the part of the federal and the state government, but what about the local community? What about, say, the San Luis Obispo County representatives? Do they have a say in the permanent process of these wind farms given that at the end of day, the tie-in occurs in San Luis Obispo County?

MR. HARLAND: Yes. That's a good question. Thank you. And I will say that I borrowed BOEM's time line because their time line and graphic looks so great and they on that time line don't go into that level of detail, but that is -- that is something we have been mapping out at the state level, is the role of local government, the role of non-federally recognized tribes who are also not represented on the task force, but are important to this process and then so that is something we're beginning to map out and each -- sort of each local government has a different role depending on where the -- where a project might interconnect let's say with...
the grid that crosses over private land versus public land, crosses over the city versus county jurisdiction and so we've looked at that on both north coast and Central Coast on a very high level and see that there are differences in how that plays out especially where there's a local coastal plan or not or where there's an agreement with the State Lands Commission to serve in a lead role in their process as well. So I don't have a direct way to say that until there's really, I think, a project proposal to know how that works.

MR. LEMIEUX: But where does it fit on the time line? Are we looking at just before installation when this would happen or how does it fit in?

MR. HARLAND: I mean, informally, it's at the task force level, I think, and it's through, you know, whether it's meetings like this or other outreach informal level. Formally, it's more than likely when there's a project that's been proposed that has an environmental review associated that I can think of and Coastal Commission will -- they will be the ones that will have to do the first review to determine consistency with coastal policies and some places that have local coastal plans, they'll have to look to those to inform what they're going to have to decide on.

MR. LEMIEUX: Thank you.
MR. HARLAND: Yeah.

MR. ANDERS: Great. Thank you, Patrick and Eli.

Next, Kara and then Scott has a question. Go ahead, Kara.

MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you.

Thanks, Eli. Nice to have you here and really appreciate your presentation.

So as I understand it, we have to these two call areas or regions in California where we may see offshore wind facilities down the road. One of them is Humboldt and the other one is offshore of Morro Bay and I understand that the Humboldt call area is a little bit ahead of maybe Morro Bay because they started the environmental review, but what I don't understand is it's my understanding that in Humboldt, the capacity to take that energy and transmit it to the state grid is reduced from that capacity off of Morro Bay, which can tie into the grid just as Diablo Canyon has. So I was wondering if you could speak to the difference in how soon these two different call areas could go online and does that transmission capacity issue and Humboldt create a problem in generating the kind of energy that people are expecting from these projects?

MR. HARLAND: Yeah. That's a good question.
Allows me, I think, to clarify the time line, as well. So when I say that they're behind, they're not necessarily behind. They're sort of on a different schedule now and it's because there's a new call that BOEM has initiated for the east and west areas outside of the Morro Bay call area and Humboldt -- at the same time that that call started, Humboldt started environmental review for Humboldt to do their wind energy area but the plan that BOEM has articulated and they shared this at the task force meeting is they would really like to arrive at the sale at the same time for both areas and so next year everything stays on time line and stays on track. Next year there will a point in time where both catch up to each other and you can have a lease sale that occurs at both areas at the same time and absent the site surveys and the things that a developer would have to do to construct and deploy, and just thinking about it from sort of an electric infrastructure point of view, we have always really been focused on trying to find an area on the Central Coast that can work because of the potential to use the existing infrastructure that's there to deliver energy to the grid because the Humboldt area is -- it's really like an energy island on the north coast where they've got two small interconnections to the broader bolt grid
and really serve a lot of the reliability needs of the local power. So to really scale up the Humboldt area will take creativity and high level energy or some pretty significant investments in the infrastructure. So I imagine that if there is the ability to use the existing infrastructure on the Central Coast for offshore wind, that you might see a small project on Humboldt go forward because it's smaller and can do it quicker and I can see a larger project going forward off the Central Coast before it goes forward on the north coast.

MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you. That's helpful.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you. Next question from Scott and then Bill.

MR. LATHROP: Yes. Eli, the way I’m seeing it in reference to repurposing of Parcel P as it relates to land, I really do see an opportunity in two ways. One, of course, would be the connection to the grid, which seems that it would work well for the existing location, but then the other issue is, of course, the port. What I have read through the BOEM reports is that the ideal location distance from the wind field or wind farm is roughly 40 nautical miles, which it seems to me that in order for it to be economically feasible for the wind, that people would have to look real serious about a port
somewhere on the Central Coast and that's kind of probably the bigger issue as far as the opportunity because that seems like a major development that would have a hard time going through the process. So that leads us to another question, the -- any kind of application that would support wind on land, who would actually be the lead agency for that? Because I believe it would be a fairly large deal in reference to try and place the port somewhere on the Central Coast.

MR. HARLAND: Yeah. Absolutely need to have a port and a port with the right characteristics is important, as well. You've got to have the ability to -- the spacing ability to construct and put together a foundation and don't have any -- anything that's at all in the way like a bridge, any deep waters for having a ship be able to come in to acquire large boats. We've started to look at the existing ports using that BOEM study that you mentioned and some other work that happened and, again, on the north coast, we definitely see an opportunity with the Harbor District there to be able to utilize the port and so part of some of the state investments in this round of the budget will go to support an application that they're putting into the Department of Transportation to do some improvements,
but on the Central Coast, we haven't really gone much further than looking at those existing ports. So Port Hueneme and Port of Long Beach are two areas where we started to have some conversations about some of the opportunity there. As far as finding locations for development of a new port, we definitely have seen the proposals and engagement from the elective leadership and the San Luis Obispo community for thinking about a Central Coast clean energy port, but kind of above my pay grade, so like really be able to say whether like those areas make sense or that concept makes sense, but, yeah, definitely agree with you there, a port is absolutely necessary to make this happen or a couple ports to come to it, right. So yeah.

MR. LATHROP: And just as a second quick question, dealing with the different goals of 60 percent and 100 percent by 2030 and 2045, of those percentages, what amount would actually come from wind or what is the projection for that?

MR. HARLAND: The SB-100 report that was prepared, the portfolio includes 10 gigawatts, so 10,000 megawatts of wind energy from the ocean and it includes another -- I think it's about 15 gigawatts from terrestrial wind, a lot of that out of state, about 4 or 5,000 within the state. So, I mean, it's a really
large --

Q. Yes.

A. -- large number. So offshore wind is large in itself and it fits within a much bigger context of ramping up and scaling up development.

MR. LATHROP: Understood. Thanks.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Scott. We're almost out of time for our Q and A session, but we have two more hands up. So let's -- Bill and then Miriam, if we could really --

MR. ALMAS: I'm short.

MR. ANDERS: -- answer questions quickly.

MR. ALMAS: Mine's short, Chuck. There's two blocks on the Central Coast identified for lease. One's called Morro Bay, the other's called Diablo Canyon. Is there any reason why Morro Bay -- if Morro Bay is the lease area and this is established as the wind generation location, that connection could not occur at Diablo Canyon Power Plant or the site of the plant?

MR. HARLAND: Yeah. So interconnection point hasn't -- hasn't been identified at this point because that will be something done in the project development stage or potentially done before by an independent system operator or utility and the names of each of those call areas, they were named that because of the
closest point of interconnection to the grid. So Diablo Canyon, Morro Bay, but I can't see why a lot of the infrastructure potential couldn't be used for the Morro Bay.

MR. ALMAS: All right. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Bill. Eli, last question from Mariam.

MS. SHAH: Yeah. My question isn't as much about wind energy. It's kind of general repurposing Parcel P question. So it might be more appropriate for Tom.

My question is about housing and workforce housing on Parcel P, and I hope I'm not putting you on the spot, Tom, but I've asked you about this in passing and I think it's important for the public to know, you know, what are the hurdles or the possibilities in regard to Parcel P ever having workforce housing?

MR. JONES: Actually, I think if we can hold that question until after our real estate folks go because they've done some of that analysis, but one of the short answers is not compatible with the current zoning, but that's a discretionary action by the Board of Supervisors, but our guests in the next section, Richard Lewis will go over that, and they've done some analysis about that, along with other types of uses from
a market perspective separate from a land plan perspective based on zoning or other things.

MS. SHAH: Okay. Thank you. Looking forward to it.

MR. ANDERS: Well, thank you, Mariam. That was a perfect segue into our next topic.

Tom -- first of all, Eli, I'd like to thank you and the California Energy Commission for your time and expertise in putting together the compensation. Thank you very much.

Our next topic regarding repurposing is the PG&E real estate consultant overview and, Tom, I'd like you to introduce our next speaker and put this topic in context.

MR. JONES: Thanks, Chuck. So a couple things. As PG&E looks at the future of Parcel P that we ask about or, you know, the area where the power plant occupies today, we're not developers, we're not real estate experts. So we've gone out to get professional help. The company hasn't, but the corporation has, the real estate department, and they count on some outside independent experts, and so with that, we use the firm JLL and we also use the Concord Group. So we have Richard today with us or this evening with us from the Concord Group. They're going to give you a market...
analysis that looks medium and long-term and there's two
circles to this diagram. I just touched on them a
little bit ago with Miriam's question, and one is -- and
we have a local coastal program here. So what is
allowed in that area from a planning perspective on the
rules of the county and the Coastal Commission Center
and then separately, what is the market, right, and
those two things aren't mutually inclusive of each
other. What are investors willing to do, what does the
site lend itself best to from an investment opportunity
and then from a utilization opportunity. So I'm going
to hand it over to Richard in just a second and, Chuck,
I believe, will run his own slides. So he'll share
screen on that, and, Richard, you have the floor and
take it away.

MR. GOLLIS: Thank you, Tom. I'm going to
share this right here and also introduce my colleague
Brett Harper who is on the screen, as well, with me. As
you mentioned, we've done for PG&E in conjunction with
JLL a preliminary market assessment. So the objective
here was really to -- let me see -- the objective here
was really to look at the core parcels here that are
outlined and try and identify based on where the site
sits in the Central Coast, where the economic dynamics
are not only in the short run, but as Tom was saying, 15
to 20 years out directionally what kind of opportunities might be in front of us. And so the things that we were focused on were really commercialization of land use. So we looked at resort hospitality and conferencing, we looked at the idea of RV camping and glamping as a terminology, the reuse of the marina as talked about before, we looked at housing opportunities both on for sale and resort-oriented, as well as from the prior comment, a component of workforce housing, and that workforce will define it for you as we get into the conversation and the work is really preliminary at this level and is looked at from the perspective of an investor and developer who may come in as a third party and look at these opportunities and what we concluded to at least at this level is a very high level programming recommendations that are going to require obviously over the next number of years as this process unfolds much more diligence both from market economic perspective and certainly from a physical planning and then ultimately from an entitlement and political perspective.

So a couple of key summary points. First off, spectacular location. We all know that. I think the number backdrops to the Zoom calls here showing some of these pictures and so from a marketability perspective, there's tremendous interest in this and we also see this
site, this specific core area as an economic development
catalyst for the broader area. So what we do here has
the opportunity to have spin-off effects. So it does
create more employment opportunities for the local
workforce, it can create better housing opportunities
and hopefully expand the economy of the local market
within the bounds of what the stakeholders are looking
for.

And most importantly, as an overall conclusion,
we are looking, again, at 15-year time frame. Order of
magnitude for these uses, about 150, 160 acres of
development in terms of hospitality, as we mentioned,
low touch, low impact RV and camping, marina on the
existing proper, plus ancillary uses that may surround
it depending on dry dock activities and storage,
opportunities for for-sale housing and certainly for
workforce and affordable either capital A or small A
affordable housing.

Importantly, as part of the process, JLL did a
number of broker outreach efforts to confirm the
marketability of these different assets for the site
across the uses and it was very consistent with the
marketability findings around hospitality, outdoor
recreation, the marina activity and housing. The lowest
marketability were really those that are blurring the
lines between market and institutional to whether they're educational or whether they're governmental, office is certainly small base in the economy, but the idea is those were uses that they may show up, may be difficult to plan and not the focus.

So I'm going to run through a few ideas what that means. Some of the font is small, but give you an idea where we concluded and we eliminated other uses, but when we start talking about the hospitality and lodging component, there are opportunities here for luxury upscale, higher-end opportunities for visitation, which will bring in fresh money and expand the economy, also tie into possibilities for satellite canvases for Cal Poly, having convention opportunities, not just resort visitors, and how all that plays in is significant opportunity we see for the site from marketable perspective.

We look at the RV. This is a very interesting trend. Not recent, but over the last tens years or so, folks are looking for a lighter touch and folks looking for opportunities to be part of the natural environment, and clearly as we look at the property, those opportunities are significant and we think there's an opportunity here specifically to tap into that.

The marina use, again, depending on how, as Tom
mentioned, the entitlement process runs, a significant opportunity -- very limited opportunities between Santa Barbara and Santa Cruz and this geography is right in line with opportunities both for a recreational, as well as commercial opportunities around the waterfront.

Next is housing. A couple of different dynamics here. The probability here is ground lease, maybe not for-sale dirt, something that has to be thought through and so that has some implications for what we can do and typically there's probably a couple of different segments that we focus on, some primary housing at certain levels, but also opportunities for second home, vacation and resort-oriented properties, as well.

And then the last point would be the rental residential and, again, looking at workforce housing as was mentioned before, that definition typically in the range of 80 to 100 percent of the area median income targeted to local employment base, typically the service industry as an important driver because if there's a compelling reason to commercialize land uses with hospitality and with other resort activities, certainly with retail that may go with it, we need places for the workers to live, not only those who are currently in the county and in the neighborhood, but also those who may
be coming with the expanded opportunity and pretty important.

So when we thought about this and kind of laid it out over 15- or 20-year time frame, the opportunities here range from -- and this will be obviously among the website materials -- the opportunity for different hotel properties again tying into conferencing, as well as resort and secondary stays, the idea for the RV park campgrounds and the yurts, as they're called, the marina facilities and housing across for sale and workforce. So overall, about 140 to 165 acres and, again, of a net use. So this can be spread around, it can be concentrated. Those decisions would be forthcoming through the overall planning process.

As I mentioned in the early summary, JLL as the -- really the largest brokerage firm now in the United States that works with institutional investors who is part of our team, did some surveys in conversations among their team and others about, again, marketability both short, medium and long-term, long-term being that 25- or 30-year period, short-term being within ten years, medium in the middle there, and really came up with a consistent approach to what we had looked at where the uses around resort hospitality, the housing modalities were the strongest and possibilities
for longer term opportunities in education, government and corollary uses. So in the interest of time, that's my allotted segment. So with that, Chuck, I'll turn it over to you.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Richard.

Tom, I'll turn it over to you and you can turn it over to Patrick.

MR. JONES: Thanks, Chuck. One thing we didn't mention is PG&E is looking at the information that Richard and his team looked at for just understanding what might come to us. PG&E is not a developer of those types of things. It's not our core mission. That would be successor entity and the governments improve those things, not PG&E.

Our next speaker is Larry Kraemer. I'll hand it over to Patrick, but Larry Kraemer is an infrastructure expert at Cannon Engineering in San Luis Obispo and Larry is here tonight because he's been a crucial partner for us over the last decade or more and he's been a part of the Diablo Canyon desalinization project, and also when we looked previously to expand it to community use, Larry was our principal engineer looking for design features for connectivity from the power plant to the community.

So with that, I'll hand it over to Patrick and
Larry will have the floor after that.

MR. LEMIEUX: Great. Thank you, Tom. As you said, our next segment is about desalinization and I've been very passionate about this. I see the decommissioning of the Diablo Canyon Power Plant as having several opportunities for our community to make our community better and we're all seeing and hearing more and more in the news these days the upcoming drought and this problem is becoming accelerated by the faster and faster pace of climate change, and while desalinization is not the be all end all solution to this problem, it is certainly an important part of the solution and in this particular case we happen to have very close to us an existing desalinization plant and I think it would be a shame to simply get rid of the -- scrap it at the end of this decommissioning process, but instead we have an opportunity here to do something with it for our community.

Now, the specific one we have at Diablo Canyon is called a seawater reverse osmosis desalinization planter, SWRO, and our next speaker is going to talk more about this. There's many ways to do desalinization and SWRO is only one of them, others are distillation and electrodialysis, but SWRO is a well-proven method. It's one of the most common scalable and cost-efficient
method for doing this and it is -- like I said, this is
something we have at Diablo Canyon. It's able to
produce about a thousand gallons per minute of drinkable
water. It's about a million and a half gallons a day
and so it's a significant source of potable water for
us. These types of systems are common. There's many
others in California, as well. Maybe the most
well-known one is the one that's in use at the Carlsbad
desalinization plant, which produces 15 million gallons
a day, so about 30 times bigger than the one at Diablo
Canyon, and one of the features of that site is it's
able to do this at a very reasonable cost, fractions of
a penny per gallon of water produced.

Now, the main cost of this water production is
the energy consumption. In the case of Diablo Canyon,
that wasn't a problem. It's sitting next to a nuclear
power plant. What we saw in the previous segment, we
have an opportunity here. We have this desal plan next
to switch yard next to power lines that are being
considered for large offshore wind farms bringing all
this electricity right next door to this desal plant and
I think that in our conversation about the
decommissioning of Diablo Canyon, we need to be talking
about the possible timing of those two things and one
possible use that's been proposed in the past in 2015
feasibility study is to construct a few miles of water pipeline to connect the desalination plant to one of our local county reservoirs, drinking reservoirs, Lopez Lake, which is, once again, in the middle of a lot of stress due to the drought and so having access to water replenishment will certainly help keep that lake in a better state than it is now.

So with this, I'm going to let our next speaker, Larry from Cannon, tell us more about the desalination plant at Diablo Canyon. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Okay. Thank you, Patrick.

Larry, do you want to share your screen and the presentation or should I bring it up here?

MR. KRAEMER: If you could share, that would be great because I've got my monitor set up and I think I would probably mess it up. So if you could do that, that would be great.

And I appreciate, Patrick, your commentary. I think I can probably skip through the first five slides because you touched on all of them, but this will be good because I'll be able to reinforce what you just said.

So I'd like to just start by thanking PG&E and the panel for inviting me to participate in this discussion tonight. I know the panel has heard -- has I
guess -- this isn't the first time the panel's talked about desalinization. So my presentation is pretty short and a primer to keep this conversation going.

So next slide, please. Let's see. So I'm a civil engineer. I've been practicing for about 35 years with an emphasis on water resources. I've been working at Cannon Engineering for the last 20 years and I've looked at a lot of the city's and county's water districts and sanitation districts in the area over those 20 years, and then prior to that, I worked for Orange County water and Orange County sanitation districts, who has pioneered a lot of these technologies over the years.

So today I'm going to touch upon this water desalinization basics and then PG&E's SWRO facilities and then future reuse opportunities after decommissioning.

Next slide, please. So the process of separating salts from seawater is a fairly basic three-step process and the first process is pre-treatment where we remove all of the sedible and suspended solids and debris and we basically use a simple duo media filter to do that, which is just a sand combination that removes a lot of that. Step two is the reverse osmosis membrane technology that Patrick
mentioned earlier and that is where we remove the dissolved solids and the predominant being chloride and sodium, which make up 85 percent of the ions in seawater. The membranes are made of a special thin film composite material, which they continue to improve over time. They've seen significant increases in efficiencies over the last 30 or so years.

As was mentioned, this is the most energy-intensive step and that it requires high pressure. In the case of Diablo and the seawater plant there, it's usually 900 psi to force water through the membranes and leaving behind the high salinity brine for disposal. And then step three, depending on the downstream use, minerals are added back into the water for taste and they're also used to stabilize the water so it prevent corrosion. The membranes themselves are actually still good at stripping all the materials, but if you don't put something back in there, the water becomes very aggressive and can strip things from the pipe material.

Next slide, please. So this technology has been around for 50 years, and as I mentioned, it keeps getting better and better. Today you see it in a variety of applications from under your sink to help soften your water to your taste to entire countries
using this as a vital component of their overall water portfolio. Both Israel and Saudi Arabia rely heavily on desal.

Next slide. There are numerous facilities along the coast of California that use this technology. These are permitted facilities you see here. DCPP is Location Number 7, and as was mentioned, it produces about one million gallons a day. Santa Barbara at Location 9 produces 3 million gallons a day and Carlsbad, the one that we've all heard about, is a significant project, produces -- that location produces about 50 million gallons a day.

Next slide. So the basic process for many of these facilities including Diablo Canyon is like the one shown here. In step one, water is drawn in from the ocean and then it goes through the power plant for cooling and then it goes back out to the ocean, and then as you see in step two, a very small portion of that inflow is diverted to the three-step process we just talked about, the three treatment, the RO filtering and conditioning for downstream use, and then steps five and six involve disposal of that brine back into that outflow stream back into the ocean.

Next slide. So how does Diablo Canyon's work? You'll see on the lower left intake structure, that's
where water is brought in. There's an orange line and I don't know if you can see that, but there's an orange line that leads up to the facility where we've labeled it the seawater RO facility and that is -- there's a blowup of that on the right. There is basically the pad location where that equipment is stored. From there, the clean water is piped up the hill to the two large raw water storage pumps that you see there in blue. These currently have a capacity of 5 million gallons of storage and then the green line is the brine disposal line and that takes the reject water back through the portion of the intake structure that eventually goes back out through the outfall.

PG&E owns all the infrastructure inputs and outputs to this SWRO facility, including the land and concrete underneath the equipment. SUEZ water owns, operates and maintains the treatment equipment and SUEZ and its predecessors have the expertise and have successfully operated this plant for over 30 years.

Next slide, please. As was reported in the previous panel discussion meeting, PG&E has extended a contract with SUEZ for another 15 years of service and that includes capitalizing many of the system components. Those -- many of the prefiltration systems will be replaced with filters in the backwash tanks, new
UV disinfection equipment and cartridge filters and some of the pumping components.

Next slide. So on an average basis, the current facility is running at about 50 percent capacity, and when we looked at this in 2015, there was about one acre foot per day of surplus capacity if the plant was operated on more frequent basis. This equates to about 500 acre feet a year. If the plant were sized up to its permitted brine disposal capacity of 1.44 MTD, there would be approximately a thousand acre fee surplus. So to put this in perspective, the Los Osos community uses about 2,000 acres a day for its domestic water demand and the greater Five Cities area, to also put it in perspective, uses about 15,000 acre feet a day.

Next slide. Okay. So that brings us to some considerations to think about when we start discussing the PG&E use of these facilities. Some of the advantages, I think it's part of the water -- it can be part of the water sustainability solution, but it's not really a panacea, as was mentioned. Another advantage is there is existing infrastructure with remaining useful life that could make this a very attractive alternative. Some of the disadvantages, it is limited in capacity and is it enough to get the water community
interested and also does it make economic sense if you have to build a 7-mile pipeline when there are other alternatives out there.

Next slide. There's always that question is that we hear can we make another Carlsbad here another 50 million a day plan and there's significant challenges with that, not the least of which is compliant with the ocean water -- ocean plan. Excuse me. So there are significant challenge with this. Increasing the capacity would trigger new intake requirements as part of the California ocean plan. DCP's shoreline is within a marine-protected area where subsurface intake would be required and the problem with subsurface intake is you need a sandy bottom. DCPP's shoreline is primarily rock and this would not be conducive to a subsurface intake.

Next slide, please. So in summary, there's certainly some advantages to repurposing DCP's SWRO system, but there are still challenges and those challenges, as we talked about earlier, will the water community see it as an asset to diversify their water portfolio and is there the political will to really push through the permit renewals and the regulatory requirements of operating without an active power plant.

Next slide. So at this point, I'll turn it back to you, Chuck and Tom, for the Q and A.
MR. ANDERS: Great. Thank you, Larry.

So now we have the opportunity to ask questions on both topics. Richard on the real estate study that was conducted and Larry with regard to desal.

So panel, if you have any questions, raise your hand. We have Sherri, Mariam and Kara and then Patrick. So go ahead, Sherri.

MS. DANOFF: Okay. Well, I wasn't planning this initially, but I want to thank Larry tremendously for an excellent presentation. It really gives us a good idea of what the obstacles are and whether there should be serious consideration of desal despite all the hopes that we've had, but thank you so much.

And then I also appreciate Richard's presentation and I do have a couple questions of Richard with the Concord Group. Were constraints considered of the -- the types of uses that have high marketability? What consideration might have been given to access? You probably realize as Avila Beach Drive is the access.

MR. GOLLIS: That's a great question. It was more from a broader economic perspective and the critical issue, as we identified next, is do they fit, is the access available and, sort of, those different issues would need to be evaluated further.

MS. DANOFF: Okay. Okay. And then is this in
the same context then further evaluation, this thing about workforce housing and the remoteness of the location from urban services, so that would be future consideration too?

MR. GOLLIS: Right. And also how in the context of what's being developed, some of those services may actually be incorporated in the master plan. So there would be opportunities to do that, as well, and, again, as Tom identified, it's really not that PG&E would do it, but that the outside community might have expressed interest in it, would then have to assess how that might work.

MS. DANOFF: Okay. Very good. Thank you so much.

MR. GOLLIS: Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Okay, Mariam, Kara and then Patrick.

MS. SHAH: Thank you. I had one question for each of the speakers. I had a question about what I often hear about desal, one of the negatives is dealing with the brine and I was wondering if you can talk a little bit about that and how it would work if it was brought to Diablo and depending on how much water was produced.

MR. KRAEMER: Well, good question. A lot of
times you hear brine as being a problem because you
don't have a place to discharge it and most water
facilities actually look for an ocean outfall to
discharge their brine. So when you see a lot of these
large plants like Orange County sanitation district
where I worked, they're recycling 100 million gallons a
day of wastewater and discharging that brine out into
the ocean. They can do that because they have an ocean
outlaw. So an inland desal plant where you might be
treating a high salinity groundwater would have deal
with that brine and discharge it. The beauty of ocean
desal is that you have your proximity to the ocean and
ability to discharge it to the ocean, and so and in the
case of existing operation, it's ideal setup for the
brine disposal.

MS. SHAH: Okay. Thank you. And then my other
question about marketability of the property, as -- I
guess I'm having a little bit of trouble with the
process because the area's not zoned for any of the
things or most of the things that it seems most
marketable for and there's no guarantees that the water
exists, there's no guarantees that you're going to have
a Board of Supervisors that agrees with the idea. So
how do you go about the marketing and how realistic is
it that will get buyers?
MR. GOLLIS: Tom, do you want me to address that?

MR. JONES: I will go first and I'll let you clean it up, Richard.

From a planning perspective because of the port or marina feature and the zoning of public facilities, student housing and the recreational components that are visitor servicing from the yurt to the luxury hotel have a regulatory path for the zoning, as does things like a campus that may also include student housing. The straight housing alone doesn't have a straight path for the zoning.

And then, Richard, you can talk about how the market views risk for regulatory change.

MR. GOLLIS: Yeah. I think that's 100 percent right. And usually, you know, when we look at these projects, we start with a vision and then we work towards identifying what the pathway is to achieve it as opposed to starting with the regulatory hurdles and then working within that. So I think it does go -- does go hand and glove along those lines, about the majority of those uses are, as Tom said, in a pathway towards, you know, potential approval where some of those items would need to be through that political process.

MS. SHAH: Thank you.
MR. ANDERS: Our next speaker is Kara and then Patrick.

MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you both for your good presentations. I just had more of a comment on Richard's presentation and then a couple questions for Larry.

In the last three years, the Engagement Panel has been holding regular quarterly and sometimes more frequently meetings and we have asked people on multiple occasions for their vision on the Diablo Canyon lands and Parcel P and potential repurposing and new future uses in light of the decommissioning and I can say we have received very, very few either as a number or as a percentage of people who have spoken about any interest at all in hospitality or glamping or heavy use of marina or housing. So maybe those are marketability issues, but I'm not sensing the support for that publicly or at least it really, really hasn't been presented to us in spite of many opportunities for the public to do that, but my questions are actually for Larry Kraemer and, I guess, Larry, I'm really interested in your judgment. If you were the one who is going to make a call on whether desal should be pursued or not, what would your call be? And if you think it's something that it's still not clear, would you recommend the next step to be
a feasibility study, and if so, do you have any estimate of how much money you would need to do a responsible enlightening feasibility study that can look at the existing facilities and challenges, including new regulatory hurdles like the ocean plan?

MR. KRAEMER: Okay. So I think there was three questions in there and I think I'll jump to the second one, which was do we need to do a little more homework. Absolutely, and we need to find the willing water purveyor that actually takes the water, manages it and sells it to its customers and we've got -- we've got to understand what it's going to take for them in terms of wanting to diversify their water portfolio. Is it worth it to them to spend the money on this or do they feel that they have better options? And so I think a study should be done to look and one similar to the real estate, find the marketability of the water and then do an assessment on how much it would take and I don't have a good number to give you right now on what that would take to do a feasibility study on that.

MS. WOODRUFF: So -- thank you. The feasibility study, I think, in 2015, Tom, do you know how much the cost of that ran?

MR. JONES: Tom Jones here. The County Board of Supervisors had allocated $900,000 to work out the
project design and everything else. All of the research that they did, and they did some pretty outstanding research on their website, cost them under $85,000.

MS. WOODRUFF: So at least a million to take the next step and explore marketability and feasibility, I would guess.

MR. JONES: I would not comment on that number because the 85,000 was an analysis and the water purveyors are aware of their needs of future growth and things like that. They look at it on a capitalization cost and per acre cost and cost to their customer and they're evaluating those options. They know their needs. It's whether or not how you allocate a project is it five entities or one entity where your cost per gallons change. Water is pretty complex, but it's also very dynamic. Larry, do you want to add to that?

MR. KRAEMER: And that's the problem with desal. It's a significant investment and you have to operate it and run it to take advantage of that investment, but there's probably always going to be cheaper alternatives that come at you like heavy winter use like high rain seasons and Santa Barbara went through this and they've ultimately said, you know what, we don't have enough reliability in our surface water and our groundwater supplies, we need to do something
different and so they've allocated a pretty significant amount of their water portfolio to desal and I think it's upward in the neighborhoods of 20 percent of their overall water portfolio.

So as Tom mentioned, you really have to -- each entity has to look at that and decide what they're comfortable with and I know we work with a couple water districts in this last drought and they were heavily dependent on groundwater. They had no surface water and they were going through contingency planning on how they were going to start trucking water for basic human needs. So it got pretty close last time and are we in -- at the beginning of that? Possibly. So it may become more marketable, as Tom said, as time goes on.

MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Kara.

Our last question -- and we've got about five minutes before our break -- is from Patrick.

Patrick, go ahead.

MR. LEMIEUX: Great. Thank you, Chuck, and thank you, Kara, for that very important question. That was the part I wanted to touch on, the need and the possibility of doing an updated feasibility study in light of especially the California ocean plan.

With respect to that, one of the answers you
gave there, Larry, is we need to find a new water purveyor and I've heard that many times as being one of the hurdles that's keeping the desal plants represents after PG&E is gone and I guess I'm hoping to understand a little bit better how that works because you've explained in your talk that currently SUEZ water runs the site and that they've recently been renewed for another 15 years, which clearly was beyond PG&E's operation of the power plant. So assuming that this renewal just happened now, there's going to be operating 10 years past the power plant, how are they going to do that? There won't be the cooling through the reactor. Where are they going to, you know, return to brine? How is all that going to work? And can they not become that water purveyor that you were talking about? Aren't they the logical player in that -- in that area?

MR. KRAEMER: And I don't want if you want to address that, Tom.

MR. JONES: I'll start. Patrick, we have a number of discharge points and then our current coastal development permit under evaluation by the County of San Luis Obispo, we do show the ultimate demolition of our discharge point, but we still show the intake for the foreseeable future as part of the repurposing breakwater. With that, the 15-year contract that PG&E
entered into with SUEZ on the extension is for water throughout the decommissioning period. So we'll use less water than the current power plant, but we still have significant water needs for the hundreds to thousand employees, for fugitive pest control or fire suppression, you name it. So we're counting on that throughout decommissioning.

The other thing is that there's a different treatment criteria for our domestic water supply where it's adding placable work versus admissible water supply. So in the 2015 evaluation, the county looked at the treatment it would need, and I'm going to hand it over to the Larry to talk about the water traveling to the pipe in the county, very different than how we delivered water to the power plant.

MR. KRAEMER: And, yeah, Tom is exactly right. The way PG&E operates that plant, there's actually multiple plants within the plant. You have the seawater RO plant, which processes water to a certain degree, which is near drinking water standards, but it's not disinfected and it's not ready for public consumption. They actually have two other plants. They have an ultrapure water plant that then treats that raw water that's pumped up into the 5 million gallon storage and that water is ultrapurified to steam standards and
that's what's currently used in the steam generators of
the plant, and then as Tom mentioned, there's a
mini-treatment plan that then polishes that raw water
into drinking water standards for all the domestic and
drinking water on site, and to my knowledge, SUEZ is not
in the survey drinking water the public business. Even
in the Santa Barbara plant, that one is -- the
equipment, to my understanding, is operated by IDE,
which is a company similar to SUEZ, but they're just
operating the RO and the interior workings. The City of
Santa Barbara is actually taking that water,
disinfecting it and selling it to its customers.

And as Tom mentioned, you know, there would
need to be some things looked at, additional
conditioning of the raw water that's produced from SWRO,
but also seven miles of pipeline, at certain times the
velocity would be so low that water would take probably
several hours to get from the SWRO unit all the way out
to Avila Beach. That travel time would need to be
factored in. You have residual disinfectant by the time
you get to the gate. So those are just some of the
challenges you'd have, not insurmountable, but things
you need to look at.

MR. ANDERS: Okay. Patrick, does that answer
your question? We do need to move on.
MR. LEMIEUX: Yeah. Thank you. And I appreciate you being here. Thanks.

MR. ANDERS: Tim, I see you have your hand up. Do you have a quick question?

MR. AURAN: Yeah. I think it's pretty quick, Tom.

We had mentioned before there was significant improvements in the membranes over the past 30 years and also electricity energy cost in producing the filtered water was the most significant part of the generation of the water. Have these refinements reduced the energy requirements or are we pretty much running up against a fundamental law of nature how much energy is going to be required to creat potable water and seawater?

MR. KRAEMER: That's a good question. I'm not a membrane expert. So I don't know what future advances they're looking at. I know the pressures for seawater are the highest when -- on RO membranes that used in the a lot of applications as I mentioned earlier from under your sink with a low initial concentration, but seawater is the highest raw water concentration, so to speak. So I think you're always -- your pressures are going to be pretty high, but they've done quite a bit to actually recover a lot of that energy and they have energy recovery units on the actual RO membranes themselves and
so I don't have those numbers for you, Tim, exactly how much more energy-efficient they can come, but at some point I'm sure there is a limit.

MR. JONES: And, Tim, for our purposes, a lot of the energy is actually lifting the water from below sea level over that 85-foot elevation. So when we think about circulating in the future and we don't have an operating plant, we don't intend to lift as much water as high and intend to have discharge and dilution only about 10 feet above sea level. So instead of lifting that -- we're going to take that 75-foot elevation out of the pumping for all of our dilution factor to try to reduce those energy costs outside of the RO process. So we look at it systemically, not just in the RO box.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you very much. We do need to move on. I wanted to thank our speakers. Excellent presentations and very good discussion.

We're going to have a break now. We scheduled a 10-minute break, but we're running a little behind schedule. So I ask that we have a five-minute break and come back and at that time we'll have public comment.

I would like to get a handle on how many people public attendees would like to make public comments. So those of you from the public who are attending and monitoring this meeting, would you please raise your
hand if you would like to make a public comment. We will see how much time we have. Okay. Looks like we have at least right now seven people who would like to make a public comment. So let's go ahead and take a five-minute break and reconvene at 8:30 -- 8:35. I'm sorry. It's 8:30 right now. So let's reconvene at 8:35. Thank you.

(Recess.)

MR. ANDERS: Okay. Let's reconvene the meeting and we have eight folks that would like to make a comment and I will -- Matt Downing, Eric Greening, Jane Swanson, Mary Lou Johnson, Jack Shoulders, John Gilespy, Lauren Brown and Susan Harvey.

So if you didn't hear your name, please go ahead and raise your hand to make sure you have the opportunity to make a comment. So let's go ahead and each person will begin in two minutes to make a comment and let's start with Matt Downing.

And, Matt, you should be able to talk right now and I will give you a heads-up in about 30 seconds.

MR. DOWNING: Wonderful. Thank you, Chuck. Hopefully everybody can hear me okay.

MR. ANDERS: Yeah, we can hear you.

MR. DOWNING: My name is Matt Downing. I'm the community development director for the City of Pismo
Beach. First of all, take the opportunity to thank everybody on the panel. It always makes me happy seeing my fellow community members participating in things like this. That really means something to the greater community. I've spoken to the group before about this process and we -- I just wanted to reiterate some of my comments. The desalinization option is great, but I will say that we do have our project, Central Coast Blue, that we are continuing to move forward with. Granted, it's hit some speed bumps as of late, but we are confident that we can work with our partner agencies to smooth all of that all out and that will provide us with the recycled water for our south county area that we need.

I think it would be a terrible waste to get rid of the marina. I know we've hinted at that in the past. So I'll just put a plug in there. Anything we can do to promote that marina would be a unique opportunity. Having some type of commercial use out there, the glamping idea is good, but as we know, anything with that large commercial draw is going to bring -- because of the remoteness that several of you spoke about is going to bring what it always brings and that's traffic. So really addressing the traffic issues, having one way in and one way out to that area currently is going to be
the foremost for our community, as we do see vehicles back up onto our local roadways from large events out in Avila. So just wanted to make those comments and thank you everybody for their time this evening and have a wonderful rest of the night.

MR. ANDERS: Great. Thanks very much, Matt. Our next speaker Eric Greening. Eric, go ahead. You should be able to speak now.

MR. GREENING: All right. Thank you. Yes.

Thank you. I'm Eric Greening and excellent presentations. Obviously, a lot of issues raised and I think the previous speaker hit on something. If there were to be a residential or resort used, I'm almost positive the county would require a secondary egress. We're not just talking about a secondary route through Avila. We're talking about a complete secondary egress from the site. That in itself would have a normal -- enormous environmental impacts creating that. Certainly, if it were no longer a roadless stretch of coast northward from there, that would have enormous impacts and so wildfire issues obviously evacuation issues from radiological and so on, there would have to be more than one way out if there were people actually living there.

Relative to the wind energy, my understanding
is current blades are made of unrecyclable materials that become waste products. Would that be the case with these absolutely enormous blades? What would their life cycle be? What would their duration be? What would their destination be once they cease to be useful? And I would advocate that Cal Poly and all other potential research partners look into bladeless options for harvesting wind energy. I understand that there are some increasing possibilities out there and I don't think we should just assume the word wind means turbines. There's marbled murrelets and wedge-tailed shearwaters and other birds that would be knocked out of sky by these blades and I think --

MR. ANDERS: 30 seconds, Eric.

MR. GREENING: -- to harvest the wind. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Eric, you had a little more time. Are you done?

MR. GREENING: I thought you were telling me my time was up.

MR. ANDERS: No. I was saying you have 30 seconds left.

MR. GREENING: Oh, okay. Anyway, I think definitely the whole characterization of future uses, of course, depends on the site being safe and there's a lot
of information we need. My understanding is the county
has not yet accepted the application as complete and
some of it has to do with waste characterization and
handling. Do we have any idea when the scoping period
will be on the county's EIR? If there's anyone from the
county to answer that, I would be appreciative. Thank
you.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Eric, and I think we
may be able to answer that in our next segment.

MR. LEMIEUX: Chuck, can I address one of
Eric's point briefly?

MR. ANDERS: We really need to -- we're going
to have a discussion period after this and I would
really appreciate holding that till that time.

MR. LEMIEUX: No problem.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you. Our next speaker is
Mary Lou Johnson and -- oh, I'm sorry. Jane Swanson.
Jane, go ahead.

MS. SWANSON: Thank you. Do you hear me? Do
you hear me?

MR. ANDERS: Yes, we can.

MS. SWANSON: Okay. Thank you. I have two
questions. Number one, given there are 750 acres in
Parcel P and given that this meeting is about the
repurposing of Parcel P, I was very surprised to hear
the real estate consultant refer to -- I thought he referred to thousands of acres or did I misunderstand that? I may have a misunderstanding. So I thought clarification when he was talking about glamping and all these touristy things, is that within the 750 acres or is that beyond?

Second question. Yet to come in this meeting is PG&E's update of the new nuclear fuel storage system with discussion by panel members to follow. I don't see on the agenda that there is an opportunity for the public to ask questions following the panel discussion and I'm hoping there is. So I would like clarification on that. Will the public be able to ask questions or clarifications following that report?

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Jane. Right now our agenda doesn't have that opportunity for the public to ask questions after that report. So if you have anything on that topic, I would say it now.

MS. SWANSON: Well, I don't know how to ask questions when I haven't heard the update from PG&E yet because I -- that's my whole point.

MS. WOODRUFF: The update is scheduled to be addressed by the panel in the first quarter of 2022, Jane. So we'll have a meeting devoted entirely to that topic and, yes, there will be public comment.
And in answer to your other question, the commercialization marketability issues only refer to the 700 or so acres of Parcel P, not beyond that.

Ms. Swanson: Okay. Thank you very much for the clarification, Kara. Appreciate it.

Mr. Jones: Jane, this is Tom Jones. For the spent fuel nuclear fuel storage system, our whole update for five items is ten minutes. I'll give you the one minute now. The request for proposal process remains on schedule and on time, and as Kara Woodruff mentioned, we'll be revealing the results of the successful vendor in the first quarter of next year. So it's just that brief of an update, on time, multiple vendors, multiple viable technical options, still in discussions.

Ms. Swanson: Thank you. That's helpful.

Thank you.

Mr. Anders: Thank you, Jane. Our next public comment is from Mary Lou Johnson. Go ahead, Mary Lou.

Ms. Johnson: Thank you so much. Yes, I'm here. Can you hear me?

Mr. Anders: Yes, we can.

Ms. Johnson: Okay. Thank you so much to the panel, especially Larry and Patrick. I am very interested in maintaining the use of the desalinization plant. I own two properties in Carlsbad and I'm very
familiar with that plant. We really do need to balance out the consideration of a seven-mile pipeline versus saltwater intrusion for highly valuable ag land in the area Huasna, Oceano. I think we need to preserve that extra water resource. Carlsbad is operated by Poseidon. It's at no cost to the taxpayers and I think you could probably get vendors to operate and provide the water through the desal plant. I'm excited about that.

Also would like to see some extra camping and glamping in the area. That's a beautiful area and I think that would be a light touch and could afford a lot of enjoyment for that area.

So those are my two -- I think the panel has been wonderful, very informative and I'm excited about learning more about this as we go ahead, but I really hope that the desal plant is repurposed and continued and we continue to learn and refine and figure out how to power that resource. So thank you very much.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Mary Lou. Our next public comment is from Jack Shoulders. Jack, you should be able to speak.

MR. SHOULDERS: Can you hear me?

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

MR. SHOULDERS: I have several comments. I'll be curt.
On the windmill issue, the 1920 Marina Act or the Jones Act requires the ships that would install these installations to be made in the U.S. and carried by U.S.-owned and crude vessels and there's no such huge ship that can install these devices in the United States at all and for the very small number of East Coast installations, they had to have a Dutch ship -- I think it was Dutch -- come to Canada to take all of the equipment and install it because there's no such ship in the United States. So I think when we talk about the feasibility of installing a few of these on the West Coast, we need to be aware of the fact there's no way to install it as I stated.

Secondly, on the desal issue, 18 months ago or two years ago, this panel had a long presentation by the engineer at Diablo Canyon that's in charge of the water and a representative of the south county organization that's responsible for water and that south county person said he had no interest whatsoever in taking Diablo desal water because of the cost issue and I'm surprised no one seems to be aware of that.

Thirdly, when we talk about the massive amount of renewable energy we need in this state to meet this goal that the state has put forth, and I listen to the galatial pace of accomplishing getting windmills
approved, it doesn't support the kind of goal that the state has. You know, this is an existential climate change and we need to do a World War II kind of thing. So we need to cut through the bureaucracy. And, finally, the access road --

MR. ANDERS: You have about two minutes, Jack.

MR. SHOULDERS: Just 30 seconds. The access road, I'm particularly familiar with the -- if you look at coming up the slope from the entrance, there's lots of slippage that's occurred over time and there's a massive threat there and an expense to keep that road open and that needs to be considered when we talk about using any installations further up north from the entrance point. I'm done.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is John Gilespy. John, you should be able to speak now.

MR. GILESPY: I've been a long-time resident in this area. I started fishing up here in 1970. I fished this coast offshore in the area of this composed development and know it very well and I'm also educated in oceanography and I'm concerned about the very interface with the water of the wind that normally would be transiting that area and the possibility of all the upwelling currents that drive the warm waters offshore
and commence the prime production process of plankton
and chlorophyll development and the basic process of
growing food fish and just fish in general. This plant
is 400 square miles. 200 of these gigantic windmills
could have an effect on this extremely important aspect
of the California coastline and especially at build-out
if they went all the way up the coast. I can tell you
when you interfere with the wind, the warm water comes
in and mandates the area and it will also have a
regional climate effect not only on the coastal
communities, but as well as those inland and as well
affect potential rain patterns and temperature patterns.

I guess I first got into this when I was
looking for was there any study about this and I didn't
see it. I had to get over the gag reflex of this
grotesque development --

MR. ANDERS: 30 seconds left, John.

MR. GILESPY: -- in this pristine ocean area
and its potential effects could alter the very aspect of
Pacific Ocean, which is a placid ocean that relies on
wind patterns and wind to commence and continue at
circulation. I don't know if I fell within that. I
could probably go on, but thank you. This panel is very
edifying and I appreciate their being part of it.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, John. Appreciate your
Our next speaker is Lauren Brown. Lauren, go ahead.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Well, first of all, I'd like to thank the whole panel and the speakers for an excellent program tonight. I very enjoyed it. I really have a couple questions, no comments. The question I had, maybe a missed the content of the speakers from the California Energy Commission, but I'm wondering what is the timing for proposals to be received for the offshore wind?

My second question may be directed to Tom Jones. Knowing that one of the aspects of the offshore wind project that ties in with the decommissioning of Diablo is making use of the power distribution system and I'm wondering, Tom, have you received any feelers whatsoever from anybody, any potential wind farm operation about tapping into the distribution? That's all I had.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Lauren. We'll have an opportunity to follow up on the questions after our last public speaker and our next speaker is Susan Harvey. Susan, you should be able to speak.

MS. HARVEY: Hi. Thank you, all. Are we all set?
MR. ANDERS: Yes. Go ahead. I hit the mute button. I apologize.

MS. HARVEY: Thank you all for the opportunity to speak. Susan Harvey. I'm the chair of the Congregation Committee of the Santa Lucia Chapter of the Sierra Club and first I'd like to say that we are very strongly committed to very local impact reuse of the Parcel P whether it be recreational or low impact research facilities.

My next thing, the idea of an industrial port somewhere on the California Coast sort of shredded my brain and I started wondering about the transmission potential of the lines coming out of Morro Bay, what that capacity was and the transmission capacity coming out of Diablo and do the Morro Bay lines and the Diablo lines feed into each other. I think that's really what I was really curious about, especially with the concept of the onshore facility that might be needed for wind.

Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Susan.

That's all the hands up that I have now. Anybody else from the public that wish to make comment? Please raise your hand if you do.

I think, John, you raised your land. I think -- there you go.
Okay. There's no one else. So let's take a few minutes to address some of the questions or comments. Lauren Brown asked regarding the timing of proposals for offshore wind and use of power distribution. Tom, can you take that on?

MR. JONES: I can answer half of it. I won't speak for BOEM or the Energy Commission presentation. I don't recall the time lines specifically. So we'll set that for follow-up.

The question about transmission at Diablo Canyon and Morro Bay, I think, was asked by two people, Lauren Brown and Ms. Harvey. So the Diablo Canyon capacity is enough to handle 2.2 gigawatts of power because that's what the power plant puts out. Morro Bay's production historically was half of that. There was four power plants there that had a total of 1.2 gigawatts. There were two 400 megawatts and two 200 megawatts. So you add those two together and that transmission was built for roughly -- those two quarters together roughly the size of what's proposed in the Morro Bay call area, but I'll commit to we'll bring back to the panel one of our transmission experts to talk about how that works. I think Dr. Brown had received inquiry and that process goes to California Independent System Operator. PG&E has rights to those lines a few
years after power generation and others can seek it as well and you heard a presentation in our repurposing working shop in Atascadero and that team was interested in obtaining transmission rights and also the interconnect down near the Oxnard area where there's another defunct gas natural power plant to have an additional tie-in. They sought to support offshore wind whoever was successful in obtaining the offshore leases and connect it to two different marketplaces, Southern California and central and Northern California.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Tom. And if I recall correctly, one of Eli Harland's slides from the Energy Commission did have an approximate timetable on for when dealing would take place. So those slides will be posted on the Engagement Panel website by tomorrow. So you can take a look at those and reference those also.

Panel, do you have any other comments or questions? Patrick, you had a comment or question.

MR. LEMIEUX: Yes. I wanted to address a comment that was made about recyclability of wind turbine blades by one of the members of the public there. It's an excellent question and it's a true important problem. Wind turbines have a life span of 20 years and afterwards their blades need to be disposed of. They're made of fiberglass and it can fill
landfills very rapidly. I'm speaking here, you know, as a person who does wind power research at Cal Poly. Recently, meaning over the past five years, that problem's been addressed and now wind turbine blades are actively being recycled by cement processor. So very successfully wind turbines are able to be recycled in a production of cement and concrete. So that problem has been largely alleviated for that. So this is -- you know, again, there is a solution to those problems and the three-bladed wind turbine is the vehicle for offshore wind, as well as onshore wind right now. It's the most developed machine for that purpose. So that's why these proposals all focus on that machine. There's no mystery there.

MR. ANDERS: Great. Thank you very much, Patrick.

Panel members, Karen, you have your hand up.

Go ahead.

MS. WOODRUFF: Yes. I just wanted to respond to kind of a comment or query by Jeff Shoulders. He had mentioned there there's no ship big enough to carry the turbines and that's absolutely true, but there are ships big enough to carry the parts and the parts have to be brought to the coast, and as mentioned by Eli Harland, at some point along the coast, it may be in multiple
areas, they have to build a port so that the assembly of all those parts can be made and then they can be put offshore.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Kara.

Any other comments or questions by the panel before we move on? I'd like to thank all the public attendees for attending and for participating in the public comment.

The next item on the agenda is the PG&E update.

So, Tom, I'll turn it over to you.

MR. JONES: Thanks, Chuck. I apologize to the panel and the public that they have to hear from me yet again.

So quickly here looking at the agenda, there are four items. We already did spent fuel storage. So I'll go in reverse order. Regulatory process update, I think we touched largely on that tonight through the Public Utilities Commission with the proposed decision. When you look at the project globally, there are only three simple things we need to do before execution. We need to have the project funded, and we're on our way for that now, we need to have the project licensed and the storage components licensed by the NRC and we have to have the project permitted by the County of San Luis Obispo, the California Coastal Commission and the
ancillary agencies that will have subordinate permits to
the main permits for those two entities. So one
milestone almost met and we're in active processing on
those other two. So that goes with the decommissioning
planning process update number one. We are on track or
ahead of schedule in every area. There was a member of
the comment of the public that asked when will the
scoping meeting occur from the environmental impact
report. The county will update folks with that, but I
would suggest to you we are weeks away from being deemed
complete rather than months, and once we're deemed
complete, the county has a thoughtful deliberate process
how they will likely hold multiple public hearings
because the project managers and planning director,
Trevor Keith, made a very firm commitment for robust
public engagement for this very important process. So
they're very dutiful at discharging those duties. So
we'll hear more from them at a later date, but that's
where we are on those items.

The last one is the lands deed restriction, the
1,200 acres. Since we last spoke, the Coastal
Commission asked for a new legal exhibit, which we
created several weeks ago and turned them in. So we're
waiting for them to say we satisfied that request. Once
that occur, we can go for execution. And just for your
knowledge, I keep a box in my car and in my house on the executed documents except for their signatures so I can go down to the county and file it once I get back from them, but we have followed up on their latest request several weeks ago and await their response.

MR. ANDERS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. JONES: Oh, I'm sorry. One important thing. Saved the best for last. We've seen someone on video tonight pop in and out and that's our new colleague, Teresa Alvarado, who has rejoined the company. She had a tenure with the company that overlapped in the late '90s to 2006. She's now our regional vice-president and her region is from San Jose down to where our service territory is near the Gaviota Tunnel. So Teresa has been following along and, Patrick, you'll be pleased to know she is passionate about water resources in California, as well. So we'll facilitate that introduction and so please welcome Teresa as she looks forward to working with the panel in the future.

MS. ALVARADO: Thanks, Tom. Hi, all.

MR. ANDERS: Teresa, would you like to say a few words?

MS. ALVARADO: In the interest of time, I'll save it for next time, but really great to be here and
I'm sure we'll have a lot of opportunities to collaborate. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Amongst yourselves, any observations, any comments, any questions? Everybody's had questions answered? All presenters must have done a very good job.

MR. JONES: Chuck, I see Patrick's hand is up, but it blends in with his --

MR. ANDERS: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm not following my own directions.

MR. JONES: And Mr. Almas is now raising --

MR. ANDERS: You guys are very polite. Patrick and then Bill.

MR. LEMIEUX: Thank you. I think the presentations tonight were excellent and I'm very grateful for the speakers that we invited, but I think the conversation is not over. I think we need to continue to have, you know, follow-up conversations on the repurposing of Parcel P in the future and I hope that as a panel we prioritize that because that seems to be a very important topic not just for us, but for the community, as well. So thank you everybody who spoke tonight and I hope that we keep the conversation going.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Patrick.

Bill, go ahead. Bill, you have a comment?
Hold on. You're muted.

MR. ALMAS: Okay. Can you hear me now?

MR. ANDERS: Yes, we can.

MR. ALMAS: Thank you. Just a question and I don't need it answered right now, but I'd like -- I'd like it to be looked into. Are there any brackish water resources on the PG&E lands? In the past life, we looked into that for desal and those familiar with desal know that as the salt content goes down in your feed water, the processing costs and the needed energy goes way down as well and so PG&E in the past has looked for fresh water because they needed fresh water, but I'm not sure if they looked for brackish water. So there may be -- and they've got a lot of property. So that is a question that I think should be answered at some point.

MR. JONES: We'll take a look at that for you.

MR. ALMAS: Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Bill.

Any questions or comments from the panel members before we wind the meeting up? Okay. The last item on our agenda is introduction of next meeting topics and I'd like to ask Mariam Shah to share with everyone our next meeting and what we plan on talking about.

MS. SHAH: Sure. Our next meeting will be
November 3rd from 6 to the 9 p.m. We will be discussing the pending project application and CEQA documents that are pending right now with SLO County and we'll also be discussing recent updates to the Engagement Panel strategic vision documents and it's my understanding from reading through some of the background materials there may be opportunities for the public to get involved with that SLO County process possibly before we meet again. So watch our website and watch public announcements and we will try to get that word out if we hear it so that the public can participate.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Mariam.

And if there are no further questions, I'd just like to thank the panel and all of the public attendees for an excellent meeting and we'll consider ourselves adjourned and enjoy what's left of the evening.

(The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.)
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