**OTC Nuclear Review Committee 6-20-2012 Meeting Summary**

|  |
| --- |
|  **Committee Chair**  |
| Jonathan Bishop  | SWRCB  |
| **Committee Members**  |
| Robert Heckler speak for: David Asti  | Southern California Edison  |
| David Barker  | San Diego Regional Water Board  |
| Dominic Gregorio  | SWRCB  |
| Melissa Jones | California Energy Commission |
| Bryan Cunningham speak for: Mark Krausse  | Pacific Gas and Electric  |
| Peter Von Langen  | Central Coast Regional Water Board  |
| Rochelle Becker  | Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility  |
| Tom Luster  | California Coastal Commission  |
| **Staff in Attendance**  |
| Mariela Paz Carpio-Obeso | SWRCB |
| Shuka Rastegarpour | SWRCB |
| Laurel Warddrip  | SWRCB  |
| Marleigh Wood  | SWRCB  |
| **Public in Attendance**  |
| Doug Dismukes | Bechtel Power Corp |
| James Kobyra | Bechtel Power Corp |
| Angela Kelley | NRDC |
| John Geesman | A4NR |
| David Siao | PPUC |
| Eric Wilkins | DFG |

1. Welcome Introductions and Updates

- Amendments to the Policy have been approved and are effective

-SACCWIS presentation to the board, no schedule for these amendments yet and one of the big issues is whether the Regional Water Boards or the State Water Board will be writing permits.

-SONGS – facility down, the monitoring report documents the flows at the units, complies with their NRC and NPDES permits.

A.I. – Rochelle Becker to send link video/presentation (SONGS?) to group

-July 12, 2012 Central Coast Regional Water Board updated their website for the OTC and Desalination issues

1. Overview of agenda

No changes needed

1. Review and approve meeting notes

Approved

1. Bechtel Presentation for the Special Studies

Update on the Special Studies, the reports have not gone through internal review yet. The interim report will be completed mid-August. The Committee would like to see any monthly reports from Bechtel.

The Utilities do not get to review the reports from Bechtel before they are sent to the Committee. Process for getting the reports to the Committee needs to be finalized.

A.I. Edit on Slide 12 – change Federal to California 316b. (done in meeting)

Question on Slide 15: does each criteria get evaluated before designated as yes or No? Answer: Yes, and evaluation takes place except when a technology is found to have a fatal flaw based on a previously reviewed criteria. Examples were provided during the discussion.

Question on Slide 16 – Phase I assessment of design basis for seismic issues is based on current requirements. What about changes in these regulations? Answer: any changes made to these regulations will be addressed in Phase II if requested.

Question on Slide 18: Reducing power beyond 80% to maintain current grid reliability was deemed by the Committee members as an arbitrary number, since there is no direct connection to actual grid reliability for this assumption. NRDC is uncomfortable tying 80% to grid reliability. 20% de-rating may not be unfeasible. The 80% threshold to declare a technology not feasible will not be used in Phase I.

Question: when did power plants determine 10% vs 20% reliability? How was this determined? Answer: this was decided before Bechtel involved, and not with Bechtel.

A.I. Edit presentation and strike grid Reliability issue (done in meeting)

Question Slide 19 - Can Committee members make comments on findings for rejection determinations? Yes Bechtel will be able to address such comments. More detailed information on the determinations will be provided to the Committee members when available.

Question from Bechtel to the Committee members: were the expectations met for the level of information provided in the presentation provided at the meeting? Answer: yes. The only comment was a suggestion that the discussion on the criterion be given before the process flow chart discussion not after. The Committee requested that as the report documents more details about process of developing the report. Bechtel agreed

A lengthy discussion took place discussing how the Committee members will receive and comment on the reports from Bechtel. The solution has to take into consideration Bagley-Keene issues. The interest of the Committee members was to get reports before any decisions made so that they have time to go over them and the interest of Bechtel was to receive a consolidated comment document with all the Committee member’s comments in a timely manner to finalize the report. The consolidated comments for Bechtel will be addressed at the July 26, 2012 OTC Nuclear Review Committee meeting (see OTC Nuclear Review Committee website for meeting schedule).

A.I. Marleigh Wood will review Bagley-Keene and a solution will be proposed that incorporates the interest of the entire group and send the protocols to the Committee members.

The following protocol was developed after the meeting and sent to the Committee members:

Dear Committee Members,

Following last month’s meeting, I conferred with management in the Office of Chief Counsel on how to approach the ongoing Bagley-Keene Opening Meeting Act issues affecting the Nuclear Review Committee.   As you know, the Committee is composed of members from diverse organizations, presenting challenges with scheduling and ensuring effective meetings while observing the open meeting requirements in our communications and meeting preparation.  The following approach should accomplish both of these purposes:

1. As has been the practice, meetings will continue to be publicly noticed, with an appropriate agenda, in accordance with the requirements of California Government Code section 11125.
2. Prior to a meeting at which specific documents will be discussed, these documents will be circulated to members.
3. Members may submit their comments on draft documents to a designated State Water Board staff member, usually Laurel Warddrip with the Division of Water Quality.  (In some instances, if Laurel is unavailable, we may instead ask that comments be sent to Shuka Rastegarpour or Maria de la Paz Carpio-Obeso.)
4. Once all comments have been received, State Water Board staff will consolidate all of the comments into a single document that will act as a staff report.  Individual comments will not be identified by Committee member.  Conflicting comments or viewpoints will be presented as options, alternatives, etc.
5. The resulting staff report will be circulated to Committee members and to the general public ahead of the scheduled meeting, so that all participants can be prepared in advance.

State Water Board Office of Chief Counsel believes that this approach will provide a relatively efficient method of ensuring compliance with open meeting law while allowing the Committee members to arrive ready to discuss all of the issues.  If you should have any questions, I may be reached at (916) 341-5169 or via email at mwood@waterboards.ca.gov.

A.I. Slide 20 – 4th Bullet – this 2 week timeline is to be changed, the July 26th meeting sets the schedule where the Committee will submit a set of consolidated comments by August 4th to Bechtel.

A.I. Slide 23 – 4th Bullet – Availability of fresh water for the use of closed cycle cooling this needs to be discussed with water rights (Jonathan Bishop)

Mark Krausse has a conflict with the July 26 meeting, possibly send alternate.

1. Public comments

Public spoke during the above discussion, no additional comments

1. Next Committee meeting

July 26, 2012 10am

Schedule can be viewed at: <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ocean/cwa316/rcnfpp/>

1. Adjourn