

OTC Nuclear Review Committee 11-26-2012 Meeting Summary

Committee Chair	
Dominic Gregorio (Acting)	SWRCB
Committee Members	
David Asti	Southern California Edison (SCE)
Melissa Jones	California Energy Commission
Mark Krausse	Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)
Peter Von Langen	Central Coast Regional Water Board
Rochelle Becker	Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility (A4NR)
Staff in Attendance	
Shuka Rastegarpour	SWRCB
Marleigh Wood	SWRCB
Mariela de la Paz Carpio-Obeso	SWRCB
Public in Attendance	
Angela Kelley	Natural Resources Defense Council
Partho Raysircar	Bechtel Power Corp.
Doug Dismukes	Bechtel Power Corp.
Bryan Cunningham	Pacific Gas and Electric
Brandon Blevins	Southern California Edison
Robert Heckler	Southern California Edison
J.C.Isham	The Shaw Group Inc.
John Geesman	Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility
Kathleen Jones	Pacific Gas and Electric

Welcome, Introductions and Updates –

Dominic Gregorio: Issued a conditional approval of Phase I Reports. Commented that State Water Board staff is moving forward with an amendment to the Once Through Cooling (OTC) Policy to shift NPDES issuance for OTC power plants back to the Regional Water Boards. This change will not affect the process underway with the Nuclear Review Committee (RCNFPP).

The CPUC was again absent from the meeting; Dominic took an action item to contact the agency in attempt to obtain more active participation in the future.

Mark Krause: The Coastal Commission recently denied PG&E's permit application for high energy seismic surveys at Diablo Canyon.

Review and approve Meeting Notes –

July 26, 2012 and August, 2012 RCNFPP Meeting Minutes: 1st motion Mark Krausse -> 2nd motion David Asti -> Minutes **APPROVED** for both July and August Meetings

Formal approval of Final Phase I Reports: 1st motion David Asti -> 2nd motion Rochelle Becker -> Final Phase I Reports for both SONGS and Diablo Canyon **APPROVED**

Discuss Phase II update from Bechtel and the Committee –

Melissa Jones: Expressed concern about the Bechtel response to committee's concerns document and how the situation was handled. Bechtel indicated that they had experienced difficulty identifying remaining issues that needed responses. Various suggestions were discussed for improving the process on Phase II. Primary issue is detailing issues identified in meetings in writing and communicating to Bechtel.

Power point Presentation:

- Bechtel: Grid stabilization costs depend on downtime; need to look at replacement power costs. Need to maximize generation time, will work with Utilities for relocation of existing equipment/ structures.
 - Mark Krausse: Will look into a Public Utilities Commission (PUC) person for cost estimating for outage. Will inform the committee on what the Utilities will do with the methodologies.
- Committee: Any communication regards to outage between utilities and Bechtel should be open to Committee members. Should always maintain as much transparency as possible. Bechtel should include a marine biologist involved in the process and review plans.
 - Bechtel: We should be able to set up a contract for a marine biologist to overlook screening and desalination/salinity changes.
 - Dominic Gregorio: The Water Board can suggest some consultants for Bechtel. We should have another Scientist to be involved on the Committee end to review and double check Bechtel's work.
- Bechtel: We have weekly meetings to receive status updates, and see how things are moving along. These teleconference meetings are open for the Utilities to call in. The public can be able to call in as well.
 - Committee: Committee members can be allowed to call in to these meeting if they wish, but they can only listen and not communicate with other Committee members or individuals on the phone line. If the committee members have an opinion or concern on a topic during the teleconference, they can express that concern to Shuka, who will forward the information to the Utilities/ Bechtel.
- Melissa Jones: Will have need of a California Energy Commission (CEC) expert for cooling towers.

- Group: Bechtel can have a meeting with the CEC and Committee members and the public can participate as well.
- Committee: When the First design comes out, Melissa can schedule a meeting with Bechtel to have her and her staff take a look at the designs.
- Rochelle Becker: Are mitigation costs not factored in? We should look at all costs involved other than construction costs.
 - Bechtel: will go through the permit list and other items that may require mitigation. Bechtel will fill in costs and provide a list to defer to the Committee.
- Bechtel: The Department of Navy owns the lands where SONGS is located, and part of the design plan involves expansion of SONGS beyond its current boundaries.
 - Bob Heckler: The Navy has expressed having issues with an expansion of the facility beyond the SONGS existing boundaries. Specifically, the Department of the Navy has stated that they have concerns associated with any development of cooling towers on the SONGS Mesa or expanding any development outside of the current lease boundaries granted to SCE by the Navy. The Navy has stated that they cannot take a position of approving or disapproving any such development without seeing the details of such development and knowing the full impacts of any such proposed development.
 - Group: Invite the Department of Navy to come to a committee meeting to discuss situation and options. Bob will provide the Navy contact information.

- Break for lunch -

- Bechtel: During Phase I we made a concentrated effort to work separate from the Utilities. Bechtel needs to work with the utilities for Phase II to make sure the designs fit with the plant. Bechtel will issue designs to get input. For security reasons, Utilities need to get permission to provide plant designs to the nuclear committee and the public.
 - Group: Utilities need to come up with a solution for how the committee can review information and plant design at the same time that the utilities receive the information. The Committee's concern is that the utilities may influence Bechtel's design and the independence called for in the OTC policy could be compromised.
- Rochelle Becker: It would be convenient if the committee received information incrementally as we go along the process, instead of receiving everything at

once. It's a lot to take in when we have to review and absorb a whole report with such limited time.

- Bechtel: Bechtel goes through a review process with its management before sending out information to the Utilities to provide to the committee. As such, the data needs to be complete for management to approve releasing such information.
- Rochelle Becker: It would be really helpful for the Committee to receive all information once it's ready as soon as possible.
- Bechtel: Bechtel will issue a draft report at the end of March, June, September, and the Final in October. Bechtel will provide these reports to the Utilities who will redact confidential items before sending them to the committee. Utilities will need to develop a protocol that ensures that the redaction of confidential information does not compromise the Committee's ability to understand the basis and conclusions regarding engineering designs and other specifics proposed by Bechtel.
 - Group: A meeting can be held after each draft report comes out. For the March draft report, we can hold a meeting in April, preferably on a Tuesday. We may also need to have a meeting before the March draft report is issued, in order to allow the Committee and public to express additional concerns and opinions. This meeting could potentially be held in January or February.
- Group: Walk-down of the plants by Bechtel needs to be informed beforehand and be open for committee members to participate, if desired. This information can be forwarded from Bechtel to Shuka, who will inform the Committee of the planned Bechtel site visit. No more than 2 Committee members can participate in the site walk-down.
- Bechtel: To be clear, all comments to Bechtel in regards to the reports must be submitted and addressed before the May-July timeframe because that is when finalization of the reports will start. This is important because this will allow Bechtel time to finalize and submit by the October deadline.

Public comments –

- Angela Kelley: The public cannot provide comments because the meeting items and the Final Reports were not posted online to be reviewed ahead of time.
 - Committee: Shuka will post the items online and provide the public a comment period. The announcement for the comment period will be sent through the Lyrus OTC email subscription list. The public comments will be forwarded to the Committee members, the Utilities, and Bechtel to review and consider.

Next meeting –

- Committee: It is agreed for a January/February meeting to take place to allow the Committee to address additional concerns and provide updates before the March draft report is released. Shuka will send out a doodle poll to Bechtel and the Committee members for an appropriate date for the next RCNFPP meeting.

Adjourn