

RCNFPP Draft Minutes 4/8/2014 Meeting

Committee Members	
Jonathan Bishop	State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
David Asti	Southern California Edison (SCE)
Mark Krausse	Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)
Jim Caldwell	Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies
David Barker (on phone)	San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
Sepideh Khosrowjah (on phone)	California Public Utilities Commission
Tom Luster	California Coastal Commission
Rochelle Becker	Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility (A4NR)
Peter Von Langen (on the phone)	Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
SWRCB Staff in Attendance	
Shuka Rastegarpour	SWRCB
Marleigh Wood	SWRCB
Mariela Carpio-Obeso	SWRCB
Public in Attendance	
Dan Williams	Bechtel Power Corp.
Doug Dismukes	Bechtel Power Corp.
Bryan Cunningham	PG&E
Binoy Mishra (on the phone)	Green Cooling Tower Solutions
John Geesman	A4NR
Kathy Jones	PG&E
Per Peterson	Diablo Canyon Independent Safety Committee
Angela Haren (on the phone)	Natural Resources Defense Council
Robert Budnitz	Diablo Canyon Independent Safety Committee
Damon Moglen (on the phone)	Friends of the Earth
Bill Powers	Powers Engineering
Sean Bothwell (on the phone)	California Coastkeeper Alliance
Eric Wilkins (on the phone)	California Dept. of Fish & Wildlife

Welcome, Introductions and Updates –

Rochelle Becker: Can the committee receive a brief update of the call following last meeting between Bechtel, Friends of the Earth, and the State Water Board?

Jonathon Bishop: We talked about the different parameters for the south lot cooling towers scenario and came to an agreement on two options to be analyzed by Bechtel. From the last meeting, I presumed that we could move forward, but decided to have another Review Committee meeting to get the committee's approval of the options for Bechtel to evaluate.

Review and approve Meeting Notes –

12/18/2013 meeting minutes - **APPROVED**

Bechtel discussion of alternate option to be analyzed –

Doug Dismukes: (Reviewed the scope, assumptions, and impacts of potential assessments discussed in the *JUOTC Diablo Canyon South Lot Evaluations* handout that was provided to the Committee and the Public)

Assessment 1: Turbine back pressure of ≤ 5 "hg. The tower approach temperature is set at 37F. Plume point set at 5%.

Assessment 2: Turbine back pressure of ≤ 5 "hg. The tower approach temperature is set at 37F. Plume point set at 55%.

Discussion of alternative options/ options to move forward with-

Per Peterson: Perhaps Bechtel can provide more detailed information for safety precautions, should there be an analysis of safety assessments.

Jonathon Bishop: At this point in time, we need to make sure that we decide on what assessments we want Bechtel to do. It is a little early in the discussion to perform these safety assessments. These options that will be provided to the Board are not necessarily the final options moving forward. PG&E will perform additional assessments and make sure that the construction related activities do not impact safety. The Board would not direct any compliance decision that would impact safety.

Mark Krausse: Is desalination not an option anymore?

Jonathon Bishop: It can still be considered especially if we cannot get the PM 10 offset. I will look into the PM 10 offsets information. The Bechtel estimate should not consider desalination for the South lot option.

Public comments-

Bill Powers: We do not concur that we've reached an agreement with State Water Board and Bechtel in our follow-up conference call regarding the back pressure issue and protection of the cooling water ducts. Bill Powers indicated that he believed that Bechtel should reduce the flow

rate of the circulating water system to approximately 600,000 gpm to reduce cost. He pointed to Turkey Point 6 and 7 and Vogtle 3 and 4 as evidence that this would be possible. Bechtel pointed out that the condensers on Turkey Point and Vogtle have twice the surface area than DCCP has so making that comparison is not valid (supporting data provided as a meeting handout). The final point is the cost. Bechtel is performing the same assessments as Tetrattech and Enercron except for the difference in plume abatement. The Enercron Report is much more expensive than the Tetrattech Report for no particular reason.

Jonathan Bishop: At the end of the day, the point of this exercise is to provide a range of prices and options; this is not to be compared to any other assessments that have been previously done.

Robert Budnitz: Increasing back pressure above current design will increase back pressure trip. The data is not currently available. This may not be a huge impact, but should be looked into.

Jonathan Bishop: The back pressure issue could be looked at if DCISC wants to look into it. This information can be provided to the Committee so that the Board can also be aware of it.

Jonathan Bishop: Is the committee comfortable moving forward with the two assessments?
YES.

Bill Powers: I will be providing ramifications of differences in assessments to the Board. I would like to review the history of all facility trips.

Bryan Cunningham: I will provide the history of all facility trips.

Green Technology Solutions: Our product uses hydro turbine power to avoid energy consumption requirements. Is the ClearSky technology the only cooling tower technology assessed?

Jonathan Bishop: We are currently not making recommendations to the Board. We are providing a range of costs and options to give them an idea of what costs of compliance would look like. Once the Board gives direction, PG&E would look into different vendors for the cooling towers, and that is when you can communicate to them about your product.

Timeline of analysis and completion of Final Report*-

Major Milestones	Deadline	Completed
Decision of options to be analyzed in the Report	April 8, 2014	
Bechtel analysis for southern lot options	June 5, 2014	
Bechtel production of Draft Final Report	June 19, 2014 ¹	
Collection of Committee comments	July 3, 2014	
Committee consolidated comments on Bechtel Final Report	July 18, 2014	
Bechtel Final Report	July 18, 2014	
Release Final Report to the public for public commenting (45 days)	July 23, 2014	
Closing date for comments	Sept 8, 2014	
Response to comments	Oct 8, 2014	
Present Bechtel Special Study Final Report to the State Water Board	Nov 4, 2014	

*Deadline have changed; please check "Timeline analysis of Final Report" under Materials for the April 8, 2014 meeting

Adjourn

¹ Committee agreed to provide the Draft Final Report to DCISC