

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Public Meeting RE Draft GEIS

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Dana Point, California

Date: Thursday, October 22, 2009

Work Order No.: NRC-3158

Pages 1-94

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 234-4433

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
+ + + + +
PUBLIC MEETING
TO DISCUSS THE DRAFT
GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

+ + + + +
THURSDAY,
OCTOBER 22, 2009

+ + + + +
DOUBLETREE GUEST SUITES, DOHENY BEACH
34402 PACIFIC COAST HIGHWAY
DANA POINT, CALIFORNIA 92629

+ + + + +
The public meeting was convened, at 7:00
p.m., Kenneth Bailey, facilitator, presiding.

- PRESENT FROM NRC:
KENNETH BAILEY, Diversity Specialist
LANCE RAKOVAN
JEFFREY RIKHOFF
ANDREW STUYVENBERG
ANDY IMBODEN
ROBIN ROSS
GREG WARNICK

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

7:02 p.m.

MR. BAILEY: Good evening, everyone. If you'll take your seats, we'll begin to get started.

Good evening. My name is Kenneth Bailey. I'm a Diversity Specialist from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC, which you'll hear often referred to tonight. I work in the Office of Small Business and Civil Rights within the Agency.

I will be the primary facilitator for this evening's meeting assisted by Lance Rakovan in the rear who works in the Office of the Executive Director for Operations.

We will give every effort to ensure tonight's meeting is productive and beneficial to all attending.

Before I go over the process, I would like to thank members of the community who were instrumental in ensuring this meeting happened.

I would also like to acknowledge the attendance of Ms. Shanna Rimke on behalf of Representative Ken Calvert's office.

The purpose of this meeting is to provide you with the opportunity to give your comments on a proposed rule amending Title 10 Part 51 of the Code of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Federal Regulations as well as the Generic
2 Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of
3 Nuclear Plants or NUREG-1437, Revision 1.

4 For those of you not familiar with NRC
5 Regulation Title 10, it is a part of the Federal
6 Regulation where you can find NRC's Regulation and
7 Part 51 is just a piece of those regulations that
8 specifically focuses on environmental protection.

9 You may hear Generic Environmental Impact
10 Statement referred to as G-E-I-S or GEIS at this
11 meeting.

12 Today's meeting is just one of several
13 ways you can participate in the commenting process.
14 Others of which will be provided to you during the
15 presentation.

16 There are two parts to tonight's meeting.
17 During the first portion, you will hear a presentation
18 from NRC staff on the topic at hand. Information we
19 think is important for your to understand.

20 There were copies of the presentation at
21 the sign-in table. In case you did not get a copy,
22 please raise hand and one of the NRC staff members
23 will bring you a copy.

24 For those of you -- no one has called in
25 on the phone yet.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The presentation will be brief because the
2 primary objective of today's meeting is to hear your
3 comments.

4 For everyone here, there are yellow and
5 blue cards we asked you to fill out when you came in.
6 The people who registered to speak, filling out the
7 yellow cards, will be called to the podium to provide
8 your comments.

9 If you haven't filled out a card and
10 besides you want to speak, that's okay. Please get my
11 attention or one of the other NRC staff members to
12 obtain a card to fill in your information to provide
13 a comment.

14 Today's meeting is being transcribed and
15 we ask that you fill out the cards to ensure we have
16 an accurate spelling of your name as well as where you
17 represent.

18 I will be going to the phone if we should
19 have someone call in. The phone line is open
20 currently. I will be going to the phone if we have
21 someone call in to allow them to provide comments if
22 they so choose.

23 Similar to those here, please identify
24 yourself with any group you are with each time you
25 make a comment or ask a question.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We ask for your understanding that we are
2 transcribing today's meeting to make sure we fully
3 capture your comments. Please help us get a clean
4 transcript by using the microphone when you ask or
5 desire to ask a question or make a comment.

6 Please try to keep side conversations to
7 a minimum which will allow the staff and the
8 transcribers to keep focus on the main person who is
9 speaking.

10 The first time you speak, please say your
11 name completely and identify yourself and any group
12 which you represent.

13 Please turn off all electronics or put
14 them on vibrate to assist us with getting a clean
15 transcript.

16 We have provided you with our public
17 feedback form. Please fill the form out here tonight
18 and give it to the NRC staff or drop it in the mail
19 sometime in the future. The postage is free.

20 Your opinion on how this meeting went will
21 help us improve upon future meetings. So, please take
22 a moment to let us know what you think.

23 For those of you who are not aware, just
24 in case, the rest rooms are directly behind the door
25 which you came in.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 At this time, I want to take a moment to
2 introduce some of the NRC staff members in attendance
3 today. Tonight's subject matter experts for the GEIS
4 revision are from the Office of Nuclear Reactor
5 Regulations beginning with Andy Imboden, Jeffrey
6 Rikhoff, Andrew Stuyvenberg, Jason Lising and their
7 assistant Robin Ross. The Region Inspectors are John
8 Reynoso and the Senior Inspector is Greg Warnick.
9 Representing our Office of General Counsel is Susan
10 Uttal and from the Region's Public Affairs Office, we
11 have Victor Dricks.

12 At this time, I would now turn things over
13 to Jeffrey Rikhoff who will be the lead for tonight's
14 presentation. I will be back when we move to the
15 second part of the meeting. If you have any questions
16 about the material covered, please hold your questions
17 until the presentation is over so that we can move to
18 the second part of the meeting.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. RIKHOFF: Thank you, Kenny. I'd like
21 to thank everyone for coming out this evening. We
22 really appreciate you coming this evening to provide
23 us with your comments.

24 Again, my name is Jeff Rikhoff. I'm the
25 Generic Environmental Impact Statement Project Manager

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and I'm here to explain how we revise the GEIS.

2 First, let me give you a little background
3 information. As part of the License Renewal Program
4 initiated in the late 1980s, the NRC understood a
5 comprehensive review of environmental NEPA issues
6 associated with the continued operation of nuclear
7 power plants beyond the term of the current operating
8 license.

9 The results of this comprehensive review
10 were published in 1996 as the Generic Environmental
11 Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power
12 Plants also know as the GEIS.

13 During the comprehensive review, the
14 Commission determined that certain environmental
15 impacts associated with license renewal were either
16 the same or similar for all plants and as such could
17 be addressed generically. In total, 92 environmental
18 impact issues associated with license renewal were
19 identified. Therefore, the main purpose for the GEIS
20 is to identify and evaluate all environmental impacts
21 associated with license renewal and assess
22 environmental impacts that are considered generic and
23 common to all nuclear power plants.

24 The GEIS also defines the number of issues
25 that need to be addressed in separate plant-specific

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environmental reviews in supplemental EISs to the
2 GEIS.

3 The results of the environmental review on
4 the 92 issues conducted for the 1996 GEIS were
5 summarized as findings in Table B-1 in NRC Regulations
6 10 CFR Part 51. In these regulations, the Commission
7 also indicated its intent to review and update Table
8 B-1 and the GEIS every ten years. This meeting
9 tonight is part of the process to revise the GEIS and
10 update the findings in Table B-1 and we are here to
11 receive your comments as part of that process.

12 The range of environmental impacts
13 considered in every environmental review for license
14 renewal is comprehensive. This slide gives you an
15 idea of some of the areas that NRC considers during
16 license renewal environmental reviews. The revised
17 GEIS discusses the environmental impacts for each of
18 these resource areas shown on this slide.

19 The information provided in Table B-1 in
20 10 CFR Part 51 is a summary of the findings on the 92
21 environmental impact issues analyzed in the GEIS. In
22 other words, the GEIS provides the technical basis for
23 the findings in Table B-1.

24 As many of you may be aware, the issues in
25 Table B-1 are categorized as either Category 1 or 2.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Category 1 issues are considered generic as the
2 impacts were determined to be the same or similar at
3 all nuclear plants. Category 2 issues are impact
4 issues that need to be addressed in separate plant-
5 specific environmental reviews.

6 Category 1 impacts are only addressed in
7 the GEIS and not in supplemental plant-specific
8 environmental reviews unless new and significant
9 information is found that would change the findings in
10 the GEIS.

11 In the review and update of the GEIS, we
12 reevaluated the original 92 environmental impact
13 issues listed in Table B-1 to determine if any of
14 these issues needed to be updated, modified or
15 deleted. We also considered whether the -- whether
16 new environment impact issues needed to be added.
17 Issues identified during plant specific environmental
18 reviews and changes to environmental laws and
19 regulations were considered. We also considered
20 reorganizing the 92 issues to simplify impact
21 discussions and to streamline environmental impact
22 analyses.

23 We also reviewed the organization and
24 format of the 1996 GEIS and revisited the discussion
25 and analysis of refurbishment impacts. The review and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 update took into account public comments we received
2 on the GEIS during scoping and during plant-specific
3 license renewal environmental reviews.

4 Several new Category 1 and 2 issues have
5 been added to the revised GEIS. In addition, based on
6 previous environmental reviews and public comments,
7 some issues were re-categorized from Category 2 to 1.
8 It's important to note that even though Category 2
9 issues would not be Category 1, the staff would
10 continue to evaluate these issues for any new and
11 significant information during each plant-specific
12 environmental review. New Category 1 issues are shown
13 on this slide. These issues were added as a result of
14 previous environmental reviews and public comments.

15 This next slide shows new Category 2
16 issues that were added as a result of previous
17 environmental reviews and public comments.

18 And the third slide shows the issues that
19 were re-categorized based on previous environmental
20 reviews and public comments.

21 As a result of the review and update as
22 well as lessons learned and knowledge gained during
23 nearly 40 environmental reviews, we came up with a
24 proposed reorganized list of 78 environmental impact
25 issues which still include all of the 92 original

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 impact issues addressed in the 1996 GEIS. The
2 reduction in the number of issues were primarily the
3 result of combining or regrouping similar issues.

4 The Appendix B handout illustrates how
5 these issues were reorganized. Many issues that were
6 addressed separately in the 1996 GEIS that were
7 similar or related have been regrouped under a broader
8 more encompassing impact issue.

9 For example, separate aesthetic issues in
10 the 1996 GEIS have been combined into one aesthetic
11 impact issue that still considers the aesthetic
12 impacts of the nuclear plant as well as transmission
13 lines.

14 We also found very few instances where
15 plants were being modified or refurbished for license
16 renewal. These refurbishment activities have
17 consisted primarily of steam generator and vessel head
18 replacement. As a result, most of the refurbishment
19 issues have been combined with continued plant
20 operations issues. Power plant modifications and
21 refurbishment activities associated with license
22 renewal will continue to be addressed in separate
23 plant-specific environmental reviews.

24 Based on comments received during scoping
25 and during plant-specific environmental reviews, we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 also decided to reorganize the GEIS from a cooling
2 systems based approach to a resource based approach.
3 The impacts on each resources area are discussed in
4 one place rather than having to hunt through several
5 chapters in the 1996 GEIS to find relevant discussions
6 of impacts. To make it easier on the reader, we
7 folded the discussion of impacts in Chapters 3 through
8 8 in the 1996 GEIS into one environmental consequences
9 chapter organized by environmental resource area.

10 The review and update of the GEIS and our
11 regulations, however, is not yet complete. All of the
12 comments received during the comment period will be
13 considered by NRC staff as we develop the final rule
14 and revised GEIS, which are scheduled to be issued in
15 early 2011. The final rule and revised GEIS will
16 contain the Commission's final determination on the
17 generic impacts associated with license renewal. The
18 comments you provide tonight and those received during
19 the comment period will help in finalizing the staff's
20 proposed rule and revised GEIS.

21 The NRC received several requests to
22 extend the public comment period for the proposed rule
23 and GEIS revision. The NRC recognizes that there's a
24 large amount of material associated with this
25 rulemaking and has extended the public comment period

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for an additional 90 days to allow additional time for
2 review. The public comment period now ends on January
3 12th, 2010, 90 days from the original date of October
4 14th, 2009. The NRC wants to make sure that members
5 of the public have sufficient time to provide comments
6 that will improve the quality of these regulations as
7 well as the license renewal process.

8 I am the NRC point of contact for the GEIS
9 revision along with Jason Lising who's the point of
10 contact for the proposed rule. We are working
11 together to ensure that all comments on the proposed
12 rule and revised GEIS are considered and addressed.

13 The proposed rule and revised GEIS are
14 available to the public on our web page and through
15 our Public Document Room. We also have several copies
16 over here on the table if you want to take one
17 tonight. You can view these documents on the web at
18 the addresses indicated on this slide, visit
19 www.regulations.gov and enter NRC-2008-0608 on keyword
20 or ID and click search. In addition, we will be happy
21 to mail copies to anyone who requests one.

22 In addition to providing oral comments
23 tonight, there are several ways to provide written
24 comments to the NRC. You can write to us at the
25 address on the slide and in your handout or by e-mail

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and the web.

2 Again, all comments received during this
3 public comment period will be considered. And with
4 that, I'll turn the meeting back over to Kenny.

5 Thank you very much.

6 MR. BAILEY: Okay. At this time, we would
7 like to know if there are any clarifying questions
8 pertaining specifically to the presentation which you
9 just received. If there are any questions, please
10 raise your hand and I will call on you as I see them.

11 If I acknowledge you, please come up to
12 this mike next to the podium to ask your question.

13 Thank you.

14 MS. CASADY: I'm Nancy Casady, the
15 Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility and I wondered if
16 we could go back to the slide that showed the changes
17 that were made to the original document. It went by
18 pretty fast.

19 MR. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you. Okay. Was
20 there a question specifically pertaining to that
21 slide, ma'am? That's fine. Okay. Okay.

22 Are there any other questions again
23 pertaining specifically to the presentation? Ma'am.

24 You can sit down, ma'am. I'll bring it to you.

25 MS. BEAUCHAMP: Thank you. Yes, my name's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Craig Beauchamp. I'm advocate from CREED the
2 Coalition for Ethical and Environmental Decision and
3 I'm also part of the Orange County Democratic Party.

4 There were a couple of things on the site
5 specific and on the presentation that this all has to
6 do with future relicensing standards. Correct?

7 And wait a minute. Okay. So, this is all
8 future relicensing?

9 MR. RIKHOFF: Yes, this rule once it goes
10 final. Is scheduled to be finalized in 2011.

11 MS. BEAUCHAMP: Okay. It's my
12 understanding that the NRC extended the licensing
13 period for San Onofre for an additional nine years
14 after the original license expiration date of 2013.

15 MR. RIKHOFF: I'm not aware of that. I
16 don't have any information about that.

17 MS. BEAUCHAMP: So, the original
18 expiration date still stands for 2013.

19 MR. RIKHOFF: The 40-year license, yes, I
20 believe to 2022 still stands.

21 MS. BEAUCHAMP: No, if I'm not mistaken --
22 Lyn, am I correct?

23 MS. HARRIS HICKS: You're correct. You're
24 correct.

25 MS. BEAUCHAMP: Okay. So, the original

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 licensing period was to 2013. As far as I know, there
2 were no public hearings or participation, EER studies,
3 GEIS studies, anything that extended it or site-
4 specific studies to extend it to 2022.

5 MR. RIKHOFF: I think --

6 MS. BEAUCHAMP: I mean you're saying it's
7 2022. We're saying it's 2013.

8 MR. RIKHOFF: Well, we'll look up the
9 current license and date. I didn't --

10 MS. BEAUCHAMP: The original license and
11 the date.

12 MR. RIKHOFF: Okay. We will look that up
13 for you.

14 MR. STUYVENBERG: Hi, ma'am. My name's
15 Drew Stuyvenberg. I'm from the Division of License
16 Renewal as well.

17 I don't know the specific dates. I do
18 know it's in the 2020s for both plants however. We
19 can find that specific information for you and get
20 back to you though if you'd like.

21 MS. BEAUCHAMP: Okay. But, there were
22 never any public hearings.

23 MR. STUYVENBERG: Because they haven't
24 been granted a license renewal extension at this
25 point.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. BEAUCHAMP: The 2022 was a license
2 extension.

3 MR. STUYVENBERG: To my knowledge --

4 MS. BEAUCHAMP: Yes. Yes. Yes.

5 MR. STUYVENBERG: We'll confirm that and
6 get back.

7 MR. BAILEY: Ma'am, allow us some time and
8 we'll confirm and get back to you.

9 MS. HARRIS HICKS: Lyn Harris Hicks. I
10 can jump right into it. Yes. Lyn Harris Hicks,
11 CREED.

12 I want to -- I want everyone to know that
13 kind of response is not acceptable. Because I'm sure
14 that you all know -- and I shouldn't say that, I can't
15 assume you know it and somebody told you. Okay.

16 The point is that we are in a very unique
17 situation around San Onofre and the original license
18 proceedings, safety proceedings, were very extended
19 and we put thousands of hours into it and the
20 decisions that were made on the length of the license
21 were made by the scientists and the engineers there
22 who were estimating how long they thought that the
23 place -- the plant could operate safely and that was
24 about 24 or 25 years and so, they gave it a 40 year
25 because it took about nine or ten years to get the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 thing built. Very complicated.

2 But, somewhere along the line, people
3 forgot about that and they were just given automatic
4 nine-years extension and I understand that this has
5 happened a lot of places in the country and that there
6 are three states which are mounting in the courts
7 opposition to that.

8 MR. BAILEY: Ma'am, it's a very valid
9 point. However, we want to on focus tonight's
10 presentation for this question period right now and
11 then we will allow you the time to comment at the
12 conclusion of the clarifying question period.

13 Once again, were there any other
14 clarifying questions specifically to the presentation
15 itself?

16 Okay. We will now transition into the
17 public commenting period. I'll be calling on people
18 to the microphone one at a time to provide comments on
19 the purpose of the NUREG.

20 MR. WARNICK: I have information just to
21 clarify --

22 MR. BAILEY: Okay. Okay.

23 MR. WARNICK: -- the operation dates.

24 MR. BAILEY: Okay.

25 MR. WARNICK: The license was granted.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 It's a 40-year license. It was granted in
2 approximately 1973.

3 The original license is a 40-year license.
4 It was granted in the 1970s around 1973. It was
5 licensed to operate for 40 years and that 73 plus 40
6 puts them to, what is that, 2013. Right.

7 And because of delays in construction, it
8 took time to build as you pointed out. They started
9 actual operation in 1982. They can still operate for
10 40 years which is what the license allows them to
11 operate for. Eighty-two plus 40 makes it 2022. So,
12 that's why the 40-year license of operation,
13 continuous operation, with refueling periods will put
14 them to 2022.

15 MS. HARRIS HICKS: It was licensed to be
16 built and operated and somewhere along the line, the
17 first part just started --

18 MR. BAILEY: Ma'am. Ma'am, excuse me. As
19 you know, once again, I mention that the meeting is
20 being transcribed. So, it's very important that we
21 have a mike when you speak.

22 I know most of you want to make sure that
23 your comments are inserted into the transcript so that
24 we can use them for later. Okay. I'll hold the mike.

25 MS. HARRIS HICKS: Yes, I wanted to point

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 out that the license was given to build and operate
2 and somewhere along the line, the build part just was
3 forgotten and sort of like the evacuation zone, the
4 high hazard evacuation zone that they set at 10/11
5 miles radius of the plant. Somewhere along the line
6 when they were working on trying to make it possible
7 to evacuate people, they changed it to emergency zone
8 and those things happen and we are concerned about
9 that and that's why we're here.

10 Not for this particular thing, but when
11 you brought this up, I felt that I had to make the
12 correction. Thank you.

13 MR. BAILEY: Thank you. Okay. Okay. As
14 I mentioned, we'll transition into the public comment
15 period.

16 We'll begin. I will first call up Dean
17 Engelhardt of Permanent -- I'm sorry. I can't make
18 out -- clarify everything. So, you can clarify when
19 you come to the mike. Thank you.

20 MR. ENGELHARDT: This mike's on. Dean
21 Engelhardt, Permanent RAD Waste Solutions.

22 MR. BAILEY: You come to the podium.
23 Sorry.

24 MR. ENGELHARDT: And I have a couple of
25 thoughts to put forward. One thought to the NRC is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 our company just recently got the only -- were granted
2 the only patent for the permanent elimination of
3 nuclear waste and it would not require any storage
4 outside in ponds or anything like that and I'd like
5 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to really consider
6 this when they go over this.

7 Secondly, there's a lot of misconception
8 by a lot of people about how dangerous living near a
9 nuclear plant is and yes, it's got radiation, but
10 what's interesting was a plant back in, and I can't
11 remember the name of it, back in I believe
12 Pennsylvania. People got a little uptight about
13 nuclear power and so, they said we want to go back to
14 a coal-fired plant.

15 So, while they were building the coal-
16 fired plant, they still operated the nuke because they
17 still needed the power and as they started testing the
18 coal-fired plant, now this is 30 miles away from the
19 nuke, the radiation alarms, the emergency level of
20 radiation alarms started going off in the nuke and it
21 drove the inspectors crazy looking for the leaks until
22 they found out it was coming from the coal-fired
23 plant.

24 Coal when it's burnt emits 4.5 parts per
25 million radio-nuclides from coal, normal coal. Clean

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 coal, that's a misnomer, 1.8 parts per million and
2 oil, like we have out here, 1.39 parts per million;
3 natural gas .18 parts per million and there are even
4 trace elements from wind power and solar power which
5 is interesting and nuclear emits nothing because it is
6 a reaction. It's not a burning. Anything that burns
7 emits trace elements of radiation and this goes on 24
8 hours a day, seven days a week. So, it's really
9 something you have to consider.

10 And that's basically all I had.

11 MR. BAILEY: Okay.

12 MR. ENGELHARDT: But, I thank you.

13 MR. BAILEY: Okay. I apologize. I meant
14 to mention that we have a lot of people who would like
15 to speak tonight. So, we want to have a time
16 limitation. We're going to ask that you speak no
17 more than ten minutes. Again, so that everybody can
18 have a chance to voice their opinion.

19 Next we will have Dorothy Boberg from UNA,
20 United Nations Association.

21 MS. BOBERG: I'm Dorothy Boberg and I'm
22 representing the United Nations Association of the San
23 Fernando Valley.

24 I have given the Nuclear Regulatory
25 Commission people here copies of my article and I'd

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 like to just add a few words.

2 If one considers the cost of the whole
3 nuclear fuel cycle from the mining of uranium to the
4 thousands of years of waste storage, it becomes
5 obvious that nuclear power is the most expensive, uses
6 the most fossil fuel to produce and store and is the
7 most polluting and most dangerous of possible energy
8 sources.

9 I get information to verify this from a
10 report of Dr. Helen Caldicott which I gave a copy to
11 some of you.

12 The law in California forbids the building
13 of new nuclear power plants until such time as they're
14 exists a Federal Government repository for high-level
15 nuclear waste. There is no repository at the present
16 time and there is no program at this time to find a
17 repository for nuclear waste.

18 To give Southern California Edison
19 permission to rebuilt it's San Onofre plant piecemeal
20 starting with the steam generators probably is not
21 against the law, but surely is against the will of the
22 people who support the law about no nuclear power
23 plants.

24 Please read my article on the table there.
25 I noticed that many of you have looked at all of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 materials over here and I gathered a lot of them, but
2 also look at the table over here which represents
3 citizen groups who have information to give you.

4 I looked -- I just want to say I looked at
5 this Appendix B and there are a number of questions
6 that I asked and my general comment on it is that many
7 of the issues in here are considered to be small
8 impact and small impact according to their publicity
9 here is environmental effects are not detectible or
10 are so minor that they will neither de-stabilize nor
11 noticeably alter any important attribute of the
12 resource. For the purposes of assessing radiological
13 impacts, the Commission has concluded that these
14 impacts do not exceed permissible levels in the
15 Commission's regulations and are considered small.

16 But, when you read the Appendix B, judge
17 for yourself whether you think some of these things
18 are small. I don't think so.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. BAILEY: Thank you, ma'am. Next we'll
21 have Ms. Lyn Harris representing CREED.

22 MS. HARRIS HICKS: I'd like to hold mine
23 until later please.

24 MR. BAILEY: Sure, ma'am.

25 MS. HARRIS HICKS: Until the time you have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the comments.

2 MR. BAILEY: We are actually in the
3 comment period.

4 MS. HARRIS HICKS: Are we suppose to
5 comment --

6 MR. BAILEY: You can make a general
7 comment at this time. Okay. Okay.

8 Next will be Ms. Billie Pinnick Lovmark
9 representing CREED.

10 MS. LOVMARK: I do represent CREED, but I
11 also represent my neighbors and myself and we live
12 along the beach just south of the pier in San
13 Clemente. So, a lot of our concerns are just nervous
14 concerns all the time.

15 They said I could probably have one
16 question. So, my neighbors asked me, they couldn't
17 come tonight, if we could find out about the spent
18 fuel pool at San Onofre and how they're doing it in
19 any of the nuclear plants that are in the planning
20 that we're checking on. Because we understand from
21 our research that this is a very dangerous part with
22 terrorism and I know I'm reaching a subject that's
23 bad, but it's one that's always in our mind.

24 So, if there's someone here who's
25 knowledgeable and could tell us. For instance, is the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 pool at San Onofre covered and how secure is it?
2 Could something come in and cause it to be our
3 explosion instead of the actual plant? And that's the
4 extent of my question.

5 MR. BAILEY: Ma'am --

6 MS. LOVMARK: Is there anyone that can
7 answer that?

8 MR. BAILEY: Ma'am, we're actually taking
9 comments at this time. We'll be happy to have someone
10 speak --

11 MS. LOVMARK: Oh.

12 MR. BAILEY: -- with you to address your
13 question specifically, but --

14 MS. LOVMARK: Can I go back and make a
15 comment?

16 MR. BAILEY: Yes, ma'am, you sure can.

17 MS. LOVMARK: My comment is that we live
18 in San Clemente and we've been here since before that
19 building was built and all. The plant. And we are
20 concerned about the, and I have it written down, the
21 spent fuel pool.

22 MR. BAILEY: Thank you.

23 MS. LOVMARK: Sorry I mis-worded it.

24 MR. BAILEY: Next we'll have Craig
25 Beauchamp, 68th ADDM CREED.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. BEAUCHAMP: This mike is better. My
2 basic comment right now although I have -- there are
3 many issues of concern, but one of the issues that I'm
4 particularly focusing on right now is the fact that
5 nowhere do I see a change or an increase in a
6 discussion on public preparedness and evacuation.

7 Three years ago, Chris Shays' committee in
8 Congress had a hearing whereby the NRC stated that
9 their responsibility was the nuclear power plant.
10 FEMA who was also present, their responsibility was
11 the disaster relief and clean up.

12 Shays mandated that FEMA do evacuation
13 feasibility studies specifically for Indian Point, I
14 think it was Turkey Point in Florida or in New York I
15 guess and then one in Florida and San Onofre.

16 Those of you, and I use to live in San
17 Clemente, know that there is no evacuation from San
18 Clemente. How in the -- you know, how on earth could
19 they build a nuclear power plant in an area where
20 there is no feasible evacuation in the event of any
21 incident.

22 A number of us have been working trying to
23 comment or contact our elected officials because we've
24 discovered that unless you live in San Clemente or
25 possibly San Juan Capistrano you do not know what to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 do in the event of a nuclear incident. This is a
2 fault in the licensing standards that there is not a
3 component that extends the emergency planning
4 preparedness beyond a ten-mile radius given the
5 current population status.

6 A comment was made by River Keepers that
7 was put forth to the NRC taking a look at Indian Point
8 because it's ten miles from New York or 30 miles from
9 New York City.

10 I don't know how many people were here
11 when they had the fire in San Onofre, but the ash went
12 to Mission Viejo, Laguna Woods, Laguna Hills, Laguna
13 Beach and that's way beyond the ten-mile radius.

14 So, to set an artificial limit of the
15 emergency protection zone to ten miles is a flaw in
16 the system and I think that when they start the
17 licensing and licensing renewal practice, they have to
18 do a much more realistic evacuation planning. To not
19 be able to have an evacuation plan is totally
20 unacceptable and would be reason to halt the current
21 retrofitting of the steam generator at San Onofre
22 right now until some sort of public preparedness is
23 created.

24 We've sent this memo to a number of our
25 state legislators and I'm going to read it because I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 don't see Carla Mays or Erin Moran here to read this
2 document. It won't take long.

3 "We are calling for the project to be
4 halted until there are safety fairs training, iodine
5 pill distribution, mailers, PSAs in the media on the
6 current Songs project and nuclear preparedness. There
7 needs to be an increase in funding of the agencies
8 specifically for this task and a mandate for immediate
9 implementation."

10 I talked to Donna Buxton who is head of
11 the Orange County Emergency Operations Center. She's
12 very frustrated that they have no resources to do any
13 public training, get out the information on a
14 potential nuclear accident. I'm hoping to address
15 this to the Orange County Board of Supervisors.

16 It is critical that we have an educated
17 public in the event of an accident. Wholesale panic
18 would be -- would create a disaster worse than
19 Katrina.

20 It's important that this education and
21 community preparedness be extended beyond just Orange
22 County and San Diego County but also to Riverside
23 County, San Bernardino County and Los Angeles.

24 We need increased security around San
25 Onofre because to take up what Berty was saying, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 nuclear power plant is more vulnerable and more
2 exposed right now to potential terrorist activities
3 and I know that we poo-poo this and we stick our head
4 in the sands, but Homeland Security after 9/11
5 designated the nuclear power plants as being prime
6 targets. This facility is now open and exposed and
7 more vulnerable than ever before. So, we -- you know,
8 part of this whole re-licensing issue must take a look
9 at the fact that nuclear power plants are potential
10 targets for terrorists.

11 We would like to see more public
12 participation and more public hearings before any
13 extension of the licensing period especially for San
14 Onofre given the fact that there is little or no
15 community education, public preparedness and I'm not
16 talking about the first responders. I'm talking about
17 you, me and the rest of the citizens so that they know
18 what to do.

19 Whether our schools are prepared. Do they
20 have the iodine pills at the various schools? Do they
21 have the transportation set up? Do the school buses
22 know what -- you know, do the schools know what to do
23 with the children in the event of an incident?

24 I think probably only in San Clemente and
25 San Juan Capistrano, but what about Mission Viejo,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Laguna Hills, Laguna Niguel and beyond.

2 There should also be radiation detectors
3 in public buildings at least within a 50-mile radius.
4 We don't know. There needs to be some sort of
5 detection that expands outside of just the nuclear
6 power plant for public safety.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you very much.
9 I would just like to state that at the conclusion of
10 tonight's meeting, the NRC staff will be sticking
11 around to address any questions which you may have.
12 We would like to kind of keep the forum focused on
13 you all providing comments.

14 At this time, we'll have Frank R. Scott.

15 MR. SCOTT: I'm a previous resident of San
16 Clemente for six years and I actually lived pretty
17 close to San Onofre for a long time.

18 Anyway, I have several comments. One,
19 Attorney General Jerry Brown on the NRC. The NRC is
20 continuing to piece by piece cut out public
21 participation and expanding its state's agreement
22 authority to prohibit state protective agencies and
23 commissions from consideration of radiation related
24 issues. NRC is approving the retention of the lethal
25 wastes on-site where they are generated first for 30

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 years and now 60 years without even site specific
2 safety proceedings. That's one.

3 Two, Helen Caldicott, J. W. Storm Van
4 Leone and Philip Smith are three of the few scientists
5 who have analyzed the balance between the amount of
6 fossil fuel energy needed to produce the nuclear
7 energy fuel cycle for one 10,000 megawatt nuclear
8 reactor. It may be impossible for most laymen to
9 consider a petro joule of energy, one million billion
10 joules and the several hundred of petro joules of
11 fossil fuels needed for the nuclear fuel cycle, but it
12 is not impossible to accept the obvious concept that
13 it takes more fossil fuel expenditures for one reactor
14 than the reactor can produce in its lifetime.

15 Dr. Caldicott reports that it takes 162
16 tons of natural uranium each year from the most
17 productive ore in sandstone and shales for one nuclear
18 plant. If the uranium is from granite ore, 40 million
19 tons must be mined or 80 million tons after providing
20 for chemical treatment of the ore. The extraction of
21 uranium from this granite rock would consume over 30
22 times the energy generated from the uranium.

23 Uranium is in short supply. If all
24 electricity worldwide were to be generated from
25 nuclear power, all the uranium would last nine years.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 In the case, uranium from high-grade ore would last
2 three years.

3 In addition to the truth of negative
4 energy from nuclear power after using fossil fuels to
5 produce it, the monetary costs have not been honestly
6 reported. What is the cost to the public of the 13
7 billion in subsidies in the 2005 energy bill? What is
8 the cost of the stranded investments paid by customers
9 of nuclear energy when a plant lasts only 28 of the
10 promised 40 years of life and then they pay again to
11 rebuild such plants as San Onofre 1 and 2?

12 What does the price -- Anderson Insurance
13 Companies, what do they protect from loss from the
14 cost to taxpayers? How much do taxpayers pay for
15 Homeland Security which has done little or nothing to
16 secure the existing 103 nuclear plants? What are the
17 medical costs for the hundreds of individuals who have
18 contracted cancer, leukemia and injured DNA from the
19 operation and accidents of nuclear plants especially
20 Three Mile Island, Simi Valley and Idaho Lab S1?

21 One other point I know that one of the
22 original targets of 9/11 was San Onofre.

23 So, I mean it's just like Craig was
24 saying. It's vulnerable. It is potentially not
25 protected. It's a very unsafe situation just from the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 standpoint of national security.

2 I'm trying to think of the other one point
3 and now I lost it. Anyway, just to summary -- oh,
4 that is the other point.

5 If you're going to take a periphery of
6 public evacuation, in other words, how much area
7 should you consider, should the NRC consider for the
8 public being evacuated, I would see Three Mile Island.
9 In other words, how much land was involved? Was that
10 a hundred mile periphery? Et cetera. Et cetera. And
11 then the other one is Chernobyl. Those would be the
12 two that I would definitely look at.

13 And it wouldn't -- like Craig said, it
14 wouldn't just be ten miles. It would be a lot more
15 than that. I mean Chernobyl is, as you know, a very
16 notorious situation.

17 Anyway, thank you.

18 MR. BAILEY: At this time, we'll have
19 Nancy Casady from Down-Winder.

20 MS. CASADY: Nancy Casady, Board Member of
21 the Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility and for
22 identification purposes, I'm the General Manager of a
23 14,000 member organic food coop in San Diego.

24 I'm a Down-Winder because I live in Lahoya
25 and we are requesting that when the standards are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 looked at all existing plants be subject to the same
2 standards as all new plants. Because if new plants
3 have to meet standards, it would make sense that those
4 were the standards that were in place to protect
5 public health. So, all existing plants should meet
6 those standards.

7 I'd also recommend that public hearings be
8 held on all waste transportation routes if, in fact,
9 the waste is moved and that those hearings are held in
10 each jurisdiction affected by such travel, that we
11 have radiation release data available on the Internet
12 in real time, that we require owners of nuclear power
13 plants to set aside sufficient money to cover the cost
14 of decommissioning, that we require public service
15 announcements to made on radio and TV directing the
16 public to evacuation and other significant nuclear
17 incident safety information and finally, that we put
18 a moratorium on relicensing until there is a permanent
19 high-level waste disposal site.

20 MR. BAILEY: At this time, we'll have
21 Derek Casady, citizen.

22 MR. CASADY: I yield my time.

23 MR. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you. Okay.
24 We'll now have Byron Costa, self.

25 MR. COSTA: Hi. This is kind of a new

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 meeting for me to be at. I'm a little mixed on what
2 to believe, but there's lots of articles on the
3 Internet for safety concerns. I was talking to a
4 gentleman beforehand, Mr. Andrew, and there was an
5 article written in The San Diego Times -- Tribune
6 Times and it said that there was -- no, on the
7 Internet, it mentioned that there were a lot of safety
8 regulation violations and he explained to me or the
9 inspector explained to me that there was levels --
10 various levels of concern.

11 But, that still concerns me and I don't
12 know really how it's going to be implemented, but
13 throughout the United States apparently there's quite
14 a few nuclear plants which I wasn't aware of.

15 I'm a environmentalist. I'm a naturalist.
16 I believe that there should be more approaches to more
17 environmentally friendly means to produce electricity.
18 Of course, I'm not going to reinvent the wheel and I'm
19 sure very few people care about how the direction of
20 our production of electricity is going to be in the
21 future.

22 A lot of people have an agenda here and
23 I'm well aware of that and I'm not too naive, but
24 basically there's a few concerns of mine and I already
25 mentioned a few of them, but safety is the biggest one

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and I went to a previous meeting and there were no
2 evacuation plans in place. There were safety like
3 plans. As people have commented, there were no like
4 drills and I don't know if that's going to change.
5 Hopefully, after this meeting, that would be great.
6 But, since I live in Southern California, I'm
7 concerned about this region although I'm concerned
8 about other parts of the region.

9 I'm a little mixed on really what is the
10 science. Is it more helpful to have a nuclear power
11 plant to produce electricity versus a coal plant
12 versus I like the hydro. I'm not sure how to say it.
13 The one at -- I think it's Hoover Dam.

14 So, I think we have the means to produce
15 electricity in different fashions. So, I would like
16 to personally see if it's a great environmental
17 concern to shut down the majority of them. But, we've
18 already had too much chemicals in our atmosphere as is
19 it.

20 So, I wondering what is truth versus
21 false. The Government has been neglectful on numerous
22 occasions and the EPA reported just recently on water
23 pollution. There are a half a million cases that were
24 reported to the EPA and they only find 3 percent.
25 This is alarming.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, in the same category, I love my
2 country, but I fear my Government at times and the
3 Katrina disaster was a level 5 and then treated it
4 like a level 1 or 2. So, the only -- okay. The space
5 shuttle disaster, the seals were -- they were faulty
6 and I can't remember which administration it was, I
7 was young, says lets go ahead with it. Okay. So, I
8 guess human beings are just a good experiment for
9 everyone.

10 The oil spills, there was just a recent
11 one. Another oil spill. I'm not sure if it was
12 Tennessee or -- but, we have regulations, laws up the
13 wahzoo and there's not enough people to go around to
14 do micro-management and I don't care if it's a right
15 or a left, but corporations run the world and we're
16 the people and we have a right to have a concern and
17 we have the control and the power to a degree to make
18 our voices heard and I would like to see these
19 regulations and standards brought way up and not walk
20 on a tightrope.

21 So, U.S. Government regulates, but the
22 violators are more than there is personnel. So,
23 history repeatedly has shown that the Government
24 Agencies have been reckless, neglectful, irresponsible
25 for protecting the U.S. citizens and if you want to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 watch an eye-opening movie, there's probably movies
2 beyond this one, but Erin Brockovich was one that
3 talked about the environmental disasters of leaking
4 into the water and the fields.

5 So, anyway, I hope we can have some great
6 improvements and we'll just let time take care of
7 itself.

8 MR. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you. I
9 neglected to mention, for those of you who are reading
10 from a script, if you would like to turn them into the
11 transcriber, we will make sure that they are included
12 so that they can be -- again, all your information can
13 be thoroughly accurate and included in the transcript.

14 Next we'll have Stephen J. Johnson, W.D.
15 Associates, Inc.

16 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. I mainly had
17 some comments and questions that are specific to this
18 memo from Ace Hoffman of Calsbad. Is Mr. Hoffman here
19 this evening? Greetings.

20 Subject is concerns regarding San Onofre's
21 stream generator replacement project and this was
22 handed out. I don't know if everyone's got a copy of
23 it or not.

24 To the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
25 Dated October 22nd of 2009. The first paragraph reads

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 "The most dangerous times for any nuclear power plant
2 are initial start up or during restart and during a
3 shutdown especially in an emergency shutdown."

4 The term dangerous is inappropriate. It
5 should read instead potentially dangerous which would
6 be more accurate and critical, the word critical would
7 be more accurate still and that's why plant start up
8 and shutdown evolutions are very, very carefully
9 controlled as is required per Federal law.

10 The second paragraph starts out with the
11 Three Mile Island Unit 2 and it goes on to says --
12 talk about the accident there in 1979. It was only --
13 the second sentence in the second paragraph reads "It
14 was slightly different from, slightly more powerful
15 than, Unit 1, which, today, was relicensed by the same
16 careless Nuclear Regulatory Commission we seek redress
17 from today as well" and it goes one.

18 I'd like to ask, Mr. Hoffman, on what
19 basis do you categorize the NRC as careless and just
20 for the record, I have no affiliation with the NRC.

21 Okay. The third paragraph on page 1 at
22 the very end, there's a statement following the Davis-
23 Besse discussion, the plant in Ohio that a few years
24 back had a serious flaw in the reactor vessel. The
25 statement reads "Except maybe the filter salesman."

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 That does not make any sense whatsoever.

2 Fourth paragraph states out by saying
3 "Many of San Onofre's sea encrusted, rusted,
4 dilapidated parts will be 60 years old, too, if it
5 makes it to retirement age."

6 MR. BAILEY: I'm sorry, sir. If you would
7 like to engage in a discussion with Mr. Hoffman, we
8 would like you to make sure it's at the conclusion.
9 That you can do it on your --

10 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

11 MR. BAILEY: Okay.

12 MR. JOHNSON: I would be happy to. Thank
13 you very much for your time, everybody.

14 MR. BAILEY: All right. Thank you.

15 PARTICIPANT: Perhaps Mr. Hoffman could
16 come up there and answer questions.

17 MR. BAILEY: That would have to be done
18 after this. This is the NRC forum. Thank you.

19 MR. JOHNSON: Sorry for the --

20 MR. BAILEY: No problem.

21 MR. JOHNSON: -- misunderstanding.

22 MR. BAILEY: Thank you, sir. I'm sure
23 he'll be glad to address it afterwards.

24 Next we'll have Ms. Janelle -- I'm sorry.
25 Janelle Worthington, self concern.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WORTHINGTON: My issue has already
2 been addressed.

3 MR. BAILEY: Thank you. Steve Netherby,
4 CREED.

5 MR. NETHERBY: Good evening. A week ago,
6 I had -- my name is not your name. It's my name.
7 Steve Netherby from San Clemente, a 37-year resident.
8 Thank you.

9 A week ago today, I had breakfast with a
10 delightful young married couple. He's a talented
11 professional surfer from Italy with a shiny new green
12 card and she's a native San Clementian and licenses
13 esthetician due to deliver their first child in a
14 couple of weeks. They want to start their own
15 business in San Clemente and raise their child here.

16 As a senior member of my community, I feel
17 a compelling obligation to do all I can to preserve a
18 healthy, safe and sustainable environment in which
19 this young couple can build their future and raise
20 their child.

21 I also feel a responsibility to promote a
22 lasting legacy of a community in which this couple's
23 child can thrive and one day raise his or her own
24 healthy children.

25 I hate the thought of these three young

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 people one day terror stricken, imprisoned in their
2 care on a gridlocked northbound freeway knowing their
3 life has been changed forever because my generation,
4 citizens as well as officials, wasn't vigilant in
5 guaranteeing that they were as safe as possible from
6 a disaster at our neighboring nuclear plant.

7 There there's the selfish fear. Though my
8 wife and I have successfully raised our three
9 daughters and are in our high 60s, we nonetheless feel
10 we have a long healthy life ahead of us full of happy,
11 well-earned rewards, but I admit a chill runs down my
12 spine when I consider the very real possibility of
13 awakening one night to disaster sirens, an eery glow
14 over a nearby ridge and the realization reinforced by
15 TV emergency bulletins that we face the probability of
16 life shortened and studded with painful, but hopeless
17 cancer therapies.

18 The NRC is made of people and your
19 constituency is people. Does it pain you as it does
20 me to consider these scenarios? In your heart of
21 hearts, of course, it does.

22 Your moral and I believe legal imperative
23 is not to protect your industry at the peril of those
24 who live in the long shadow of SONGS that Beauchamp
25 described. It is to all you can to protect ordinary

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 citizens, young and old, from humankind's most
2 powerful and hazardous technology.

3 A good first step in fulfilling your moral
4 and legal responsibilities is to require a rigorous
5 on-site specific review of environmental health,
6 economic and safety impacts of SONGS generating
7 license extension application.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. BAILEY: Next we'll have Tim Nader,
10 Former Mayor, Chula Vista, California.

11 MR. NADER: Thank you. My name is Tim
12 Nader. I'm from Chula Vista, California. That's the
13 city at the opposite end of San Diego County from San
14 Onofre. I thought I was coming a long way to come up
15 here until I remembered that that's only about 1/20th
16 of the distance that Chernobyl spewed dangerous
17 radioactive waste.

18 When I was mayor, fortunately, we only had
19 a couple of public emergencies that we had to respond
20 to as such. One was a break in the San Diego sewer
21 main which our waste water flowed through and the
22 other was some localized flooding that resulted from
23 heavy rain that we kind of long for right now.

24 In the latter case, it was a challenge to
25 get the bureaucracy of a California city to respond by

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 moving up the priority list a drainage channel that
2 needed to be widened to provide relief to some seniors
3 who were flooded out of their homes. I hate to think
4 what would have happened if we had been called upon to
5 evacuate a city because of an unexpected nuclear
6 accident.

7 It doesn't particularly reassure me either
8 to know that the Federal Government's zone of
9 responsibility is only ten or 15 miles from the plant
10 or to know that within that zone of responsibility,
11 the Federal Government would take responsibility for
12 evacuation or for emergency response.

13 And my first comment on the draft Generic
14 Environmental Impact Statement is that the more
15 realistic impacts of an accident no matter how
16 unexpected that accident might be -- accidents by
17 definition are unexpected. If you expected them, they
18 wouldn't be accidents. Right? No matter how
19 unexpected that accident might be, the impacts to be
20 reviewed and considered need to include the impacts
21 outside of your ten or 15-mile zone.

22 The ones that -- a more realistic reading
23 of history shows us -- in the case of Chernobyl, I
24 believe it was about 1200 miles away. I realize that
25 Chernobyl was a somewhat different technology. It was

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Soviet Union which we hope had laxer and less
2 accountable standards than America, but it does
3 illustrate what can happen if something goes
4 unexpectedly wrong with this technology and I don't
5 think it's adequate or sufficiently reassuring to
6 simply dismiss it by saying that we don't expect it to
7 happen.

8 Secondly, I'm concerned and this has been
9 alluded to by a couple of the other people commenting
10 tonight and I won't lie and claim that on a series of
11 lunch breaks at my day job I was able to thoroughly
12 read and memorize the entire 600-plus page document,
13 but in reading over that document, I didn't see any
14 mention of terrorism or national security implications
15 of this technology. It would seem to me that a
16 Generic Environmental Impact Statement that is
17 intended to apply to every relicensing of a nuclear
18 plant in America should be considering at a threshold
19 level the potential for terrorist targeting of these
20 plants as well as the nuclear proliferation
21 implications at a time when we are seeing rogue
22 regimes around the world obtaining nuclear weapons and
23 terrorist organizations including al-Qaeda so far we
24 hope being caught again and again attempting to obtain
25 nuclear material which is ultimately obtained through

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the civilian commercial nuclear industry.

2 I think that the impact of proliferating
3 this technology and participating in an international
4 regime which makes this material more readily
5 available with each plant that we license or relicense
6 to these groups that are a threat to our national
7 security that possibility -- and the environmental
8 implications of that possibility because such a
9 terrorist attack will clearly have severe
10 environmental repercussions wherever it occurs and in
11 a wide region around wherever it occurs, that
12 potential really does need to be addressed in the
13 environmental impact statement.

14 Finally, the cumulative impacts. I
15 learned tonight that cumulative impacts are being
16 classified as a category 2 impact. In other words,
17 that the cumulative impacts will be looked at on a
18 case-by-case basis in each relicensing. In some
19 degree, that's reassuring, but I think it needs to at
20 least be acknowledged that there's a difference
21 between the impact of relicensing one nuclear power
22 plant and the cumulative impact of hundreds of nuclear
23 power plants.

24 We have certain individuals in Congress
25 right now who are proposing that we build what I at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 least think of as a hundred new targets of opportunity
2 for terrorists throughout our country as an energy
3 plan. Any one of those doesn't present the same
4 potential as the cumulative impact of all of them and
5 so, I think it needs to be clearly stated that
6 cumulative impacts will be considered in each
7 relicensing process.

8 I thank you for your time and for
9 considering my comments. I hope that they will be
10 seriously considered. I do appreciate that the NRC is
11 having the meeting here in our region tonight to take
12 public comments. I appreciate that the member of
13 Congress who represents the district in which San
14 Onofre is situated is here through a representative.
15 I hope that the comments that are being taken at this
16 meeting and others like it will result in a stronger
17 energy future for our country.

18 Thank you very much.

19 MR. BAILEY: Thank you. Okay. Next we'll
20 have Ms. Sharon Hoffman.

21 MS. HOFFMAN: My name is Sharon Hoffman.
22 I represent the citizens of the United States.

23 The citizens of the United States do not
24 want nuclear power. It's expensive. It's dangerous.
25 It's not ensured. It's not cost effective. It was a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 bad solution from day one. It feeds the nuclear
2 weapons industry. We don't need it. We don't want it
3 and that should be the end of the discussion.

4 But, it's not the end of the discussion
5 unfortunately. We've been at many of these meetings.
6 We've had these discussions.

7 So, let me share some things that have
8 happened in these meetings. About five years ago,
9 there was a NRC hearing and there was a representative
10 from FEMA at that hearing. There's been a lot of talk
11 about evacuation tonight. So, I asked the gentleman
12 from FEMA to please explain to me how he would
13 evacuate at 5:00 on a Friday before a holiday and his
14 answer was that's not a fair question. I think that's
15 a really fair question because accidents as the
16 eloquent gentleman before me just pointed out are
17 accidents. We do not know when they will happen and
18 the idea that we could evacuate the area around San
19 Onofre is ludicrous. Could never be done.

20 It couldn't be done on a Wednesday morning
21 at 10:00. Because as soon as anybody got wind of the
22 problem, the roads would be a parking lot and not just
23 in the immediate area of San Onofre. All the way to
24 San Diego. All the way to Los Angeles. All the way
25 to Las Vegas.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, evacuation is just one part of the
2 problem.

3 Another part of the problem is that no
4 matter how many people say we not relicensing San
5 Onofre, we are -- we are -- they are rebuilding it
6 from the inside out and corporations do not invest
7 money to do that unless they have every intention of
8 continuing to operate and if they were actually
9 rebuilding everything from the inside out, that would
10 be terrible, but it would be better than what they're
11 doing. Because what they are doing is rebuilding what
12 they can see is broken. What about all the parts they
13 cannot see?

14 So, this forum is called a public comment
15 forum. My forum and my comment is shut it down now
16 before an accident happens, before we destroy all of
17 Southern California and who knows what else beyond.

18 Thank you.

19 MR. BAILEY: Next we'll have Ace Hoffman.

20 MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you. My name is Ace
21 Hoffman and I wanted to just make a brief comment for
22 the guy that was commenting on my document. Oh, what
23 did I do with my document now? Well, anyway, here --
24 here we go. Yes.

25 The careless Nuclear Regulatory

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Commission. Well, in the next paragraph, two
2 incidents are mentioned which I think indicate a
3 careless Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The emergency
4 core cooling system at Monticello was unavailable for
5 30 years. Thirty years because the shipping bolts had
6 not been removed when they installed it. So, who
7 knows whether it would have worked and who knows who
8 should have figured that one out, but my guess is the
9 Nuclear Regulatory Commission should have.

10 And then the other one is the Davis-Besse
11 reactor. The comment about except maybe the filter
12 salesman which makes no sense unless you know what
13 actually happened there and what actually happened is
14 the reactor pressure vessel had got a hole about as
15 big as a football and over they estimate I think it
16 was about three months it took for that hole to
17 develop what happened? Well, the filters kept getting
18 clogged and they kept replacing them, but nobody
19 figured out why except maybe the filter salesman.

20 Taking a quick look at this book, I'm sure
21 we've all read it since it came out a few hours ago.
22 When we go over to the renewable energy section and I
23 don't know where these guys get off acting like
24 experts. That's what really bothers me in that
25 section.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Let's see. Large dams diminished due to
2 increased public concerns over flooding, habitat
3 alteration and loss. Okay. Well, there's public
4 concerns about nuclear power, too, but that hasn't had
5 any affect. It says large dam -- hydroelectric
6 facilities can provide 10,000 megawatts. That's ten
7 nuclear reactors worth of energy, but you might have
8 to divert because fish and so, therefore, let's go
9 with the reactors.

10 Okay. Geothermal. Geothermal can provide
11 23,000 megawatts according to current technology.
12 However, it's located far away and we'd have to build
13 transmission lines and we're building transmission
14 lines to get to Palo Verde just so that San Onofre has
15 a backup nuclear reactor. I think we can build
16 transmission lines if we need to.

17 Let's talk about wind turbines. They have
18 visual resource degradation. They're ugly. San Onofre
19 isn't, but they are. Okay. Yes, it's bird
20 collisions, shipping lane interference, noise. You
21 know, it's too bad nuclear reactor radiation doesn't
22 make a little sound when it decays. It does on a
23 Geiger counter, but too bad it's doesn't actually make
24 that sound because then we'd be hearing it constantly
25 and maybe we'd start to fear it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Let's see. Photovoltaic systems aren't
2 going to work because they've only been used in small
3 appliances in homes and remote locations. Not a
4 chance. Okay.

5 It says here that according to California
6 there's no significant health affects from solar.
7 Although you've managed to list the hazardous
8 chemicals including arsine, phosphine, saline. I
9 can't pronounce all of these. Sulfur hexafluoride.
10 Moliptinam hexafluoride. Tungsten hexafluoride and
11 you know what? I bet you can't find all the chemicals
12 that are used to make nuclear fuel listed in here, but
13 all the ones used to make solar and how bad they are,
14 that's listed.

15 Okay. And ocean wave technology is in its
16 infancy. So, therefore, it can't work. Well, they
17 said that once about nuclear power and it wasn't all
18 that long ago and guess what? It still doesn't work.
19 So, that's not a reason not to give it a chance.
20 Okay.

21 Well, that's all I wanted to say. Don't
22 forget to pick up a copy of my book especially all you
23 reporters.

24 Thank you very much.

25 MR. BAILEY: Next we'll have Gary

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Headrick, San Clemente Green.

2 MR. HEADRICK: Hi. My name is Gary
3 Headrick with San Clemente Green and I appreciate the
4 opportunity to speak here tonight. I appreciate the
5 NRC having a public forum like this.

6 And the main reason I'm here tonight is to
7 address the streamlining process of the environmental
8 impact report and the impression I have is that it
9 might result in fewer opportunities like this for the
10 public to participate and I think that's a huge part
11 of the process that we need to encourage and even if
12 I may not be accurate about that assumption, I would
13 still -- my comment is to promote even greater
14 participation with the public, get more feedback from
15 alternatives and other opinions and do far more public
16 outreach so a larger number than tonight by hundreds
17 could enjoy the process, participate in it and become
18 better educated on a very important topic.

19 Because I think this environmental process
20 should include consideration of the alternatives, fair
21 and honest open debate about how we're going to really
22 address global concerns that are a result of climate
23 change in the short time we have to figure this all
24 out. We have to have very honest realistic solutions
25 and I'm not saying whether we're pro or against

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 anything. I think all options should be on the table
2 and we have some serious issues to deal with and I
3 just am here tonight especially to encourage the
4 public input and consider all these things that we
5 heard tonight. Very important topics and ideas and
6 suggestions, concerns.

7 We just need more people participating in
8 that. So, that's what I'm here to encourage.

9 Thank you.

10 MR. BAILEY: Next Sandy Exelby, San
11 Clemente resident. Sandy Exelby.

12 MS. EXELBY: My name is Sandy Exelby and
13 I've been a resident of San Clemente for 34 years.
14 I'm also a member of the League of Women Voters and I
15 didn't put that on my card, but I will.

16 From so much of what I've heard tonight
17 and comments, our position -- our state position on
18 energy is so relevant and it's very short. I'd like
19 to read it.

20 "The League supports development of a
21 state energy policy that will ensure reliability of
22 energy resources and protection of the environment and
23 public health and safety at reasonable customer rates
24 giving primary consideration to conservation and
25 energy efficiency. State government should provide an

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 efficient coordinated energy administrative structure
2 with open, transparent procedures."

3 And we studied -- the League studied
4 energy two or three years ago and we found it
5 extremely complex and that's kind of how I would like
6 to begin my comments.

7 I think it's pretty hard for most
8 residents to understand energy and all the
9 complexities of it.

10 I have a letter that the Mayor of San
11 Clemente wrote to CPUC Commissioner and it talks about
12 being grateful for having workshops in San Clemente,
13 but how little they felt informed at the end. That
14 they didn't feel that they really had a good
15 understanding of what they needed to know and I feel
16 that transparency is part of the problem.

17 I don't understand the budget process.
18 I'm not sure how many of you understand the budget
19 process, but I would like to know how these things are
20 factored in. One other gentleman tonight mentioned
21 those. I don't understand the cost of delivery for
22 our electricity. I don't know what is factored in.
23 I don't know if the storage of waste is. If the
24 security and the -- I did go to one of the NRC
25 meetings where they had teams from different agencies

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 coming up and reporting on their activities and their
2 plans. I don't know if that's factored in.

3 I would like to know how much the CEOs of
4 Edison make. I just -- I would like to know the
5 mitigating costs of the reef. I believe it was,
6 somebody can probably correct me, 500 million or
7 something to build the reef off of our coastline here
8 very close to us and I don't know whether that's
9 factored in and I don't know whether the problem that
10 caused it has been fixed. That is a concern I'm sure.

11 These are things that I bring up as
12 comments because they're things that I'm not sure of
13 and I think most of us would like to know a little bit
14 more about that.

15 I also am concerned about the storage of
16 waste. We hear about the seismic activity that the
17 generating plant can withstand, but how about the
18 storage areas? Are they vulnerable? I mean how much
19 can they take? I know in the last year we had a
20 couple of minor 4.0s off of our coast between here and
21 San Clemente Island, but I'd like to know more about
22 that.

23 I wonder how often the water is tested and
24 how many other nuclear plants are on sites so close to
25 swimming. Maybe somebody -- after the meeting, maybe

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 somebody can tell me that it's common to put nuclear
2 plants close to where people swim.

3 Naturally, I'm concerned about the
4 evacuation. The fact that the only way you can go
5 south out of here is down one road is frightening
6 because of our -- because of Camp Pendleton and the
7 only way I know of to get out of here going the other
8 direction is Pacific Coast Highway or the same freeway
9 and I know what it's like. I commuted to Irvine for
10 many years when I taught there and I can tell you that
11 one accident of moderate severity and maybe no
12 injuries can tie up that freeway for hours and I have
13 made the mistake more than once of getting off
14 thinking I could do better. I probably don't need to
15 tell you what happens because you probably have the
16 same problem.

17 Thank you. I think that pretty well
18 covers it. I thank other people, too, for commenting.
19 I always learn more than I can share. So, I
20 appreciate this opportunity.

21 MR. BAILEY: Jerry Collamer, a San
22 Clemente resident.

23 MR. COLLAMER: Thank you. Whoops. I
24 think I just pulled the plug. No, we're good.

25 Hi. Jerry Collamer, San Clemente

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 resident. Surfer. Been surfing down there in that
2 vicinity since about 1954 and permanently moved to San
3 Clemente, my wife and I did, 11 years ago because of
4 surfing I guess.

5 And certainly SONGS wasn't new to me. I
6 know it was there. I used to surf out in front of it
7 actually. I would say my consciousness was pretty low
8 at that point.

9 And I have been coming to every Nuclear
10 Regulatory/Edison thing that they've had in San
11 Clemente for, I think, four or five years. I attended
12 as a resident.

13 I used to get As in literature and I used
14 to get Fs in math and every time I go to one of these,
15 not this one particularly, but when I -- when, for
16 instance, a few months back, six months ago or so, I
17 think they had something here at the -- in this same
18 room and it was SONGS. It was kind of a pep rally for
19 SONGS. I guess there's been a regime change and
20 they're trying to get that place back in order and I
21 guess they've -- hopefully, they've achieved that. It
22 was full of all the scientists that work there and I
23 know that all the people that are involved in nuclear
24 power are very bright. They're all the guys that got
25 math when I was having trouble getting math and every

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 time I go to one of these events and I talk to
2 experts, like the gentleman back there who was
3 criticizing Mr. Hoffman's report, was they all get it
4 and I don't get it.

5 And the more of these meetings that I've
6 gone to and listened to the experts talk and now, I
7 become very conscious about nuclear power and I read
8 about it everywhere in the world and all the plants
9 and America is -- the thing that I know is that it's
10 absolutely deadly and I don't think there's any
11 protecting that plant down there. I mean I can walk
12 right up to the wall everyday and I just don't see
13 even the Marines. I know in France they're going
14 crazy. They're putting anti-aircraft guns and stuff
15 around their plants because the whole country is
16 powered by nukes and they're pretty frightened about
17 the whole tourist activity.

18 But, I'm really more frightened about the
19 safety factor because I don't think there's a way to
20 make it safe and nobody's proven to me that there is
21 a way to make it safe. I think we live under the law
22 of accident and let's say we have an 8.5 shaker. At
23 that plant, I think, according to what I heard last
24 time, that plant really isn't equipped to even test
25 the seismic responsibility to that place because of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the nature of the way it's constructed. I heard that
2 from an engineer.

3 About it must have been four or five years
4 ago in San Clemente under the old regime at SONGS,
5 they came into our community center and gave us a long
6 and very detailed interaction with the public. They
7 had all the experts there and all the people there to
8 talk to all of us and basically to calm our fears. I
9 mean I would get the feeling that's what this is
10 about. Calm our fears.

11 The problem is I don't think I'm paranoid,
12 but every time I leave one of these, I'm more
13 frightened than the time before. But, again, it's
14 probably because I don't get math.

15 But, I asked -- at that point, I asked the
16 PR director. We were outside talking and I said well,
17 you know, the plant's old. I mean I know about
18 automobiles and stuff and technology and living by the
19 beach, everything for us and, you know, it's tough to
20 control the longevity of things especially melted
21 parts and all that stuff and then when there's 18
22 billion gallons of water or whatever it is that go in
23 and out of that place 24 hours a day. I said if
24 you're going to build it new, first of all, would you
25 build it there and would you use the same technology?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Because I don't know about nuclear plant technology
2 because I don't get math.

3 And he said no, we wouldn't do that. It
4 wouldn't look anything like that plant and then
5 somebody interrupted the conversation and I didn't
6 really get it fully answered, but I thought well,
7 that's terrific.

8 So, we really do have this ancient relic
9 down there that we keep Band-Aiding together hoping
10 that we don't have one of these accidents.

11 Now, about public safety and the citizens
12 of San Clemente knowing about this, that has been
13 explained in detail, but the public's never there.
14 I'm usually -- me and about four other citizens are
15 the only ones in the room and everybody else is
16 explaining. All of the first respondings and I'm
17 telling you they really have thought about this, but
18 the public I don't think knows it and according to
19 what I've heard tonight, I would -- and that meeting
20 I went to, that was two years ago when I heard that
21 one. When they did get up and explain all that.

22 So, I was sitting in the chair here and
23 the train went by over here and my chair was rumbling
24 and I think that plant is closer to the railroad
25 tracks than the train that's running by here and then

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I keep remembering that they don't have really a way
2 of testing the seismic responsibility of this mega-
3 boiler sitting on sand.

4 So, the point -- I agree with Ms. Hoffman.
5 That I think what the plant should do is not exist.

6 Now, I know that even if it was in some
7 miracle of miracles that nobody got hurt and the plant
8 did shut down permanently, I know that we're going to
9 be left with that fenced off piece of ground for
10 probably the next eternity because the ground's too
11 hot. They'll never build anything there.

12 But, it would make me feel better driving
13 by to know that those -- that all that dangerous stuff
14 sitting there isn't there and especially when little
15 solar panels on roofs that don't kill anybody could
16 solve the whole problem for power that's going to
17 Riverside.

18 Thank you very much and I want to thank
19 the NRC was doing this and making us maybe more
20 frightened. But, anyway, thank you.

21 MR. BAILEY: Next we'll have David
22 Weisman, Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility.

23 MR. WEISMAN: Excuse me. Who follows me?

24 MR. BAILEY: Rochelle Becker.

25 MS. BECKER: I'm like -- can I go first?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BAILEY: Okay. No problem.

2 MS. BECKER: My Rochelle Becker and I'm
3 the Executive Director of the Alliance for Nuclear
4 Responsibility.

5 According to the California Energy
6 Commission, Southern California Edison plans to file
7 for a SONGS license renewal application in late 2012.
8 PG&E expected to file one in 2010. Today, as I was
9 waiting for my car battery to be recharged because I
10 had a dead battery, I got an e-mail saying that PG&E
11 has filed with the PUC to be reimbursed to start its
12 license renewal application process.

13 On page S2 of the GEIS, it states "The
14 purpose and need for the NRC's proposed action is to
15 provide an option to continue plant operations beyond
16 the current licensing term to meet future system
17 generating needs."

18 These needs and ultimately the decision to
19 operate a nuclear plant under a renewed operating
20 license are to be determined by state utility system
21 and where authorized Federal other than the NRC
22 decision makers. The NRC has no role in energy
23 planning decisions. State regulatory agencies, system
24 operators, powerplant owners and in some cases other
25 Federal agencies ultimately decide whether the plant

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 should continue to operate.

2 Yet, the GEIS process will not be
3 completed and adopted before PG&E and perhaps SCE's
4 anticipated filing date for license renewal
5 applications. Therefore, how is the public assured
6 that the GEIS revisions much less the public's
7 comments will be thoroughly considered before the NRC
8 considers a license renewal application for Diablo
9 Canyon or San Onofre?

10 This question is especially relevant as
11 the NRC has already licensed over 50 reactors without
12 the benefit of the input from the public on GEIS
13 revisions.

14 It is, therefore, vital that the PUC, the
15 Energy Commission and the state legislature agree and
16 require, not recommend, that all cost benefit and risk
17 studies resulting from the state's analysis be
18 completed, adopted and implemented and the GEIS
19 process be completed and approved before any repair
20 funding for the license renewal for California's
21 reactors be allowed.

22 In June 2009, the California Public
23 Utilities Commission sent letters to both utilities
24 emphasizing the need to address issues raised in the
25 AB 1632 Report. That report was sponsored a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Republican Assemblyman from San Luis Obispo who also
2 has a Ph.D. in seismology.

3 The 1632 report is part of their license
4 renewal feasibility study assessment such as seismic
5 and tsunami hazards, local and economic impacts of
6 shutting down the plants, waste storage and disposal.
7 However, based on information submitted by the
8 utilities in response to the Energy Commission's data
9 request as part of their annual energy report, it
10 appears that the utilities are not on schedule to
11 complete these activities and studies in time for
12 consideration by the PUC and they may not intend to
13 make any of their studies available to the public.

14 The Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility
15 would like to see a written agreement between Federal
16 and state agencies and the legislature that all
17 studies to determine if continued operation of
18 California's aging reactors especially in light of
19 recent seismic and erosion reports be completed,
20 adopted and implemented before any consideration of
21 extending licenses for San Onofre or Diablo Canyon.

22 Absent this written agreement, the
23 public's participation in the process will be viewed
24 as a mockery of the democratic process.

25 Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. WEISMAN: Good evening. My name is
2 David Weisman. I am the Outreach Coordinator of the
3 Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility.

4 It's ringing in my ears. Okay. All
5 right.

6 The Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility
7 and I'd like to take a second to backtrack from Ms.
8 Becker's rather detail report and look at the concept
9 of what she discussed in terms of the Generic
10 Environmental Impact Statement to give you a broader
11 idea.

12 Think very carefully about the paragraph
13 she mentioned from Section S2 imbedded in their
14 document. What rights are reserved to the state and
15 what to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission?

16 Now, the fact is we can have many comments
17 about issues that we find deficient with the revised
18 GEIS. They could range from, as was brought up in San
19 Luis Obispo yesterday as well, inadequacy of thorough
20 evaluation of alternative forms of energy which is
21 glossed over very haphazardly. This has been noted.

22 It can be noted, for example, that under
23 the one seemingly innocuous category of soils and
24 geology, seismic is also in soils and geology. How
25 would one relegate seismic issues to a generic

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 category when you have plants sitting on as diverse
2 seismic backgrounds as Indian Point's fault on the
3 Hudson River or the New Madrid fault that runs through
4 the lower midwest to the southeast. Not to mention,
5 of course, our differing faults here on the Pacific
6 Coast.

7 So, the idea that in one -- in fact, you
8 notice this and Rochelle and I have been through most
9 of the 600-page document enough to give you a word
10 count. The seismic paragraph consists of 152 words
11 out of the 600 pages.

12 And given that we now know at the Diablo
13 Canyon and PG&E has announced that there is a new
14 earthquake fault, it would seem that evolving science,
15 and one who lives in California one always hears that
16 seismology is constantly an evolving science, would
17 require the inability to consider this a generic
18 impact.

19 So, what I bring up is this. While there
20 may be many questions and many considerations for
21 failure or flaws in the Generic Environmental Impact
22 Statement, the fact is the residents of California can
23 make it a moot point. You needn't concern yourself in
24 a sense beyond a certain point and here's why. As Ms.
25 Becker alluded, in the current process, the Nuclear

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Regulatory Commission has not denied a single
2 application for relicensing nor has any state that has
3 brought particular contentions whether it was state of
4 New Jersey's Department of Environmental Protection at
5 Oyster Creek or those in New England or now the state
6 of New York has filed. None of them have ever been --
7 have prevailed. No state has ever prevailed in an
8 attempt to stop a license renewal at great cost to
9 taxpayers whose money funds the attorney generals and
10 those who must pursue these things.

11 And it is with this cost, remember what is
12 not precluded to the state, that we have costs and
13 reliability. This brings up Assembly Bill 1632 which
14 may be new to you. How many of you have familiarity
15 with Assembly Bill 1632? Anyone? A couple of people.

16 The bill in question requires our state to
17 decide is it cost effective and will it provide
18 reliable power for the future.

19 To the lady from the League of Women
20 Voters who asked what costs are factored in, to the
21 League of Women Voters I suggest join us at the
22 California Energy Commission where we've exactly asked
23 for the numbers to be placed on the future cost of
24 nuclear power so our state regulators can determine
25 this.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We wouldn't need to worry about the
2 inadequacies of a Generic Environmental Impact
3 Statement if our state's Public Utilities Commission
4 and Energy Commission decides we don't see a value in
5 extending the lie for 20 more years.

6 So, in other words, there is a way you can
7 participate at a state level traveling only to
8 Sacramento and not to Washington, D.C. if you join and
9 help the Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility bring
10 these issues to our Energy Commission and our Public
11 Utilities Commission and we do that also through our
12 legislature by getting a bid passed that mandates
13 dollars and cents. What does this cost and we await
14 that answer and December 2nd come to Sacramento. Come
15 to the hearing room of the Energy Commission where
16 they will reveal the latest draft of this report.

17 So, in short, what we're talking about
18 here is that we have a way to in California prevent
19 relicensing before it even gets the ball rolling.
20 This documents flaws and failures would be a moot
21 point for those if we make a case that on terms of
22 economics alone, California has no interest in moving
23 forward for 20 more years of nuclear power. We do
24 this by working with the legislature and we believe we
25 have a good chance at this because our Energy

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Commission has looked at the answers of the utilities.

2 Just one quick example, cost. We ask what
3 does it cost? We've heard that the League. They were
4 asked the question by the Energy Commission. Predict
5 for us please the future of the uranium fuel cycle in
6 terms of cost and availability and PG&E provided a
7 five-page detailed footnoted researched answer of
8 various factors which concluded they predict a global
9 problem in uranium supply and cost by the year 2015.

10 Edison's answer was much simpler. It was
11 less than -- well, it was only one sentence. We see
12 no foreseeable problem in the future.

13 Okay. Now, you have the two major default
14 utilities in the state providing completely
15 diametrically opposed answers to the State's Energy
16 Commission. The State Energy Commission has now the
17 cold fact before them and said explain.

18 You can be a part of that process here in
19 the state and so, I suggest that while one can look at
20 the environmental impact statement under analysis this
21 evening and find many flaws and deficiencies, you have
22 a change to supersede it, get a jump on it and move
23 ahead before it's too late.

24 I encourage people to visit the website of
25 the Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility at a4nr.org

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and look to work on a state level.

2 Again, the NRC in that very opening
3 paragraph has given us the right to do so and we
4 should not take that right lightly.

5 Thank you.

6 PARTICIPANT: What was that website again?

7 MR. WEISMAN: a4nr.org.

8 PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

9 MR. BAILEY: Okay. Next we'll have Ruth
10 Hult Richter.

11 MS. HULT RICHTER: Hult Richter.

12 MR. BAILEY: Hult Richter. Chairman,
13 PHOC. Ma'am, unfortunately, for this forum, we won't
14 allow you to have the sign. You can put it to the
15 side if you want.

16 MS. HULT RICHTER: Okay.

17 MR. BAILEY: Such as he has this table
18 over there, but not up front.

19 MS. HULT RICHTER: Okay. Article talking
20 about San Onofre --

21 MR. BAILEY: Ma'am, unfortunately, we
22 can't have you display it right there, ma'am.

23 MS. HULT RICHTER: Okay. Well, I'll put
24 against the wall then.

25 MR. BAILEY: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. HULT RICHTER: Okay. I'm Ruth Hult
2 Richter. I'm the Chairman of the Patrick Henry
3 Democratic Club of America. A club that has members
4 from California to New York. The Patrick Henry
5 Democratic Club is also part of a coalition for
6 nuclear safety.

7 Several things have come to my attention.
8 One is a list of concerns of a number of professionals
9 regarding what's going on in San Onofre. Most of this
10 has been documented in various articles you can find
11 in your newspapers.

12 One, officials at San Onofre were caught
13 falsifying five years of hourly safety logs,
14 fabricating five years of safety patrols that never
15 took place. Real -- right?

16 Two, Edison has a history of putting
17 unqualified workers into positions where public safety
18 could be endangered.

19 Three, San Onofre has been repeatedly
20 caught leaking radioactivity into the water and air.

21 Four, San Onofre came close to a Chernobyl
22 level meltdown when the safety systems were off-line
23 during the wildfire that almost hit the plant in 2007.

24 Six, there is an epidemic of -- oh,
25 excuse. Five, certain types of cancer such as breast

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 cancer and leukemia are at a national high in Orange
2 County. Think of it, Orange County gets to be number
3 one in something. Cancer. Think about it and there
4 are especially cancer pockets as you get closer to the
5 plant.

6 The other night, I was talking to a young
7 woman from Dana Point who had breast cancer.
8 Genetically, she said it was impossible. Her doctor
9 was absolutely shocked. She knew of a number of other
10 people who had -- because it wasn't in their genes or
11 in her lineage. She knew of a number of other people
12 who had impossible cancers.

13 You know, it's amazing these cancer
14 pockets that pop up and nobody from the NRC seems to
15 have noticed this.

16 Six, there is an epidemic of cancer among
17 small animals. What's really interesting about these
18 cancers among the small animals is that a lot of them
19 don't fit the traditional modes. Our little seven
20 pound Eskie died at six years of age, it should have
21 lived to 20, of a cancer similar to bone cancer, but
22 not quite that the doctors couldn't even identify it
23 was so bizarre and we've heard of other small animals
24 receiving similar types of cancer here in Orange
25 County.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Seven, radiative kittens were found near
2 San Onofre.

3 Eight, San Onofre is expensive to operate
4 and run. The PUC has agreed to pass off costs of
5 renovation to the public.

6 Nine, Edison officials have repeatedly
7 denied past radiation leaks despite documented
8 findings of those leaks.

9 Ten, on October 14th, 2009, citizen
10 watchdogs observed readings of 180 times the normal
11 level of radiation in Mission Viejo approximately 18
12 miles from San Onofre on a gamma-fed radiation
13 detector. Neither San Onofre officials nor any public
14 agency notified the public nor warned the public with
15 -- or supplied them with potassium iodine pills.
16 Schools were not warned. Santa Ana levels 29 miles
17 away were elevated seven to ten times normal level.

18 Now, you know, if somebody tells me
19 something about a radiation detector, I'd want to see
20 it. Right? Wouldn't you?

21 Well, you know, this -- on Saturday, last
22 Saturday, a radiation detector was connected up in
23 Santa Ana and the gamma-fed -- the normal level for
24 the gamma-fed is one flash per every 60 seconds.
25 That's normal. This is seconds not minutes. I mean

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 so, instead of getting one flash for every 60 seconds,
2 you have multiple flashes per second.

3 The average seems to be what I would say
4 would be about 120 times the normal level and in this
5 section, you can see it's about 360 times the normal
6 level of radiation.

7 We are not informed when we have major
8 increases. Nobody cares and when we were at the
9 disaster preparedness meeting in Orange County we
10 found that they're waiting for somebody in San Onofre
11 to pick up a little yellow phone. These guys who
12 faked five years of safety reports.

13 Eleven, Orange, Los Angeles, San Diego
14 County residents are not notified when radioactive
15 waste travels through their community. For example,
16 recently a truck took radioactive waste from San
17 Onofre to the Port of Long Beach where it was turned
18 away because it was radioactive. It set off the
19 radiation detectors there. Okay. Then it drove back
20 to San Onofre. The only reason it made news is that
21 it was turned away.

22 Twelve, which matters more? Edison's
23 profits or your kids' lives.

24 Thank you.

25 MR. BAILEY: Ms. Marion Pack.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. PACK: My name is Marion Pack and I'm
2 a resident of Laguna Beach and I have been involved in
3 and concerned about production of electricity with
4 nuclear fuels for over 30 years.

5 It first began for me back in Ohio when
6 there was a plant called Perry Nuclear Power Plant
7 under construction about seven miles from my home.
8 They had sent, they being the utility company, had
9 sent home information with my daughters that were then
10 in first and in third grade on how to protect yourself
11 from radiation and how to build a bomb shelter. These
12 materials had been printed in the 1950s in the duck
13 and cover era and I thought hum. My utility company
14 is building a power plant and I'm suppose to build a
15 bomb shelter. There seemed to be something wrong with
16 that picture and it kind of turned me, you know, your
17 average middle class housewife, mother, working mother
18 from that particular phase of my life into a full-
19 blown anti-nuclear activist.

20 For many, many years, I was the Director
21 of the Alliance for Survival here in Orange County and
22 I testified in front of the NRC and Edison at a number
23 of different hearings over the years and in many ways,
24 this is deja vu. It could have been what is going on
25 here today 25 years ago, 20 years ago, 15 years ago.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We were discussing the same thing. What can we do
2 with the waste? How do we take care of the waste? We
3 still don't have the answer.

4 Evacuation planning. The exact comment
5 that was made about getting out of an area around San
6 Onofre on a Friday afternoon at 5:00 was said 20 years
7 ago. We still don't have an answer for it now.

8 Being a resident of Laguna Beach, when the
9 evacuation plans were set up, Laguna Beach residents
10 were told that they were going to be hosts for people
11 that would have be evacuated and the city council of
12 Laguna Beach said hosts? We're leaving, too.

13 So, we haven't come up with the solutions
14 to these problems and we're adding new ones and the
15 new one that I would particularly like to address
16 today is the containment structure of San Onofre.

17 That particular containment structure was
18 built specifically because we live in an area that is
19 sensitive to earthquakes. It sits about three miles
20 off the Newport/Inglewood fault and so, to try to make
21 it safer, the structure containing the reactor was
22 beefed up tremendously. It has about ten feet of
23 concrete, steel and rebar and I just don't understand
24 how you could cut a 28 by 28 foot hole through a
25 containment structure like that, take out the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 generator, put in a new generator and close it back up
2 and have the same type of integrity that you had in
3 the first place. It can't be done.

4 So, we've added to the issues of
5 evacuation planning and safety and what do we do with
6 the waste. Now, how do we make a containment
7 structure the same level of integrity that it was
8 before.

9 So, it seems prudent and wise. Yes, we've
10 dodged the bullet this long at least here locally. We
11 have had accidents in the past and there certainly
12 have been a significant number of accidents down at
13 San Onofre, but prudent to not extend the life of this
14 plant and really when it comes right down to it, back
15 in 1979, there was a ballot initiative passed in the
16 state of California that basically said the people of
17 California do not want anymore nuclear power plants
18 built in California until there is a way to handle the
19 waste.

20 Well, we still do not have a way of
21 disposing of the waste and San Onofre's Units 1 and --
22 or excuse me, Units 2 and 3 initially were licensed to
23 2013 and 2014 and so, if it's not a violation of the
24 spirit -- I'd say the letter of the law, it certainly
25 is a violation of the spirit of the law in that now

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 these reactors are going to be operating past that
2 time to at least 2022 and certainly Edison is
3 concerning on further into the future.

4 It seems it's time to find -- well, we
5 know there's other ways to boil water, but what we've
6 been doing is using one of the most dangerous
7 substances to do something as basic as boil water to
8 produce steam to turn a generator to produce
9 electricity. Let's find a safer way.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. BAILEY: Ms. Lyn Harris, CREED.

12 MS. HARRIS HICKS: I like your deja vu.
13 Same thing with Rochelle. She didn't go back as far
14 as we did, but she's been the foremost person in
15 making achievements to try to end this terrible
16 situation that we have with nuclear power that I know
17 of.

18 Anyway, I have such a number of ones there
19 that I think I would like to add to, but I think that
20 what's most important right now is that we recognize
21 that the decisions that are made by the Nuclear
22 Regulatory Commission, and I'm not talking about the
23 gentlemen in the room here, I'm talking about people
24 back there some place, are made with the full
25 knowledge that they have the power, they have the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 control.

2 The nuclear energy cadre in the country
3 and in the world is running it all and I have then
4 come to face that again and again and I'm sure
5 Rochelle has, too, with our commissions. That there
6 are very dedicated people working in them, but when it
7 comes down to the vote, it's the nuclear industry that
8 gets the vote and we went through that just recently
9 with the rate increases.

10 We didn't need a rate increase because we
11 have been on the path of efficiency programs and
12 renewables distributive for all these years. It's the
13 action plan of the state, the energy action plan of
14 the state. It doesn't have nuclear in it.

15 But, because we made the law allowing them
16 to have dispensation, the ones that are existing
17 already, they've gradually been diminished until we
18 just have the two sites now. But, it's different now.
19 Because the owners of those two have decided that
20 they're going to go on forever and I say that with --
21 I know. I just know it.

22 And the way I know it is that we found out
23 that we're not dealing with something where technology
24 or whatever where you build it and then it lasts its
25 lifetime. The 24/25 years is what they've found out.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 When we were told, we were sold 40 years of energy.
2 It doesn't do that like the other ones. It's a
3 perpetual destructive mechanism. Perpetual
4 destruction.

5 And some of our friends who work down
6 there have given us little glimpses of this and one of
7 them, just a wonderful guy, when he was asked about
8 what happens there when they're down to refuel, he
9 said when we go down for refueling, he said, they
10 bring in a thousand workers to replace a thousand
11 valves and then another time we were talking with a
12 scientist. He says that the problem really is that we
13 don't have a metal that can withstand the pressures
14 and the -- it makes the metal that we're counting on
15 there to protect us unstable. Is the way they say it
16 and that's what a meltdown is really. It gets too
17 unstable.

18 And so, because they can't, they haven't
19 been able to, I shouldn't say can't, we never say
20 can't, they feel that -- it isn't a feeling. It's a
21 conviction and it was expressed to me tonight by one
22 of the gentlemen here that they are convinced that the
23 Federal Government will find a way to take care of the
24 waste.

25 And it's not just repository. Several

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 people said repository. Our state law says disposal.
2 Proven disposal and you all know the difference
3 between what we have now repository on our beach or
4 disposal which is something that we don't have to
5 think about anymore. It's finished.

6 And the other night I was thinking about
7 that from the standpoint of the costing that Fannie
8 was talking about because we're really into that in
9 the California Energy Commission right now. Trying to
10 get a realistic cost analysis of the comparative
11 energies.

12 And I realized that what we had here
13 tonight is exactly the example. Because we came
14 thinking about environmental -- regulations for
15 environmental requirement and we found once again that
16 it doesn't include anything that has anything to do
17 with radiation. It's not human environment. It's the
18 critters and the grasses.

19 And the California Energy Commission when
20 they -- I'm sorry. The California Coastal Commission
21 when it got the only permit that was asked for it had
22 to do with what would happen to the grasses on the
23 beach when they pulled it over the beach and it had to
24 do with what happens with the critters in the wetland.
25 But, nothing about what happens to the rest of us in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the ensuing times.

2 And I realize that we've been spending the
3 last 24 or 25 years of life of those plants figuring
4 well the state really knows best and let them wear it
5 out and then to close it. Which would be 2013. Which
6 was the only really valid license they ever got.

7 All this business about '22, that was just
8 a gift of nine years that the Nuclear Regulatory
9 Commission gave them because they misinterpreted the
10 entire of the scientists and the engineers who
11 calculated that in the beginning and those of us few
12 here who are still alive who went through that period
13 of the license stage, site-specific license stage
14 proceeding know that they were figuring pretty
15 carefully on that and that it has proven because Unit
16 1 was 24 years when they closed it down and they
17 closed it down because it was worn out. Simple as
18 that. No trying to put in new steam generators, new
19 heads, new whatever.

20 And then these now are the same thing.
21 They began the operation in '83 and '84. They were
22 licensed in about '73/'74 whatever and it was the
23 people who had the wisdom to know what was going to
24 happen and it's all speculation because we're all in
25 the middle of the great big test tube. We're just the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 guinea pigs.

2 Figured out that this is the time when it
3 would be the right time to close it and then we got
4 into the sessions with the California Public Utilities
5 Commission on whether or not we're going to have this
6 transfer and it was so obvious. It was so obvious.
7 One time after another all the decisions that were
8 made and the way it was handled that it was being
9 handled in such a way that they could -- they could
10 say this is all right, this is safe, we could do this
11 and it's all right, without having any proof at all.

12 It's like the -- what they told us at the
13 beginning and sold us 40 years of energy, clean, safe
14 and too cheap to meter. You remember? No. No,
15 you're not -- you were not born yet.

16 But, anyway, that's the pattern. That's
17 the pattern. They make the claims and then there's no
18 requirement for them to provide the accomplishment and
19 this night in talking with one of the really good-
20 hearted gentlemen here who helped us some, I think, he
21 said that this phrase that they use here, I don't even
22 remember what it was now, but he said that's an
23 assumption that we all agree. We all agree that the
24 Federal Government will find a way to take care of the
25 nuclear waste.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And that reminded me of Ray Golden who sat
2 in our lunch meeting in the League of Women Voters
3 down in San Diego and kind of grimaced. He said oh,
4 don't worry, folks. He said we feel very confident
5 that they'll find a solution -- a cure for cancer
6 soon.

7 So, I think it's partly our role to make
8 the decision whether we want to be just guinea pigs on
9 a target for another 24 years, maybe more, maybe more
10 and the California Coastal Commission, the gal who has
11 to do with mitigation said well, they haven't quite
12 finished the mitigation from the beginning.

13 When we went through this court case, we
14 got some concessions and one of them was the Marine
15 review committee and it brought us these -- all this
16 information about the damage to the ocean out there
17 and that's -- Edison put that in. Forty-six million
18 it was by the way. Forty-six million dollars it cost
19 to put those reefs in so the fishermen can get back
20 their fish because we were destroying them every
21 minute.

22 And if you want to just think about it
23 from the standpoint of money because that's what it
24 usually comes down to at the end and I think it will
25 in this case, too, that money wasn't like the Edison

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 our newspaper articles said. What a wonderful thing
2 that Edison's doing out there for us. Everything they
3 spend money on comes from our rate money. We have to
4 remember that. We bought that. We bought that and
5 so, well, I could go into that for a long time, but --

6 MR. BAILEY: Excuse me, Ms. Harris.

7 MS. HARRIS HICKS: I'm finished.

8 MR. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you.

9 MS. HARRIS HICKS: I'm finished. Let me
10 think for a minute if there was anything else there
11 that somebody didn't -- well, oh. Oh. I didn't do --
12 well, we'll turn this in instead of me saying it, but
13 the emphasis here today --

14 MR. BAILEY: Ms. Harris, if you could just
15 take one more minute to summarize.

16 MS. HARRIS HICKS: Yes, I just --

17 MR. BAILEY: We extended your time.

18 MS. HARRIS HICKS: Thank you very much.

19 MR. BAILEY: All right. Thank you.

20 MS. HARRIS HICKS: Thank you very much.
21 I just -- now, this is something that we didn't have
22 much time to do and I wasn't able to get everybody's
23 approval of it I didn't think there was anything in it
24 that was -- would be contrary to our purposes and so
25 forth.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We were asking that these most important
2 considerations on the list and so forth not only be
3 retained in the area of public participation because
4 that's the most important thing to most of us right
5 now. Is that we have the transparency and the --
6 what's the word? Accountability. We have to get
7 accountability now on the money thing because that was
8 kind of a joke. Somebody said about -- what about the
9 billion -- millions of dollars that they're putting in
10 their pockets there on this?

11 But, it isn't. Because when the
12 California Public Utilities Commission was
13 deliberating this, they asked specific things from
14 Edison. What the money was going to buy and they
15 asked to have a list of what remuneration was for the
16 top levels of the administration and the owners and so
17 forth and Edison declined to provide it. Declined to
18 provide it.

19 And to me, that one fact was just final
20 proof that our California Public Utilities Commission
21 wasn't in charge. They weren't running it. They had
22 to let that go because in all levels of our Government
23 the people who are running it and making the decisions
24 and giving themselves the money make sure they have
25 the laws with them before they do it. They make it so

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that they didn't break any law. Okay. So, I think we
2 have to pursue that right away.

3 But, what I needed to say here is that we
4 want these things to be made prerequisites for the
5 ability of Edison or any other in the country to put
6 our money into making their 600-page documents and in
7 this hearing, in the testimony that was given on this,
8 Edison's asked for four years of money to put together
9 that document and you know that it's the same pattern
10 on the national level. Coming into Congress with a
11 bill like that. A lot of times they don't even have
12 time to read it.

13 Well, in this case, the Division of
14 Ratepayer Advocates didn't have time to look into it
15 enough that they could protect us and they know it and
16 we know it.

17 But, anyway, if it were a prerequisite, we
18 wouldn't be giving 4.4 million of our money to Edison
19 to make us live under the terrible stress on our
20 minds. I live two miles from that plant. That we
21 live on all these years. That they're making us pay
22 so that they can put the information on the paper
23 enough that they can get it through and if we aren't
24 pretty active, they'll get it through because they're
25 in charge. They're running it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Okay. So, the prerequisite. If a few
2 good people here who have anything to say about it at
3 all can get that in there, any of these things, the
4 prerequisites and I'm not even going to read them.
5 But, we have five here that we've suggested.

6 And I am asking tonight after these 24 or
7 25 years of working so hard with everybody on trying
8 to visualize and actualize our state's Energy Action
9 Plan and our state's law that says we won't have
10 anymore until they have a proven disposal, I think
11 that I've come to the point where we have to say as
12 Helen Caldicott told us when we said how can we
13 protect ourselves? She said stop creating plutonium.
14 So, that's mine, too.

15 MR. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you all for
16 making your comments. That was the last submitted
17 registered comment.

18 Before we proceed to formally close, as I
19 mentioned earlier, the NRC staff will remain around
20 after the meeting to address and answer some of the
21 questions which you may have and before we close, I
22 would like to now bring up Mr. Andy Imboden to give
23 some final words. Thank you.

24 MR. IMBODEN: Thank you. My name is Andy
25 Imboden. I'm the Branch Chief of the Environmental

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Review Branch in the Office of Nuclear Reactor
2 Regulation. What that means is that it's my
3 responsibility to ensure that all the plants comply
4 with the environmental regulations.

5 And I'd like to echo how Kenny began. For
6 those of you who have been to prior NRC meetings maybe
7 even in this hotel, there's been a table of NRC people
8 and the citizens on the other side. Two microphones.

9 The purpose of this meeting was to get
10 your comments. It was set up differently on purpose.
11 That's why we're here and I appreciate everyone who
12 has done that.

13 I saw a lot of people taking notes during
14 this and we've got the open period on these documents.
15 It was up there earlier. I've got a bad angle. But,
16 January 12th.

17 Lots of different ways to submit your
18 comment in writing, through e-mail, the Internet and
19 that kind of thing. So, I look forward to those.

20 You know, well, why we're here was we're
21 in the process of re-looking at the Generic
22 Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of
23 Operating Power Plants and this is document my group
24 relies on to address the issues that are common to all
25 nuclear power plants considering renewal of their

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 license and it was last updated in 1996. You know,
2 we've done quite a few. There's been developments,
3 experience and so, we're taking a look at that
4 document again to make it better, to make it clearer,
5 easier to understand even if you weren't that good at
6 math. I can't surf. So, you got me there.

7 And I'd also to thank Kenny and his
8 insistence that people speak into the microphone and
9 give their name. The purpose of that -- it's my
10 fault. I want to make sure that all the comments that
11 we do receive are, you know, addressed in our
12 documents and brought before the decision makers in
13 the Agency via the rule or the comments directly on
14 the documents there.

15 So, and again, the schedule for issuing
16 the documents is roughly mid-2011 and I heard a lot of
17 comments tonight on very important subjects:
18 emergency preparedness, terrorism, evacuation issues,
19 lots of San Onofre specific issues and so, we don't
20 have the Agency experts in all these matter with us
21 here today. We'll do our best and also we'll be able
22 to share with you how best to directly contact the
23 experts that are back in Washington and wherever else
24 they may be.

25 And I know it's been a long day, but I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 encourage the rest of the NRC staff to stay around,
2 too.

3 And I'd just like to finish with why are
4 we here? This is a Generic Environmental Impact
5 Statement. It affects all plants from Atlantic to the
6 Pacific and this community has played an important
7 role in the governance of nuclear power. It's
8 demonstrated by your participation at previous
9 hearings, meetings, conferences and I've never been in
10 a public meeting before where people could quote bills
11 that are working their way through state government.
12 This is a very sophisticated group.

13 I don't think we had a head count, but
14 maybe 50 people were here which would make this the
15 most highly attended meeting that we've had on this
16 subject. So, I thank you about that.

17 To care about the -- well, you know, just
18 thank you for your input on this national issue and I
19 look forward to, you know, going over these comments
20 and the ones that may come in writing later.

21 And thank you for your interest in nuclear
22 safety and the environment.

23 (Whereupon, the meeting was concluded at
24 9:19 p.m.)
25

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701