# **Official Transcript of Proceedings**

# **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title: Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant

License Renewal Environmental Scoping

Public Meeting, Evening Session

Docket Number: 50-275, 50-323

Location: San Luis Obispo, California

Date: Wednesday, March 3, 2010

Work Order No.: NRC-092 Pages 1-105

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

	1
1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	PUBLIC HEARING
5	TO RECEIVE COMMENTS ON SCOPE OF LICENSE
6	DIABLO CANYON NUCLEAR POWER PLANT
7	+ + + +
8	Wednesday,
9	March 3, 2010
10	+ + + +
11	The hearing convened in the Embassy
12	Suites, 333 Madonna Road San Luis Obispo, California
13	at 1:30 p.m.
14	PRESENT:
15	CHIP CAMERON, Facilitator
16	MICHAEL FULLER, Co-Facilitator
17	ELIOT BRENNER, Director, Office of Public Affairs
18	BECKY SCHMIDT, Director, Office of Congressional
19	Affairs
20	TROY PRUETT, Deputy Director, Division of Reactor
21	Safety, Region IV
22	VICTOR DRICKS, Senior public affairs officer,
23	Region IV
24	LARA USELDING, Public office Officer, Region IV
25	AGNES CHEN, Region IV

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

\_

2

2

4

-

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PRESENT: (Cont'd)

MICHAEL PECK, Senior resident inspector, Diablo Canyon

TONY BROWN, Resident inspector, Diablo Canyon

DREW STUYVENBERG, Project manager, Division of License

Renewal

KIM GREEN, Project Manager, Division of License

Renewal

DAVE WRONA, Branch chief, Division of License Renewal

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

# PROCEEDINGS

(6:30 p.m.)

MR. CAMERON: Welcome to tonight's meeting. Our topic tonight is the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC's, environmental review of Pacific Gas & Electric's application to renew the license for the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant. And my name is Chip Cameron and I work for the executive director for Operations at the NRC, and it's my pleasure to serve as your facilitator for tonight's meeting, and in that role, I'll try to assist you in making sure that you all have a productive meeting tonight.

And tonight, I'm going to be assisted by Mike Fuller, who's right here, and Mike is in our facilitator training program at the NRC. And I just wanted to go over a few items about the meeting tonight, the meeting process, so that you know what to expect this evening, and I'd like to talk about the format for the meeting, and then the ground rules for the meeting.

 $\label{eq:and then I want to introduce the NRC staff}$  who are here tonight to listen to you.

In terms of format, it's a two-part meeting. The first part of the meeting is to give you some information on how the NRC conducts its review of

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

this license renewal application, particularly the environmental part of the review, and we have Drew Stuyvenberg, right here, who is the project manager for the environmental portion of this review, and he's going to give you a brief presentation on the NRC review process, and how you can participate in that process.

We'll have a small amount of time, after Drew's presentation, where we can go out to you for some questions about the NRC review process, to make sure that we were clear on how that all happens.

And then we're going to move into the second part of the meeting, and that's an opportunity for the NRC staff to listen to you, your comments, your advice, your recommendations on what the NRC should consider when it does its environmental review.

And we're taking written comments on these issues also. But anything that's said by you tonight will carry the same weight as those written comments. And you may hear something tonight from the NRC, or from others in the community, that would prompt you to submit some written comments. Or you may want to amplify on the comments that you give tonight.

And if you do want to speak, I would just ask you, most of you have already done this, fill out

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

1|3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

a yellow card that we have at the desk, and that gives us an idea of how many people want to speak tonight.

If you get the urge, that you do want to speak, and you haven't filled out a yellow card, you can do so during the meeting itself. I would just ask you to give us those cards before 9:30, okay, so that we know how many people want to talk. And in terms of ground rules, first, please wait until Drew is finished with his presentation before you ask questions.

And then when we go to the question period, if you could just signal me and I'll bring you this cordless microphone, please introduce yourself, and then we'll take your question.

And I would just ask you to limit it to questions—a lot of times a question will morph into a comment, and we'd like to save the comments for the comment portion of the meeting.

And if we can't get to all the questions that you have during the question period, the NRC staff will be here after the meeting to talk with any of you about your questions, whether they're about the NRC review process, or something about the Diablo plant. Now a second ground rule is that I would ask that only one person speak at a time, and that's so we

10

1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

1|9

20

2 1

22

23

24

can give our full attention to whomever has the floor at the moment. But it also helps us to get a clean transcript. We're taking a transcript of the meeting, and this is Pam Hollinger, who is our court reporter, and Pam will know exactly who is talking, and that transcript will be your record of the meeting and it'll be our record of the meeting.

And a third ground rule is I would ask you to be brief, be economical in your comments, so that we can hear from everybody who wants to speak tonight. We have quite a few people signed up. And I'm going to set a 3- to 5-minute ground rule, and I'll let you know when you're getting near the five minute mark, and I apologize, in advance, if I have to ask you to stop speaking, so that we can go on to the next person, because I know that you have spent a lot of time preparing your comment. So I apologize for that. But if you don't have time to give your complete comments, you can amplify, in writing, send that in to the NRC, or we do have forms out by the desk where you can write a comment and we'll take that back to Washington, and put it on the record.

Please note that the NRC staff is here to listen to your comments tonight. They're going to listen carefully, and they're not going to be

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

responding to any comments. They're not going to be responding to any questions that might be asked from the podium when we get to the comment part of the meeting.

But when the NRC staff prepares the scoping report on this meeting, they will address the comments and questions that they heard tonight.

And the final ground rule is I would just ask everybody to just extend courtesy to everybody in the room. You may hear opinions tonight, that you don't agree with, but just please respect the person that is giving them, and the courtesy rule obviously applies to the NRC staff as well as everybody else in the room.

Thank you for being here to help the NRC with its decision, and I always like to stress, that this is one, this meeting is one data point. Drew Stuyvenberg is going to give you phone numbers and contacts for NRC staff. Please feel free, if you have concerns, questions, to call them, or e-mail them, and we can maintain some continuity in this rather lengthy process of deciding whether the licenses should be renewed, or not.

And I've introduced Drew to you. I'm going to introduce the rest of the staff, so that you

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

know who they are, if you want to talk to them, and they wanted to hear from you in person, to talk to you. That's why they're here tonight.

I'm going to start at the "top of the food chain," so to speak, and start with Eliot Brenner, who is the director of our Office of Public Affairs at the NRC in Rockville, Maryland. And Becky Schmidt, who's the director of our Office of Congressional Affairs in Rockville.

We have Troy Pruett. Where is Troy.

Troy. Troy Pruett, who is the deputy division director for Reactor Safety in NRC's Region IV office in Arlington, Texas. We also have Victor Dricks, who is our senior public affairs officer, again in Region IV, in Arlington, Texas. And we have Laura Uselding who is public affairs officer in Region IV, and Agnes Chen, who you all met, who's helping us with the administrative part of the meeting.

We have our resident inspectors. These are the people who are actually at the operating reactors, and these are the residents that are Diablo Canyon, and we have our senior resident, who is Michael Peck right here, and then we have our other resident, Tony Brown, right here. And we have our license renewal team, Drew, the project manager for

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

the environmental part, and we have Kim Green, right there, who's the project manager for the safety part. The branch chief of renewal projects is Dave Wrona, who's here, and I introduced Mike Fuller, and I think that's it, and we're just going to go to Drew now for a presentation, and then we'll be back out to you for questions.

MR. STUYVENBERG: All right. Thank you, Chip. Before I get started this evening, I'd like to briefly explain the term, environmental scoping, as it pertains to today's meeting. In short, we want your input on environmental issues that we ought to consider in our review of the proposed license renewal.

There are two major pieces to this process. One is that we're looking for your input on the potential environmental impacts of continued operation of Diablo Canyon. In short, what would happen to the local environment if the two units are granted an additional 20 years of operation?

The second is that we're looking for your input on potential alternatives to license renewal. We want your input on what other options to generate electricity, or address electrical demand, NRC ought to consider in its analysis.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

119

20

21

22

23

24

We're also interested in gathering information about the environmental impacts of those alternatives. With that as preface, I'll begin my formal presentation.

The purpose of today's meeting is for the NRC staff to receive input from you all environmental issues and license renewal. Generally, NRC will be in a listening mode today. We have a brief question-and-answer session to address questions on our process, and then we'll begin the formal comment period. All comments that you present will be formally transcribed for later consideration response by NRC staff as we continue the environmental review.

If you filled out a blue or yellow card with your contact information, then you will receive a compilation of all the comments that the NRC receives, as well as the NRC's staff's responses to those comments.

We plan to publish that compilation prior to the time that we publish the draft Environmental Impact Statement. Also, you may have noticed the video crew here. This meeting will be recorded and rebroadcast on SLO-Span, a number of times over the next 30 days.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

119

20

2 1

22

23

24

As we discussed at our February 9th public meetings, license renewal involves two parallel reviews. One review track is a safety review that focuses on managing the effects of aging on the power plant.

The other is an environmental review track in which we address potential environmental effects of license renewal, and possible alternatives.

As you can see, I will be focusing on the environmental review today, which constitutes the bottom path in this diagram.

In the course of the environmental review, the NRC staff consults with local, state, federal, and tribal officials. We also request input from the general public and interested groups.

Part of that process is today's public meeting to receive your input.

You may also notice the box in this diagram that refers to NRC's adjudicatory hearing process. That is another opportunity for the public, groups, and governments, to use, to formally raise issues related to either the safety or environmental reviews.

We have instructions on how to use that process on the table out in the lobby.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

NRC's regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act, often referred to as NEPA, require that we prepare an Environmental Impact Statement to document our environmental review. In our Environmental Impact Statement, we'll compare the likely environmental impacts of license renewal to the likely environmental impacts of alternatives to license renewal.

These alternatives include other means of generating electricity or dealing with electrical loads, other than the current power plant. These can include, for example, fossil fuel generation, renewal generation, or other means of addressing electrical demands.

Input from the public and agencies in the scoping process can affect how NRC considers environmental issues and alternatives during the course of the license renewal review.

We evaluate a wide range of issues in our Environmental Impact Statement. This slide includes issues for which we require site-specific evaluations in our license renewal Environmental Impact Statement.

As you can see, this includes a number of issues that are of concern in this area. I will mention two of these, in particular. The first, at

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

1|9

20

2 1

22

23

24

the top of this list, are the impacts from the facility's once-through cooling system. NRC staff will evaluate impacts from continued operation of the cooling system on aquatic life.

Specifically, we will look at how the cooling system affects aquatic life through impingement, or what happens when organisms are trapped against the plant's intakes, entrainment, or what happens when organisms are pulled through the plant.

And finally, we'll look at the thermal effects from the plant's heated discharged.

The second item I'll specifically point out, the severe accident mitigation alternatives. This analysis is the one area of the license renewal Environmental Impact Statement where seismic issues can play a role, and we know that seismic issues have been a visible concern lately.

Now as most of you know, we deal with seismic issues as they arise, as part of our ongoing oversight. That is, we don't wait for a license renewal review to address them.

For this plant, that means we are continuing to monitor and respond to new seismic information. That said, in considering severe

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

1|3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

accident mitigation alternatives in the Environmental Impact Statement, an assessment of seismic risk is an input to determining whether the proposed mitigation alternatives will be cost-effective.

This range of issues also includes those issues for which reached we have generic determination, as documented in our generic Environmental Impact Statement for license renewal. In the scoping process, we are looking for any new and potentially significant information that may challenge our generic determinations. One of these areas that is of substantial local interest is the issue of waste management for the facility during the license renewal period.

In the course of the environmental review, we will look for scoping comments that may challenge the determination on this topic that the staff reached in the generic Environmental Impact Statement.

If you are interested in reviewing the generic Environmental Impact Statement, we have several reference copies available on the tables in the hallway.

As I mentioned at the beginning of this presentation, we are not only looking for in on the impacts that may result from continued operation of

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

1|9

20

21

22

23

24

Diablo Canyon. We will also look at potential alternatives to continued Diablo Canyon operation, and the impacts that could result from reliance on those alternatives. In this case, alternatives are other means of generating electricity or dealing with electrical load.

We've already heard that considering an array of energy alternatives is an important issue in this area.

While we'll be evaluating a wide variety of environmental impacts from license renewal, and possible alternatives during our environmental review, I wanted to point out that many of the issues we'll be evaluating are in areas in which the State of California has ultimate jurisdiction.

For example, when it comes to planning for energy demand, and dealing with approving or denying means of generating electricity, the state Energy Commission and Utilities Commission have authority, respectively.

We've already been in touch with staff from both organizations as part of this review, and several staff from the Energy Commission are currently in attendance this evening. The Utilities Commission, in addition, also holds authority over electric rates.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

While NRC staff will consider issues related to water use and quality, the state's Water Control Boards exercise permitting authority over these matters.

In addition, the Coastal Commission specifically addresses coastal land use, and the Air Resources Board addresses air quality and air permitting.

NRC's evaluation of environmental issues relating to these matters will not preempt any decisions made by these state level authorities. NRC does, however, have primary oversight for plant safety and for the plant's operating licenses.

And we want to make sure that you know that there are a number of ways that you can submit scoping comments to us, and that you're not limited to providing spoken comments during today's meeting.

If you have a written statement, or written comments that you would like to provide to any NRC staff person, you may do that this evening. If you come up with additional comments after this meeting, you may submit them via e-mail or via regular mail, and we'll provide those addresses at the end of this presentation.

We'll handle all of your comments in the same manner, and afford them the same consideration,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

119

20

21

22

23

24

whether you've submitted them in person, in hard copy, or electronically.

We will continue to accept comments on the environmental review through April 12th of this year. As I mentioned earlier in this presentation, anyone who provides contact information, either a blue or yellow card, will be added to this mailing list to receive the compilation of all comments received by NRC, as well as the NRC staff responses.

Today's meetings are part of a broader environmental review for the proposed license renewal of Diablo Canyon. Later this year, we plan to return to the power plant site to conduct an on-site audit.

After reviewing the information we gather from scoping, from the on-site audit, and from any information requests that we make of PG&E, we plan to publish our draft Environmental Impact Statement in October of 2010.

We then plan to hold an additional set of meetings, similar in format to this meeting, in this area, in December of this year. Now many of you may be mindful that we've received several requests to delay the license renewal review until PG&E completes certain studies for the state.

We are currently reviewing those requests,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

119

20

21

22

23

24

and we plan to have a decision in response to those requests by the end of this month. Until that time, we will proceed with the review, as scheduled. Though it's not listed here on the schedule, I wanted to let you know that NRC staff will return to this area as part of ongoing safety oversight, in six to eight weeks, for the end-of-cycle meeting. This meeting will provide an opportunity for questions and answers as well as extensive interaction with the NRC staff. We will issue a press release and take out ads in local papers prior to that meeting, to publicize it.

If, during the course of this meeting, you wish to review the environmental information that PG&E submitted to the NRC as part of its license renewal application, or to review NRC guidance or background documents on environmental impacts of license renewal, we have hard copies available for your review in the lobby, as well as copies on CD that you may take with you.

In addition, copies of the license renewal application are available for public review at local libraries in San Luis Obispo and Paso Robles. You can also link to them through the NRC Web site.

If reviewing any of these documents triggers additional comments, you may submit them

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

1|3

14

15

16

17

18

1|9

20

2 1

22

23

24

through April 12th. Now as I mentioned earlier, you may submit additional comments through a variety of means. I'll leave this slide up for you during the remainder of the meeting.

With that, I will conclude my presentation for this meeting, and note that there are a few remaining slides in your packets. Those contain contact information for me and my safety counterpart, Kim Green, as well as additional information about how to petition the NRC for an adjudicatory hearing.

And with that, I'll turn the meeting back over to Chip. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you very much, Drew. Drew's given you a high-level overview of the NRC review process.

Are there any questions, so we can make sure that all of this was clear to you, questions about the process? Anybody have a question?

[No response]

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Well, we're going to get right into comment, and we're going to go to Barbara Byron of the California Energy Commission.

Barbara. Barbara Byron.

MS. BYRON: Thank you. Good evening. My name is Barbara Byron. I'm a senior nuclear policy

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

adviser with the California Energy Commission. We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments here today regarding the scope of the environmental review for the Diablo Canyon license extension application.

My comments will be brief since we plan to submit written comments at the end of this month. In November 2008, as required by California Assembly Bill 1632, which was authored by Assemblyman Sam Blakeslee, the California Energy Commission completed a comprehensive assessment of Diablo Canyon and San Onofre Nuclear Power Plants. We also completed two additional integrated energy policy reports in 2008 and 2009, and all of these reports are available at our Web site, www.energy.ca.gov. And if you're interested, I can, in the break, or after the meeting, I can give you—help you get to these sites, or give you the Web link.

We completed these studies, and this assessment included studies of the seismic hazards at Diablo Canyon, and San Onofre, and the seismic vulnerability of these plants.

We found, through this assessment, that important data on Diablo Canyon seismic hazard and vulnerabilities are incomplete or are outdated.

In addition, just prior to the completion

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

1|3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of our assessment, PG&E announced the discovery of the Shoreline Fault, which you've heard a lot about today.

As a result, the Energy Commission recommended that PG&E conduct a number of additional seismic hazard and plant vulnerability analyses.

The California Public Utilities Commission also directed PG&E, in 2009, to report on the major findings and conclusions from these studies as part of its license renewal feasibility studies for Diablo Canyon.

These important studies include updated seismic tsunami hazard studies, including using three-dimensional seismic reflection mapping, and other advanced techniques, to explore fault zones near Diablo Canyon. Assessments of the long-term seismic vulnerability and reliability of the plant, focusing on switch yards and non-safety related components.

An evaluation of additional preplanning, or mitigation steps that PG&E cold take to minimize plant outage times, following a major seismic event, such as the event that occurred after the major earthquake in Japan in 2007, that affected their large nuclear power plant. And then finally, an evaluation of the adequacy of access roads to Diablo Canyon and surrounding roadways, for allowing emergency personnel

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1

12

1|3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to reach the plant and local communities and plant workers to evacuate.

PG&E's completion of these seismic studies is particularly important in light of the nearly three year outage of the Kashiwazaki-Kariwa Nuclear Power Plant in Japan, following the 2007 earthquake.

The Energy Commission and the Public Utilities Commission have also identified a number of other studies that are needed, in order to determine the economic, environmental and reliability implications of relicensing Diablo Canyon.

These studies would answer the following questions. What would be the local economic impacts of continuing to operate the plant, and how would these impacts compare with potential alternate uses of the Diablo Canyon site?

What would be the low-level nuclear waste disposal costs, and spent fuel costs, in estimated storage, and disposal plans for spent fuel from the plant's operation, the 20 year license extension, and decommissioning?

What alternate power generation options could be used in place of power from Diablo Canyon, and what would be the reliability, economic and environmental impacts of these options, compared to

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

1|3

14

15

16

1/7

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

the impacts of Diablo Canyon?

What mitigation plans may be needed to ensure the integrity of the Diablo Canyon reactor pressure vessel over a 20 year license extension, in light of any updates to the estimated seismic hazard at the site?

And finally, what are the options and costs for complying with California's once-through cooling policy?

The seismic studies, and these additional studies, are all needed to assess the cost and benefit to the state of continuing to operate Diablo Canyon for an additional 20 years.

In addition, some of these studies are also relevant to the NRC's evaluation of the environmental and safety implications of continuing to operate the plant. For example, an updated seismic hazard assessment is needed to assess the vulnerability of aging plant components to earthquake.

This is especially important for those reactor components, such as the reactor pressure vessel, that have been embrittled by neutron bombardment.

In addition, the environmental assessment

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

should consider possible changes to Diablo Canyon's cooling system, resulting from the state's emerging once-through cooling regulations that are required by provisions of the U.S. Clean Water Act, and updated assessments of site evacuation plans.

Therefore, request that the NRC we evaluate the safety and environmental implications of studies, as recommended in the AB 1632 these assessment, and that have been identified by the California Public Utilities Commission and the Energy Commission, and require that these seismic studies, and the other state-mandated studies, be reviewed as part of the Diablo Canyon license renewal review proceeding. Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Barbara. Next we're going to go to Chris Joyce, and then Chris Ungar, and then Barbara Scott. And this is Chris Joyce.

MR. JOYCE: Good evening, and thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. My name's Chris Joyce. I've been here, I've been blessed enough to be a part of this county, part of this—I came to Cal Poly in 1978 and they couldn't get rid of me. I managed to get a job with PG&E. So I am a plant employee. But tonight I speak on behalf of myself,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

not on behalf of the plant.

And what I would say, if you look at Diablo Canyon, particularly, the NRC is looking at the environmental, I would suggest that there would be a much larger impact to the county of San Luis Obispo, and the State of California, if Diablo Canyon were to go away, because just as much as I am a part of this county, my wife, my family, my kids—everything—we have grown, we're a part of this community, it would be much more environmental impact if there were no Diablo Canyon.

Diablo is, has been a fantastic environmental steward. I've been driving that access road for a number of years, and I look at the things that I do, I do look at the thing that my peers do in the community, and, you know, we're soccer coaches, we're worship team leaders, we're active in a number of things. We're docents. We're a lot of things to this community.

So I look at the environmental, and again, just a real simple statement. I think that for Diablo Canyon to not be here would be a far greater impact than the impact Diablo Canyon is going to make in terms of relicensing for 20 years. The way I see it, relicensing for an additional 20 years is zero impact,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

because it has grown and it is a part of the community, just like I am here today. That's all I have. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Chris. Chris Ungar. Then Barbara Scott.

MR. UNGAR: Thank you. I'm Chris Ungar and I'm a trustee of the San Luis Coastal Unified School District, and I'm here to talk tonight about the financial impact of the power plant to our school district as a public service. As most of you know, billions of dollars have been cut from school districts throughout California. Thousands of layoffs of teachers and program cuts have affected countless children throughout our state.

Because of the complexity of the state revenue system, which is, in part, based on property taxes, we're fortunate enough to have the power plant in our jurisdiction and within our boundaries. We received several million dollars in property taxes because of PG&E and because of the nuclear power plant.

This directly benefits our children and our community. Without this, we would lay off teachers, classified staff, including teacher's aides, custodians, and other members of our community.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

In addition, PG&E employees donate thousands of dollars and many hours of time to our local schools. We consider this a valuable resource which contributes to the education of our students and to the San Luis Coastal Unified School District community. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. And this is Barbara Scott.

MS. SCOTT: Thank you. My name is Barbara Scott, and I bought a newspaper, in case you hadn't noticed that a plane had gone into an IRS building. And I thought about the safety of Diablo, immediately. The fact that it could happen—this is a disgruntled person. How many disgruntled employees, how many "crazies," in psychological terms, who fly planes? We have no restriction on flying over Diablo as far as I know, and I want to point that out.

And as far as Diablo being part of the community, of course it is, and the idea that we could have an alternative windmill, or geothermal, or solar, aspect to this, and really reduce the possibility of having harmful, spent fuel rods sitting in our back yard. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Barbara. We're going to go to Jim Bennett next, and then to June,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

June Cochran.

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

119

20

21

22

23

24

2|5

MR. BENNETT: Thank you. My name is Jim Bennett. I am also an employee at Diablo Canyon. I've lived here since 1975, and raised my family here. I'm here tonight speaking on my own behalf. I'm not a spokesman for Pacific Gas & Electric. I'm a bargaining unit, hourly employee, so that affords me the opportunity to walk around in the plant and actually work on the equipment.

I feel Diablo Canyon, myself, is a very safe place. I'm very glad, and have the opportunity to work there, and even though I know I'm a thorn in management's side from time to time, raising issues, I'm very pleased, and here to tell you, that there's not one issue that I've raised, that they haven't really addressed.

The management at Diablo Canyon takes nuclear safety and this community very seriously, and I'm really proud to work for them. I plan on retiring here in a few years, and going to continue to make this my home, and I graduated from Cal Poly and met my wife there. I graduated in 1980. And so I don't necessarily need Diablo Canyon to be here when I retire. I don't need the job. But our community needs Diablo Canyon. It provides a great opportunity

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

for a lot of people here. It enriches out community and provides a lot of opportunities.

And, you know, so as far as environmental stewardship, it's a beautiful drive, too bad that the general public doesn't have the opportunity to drive out to the plant. PG&E takes very good care of the property as far as I can tell, down to the point where we're even limited on how we rinse our cars off in the parking lot.

So they're--from my perspective as an employee working out there, I'm very impressed with the way management addresses environmental stewardship, and the safety, and the general public at large. Thank you very much.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Jim. And June Cochran's going to join us, and then we're going to go to Jill Zamek and Jane Swanson.

MS. COCHRAN: My name's June Cochran, and I live in Shell Beach, which is where the plume would hit, if there was an accident, and we saw with the big rig accident, just last year, that Highway 101 is the only way in and out of this place, and it was clogged up for hours. Imagine, if there was an evacuation.

And no one has addressed these issues, really. It is a two-lane road, in and out of Avila,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

and it is a very narrow 101 that goes through San Luis Obispo County, trying to get out of the area. That's one segment.

The next is that let's not waste money on an old plant, with aging parts, on top of this seismic nightmare. Instead, let's see what we can do in the next few years—and maybe it's a good thing that PG&E asked for this license now, because now we can start thinking about the alternatives. As Drew said, we need to be thinking about wind, solar, and new technologies. Wave. There's so many things coming out.

Santa Barbara, Ventura, and San Luis Obispo County have gotten together, and they're talking about fossil-free by thirty-three. Well, in their plan, they don't really have nuclear as part of the equation.

We're hoping to make up the difference by conservation, by education, and by new technologies. And there's new technology in the solar field, it just came out in USA Today, just this weekend. So this is a very viable thing to do.

One of the things that concerns me in addition to the aging plant, and the cable systems--you've seen my pictures before of the cables

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

corroding, the pipes corroding, and there's no way to know how many of these pipes are corroded, and whenever I ask PG&E, are you going to dig these up, especially the fire system, the fire protection system, which was almost the first thing that went in, they go, no, we'll just wait till we have a problem with it, which they have, and that's why we have the pictures of it.

And Diablo Canyon would be so perfect—there's a nice windstream in there to put more wind up, we could have a retraining session, so that these wonderful PG&E employees that love the area and do so much community work can stay here, and just retrain into the renewable fields, and continue with their community service.

So the waste problem is the next thing, and the last thing I'll talk about. We have these casks up there, and there's several things that worry me about the casks, and the gentleman from the school district is concerned about the children not having money. But I would be concerned about the children having waste in their backyard for hundreds of thousands of years, and the casks are not all that well made. There's been a lot of studies that talk about the welding being a problem. They have to be

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

relicensed every 20 years, infinitum. How is that going to be financed?

Our grandchildren are going to have to do that.

We're already going to have all the waste from what it's come up with now. Or do we really want 20 more years of waste there? I don't think so. So thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, June. And Jill, Jill Zamek, and then we're going to go to Jane Swanson, and then we're going to go to Rochelle Becker on video.

MS. ZAMEK: My name is Jill Zamek, and I'm speaking on behalf of the San Luis Obispo Mothers For Peace. In the NRC environmental review for PG&E's license renewal, Mothers For Peace requests that the issue of inadequate design basis documentation be included. NRC document titled "Frequently Asked Questions on License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants" states that, quote, the current licensing basis, the CLB, is the particular set of NRC requirements applicable to a licensed operating nuclear power facility. End quote.

These CLB changes are noted in documents such as the Final Safety Analysis Report, Technical Specifications and License Amendments.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

119

20

21

22

23

24

10 CFR 54.29 requires that, quote, there is reasonable assurance that the activities authorized by the renewed license will continue to be conducted in accordance with the current licensing basis, and that any changes made to the plant CLB in order to comply with this paragraph are in accord with the Act and the Commission's regulations.

Mothers For Peace asserts that the design basis documentation is lacking at Diablo Canyon, and that these design and configuration deficiencies could affect the operability of required equipment, interfere with the functionality of aging structures and components, and raise unreviewed safety questions.

Recent NRC inspection reports identify multiple examples of PG&E making unauthorized changes to its facility.

10 CFR 50.59 allows PG&E to make changes without prior NRC approval, if certain conditions are met. Otherwise, a license amendment is needed.

PG&E has a history of poor implementation of this regulation. An adverse trend has been noted by the NRC inspectors regarding issues related to poor licensing and design basis management.

In the NRC integrated inspection report from August 5th, 2009, noted violations demonstrating-

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

119

20

2 1

22

23

24

-and these are all quotes--failure to maintain adequate plant design basis, weakness in the licensee's programmatic processes to evaluate problems associated with maintaining the plant licensing basis; failure to implement the industry 50.59 program; failure to understand when prior NRC approval is required for change to the facility; and failure of the licensee to recognize a condition outside of the plant design basis.

These violations involved a variety of systems--off-site power, spent fuel pool, 500 KV switch yard, containment sump, emergency diesel generators, and explosive mixtures of oxygen and hydrogen.

In the NRC inspection report, from the recent one, February 3rd, 2010, identified an adverse trend in problem evaluation, which includes eleven-quote--11 NRC documented findings with problem evaluation crosscutting aspects.

The inspectors concluded that most of the NRC-identified examples of less-than-adequate problem evaluation during the first two quarters of 2009 were related to a poor understanding of the plant design, licensing basis, or implementation of administrative regulatory programs. End quote.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

In April 2009, PG&E completed a root cause analysis of the adverse trend, and concluded that, quote, Diablo Canyon evaluations were focused on meeting historical compliance based on licensing and design positions, or relied on previous evaluations.

The licensee concluded that contributing to this trend was that the complex Diablo Canyon licensing basis is not well understood or communicated.

The inspectors concluded that the licensee's corrective actions, associated with October 2009 apparent cause evaluation, were insufficient to identify and correct past inadequate evaluations that have led to incorrect changes in the plant licensing basis. End quote.

Examples of the adverse trend provided in this inspection report included inadequate 50.59 evaluation of steam generator tube rupture; less-than-adequate replacement reactor head modification design control; and less-than-adequate change evaluation to the facility as described in the final safety analysis update, involving the critical seismic damping values.

Unresolved items in the corrective action following degraded off-site power system; containment sump recirculation valve position interlock failure

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

due to inadequate testing.

Given PG&E's demonstrated lack of a clear understanding of the current licensing basis, Mothers For Peace claims that PG&E cannot offer reasonable assurances of its ability to manage the effects of aging into the renewal period.

Mothers For Peace seeks a thorough examination of all the discrepancies between the current licensing basis and the plant design basis. All inconsistencies must be rectified and confidence restored, before the NRC can grant a license renewal. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very much, Jill. And now we're going to go to Jane Swanson, and then will we be ready to play the video? Okay. This is Jane.

MS. SWANSON: Yes. Jane Swanson speaking on behalf of San Luis Obispo Mothers For Peace. Before I present our prepared scoping comment related to seismic issues, I want to share a news report that came to our attention over the dinner hour.

A 6.4 earthquake is reported to have happened in Taiwan at dawn on Thursday. So that was just a very few hours ago. Taiwan of course is on the Ring of Fire, along with Chile and Japan, sites of

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2|1

22

23

24

recent great quakes.

The dozen faults in the vicinity of Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant are also on this Ring of Fire. Add to that the quake in Haiti, and we are reminded that tectonic plates are moving and we need to take them into account. Okay. On to our prepared scoping comment.

In the NRC environmental review for PG&E's license renewal application, Mothers For Peace requests that the issue of new seismic information and potential environmental impacts of postulated severe accidents be included.

Although seismic issues are codified as category one, or generic, in the NRC license renewal environmental protection rule, the NRC does allow for the identification and analysis of new, significant information.

Furthermore, the National Environmental Policy Act focuses on environmental impacts which are considered in the site-specific supplement to the generic Environmental Impact Statement. The environmental review takes into account the environmental effects of postulated plant accidents that might occur during the license renewal term.

Mothers For Peace thus argues that the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

issue of the potential for environmental impacts as a result of seismic activity on the newly-discovered fault is within the scope of this license renewal process.

On November 14th, 2008, PG&E notified the NRC that preliminary results from ongoing studies by PG&E, and the U.S. Geological Survey, indicated the presence of a result, referred to as the Shoreline Fault, approximately 25 kms. in length and located approximately one km. offshore from Diablo Canyon.

PG&E and the NRC attempt to placate the public with assurances that the newly-discovered Shoreline Fault adds no additional risk to a severe-no additional risk of a severe accident.

In the January 20th, 2010 NRC Summary of January 5, 2010 Meeting with PG&E regarding Shoreline Fault--that was a title--it was, quote: Concluded that any damage due to secondary faulting is very unlikely and the impact on the Diablo Canyon Power Plant seismic core damage frequency is negligible. Unquote.

PG&E admits in this same summary, however, that data collection and interpretation are not complete.

Mothers For Peace asserts that the discovery of the Shoreline Fault is significant and

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2

22

23

24

has serious implications for environmental impacts during the renewal term. The consequences of an earthquake on this unreviewed fault has the potential to cause a grave accident at Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, resulting in considerable environmental impacts.

not provided evidence, PG&E has or reasonable assurance, the newly-discovered that adversely affect Shoreline Fault will not operations at Diablo Canyon during the license renewal period. Data is incomplete, studies have not been completed, an independent analysis has not yet been Barbara Byron of the California Energy performed. Commission spelled this out in her statement.

Mothers For Peace argues that PG&E and the NRC cannot legitimately claim the impact--I'll start that sentence again. Mothers For Peace argues that PG&E and the NRC cannot legitimately claim the impact of the Shoreline Fault to be, quote, negligible, unquote, until studies are complete.

The burden of proof lies with the applicant, not with Mothers For Peace. The NRC cannot draw a conclusion favorable to the applicant unless and until a complete and independent study provides objective evidence to support such a conclusion.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

The NRC cannot meet the licensee renewal rule requirements until the new earthquake fault has been proven to be within the current licensing basis. Mothers For Peace seeks five things. One. completed, thorough study of the Shoreline Fault and its interactions with other faults in the area. Independent and peer-reviewed analysis of the significance of the data. Three. Analysis of the effects of an earthquake on transformers, containers, piping, and the mechanical and electrical equipment that are not built to withstand a significant seismic Four. the effects of Analysis of event. earthquake on ageing seismic components. And finally, a delay of the license renewal process until the results of these studies have been examined.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Jane. We're going to show a video of Rochelle, Rochelle's comments, and I'm going to turn these lights out so you can see it.

[Videotape of Rochelle Becker shown]

MS. BECKER [on video]: Good evening. My name is Rochelle Becker and I'm executive director of the Alliance For Nuclear Responsibility. I'd like to thank the NRC for allowing this unusual presentation tonight, but we are on our way, as we speak right now,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

119

20

2

22

23

24

to meet with Commissioner Jaczko, the chair of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, to discuss our biggest concern, seismic activity and the relicensing of the nuclear power plant for an additional -- 1800 feet offshore of Diablo Canyon. But we had asked them to look at some seismic studies five years previous to that, when the NRC came to San Luis Obispo to license an on-site radioactive waste dry cask storage facility.

Now the facility has been built with no seismic hearings, whatsoever. Now you're expected to live with this waste in a temporary manner, but the NRC has no definition for temporary. Yucca Mountain has been ostensibly cancelled, and therefore we are living with highly radioactive waste on a seismically active coast, less than three miles from two major active earthquake faults.

If earthquakes are foreseeable then to Diablo Canyon, I don't know what is. I don't know why the NRC refuses to make sure that the state-required studies aren't being finished before they continue with the license renewal application process. I don't know why PG&E refuses to do these seismic studies and get them out of the way.

We do know that the state spent a great

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

1/7

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

deal of time doing an in-depth analysis, and recommended that high-level, high-definition, new seismic studies be done. 3-D studies. 3-D mapping. These are new studies. These are studies that haven't been done before, and we need them completed, and we need them completed now.

The NRC is not to be trusted with this information. The NRC has proven in the past, that when PG&E said no, don't look any further, and no, we tell you everything is okay, that that hasn't been the case. And when they did this in the past, they cost us \$4.4 billion, according to the CPUC's own staff. It's time to start this process. It's time to do it right, to do the collaboration that the NRC talks about, to do the transparent and open proceedings that the NRC talks about.

It is time to do the seismic studies. Quit spending money coming to our community to talk about scoping and process, when the one issue, the one issue that this community cares most about—earthquakes, nuclear power plants and radioactive waste are being ignored. We need these studies done now, we need to stay in the process now, we need a joint panel with the NRC, the USGS, and state oversight agencies now.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

Anything less is not what this community deserves. We need these studies now and we hope you are listening. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Karen Swift, and Jeff Buckingham, and Henriette Groot. This is Karen Swift coming up to join us.

MS. SWIFT: Good evening, everyone, and thank you, NRC staff, for being here to hear and hopefully listen to public commentary regarding the relicensing of PG&E.

I was here earlier this afternoon, between 1:30 and 4:30, as well as now, and I've heard perspectives, as everyone has, on the relicensing. Some of those views expressed would like immediate closure of the plant, if that were possible, due to reasonable concerns about there being two major fault lines within the near vicinity of PG&E, one only 1800 feet from the plant.

I do not need to outline these concerns, once again, because others have been very good at doing so. Others we have heard from would like to have quick renewal, without any further delays, no more seismic surveys.

Yet anyhow, there have been two kind of overlapping views expressed by people. One is

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

119

20

21

22

23

24

economic concern. I understand that most people would like to have job stability, would like PG&E to contribute to the tax base, and would like PG&E to contribute to the school system. Yet we have not looked at other renewable job possibilities. I'd like to mention two studies, recently.

by the One has been University of Political Economy Massachusetts, and Research Institute, in which they looked at -- I can pass out the survey later, in a moment--they looked at if you were to invest \$1 billion into an economic recovery package, for example, that would create four times as many jobs, that would otherwise have been created within the oil industry, which is about equal, if not more jobs, than within the nuclear industry.

Another study that has been conducted is that by Navigant Consulting, which shows that if utility companies were to invest--or were to create 25 percent of their energy from renewable sources, they would create up to 274,000 jobs.

There are many possibilities, and I think people are lacking creativity and looking at solutions into this, and looking at renewal, 15 years from now, when we have yet to come up with new technologies.

Photovoltaic, by the day, has become

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

cheaper. A few years ago it seemed unfeasible. Now people are putting it up, continually. I don't know what it'll be in 15 years, but even General Electric's chief engineer has stated that by 2015 there will be equal amounts of energy—I mean, in terms of money, it will be cheaper, if not equal to current conventional energy production.

Another issue that has been expressed is the fear of climate change. Understandable. And nuclear energy, some have said, is necessary to avoid catastrophic climate change. Yet let's look at the UNFCCC conference in Copenhagen which didn't show very much optimism in terms of government doing anything toward this.

So let's not get too far from this topic and let's see. If nothing is done by 2013, the glaciers may melt, who knows what will happen, and we're talking about renewing this plant 15 years from now.

I think we need to think about these issues in a broad perspective. We also need to think about the potential of human creativity and new technologies that can be created. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Karen. And Jeff. Jeff Buckingham.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. BUCKINGHAM: Hi. I'm Jeff Buckingham. I live on a ranch outside of Los Osos, and I think it's important, when we look at this plant, and the relicensing process, that we really look at the whole environment here. We've already paid whatever price, environmentally, we needed to pay to have the plant in place today.

And I find it really interesting, that when you look at the way PG&E is structured and compensated, PG&E as a company is viable, producing power through whatever means that it produces. The real benefit to the plant being here is really to all of us as ratepayers and as citizens.

For PG&E, they'll be fine. They could make power any way they want. We've paid the price for this plant. It's here today. We get the benefit of the electricity from this plant as we actively pursue many other ways to provide environmentally-safe power, and of course PG&E has been a champion of that.

As I mentioned, I live on a ranch outside of Los Osos. I actually live off the grid. I'm probably one of the only people in San Luis Obispo County who's not a customer of PG&E. However, I have several sets of high-power lines that cross the ranch,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and I have an opportunity to interact with PG&E all the time.

And a couple of things I've noticed about PG&E. One of them is their stewardship of the land around Diablo Canyon is exemplary, and I often wish that I could afford to put as many resources in to protecting my land as PG&E puts into protecting theirs. Last weekend, my wife and I were out with our shovels, trying to kind of do some thing that PG&E had done a much better job of. We were doing them by hand. But they set an example for that.

And in my experience with working with PG&E, I've seen them in all kinds of situations, and what I see is they do the right thing when nobody else is even around to look, and I think given that, and the way that they've run this plant, and the price that we've paid for, to have it, we certainly ought to continue to use it as long as possible while we explore all other kinds of sources for power, you know, in the future. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Jeff. Henriette.

And then we're going to go to James Patterson, who's a supervisor, here, in San Luis Obispo County.

MS. GROOT: Good evening. My name is Henriette Groot. When fishermen out at sea want to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

call another boat, they go, "Hey, Johnny, you got your ears on?" meaning have you got your radio turned on. I'm glad the NRC has got its ears on tonight. We have talked about some of these things before but we are again doing so.

I do want to talk to you about fish and fishermen. We are told by health professionals to eat more fish, but the fish we can find to eat often comes from far away. Our local coast is getting "fished out," is getting more empty.

In an effort at conservation, fishermen are severely restricted in where they can fish, what they can fish, and how much. Some of them have gone out of business, consequently, and that, in the State of California, called by a Pew study from some years back, the state with the fifth largest ocean-related economy in the world. The biggest fisherman of them all, Diablo, is still in business, and even asking to be relicensed for another 20 years on top of the current expiration date after 2025.

How does Diablo take fish? Diablo uses 2.45 billion gallons of sea water per day to cool its turbines. That is not just water they are using. That is fish, fish larvae, and invertebrates. They catch live fish, as has been explained earlier, is

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

called impingement. In 2008, Diablo had to shut down because of so many jellyfish were plugging up its intakes.

In 2004, it was San Onofre Nuclear Plant which was stopped by masses of sardines.

One time, Diablo even caught a live scuba diver that way.

But that is not even the worst. More disastrous is what is called entrainment. Many, many fish larvae and invertebrates are sucked into the plant and killed that way.

That's what does the real damage. That is what does the damage to future generations of fish, because the breeding stock is being depleted. There are some who say that fish produce so many eggs, so many larvae, that it does not really matter that much.

But here we get to the issue of cumulative impact. Year after year, fewer fish are producing fish, to the point where eventually, a population may collapse.

Think of it. Extending the license would be a death warrant for how many more fish in the future? Are we going to get to the point where there will be no fish in the water to worry about? The sea water would then, indeed, be just sea water.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

119

20

2 1

22

23

24

Of course the water quality control people have been trying to do something about this problem for years. Various approaches have been tried over the years, but basically they have not succeeded in finding a way and making it stick.

This very month, though, the State Water Board will come out with new regulations to control the damage done by once-through cooling, to finally satisfy the requirements of the environmental--of the EPA.

Coastal power plants will be required to reduce their impact on marine life, about ninety, or is it 95 percent of what would be the impact, if they changed over to cooling towers.

Nuclear plants are not exempt this time. They will be required to do studies about how to reduce their impact, and they will be required to report on these studies three years after the new OTC policies went into effect. So that would be, hopefully, three years from now.

And then by December 2021, they are supposed to be in compliance with the policy. So why would we, at this point, already extend the nuclear power plant licenses? We need to know the results of seismic studies, and we need to know how the marine

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

impacts are going to be reduced, in accordance with the new OTC regulations.

And the NRC should also address—now this is kind of a separate issue—whether it makes any sense, any more, to have large power plants generating electricity, and to send that power over long transmission lines to distant cities.

If I remember correctly, there's supposed to be about a 15 percent loss over long transmission lines. Some recognition of that fact is already seen by the newer facilities that are being built closer to where the power is needed.

And so it's my opinion that the California Energy Commission and the PUC, who have not approved this application to extend Diablo's license, that they need to do so, need to look at this first. They have the duty to do that. They need to decide whether large coastal power plants are what is best for the energy needs in our future. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Henriette. Supervisor Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: I first want to take a moment to thank the NRC for responding to local requests to have multiple hearings, here, in San Luis Obispo. The Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant has

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

been a fixture here--well, actually, the process has been going on since the mid '60s, and there is a lot of passion revolving around the plant, and I think it's very important that the community have an opportunity to "weigh in."

I want to thank all of you also for taking advantage of this opportunity to speak directly to the NRC about your concerns relative to the plant. I know tonight's meeting is focusing on scoping for the environmental impact report for the relicensing of the plant. But before I make my comments relative to the scoping, I want to comment about the relicensing.

I've been following this for the past several months. As you all know, there's been a new earthquake fault discovered off the plant. They are calling it the Shoreline Fault. The California Public Utilities Commission has asked for a thorough analysis of that fault and its connectivity to other faults offshore. Our Assemblyman Sam Blakeslee has also made the same requests of the NRC to postpone any relicensing procedures until we have the full data on that newly-discovered Shoreline Fault.

And I have to concur with the California
Public Utilities Commission as well as Assemblyman
Blakeslee. I think it's premature to pursue licensing

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

at this point in time. It's been stated that the relicensing process—and the NRC has completed about fifty of those, I understand, and there's still another twenty or twenty—five actually in process now. But they take an average of about five years to complete, and here we are with reactors that are 14 to 15 years, under their current license, left to operate.

And we need to keep that in mind. That the plant is licensed to operate for another 14 or 15 years. We have an opportunity, during that time, to do a thorough analysis of the seismic potential off of the coast. We have additional time to review and analyze alternatives to nuclear power for electrical generation, renewable technologies, and other energy-producing means are rapidly developing. They're becoming more and more cost-effective, by the day, literally, and so we need to keep that in mind.

And we also need to keep in mind that the more money we invest in this process, the more difficult it is to alter that process or back out of that process as we move along.

So I think we need to be more logical in the pursuit of relicensing for Diablo Canyon and we need to be more physically responsible in that

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

pursuit.

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

2|5

Relative to the issues of greatest concern to me is obviously that newly-discovered earthquake fault. We've just, in recent weeks, seen the devastation of earthquakes throughout the world, and it could happen here, and I have to ask, are we tempting fate here, with moving forward, without having all the information that can be available to us, within the next year or two, if we focus our energy and effort on completing the seismic studies of those faults?

So that's a huge concern to me. Another issue is I think in the environmental analysis we need to take a robust look at alternative technologies, energy efficiency and conservation, and do the economic analysis that goes along with that, to see what alternatives are available to us.

The once-through cooling that has been proven to be a significant impact on marine resources off our coast, we need to consider that, we need to take a look at the on-site storage, both the dry cask storage and the cooling ponds that they now use. For many years, they were beyond their design capacity because we didn't have alternatives for storage, so we need to take a very close look at the storage options,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

the long-term storage opportunities.

Do we have it? Are we going to have a storage facility, here, in San Luis Obispo County, indefinitely, because there's no place else for that nuclear waste to go?

So that's very much a part of it, in my mind. I think we ought to focus our energy and efforts, here, in the next year or two, on analyzing, again, the newly-discovered fault offshore, and see how that would potentially impact the future of Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant. It's the fiscally responsible and sensible thing to do, and I would hope that the NRC would recognize that fact, and help us move forward with those analyses. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Supervisor. We're going to go to Larry Womack, and John Lindsey, and Charlie Smith, right now, and this is Larry.

MR. WOMACK: Thank you for this opportunity to speak before you this evening. By way of background, I first settled in San Luis Obispo County in 1978. I'm now a resident of South County, where my wife and I are raising our two young children. I retired from PG&E in 2004. I am not under the employment of PG&E nor am I spokesman for

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2|1

22

23

24

PG&E. I do not own any shares of PG&E stock.

I have confidence in the continued operation of Diablo Canyon. Other than being a customer who wants reliability and controlled cost, I don't have a stake in this endeavor.

Let me give you a little background, so that my comments can be put into perspective. I was under the direct employment of PG&E for nearly 27 years.

More than twenty of those years associated with Diablo Canyon, where had responsibilities such systems design as and engineering, licensing, operations, and where received a senior reactor operator's license from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

The remainder of my PG&E career comprised responsibilities in fossil, geothermal and hydro generation, where I held direct day to day operational and long-term planning responsibilities for PG&E's non-nuclear generation assets, at both the director and at the officer level.

Through that process, I became familiar with the short- and long-range integrated generation resource planning undertaken by PG&E, the California Energy Commission, the California Public Utilities

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

119

20

21

22

23

24

Commission, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, as well as the day to day, hour by hour, minute by minute operation of the Northern California electrical power grid.

It's with this background that I make the following comments, and I am only going to hit the high points here. Three to five minutes allows no more.

My first point. Diablo Canyon is vital to the Northern California electric grid. Baseload generation capacity and voltage support cannot be easily or quickly replaced. Diablo Canyon produces approximately 20 percent of the energy needs for Northern California and approximately 10 percent of California's energy needs.

Arguably, Diablo is the lowest incremental cost source of energy amongst PG&E's generating assets. Possibly only one or two hydro river systems generate at a lower incremental cost. And Diablo operates at a comparatively low all-in cost, or the total cost of operation in going forward, and it is amongst PG&E's best.

Diablo's 2300 megawatts of capacity provide a sizeable corner for the California electric system foundation. Energy and capacity are critical,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

both for the safety of California and to its economy.

Diablo provides critical voltage support to the 500 kV, or kilovolt, main transmission backbone, the backbone of California's electrical grid.

And in particular, Diablo, and some other resources, provide the responsiveness to "push or pull" the reactive power needs of the grid, that many other sources of generation invoked today cannot supply, such as solar or wind power.

My second point. Diablo is a diverse energy supply. Not unlike diverse investments, a diverse energy supply is vital to PG&E's customers, others in this room, and me, as well as the vitality of the California economy. Diversification in our electric supply protects us from the annual fluctuations. In the rains, PG&E gets hydro power not only from its own system but also from the Bonneville Power Administration in Washington State, and British Columbia Hydro. Those vary with the annual rainfall, and as the prices of natural gas vary.

California fossil generation supplies are predominantly gas-fired. As well as the daily and seasonal fluctuations in wind and solar generation. As such, Diablo provides diversity comparable to the stability of bonds in a diversified retirement

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

portfolio.

10

1|1

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2|5

My third point. Geography and limited electrical import capability require California to be more self-sufficient than most of the rest of the United States, where the grid is more interconnected, underscoring the importance for native generation.

Fourth point. The resource planning horizon for energy and capacity needs is underway. The fundamental elements of generation and capacity planning are carried out decades in advance of anticipated need. It is for this reason that PG&E seeks license renewal ten years in advance of license expiration.

With or without Diablo Canyon, I am confident that PG&E will line up the necessary generation to serve its customers. Which brings me to my next point. Costs.

PG&E will recover the full cost of Diablo Canyon. That's a given. Similarly, PG&E will recover the costs of future generation and energy purchases made on behalf of its customers.

As I mentioned in my preceding comment, PG&E will obtain the resources needed to supply its customers. Accordingly, logically, it makes infinite sense to me to continue the operation of Diablo

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Canyon, whose costs will be fully recovered, rather than to cease Diablo operations, replace it with other supplies, and recover those costs on top of the investment we, the customers, have already made.

My last point. Diablo is environmentally friendly. Diablo does not use fossil fuels to produce energy. As such, it has a negligible carbon footprint. California and the United States have set ambitious goals for greenhouse gas reduction.

Not only can these objectives be met with a generation portfolio containing nuclear elements, but arguably, must employ substantial environmentally friendly nuclear supplies.

In conclusion, Diablo is the preferred California energy choice for today and the foreseeable future. Diablo is a key ingredient of a safe, reasonable cost, California energy portfolio. Resource planning decisions for the next 10 to 30 years are being made now, right now.

As customers, we don't need, much less want, to pay twice. Allow us to reap the benefit of the investment we've already made in Diablo Canyon. Few resources can provide the generation reliability provided by Diablo. Those needed for minute to minute, day by day, year in, year out needs of this

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

state.

10

1

12

1|3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2|3

24

2|5

And lastly, nuclear energy is a critical ingredient if California and the United States are to reduce production of CO2 and other greenhouse gases. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Larry.

MR. WOMACK: I hope it was not too long.

MR. CAMERON: Just a little bit, but was very articulate so--at any rate, this is John. John Lindsey. And then we're going to go to Charlie Smith.

MR. LINDSEY: First of all, I'd like to thank the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for allowing us to make these comments to the public. Second of all, my name's John Lindsey and I am a PG&E employee. As a kid growing up in Sonoma County in Northern California, I fell in love with the ocean by doing quite a bit of diving off the coast of Sonoma County and Marin County.

At that point I joined the Navy and spent 24 years in the Navy, and had the opportunity to dive throughout the world, from the Red Sea, the Indian Ocean, to the Eastern Pacific, Western Pacific.

And in 1990, I began my career at Diablo Canyon, and was asked to join the PG&E dive team, and I said of course. I could tell you that over my years

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

of diving into the intake cove -- the intake cove, by the way, is 32 feet deep. Consequently, the currents going into the intake structure are very gentle, less than foot per second, and doing bar rack inspections, you could actually see the fish swimming in and out of the bar racks, and, you know, large divers, like myself, were never impinged upon the bar And just, just the number of fish and marine racks. mammals, and invertebrates, were just amazing.

I could tell you that the coast lying along Diablo Canyon is some of the richest and most diversified, and healthy waters I've ever had the opportunity to dive in before. Along with diving in the intake, I've had the opportunity to dive in the discharge cove, and once again, the discharge cove is an amazing place to dive in, and I wish that all of you could actually see that. It is really remarkable.

Along with the subtidal areas of our coastline, along this particular coast, I could tell you that the intertidal zones are just as productive, and rich and healthy, as the subtidal areas. I usually take my kids, my son and my daughter, to the intertidal zones, and we explore the tide pools in Montana de Oro State Park. And I could tell you that the contrast between Montana de Oro tide pools—we—I think we love them to

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

death, and the tide pools along the Diablo Canyon coastline, once again, is a stark contrast.

The tide pools along the Diablo Canyon coastline are absolutely pristine, with a tremendous amount of life and diversity. Now where the land meets the sea is the intertidal zone. But also the land, the land stewardship program that Diablo, that PG&E sponsors, is also remarkable. I think Sally Krenn said it eloquently, when she talked about Bob Blanchard and his managed grazing on the north property.

Once again, it's just remarkable, the stewardship that PG&E has practiced on the Diablo Canyon lands. And I just want to say thank you very much for your time, and have a great night.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. And this is Charlie Smith.

MR. SMITH: I'm Charlie Smith from Templeton. I don't represent anybody, just myself. Last month, I was able to speak to two local students who went to the Copenhagen conference, and I asked them, was nuclear power brought up as part of the solution for climate change. They were very surprised, because many of the leaders there in Copenhagen mentioned that nuclear power had to be part

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of the solution.

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

2|5

This was something they didn't expect, and, to me, that was really good news. I know, in listening to some of the speakers here, a question came up. I know everybody's talking about switching to solar power, solar panels. My question is, if we have a 7.5 earthquake, what's going to survive? The Diablo Canyon or a bunch of solar panels?

I don't know if that issue has been addressed, or not, the durability of solar panels to earthquakes. Even the windmills, I'm sure, can be very vulnerable in an earthquake.

The issue--again, if you want to push for solar power, I feel that within ten years, a lot of us are going to be driving plug-in hybrid cars. If you want to charge your car up overnight, you're not going to do it with solar panels.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Charlie. The next three speakers. Dave Christy. Judy Evered, and Joe Boysen.

MR. CHRISTY: Hi. I'm Dave Christy from San Luis Obispo. I got interested in this issue, when I saw, in a recent newspaper article, the proposal that the relicensing effort be postponed until the completion of the 3-D seismic studies that are

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

proposed for the offshore fault that has been identified, because at the conclusion of this study, we then know if it was going to be safe.

This concerns me because I think that it's an attempt to either deliberately misunderstand what science can do, or to politicize science and manipulate it. At the end of this study, we won't know, conclusively, what will happen to that fault. But we'll know a lot more, and it'll trigger us to do another study, and another study after that, because that's how science proceeds.

It's not a matter of doing a single study, collecting some data, having people decide, here's the answer, and it's finished. We don't understand cancer. We don't understand AIDS. We don't understand global warming. We don't understand a lot of things. But if we believe that science is a method by which we can understand the world that we live in, then we have to commit ourselves to the systematic step by step analysis.

If the proposal to postpone the relicensing effort is to use this argument, I think that it's fallacious. And I think that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is one of the public standards of scientific knowledge in our society. Just like we

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

expect NASA, and the Office of Surgeon General, and the National Institutes of Health, and the Centers For Disease Control, to act responsibly about scientific information, and to educate the public about what we can and cannot expect from science, I would really hope that the NRC rejects this particular approach to postponing the relicensing effort.

If there are other reasons to postpone it, let the proposers suggest those. But I would rather not see science be manipulated or distorted for this purpose. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Dave. Judy, are you ready? This is Judy Evered.

MS. EVERED: I'm from Santa Barbara, and I'm the only one here from there, but we're very interested because we know that we're in the plume of the downwind from Diablo. So some--I've been very, very interested in nuclear power for many years, because we lost our son at the age of six years. first born was in England when the Windscale nuclear-well, it was called Atom Research, had an explosion, and it didn't get reported in the Sunday, or the London Times. It merely said the explosion was under control, and that they threw 200 gallons contaminated milk into the Irish Sea. But of course

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

119

20

2 1

22

23

24

they didn't tell people that it was polluted until about maybe a week after the accident.

So my son drank a lot of milk, and we didn't know that it was going to kill him. So he died about four years later, and we're pretty certain that was the reason. There was no other thing. So cancer is caused by radiation, and they're finding, now, that a lot of small exposures are as bad as one big one, and sometimes much worse.

So I followed earthquakes, because they're often associated with the dangers of nuclear power. instance, for Lucy Jones, the Now, earthquake specialist from CIT, said that the earth can be moved 10 feet in a second with ground motion. And I guess we haven't talked much about ground motion. There's been talk of tsunamis here, and in 2004, a 98-foot high tsunami originated in Thailand, and we're not safe anywhere, really. I have to be amused, to think that we can understand and predict earthquakes, when some of them originate 25 miles underground.

In 1975, PG&E engaged six seismologists, really clever, well-researched people, and they asked that these seismologists would prove that it's safe, Diablo Canyon is safe. But the outcome of that-probably it took a year--for them to come to the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

conclusion that it would take a 100 men or a 100 people more than a 100 years, perhaps, to actually try to prove something like that.

But to get to another point, it doesn't take an earthquake, or an accident, to kill people from nuclear power. There's some brilliant research done by someone called Jay Gould & Associates, and he reported this work in a book called "The Enemy Within," and I guess he's meaning nuclear power is an enemy because it kills. And he did—he was a very clever statistician, and he went to the health departments in many counties where they had a nuclear power plant. And he proved that up to 50 miles, there was more cancer than over 50 miles, and under a 100 miles, there was less, but over a 100 miles, still less. So he did this for 50 plants throughout the country.

Now he didn't do Diablo Canyon, but we can be sure that it's happening here.

For instance, in, I think it was 1994, there was a public meeting in San Luis Obispo, that about a dozen of us came up from Santa Barbara to hear, and people there were furious at the amount of cancer. There was a doctor there that said he was going to stop being a doctor because too many of his

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

patients had lung cancer. And then people from Pismo Beach, I remember saying they were furious at the NRC. They said you are killing us. And that fits right in with Jay Gould's research. And so you don't need an earthquake to be killed by nuclear power pollution.

So I think that's just about all I need to say for now. I'm writing a book about Diablo Canyon, the protests that were made in '81, and the thousands of people who were against the nuclear plant. Not the people in the nuclear plant, because we think that there should be economic conversion, because more workers are needed for wind, solar, thermal, and so on, than are needed in nuclear power, without the expense of nuclear power, and without the dangers.

So thank you for your attention.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Judy. And now we're going to hear from Joe Boysen.

MR. BOYSEN: My name is Joe Boysen, and I live in Sunset Palisades, and have for about 22 years. And I was here today, so I'm not really addressing any of my remarks to the NRC people, because I think they have heard about as much as they want to hear from me. I'm hoping to reach people in the audience who are perhaps of a like mind.

I hope we can count on the NRC. I think

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

they're fine people, especially this handsome leading man who is quite an asset to them, I think, Troy Pruett. But I don't think that—I think they're going to approve this, you know, and I think we have to look elsewhere. The score, right now, is 57 to nothing. They've approved 57 extensions.

I don't know why they have twenty more. I mean, I think there's 63 plants and locations, 104 reactors. So if they've approved 57, it seems like, you know, they've all been given a new lease on life.

I am a little disturbed by so many things, but one of them is I think that it's a bit of abuse of the process to have so many PG&E loyalists speaking, naturally, on behalf of, you know, the company, that they have a lot of loyalty to.

I've heard some comments I want to try to respond to. The beautiful drive in on--which one of the fellows mentioned--why he regretted that we can't enjoy it. And I would say why can't we enjoy it? 12,000 acres. I would point out that if Judy does write her book, that's a squalid history. That land is land of Chumash people. That's land of people that were put in internment camps in 1942. That's land of old white ranchers facing bankruptcy. That land has a bad chain of title, and I think that the real story is

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2|1

22

23

24

even worse.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2|5

They own that land, and they bought it with our money. We're the sovereigns here, we're the rich people, not PG&E. I, and others, pay 85 percent of the school cost in San Luis Obispo Coastal, taxpayers, and that should be taken into account. appearance here of a school superintendent today was a little upsetting. And then to have somebody from the trustees--it board of seems to me like that We're the 85 percent. We're the rich politicizes. people. The money that PG&E has is money that has been obtained from us.

We need a grassroots opposition group, I think here, and if anyone wants to throw in on that, because we're be--as far as this NRC process, no matter that--they're going to interpret this the way they do. It's scary here. I tried to put an ad in the Tribune, and was just locked out. They just so heavily censored it, that to get announcements out to people--you know? Because I know what has to happen is phone calls.

But that was a very upsetting experience.

I went in and--including after this Chilean thing. I
thought, for sure, they would relent. They wouldn't
let me talk about earthquakes and tidal waves.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Wouldn't do it. Too much red meat. Had an interview with the KSBY 6 today. Didn't show up on the news. Okay. I don't need the exposure. But the people need to hear these things.

We are the sovereigns here. We are the rich ones. We're playing Russian roulette with Murphy's Law, and with Mother Nature. With Murphy's Law, in so far as we are dealing with the most dangerous technology in the history of mankind. With respect to Mother Nature, the Pacific Ocean, the tidal wave threat that's present in this county, on this coast. Where I live was destroyed in 1907. There was a brand new refinery. It lasted three weeks.

It was a place called Oilport. Actually existed. There was a harbor--what do you call it? You know, the pier was destroyed, and the buildings, and never functioned after that.

Avila was destroyed by a tidal wave in 1878. God only knows what else the record would show. This jobs argument. We hear that all the time. The 20 percent—there's going to be plenty a jobs. I mean, the county was probably better off before. 20 percent argument. That we get 20 percent of the power. Well, it's been used to finance growth that we don't need and don't want.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We can--the one, clearest solution, is the one that's available from conservation. And this business about bashing. This is now being used to push this Obama plan, to reinvigorate the nuclear industry. And this business about bashing carbon. Global warming is one thing, and that's fairly well-acknowledged.

But the carbon--the scientists are standing against the carbon as the causative force there. They say it's like being a Holocaust denier. They're just shut down. They can't get their word out.

Subsidy of unlimited growth. Altitude questions. I've asked this over and over again. I think that plant's lower than 85 feet, and that storage is lower than 300 feet. I was told, first, it was a mile back. It's a quarter-mile back. Jeff said we have already paid the environmental price. Well, I hope he's right, but I think we haven't paid the environmental price. That's what we're concerned about paying, is the environmental price, which would be--imagine trying to--that plant needs to be shut down now.

You couldn't get a license for it now and you don't extend a license, and it shouldn't be

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

extended. But why would you extend a license if you, if you—in other words, if you don't extend the license, that means you have to shut it down now, rather than take another 15 years of risk.

We wouldn't, we wouldn't give the license now, so we're the ones that are on the line. It's not PG&E. PG&E's broke. Abuse of--jobs argument--environmental-friendly. Larry said it was environmentally-friendly. I don't know how you can say that with a straight face, when you're creating fuel, spent fuel that will, many thousands of years from now will still be--and you're storing it on site, and they have eight casks out there but there ought to be eighty.

They have another eight they're going to fill. But there's so much stuff in the ground, they, they already have 87 of them spoken for. They need three and a half a year, and this--we'll end up with two hundred--

MR. CAMERON: Mr. Boysen, I'm going to have to ask you to wrap up.

MR. BOYSEN: Okay. Can I just wrap up here?

MR. CAMERON: Okay.

MR. BOYSEN: This business about the tide

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

pools, and, you know, it's so much better down by the plant than it is over by Montana de Oro, so I guess we ought to put a reactor out there, so they can clean the water up. I would say, those who have confidence in—a lady said today, she said they wouldn't be operating if it wasn't safe, and this fellow said NASA, you know, that's something we can look up to. Well, NASA was in charge of the Challenger fiasco, and I hope I'm not like the guy that they wouldn't listen to on the O rings.

One-legged birds and pristine tide pools.

What I remember are the one-legged birds that used to hang over by Fat Cats, and I think I don't see them anymore because I think they're extinct.

MR. CAMERON: Okay.

MR. BOYSEN: If anybody wants to--

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much.

MR. BOYSEN: --join up, let me know. Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you. And we're going to go to Chuck Linden at this point.

MR. LINDEN: Good evening. I'd like to thank the NRC, being here, and allowing this open session with everybody here. I am from the Midwest. Life's a lot different. We don't have earthquakes.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11:

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

We've got tornadoes and hail, and other things that create "dimpled darlings" out of your cars.

But the fact is we do have problems like you. There's faults in Missouri. There's faults all over the world. There was recently a Japanese nuclear power plant that experienced a direct hit by a earthquake. They inspected it. It's up and running. I'm not saying it's a perfect world. As far as solar, I tried to price solar for my home, so I could have a carbonless green footprint.

Thirty-, \$40,000, you can have one. But let me tell you a little bit They're there. about the NRC from my years of experience. 1978, I have slept with reactors on nuclear submarines, lived with them for years. I have worked with the NRC, and trust me, I hate to work with them on a good day but I'd rather not work with them on a bad day either. They are very thorough, very direct, and they don't leave a stone uncovered. And that's their job. Their complete job is to ensure that we produce safe electricity using nuclear power for peaceful application.

If we had not used nuclear power as a weapon in World War II, I don't believe any of us would be here, talking, today. We'd be using it all

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

111

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2|1

22

23

24

over. And several other things. I have worked for TVA, Exelon. I've been all over the country with nuclear power plants. My primary job for Calhoun Station was to be in charge of valves required to perform safety-operated functions, to shut down the plant if anything were to occur, for any reason.

And I spent ten years of my life researching it, to make it better, to In 1980's, nuclear power plants were operation. running about 84, 85 percent capacity factor. Well, today, now, they're pushing high in the nineties, with unreal success. I didn't believe they could ever ring another megawatt out of a nuclear power plant.

Today, they're going to power upgrades, successfully. They've reextended licenses several ways, one by getting a five-year extension through license granted through construction. A little oversight there, not a bad oversight, but a good thing, because they weren't running for five years. They were being built.

So these were allowed. And today, they've examined our--we've been challenged, we're extending licenses for power plants. Our country cannot whip up any more power right now. Everybody is running with minimum extra surplus energy on the grid. You don't

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

have it. It's growing at a phenomenal rate.

These extensions, the 20 year extension, they go all the way back to the plant current license basis. I hear about people talking they're not current, they're not this. Nothing's current. Have you looked at your financial records? The same thing. You have to--it's a dynamic situation. As new technology arises, we're updating, improving things rigorously, every time. We constantly raise the bar.

Victor Petrenko, in the Olympics, recently, lost. Why? Because the bar raised and the system changed. The system is working for us. We are making improvements in nuclear power that I never believed possible. And the NRC, along with several other organizations, such as INPO and WANO, constantly peer pressure for us to improve, improve, improve.

And findings are routine in our business, because we want to know what's going on with our plants. They're there for a purpose, so that we can learn and improve. Sometimes bad news is also a little bit a good news, because you learn from it, you improve, and you perform in the community, responsible manner. I believe that PGE--I've worked with them for the past six months, over the past 10 years, off and on--is a very responsible thing.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

You heard from your own peers in your community that work for this company, even retirees, scuba divers, and everything, what it's like there. It is a wonderful plant, very upbeat attitude, and I'm proud to be associated with them. Thank you very much.

MR. FULLER: Thank you, Mr. Linden. Next we'll have Mark Phillips, and after Mr. Phillips, we'll have Jack Biesek or "Bysek." I hope I'm not messing that name up too badly.

Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Good evening. My name's Mark Phillips. I'm a registered professional engineer in the State of California, mechanical engineer, and I have several comments I'd like to make. Regarding the Shoreline Fault, I'd like to echo the statements of several other people that say that we should be studying that, up-front, we should find out what we can from a complete study of that, with all the tools that we have at our disposal. That should be like order number one of priority.

The fact that it's not, to me, just tells me how much PG&E doesn't really want to know. You know, they don't want to look at something if they're afraid the answer might not be something they want to

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

hear. So they don't look, or they don't look very hard, or they don't look very soon.

A lot of people that work for PG&E have come up here and told you how great it is to work for them, and how they'd like to stay here and live in this area, and they like the paycheck they're getting. It's all very understandable. It's also why you don't really want PG&E being the ones doing this sort of work, because they have such a vested interest in the outcome. They're not independent, or, or--I mean, they, they have their agenda. So those sorts of things bother me.

I'm really getting tired of people saying things that don't turn out to be true, that don't be turned out to be backed up by facts. One of the worst is--well, I mean, nuclear power, in terms of new plants, is horrifically expensive.

The cost per kilowatt hour generated ranges from 50 to 21 cents by one study. That compares with about 7.5 cents for wind. So we're talking two to three times more expensive for nuclear.

People try to say that nuclear's going to, you know, save us, global climate-wise. That's also a fallacy. A dollar spent on nuclear will remove about 5 to 8 kilograms of carbon, but for that same dollar,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

you can remove 13 kilograms of carbon by--with wind.

And if you use energy efficiencies, what they call negawatts, the watts that you don't use, you can save 50 to a 100 kilograms per dollar spent.

So clearly, if global warming is the issue, if that's what we're trying to accomplish, then spending it on renewables and wind is the smart, sensible way to go. Spending it on nuclear power is suicidal. In particular, when you consider how long it takes to build a nuclear power plant, it's even more suicidal.

One of the biggest problems we have here, though, is the problem of trust. People in this community need to trust PG&E, we need to trust the NRC that things are going to be handled in a sensible manner, in an honest manner.

That would be great if that were true, but the evidence, again, doesn't support that. I'm looking particularly at what's been going on up at the Vermont Yankee Plant. There's a gentleman up there, Ernie Gunderson, who used to work for the owners of that plant, he found many violations of NRC regulations, he went to his boss to tell him about these and was promptly fired.

He worked, as best he could, to try and

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

expose these, and got no help from the NRC. Again and again, in his story, he talks about how the NRC did not help him at all.

He found out that—he was the one that found out that there were underground pipes at this plant. The operators of this plant denied it for over a year. And where was the NRC? Where was the NRC, the watchdog, the people that are supposed to be verifying this stuff? Nowhere to be found.

It was Ernie Gunderson who finally found that they, there were pipes under there, and these pipes are leaking radiation tritium, even now.

He--the operators of the plant have lied several times, they've been fined twice so far, they've had horrible accidents there, the transformer fire, a cooling tower collapse, and they've lost nuclear fuel.

These are some of the reasons why the Vermont legislature voted not to extend the license for this plant. It's the only time that's happened. Vermont's the only state that has the ability to do that, and they looked at the record of Vermont Yankee and said no, we do not--we don't want any more of this. So they just recently, in the last few days, voted to not re, you know, renew that license.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

Again, Ernie Gunderson found these many violations, tried to enlist the NRC's support, could not get their support. The NRC finally went in to look, to try to verify his claims. They found no evidence of, of any problems, but yet, when John Glynn and some others went into the plant, they found seven serious violations.

They also found that the NRC was taking illegal gratuities from the owner of the power plant.

Again, how are we supposed to trust the NRC if they're taking gratuities from the people they're supposed to control and regulate?

So I guess that covers most of my comments. Thank you very much.

MR. FULLER: Thank you, Mr. Phillips.

Next we have Jack--and please, when you get up, go ahead and pronounce your name for me, so I'll stop messing it up so bad.

MR. BIESEK: Biesek.

MR. FULLER: Biesek. Thank you.

MR. BIESEK: Good evening. My name is Jack Biesek. I'm a 40 year resident of San Luis Obispo, and I am opposed to nuclear power at the Diablo Canyon Power Plant. In my opinion, it has not proven to be a logical, economical or a sustainable

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

119

20

2 1

22

23

24

resource for our county. Rather, it's proved to be just a hell of a way to heat water and create steam. It definitely has not lived up to the promises that were given, that go back 40 years ago, 30 years ago, when it was announced and first developed.

On a broader note, shouldn't we be here tonight to discuss putting solar panels on every household in California? What if the \$50 billion spent at Yucca Mountain was put into solar panels? The gentleman who spoke about a 30- or \$40,000 expense could be given a subsidy, a tax break, or whatever. Who is supporting this kind of logic and common sense, the soft footprint of solar?

It's a better, more sustainable way, and a way to lighten our foot--our foot, carbon footprint.

But on a broader note, too, maybe we need to speak about money and follow the money. Yes, the county gets money. Yes, the schools get money. But that is short-term unsustainable thinking. It's really more like a bribe, to help with immediate needs, but ignore the long-term needs. We're talking about hundreds, thousands of years of storage.

Who is taking the long view here? And we also need to consider where that money comes from. It comes from the ratepayers. That is us. This

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

119

20

2 1

22

23

24

expensive nuclear industry, including what's going on here tonight, the planning, the studies, the research, is being funded by you and me. Frankly, I've had enough of that. We need to consider where the money is also going.

It is going to PG&E stockholders, PG&E executives, PG&E lawyers, PG&E lobbyists, nuclear industry lobbyists, and other, others that profit from nuclear power industry, including the NRC staff and its employees, many who have probably flown in here tonight at our expense, ultimately.

Why is it that a few people get to make so much money at the expense of the environment and at the expense of the ratepayers?

Where--when, in the history of mankind, did we encourage this kind of profit-taking activity?

Who's looking out for this oversight? Do we need an oversight group to oversight, look at the NRC? And what is fair from a humanist, balanced Earth standpoint?

Maybe we should change the name of Diablo to Lemming Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, because that's what I see--all of us just giving in and letting go, and following the status quo.

But someone needs to speak up for the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

environment, and for the humanist aspect. I'm concerned about the long-term deterioration of Diablo, as well as the projected cost to maintain a nuclear waste dump for hundreds and thousands of years.

In effect, we are borrowing money and maintenance efforts from future generations, by putting the responsibility for storage of the waste into their hands.

What happened to the pay-as-you-go lifestyle? What happened to being responsible for our actions? What happened to stepping up to the plate and living within the means of what we're given?

We are making a big mess for others to clean up. What lasts for 10,000 years? Who can even think in those terms? What happens when the cost of storing the waste is more than what the funding reserves can cover. The original plant was estimated at \$800 million to construct. Recently, the steam generators were \$800--\$800 million to replace. I don't think we need an accountant to tell us that the future is going to be way more expensive than we thought it would be.

We were promised, in 1977, that radioactive nuclear waste would be stored in a repository, a safe storage site outside California, to

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

119

20

21

22

23

24

be provided by the U.S. Government, and that Diablo was only going to temporarily hold these wastes.

What is the status of that promise today?

It's a broken promise. And what are the current plans for removing the waste? No plans. We're going to be the dump, a nuclear waste dump for a permanent storage of the waste.

And what is the status of PG&E being responsible for current and future efforts? They can file bankruptcy. They have. They can go away. What are we left with then? Why would we be granting a new license to store waste in our backyard? This is ludicrous, unfair, unjust, and unsustainable.

What kind of planning process and EIR would allow hazardous materials to be stored for thousands of years, and what kind of logic are we following here as a human species?

I submit that the only reasonable plan would be to close Diablo until a storage site is approved, thereby stopping the generation of hazardous material that might end up as a terrorist bomb, a terrorist target, or any other unforeseen nuclear disaster.

Let's look at recent history. How many nuclear plants have been opened since Three Mile

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

Island? Zero. Let's look at our state. Humboldt Nuclear Plant. Closed. Rancho Seco Plant. Closed. The Yankee Plant now is slated to be closed.

Let's look at the world. Chernobyl. What a waste of human resource, and a shame upon the human race. I don't know how many of you executives have been to Chernobyl, but I hope there's a lesson to learn from that.

Are we going to repeat that kind of disaster here, in California? Are we going to have this kind of threat in our neighborhood for decades to come? We hope not, and that is why I am here tonight, to ask the NRC to hold on any licensing until Diablo can--until a permanent waste storage is found and until nuclear power is truly clean and recyclable. Zero waste would be what I would support. Anything less is selfish, greedy thinking. Let's live within our means and be stewards for the future, and be sensitive to the human race. Thank you.

MR. FULLER: Thank you, Mr. Biesek. Next we'll have John Holloway, and after him Mr. Steve Zawalick. And then Will, Mr. Will Landreth. Mr. Holloway.

MR. HOLLOWAY: Hello. My name is John Holloway and I'm a maintenance electrician at Diablo

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

1/7

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

Canyon, and the whole reason that I drove down here—I live in Atascadero, I have for 41 years, I'm 45 years old, I'm married and have three young children. And the whole reason I drove down here today was to try to convey to people in this audience right now, the safety that is encouraged at Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant.

I've been an electrician for 20 years, and 10 years of those has been at Diablo Canyon. And I can tell you right now, that it's the safest place I've ever worked. The safety commitment is there. Every morning, when we go to work, the first thing we do is we have a crew meeting, and at that crew meeting, the first question asked is are there any safety or human performance issues that anybody would like to discuss.

And invariably, there's always somebody in the crew, there's 35 of us electricians out there, there's always somebody that raises their hand and says, yes, you know what? this happened to me yesterday. And we all learn from that.

And at Diablo Canyon, the management at Diablo Canyon not only expects that but they encourage it. And just like one of the speakers before me mentioned, there's never been an issue that I have

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

15

16

1/7

18

119

20

21

22

23

24

seen, or I have heard of, as far as nuclear safety or personal safety, that has been brought up, that has not been addressed at some point, whether that be that same day, depending on the severity of the issue, or maybe a week or two later. But the safety issues that are brought up at Diablo Canyon are always addressed, and I feel very strongly about that, because like I said, I have there young children and I'm raising them in Atascadero.

I might not be in the plume, I'm not even really sure what that is, but I'm close enough, that I know that if my children-my children are safe, and that, as parents, I'm sure all of you-everybody that is a parent understands that. My children are safe and I feel very--very good about that.

Another thing that we do at Diablo Canyon also is any job that we perform, we are expected to have a questioning attitude. And that's a great human performance tool. And when management expects you to have a questioning attitude, what that means to me is if there's something that I'm not really sure about with the job that I'm asked to perform, is I'm to—-I'm to stop. I'm to stop and say, hey, time out. I'm going to ask for direction here. You know what? There's something about this that is just not right,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2|1

22

23

24

and every single time before that job is performed, before that maintenance is performed, that issue is addressed, to my satisfaction, and it always has been.

I would like for the NRC--first of all, thank you for giving me the opportunity to come here today. And I would like the NRC to take these issues, and what I'm saying about safety, please take these into account when you do your review for the relicensing of Diablo Canyon. Thank you.

MR. FULLER: Thank you, Mr. Holloway.

Next we'll have Mr. Steve Zawalick, and then after him

Mr. Will Landreth, and then we have--I'm going to

apologize, the last name is Moffatt and I cannot read

the first name. So--okay. So after that, Ms.

Moffatt.

So Mr. Zawalick.

MR. ZAWALICK: Hi. Thank you very much for letting us all speak, and say our piece. I appreciate it. Thank you, everyone here, and those that will watch this eventually on TV, for listening.

My name is Steve Zawalick. I didn't grow up in California. I grew up in Wisconsin. I was an only child. I grew up in the country, so I spent the vast majority of my childhood out in the woods or on the water, and I'm an environmentalist, and I care

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

119

20

2 1

22

23

24

deeply about Mother Earth, and the planet that we've been given to take care of.

And I figured it was only natural for me to speak here tonight, because this is all about the environmental impact of this operation, and should we continue.

I think it's important that we all realize that we are not in an ideal situation. As a civilization, we have issues. There are too many people on this planet and population control is not on the table as a discussion topic yet. That being said, electrical demand in this country is not decreasing any time soon. It's a serious issue.

You know, we've tried our best at, you know, energy efficiency measures, and I can't find another place in my house for a fluorescent light bulb. But, nonetheless, we keep having people--we keep buying things at Best Buy. We keep increasing the electrical demand load, including--now we're going to talk about using electrical cars, which would be a huge increase in electrical demand.

I spent the vast majority of my adult life studying nuclear power. When I was a child in high school, I grew a plant in radioactive water and mapped the nutrient flow. That's what we did in high school

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

in Wisconsin.

10

11:

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

2|5

I got degrees in nuclear power, nuclear engineering, a degree in physics from the University of Wisconsin-Madison. I've been licensed to operate a research reactor and have a certificate for a senior reactor operator license at Diablo. My current job, I'm involved in oversight at this facility, and I'm-part of my job is I look at the problems. I look at the organizational impact of what we're doing, why we're doing it, and is it the right thing to do.

And I work daily with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and I--you know, I'm proud to call them peers. I think they're doing an excellent job out there, and they're doing the right thing, and I think a lot of people have issues with trust here, and that's a big thing. You know, we need to trust people. There's a pause there, okay, on purpose.

We need to trust seismologists because they've spent their lives studying that. We need to trust engineers. They've spent their lives studying that. Okay.

I understand there's fears out there, there's concerns, but at some point you can't do everything. You need to trust. And the people who are in charge of this power plant, the people who do

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

the oceanography studies, the people that do maintenance out there, the people that operate the plant, have come here, repeatedly, and told you it's okay, we've look at it and it's okay.

So that's all. Thank you.

MR. FULLER: Thank you. Next we have Will Landreth and then Ms. Moffatt. And then we'll hear from Mr. Carl Dudley.

Mr. Landreth. Did Mr. Landreth leave before we had a chance to hear from him? It seems so.

Okay. Ms. Moffatt. Oh. And could you please state your first name. Thank you.

MS. MOFFATT: I sure will. My name is Carolyn Moffatt. I'm president of the San Luis Harbor Commission. As the nearest neighbor to PG&E Diablo Canyon Power Plant, the district wishes to ensure that the following five issues are addressed prior to relicensing. The first cannot be overemphasized, so it's not redundant, nor is it manipulative. The district believes the precursor to any discussion of relicensing must be a comprehensive evaluation of the hazards of seismic activity.

PG&E is currently conducting additional studies and three-dimension mapping. The relicensing application should be put on hold until such time that

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

119

20

2 1

22

23

24

these studies are complete, have undergone a significant level of rigorous peer review, and have shown that the plant can continue to operate and store waste safely.

This is not only common sense. It should be economically prudent in the long run.

The second issue that we've been asked to address is economic impact of the one mile water exclusion zone around the plant on the livelihoods of commercial fishing fleet, which are cumulative and incremental when added to the impacts of the marine-protected areas. What does this zone actually accomplish? How effectively can it be enforced for security purposes?

The zone should either be lifted or factually justified. By comparison, there is not a no-fly zone over the plant.

The third item that we'd like to address, the harbor district lies less than a half an hour downwind from Diablo Canyon, given the prevailing meteorological conditions. There continue to be shortcomings in the ability of the district, the county, PG&E, and OES, to provide for safe evacuation from the port and beach facilities in the event of an incident at the plant.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

Specifically, but not exclusively, this relates to the ability of emergency response vessels to respond to the harbor due to excessive shoaling near the near-shore facilities which require annual maintenance dredging. The lack of facilities for water-based evacuation at Point San Luis lighthouse as well. Absent a U.S. Coast Guard present at the Port San Luis, a number of security and safety functions fall to the district's harbor patrol.

These concerns should be addressed prior to relicensing of the plant for an additional 20 years.

An additional impact that we'd like to address is that of the once-through cooling system for the ecosystem support, supporting forage and habitat of marine species adjacent to the plant.

This should be evaluated and directly and indirectly mitigated. Cooling alternatives should be evaluated in project level detail. Finally, the EIR/EIS for temporary dry cask storage facility works for a hundred years, or until Yucca Mountain was opened in 18 years, and did not include relicensing. The elimination of Yucca Mountain requires a new EIR/EIS for waste management for relicensing. This should include evaluation of new technologies for

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

1|3

14

15

16

1/7

18

119

20

21

22

23

24

management of spent fuel as dry cask storage may be obsolete before the end of the current license.

We will submit additional detailed comments before the end of the scoping period, and I thank you very much for this opportunity to speak to you and address our concerns. Thank you.

MR. FULLER: Thank you, Ms. Moffatt. Next we'll hear from Carl Dudley, and then after him Mr. James Byerley, and then finally Sonja Swift.

MR. DUDLEY: Good evening. I'm Carl Dudley. I'm a resident of San Luis Obispo, San Luis Obispo County. To answer one question, to start off with, how many power plants have been opened since Three Mile Island? There's been at least two, because Three Mile Island happened in 1979. So we've had the two here that have at least been opened.

I believe that the relicensing process needs to continue, but the first and foremost issue is soundness and safety. And I challenge anybody from the NRC, the employees of PG&E, that if there is something wrong, to get it out in the public so that it is fixed.

After that, nothing else really matters, other than the safety and soundness. I trust the NRC. I trust the "evil," big company PG&E, and I trust

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

their employees, and I specially trust Mr. Womack and other people like him, that are retired, know the intricacies of the plant and are still here. I look at them as the "canaries in a tunnel." If they're still here, we're still okay.

And I believe that we do have to go forward with this. I do believe that solar, wind, wave, all have a place to play in our energy needs, but I do not believe that they can give the power, on a consistent basis, that a nuclear power plant can give.

I believe that Diablo Canyon, in our area, has been an excellent citizen of our community. They have given a lot to the nonprofit community, and it's not only to nonprofits in general, but to nonprofit organizations that fight against them. So I think it's a strange bedfellow but it does happen, and I think that says a lot about them. It says a lot about the regulatory process.

There was a question that was brought up about the earthquake fault. I believe that that should definitely be studied.

This process, though, should not be stopped, in spite of that. If there is a serious issue with the earthquake fault, then I believe the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

plant has another issue, and I don't think we ought to wait till 2024 to decide what we're going to do about it. That's something that needs to be done right away, if it's severe. I have other, but in the interest of time, thank you.

MR. FULLER: Thank you, Mr. Dudley. We'll now hear from Mr. James Byerley, and then Sonja Swift after that, and then that's all we have signed up at this point. After Ms. Swift, we will hear from Dave Wrona of the NRC, who will wrap things up for us this evening.

Mr. Byerley.

MR. BYERLEY: Thank you. Well, I was told in elementary school not to be nervous, to imagine everybody in their underwear, so if you'll excuse me. I spent four days in jail, civil disobedience, back in the '80s, protesting Diablo. So that'll give you a hint on what I'm about to say.

I want to thank all the great speakers I've heard and I want to thank the Commission for this democratic moment. I've heard several—I got here late but I heard several workers reassuring us to trust them, and that Diablo's safe. Safe. Safe. Why do we need to hear that over and over? Because it's one a—plutonium and the waste is one of the most

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

1|3

14

1|5

16

17

18

119

20

21

22

23

24

toxic substances known to human beings.

I believe that if everyone in this community knew that, was well-informed, we would not have Diablo Canyon. I call it an invisible Pandora's Box. It's invisible. All of us still mourn 9/11, because you could see the planes. All of us watched it on TV. And you could see the terror, and so many horrors.

You cannot see plutonium when you ingest it, when you breathe it in, when it pops up in cancer, five, ten, fifteen, thirty years later. Yes, I know where it came from. I propose a study, before relicensing, to examine the health of all the workers at Diablo Canyon who've worked there, what kind of health problems that they've had.

Is it any coincidence, is anybody trying to tell us something, that we've having this meeting tonight right after the Chile earthquake? Right after the Haiti earthquake. What does Diablo mean in Spanish? I say shut it down. Let's think ahead. In Katrina, and many other disasters, they're behind the eight-ball, and they clean up after the disasters. Let's all think ahead.

Let's shut it down now. Thank you all for listening.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2|1

22

23

24

MR. FULLER: Thank you, Mr. Byerley. We'd now like to hear from Sonja Swift. Then after that, like I said, we'll hear from Dave Wrona, to sort of wrap things up for us tonight.

MS. SWIFT: Good evening. I appreciate the chance to speak. I can't--tonight, I wonder if these words will be heard. Like many of the words of the audience, there doesn't seem to be much of a track record for listening to these concerns; but I'll share a few. Let's see. Some other attempts at creating renewable energy, such as what's been going on in Marin County with the Marin Energy Authority, which is the renewable energy alternative to the sources of power, but still, to be delivered through PG&E's grid.

They--well, this is their project, and PG&E doesn't want to cooperate with these other attempts at securing alternative energies, and is adamantly opposing such possibilities.

Prop--so in June, on the June ballot, there will be a Prop 16, as it's called, which would mandate any local agencies wanting to sell retail electricity to customers. They would need to first get two-thirds of the local electrics to sign on, and this is kind--you know, if this is passed, it's basically quite likely that it would end local efforts

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

1|9

20

21

22

23

24

to create energy cooperatives, and PG&E is using a good \$30 million to push Prop 16 forward. So this is an interesting reminder that we are dealing with a monopoly.

In California, although a fee-and-tariff system was implemented, it only allows individual home owners who put up solar panels to sell back excess energy to the grid, until their meter turns to zero.

Further, the size of eligible systems is capped at 5 megawatts per household and individuals are not allowed to put up more solar panels than what would generate their historical power usage.

In my mind, individual homeowners should be able to sell their energy into the grid, without limits. As it is now, you can only do that if you are an energy corporation. A few thoughts to share, think about. I'd encourage you all to vote no on Prop 16.

I heard a few people earlier on associating Bob Blanchard and his rotational grazing practices with PG&E's environmental track record, and I just find that rather absurd, given that he leases the land, and I think he was there before Diablo. I just wanted to mention that.

And I live up Clark Valley Road on the same lands I grew up on. I've been here since I was

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

born, and we have a siren in our back valley, and what that siren means is—if it goes off, I need to, with everyone else, run as fast as I can and never return.

You know, this is a little insane. So one more thing. While I don't think it's necessary to restate the concerns regarding seismic activity, let's just not be arrogant, or cage ourselves in denial of this blatant risk. Thank you.

MR. FULLER: Thank you, Ms. Swift. We'd like to now hear from Dave Wrona. He's our branch chief in the Division of License Renewal, and Dave, you'll kind a wrap things up for us. thank you.

MR. WRONA: Okay. Thank you, Mike. First off, I'd just like to thank everybody for coming out tonight, taking time out of your busy schedules to participate in our environmental scoping process. All the comments we've heard today, earlier in the afternoon and then this evening, will help us define our scoping for the environmental review.

All of the comments will be addressed in our environmental scoping summary report, which is currently scheduled to be issued around the October timeframe, or before the DSEIS which is scheduled to be issued in the October timeframe.

If you signed up and provided your contact

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

information on one of those blue or yellow cards, you'll receive a copy of the environmental scoping summary report.

If speakers today made you think about other comments that you didn't have a chance to provide to us today, as Drew pointed out on one of his slides, you can provide that to us via the U.S. mail or through an e-mail, with a deadline of April 12th.

How we address the environmental scoping issues will be documented in our draft supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. We will be back here around the December timeframe to specifically, in meetings very similar to this, hear comments from you on that document.

The last thing I'd like to say that the NRC staff will be here for a short period of time, cleaning up our stuff and breaking down.

If you didn't have a chance to ask some questions that were, you know, not related to license renewal, or even that are related to license renewal, take the advantage of stopping and seeing one of us. We'll try to address your questions. If we don't have the right folks here, we'll take your contact information and get the right person in contact with you.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

1|1

12

13

14

1|5

16

17

18

19

20

2 1

22

23

24

And with that, I'd just like to thank everybody again for coming out and participating in our process.

[Whereupon, at 9:38 p.m., the public meeting was concluded.]

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

17

18

19

20