

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS SOUTHERN CA
EDISON'S PROPOSED LICENSE AMENDMENT
REQUEST

April 3, 2013

1:00 P.M.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Public Meeting

APPEARANCES

Southern California Edison:

Richard St. Onge
Director of Nuclear Regulatory Affairs, San Onofre Station

Vic Nazareth
Manager of Nuclear Fuel, Southern California Edison

Ryan Treadway
Regulatory Affairs Manager, Southern California Edison

Michael Short
Steam Generator Recovery Team

NRC Staff:

Randy Hall
Senior Project Manager, SONGS Special Projects Branch,
NRR

Doug Broaddus
Branch Chief, SONGS Special Projects Branch, NRR

Michele Evans
Director, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, NRR

Ken Karwoski
Senior Level Advisor, Steam Generators, Division of
Engineering, NRR

Rob Elliott
Branch Chief, Technical Specifications Branch, Division of
Systems safety, NRR

Rick Daniel, Facilitator, Office of Enforcement

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 RICK DANIEL: Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. My name is
3 Rick Daniel. This is the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Category 1 public
4 meeting. This meeting will be between the regulator, the Nuclear Regulatory
5 Commission, and the licensee, Southern California Edison. Southern California
6 Edison requested this meeting because this meeting is a pre-application meeting.
7 It's going to be about the license -- draft license amendment request which they
8 provided the NRC on this past Friday. It's on the NRC website and the
9 presentation that you're going to see today is also on the website that was
10 provided on Monday. There's some minor changes between the presentation
11 that was sent to us on Monday and the one you're going to see; very minor
12 changes, so I don't think it will make that much difference.

13 This is a meeting where we're not going to get deeply into the RAIs,
14 request for additional information -- we've had other meetings on those --
15 however, there will be some RAI discussion pertaining to this draft license
16 amendment request. So, but for the most part I'm going to keep the discussion
17 on the topic of this meeting. Now we're not going to get out in left field, right field,
18 or whatever. So this is part of the normal pre-application licensing process. So
19 we're just going to have brief introductions and then I'm going to talk a little bit
20 about the format. Before we get into introductions I'm going to -- Michele Evans,
21 director of operating reactor license -- director of operating reactor licensing is

1 going to address us. I knew I'd fumble over that one.

2 MICHELE EVANS: After the introduction --

3 RICK DANIEL: Okay. Why don't you guys introduce -- Southern

4 California Edison, why don't you introduce yourselves first?

5 RICHARD ST. ONGE: Okay, good afternoon I'm Richard St. Onge.

6 I'm the director of Nuclear Regulatory Affairs at the San Onofre Nuclear

7 Generating Station.

8 RICK DANIEL: Vic?

9 VIC NAZARETH [spelled phonetically]: I'm Vic Nazareth. I'm the
10 manager of Nuclear Fuel at Southern California Edison.

11 RICK DANIEL: Ryan?

12 RYAN TREADWAY: I'm Ryan Treadway. I'm the reg affairs
13 manager at Southern California Edison.

14 MICHAEL SHORT: Michael Short, member of the Steam
15 Generator Recovery Team at Sentinel [spelled phonetically].

16 RICK DANIEL: Okay, now the NRC folks.

17 RANDY HALL: I'm Randy Hall, the senior project manager at the
18 SONGS Special Projects Branch.

19 DOUG BROADDUS: Doug Broaddus, I'm the branch chief for the
20 SONGS Special Projects Branch.

21 MICHELE EVANS: Yes, and I'm Michele Evans, director of the
22 Division of Operating Reactor Licensing in NRR.

23 KEN KARWOSKI: Ken Karwoski, Senior Level Advisor for Steam
24 Generators.

25 ROB ELLIOTT: I'm Rob Elliott. I'm the tech spec branch chief.

1 RICK DANIEL: All right, thank you very much. See that was even
2 a mouthful title for yourself, right? I should've let you do it in the first place. So,
3 Michele, why don't you start us off with an introduction there?

4 MICHELE EVANS: First of all I'd like to welcome everybody in
5 attendance today, especially Southern California Edison, the NRC staff,
6 interested stakeholders, and members of the public who are here in person and
7 on the telephone. I believe this is also being web-streamed, correct? So thanks
8 for coming in everyone's interest in this topic. As Rick, our facilitator, has
9 indicated, this is a pre-submittal meeting to discuss Southern California Edison's
10 draft license amendment request. The draft license amendment request
11 addresses proposed technical specification and license condition changes for
12 SONGS Unit 2. The licensee intends to provide a presentation and details of
13 their draft license amendment request. The nature of a pre-submittal meeting
14 allows for discussion, and questions, and clarifications to occur between
15 Southern California Edison and the NRC staff. Because open exchange of
16 information is the purpose of today's meeting, I encourage both parties to actively
17 engage in the dialogue as needed. As a pre-submittal meeting, no decisions will
18 be made at today's meeting and we can discuss next steps in the schedules at
19 the end of the meeting, as appropriate. I think at this point we're ready to turn it
20 over to Rich St. Onge to begin their presentation.

21 RICK DANIEL: Rich before you start, I want to let Doug's --

22 DOUG BROADDUS: Actually I was just -- did you have any other -
23 - you wanted to go over --

24 RICK DANIEL: Just format --

25 DOUG BROADDUS: Format? Why don't you go ahead.

1 RICK DANIEL: Okay --

2 MICHELE EVANS: Yeah.

3 RICK DANIEL: Let me talk a little bit about the format of this
4 meeting. And ladies and gentlemen on the phone we also want to welcome you.
5 We're really glad you're here with us somewhere we can't see you, but you can
6 see us, but we're very -- we're happy you're here.

7 Let me go over the format a little bit. Southern California Edison's
8 going to give a brief presentation, and the first part of this meeting is going to be
9 between the licensee and the regulator. They're going to give a presentation and
10 as we go through their slides the NRC may make comments, it may make
11 questions, you'll hear some discussion back and forth. At the conclusion of that,
12 when we get through that presentation, and all the technical discussion back and
13 forth, we're going to open up the phone lines and we're going to take questions
14 from those of you of the public that might be here with us today and folks on the
15 phone. Okay? So that's how things are going to go. Doug? Why don't you go
16 ahead --

17 DOUG BROADDUS: Actually, we're going to go ahead and --

18 MICHELE EVANS: Yeah.

19 RICK DANIELS: Okay.

20 DOUG BROADDUS: Come on over here, Rich.

21 RICK DANIEL: Okay. Go ahead, Rich.

22 RICHARD ST. ONGE: Okay. Thank you very much. Again,
23 Richard St. Onge, director of Reg Affairs at San Onofre. I really appreciate you
24 all coming and spending time with us this afternoon on this very important
25 subject. I'm here, as you can see, with a small team of folks from San Onofre to

1 go over questions and just have a discussion about the license amendment. Can
2 I have the next slide please?

3 So we've got an agenda there broadly laid out for you where I'll
4 provide just a few moments of comments and then I'll turn it over to Mr.
5 Treadway. We will go through the details of the license amendment request
6 having dialogue as we go. And then we have some questions at the end that we
7 would like to present to the stuff just, again, for discussion purposes. And then,
8 again, I'll end with just a few closing remarks. So that's where we intend to go
9 today. Next slide, please.

10 So the purpose the meeting, again -- we'll have a discussion for
11 why Edison's making the submittal. That's part of why we're here. We also
12 really look forward to technical discussion on procedural matters as they relate to
13 the proposed amendment. We've got a few questions as I indicated that we'd
14 like to talk to you about. Also talk about the scope and content of proposal.
15 That'll be the bulk of the discussion. Next slide, please.

16 Little background information: I think most of the folks in the room
17 know, but on January 31st, 2012, after 11 months of operation, our SONGS Unit
18 3 experienced a small steam generator tube leak. Subsequent inspections
19 revealed extensive tube-to-tube wear in a small concentrated part of both of the
20 Unit 3 steam generators. Out of an abundance of caution, our Unit 2, which was
21 preparing a return to service after a 21 month run in a successful refueling
22 outage, Unit 2 was held offline while the problems at Unit 3 were better
23 understood. SCE gathered the best industry experts and formed a technical
24 team that examined both Unit 3 phenomena and the potential impact of the
25 problem to the Unit 2 generators. As most of us know, Unit 3 had experienced

1 Fluid-Elastic Instability. This was a previously unseen phenomenon in
2 commercial u-tube steam generators. And again that was in the in-plane
3 direction. After several months of examination and preventative actions to
4 ensure Unit 2 would not experience FEI, SCE submitted its CAL response letter
5 on October 3rd, 2012. That letter provided the insights of what actually occurred
6 in Unit 3 which caused the FEI condition and it proposed corrective actions that
7 would prevent FEI from occurring in Unit 2. These actions are outlined in the
8 return to service report which was included in the October 3rd CAL response, and
9 in that response is when we first proposed running the unit at 70 percent power,
10 which of course is a subject of this license amendment request.

11 Currently NRC has issued 72 requests for additional information
12 regarding the return to service report. Of the 72, 68 have been formally
13 responded to. We expect to have the other four out in about a week's time. Of
14 particular interest today is RAI number 32, we'll spend a little bit of time on that
15 and have again some questions there we'd like to go over with the staff. It is our
16 intention to return Unit 2 to service at 70 percent power in time for the Southern
17 California peak electrical usage period. This traditionally starts June 1st, so that's
18 the date that we're looking for a potential restart of the unit. This is needed to
19 ensure good reliability and stability in the Southern California area. Next slide,
20 please.

21 So a little recap on RAI 32: In our response to RAI 32 there really
22 were two questions we answered. First was the question around compliance
23 with Tech Spec 5.5.2.11 Bravo 1. This we answered in a manner that provided
24 for the operational assessment determining what the power level needed to be to
25 operate safely for the next operating period. The second part of that was the

1 operational assessment tool -- I'm sorry. The second part of that was providing
2 an operational assessment at a 100 percent power whereas the other OAs were
3 at 70 percent power, so that has been provided to the NRC staff and, of course,
4 remains under review with the staff right now. In order to ensure the appropriate
5 regulatory actions are underway to support return to service of our Unit 2 facility
6 for that peak summer demand period, we are considering today a license
7 amendment request to be a parallel path to getting the unit returned to service. I
8 think you all understand that it's a proposed submittal at this point. If the NRC
9 determines that the previous supply of 100 percent OA is sufficient to
10 demonstrate compliance for that tech spec 5.5.2.11 Bravo dash 1, then this
11 amendment would be withdrawn by SCE. And with that I'd like to transition to
12 Mr. Ryan Treadway, again, who's our manager of regulatory licensing at San
13 Onofre.

14 RYAN TREADWAY: Okay, thanks Rich. The next couple of slides
15 that you'll see here provide an outline of the proposed license amendment. For
16 several months, as you know, a team of experts has worked with SCE's
17 engineering team and determined that operation at 70 percent power will prevent
18 loss of tube integrity due to fluid-elastic instability. Very simply put, the lowering
19 power has a direct effect on the thermo-hydraulic conditions affecting the tube-to-
20 tube wear in the steam generators. And we have determined that operation at 70
21 percent power will ensure the steam generators operate safely. Also we
22 understand to address this change associated with operation at 70 percent
23 power a license amendment is required. Next slide.

24 So SCE has proposed a license amendment for operation at 70
25 percent power which allows consistency for the submittal that we provided on

1 October 3rd: the CAL response letter and the return to service report. And the
2 changes made to the license and the associated tech specs are also consistent
3 with this submittal. Because this proposed license amendment is a temporary
4 amendment for cycle 17 only, we have proposed a footnote change to both tech
5 spec 5.5.2.11 and the license condition for maximum power level. Next slide.

6 So what we've put together here in our proposal, in our license
7 amendment, its changes to both that tech spec 5.5.2.11 for the steam generator
8 program and the license condition. We feel that this was conservatively done in
9 the event that NRC's review of the 100 percent OA is not complete to support the
10 June 1st restart date. At this point, we understand that both our success path,
11 either completion of the 100 percent OAs reviewed and approved by the NRC
12 staff or a license amendment to address both the conditions in tech spec
13 5.5.2.11, are complete. This proposed license amendment to both 5.5.2.11 and
14 the license are for cycle 17 only and we've also incorporated PRA comparative
15 analysis for operation at 70 percent power and 100 percent power and have
16 concluded that the steam generators in the plants are safe to operate. Next
17 slide.

18 The specific changes to the tech specs is what this slide provides
19 an overview for. This is the steam generator program technical specification and
20 it clarifies that normal, full power operation is limited to 70 percent power; again,
21 which is consistent with our CAL response and our return to service report.

22 Again, we have determined that the license amendment is temporary until the
23 final power level at which Unit 2 can operate is determined. Therefore the final
24 power level that we will be determining will be addressed in cycle 17. Next slide.

25 Now that I've covered the specific changes addressed in the

1 proposed license amendment, I would like to provide an overview of this LAR.
2 Specifically for the license condition consistent with the tech spec, we propose
3 not to operate in excess of 70 percent power for cycle 17. The changes to the
4 license condition are, again, consistent with what was outlined in the change to
5 tech spec 5.5.2.11. The basis for our conclusion and the proposed license
6 amendment is supported by, it is safe to operate at 70 percent power. The basis
7 for the conclusion is that operation at 70 percent power reduces the thermo-
8 hydraulic conditions in the steam generator and prevents fluid-elastic instability,
9 which is supported by our CAL response and return to service report. The
10 technical basis for both these conclusions has been provided, as discussed
11 previously, in the CAL response letter and the return to service report.

12 Okay so going on to the -- on slide 11, the changes to tech spec
13 5.5.2.11 address the questions that were raised in RAI 32. In addition, these
14 changes align with the proposed changes to our tech spec and our license
15 condition. As discussed before, the analysis and the evaluations we have
16 completed in the CAL response and the return to service report demonstrate we
17 are safe to operate at 70 percent power. The CAL and return to service report
18 specifically address the actions that are necessary to ensure tube integrity and
19 the steam generator tube integrity requirements are met. We have completed a
20 comparative PRA analysis for operation at 70 percent power and 100 percent
21 power and these conclusions support the license amendment. Next slide.

22 So you can see here in the no significant hazards consideration, we
23 have concluded that there is no significant increase in the probability of a
24 consequence previously analyzed. Specifically, we have evaluated the steam
25 generator tube rupture and the main steam line break-induced tube rupture

1 event, as well as other design basis accidents and determined there is no
2 significant increase in the probability of a previously analyzed event. We have
3 also concluded that there is no possibility of a new or different kind of accident
4 introduced because of this amendment. Based on our analysis, we have
5 determined that the thermo-hydraulic conditions that caused fluid-elastic
6 instability do not exist at 70 percent power. And lastly, we concluded that there is
7 no change within this license amendment that's proposed that involves a
8 significant reduction in margins of safety. The proposed license amendment
9 incorporates changes for operation at 70 percent including plant safety system
10 changes and procedure changes necessary to operate at 70 percent and they do
11 not introduce a significant reduction to safety. Next slide.

12 In the proposed license amendment, you'll see a commitment, and
13 it specifically reads that we will submit and obtain NRC approval of -- with the
14 license amendment request for long term continued operation beyond cycle 17.
15 So with that, that provides a synopsis and an overview of the proposed license
16 amendment, and at this time we'd like to offer up any questions that the NRC
17 may have with this proposal.

18 RICK DANIEL: NRC folks, questions.

19 MICHELE EVANS: Want to start?

20 ROB ELLIOTT: Have any questions about --

21 MICHELE EVANS: In general?

22 ROB ELLIOTT: Are we going to go through slide by slide just --
23 your slides have specific topic areas. Do you want to --

24 RYAN TREADWAY: Yeah.

25 ROB ELLIOTT: And we do have questions regarding scope. Do

1 you want me to raise that now or?

2 RYAN TREADWAY: Well we can do it by the slides that we've
3 outlined that go by topic if you'd like.

4 RICK DANIEL: Or go slide by slide and take questions --

5 ROB ELLIOTT: Yeah.

6 RICK DANIEL: -- by the slide then.

7 ROB ELLIOTT: We can do that.

8 RICK DANIEL: All right. So no questions so far, right? All right.

9 MALE SPEAKER: Rick.

10 RICK DANIEL: Yes?

11 MALE SPEAKER: Microphones?

12 RICK DANIEL: Okay. Yes, when you -- when you speak turn the
13 microphone on. Doug, did you have some --

14 DOUG BROADDUS: From, I mean, I think you're going to -- so are
15 you, you're going to be going through the questions that are in the topics --

16 RICK DANIEL: The topics --

17 DOUG BROADDUS: -- down here?

18 RYAN TREADWAY: The topics will address the questions that we
19 have for the staff.

20 DOUG BROADDUS: Okay, yeah, and I think, yeah, I think the
21 questions that I have will be covered in --

22 RYAN TREADWAY: Related?

23 DOUG BROADDUS: So go ahead.

24 RYAN TREADWAY: Okay, so with that we'll proceed, and if you go
25 to the next slide you see the topic we have there is maximum power. So we had

1 a question, does the staff see any further information that's needed beyond what
2 was provided in reference to RAI 11 that is needed for the evaluation or the
3 review of this tech spec change?

4 ROB ELLIOTT: Not at this time, from a preliminary view --

5 RYAN TREADWAY: Okay.

6 ROB ELLIOTT: -- review of it.

7 DOUG BROADDUS: The one -- when you're talking about
8 maximum power, I'm assuming that would also encompass the analysis of the
9 change of the power level from 100 percent to 70 percent. You referenced RAI
10 number 11. In our previous RAIs there was a 12, 13, and 14 as well, also
11 address that topic area. And I'm wondering why you're not including as RAI
12 number 11, the responses to that as part of this overall. And if there's a specific
13 basis for why you don't believe that it's not applicable to this request --

14 RICHARD ST. ONGE: Just to clarify, so I think what I heard your
15 question was, you know, had we considered submitting 12, 13, and 14 and
16 decided not to do that. Is that --

17 DOUGH BROADDUS: Is that -- yeah.

18 RYAN TREADWAY: So we specifically chose to include RAI 11 by
19 reference due to the questions that were coming, you know, back and forth
20 dialogue between the NRC staff and Southern California Edison. So we
21 understand that there are some additional related questions addressed in RAIs
22 12 and 13 and possibly 14. At this time we felt that the license amendment and
23 the no significant hazards consideration and the inclusion by reference of what
24 we supported in the reference documents was satisfactory; so if the NRC sees
25 that additional RAI responses may be necessary we can include them by

1 reference as well.

2 DOUG BROADDUS: Okay, yeah, and I believe you got some
3 questions later on about corporation by reference and so I'll discuss that when
4 we get to that point.

5 RANDY HALL: Yeah, just to follow up, questions 11 through 14
6 were generated along the theme of performing confirmation if you will that the
7 accident analyses and tech specs were unaffected by the proposal to operate at
8 70 percent. In your RAI 11 response, which we understand you've just recently
9 revised, you have a table that captures I guess the extent of the review you did of
10 the UFSAR and the tech specs to evaluate the impacts. Does that, at least in
11 part, address the responses to the other questions, 12, 13, and 14 in terms of --
12 how would you measure flow, I believe, was a focus of question 12.

13 RICK DANIEL: Vic?

14 VIC NAZARETH: Yeah, RAI 11 is all encompassing, okay?
15 Twelve, 13, 14 is a little more detailed basically on specific aspects of RAI 11.
16 So RAI 11 incorporates the entire accident analysis, okay? RAI 12 goes into
17 some specifics about uncertainty and then RAI 13 talks about LOCA in more
18 detail, okay? So they're all incorporated through RAI 11, but RAI 11 has the
19 entire what we do for 70 percent power. So we can incorporate them specifically
20 if you like and just add them on or -- but they are incorporated through RAI 11.

21 RICHARD ST. ONGE: Yeah, again, if it supports the staffs review,
22 we would be willing to include those other responses, so if that's what we're
23 hearing we'll do that. If you need some more time and you want to look at a little
24 bit differently and then have a discussion over it later we can do that too.

25 DOUG BROADDUS: What I would say is just on our quick review

1 from the tech staff standpoint, the question was really, you know, they appeared
2 to be applicable and so we wanted to understand if there was a specific reason
3 why they had been excluded. If there was just because you thought 11 covered
4 everything -- I mean it sounds like incorporating those would probably be an
5 appropriate thing to do.

6 RYANTREADWAY: Okay are there any other questions associated
7 with the topic of maximum power?

8 MICHELE EVANS: No.

9 DOUG BROADDUS: No, I guess not.

10 RYAN TREADWAY: Okay, so the next slide in the topic we
11 proposed to discuss is RAI 32. Again, like was discussed in the presentation, we
12 understand that there are two paths to address the concerns and the questions
13 raised by the authors of RAI 32. One would be a 100 percent OA that's reviewed
14 and approved by the NRC, the other would be an amendment to make that
15 change. And so would the proposed amendment that's been provided, do the
16 proposed tech spec changes provide a response that is adequate to address the
17 questions raised in RAI 32?

18 DOUG BROADDUS: I think I have to use my normal canned
19 response which is, we can't provide any determinations at this particular time,
20 obviously, as to the adequacy of the amendment, whether we would be able to
21 approve that or not and what we will be doing -- we'll be doing a -- once we
22 received the actual request we'll be doing an acceptance review to ensure that it
23 has all the information we need in order to complete our review. So we will be
24 able to give specific feedback at that point as to whether it contains that
25 information. As to whether it adequately addresses RAI 32, that's not something

1 we can -- till we complete the review we wouldn't be able to make that
2 determination, the full review of it.

3 ROB ELLIOTT: Well I will say that, that is what the RAI is asking
4 you there. Give us an assessment of a 100 percent, operation at 100 percent
5 power, or --

6 RYAN TREADWAY: Right.

7 ROB ELLIOTT: -- or you'll need a license amendment. So you're
8 correct that those are the two paths that RAI 32 is asking you about.

9 RYAN TREADWAY: Okay, so I guess the follow would be are
10 there any other changes that you see would be necessary to facilitate the review
11 for RAI 32?

12 ROB ELLIOTT: This is where I think I was going to talk a little bit
13 about scope. You reference -- you incorporate by reference RAI 11, which, in the
14 discussion I understand you took a look at how the change in power level would
15 change LCOs and surveillances. The question we have is did you also look at
16 conditions and actions? It looks like there's potential where there's -- where you
17 have action statements that are tied to greater thermal power, that you need to
18 make sure you either adjust them or can you do them and remain in compliance
19 with your tech specs.

20 RYAN TREADWAY: A complete review was done and for the
21 details I'll turn to Vic to provide a response.

22 VIC NAZARETH: The answer to your question is yes. We looked
23 at all of them. We looked at the actions and we looked at everything that's
24 related to power, okay, and so we did a thorough review of all of that. That's
25 correct.

1 ROB ELLIOTT: That's the only question I had.

2 RYAN TREADWAY: Okay. Okay, any other questions for the topic
3 of addressing RAI 32? Okay. Next slide we've got, kind of segued into this
4 already, but the scope of the license amendment request. So that one particular
5 question was already answered. With the scope of the license amendment that
6 we proposed, is this appropriate for both the tech spec 5.5.2.11 and the license
7 condition changes that we are proposing to make? You know, more specifically
8 you talked about the two paths in RAI 32, and so you see we have a proposed
9 license amendment put together that has changes to both tech spec 5.5.2.11 and
10 the license condition. So I understand that you can't make any pre-decision or
11 determinations yet, but would they address the scope of what is considered to be
12 the issue at heart of RAI 32?

13 ROB ELLIOTT: Well there's overlap between the questions here,
14 and part of the scope question does RAI also provide is the questions of RAIs 12,
15 13, 14 having relevance also to the overall basis for the amendment.

16 RYAN TREADWAY: Okay.

17 DOUG BROADDUS: I want to make sure we understand
18 specifically what you're trying to ask in this particular instance. The question in
19 RAI 32 was, you know, demonstrate compliance with the tech spec or provide an
20 OA that would essentially demonstrate compliance with the tech spec. Is your
21 question, you know, is this a way to be able to demonstrate compliance? Is that
22 what you're asking? You know, by the manner that you've requested in the
23 amendment --

24 RYAN TREADWAY: Again, referencing back to the two paths to
25 address RAI 32, if we propose a license amendment and you see the changes in

1 front of you specific to tech spec 5.5.2.11 for the steam generator program and to
2 the license condition would there be any other changes that would be necessary
3 to address the concerns raised with RAI 32 or the question raised with RAI 32?
4 So it gets to the heart of the compliance aspect that's, you know, ultimately what
5 we're after. But the proposed changes we have to tech spec 5.5.2.11 and the
6 license condition we've determined would be satisfactory to demonstrate
7 compliance, and obviously we want ensure that there are no additional changes
8 that would be needed to be addressed as well.

9 DOUG BROADDUS: Okay. I mean the purpose of RAI 32 was, as
10 I indicated, to address compliance with the tech spec. With what the draft you've
11 given to us, you know, changing the power level to 70 percent and the tech spec
12 to 70 percent then the requirement would be to show -- you have to meet
13 compliance, be able to demonstrate compliance with that revised power level.
14 That's, so I mean, believe that's -- I mean I think that's what you're asking. So it
15 appears that wouldn't -- I mean, if that's what your intent is, that that wouldn't -- I
16 would address that particular issue. But we still have to look at the law. I mean
17 there's more to it than just does it demonstrate compliance and with respect to
18 the 70 percent, it's, you know -- what are the implications of the change to a 70
19 percent power and longer term operation at 70 percent? And that's where Rob
20 was getting at with -- we need to make sure we -- that you fully address and
21 considered the implications at 70 percent power for all operations, all tech specs,
22 all analyses and such. And so that's going to be part of our review as well.

23 ROB ELLIOTTT: Just would add, after looking at it with a day or
24 two days -- whatever we've had. No, we haven't identified other specs, if that
25 what you're getting to -- that we would say you need to address this. That's not

1 to say that when we were doing more thorough review, we won't, but we haven't
2 identified anything through a cursory review.

3 RYAN TREADWAY: Okay, appreciate that.

4 RANDY HALL: I think a variation on that is if you're asking us was
5 there more to RAI 32 than you've perceived in trying to address it in several
6 different ways. I think the answer is no, we'll have to look at the LAR on its
7 merits, but did the staff have something significantly different in mind than what
8 you're proposing. I don't there was any assumption that was not conveyed by
9 the staff regarding compliance with the --

10 RICK DANIEL: Nothing at this time, then, right? So we can move
11 on.

12 RYAN TREADWAY: Okay. Appreciate that response. If there are
13 no other questions for this topic, we can go ahead and go to the next slide. And
14 this topic is License Amendments, Request Process Issues. And so this kind of
15 gets into the incorporation by reference topic. So, the ability to incorporate
16 what's already been done and reviewed by the NRC staff by the CAL response
17 and return to service report Will this satisfy the ability of the NRC to complete
18 their review of this proposed license amendment?

19 DOUG BROADDUS: I think from the standpoint of incorporation by
20 reference, I think the feedback that we would provide is we need to know
21 specifically and clearly what is the -- what are you incorporating by reference?
22 It's in the draft that we got. It wasn't always clear to us that what exactly you --
23 everything that you were referencing. You know, there were some cases where
24 it seemed like you might be referencing, including by reference everything that
25 was submitted in the previous, you know, March 3rd [October 3rd] submittal and

1 all the RAIs and other cases. That there's only limited amount of information
2 from that. You made previous commitments as well in that submittal and it's not
3 clear whether those commitments are also being incorporated by reference into
4 this LAR. So it -- we need to make sure it's clear to us that, you know, what it is
5 that you plan on incorporating by reference. Otherwise it -- you know -- if it's
6 everything, it's a much broader scope. If it's more limited, you know, then that
7 wouldn't limit that --

8 RYAN TREADWAY: We see this as two distinct processes, and so
9 for the license amendment, we provided a justification for operation at 70 percent
10 power. We're making a change to tech spec 5.5.2.11 and in our license condition
11 to operate at 70 percent power. And we believe we've included the technical
12 basis and justification within the proposed license amendment and the
13 determination for no significant hazards consideration within the proposed LAR.

14 Separate from that, we know that to meet the steam generator tech
15 specs, we have to complete the operational assessment and the tube-to-tube
16 wear that was -- the tube-to-tube wear issue that was identified for the steam
17 generators. So that is a separate action that's being addressed with the CAL and
18 the return to service report. And the technical justification for addressing tube-to-
19 tube wear and fluid elastic instability is separate in our minds from the license
20 amendment to operate at 70 percent power.

21 DOUG BROADDUS: Yeah. And I don't think that there was a
22 question from our mind as to, you know, the distinction between those two types
23 of activities as well. I mean, a license amendment request and a CAL process
24 are two distinct activities, so. But I think it's for our purposes to understand what
25 information you believe is necessary to support the LAR and the license

1 amendment request. It's important for you to clearly identify and make sure it's
2 very clear to us -- you know -- which information you are incorporating by
3 reference so that we can know which information to look at. And, you know, if
4 there's additional information that we need, we would ask RAIs in that case, so.

5 RICHARD ST. ONGE: Thanks for that clarification, Doug. I think
6 we understand what you're looking for.

7 RYAN TREADWAY: Okay, so with the regards to the license
8 amendment request process, are there any other questions that need to be
9 addressed at this time?

10 RICHARD ST. ONGE: Just maybe one thing to put on the table,
11 Ryan. I think we went over pretty quickly, but this is a one-cycle license
12 amendment request. I think you understand that. And it would be our intention
13 during that operating cycle -- cycle 17 -- we would continue to work with
14 Mitsubishi and our experts and determine the long-term power level would be.
15 Perform or create another license amendment request and then submit that to
16 you in sufficient time that we would establish what the long-term power level of
17 the plant would be for cycle 18 operation. So I just want to make sure I was clear
18 on the --

19 RANDY HALL: As you stated, Rich, that your intent is to request
20 this license amendment for cycle 17 -- a full fuel cycle. Do you have an
21 estimation at this point, how many actual start-ups and shut-downs that might
22 include or additional period of operation beyond this five months, or...

23 RICHARD ST. ONGE: Ask Mr. Short to answer that question.

24 MICHAEL SHORT: The question is how many start-ups and shut-
25 downs are we likely to go through during the timeframe of cycle 17. Cycle 17 will

1 be approximately two years long at 70 percent power. So if you assume for a
2 moment, I think conservatively that the five-month operating interval is sustained
3 throughout that cycle -- could be as many as four or five start-ups and shut-
4 downs over that period of time. And that would be, I think, a conservative
5 estimate of the number.

6 DOUG BROADDUS: Along those lines, again, getting back to my
7 previous question as well. In the response that you provided to RAI 32 there --
8 the first path of the response that you provided to RAI 32, there was an approach
9 described on how you plan to go forward with operation, you know -- and I had
10 asked the question at the time, you know, were you planning to make those
11 statements commitments. And so I guess the question still applies here. You
12 know, I think my understanding of the response was that it would depend upon
13 whether or not we agreed, I guess, at the end, you know, to allow -- to restart and
14 such. So I am trying to understand, still, you know, are there going to be
15 additional commitments beyond the one to submit a license amendment request
16 for -- prior to cycle 18? Or are the commitments part of this LAR request, or are
17 they part of the CAL response? And how do they kind of work together?

18 RYAN TREADWAY: For the actions we've outlined and that portion
19 of the response for RAI 32, those are actions that we're obviously willing to
20 commit to take. For the proposed license amendment, we've only identified this
21 specific commitment that's necessary to support the NRC's review of this
22 proposed licensed amendment. And with those actions that we outline in our
23 response, we obviously wouldn't commit to. The vehicle at which we decide to
24 commit to in this case would be the CAL response. We also knew that some of
25 those actions that we outlined in the RAI 32 response still had some critical

1 decisions that influence the outcome or the final language in those commitments
2 as we move forward.

3 But to answer your question, we feel that the CAL response would
4 be the vehicle on which to address those commitments, if necessary for a long-
5 term continued operation for the proposed license amendment -- the one
6 commitment you see identified as the one that we felt was necessary to support
7 the NRC's review.

8 DOUG BROADDUS: Okay. And from that perspective to -- a one
9 time, temporary change generally, you know, when we've handled these types of
10 requests before, previously, with a one-time change, there was something that,
11 you know, there's something that's going to end at the end of that temporary
12 period that would either allow you to go back to normal operations or there would
13 be some type of commitment of, you know, that there would be a change. In this
14 case, if I'm understanding correctly, that it would just be to submit another LAR.
15 At the end of the period, though, what would your expectation be, or what do you
16 perceive at the end of that time period -- the end of cycle 17, you know, if you
17 haven't submitted a LAR at that point or you've submitted a LAR to us -- a license
18 amendment request to us, and we haven't finished it yet. What do you see --
19 foresee the action that would be taken at that point? What are you asking for
20 from that perspective?

21 RICHARD ST. ONGE: I think from Southern California Edison's
22 perspective, we would give you lots of time to look through and approve that
23 license amendment request. So we understand the urgency of getting that cycle
24 18 -- if I can call it that -- license amendment request in front of you as quickly as
25 possible. Now we do want to inform that license amendment request for full --

1 you know, long-range maximum power based on the five-month operating period
2 that Mike referred to just a moment ago. So, you know, it's not like we'll give it to
3 you at the very beginning of the cycle, because we do want to see the results of,
4 you know -- we expect the five months to confirm our analysis. That's what our
5 expectation. And if there's a change to that, then we'll have to regroup. But at
6 this point, we believe it'll confirm our analysis, and we'll be prepared to come
7 forward with a long-term LAR sooner than later.

8 RYAN TREADWAY: In addition to that five-month operating cycle -
9 - confirming and validating our initial analysis -- there are other ongoing actions
10 that we're working with MHI to address continued operation beyond cycle 17. So
11 both of those would factor and feed into that decision, but, you know, like Rich
12 said, once we get through the first five-month operating window, and those
13 results come back and confirm and validate our initial results, we'll have a better
14 idea of what the final LAR would be and the proposed changes necessary to put
15 in front of the NRC for review and approval. But we wanted to also highlight the
16 fact that there are additional actions we're considering for long-term continued
17 operation.

18 RANDY HALL: I think you mentioned earlier that if the staff accepts
19 the 100 percent OA, that you would withdraw the amendment request that we're
20 contemplating, would the commitment still stand? Would it be captured in the
21 context of the CAL response, or?

22 RYAN TREADWAY: If at such time that the NRC approves 100
23 percent OA and we demonstrate compliance, we would have to address the
24 commitment made in the proposed license amendment, but we -- you know, at
25 that point in time, we wouldn't know exactly what the commitment would change

1 to. It would depend on, you know, the results and the conclusions made from the
2 NRC staff's review of the 100 percent operational assessment.

3 RICHARD ST. ONGE: Yeah, we've talked about that, Randy, and
4 you end up in a cycle of continuing to do 100 percent OAs indefinitely. And so
5 we'd have to look at the sustainability of that. It's just that in our mind,
6 sustainable or not -- and the answer was not, then I think we're back to a license
7 amendment.

8 RYAN TREADWAY: So, to address your question specifically,
9 there may be a change to the commitment necessary if the staff approves 100
10 percent operational assessment.

11 RANDY HALL: Thanks.

12 RICK DANIEL: Any other questions, comments from the NRC? All
13 right. Go ahead.

14 RYAN TREADWAY: Okay, the last slide and the last topic for
15 discussion that we had was the technical basis that was provided and
16 documented for the no significant hazards consideration. And so we've, you
17 know, touched the aspects of the no significant hazards consideration and the
18 basis. And I guess we wanted to broach the topic. Is this satisfactory for the
19 NRC's review that the inclusion by reference and the supporting basis that we
20 have? Supports our no significant hazards consideration, or is there additional
21 information at this point in time, preliminary that the NRC feels is necessary to
22 support that conclusion?

23 DOUG BROADDUS: Yeah, I think on that one -- again, we can't
24 provide a determination -- any decisions at this point. However, we have not --
25 with our preliminary review, we haven't identified any issues associated with that.

1 RYAN TREADWAY: Okay, that was the question we had on the
2 table where the no significant hazards consideration.

3 RICHARD ST. ONGE: So our next slide is a closing slide. But
4 before we go there, are there other questions that the staff has for Edison?

5 KEN KARWOSKI: Yeah, I guess as you were going through your
6 presentation, something came into my mind. As you know, your technical
7 specifications have reporting requirements for the steam generator results.
8 Those typically say 180 days following entry into mode 4. Given that you're only
9 going to be operating five months, that would mean that report would come in
10 basically -- it could potentially be in your second five-month interval if we were to
11 approve this request or the return to power report. Have you given any
12 consideration in this request to revise that reporting requirement?

13 RYAN TREADWAY: And at this point in time, our review has
14 concluded that there would be no necessary changes to that 180-day report
15 requirement. So once we enter mode 4, that would start the clock for our 180-
16 day report, and we would provide that --

17 KEN KARWOSKI: Okay, you recognize those results will come in
18 after -- you would already potentially started another interval of operation.

19 RYAN TREADWAY: Correct.

20 KEN KARWOSKI: Whereas currently the 180 days gives sufficient
21 time for the staff to take a look at it before you complete your current operating
22 cycle. That'd be a little inconsistent.

23 RYAN TREADWAY: Okay. I understand the question that you're
24 raising and we'll have to look at that a little more closely.

25 RICHARD ST. ONGE: Let us take that one off line here, Ken, and

1 we'll talk internally. It is a good question. It sounds like what the NRC would be
2 looking for is a report sooner, right?

3 KEN KARWOSKI: Yes.

4 RICHARD ST. ONGE: We'll take a look at that.

5 KEN KARWOSKI: Or we would need to understand why you want
6 me to change that requirement.

7 RICHARD ST. ONGE: Okay. All right. Any other questions? Let
8 me move on, then, to my closing remarks here. I really want to thank NRC for
9 this opportunity today. Really appreciate the candid and insightful feedback
10 we've been getting. It is helpful. This is very important to our ability to, again, to
11 return the unit to service, meet our customers' needs. And that's important to the
12 company, important to our customers and our other stakeholders. We look
13 forward to working with your staff and -- you know -- should we decide to submit
14 this LAR, which, again we're still under consideration, we look forward to working
15 with the staff to iron out any other problems or process issues that are out there.
16 With that, I'll turn it back over to Rick.

17 RICK DANIEL: All right. Thank you, Rich. Any closing -- Doug?

18 DOUG BROADDUS: And actually, I apologize. I did have one
19 additional request. I think you said earlier you were planning to -- have you
20 made a decision that you are going to submit this to us, and when would we
21 expect that?

22 RICHARD ST. ONGE: Okay, very good question. We are in the
23 decision making process right now. And this is part of that, you know. Results of
24 today's meeting, we'll incorporate -- be incorporated into our decision. So we
25 haven't made the decision yet. I expect within a week, we will have made a

1 decision and we'll -- and if we have made that decision, we'll have submitted a
2 LAR to you. So I think in about a week's time, you'll have both a decision and --
3 as well as the LAR, should that decision be affirmative.

4 DOUG BROADDUS: Yeah. The -- I mean, your timeframe that
5 you specified, you know, June 1st start-up timeframe. Just from the perspective
6 of processing a license amendment in that amount of time -- that short a
7 timeframe is a -- would be a challenge by itself. We also have in parallel the --
8 also the ongoing CAL actions and our reviews associated with that and finalizing
9 that -- those reviews as well. So there are going to be competing priorities for --
10 from that respect as well as, you know, just getting through the -- even from a
11 process standpoint, just going through each of the steps in that timeframe is --
12 will be a challenge.

13 RICHARD ST. ONGE: Sure.

14 DOUG BROADDUS: I just -- you know.

15 RICHARD ST. ONGE: I think we understand the --

16 DOUG BROADDUS: If you're looking for a date to that -- the
17 sooner you get something into us, the quicker we can start working on it. But
18 that -- you know, and I'm not going to make any commitments as to whether or
19 not we can meet that date or not in any way, other than, you know, we typically,
20 you know, when utilities ask for -- a licensee asks for a quick turnaround or -- we
21 try to meet their dates as the best we can. But --

22 RICHARD ST. ONGE: So we understand it's a strain on the
23 resources for the NRC and to the extent we can help in terms of priorities. We're
24 willing to do that. Try to get the license amendment to you as soon as we can.
25 That's my commitment.

1 DOUG BROADDUS: Okay, all right. With that, from a close-out
2 standpoint, I just wanted to say thank you for coming in and giving the
3 presentation today. I think, you know, we also appreciate getting the materials
4 ahead of time. It gave us an opportunity to look at those and try to see if there
5 are any specific questions that we might have. We did have a few, but in general
6 I think we understand what you're asking for, and we hope -- we've been able to
7 convey what it is we're, you know, what else would be needed in order for us to
8 move forward with the review.

9 As you've mentioned, and you recognized in your presentation, I
10 want to make sure it's clear, you know. The CAL -- the CAL process and the
11 amendment process are two different, distinct processes. They are -- and they
12 can, in fact, you know, proceed in parallel. As I indicated through -- we'll
13 probably be having the same people working on both, so it'll be, you know --
14 they'll be working those in parallel. But they're -- you know -- we -- you know, we
15 are planning to work on both of these going forward. Both the OA as well as the
16 -- any amendment request you might send it to us in finalizing that.

17 The one thing, as well, is I wanted to just mention that the two are
18 not dependent upon each other. We don't see that any -- that a license
19 amendment would be dependent on a CAL or a CAL would be dependent on a
20 license amendment in this case. But I think I -- as you've recognized, completion
21 of both of these actions is necessary. It's an important component to your ability
22 to be able to restart, and so I think, you know, although from our perspective,
23 they may be independent and can be conducted in, you know, separate from
24 each other. I understand from your position that you're seeing them as one
25 needing to go forward, so. With that, you know, and I think that's why we do plan

1 to work on them concurrently together going forward.

2 But and the one thing I want to make sure is clear as well, we don't
3 necessarily have to complete each of them at the same time as well. And so if
4 we finish one before the other, then that -- it'd just be how it works out. I think
5 that's about all I wanted to say is one -- the other point is we do have a schedule
6 that we've laid out on the -- on our website and such. You know, once we get the
7 LAR and we know, you know, that basically starts the clock from that standpoint.
8 We'll try to make sure that that's updated. We'll also do a review of the schedule,
9 you know, and make you aware of that review of the schedule. And we'll also
10 update that information on the website as well so that we have that information
11 as well as, you know, the current process information in there together. We think
12 that that's important to get that information out both to you as well as to the public
13 and the stakeholders -- the external stakeholders -- so that they understand the
14 process. All right? And I think that's all I had to say -- wanted to say, so.

15 RICK DANIEL: Okay. Is there anything else from either licensee or
16 regulator?

17 RICHARD ST. ONGE: I think our team is satisfied.

18 RICK DANIEL: Okay. NRC?

19 MICHELE EVANS: All right. Well, I'd like to say thank you to
20 Southern California Edison and the various stakeholders who are here today,
21 and also to the NRC staff. Think this has been a good dialogue, and at this point,
22 Rick will move us into the next part of the meeting.

23 RICK DANIEL: All right. Thank you, Michele. So, ladies and
24 gentlemen, this concludes the technical portion and discussion between
25 Southern California Edison and the NRC. We're going to be opening up the

1 phone lines and we're going to be taking questions from the audience. So,
2 operator, I assume you can hear me at this point. Why don't you go ahead and
3 give directions to the folks on the phone and as soon as you do that, we'll wait for
4 you to do that. And as soon as you do that, we'll be starting out with questions
5 here in this room first. So, go ahead, operator.

6 OPERATOR: [inaudible]

7 RICK DANIEL: Okay, thank you, operator. And from there, we're
8 going to take a question here in the room first, and we're going to bounce back
9 and forth according to who has questions where. Sir, why don't you stand up,
10 and there's a microphone coming here to you. And we'll take your question.
11 And, again, ladies and gentlemen, and I ask that you keep your questions and
12 comments contained to the subject at hand -- this draft license amendment
13 request.

14 S. DAVID FREEMAN: My name is S. David Freeman. I was the
15 CEO of several nuclear utilities, including the Tennessee Valley Authority, the
16 New York Power Authority, and Sacramento Municipal Utility District. I have had
17 probably more experience with nuclear power as a responsible CEO than anyone
18 in the room. And I must say to you that I find this meeting shocking. It's
19 shocking because it's portrayed as a public meeting, and yet I feel like I am
20 looking through a peephole behind the nuclear curtain at discussions that are
21 going on, that the public is not participating in. And this is simply a chance for us
22 to see one discussion. But I know these discussions will continue. And the idea
23 that the utility has the right to ask the judges to tell them what they need to
24 supply in order to get approval just strikes me as unreal. We're talking about a
25 nuclear reactor with steam generators that are so damaged that no utility -- if it

1 were initially trying to get a license -- would come before the Nuclear Regulatory
2 Commission with equipment of that kind and ask for a license. I'm sure that no
3 one in the room would disagree with me. And my question is this is -- all about
4 paperwork, but, frankly, with the chairperson of your Commission and others
5 talking about transparency and public hearings, the public is not being heard
6 here today. And there is no public hearing, and we're talking about restarting a
7 reactor that has not been fixed which the utility admits is broken. And we're
8 talking about footnotes and paperwork instead of safety. And then you have
9 three judges that are also sitting there trying to decide whether your CAL process
10 is a de facto licensing process. And so here, going behind everybody else's
11 attempt to grant people a license without changing anything and without the
12 public having a voice in it. And frankly, I think -- I know everyone here is very
13 sincere in what you're doing. Don't get me wrong. I've been a staff person
14 myself, and I've worked in agencies. And I've worked in utilities.

15 People believe they're doing the right thing. But you folks need a
16 mirror. This is -- this is the opposite of a public hearing, and the idea of restarting
17 this reactor without having the public hearing is an insult to the 6-, 7 million
18 people in Southern California that are scared to death of what's going on.

19 RICK DANIEL: All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Freeman, for
20 your comments and your question. Why don't you folks go ahead and address --

21 MICHELE EVANS: Yeah, I'll just start by thanking you for your
22 comment. And the intent here is not a hearing. As we indicated in the beginning,
23 this is a pre-submittal meeting between Southern California Edison and the NRC
24 to do exactly what we did -- was to allow them to ask, you know, present their
25 draft license amendment request and have a dialogue with us about the content

1 of it, and ask any questions that they may have. Part of our -- you know, as we
2 move forward, the goal here was to have an understanding and maybe share
3 some information to enable us to -- if they do submit it -- to be able to go through
4 a review process in a timely manner. That's the purpose of this type of meeting.
5 Anyone want to add anything?

6 DOUG BROADDUS: Yeah. From the perspective of -- the second
7 half of what you were addressing, which is, you know, a public participation in the
8 process. That begins, you know, after something is actually submitted to us. So
9 once a LAR -- a license amendment request -- is submitted to us, we'll go
10 through our --

11 S. DAVID FREEMAN: Needs to occur before they get a license.

12 DOUG BROADDUS: We'll go through the process, you know, that
13 -- our defined process, which is to do the

14 S. DAVID FREEMAN: My question, will you guarantee that that
15 real hearing will occur before you give them a license?

16 DOUG BROADDUS: A request -- a hearing request -- an
17 opportunity for a hearing request will be part of the notice of the receipt of the
18 application. So, there will be an opportunity for -- to request a hearing once we
19 get that -- the request in. And when we issue that, one of our requirements is
20 that there's -- we can't take action until that comment period, which is typically a
21 30-day comment period, is -- ends. So, we won't take action until that occurs.

22 S. DAVID FREEMAN: Guaranteeing we will actually have a public
23 hearing in which our experts can testify before you make a decision?

24 DOUG BROADDUS: I cannot guarantee that anyone would ever
25 have a hearing because that is not a decision that we make. It is a decision that

1 the ASLB makes. The ASLB are the ones who hear the request for the hearing,
2 they hear the -- whether they're --

3

4 S. DAVID FREEMAN: [inaudible] before you issue a license
5 amendment?

6 DOUG BROADDUS: We're going to follow our process, which -- it
7 depends upon the outcome of our review, and specifically with the notice of no
8 significant hazards consideration determination. If that is determined that the
9 amendment request meets the criteria for that, there -- we are -- the regulation
10 specifies that we would proceed without -- even if we have a -- or the amendment
11 request could be issued even if we have a hearing request.

12 RICK DANIEL: And this is a known process. It's outlined in NRC
13 regulations. It's on the website.

14 S. DAVID FREEMAN: -- quite well known, that's my problem.

15 RICK DANIEL: Pardon me?

16 S. DAVID FREEMAN: The process is quite well known, that's my
17 problem.

18 RICK DANIEL: Okay. Well --

19 S. DAVID FREEMAN: I want to know whether the NRC is actually
20 going to practice what they're preaching now, which is to give the public a right to
21 present testimony and witnesses in contradictory. People -- I believe that these
22 folks believe that reactor sank.

23 RICK DANIEL: Okay.

24 S. DAVID FREEMAN: [inaudible] self-serving.

25 RICK DANIEL: Sir, I think he answered the question regarding the

1 ASLB and there is a process, an existing process, and Mr. Broaddus has
2 addressed your question. If you want to discuss it in greater detail, we'll be
3 happy to take it up with you after the meeting. Okay?

4 S. DAVID FREEMAN: We both agree this is not a public hearing.

5 RICK DANIEL: That is correct. That is correct, nor was it billed as
6 one. Operator, do you have someone standing by on the phone? We can take
7 your call.

8 Thank you.

9 MALE SPEAKER: [inaudible]

10 RICK DANIEL: All right. Thank you for your question. Mr. St.
11 Onge.

12 RICHARD ST. ONGE: Rick, I think the NRC probably should
13 answer that question. They're asking once you're in receipt of the LAR, how long
14 would it take before you had some certainty around the June date, is what I
15 heard.

16 MICHELE EVANS: So, the way the process works, they need to
17 submit this amendment, get it in-house to us, we need to do an acceptance
18 review, we need to notice the no significant hazards determination in the
19 amendment --

20 DOUG BROADDUS: And the opportunity for hearing.

21 MICHELE EVANS: -- and an opportunity for hearing, thank you.
22 And there's a -- that comes with a 30-day window once it's posted and noticed,
23 so you have a 30 day window there. And then after that point in time, if our
24 review, you know, if we agree that the amendment can be issued and at that
25 point in time, the earliest we can move forward would be after that 30-day

1 window. So, maybe you're talking a week plus 30 days, you know, the
2 acceptance review and the getting it noticed, plus a 30-day window, plus any
3 time on the other end, a few days.

4 DOUG BROADDUS: Yeah, I think the important point is, you know,
5 we'll do our best to try to meet the timeframe that's being requested, but we will
6 take whatever time we need in order to complete our review of this request, just
7 as we've indicated previously that we'll take as much time as we need to -- in
8 order to complete the CAL process as well. And the one thing that I wanted to
9 clarify is that they are -- you know, as I tried to indicate previously, they are two
10 different processes and so I think -- what -- the caller -- what you indicated is this
11 appeared to be a -- an alternative path to get to the same result. I want to make
12 sure it's understood that the CAL process and our review and closeouts, in
13 conclusion of that, will proceed, you know, in the same -- you know, regardless of
14 whether there's a license amendment request or not. And that will not be
15 completed until we've completed it. So, you know, from that perspective, the
16 CAL is there -- there's a commitment from the licensee to not restart until we've
17 completed that. And we've indicated that we will provide a notification when
18 we've made a decision regarding the restart at that point and based upon that
19 CAL. This amendment request -- we will also proceed in the manner that Ms.
20 Evans just indicated, and, you know, we will also make a notification at the end of
21 that when we're completed with our license amendment review at that point and
22 the determination we have at that point, as well.

23 MALE SPEAKER: Can I just follow up what I heard out of the
24 answer is that it will take a week to certify that the application is complete and
25 that there's -- that they've met the no hazard test, is that what I heard? And then

1 you will issue a notice for the hearing, which has to have a 30-day period
2 attached to it. Is that what I heard?

3 DOUG BROADDUS: No. I think what Michele was trying to
4 indicate, we have to do two initial steps. One is acceptance review. The second
5 is the review, our own internal review of the notice of the no significant hazards
6 consideration determination, and then a publication of the notice of the receipt of
7 the application, the opportunity for a hearing, and the opportunity to comment on
8 the no significant hazards determination in that case. Yes, it takes -- in order to
9 get it published, a notice published, it takes a couple days to actually just do that,
10 and once we actually have the notice prepared and put out there. So, in order to
11 be able to get through that entire process, you know, would be -- we would need
12 at least a week, I think, to get through that process if everything went perfectly
13 smoothly. It may take longer.

14 MICHELE EVANS: Well, and to clarify, the actual review that the
15 amendment is acceptable, you know, doesn't occur in that first week, that just
16 keeps us moving along and then we have a 30-day window, but I do want to
17 point out that we have been reviewing this issue for a year or so already. So, it'll
18 be -- even though they're separate paths, the content is similar to what we've
19 been looking at for the past year, so, you know, the -- we're trying to just provide
20 a time line of the -- at the earliest when, you know, my math shows, you know,
21 seven weeks of a timeframe based on the dates that I've laid out. Whenever you
22 do submit it until there could be a point when we issued it if we found it
23 acceptable.

24 RICK DANIEL: All right. Thank you, Michele. Go ahead, do you
25 have something else? Okay. Thank you, caller. We're going to take a question

1 from Kendra Ulrich here from Friends of the Earth in the room and then we're
2 going to go back to the phone. Go ahead, Kendra.

3 KENDRA ULRICH: Hi. My name's Kendra Ulrich. I'm with Friends
4 of the Earth. First, I just want to say that I find the fact that Edison is literally
5 making safety a footnote at the bottom of their page is absolutely appalling, that
6 this does not address all of the safety concerns that were raised in the restart
7 proposal for this incredibly damaged reactor. But specifically, I have two
8 questions, one related to something that Mr. Nazareth said regarding the
9 analysis that you had done. You had said that you had done an analysis of all
10 reactor systems that are impacted by operation at reduced power levels for
11 extended periods of time. I would like to know when that analysis is going to be
12 made public.

13 MALE SPEAKER: Made available on your website.

14 DOUG BROADDUS: Yeah, I mean, I -- if what you're talking about
15 is what they've submitted to us, I believe the response is any -- either -- unless
16 they're proprietary, all of the responses are available either on Adams or on our
17 public website.

18 KENDRA ULRICH: I haven't seen it. My question is when?

19 DOUG BROADDUS: Is that -- do you know [unintelligible]?

20 RANDY HALL: Are you talking about -- excuse me, would that be
21 included in RAI-11 responses then?

22 VIC NAZARETH: Yeah, RAI-11 has already been out, right? The
23 original then would be just revised RAI-11.

24 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah, that's right.

25 VIC NAZARETH: The initial RAI-11 response, I understand is out,

1 so.

2 MALE SPEAKER: Right.

3 DOUG BROADDUS: Do you recall if that contained proprietary
4 information off the top of your head? I don't remember --

5 VIC NAZARETH: That R.A.I. -- the initial one did not. Okay, the
6 new one does and very selected sections. Okay? The revision is in selected
7 sections. Most of it is cleaned up, right?

8 RANDY HALL: Right. So, the prior response to RAI-11 is publicly
9 available. The most recent one, we understand, was dated on Monday and that
10 has not been processed yet, but the portion of that response that's publicly
11 available will be made public in Adams shortly.

12 KENDRA ULRICH: Okay. Well, we'll be looking for that. I look
13 forward to seeing your analysis of all the various reactor systems that are
14 impacted by this proposal.

15 RICK DANIEL: So, what's your second question, Kendra?

16 KENDRA ULRICH: My second question, well, it specifically relates
17 to the fact that, you know, Edison has asserted here over and over again that
18 they have some degree of certainty about the safety of this proposal of operation
19 at 70 percent, when, in fact, Westinghouse and AREVA, their own experts,
20 disagree as to the cause of the tube wear. Westinghouse says that it's tube pitch
21 and turbulence. AREVA says that it is fluid elastic instability. Intertek and
22 AREVA disagree on the time the tube burst. So, there's no agreement between
23 the experts that Edison has submitted to you for their justification for restarting
24 and restarting for five months. I -- Mr. Broaddus had made a comment that, you
25 know, the CAL could be, you know, completed afterwards. I would assume that

1 having a technical basis for approving a license amendment of this type would be
2 a requirement. So, that -- therefore, that would have to be completed before you
3 could issue a new license amendment, or at least the technical evaluation report
4 would have to be completed. As such, the --

5 RICK DANIEL: Why don't they answer that first, Kendra.

6 KENDRA ULRICH: Okay.

7 RICK DANIEL: Go ahead. Ken?

8 KEN KARWOSKI: The licensee's proposed license amendment
9 request is basically changing the acceptance criteria for the steam generator
10 tubes. It's redefining the power level at which they have to determine what the
11 acceptance limits are. That review can be handled independently of the CAL
12 response, which is how are they demonstrating that they are actually meeting
13 that. The steam generator technical specifications are performance-based. We've
14 specified the acceptance criteria, licensees are responsible for ensuring that they
15 meet those acceptance criteria and those analyses that they perform to do that
16 are subject to the inspection and oversight process. And in this particular case,
17 it's being covered as one of the CAL items.

18 KENDRA ULRICH: Right. So, their justification for why they can
19 demonstrate tube integrity at 70 percent is based upon operational assessments.
20 Is that correct?

21 KEN KARWOSKI: That is correct, yes. But that's --

22 KENDRA ULRICH: Okay. And their operational assessments that
23 they've submitted to you only show that they can demonstrate that. Again,
24 disagreement amongst the expert [spelled phonetically] that they submitted to
25 you, but they've only submitted anything for five months. They are asking for

1 approval for two years. So, essentially, Edison is coming to the NRC and asking
2 you to approve something with no technical basis to actually be able to fall back
3 on. So, if there is an accident, you are liable as the regulators. And quite frankly,
4 any regulator that's worth their name would turn this down on its face. Or, my
5 second question was, are you going to be requiring them to submit an
6 operational assessment that actually gives you a technical basis for approving a
7 license amendment for two years?

8 KEN KARWOSKI: The proposal is to change the acceptance
9 criteria that the steam generator tubes have to meet. Every -- the licensee is
10 required to follow those --

11 KENDRA ULRICH: For two years, right?

12 KEN KARWOSKI: Yes. Their counterproposal is for a cycle 17
13 operation, so it's one cycle --

14 KENDRA ULRICH: Which is what he just said, is two years, right?

15 KEN KARWOSKI: Right. But the licensee is required to meet
16 those acceptance criteria. They have to determine how long they can operate,
17 whether it's five months, four months, six months, they have to make that
18 determination and that's consistent with how every licensee in the country does it
19 for their steam generators. They have to make the determination of how long
20 they can run while still meeting those requirements. Those analyses are subject
21 to the inspection and oversight process and in this particular case we're
22 reviewing those as part of the CAL response.

23 KENDRA ULRICH: Except that their technical experts that they've
24 submitted to you also disagree with one another. So they were asking you to
25 accept something for two years with no technical basis and no agreement

1 amongst their experts.

2 KEN KARWOSKI: The return to power report that's being reviewed
3 under a separate process -- our review is still ongoing and we'll make a
4 determination -- and that's -- in their current proposal.

5 KENDRA ULRICH: And that will be completed prior to a license
6 amendment being issued.

7 KEN KARWOSKI: I -- those are two independent processes. If
8 they can --

9 KENDRA ULRICH: So, your technical evaluation for justifying
10 restart, for allowing them to restart these reactors, the basis for 70 percent
11 integrity, tube integrity, is separate from approving a license amendment to make
12 a footnote at the bottom of the tube integrity technical specification?

13 KEN KARWOSKI: Yes, because the current proposal is just to
14 change the acceptance criteria, which the tubes are required to meet. That is a
15 separate review from how do they go about meeting them. So, it's two separate
16 reviews, and so --

17 KENDRA ULRICH: So, you're literally taking safety out of the
18 question.

19 RICK DANIEL: Kendra, why don't you let them answer while we
20 hang on.

21 KEN KARWOSKI: The safety is being addressed as a result of our
22 review and the return to power recorded in response to the confirmatory action
23 letter, so, the answer is no. We are focused on safety, but they're two separate
24 processes, the acceptance criteria for the tubes is in the license amendment
25 request and the safe -- how you go about meeting that acceptance criteria is part

1 of the CAL response.

2 RICK DANIEL: Michele?

3 MICHELE EVANS: Yeah, to clarify, this license amendment
4 doesn't give them -- this is not the only thing they need to restart the unit. So, we
5 need license amendment, you know, ideally, if things line up right, you'd have a
6 license amendment. We would get through and finish our review of the
7 confirmatory action letter submittal to restart, which only -- where a proposal is to
8 run for five months. At the end of an inspection report, that still has to be -- we
9 still need an exit meeting and a report, so the close-out inspections that have
10 been going on for the past six months or so, okay? So those things all need to
11 come together, at which point, if they do and they line up, we would authorize
12 restart for five months. So, that five month cycle.

13 RICK DANIEL: Not two years.

14 MICHELE EVANS: Not two years.

15 KENDRA ULRICH: Except they're asking you for a no significant
16 hazard consideration for restarting a reactor --

17 DOUG BROADDUS: Now what they're asking in no significant
18 hazard -- what they provided for their proposed no significant hazards
19 consideration determination is on the change to the tech spec --

20 KENDRA ULRICH: But on tube integrity, right?

21 DOUG BROADDUS: On the performance criteria for the tube
22 integrity.

23 KENDRA ULRICH: Yeah. I understand that wholly, and Michele, I
24 just want to make clear I understood that, as well, that approving a license
25 amendment isn't approving restart. It's removing a critical licensing question

1 from this process and approving a no significant hazard consideration with so
2 much uncertainty. I can't imagine that any engineer also worth their name and
3 their professional reputation, would approve such a thing. Thank you.

4 RICK DANIEL: All right. Thank you, Kendra. Operator, we're
5 going to take another question from someone on the phone, and do we have
6 someone lined up, please?

7 OPERATOR: Certainly. The next question will come from Linda
8 Adams. Your line is open.

9 RICK DANIEL: Hi Linda. Go ahead, what's your question?

10 LINDA ADAMS: Good afternoon. My name is Linda Adams,
11 former secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency. I also
12 served as the legislative secretary to Governor Gray Davis during the California
13 electricity crisis. In that capacity, I was responsible for negotiating emergency
14 legislation that allows the state to take over the purchase of power in order to
15 keep the lights on in our state. As a longtime advocate for environmental
16 protection, it's critically important that we have a safe and reliable supply of
17 power generation in California. One of the key questions that must be addressed
18 with regard to the restart of SONGS, is what is the impact from a power delivery
19 and reliability perspective should SONGS not restart. More importantly is the
20 question of operational safety of the unit, including whether the best available
21 technology is being used to ensure the safety. And finally, the NRC has been
22 reviewing data from Edison for several months now, and the question is whether
23 the NRC has the resources, and more importantly, the information needed to
24 evaluate the data and make a decision prior to the beginning of California's peak
25 period. I believe strongly we need to ensure reliability of our electricity service in

1 California, but not at the expense of public safety. And I know a lot of these
2 questions have been discussed over the course of this meeting, and I know that
3 NRC may not be able to immediately answer these questions, but I think these
4 are the questions that need to be addressed prior to any decision being made.
5 And, so thank you. That concludes my statement.

6 RICK DANIEL: Thank you very much, Linda.

7 DOUG BROADDUS: So, to answer your question, do we have all
8 the information that we need in order to be able to make a decision in time for the
9 -- what I understood -- the critical time for power, I guess, the peak summertime
10 period, I think is what you said. From the standpoint of the CAL actions, we do
11 still have some RAIs as Rich St. Onge mentioned earlier, there are still some
12 additional RAIs responses that are pending. We do need those in order to be
13 able to continue that review. From the standpoint of any license amendment
14 request, we don't have one yet, so we can't -- we can only move forward when
15 we get that, and we'll move forward as quickly as we can. But, again, as we've
16 specified, there are specific timeframes that are, you know, required, and those
17 timeframes for comments and hearing requests and such, will be provided in this
18 process as well. So, we're going to have to -- those are going to be part of that --
19 the timeframe and the schedule for that. So, I can't answer the second half from
20 that perspective, until we have all the information we need.

21 LINDA ADAMS: Correct. Correct. Thank you.

22 RICK DANIEL: [affirmative] All right. Thank you, Linda. A question
23 in the room and we'll get back to you in a minute, operator.

24 ANTHONY CRAWDOW [spelled phonetically]: Anthony Crowdown,
25 just a timeline question. If you want to take it off-line it's easier because you

1 probably addressed it. Just if you go through the steps on from today to potential
2 restart, it's one of the milestones and if you have the schedule online I'll just -- if
3 you'll just walk me through then, I would really appreciate it.

4 DOUG BROADDUS: Okay. Again, I'm not going to necessarily put
5 dates on and -- except for the dates that are specified by regulations or
6 someone, for a first step --

7 ANTHONY CRAWDOW: Easy question compared to your last
8 couple.

9 DOUG BROADDUS: [laughs] Sure. Our first step is once we
10 receive the license amendment request is to conduct an acceptance review and
11 to review the proposed no significant hazards consideration determination
12 submitted by the licensee. We then take -- if we accept that -- the application, we
13 would then notify the licensee of that, we would then put --

14 ANTHONY CRAWDOW: Does that mean approve or that's a
15 different part?

16 DOUG BROADDUS: No, accept means that it's accepted for our
17 review. Our acceptance review -- the purpose of the acceptance review is to
18 determine whether the request has sufficient information for us to be able to do
19 our review. And, you know, it's kind of a completeness review, you know, is
20 everything there that we need? If it's not, we would then give the licensee an
21 opportunity to supplement that or, if it's something where they're going to have to
22 need significant amount of additional analyses in order for us to be able to do our
23 review, we would not accept it at that point in that case. So, that's our first step
24 in the process is our acceptance review. Once it's accepted, then we would --
25 soon after that, we would issue the notice that would include the -- basically the

1 fact that we received it, what -- as a summary of what that -- of what the request
2 is, our proposed notes, and this is the staff's proposed no significant hazards
3 consideration determination, which may be different than what the licensee
4 submitted to us. I mean, we have to do our own review and make sure --
5 whether we agree with what they provided or whether we think that there's
6 something, some -- a difference in what they provided. So that would be
7 provided and the opportunity for comments on that as well as an opportunity to
8 request a hearing, would all be included in that notice. There would be a 30-day
9 period, a minimum 30-day period for comments and a minimum 60-day period for
10 -- to request a hearing. Okay, once that's -- the 30-day period is complete, we
11 would --

12 ANTHONY CRAWDOW: Do they run parallel or --

13 DOUG BROADDUS: Yes.

14 ANTHONY CRAWDOW: Or that 30/60 day run parallel --

15 DOUG BROADDUS: Parallel. Yeah, they're concurrent.

16 ANTHONY CRAWDOW: And the 30-day starts when you agree to
17 accept --

18 DOUG BROADDUS: It starts on the date of the notice.

19 ANTHONY CRAWDOW: Is that when you accept the application?
20 Or is it the 30-day --

21 DOUG BROADDUS: No, that's the date the notice is published in
22 the Federal -- typically it's published in the Federal Register. All right. So, then
23 once the 30 days is over, then it's however much time we need to complete our
24 review at that point. And the 30 days, you know, for a comment period, we'll be
25 conducting our review during that time period. So, it's not like we wait until the

1 end of the 30 days to start that, no we don't. We -- we're reviewing it from --
2 essentially from day one as soon as we've accepted it, we start reviewing it. And
3 so, however much time we need after that is when we would actually issue the
4 final determination. And it would either be an approval or a denial at that point.

5 ANTHONY CRAWDOW: Is the time of decision approval, is that
6 the approval for restart?

7 DOUG BROADDUS: No. It's -- it would -- what we would do is
8 issue -- THE request -- the question was because there wasn't a mic there --

9 ANTHONY CRAWDOW: I apologize.

10 DOUG BROADDUS: -- I'll restate it. It's okay. The question was is
11 that an approval to restart, no, and that's why -- I wanted to make it clear that
12 there is a distinction between the CAL process that we're following and the
13 amendment process that we would follow. It would only be the issuance of the --
14 of an amendment at that point. If approved, we would issue the amendment.
15 That would also be issued in the Federal -- we would put a notice in the Federal
16 Register at that point and it would specify the date that it's applicable -- the
17 amendment is applicable, and which would typically be immediately after -- upon
18 issuance of that.

19 ANTHONY CRAWDOW: Okay. So, now at that period it's an
20 amendment to run at 70 percent, you know --

21 DOUG BROADDUS: Yeah. And it would -- the approval in a case
22 based upon what they've submitted to us -- I mean, provided to us as a draft at
23 this point, is the issue -- the amendment that would be issued would only be an
24 amendment that changed the tech spec and changed -- and we put those
25 footnotes in place -- that's what would be issued. They would be -- that in

1 essence would restrict them from that point going forward from operating above
2 70 percent. Right now, their license authorizes them to operate up to 100
3 percent. If we approve that amendment and issued it, then they would be
4 restricted from that point on from operating above that 70 percent level. It would
5 not give them any authorization to operate other than any more than what they
6 have right now. And so, through the CAL process, that's not -- we're working
7 right now on whether or not we would provide any -- you know, a determination
8 on whether they should be allowed to restart.

9 ANTHONY CRAWDOW: And when does the decision come out on
10 the CAL process to -- like so that's running parallel to the license amendment --

11 DOUG BROADDUS: Yes.

12 ANTHONY CRAWDOW: -- and like is there a timing that that
13 happens before or after you get a license?

14 DOUG BROADDUS: As I said, it doesn't have to happen -- it could
15 happen before or after. Right now, what we expect is that -- and this is what we
16 put on our website -- is we don't expect -- let me take a step back. The next step
17 in that process would be a public meeting that we're planning to have out in the
18 Southern California area, that -- where we would present basically the -- we
19 would have it as an exit meeting on the inspection report itself, the inspection
20 that's being conducted as well as our findings from our technical evaluation of
21 their restart time that they submitted back in October. So, that -- we don't expect
22 to be able to have that meeting until some -- until early May timeframe at this
23 point.

24 ANTHONY CRAWDOW: That's the public meet -- the early May
25 timeframe.

1 DOUG BROADDUS: The May timeframe would be a public
2 meeting. At that point, we expect to be essentially done -- well, actually the
3 meeting will not occur until we're essentially done with that review. And so, when
4 that happens, you know, when we have that public meeting, we'll be essentially
5 done. We will give the information about what our findings are, you know, and
6 provide that information. And then we'll -- shortly thereafter we expect to issue
7 the inspection report and the technical evaluation and then the restart decision
8 would be based on those two documents.

9 RICK DANIEL: And there's more information on the website about
10 a lot of this and we can take some more discussion when you have the meeting.
11 Operator, why don't you give us the next caller, please.

12 OPERATOR: Thank you, the next question will come from Tom
13 Gurdziel. The line is now open.

14 RICK DANIEL: Thank you. How you doing, Tom?

15 TOM GURDZIEL: I'm doing real good here. I'm about eight miles
16 away from three operating nuclear reactors up here in New York -- in New York
17 state. I've got three things to make -- three comments to make here. Number
18 one is, if the use of the Unit 3 generator asynchronous condenser which stabilize
19 electric voltage and the grid, has anybody considered doing that? That's number
20 one. Number two, I can't see where we can spend all this time going through this
21 process and that process because the other process isn't quite done yet. So,
22 what I'm suggesting is the NRC do a preemptive action of putting the license at
23 Unit 2 to 65 percent for three months -- for five months, excuse me, with the
24 stipulation that if there's any leaks in those five months, their power goes to zero
25 percent and that's permanent. And the third thing I want to say is I think Unit 3

1 ought to get a zero percent power license change right now. I don't understand
2 what the delay is. So, it's 14 months and where are we? No place. Okay.
3 That's all I got. Thanks, Rick, bye.

4 RICK DANIEL: Thank you, Tom. Operator, how about the next
5 caller?

6 OPERATOR: Thank you. Greg Van Pelt [spelled phonetically],
7 your line is open.

8 Greg Van Pelt: Thank you very much. I'm Greg Van Pelt. I'm from
9 the California ISO. I appreciate the opportunity to ask a question here. I think
10 the question's been asked and answered perhaps a couple times, and not to
11 belabor it, I want to ask a question about a schedule for the process. Clearly, the
12 ISO is interested in safety, and nothing we want to do is to put safety at risk in
13 any way. Our interest is in reliability and, of course, we have to enable planning
14 and we appreciate the previous comments about the need for electric reliability.
15 And so, we're hopeful that a firm schedule can be established for the issues
16 associated with San Onofre as to when it may be available or may not be
17 available. And our interest, again, is in a firm schedule to enable planning
18 without looking to rush or cause any bypass of process or by any means to put
19 safety at risk, but I think it's important to say that we all recognize the need to
20 assure that the reliability planning can be done in a somewhat time-urgent way
21 and we'd like you to take that under that consideration. And with that, I
22 appreciate the opportunity. Thank you.

23 RICK DANIEL: Thank you very much, Greg. Operator, we'll take
24 the next caller, please.

25 OPERATOR: Thank you. Dan Hirsch, you may ask your question.

1 RICK DANIEL: Hi Dan, how you doing?

2 DAN HIRSCH: Miserably, how are you?

3 RICK DANIEL: Better than you, better than you. Go ahead.

4 What's your question or comment?

5 DAN HIRSCH: I'm quite struck by the lack of candor in response to
6 Secretary Adams' question as to whether the process that you are contemplating
7 will permit all of the necessary safety information to be available and be reviewed
8 prior to making a decision.

9 RICK DANIEL: Well, let's take another --

10 DAN HIRSCH: Excuse me. Let me try to finish.

11 RICK DANIEL: Go ahead.

12 DAN HIRSCH: What has not been said here clearly is that what is
13 being proposed by Edison, and apparently with some kind of indication of prior
14 agreement by NRC staff, is to get this license amendment, which is essential for
15 a restart of the crippled reactor, and do so with a safety hearing that would occur
16 after the fact. The phrase that has been used over and over again is that they're
17 requesting a no significant hazards consideration, but you really have not
18 disclosed what that means, is as in the Old West days where the judge says,
19 "We'll hang him now, but we will give him a fair trial later." What you are
20 proposing through this entire session have not been candid about is to permit a
21 hearing but only after it is too late to give them the approval and allow a hearing
22 to occur long after the fact. And this occurs after Edison had screwed up initially
23 on the steam generators, but insisting that they be able to be put in without a
24 hearing, a hearing which could have disclosed the fundamental design problems,
25 and NRC staff having screwed up in allowing that to occur. So, what is going on

1 right now, I think we just have to be really clear about. About 10 days ago there
2 was a oral argument before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board about
3 whether or not what the two of you are doing violates the law and is, in fact, a de
4 facto license amendment process, and that a hearing would be required. And
5 what NRC staff and Edison are doing, after being given a very rough time by the
6 licensing board, which was very skeptical of what you are doing, is you're trying
7 to pull the rug out from under three administrative law judges of the Nuclear
8 Regulatory Commission, carrying out a mandate given to them by the
9 Commission to determine whether what you're doing really does require a
10 hearing. The idea that you could try to get this thing turned on in less than two
11 months from now and hold the hearing long afterwards, I think is simply
12 scandalous. And at least you should be candid about it. You should say, "Yeah,
13 Edison wants us to give them this approval," but make sure that none of the
14 safety concerns that the experts who are not at Edison and not at NRC staff wish
15 to raise before a licensing board could be heard before they get the approval.
16 We really do not have a system of justice in this country that is supposed to hang
17 you first and give you your trial later. But that is what you two entities are doing
18 right now. I don't think you'll succeed. I think you'll do it from the -- in the face of
19 that licensing board that will anger them greatly. I think it will create a furor on
20 the Hill because the Commission has promised the Congress that there would be
21 complete review and that review completed before any decision to start up. But
22 at least you should today have been clear that what you're proposing is to have
23 the review after the approval, the hearing would be permitted and long after it
24 could make any difference. And I just think that you're undercutting any chance
25 of credibility for Edison to be believed that it can run a facility safely or for the

1 NRC staff to be viewed as an entity that can determine whether or not it is safe.
2 So, I just want to say it's exceeding troubling, and if you're going to do it, at least
3 you should be candid about it. To have gone through this whole meeting and not
4 really made clear to people that you're proposing that any safety hearing occur
5 after the fact really shows how embarrassed you are about what you're really
6 doing.

7 RICK DANIEL: All right. All right. Thank you, Dan.

8 DOUG BROADDUS: I'm not sure there's specific questions in
9 there. What I'll try to do is respond to some of the statements that were made in
10 that, first of all, as we've stated in numerous instances previously, and I'll restate
11 again today, that it is -- you know, we will not allow a restart until we're confident
12 that there -- the unit can be operated safely. And that's independent of any
13 license amendment requests or even the ASLB activities, you know, we would
14 not allow them to operate if we did not believe that they were safe to operate,
15 and we will not allow that to occur. And we will take whatever time necessary in
16 order to make that determination. The -- from a standpoint of the license
17 amendment request and any hearing process, we're going to follow the process
18 that's required of us, and we are going to do that, we are going to be in full
19 compliance with that. We're going to follow the normal -- it's our normal process.
20 We are going to do that -- the licensee, the SCE has not asked for an exigent or
21 an emergency amendment request, so, you know, there is no cutting short any
22 timeframes by which people can make, you know, can request a hearing or
23 cutting short the opportunity for public participation because of making
24 emergency or exigent situations, you know, that apply. So we're going to follow
25 that process, the normal process. So that's, I mean, I hope that that response to

1 the --

2 DAN HIRSCH: Not at all. You just weren't candid. Is it not true
3 that what you and Edison are proposing to hold the hearing as to whether this is
4 safe after the fact? Is that not what you're proposing?

5 DOUG BROADDUS: I'm indicating that we're going to follow our
6 process. The regulation --

7 DAN HIRSCH: But the process you are following is to hold the
8 hearing after the decision to approve the license amendment.

9 RICK DANIEL: Okay. All right.

10 DOUG BROADDUS: The regulation --

11 DAN HIRSCH: You're having the trial after the hanging.

12 RICK DANIEL: All right. Hang on a second, Dan. He's trying to
13 respond to you. Doug?

14 DOUG BROADDUS: The right -- the regulation that dictates our
15 review of the no significant hazards consideration specifies that if we, the staff,
16 are able to make a no significant hazards consideration determination, that we
17 are able to proceed with that regardless of whether there is a -- any request for
18 hearing or other pending action within the ASLB, you know, whether it's either
19 before the ASLB. What we do plan to do is make the notification, notifications
20 that are specified in that regulation as well, if there is a hearing request or if the
21 ASLB, you know, the action is still ongoing, we will make another -- our plan is to
22 make a notification prior to that action being completed, any action being
23 completed, whether it's our restart decision under the CAL or in a decision under
24 a license amendment. That -- my understanding of this, and I'm getting outside
25 of my range of full understanding here, but my understanding is that -- so that

1 there's an opportunity for parties, you know, parties of the -- of those actions to
2 be able to make -- to take action as a result of that, that possible action that could
3 be reoccurring. So, that's -- you know, we want to make that notification prior to
4 either of those two decisions being made.

5 DAN HIRSCH: All right.

6 RICK DANIEL: All right. Thank you, Dan. Thank you for your
7 comments and your opinions. We appreciate them. Operator, we'll take the next
8 caller, please.

9 OPERATOR: Certainly, sir. Frank Lopez, your line is open.

10 RICK DANIEL: Go ahead, Frank.

11 FRANK LOPEZ: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Frank
12 Lopez. I'm commenting today on behalf of the Los Angeles Area Chamber of
13 Commerce. The Chamber is the largest business association here in Southern
14 California. We represent the interests of about 1,600 member companies and
15 organizations who collectively employ about 650,000 people. On the call today
16 to make sure that the business community here in L.A. has a voice during this
17 important public review process. The Chamber has participated in multiple public
18 meetings now as part of the NRC's regulatory review of the SONGS restart plan.
19 We're concerned that with the impact of SONGS having on good reliability and
20 energy affordability in the region, and we're really concerned that during the
21 summer we won't have the capacity to deal with the peak demand. Businesses
22 depend on reliable and affordable electricity, and reliable and affordable
23 electricity is going to be hard to come by if SONGS is offline during the summer.
24 We understand that there needs to be a thorough public review of the proposed
25 restart plan to determine if SONGS can be safely restarted, but we believe that

1 what we need right now, in our view, is a reliable and impartial regulatory
2 process. A regional economy cannot afford to have this rigorous, time-tested
3 process that has been built on a foundation of safety and thorough technical
4 review, politicized. The question I have for the NRC today is, what are you doing
5 to ensure that your decision-making process regarding the proposed restart of
6 SONGS is based on sound technical review, and not political influence or special
7 interests?

8 RICK DANIEL: Thank you, Frank.

9 DOUG BROADDUS: Ken, do you want to talk from a technical
10 standpoint? How we're ensuring the review is technically justified.

11 KEN KARWOSKI: Yeah, I guess just from a technical perspective,
12 you know, we've gotten the return to power report and we've been reviewing that
13 for several months. And we've identified a number of issues and we've provided
14 RAIs so that the licensees provide some -- most of the responses. We're still
15 waiting on some of those. But our review is independent of any external
16 influence. We're engineers. We take a look at those submittals and we review
17 them and we make recommendations to our management on the acceptability of
18 those reviews.

19 RICK DANIEL: Okay. So the NRC is just following the process
20 that's mapped out for them, correct?

21 DOUG BROADDUS: Yes. And, I mean, our process for making
22 decisions is very well laid out and very well established throughout. It has been
23 established and, you know, for years. It's not a new process, we're not changing
24 our process in this particular situation, you know. And, you know, if there's a
25 desire to influence our decision, as an independent regulator, we're going to do

1 our best to ensure that that does not -- that there is no influence on our decision.
2 You know, it's why we have our technical experts, we have people here that have
3 been doing this for a long time, and we rely upon them to provide to us the best
4 advice and their review of the technical issues. And that's who we rely upon to
5 provide us the basis for our decision making.

6 RICK DANIEL: Okay. All right. Thank you, Doug. Thank you, Mr.
7 Lopez. Operator, we'll take the next call, please.

8 OPERATOR: Mike Tyner [spelled phonetically], you may ask your
9 question.

10 MIKE TYNER: Yes. I'm a representative of the building
11 construction trades department at the AFL-CIO. I understand that the NRC has
12 conducted a series of public meetings on San Onofre and I wonder if the staff
13 could outline the NRC's public meetings and hearings on SONGS since it's
14 January 31, 2012, shutdown.

15 RICK DANIEL: You know, Frank, I mean --

16 MIKE TYNER: Mike.

17 RICK DANIEL: I'm sorry, Mike. I'm still on the last caller. You
18 know, Mike, that information is readily available on the NRC website and it's all
19 mapped out for you there by date and everything. So, I'd prefer for right now that
20 we don't spend time on that. It is very much available to you if you go in and look
21 at the public meetings under the NRC website. It talks about SONGS and all the
22 dates and the meetings are laid out there and what the meeting was about, and
23 so on. And there's even public -- there's even transcripts available for each
24 meeting, okay? Does that answer your question?

25 MIKE TYNER: It does. Thank you very much.

1 RICK DANIEL: Yes, sir.

2 DOUG BROADDUS: And just for everybody's information, I think,
3 you know, it's about 10 meetings that we've done total, you know, but, again, all
4 that information is -- we're making all that information available on our website,
5 as, you know, we will in this case -- we'll make the final set of slides that SCE
6 provided to us, we'll make those available on the website. And when we receive
7 license amendment requests, I expect we'll put that on there, as well. The --
8 we've put out the draft version of that is there. So, what we're trying to do is
9 making sure that, you know, all the information we have -- the information that
10 can be made publicly available, as long as, you know, that would exclude
11 proprietary information, obviously. But, all that information that's, you know, is
12 readily available on that website.

13 RICK DANIEL: All right. Thank you, Mike. Operator, we'll take the
14 next caller, please?

15 OPERATOR: The next question is from Opti Ahmed [spelled
16 phonetically], your line is open.

17 RICK DANIEL: Hi, Mr. Ahmed. Go ahead, we're listening to you.

18 OPTI AHMED: Thank you very much and good morning. I'm a
19 small business owner in the service area and I wanted to acknowledge your firm.
20 Now, what is critical for me and for my employees is, (a) reliability and safety,
21 and more importantly also, affordability. What is NRC going to do to protect my
22 business? Because at the end of the day if there's no electricity, especially
23 during the peak period, then I will not be able to be in business. If I'm not in
24 business, then I will not have employees that I can support. So, what are the
25 complete plans for NRC to actually address this prior to the peak period? Thank

1 you very much.

2 RICK DANIEL: Thank you.

3 DOUG BROADDUS: That's -- I mean, I think we understand the
4 desire to ensure that there is reliable power and is affordable available. Our
5 primary responsibility is safety. So, we have to make sure that before any restart
6 can be authorized that the plant can be safely operated. And I do want to make,
7 you know, just try providing some type of reassurance that we are -- this is, you
8 know, a high priority action for the agency. We are taking -- you know, we are
9 doing this -- we have dedicated teams for this that are working on this, you know,
10 and so this is something that we are focusing on and we're not taking, you know,
11 we're not putting this on the backburner and just taking our time on it. We're
12 trying to do this as expeditiously as we can.

13 RICK DANIEL: And there's a lot of interest on all sides.

14 DOUG BROADDUS: Yeah.

15 RICK DANIEL: Thank you, Doug. Operator, we'll take the next
16 caller, please.

17 OPERATOR: The next one is from Betty Jo Toccoli.

18 RICK DANIEL: Hi, Betty Jo.

19 BETTY JO TOCCOLI: Good afternoon, or I guess it's afternoon
20 there and morning here. I represent the California Small Business Association
21 and we have over 200,000 small business owners. And I think you partially
22 answered my question on reliability. We certainly understand that safety needs
23 to be and we think you're doing a great job, both you and Edison. We don't have
24 any concerns about either party not being concerned about safety, but reliability
25 is our issue several have addressed, and so here's my question. Even if you

1 started SONGS and something went wrong, is there any reason you couldn't
2 shut it down again?

3 DOUG BROADDUS: If your question is whether we have the ability
4 to require them to shut down once they've started up, and yes, we do. We have,
5 you know, we can issue an order to the licensee to, you know, if there's a safety
6 issue to require them to shut down. We have a resident inspector that's there all
7 the time. You know, resident inspectors are there monitoring their day-to-day
8 activities and that person is there specifically to look at the, you know, the
9 ongoing safety in the operation of the plant.

10 MICHELE EVANS: Yeah, I was just going to add the licensee is
11 required to follow their technical specifications. So, if there is additional issues
12 related to the steam generators they would become aware of that and be
13 required to shut down the plant at various parameters.

14 BETTY JO TOCCOLI: Well, we would just like to encourage you to
15 take care of us over these hot summer months. We were lucky last year, but I
16 don't think we're going to be this year and we're extremely concerned about
17 small businesses staying in business and the jobs they create. And we thank
18 you for all your hard work.

19 RICK DANIEL: Betty Jo, Southern California Edison wants to
20 comment on your question as well.

21 RICHARD ST. ONGE: Well, it's our ultimate responsibility to run
22 the plant safely and we certainly wouldn't want to go into a scheme while we're
23 waiting for the NRC to tell us to follow our tech specs or when it's time to shut
24 down the unit. So, long before the NRC came to that conclusion, we would come
25 to that conclusion.

1 RICK DANIEL: Thank you, gentlemen and ladies. Thank you,
2 Betty Jo. How about take a question from Mr. Freeman here in the audience, Mr.
3 Freeman?

4 S. DAVID FREEMAN: I just wonder if the panel is aware of the fact
5 that the ISO has said publicly that they are not planning on San Onofre running
6 this summer at all. Their plans for the summer, which are quite well publicized
7 and well known to everyone, assume that San Onofre will provide zero power. I
8 am a founding trustee of the ISO. I ran two utilities in California as a CEO, and I
9 was Gray Davis' Senior Advisor during the energy crisis. So, there's nobody
10 more concerned about reliability than I am. But the State of California is not one
11 power plant away from a blackout anymore, that was 10 years ago. The ISO has
12 worked diligently last year and this year to make sure that there's adequate
13 power supply, and that reliability is a responsibility of the State of California, not
14 the responsibility of the NRC and you all know it. And that issue should have no
15 bearing on your decision. I'm sure it doesn't, and it should not have any bearing
16 on the Edison Company's decision making either. We have a serious safety
17 problem that has not been fixed at this power plant, and all this paperwork is not
18 assuring anybody that a restart is in the public interest. And all this hyped up
19 concern by the Edison Company's PR department really should be ignored by
20 you today because it's irrelevant to your decision.

21 RICK DANIEL: All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Freeman. Any
22 comments?

23 MICHELE EVANS: Well, no, I would just thank you for that
24 information. As Doug had indicated, our focus is on safety and the safe
25 operation of the unit. We won't authorize restart until we believe it is safe to do

1 so. With regard to California's power situation, that is not our concern.

2 RICK DANIEL: Thank you, Michele. Operator, we'll take the next
3 question.

4 OPERATOR: Thank you. The next question is from Arnold
5 Packard.

6 RICK DANIEL: Okay, go ahead, Arnold.

7 RON PACKARD: It's Ron, Ron Packard.

8 RICK DANIEL: Ronald, I'm sorry. Ronald, go ahead.

9 RON PACKARD: Let me introduce myself. I'm Ron Packard. I
10 had the honor and privilege of serving in the United States House of
11 Representatives for 18 years in the 43rd and later the 48th Congressional
12 Districts in California. During the last part of my service, I was chairman of the
13 House Appropriation Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, which
14 has jurisdiction over all generating plants in the United States, including nuclear
15 plants. My congressional district covered North San Diego County, South
16 Orange County, and Western Riverside County. The San Onofre nuclear
17 generating station, SONGS, was in the geographic heart of my district. I officially
18 visited SONGS frequently during my tenure in congress and each time reviewed
19 carefully the operation and maintenance of the plant. I always felt convinced that
20 safety was the priority of San Onofre and knew that the owners and operators of
21 the plant were operating and maintaining the plant properly. My energy and
22 water subcommittee funded research and development on alternative sources of
23 energy, but these sources of energy will only fill a small percentage of our
24 national as well as our regional energy needs. While I totally support alternative
25 energy production through solar, wind, biomass, geothermal, and all other

1 sources of alternative energy, they can never replace the need for nuclear
2 generation. The NRC would serve the people of California and the Western
3 states best if they would allow San Onofre to reopen before summer when we
4 could be faced with potential brownouts or blackouts. It is incumbent upon the
5 NRC and any other governmental regulatory agency to do the right thing here
6 and complete their work with Edison on this issue in a timely manner. To do
7 otherwise would be to act overly bureaucratic or even adversarial and would
8 directly hurt the day-to-day wellbeing of the very same constituents that I was
9 honored to serve in Congress.

10 RICK DANIEL: Yeah.

11 RON PACKARD: Clearly, there are some stakeholders who want
12 no nuclear power in the United States at all, not just safe nuclear, no commercial
13 nuclear plants whatsoever. These parties are motivated to grind the regulatory
14 process to a halt and it seems to me that the process has already been dragging
15 on and on.

16 RICK DANIEL: Okay.

17 RON PACKARD: That just -- that simply can't happen because we
18 do not want Washington to have an impact negatively on the people of California.

19 RICK DANIEL: We --

20 RON PACKARD: It's already been answered. I was going to ask
21 the question.

22 RICK DANIEL: Sure, go ahead.

23 RON PACKARD: What your process would do and -- what's your
24 process and when do you intend to make the decisions on a safe restart?
25 You've already answered that question, for which I appreciate. I simply would

1 like to know if you are going to be able to meet the timeline and allow the plant to
2 operate during this next summer.

3 RICK DANIEL: Thank you, Mr. Packard. I think the timeline's
4 existing on the website, Michele?

5 MICHELE EVANS: Yeah, thank you for your comments. Yes, we,
6 as I indicated we are completing our safety review in as timely a manner as
7 possible. The licensee does still owe some information in some areas, so we are
8 waiting for that input and we'll continue to move forward. I will say the timeline
9 on the website says, you know, a public meeting in the April/May timeframe.
10 Internally, we've talked about it's really the May/June timeframe. So, we're
11 shooting for the May timeframe, but it could be June, I'll be, you know, honest
12 here. So, that's where we are with it.

13 RON PACKARD: You indicated, and I've listened to your entire
14 presentation today, and it's been very informative, but you've been working on
15 this for the past year and I'm sure you've been reviewing much of the technical
16 data. There's additional technical data that you will need to review between now
17 and the start time. And I assume that you can do that in a manner of time that
18 would allow the amendment to be approved and thus the operation could take
19 place -- the start could take place during the summer months. It's the summer
20 months we're very concerned about. This coming summer we simply cannot
21 afford brownouts or blackouts, and I'm convinced that you'll be able to do the
22 right thing.

23 RICK DANIEL: All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Packard.

24 DOUG BROADDUS: The one thing, if I will commit to everybody
25 that we will do is, you know, as soon as we develop a schedule, you know, for

1 this and for the review of our license amendment. I want you to be assuming that
2 we would receive one, we will get that information up on the website as well so
3 that we can have that as well as the CAL review process, that information
4 available on the website.

5 RICK DANIEL: Thanks, Doug. Operator, we'll take the next caller,
6 please.

7 OPERATOR: Question from Ruben Guerra.

8 RUBEN GUERRA: Hey, this is Ruben Guerra, can you hear me?

9 RICK DANIEL: Yes, we can hear you loud and clear, go ahead.

10 RUBEN GUERRA: Thank you. My name is Ruben Guerra and I'm
11 the Chairman and CEO of the Latin Business Association out of California,
12 representing over 800,000 Latino-run businesses. And, you know, I just -- I've
13 been reading all the remarks today and it's very wowing to me that we've been
14 given all this rhetoric, you know, that the NRC has been listening to all these
15 people talking about SONGS when they really have no experience, they haven't
16 been to SONGS, they just go by what they hear. [unintelligible] was calling
17 people scandalous. You know, unfortunately people that do that are scandalous
18 themselves. You know, there's nobody more that knows about the situation of
19 electricity in California than we do. You know, we experience it every day. Right
20 now our businesses are suffering with rate hikes. We're looking at future rate
21 hikes if SONGS isn't opened soon. And I'm in the renewable energy business.
22 And I would be saying, you know, for me to be here to support SONGS would be
23 against my rules of doing business, but I'm here to support it because it's the
24 right thing to do. Renewable energy will not be sufficient enough. It's going to
25 take another 20 to 30 years to come up to speed on renewable energy. You

1 know, according to the information released by the U.S. Energy Information
2 Administration, costs for energy are beginning to rise in Southern California, you
3 know, the EIA has attributed those difference of SONGS being offline. Operating
4 SONGS directly generates economic activity worth an average of \$2.2 billion per
5 year. You know, in other countries -- this is why our economy suffers. But
6 because there's too much process, there's too much hearing, there's too much
7 rhetoric. We need to get this online and we need to do it now.

8 RICK DANIEL: All right. Thank you very much, Ruben, for your
9 comments. Operator, we'll take the next caller, please.

10 OPERATOR: Next question is from Ace Hoffman.

11 RICK DANIEL: Operator, can you just tell us --

12 ACE HOFFMAN: Thank you for taking my call.

13 RICK DANIEL: -- do you have any clue as to how many callers are
14 left on the line?

15 OPERATOR: Yes, sir. We have about six questions remaining.

16 RICK DANIEL: Okay, we're likely only going to take six more
17 questions. Go ahead, Ace.

18 ACE HOFFMAN: Okay, thank you for taking my call.

19 RICK DANIEL: And we're running over, but go ahead.

20 ACE HOFFMAN: Okay. We -- some of us have been studying San
21 Onofre very, very carefully for many years and we are not hearing a lot of
22 answers to question that we have right now. For example, we didn't hear
23 anything about a multi-tube break in the case of a main seam line break because
24 there are thousands of damaged tubes. We don't know if those tubes are
25 damaged by inward elastic instability, probably not in Unit 2, but flow-induced

1 vibration certainly, and what about fatigue? That hasn't been mentioned at all.
2 These are technical issues that the public would like to see the answers to. We
3 don't want them to be redacted or ignored.

4 DOUG BROADDUS: Yes --

5 ACE HOFFMAN: Is there any chance that we will be getting a full
6 technical description of why San Onofre thinks that they can restart the reactor?
7 And I also want to make a comment about some of the early comments at the
8 beginning, where they said that San Onofre is needed, that was their word
9 "needed," for voltage support and to supply power to Southern California Edison -
10 - to Southern California. But the ISO has made it clear that we have an excess
11 of power without San Onofre even having tried to install thousands of rooftops,
12 solar, demand response, wind generation, and all these things have been
13 ignored for nearly two years now. So, it's time to move on, and perhaps the NRC
14 should stand up, get a spine, and tell San Onofre that they're nowhere near close
15 to restarting. You can't start a broken reactor. Thank you very much.

16 RICK DANIEL: Thank you, Ace.

17 DOUG BROADDUS: Okay, yeah. I just briefly -- we, you know,
18 that the, as I mentioned earlier the CAL actions, the review of the restart plan is a
19 separate activity, and that's really the intent of the meeting today. But I wanted
20 to just reinforce that we are planning to have another public meeting in California,
21 in probably the May timeframe is what we're looking at at this point, where we
22 would be able to discuss the issues, you know, that we have reviewed as part of
23 this the return to service plan and our CAL actions as well as the inspection
24 activities. Ken can kind of give you some background on those, you know, the
25 specific technical questions that you asked about and how those, you know,

1 would be considered.

2 KEN KARWOSKI: Yeah, I guess in terms of you brought up the
3 multiple tube break during the steam line break. The technical specification
4 requirements for San Onofre and for other units are intended to prevent that from
5 occurring. They're supposed to have margins of safety against breakage during
6 a steam line break accident of approximately 1.4. So, the technical specification
7 requirements are intended to prevent that. That is one of the focuses of our
8 review of the return to power report is to ensure that tube integrity would be
9 maintained consistent with those factors of safety and the technical
10 specifications.

11 RICK DANIEL: All right. Thank you, gentlemen. Operator, we'll
12 take the next caller, please.

13 FEMALE SPEAKER: John Geesman.

14 JOHN GEESMAN: This is John Geesman. I was a member of the
15 California Energy Commission during the Davis and Schwarzenegger
16 Administrations. I'm a former board member of the ISO. I have a question for
17 both the NRC and for Edison. Based on information Edison has turned over for
18 the investigation being conducted by the California Public Utilities Commission,
19 even if both Units 2, Unit 3 were working perfectly, there were only 96 hours in
20 2012 when they would've been competitive with the market price for power
21 Southern California. That's a little more than 1 percent of the time. Why are we
22 putting ourselves through so much regulatory pain and suffering for a plant that is
23 not cost effective 99 percent of the time?

24 MICHELE EVANS: Well, thank you for your comments, John.
25 However, as we indicated earlier, for the agency our focus here is on the safety

1 of the units and, you know, making a decision as to whether they're able to be
2 operated safely. With regard to your other comments and reliability and those
3 issues, that's not in the jurisdiction in the NRC.

4 JOHN GEESMAN: What's Edison's explanation?

5 RICHARD ST. ONGE: You know, we're not prepared today to be
6 talking to that. We came here with a group of technical folks, not financial folks,
7 so no comment.

8 RICK DANIEL: All right. Thank you, John. Operator, we'll take the
9 next caller, please.

10 OPERATOR: Ray Lutz.

11 RAY LUTZ: Yes, hello. This is Ray Lutz with Citizens Oversight.
12 And in talking about this no hazards determination, there were some words that I
13 didn't hear from the NRC when this was proposed. And the words are "you've
14 got to be kidding." I mean this is a plant that we know now -- I mean, we should
15 be given an award to SCE for their ability to avoid public meetings and public
16 scrutiny and a full technical review. The defective steam generator design
17 occurred because they worked to avoid a license amendment process, and now
18 we know that they actually didn't make changes to their steam generators after
19 they already knew that they were going to be subject to excessive fluid elastic
20 instability type of dangers. And they didn't do that because they didn't want to
21 have a license amendment process happen. Now, they're coming in with a
22 request to avoid any kind of full technical review of a plant that is already known
23 to be completely defective because of these steam generators. And they want to
24 add a footnote and then say to you guys, "Now we can -- we're going to be, this
25 plant is just like its brand new. It's -- there's nothing wrong with it and there's no

1 hazard at all.” I cannot believe that these words did not come out of your mouth,
2 “you’ve got to be kidding.” To make this request of the NRC and the public
3 review of this situation to come in there, Southern California Edison, and ask for
4 a no hazard determination when we know this plant is a suffering design mistake
5 because of your fault, a \$1 billion mistake that you guys are still sucking money
6 out of the public to fund. Now, if this goes forward and the NRC says this is fine,
7 I mean, I’ve got to ask the NRC, doesn’t this take your breath away for someone
8 to come in and say there’s no hazard at all? Even though the thing was shut
9 down, there’s hundreds of tubes that are plugged, we put in stuff, and we did
10 analysis. We’re talking about fluid elastic instability even though a lot of it has to
11 do with random turbulence.

12 RICK DANIEL: All right.

13 RAY LUTZ: It’s got to take your breath away. I mean I cannot
14 believe that this -- you guys are sitting there talking about process and how
15 you’re following the procedure, but I don’t even know why you’re getting past
16 square one. The answer should be, “No, we’re not going to even look at that
17 stupid thing.”

18 RICK DANIEL: All right. Thank you, Ray. Michele?

19 MICHELE EVANS: Thank you for your input. You know the
20 licensee is following their process and they are looking at a license amendment
21 request, and I know you don’t want to hear that and that is the process and that’s
22 the one we’re following. Along with that we are doing a thorough technical
23 review of the technical issues associated with the steam generators. That’s
24 about all I can say.

25 DOUG BROADDUS: Yeah, the only other thing that I would add to

1 that is that from the standpoint of the no significant hazards consideration, there
2 is specific criteria that are called out in the regulations that we have to review that
3 against. And actually, I'll go ahead and just read those so that everyone can
4 understand what those are. "The consideration has to look at whether the
5 requested change in the amendment involves a significant increase in the
6 probability of consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Number 2:
7 creates a possibility of a new or different kind of an accident from an accident
8 previously evaluated. Number 3 involves a significant reduction in the margin of
9 safety." Those are the criteria that would have to be evaluated and they have to
10 be evaluated based upon the requested change in the amendment. Those are --
11 it is not something that goes beyond what is being requested in the amendment.
12 It is only what is requested in the amendment and does the change result in any
13 of those occurring and that's the criteria that we have to evaluate that against.

14 RICK DANIEL: Any other comments, Ray? All right. Operator,
15 we'll take the next caller, please.

16 OPERATOR: Thank you, Thomas Herring.

17 THOMAS HERRING: Hello, this is Tom Herring; I'm a resident at
18 Mission Viejo, California, and a practicing mechanical engineer and I just wanted
19 to respond to an earlier comment that the NRC has not done a good job with
20 making these meetings public. I've been to all the local public meetings and I'm
21 enjoying this meeting here. And I just wanted to compliment the NRC in being
22 balanced and doing a good job and that's all I had to say.

23 MICHELE EVANS: Thank you.

24 RICK DANIEL: Thank you, Tom. We'll take the next caller,
25 operator.

1 OPERATOR: Hugh Moore.

2 HUGH MOORE: Good morning.

3 RICK DANIEL: Good morning.

4 HUGH MOORE: My name is Hugh Moore; I'm a member of the --
5 treasurer of the San Diego County Green Party, I'm also a past Navy Veteran. I
6 worked as a radiation safety technician in the Navy. And back then, you know,
7 the discussion was always you talk about safety, safety always comes down to a
8 risk-benefit analysis. And when you do a risk-benefit analysis, you determine the
9 amount of risk depending upon the benefits that you get back from whatever
10 you're doing. And with the SONGS plant, the benefit, of course, is energy
11 production. And when it was originally applied for -- when Edison originally
12 applied for its application, it was guaranteed 100 percent power usage from two
13 different plants that would produce power that we would be able to get from it,
14 making the benefit. And with that amount of power, that benefit was accepted as
15 a proper risk. There was enough, you know, benefit to pay for the risk that you
16 were going to receive, I mean, pay for the benefit that your -- enough benefit to
17 pay for the risk that you were going to put the public at. Well, at this point we
18 know that neither power plant is going to work at 100 percent because there are
19 increased significant risks, which the Edison Company is admitting to, saying,
20 "We can't run at 100 percent. We're asking for the amendment to allow us to run
21 at less than 100 percent of only one plant." That being the case the amount of
22 power that they're going to produce never meets the benefit to outweigh the risk.
23 So, yeah, well there is all this regulatory issue going on which I, you know,
24 respect and think we have to do obviously because we have to produce safe
25 power and we can't put the public at any greater risk. But I think the decision has

1 already been made. And I would like the NRC to respond to, how can you say
2 that the risk from running a nuclear power plant when they say they can't run it at
3 full power because of the dangers inherent in the design that they have already
4 made mistakes in, ever outweighs the -- I mean, the benefit ever outweighs the
5 risk and therefore, safety, if it is your primary concern, you can never approve
6 this amendment. So, can you respond to that?

7 RICK DANIEL: Thank you, Mr. Moore.

8 DOUG BROADDUS: I would just indicate that, you know, I
9 reinforce what I said before that as part of the CAL process, we would not allow
10 restart of the unit, either unit, unless we've determined that they are safe to
11 operate. And what I mean by safe to operate is are they able to meet all the
12 criteria, all the requirements that are specified in our regulations, you know, all
13 the requirements in the license, you know, which are all based upon safe
14 operation, a reasonable assurance of safe operation. So, that's, you know, when
15 you talk about do the benefits outweigh the risks, you know, from that
16 perspective we need to make sure that it meets our safety criteria, all the safety
17 criteria in our requirements, and that is what we're going to be doing.

18 HUGH MOORE: Then clearly you're correct. You should be
19 looking at only safety and you are right; therefore, you would have to approve it if
20 it met your criteria. Well, let's remember that your criteria should not be
21 dependent upon the capability of the plant that's left. Your criteria should remain
22 at the same level of what you would do at a new plant. And if it can't operate at
23 100 percent, then it can't meet the criteria.

24 RICK DANIEL: Okay. All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Moore.

25 HUGH MOORE: I appreciate the time, thank you.

1 RICK DANIEL: Yes, sir. Operator, we'll take another caller. You
2 have how many more on the line?

3 OPERATOR: We currently have three standing by. And the next
4 question is from Gary Headrick.

5 MALE SPEAKER: Hi, Gary, go ahead.

6 GARY HEADRICK: Hi, I'm Gary Headrick; representing San
7 Clemente Green, about 2,000 people living in harm's way near it. First off, I think
8 it's important to look at the total picture when we're talking about the processes
9 the NRC is considering. And it certainly must've been a humbling experience
10 when you look back on Fukushima and realize how badly the seismologists and
11 engineers missed the mark in predicting what might happen. And now, you have
12 the opportunity to follow the process, which I've heard a lot about today, but
13 another process the NRC has available is the adjudicated license amendment
14 hearing. And the question to NRC is why not just go with the most safe bet, do a
15 more thorough investigation, and use all of the great minds that are at your
16 disposal to make this determination, especially in the fact that we need to be
17 absolutely certain that if you allow them to restart it that everyone's had a chance
18 to weigh in on that very important process. So, that's a question for NRC. Why
19 not just jump right to the adjudicated license hearing and then I'd like to follow up
20 with a question to Edison.

21 RICK DANIEL: Okay, thank you.

22 DOUG BROADDUS: Again, I think, you know, I appreciate the
23 question there. You know, again, we are going to follow the process, which in
24 this case would, you know, for a -- for any license amendment request would
25 provide an opportunity to request a hearing or an opportunity for a hearing. So,

1 that would be there, you know, and that's going to be provided in accordance
2 with our normal process. So, I mean, I'm not sure what else I can --

3 RICK DANIEL: Well, what you're saying, Doug, is that it's still --

4 GARY HEADRICK: Well, your process, as I understand it, your
5 process could allow for approval of a restart before we get a more thorough
6 hearing that would follow after the fact that Dan Hirsch so aptly put.

7 RICK DANIEL: [affirmative]

8 DOUG BROADDUS: And in that case the regulation will provide
9 that if the staff is able to make a, you know, significant hazards consideration
10 determination that none of those criteria are met, in this case that the -- we could
11 issue an amendment in that case, even if the hearing had been requested. The
12 hearing would still occur, yes, and it would still occur if it was granted by the
13 ASLB. I mean that would be up to them to make that determination as to
14 whether it met all their contention and admissibility criteria from that standpoint.
15 But it could occur, you know, we wouldn't be able to issue it if we were able to
16 make that determination.

17 RICK DANIEL: He had a follow-up question for Edison?

18 GARY HEADRICK: Well, yeah, just to follow up on that a little
19 further. Now, you guys are the ones that got it wrong the first time when they
20 should've had a license and then to avoid this problem to begin with. And if you
21 expect the public to trust your judgment without getting everyone's input on this,
22 then I think you're going to get a lot of resistance and I hope it will change your
23 mind. It's just astounding to me that you would even cooperate with Edison and
24 avoid that adjudicated license amendment hearing. That's -- I just still don't
25 understand it, but I'll go on with the question for Edison, if you don't mind.

1 RICK DANIEL: Sure.

2 GARY HEADRICK: Edison continues to recite the mantra that
3 safety is first, and we know from David Freeman's testimony and other people,
4 experts in the field, that we really do not have a problem meeting our energy
5 needs in the summer regardless of what their friends in the Chamber of
6 Commerce and business communities say. We're going to be fine. And so, what
7 other reason besides profit for Edison is there to rush this decision? Can you
8 please explain why you have to rush this, because it's not for the benefit of
9 Californians?

10 RICHARD ST. ONGE: Gary, again, the folks that are with us today
11 are technical people; I don't have system-planning folks available to me. If you
12 want to get a hold of us outside of this meeting, we can tell you what our
13 forecasts are for the Southern California area. I don't have anybody here that
14 can talk to that right now.

15 RICK DANIEL: All right, thank you, Rich.

16 GARY HEADRICK: Well, thanks for your time and just please be
17 exceptionally safe and err on the side of caution, please.

18 RICK DANIEL: Got it. Thank you very much, Gary. Operator, we'll
19 take the next caller, please.

20 OPERATOR: Ted Quinn, I believe.

21 TED QUINN: Oh, yeah, my name is Ted Quinn; I'm a 30-year-
22 resident of Southern Orange County, and I certainly support the restart of San
23 Onofre, if in fact the NRC review and determination approves that. So, my
24 question goes to a fundamental that both our last speaker addressed and others.
25 It has to do with this no significant hazard determination. I think there's some

1 confusion in this area and I'd like to ask a couple questions. First to the NRC
2 staff, is it uncommon for nuclear facilities to request a no significant hazard
3 determination as part of a license amendment submittal; and second, honestly,
4 what is the purpose of a no significant hazard determination? If you could go
5 over it -- I know you read the text earlier, if you could reinforce it, if you could,
6 please.

7 RANDY HALL: The no significant hazards consideration
8 determination, I think there's a lot -- fair amount of misunderstanding about that.
9 That's a procedural standard to determine whether the staff can make a decision
10 as to whether a license amendment should be or could be issued prior to the
11 conduct of a hearing. I think the process would, as explained, would have the
12 licensee in the proposed amendment request provide their proposed no
13 significant hazards consideration determination, addressing the three criteria that
14 Doug Broaddus mentioned just a few minutes ago. The NRC in turn would
15 review that proposed no significant hazards consideration determination and
16 make its own independent judgment as to whether it agreed with the licensee's
17 analysis or believes that a no significant hazards consideration determination
18 was appropriate, and that would be published as a, again, a proposed
19 determination. The staff would review an amendment, if they found it acceptable;
20 would prepare to issue that amendment, approve it. If there was a request for a
21 hearing in the interim, then the staff would make, potentially, a finding -- a final
22 finding of no significant hazards consideration. So, it's at that point in the
23 process when the staff consciously determines there is no significant hazards
24 consideration in accordance with the criteria to be applied, that there'd be a
25 conscious decision to go forward with the amendment request and hold a hearing

1 after the fact. Once again in accordance with our process, we would notify the
2 Commission itself, the five commissioners, with at least five days' notice prior to
3 issuing that amendment that we had made the final determination and we're
4 proposing to issue the amendment even though a hearing had been requested in
5 that case. So, the Commission would have the discretion at that point to direct
6 the staff otherwise or take some other action, if they so chose. So, that -- did I
7 answer your question or was there a second part to it that I didn't address?

8 TED QUINN: Yes, no, you answered it. I think if I could just clarify
9 what you've stated is independent of what San Onofre submits, the SCE submits,
10 the NRC staff will make an independent determination on whether it's acceptable
11 on the no hazards significant hazards determination or not, right?

12 RANDY HALL: That's correct. And I believe the first part of your
13 question was whether this was uncommon or common. It's required that they
14 make in their application a proposed no significant hazards determination so that
15 part is standard. I would say in a majority of cases, I don't have the statistics, the
16 staff would agree or independently determine that a proposed no significant
17 hazards determination was appropriate for a particular amendment request.
18 There are some cases in which that's not the case, but it is common.

19 TED QUINN: Okay. Thank you for going through that, I appreciate
20 it.

21 RICK DANIEL: All right. Thank you, Mr. Quinn. And operator,
22 we'll take the final caller, please.

23 OPERATOR: And Myla Reson, your line is open.

24 MYLA RESON: I'm here, and thank you very much for taking my
25 call. I'm calling from Los Angeles, which I also consider to be part of the San

1 Onofre nuclear danger zone. Should a serious event happen at San Onofre, I
2 don't think that anyone in Southern California's safe. My question is, in the two
3 years following the events that triggered the ongoing nuclear catastrophe in
4 Fukushima, has the NRC evaluated the ability of Unit 2 to withstand a beyond
5 basis -- beyond-design-basis event, such as a great tsunami or an earthquake of
6 greater magnitude of 7.0? And following on that, because I believe you have not,
7 and you talked about how you would only be evaluating a previously evaluated --
8 I'm sorry -- that you would be making your determination about the no significant
9 hazard consideration based on previously evaluated criteria. Is it my
10 understanding that, in fact, you did not make this previous evaluation of the
11 beyond design basis events and you would not be taking them into
12 consideration?

13 RICK DANIEL: Thank you.

14 MICHELE EVANS: Okay. For the first part of your question --

15 MYLA RESON: I have a follow up.

16 RICK DANIEL: Okay.

17 MICHELE EVANS: Okay, well wait. Let me get the first part.

18 MYLA RESON: Please.

19 MICHELE EVANS: With regard to the events of Fukushima, the
20 agency reviewed the status of our operating reactors at the, you know, not long
21 after the events of Fukushima occurred and determination was made that the
22 plants were safe to continue to operate. Actions have occurred since then,
23 though, to request additional information with regard to seismic, for one. There's
24 flooding, seismic, and several other areas. And the plants have been, you know,
25 grouped and prioritized and we're in a process now where each operating plant is

1 reevaluating their seismic hazards in light of new, current information in the U.S.
2 So, that was the first part. I didn't -- you did ask something else, but I didn't catch
3 what that was.

4 MYLA RESON: So, let me follow up on that. So, given that you're
5 still in the process of reviewing whether or not San Onofre can withstand an
6 earthquake of greater magnitude than 7.0 and run safely or can withstand a
7 potential great tsunami, it is in a tsunami zone. Is it -- there is a possibility that in
8 fact you will allow Edison to restart their damaged nuclear reactor prior to having
9 that full evaluation in place?

10 MICHELE EVANS: Okay. So, yeah --

11 MYLA RESON: Yes.

12 MICHELE EVANS: Yeah, the other view you --

13 MYLA RESON: Are you saying, yes, there is a potential for you to
14 grant that --

15 MICHELE EVANS: Yes, I'm saying --

16 MYLA RESON: -- permit prior to making that evaluation?

17 MICHELE EVANS: I'm saying that the activity's ongoing at all the
18 plants in the country, with regard to Fukushima follow up are not, you know,
19 nothing needs to be resolved at this point prior to the restart decision on -- for
20 SONGS.

21 MYLA RESON: And why is that?

22 MICHELE EVANS: That goes back to the initial thing I said where
23 following the events of Fukushima, the reviews were conducted and the agency
24 determined that all plants at that point, unless there's something specific about a
25 particular plant, were safe to continue to operate.

1 RICK DANIEL: All right. And Doug, you're going to address the no
2 significant hazards question.

3 DOUG BROADDUS: Yeah, I think you asked the question as well
4 as to whether or not those actions are part of the no significant hazards
5 consideration determination, and those are not. What is part of that no significant
6 hazards consideration determination is the change to the license that is being
7 requested. That's what we have to look at is, is the change that is being
8 requested; does that change increase the probability or, you know, significantly
9 increase -- result in a significant increase and the probability of those criteria.
10 So, and again, that does not consider other activities that are ongoing. It's not --
11 you can't -- it doesn't go beyond the amendment request. It has to be focused
12 only on the changes in the amendment request.

13 RICK DANIEL: And just a follow up --

14 MYLA RESON: You know, what I'd like to remind you that
15 Chairman Macfarlane stated, that as a geologist she has "an acute appreciation
16 of the challenge of predicting the earth's behavior, and that since the earth is
17 constantly changing and our recorded knowledge represents roughly one-
18 millionth of the earth's history, there is much we don't know. In light of this, we
19 must be wise in balancing confidence in our engineering prowess with the
20 humble recognition that natural systems have repeatedly demonstrated the ability
21 to confound us." Those are the words of Chairman Macfarlane. I have no
22 confidence that you, you know, that you would restart a damaged nuclear reactor
23 in a tsunami zone riddled with earthquake faults. I'm just appalled by that
24 possibility. I think that the hubris that is demonstrated by your confidence in your
25 determination is just absolutely shocking.

1 RICK DANIEL: All right. Thank you very much, ma'am, for your
2 comments and your questions. We certainly appreciate your opinion. And
3 operator, that will conclude our questions from folks on the phone today. I'm
4 going to ask for closing comments from Southern California Edison, anything you
5 folks like to say in conclusion of the meeting today?

6 RICHARD ST. ONGE: Again, I want to thank the NRC for their
7 time today in providing Edison with a very candid feedback on the proposed
8 license amendment. Doug, I understand you'd like to get a proposed
9 amendment to you as soon as possible so you can continue the work so I'll take
10 that back to the management at Southern California Edison and we'll arrive at a
11 decision as quickly as possible, thank you.

12 RICK DANIEL: NRC?

13 MICHELE EVANS: Yeah. Once again, I just want to thank
14 everyone for their time and everyone's input and opinions, thank you.

15 RICK DANIEL: And that wraps up our meeting, but I'd just like to
16 add a personal note. I've had the privilege, and I'd be remiss if I didn't say
17 something, but I want to thank the NRC for giving me the opportunity to facilitate
18 these meetings over the last year. They've been interesting, they've been
19 challenging, but I'm going to be leaving the NRC here in 30 days, moving on to
20 new horizons, and I certainly want to thank the activists and the non-
21 governmental organizations and all the people I've met for having faith in me
22 running these meetings. And Southern California Edison and the NRC, I know
23 you'll continue to try to do what you're saying you're going to do and I have faith
24 in the process. So, thank you very much. I wish you all a good evening.

25 DOUG BROADDUS: And we really do appreciate, Rick, all the

1 help you've given to us, I mean, you've been an integral part of these meetings
2 and helped us out in getting through them and being a facilitator to help, you
3 know, make things run smoothly and we will certainly miss you. And it'll be hard
4 to find somebody to fill your shoes, but --

5 RICK DANIEL: Well, honestly, it's been my pleasure and I wish the
6 very best to the next person that comes along, thank you.

7 DOUG BROADDUS: Thank you.

8 MALE SPEAKER: Thanks, the meeting is concluded.

9 [Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded]