

Date / Time

1/14/2019 09:49

Type Comment

Comment Form

Decommissioning Topic

Repurposing of Facilities (Harbor/ Intake Area, Switching Yards/Power Lines, Administration Building, Desalination Facility, Emergency Planning Assets, Turbine Building

Name (Optional)

Fred Bruen

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

SLO County resident

Comment / Suggestion

How about a solar powered de-sal plant. There is a small scale system on site now. Solar technology should expand to the point where it would be feasible to operate using solar power as main source. Run the fresh water product along the access road into Avila and tap in there.

Date / Time

1/14/2019 17:45

Type Comment

Comment Form

Decommissioning Topic

Community Outreach Process

Name (Optional)

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Comment / Suggestion

This website is extremely difficult to navigate! Example: I wanted to compare the views of Alex Karlin and Lauren Brown on the future of the DCDEP. Why isn't there a search box that will use key words to pull up desired information? The only way I was able to find the two documents was by asking a member of the panel for help.

Date / Time

1/15/2019 09:59

Type Comment

Comment Form

Decommissioning Topic

Lands (Use of Lands, Public Access, Cultural Resources, Cleanup Standards)

Name (Optional)

Lina Dovidio Age:8

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

inspire schools

Comment / Suggestion

My Ideas for Diablo Canyon I have ideas for the land. I think the land should become a nature preserve with hiking trails, a children's garden, and maybe a lake or pond for birds. Now I will share my ideas for the buildings. I think we should turn some of the buildings into a natural history museum, a rehabilitation zoo, and a welcoming center. I love nature and think this needs to be seen by the people and not destroyed

Date / Time

2/5/2019 17:42

Type Comment

Email

Decommissioning Topic

Community Outreach Process

Name (Optional)

Jane Swanson

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace

Comment / Suggestion

Please update the PG&E Engagement Panel website regularly. In February when a public meeting date was canceled it was not updated on the website in a timely way, so I went to a non-meeting. I am looking at the online information on the Feb. 22, 23 workshops on waste storage, which states the meetings are 8 am to 5 pm. But a member of the DCDEP tells me the Friday workshop goes until 7 pm and the Saturday probably will end more like 4 pm. I also think it would be appropriate for the public to have access to the agendas for these workshops. Who will be presenting on what topics? Can we be informed of the approximate times of various presentations?

Date / Time

3/1/2019 08:28

Type Comment

Email

Decommissioning Topic

Dry Cask Storage of Spent Fuel

Name (Optional)

Justin Cochran

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

California Energy Commission

Comment / Suggestion

The following email was received on 2/25/19 from Justin Cochran in response to questions asked at the Spent Fuel Workshop on 2/22/19. Good day Thomas.

This email is intended to address some of the questions asked by the Panel.

1) Independent Peer Review Panel (IPRP) - The IPRP is still active and the Energy Commission has two staff (engineering geologist, nuclear advisor) that work on IPRP activities. The IPRP is comprised of technical experts from the Energy Commission, California Geological Survey, California Coastal Commission, California Seismic Safety Commission, and the County of San Luis Obispo.

CPUC web link:

<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.cpuc.ca.gov%2FGeneral.aspx%3Fid%3D11370&data=02%7C01%7CTPJ2%40pge.com%7Cf914a25935a74305340b08d69b354617%7C44ae661aece641aabc967c2c85a08941%7C0%7C0%7C636867050449591816&sdata=MRcOXCQBCQLFWIVMmv0zQW45l6L7c3xTv2BfUECoPU0%3D&reserved=0>

2) Western Governor's Association Waste Isolation Pilot Program Transportation links. Energy Commission webpage:

<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.energy.ca.gov%2Fnuclear%2Fshipments.html&data=02%7C01%7CTPJ2%40pge.com%7Cf914a25935a74305340b08d69b354617%7C44ae661aece641aabc967c2c85a08941%7C0%7C0%7C636867050449591816&sdata=m4Bu0bVp4WIEgNgxOW%2Fol3vXGBm5CmNHQsJMDbBM%2BOQ%3D&reserved=0>. WGA webpage and additional resources:

<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwestgov.org%2Freports%2Fwipp-transportation-safety-program-implementation-guide&data=02%7C01%7CTPJ2%40pge.com%7Cf914a25935a74305340b08d69b354617%7C44ae661aece641aabc967c2c85a08941%7C0%7C0%7C636867050449591816&sdata=yuLbkvFXelHOGdXB6XZcfluMbBZIDXPCTc7FObngzU%3D&reserved=0>.

Also, WGA has a policy resolution that touches on nuclear waste transport:

<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwestgov.org%2Fresolutions%2Fpolicy-resolution-201810-transportation-storage-and-disposal-of-radioactive-waste-radioactive-materials-and-spent-nuclear-fuel&data=02%7C01%7CTPJ2%40pge.com%7Cf914a25935a74305340b08d69b354617%7C44ae661aece641aabc967c2c85a08941%7C0%7C0%7C636867050449591816&sdata=O%2FkoUtKeFMhKOajpBde42rHDIR2Ai5Fgb8AFxM3tv4c%3D&reserved=0>.

3) Western Interstate Energy Board High Level Radioactive Waste Committee webpage:

<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwesternenergyboard.org%2Fhlrwc%2Fwho-what%2F%23&data=02%7C01%7CTPJ2%40pge.com%7Cf914a25935a74305340b08d69b354617%7C44ae661aece641aabc967c2c85a08941%7C0%7C0%7C636867050449591816&sdata=%2FWAdB11GirO6lHYiMJt%2F0vIJQgnRWx8vyS7utY%2BeyLo%3D&reserved=0>

Links to the Committee policy papers on spent nuclear fuel transport:

<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwesternenergyboard.org%2Flibrary%2Fhlrwc%2F&data=02%7C01%7CTPJ2%40pge.com%7Cf914a25935a74305340b08d69b354617%7C44ae661aece641aabc967c2c85a08941%7C0%7C0%7C636867050449601825&sdata=3fc3EN%2FEjkZfwoB9R6OKp8hUL5ql2P%2FEfD17RmD8cll%3D&reserved=0>.

Best,
Justin Cochran

Date / Time

3/3/2019 20:12

Type Comment

Email

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Rochelle Becker, Executive Director

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility

Comment / Suggestion

During the Decommissioning Engagement Panel’s recent workshop on spent nuclear fuel (“SNF”), Kara Woodruff requested a response from the Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility (“A4NR”) to PG&E’s asserted conflict between reducing pre-shutdown inventories of SNF in the Diablo Canyon fuel pools vs. achieving the earliest possible post-shutdown elimination of wet storage of SNF. A4NR believes both objectives are compatible and the expected consequence of the direction from state regulators PG&E has ignored for more than a decade. Beginning with its AB 1632 Report in 2008, the California Energy Commission has urged PG&E to return each of the two fuel pools to its original design capacity of 270 fuel assemblies. In 2014, the California Public Utilities Commission conditioned financial approval of PG&E’s expansion of the ISFSI pads on PG&E filing with its 2017 general rate case “a satisfactory plan to comply with California Energy Commission recommendations regarding the transfer of spent fuel to dry cask storage in its Assembly Bill 1632 Report.” Rather than file such a plan, PG&E agreed in settlement of its 2017 general rate case and in its Joint Proposal to Retire Diablo Canyon to coordinate and collaborate in good faith with the Energy Commission to file an SNF plan as part of its 2018 NDCTP filing. The CPUC directed that this collaborative effort evaluate both pre-shutdown and post-shutdown expedited transfers of SNF to dry casks. At the Engagement Panel’s February 22, 2019 workshop, the Energy Commission’s Executive Director made clear that this collaboration never took place. Determining an optimal dry cask loading schedule is a computationally intensive task, which is why the engagement of the Energy Commission as an objective and transparent forum is indispensable. A4NR has long embraced the guidance offered in 2008 by the NRC Chairman, Gregory Jaczko: “The most clear-cut example of an area where additional safety margins can be gained involves additional efforts to move spent nuclear fuel from pools to dry cask storage.” The Diablo Canyon Independent Safety Committee reached a similar conclusion in 2013, observing also that dry cask loading costs will likely be absorbed by the Federal government. PG&E’s cask vendor began (successfully) licensing a 3-year cask in 2011, announcing an NRC License Amendment Request to accommodate plants that have loaded canisters with predominantly low decay heat fuel assemblies over the years, and have thus substantially depleted the number of cold fuel assemblies remaining in their pool inventory. This LAR has also been prompted by the cataclysmic events at Fukushima Daiichi which indicates that a more rapid movement of used fuel in wet storage to dry storage may be the preferred approach. This high heat-load cask would appear

directly applicable to the constraints PG&E often cites for extended wet storage. It is implausible that its existence has been unknown to PG&E, given the requirement of California's Nuclear Decommissioning Act of 1985 that each triennial update to PG&E's decommissioning cost estimate reflect changes in technology and regulation. Yet PG&E currently relies on a 7-year wet cooling assumption, and was faulted by the CPUC for the unreasonableness of its 10-year assumption in the 2015 NDCTP and its 12-year assumption in the 2012 NDCTP. A4NR is uncertain what significance to attach to statements about the availability of a 2-year cask for Diablo Canyon made by two of the vendors at the Engagement Panel workshop. But in early 2018, the NRC staff recommended approval of a 2-year wet storage period to accommodate the accelerated transfer of high burn-up fuel assemblies from Vermont Yankee's final core offload. Why has PG&E been so slow to adapt? It is widely believed that the company's culture allowed insular decision-making and cognitive bias to inhibit best practices in gas pipeline inspection, vegetation management, and distribution line reclosers and insulation. The sad state of PG&E's SNF policy conforms to this pattern.

Date / Time

3/10/2019 15:48

Type Comment

Comment Form

Decommissioning Topic

Safety

Name (Optional)

Carol Courcy

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

CC4A

Comment / Suggestion

For me the safety for Avila visitors, employees and residents is of PRIMARY IMPORTANCE and involves limiting truck trips for removing radioactive and other materials through Avila to typical times of lowest traffic volume.

Date / Time

3/13/2019

Type Comment

Public Comment at Panel Meeting

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Carole Hisasue

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Mothers for Peace

Comment / Suggestion

10 CAROL: Good evening. Thank you for being here
11 tonight and thank you for this opportunity. We're going
12 to have enormous amount of extremely radioactive nuclear
13 waste by the time both reactors shut down at Diablo
14 Canyon and this is probably the most lethal stuff on the
15 planet, most likely to stay where it is for my lifetime
16 and probably beyond for several generations. This is
17 and will continue to be the biggest problem at San
18 Onofre in Southern California.

19 So why were there so few residents at the
20 decommissioning workshop in late February, or
21 governmental officials or workers? I was very
22 disappointed and distressed to see there were no elected
23 officials in attendance, either. Congressman Carbajal
24 came to deliver a statement about a bill he co-sponsored
25 to move the waste to interim storage and he didn't stay
0098

1 for the workshop, nor did Adam Hill, who accompanied
2 Mr. Carbajal. I wish they had.

3 Not enough people are paying attention and
4 trying to educate themselves, given that we'll be living
5 with this for decades, maybe generations to come. The
6 workshops that were held in late February have been
7 taped so you can watch it online and I urge you to do
8 so. If I sound agitated, well, I am. It's only been
9 days after the eighth anniversary of the Fukushima
10 disaster. Fukushima might never have happened if the
11 community were more engaged, if they had had a citizens'

12 watchdog group making sure TEPCO was doing the right
13 thing. If the locals, the residents and the government
14 were not complacently living with blinders or believing
15 everything the utility told them, ooh, economic
16 benefits, ooh, jobs, and now they're paying for their
17 lack of involvement and engagement big time with their
18 livelihood, their homes and ranches and farms, their
19 children's health, their own health, the nation's and
20 the world's health.

21 If you'd kept up with the flow of new
22 information from Fukushima, you would know that the
23 power plant did have earthquake damage before the
24 tsunami, but it was covered up for the benefit of the
25 nuclear industry. More disturbing, the government
0099

1 issued new data on tsunamis in 2008 and the workers at
2 Fukushima, they did their own analysis and found out
3 that they needed a bigger, better protective wall and
4 they asked their bosses if they could start a plan for
5 better protection, and in the beginning, TEPCO
6 executives said, okay, go ahead, but then abruptly
7 stopped them and they never resumed. The government
8 didn't find out until days before March 11th. The
9 executives claimed they never had any knowledge of the
10 new analysis or the new plans. They're being tried now
11 for criminal negligence, but it's too late for Japan.

12 If something like that were to happen here, who
13 would compensate for the loss of homes? Avila has
14 mighty expensive real estate. What about the farmers
15 and ranchers, the wineries, their land, investment,
16 operation? TEPCO can't compensate all its victims and I
17 seriously doubt that PG&E will be able to, either. We
18 need to be involved and stay involved, both the
19 residents and their elected representatives. We need to
20 keep probing, not taking what the nuclear industry tells
21 us at face value. We need to be skeptics. This waste
22 is going to be toxic for hundreds and thousands of
23 years. We need to learn the facts and make sure PG&E
24 makes the right decisions or, since using radioactive
25 fuel in the first place to boil water I think is a
0100

1 terrible decision, at least the best decisions. We all
2 need to care before it's too late. Thank you.

Date / Time

3/13/2019

Type Comment

Public Comment at Panel Meeting

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Jane Swanson

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Mothers for Peace

Comment / Suggestion

8 MS. SWANSON: Yes. I'm Jane Swanson,
9 spokesperson for San Luis Obispo Mothers For Peace and I
10 1,000 percent endorse every word that Carol just said,
11 very much worth thinking of and it ties into the one
12 topic I want to bring up.

13 At the two days of workshops in February, there
14 were extensive presentations comparing different types
15 of casks and canisters for storing that spent fuel. The
16 information was well-presented and it was valuable. I
17 learned a lot, but the conclusion I drew was that
18 there's no such thing as the perfect canister or the
19 perfect cask. There are issues with all of them related
20 to monitoring, inspections, leaks, corrosion, blah,
21 blah, or how thick the walls of a canister should be.
22 The ones currently used at Diablo are less than a half
23 inch thick; whereas, in Germany and Japan, they are nine
24 inches or more. Lots to think about and debate there.

25 So I'm asking this panel, and especially

0101

1 Pacific Gas and Electric Company, to seriously ponder
2 the concept of hardened on-site storage. At that point,
3 you're quibbling over which kind of canister or cask.
4 You do the best you can, but you don't count on them for
5 your total package of protection.

6 Given that spent fuel is a million times more
7 radioactive when it comes out of the reactor than when
8 it goes into the reactor, it's crucial that this spent
9 fuel be protected from a possible terrorist attack.

10 It's something we cannot rule out in this day and age.

11 Hardened on-site storage requires that the
12 spent fuel be surrounded by earthen berms or concrete or
13 gravel or something to make them less visible to
14 possible attackers and also sheltered from such an
15 attack.

16 Given that there is not presently any long-term
17 underground storage for radioactive waste, given that if
18 eventually a repository even the size of a Yucca
19 Mountain one should open, it will only be able to take a
20 fraction of the radioactive waste that's already stored
21 at various reactors.

22 Given that the proposal for consolidated
23 interim storage is currently merely an idea and it is
24 definitely contrary to federal law because federal law
25 says no fair doing interim storage unless you have a
0102

1 permanent repository already in place, which we don't,
2 we have to assume that the waste will be stored at
3 Diablo Canyon for decades or hundreds of years or more,
4 we don't know, and given that length of storage, it only
5 makes sense to seriously consider hardened on-site
6 storage.

7 It would be most -- much preferable to the
8 current reality with the casks grouped together all
9 nice, neat rows and totally visible from the ground, the
10 ocean or the air. Yes, hardened on-site storage would
11 be an additional expense, but given the possible
12 consequences of a terrorist attack, it seems a very
13 worthwhile investment. Thank you.

Date / Time

3/13/2019

Type Comment

Public Comment at Panel Meeting

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Carolina Van Stone

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Comment / Suggestion

20 MS. VAN STONE: Hi. My name's Carolina Van
21 Stone and I had a question about the little videos. I
22 guess it's from PG&E. I'm trying to understand all of
23 the spent fuel and in the pools and the cask, but when
24 the video was showing how you would load the spent fuel
25 into those square -- the square grid and then it came
0103

1 above and then it -- you take the water out and then it
2 looked like they have pipes. They said that there were
3 pipes going to these canisters loading fuel into those.
4 Did I totally misunderstand that? I mean, I thought,
5 wait a minute, I am sleepy, but I don't think I got it
6 that wrong. So that's a question I have for you, and
7 that video's not on the little thing out in the front,
8 is it, the new three-minute one that you made?

9 MR. JONES: Yeah, it is.

10 MS. VAN STONE: Okay. I should probably watch
11 that again.

12 And then the other thing about seismic safety
13 and the plant being able to withstand earthquake, that's
14 one thing, but he -- Dr. Budnitz was talking about the
15 tsunami. Well, what's to say if we had an earthquake
16 here that we wouldn't have a subsequent tsunami? That's
17 just a consideration that I had.

18 And then the third thing I think that given all
19 of the controversy with the credibility of casks and if
20 they're corrosive or this or that, I agree with if --
21 the hardened on-site storage would be what I would
22 propose as a public person. Thank you.

Date / Time

3/13/2019

Type Comment

Comment submitted at Panel Meeting

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Bill Woodwon

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Comment / Suggestion

1. When and where will security of Diablo spent fuel be discussed by the Panel?
2. What are the specifics of the San Onofre off-loading: time, strategy of hot and cold rods, what kind of casks are they using and can they be transported?
3. Why is \$ an issue since the cost of off-loading is passed on to the consumer?

Date / Time

3/13/2019

Type Comment

Comment submitted at Panel Meeting

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Comment / Suggestion

Given that there is no good solution to deal with all the waste, I and many others think you should shut down now.

Date / Time

3/13/2019 14:14

Type Comment

Comment submitted at Panel Meeting

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Comment / Suggestion

Who will pay for the emergency planning and response necessary while the fuel is in the pool, and when it is sent to dry cask?

Date / Time

3/20/2019 13:54

Type Comment

Comment Form

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Heather Matteson

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Comment / Suggestion

(This comment is offered after watching the March 13th meeting, and also the recent 2 day workshop on spent fuel). COMMENT: I don't think I don't think there has been enough of an effort by the March 13th presenters (Dr. Budnitz and PGE) to explain to the public that the fuel currently being used in the reactors, will be hotter when it comes out of the reactors not simply because it just came out of the reactor. It will be hotter because the current generation of fuel used in nuclear reactors is what is called high-burnup fuel, which by its nature, is intentionally hotter than previous generations of fuel used in the reactors. So it seems to me that what is being missed here, is that a big part of the spent fuel problem, is that PGE plans to operate the plant another 5 to 6 years, utilizing this much hotter, high burnup, fuel. It is the continued use of this high burnup fuel the next 5-6 years, that is a very big contributing factor, to PGE's decision and perceived need to halt offloading fuel from the pools now.

Date / Time

3/22/2019

Type Comment

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Michael Layton, Director

Division of Spent Fuel Management

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Comment / Suggestion

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops. See Workshop Video.

Date / Time

3/22/2019

Type Comment

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Drew Bohan, Executive Director

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

California Energy Commission

Comment / Suggestion

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops. See Workshop Video.

Date / Time

3/22/2019

Type Comment

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Chris Miller

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

ORANO

Comment / Suggestion

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops. See Workshop Video.

Date / Time

3/22/2019

Type Comment

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Dirk Becher

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

GNS

Comment / Suggestion

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops. See Workshop Video.

Date / Time

3/22/2019

Type Comment

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Jearl Strickland

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Holtec

Comment / Suggestion

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops. See Workshop Video.

Date / Time

3/22/2019

Type Comment

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Kevin Kamps

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Beyond Nuclear

Comment / Suggestion

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops. See Workshop Video.

Date / Time

3/23/2019

Type Comment

Public Comment at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Layse & Enzo Johnson

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Comment / Suggestion

<http://cal-span.org/unipage/?site=slo-span&owner=DCDEP&date=2019-02-23>

Date / Time

3/23/2019

Type Comment

Public Comment at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Lindsay Bazet

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Comment / Suggestion

<http://cal-span.org/unipage/?site=slo-span&owner=DCDEP&date=2019-02-23>

Date / Time

3/23/2019

Type Comment

Public Comment at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Carole Hisasue

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Comment / Suggestion

<http://cal-span.org/unipage/?site=slo-span&owner=DCDEP&date=2019-02-23>

Date / Time

3/23/2019

Type Comment

Public Comment at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Jane Swanson

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Mothers for Peace

Comment / Suggestion

<http://cal-span.org/unipage/?site=slo-span&owner=DCDEP&date=2019-02-23>

Date / Time

3/23/2019

Type Comment

Public Comment at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Kevin Kamps

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Beyond Nuclear

Comment / Suggestion

<http://cal-span.org/unipage/?site=slo-span&owner=DCDEP&date=2019-02-23>

Date / Time

3/23/2019

Type Comment

Public Comment at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Klaus Janberg

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Comment / Suggestion

HUHOMS has become inspectable; that's a notable improvement. For the time being a better solution than HOLTEC.

Date / Time

3/23/2019

Type Comment

Public Comment card submitted at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Sherry Lewis

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Mothers for Peace

Comment / Suggestion

As a result of this meeting, I know more about the Diablo Canyon decommissioning process.

Date / Time

3/23/2019

Type Comment

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Klaus Janberg

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Comment / Suggestion

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops. See Workshop Video.

Date / Time

3/23/2019

Type Comment

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Molly Johnson

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Mothers for Peace

Comment / Suggestion

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops. See Workshop Video.

Date / Time

3/23/2019

Type Comment

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Congressman Salud Carbajal

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

United States House of Representatives

Comment / Suggestion

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops. See Workshop Video.

Date / Time

3/23/2019

Type Comment

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Klaus Schumann

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Past Member of SLO Nuclear Waste Management Committee

Comment / Suggestion

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops. See Workshop Video.

Date / Time

3/23/2019

Type Comment

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Fred Frank

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Past Member of SLO Nuclear Waste Management Committee

Comment / Suggestion

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops. See Workshop Video.

Date / Time

3/23/2019

Type Comment

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Donna Gilmore

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

San Onofre Safety

Comment / Suggestion

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops. See Workshop Video.

Date / Time

3/23/2019

Type Comment

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops

Decommissioning Topic

Spent Fuel Storage

Name (Optional)

Torgen Johnson

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

The Samuel Lawrence Foundation

Comment / Suggestion

Presentation at Spent Fuel Workshops. See Workshop Video.

Date / Time

4/25/2019 20:20

Type Comment

Kara Woodruff

Decommissioning Topic

Community Outreach Process

Name (Optional)

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Port San Luis Harbor District Commission

Comment / Suggestion

I made a brief presentation on 4/24/19 to the Port San Luis Harbor District Commission about the Panel activities to date, including publication of the Strategic Vision and how to find it. I also mentioned future meetings and encouraged the participation of the Commission.

Date / Time

6/12/2019

Type Comment

Public Comment at Panel Meeting

Decommissioning Topic

Community Outreach Process

Name (Optional)

David Houghton

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Comment / Suggestion

19 MR. HOUGHTON: Thank you, Chuck. My name is
20 Dave Houghton, and I live in San Luis Obispo.

21 Interesting meeting. I didn't expect to see a
22 lot of PASON at a meeting like this, but I think we're
23 getting some and that's good.

24 So I was at the last meeting where Bob Budniza
25 held forth with what's happening actually with
0076

1 decommissioning and the process and so forth and the
2 technical side of it. And at that meeting, I recall that
3 there was a possibility that the DCISC would continue into
4 decommissioning, and that that may have been a proposal
5 before the PUC, so that's one question I have. Does that
6 having legs? Is that likely to go anywhere? And is that
7 committee likely to continue? Because it seemed like
8 everybody agreed that would be a nice idea.

9 So I am going to roll on with my questions --

10 MR. ANDERS: Our normal process is to not
11 respond during your comments but possibly after.

12 MR. HOUGHTON: Okay. So should I keep asking
13 questions?

14 MR. ANDERS: Yes.

15 MR. HOUGHTON: And then you'll rack them up.
16 Okay.

17 And my next comments and questions are about
18 Alex's proposal.

19 And Alex, I certainly understand the
20 philosophical underpinnings of what you're getting at
21 there, and my question is more about the practical side of

22 it. So are you concerned truly about influence that might
23 be exerted by PG&E or are you concerned more about the
24 perception of the structure of this? And are there
25 specific actions that you think that might or might not be
0077

1 taken by this committee -- and again, remembering that's
2 only advisory, not even advisory, but engagement -- that
3 you could point to that you think might be harmful, that
4 either would or wouldn't be taken?

5 And then my last question was about the cost of
6 this committee has been mentioned a couple of times. And
7 I probably could look this up somewhere. I did try to
8 look up the new website, and all I got was something that
9 told me that my phone was being infected; so whoever
10 that's connected to right now probably need to --

11 So the cost, what is approximately the cost of
12 this and the budget of this committee? I understand it's
13 shouldered by PG&E and currently by shareholders rather
14 than ratepayer funding. It's my understanding it's not in
15 the rate base. And are there per diems for this committee
16 in addition to covering traveling expenses? So those are
17 my questions. Thank you.

Date / Time

6/12/2019

Type Comment

Public Comment at Panel Meeting

Decommissioning Topic

Community Outreach Process

Name (Optional)

David Weisman

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Aliance 4 Nuclear Responsibility

Comment / Suggestion

25 MR. WEISMAN: Good evening, Panel. David
0078

1 Weisman, Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility. And it's
2 not really a question, unless the question is so what are
3 you all doing on June 28th? Okay, there you go. That's
4 the question. And I don't know, maybe this has already
5 been announced and I'm late to the party on this one. But
6 in this very room on the 28th of June -- tell me if I am
7 already -- this has already been out there. Okay. In
8 this room on June 28th will be a public forum or a
9 symposium put on -- I think the host is our senator, Bill
10 Monning. And it will be the introduction or unveiling of
11 the results of the Senate Bill 968 study on the economic
12 ramifications of a post Diablo Canyon economy for this
13 county. And as I understand it, it's 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. on
14 Friday the 28th of June in this room.

15 So having seen that that's item No. 14 here,
16 introduction of next meeting topic, Economic Impacts of
17 Decommissioning, it would seem probably a good thing to be
18 in attendance for that meeting on June 28th. And as I
19 understand it, they are going to have AGP video, and it's
20 going to be taped and recorded as well, and there will be
21 a public comment period. You'll be able to -- I'm
22 assuming we will be getting some kind of press release
23 from the senator's office about this at some point.

24 And then a couple other dates for folks to put
25 on their calendars, not just here tonight but in the

0079

1 county in general, and that would be August 7th and
2 August 8th because those are the dates the judge in this
3 decommissioning hearing has scheduled the public
4 participation hearing for the nuclear decommissioning
5 triennial proceeding at the CPUC. And once again, I think
6 they have reserved this room because of its video and
7 television capacity. So the public might want to put
8 those two dates. I think it's the evening of the 7th and
9 the day of the 8th, if I'm not mistaken. So that's all I
10 have to say is just put those dates on your calendar if
11 the public is looking to have further input and
12 participation in the decommissioning process. Thank you
13 very much.

Date / Time

6/12/2019

Type Comment

Public Comment at Panel Meeting

Decommissioning Topic

Community Outreach Process

Name (Optional)

Jane Swanson

Group Affiliation, if any (Optional)

Comment / Suggestion

17 MS. SWANSON: Yes, Jane Swanson. I am speaking
18 just as an individual, not on behalf of an organization
19 tonight. And this is very brief and very general, but
20 this discussion has been excellent tonight. And everybody
21 has valid points to be made. But the question is how do
22 you bring it together? And I have no wisdom on that, but
23 I just wanted to point out some reflections on the word
24 expert. Some of the -- a fair amount of the discussion
25 was about the availability of experts and the value of
0080

1 experts. And yeah, experts are very valuable, but I want
2 to point out my own personal thoughts that being an expert
3 does not make one right or wise. If you think about what
4 experts do, in my personal vision, what experts -- there
5 is a risk -- I'm not saying all experts do this, but there
6 is a risk for an expert to get a little bit of tunnel
7 vision and not see beyond it.

8 So I was just thinking -- so talking about
9 technical experts that know a lot about nuclear physics,
10 what have they done for the world so far? Well, they
11 brought us atmospheric testing of weapons which has
12 polluted our earth totally. They brought us the bombing
13 of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and some people justify that.
14 I won't argue about that. I'll just say experts did that,
15 and some of those experts had second thoughts about it
16 also. And so I don't mean my comments to be geared only
17 toward nuclear experts, but it's true of anything. City
18 planners, experts in medicine, whatever, it's easy to get
19 into the tunnel of your expertise and not see the broader

20 vision. That's why I come to these meetings because I am
21 not an expert in anything. But like some people on this
22 panel, I've been around for 75 years, so I know a little
23 bit about life and the bigger picture. Thank you.
24 MR. ANDERS: Thank you very much.