

OTC Nuclear Review Committee 4/17/2013 Meeting Minutes

Committee Members	
David Asti	Southern California Edison (SCE)
Melissa Jones	California Energy Commission
Mark Krausse	Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)
Rochelle Becker	Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility (A4NR)
David Barker	San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
Jim Caldwell	Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies
Peter Von Langen	Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
Staff in Attendance	
Shuka Rastegarpour	SWRCB
Marleigh Wood	SWRCB
Rik Rasmussen	SWRCB
Public in Attendance	
Dan Williams	Bechtel Power Corp.
Doug Dismukes	Bechtel Power Corp.
Bryan Cunningham	PG&E
Brian Metz	SCE
Shane Beck	MBC
John Steinbeck	Tenera
Joe Dillon	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries
John Geesman	A4NR
Kathy Jones	PG&E
Eric Wilkins	California Dept. of Fish & Wildlife
Sean Bothwell	California Coastkeeper Alliance

Welcome, Introduction and Updates -

1) SONGS and Diablo Canyon Plant Site visit

Jim Caldwell: General impression of sites-

We are still missing the SCE drawings.

Diablo: Based on impressions from the visit, there do not seem to be any obvious reasons why any of the alternative options would be infeasible for construction. However, the upgraded security system at Diablo will be at least somewhat challenging and/or add cost for the intake screen options. Debris management at the intake structure during storms is already an issue at Diablo and going to finer mesh will make this even more critical. Security requirements at the intake structure which is on the security perimeter will complicate this issue even further.

SONGS: SONGS is planning to upgrade their security system, but I did not get the impression that there would be any significant problem in this regard with feasibility or cost for any of the alternative options. I believe the most sensitive feasibility/cost issue will be land use on the "mesa" east of the freeway with respect to renegotiating the lease from the Navy.

Committee: When the SCE drawings are submitted, the committee can provide comments.

Melissa Jones: Can the Independent Review Panel (IRP) for Diablo Canyon look at the preliminary drawings?

Mark Krausse: We can send it to them and invite them at the next meeting.

2) SACCWIS meeting

David Asti: Attended the most recent SACCWIS meeting and noted that an update on the progress of the RCNFPP was not given.

Dominic Gregorio: We should make sure that both committees are up to date on the status of the work of the other committee.

3) Public comment distribution

Dominic Gregorio: Received a public comment and we need to make sure these are sent to and received by the committee members.

Shuka Rastegarpour: There are several that I've received that I will forward to the committee.

4) Letter submitted by David Asti about the Bechtel Report has been received by the State Water Board

Dominic Gregorio: This sets a bad precedent. Individual committee members should not be individually sending letters to the executive office of the State Water Board or the Board members without it being discussed with the committee internally first. The State Water Board staff will prepare a letter in response to SCE letter.

Public comment-

John Geesman: Edison and PG&E, by their prolonged retention of the Bechtel Report and their efforts to change its content, have compromised the Committee's independence. Edison's attempt to circumvent the Committee process by David Asti's letter created an untenable situation, and it is imperative that the SWRCB staff correct the matter in writing.

Review and approve Meeting Notes –

Minutes- **APPROVED**

2/11/2013 Minutes Action Items follow up –

Note: was discussed during Minute approval process.

Marine Biological Assessment –

Tenera Report: John Steinbeck

Jim Caldwell: I would like the addition of error bars and a table for expected population for SONGS/Diablo

John Steinbeck: Will revise and resubmit.

Dominic Gregorio: Would like to see if the Expert Review Panel convened for Desalination amendment to the Ocean Plan would review this Tenera Report.

Lunch –

Discuss Phase II update from Bechtel and the Committee-

JUOTC Project for PG&E and SCE March 2013:

Bechtel: Intention of the report was to send out in process drawings and update the status of work being done. The cost estimates from the suppliers are delaying the Bechtel effort but Bechtel is making every effort to not have this impact the schedule for issuing the final report..

Items that were changed in the Interim Report at the request of the Utilities prior to sending them to the RC are:

1. Removed modified drawing (portion of Diablo Canyon plant) for security reasons
2. Bechtel also removed two drawings from the report due to security reasons
3. Bechtel also removed a figure from the write-up at the direction of SCE for security reasons
4. Section 10/11 statement of a finding was not supported

Committee: Why was a statement removed without consultation of the committee?

Mark Krausse: PG&E decided to remove a statement that they believed was not fully supported, and did not want in the Report.

Mellissa Jones: If Bechtel removes statements from the Report under the direction of the utilities this compromises the integrity of the process and the independence specifically called for in the Water Board's OTC Policy. It is inappropriate for Bechtel to remove statements or conclusions from their reports at the utilities request without consulting with Review Committee. The Committee clarified that in the future if a utility has a disagreement with findings in Bechtel's Phase II work; they were to bring the issue to the Committee for resolution.

Bechtel: At the request of PG&E Bechtel removed the 1st and 2nd sentences of the third paragraph. The removed sentences read "It has been preliminarily determined that all three technologies pass the criterion 10 assessment. Final documentation of this evaluation is in progress." Additionally, some security information was removed at the request of PG&E. A revised report was provided to PG&E. The revised report with an additional security related redaction was provided to SCE at their request on April 15, 2013.

Bechtel stated that they removed the Criterion 10 statement because it did not influence the findings or independence of the finding in any way. Bechtel has gone to great pains to ensure that our work is not compromised by either Utility.

Marleigh Wood: Statements and/or content should be redacted rather than removed, unless it poses a security issue to do so. Any items that are redacted should include language documenting why the statement or content was redacted.

Committee: Several Committee members raised the on-going issue with reports and material not being provided to Committee members in advance of the Committee meetings as previously agreed. The Committee wanted this issue to be resolved now. The Committee discovered that Bechtel provided materials to the utilities on March 7, 2013, several weeks before they were forwarded to Committee members. On April 15 there was one figure in the write-up for SONGS that SCE requested be removed for security reasons, The Committee expressed that several weeks for a security review was not acceptable, especially since the original agreement at the beginning of the study process was that the utilities would forward materials to the Committee within 1-2 days of receipt of them. The Committee agreed to extend up to 5 business days for utilities to review materials for security issues before forwarding future reports or materials to the Review Committee.

The Committee asked if Bechtel could provide materials directly to the Committee, rather than through the utilities.

Bechtel and Utilities: Responded that this had been discussed at an earlier committee meeting, but , Bechtel was contractually prevented from giving materials to the Committee directly.

Committee: Requested Bechtel and the utilities to look into providing materials directly to the Committee both for timeliness and to ensure independence. The Committee asked to see specific contractual provisions that would prevent this and requested that Bechtel and the utilities reexamine whether the process can be changed going forward, even if it meant changing contract terms.

Bechtel and Utilities: Agreed to look into the issue again and report back to the Committee.

Mark Krausse: will send report to the Diablo Canyon Independent Safety Committee (DCISC) and invite them to the next meeting

Bechtel: The next report is to be submitted at the end of June.

Dominic Gregorio: The committee would like to meet between June and October. The Final Report is due to the Water Board by October 1, 2013.

Bechtel: Our target deadline is to provide the Final Report to the joint-utilities by September 1, 2013.

Dominic Gregorio: Let's keep in mind that there's a separate report that the Review Committee must submit along side the Final Report submitted by Bechtel that reviews what the committee thinks of the Report.

Utilities: will report back on funding that was committed and how much has been spent up to date, and the percent of work done.

Bryan Cunningham: 6 mm wedgewire screen won't do much to reduce entrainment, operability of the smaller screen sized - such as 2 mm- is an issue on how to keep them clean.

Bechtel: Reports show that there is no industry data currently that can be used to accurately predict the probability that these screens would clog. This is why in situ testing is done; to review the effectiveness of the technologies.

Mark Krausse: skepticism on whether it's worthwhile to continue with this technology if in situ testing would show defectiveness.

Dominic & Melissa: We haven't heard anything that convinces us that the option is infeasible.

Jim Caldwell: Need affirmation of the committee to continue cost of evaluating whether the technology is an appropriate alternative.

Bechtel: If the technology were selected in the final report to the Water Board, the in-situ testing would occur after the Final Report submission early in the detailed design phase of the project. If the technology doesn't show feasibility, a different technology will be selected for compliance with the Policy.

Committee: Affirmed that Bechtel should continue evaluating costs of screen technologies.

Committee: We need to investigate California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and the California Coastal Commission (CCC) involvement in the committee.

Shuka Rastegarpour: CCC member Tom Luster is on vacation, but attended several earlier meetings.

Rochelle Becker: Was notified that CPUC member Eric Greene may not be the best person for this committee.

Committee: We need to ensure that a CPUC member is actively participating in the Committee and if the current staff is not the appropriate person, we need to ask for a replacement.

Dominic Gregorio: Will forward request to Tom Howard, Executive Director of the State Water Board and Melissa Jones will forward the request to Rob Oglesby, Executive Director of the Energy Commission.

Public Comments-

None.

Next Meeting-

Group: 2nd week of July.

Adjourn.