

Comment Set PM2
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

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

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF SCOPING MEETING

RE: SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION
STEAM GENERATOR REPLACEMENT PROJECT DRAFT EIR

SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA

MAY 12, 2005

REPORTED BY KERSTEN SONG, CSR NO. 12796

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF SCOPING MEETING,
2 commencing at the hour of 7:50 p.m., on Thursday, May 12, 2005,
3 at 100 North Calle Seville, San Clemente, California, before
4 Kersten Song, Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State
5 of California.

6
7

8 I N D E X

9

10 WELCOME TO SCOPING MEETING PAGE

11

12 Karen A. Linehan, Facilitator (Untranscribed)

13
14

15 STAFF PRESENTATION:

16

17 By: Jon Davidson (Untranscribed)

18

19 By: Andrew Barnsdale (Untranscribed)

20
21

22 PUBLIC COMMENTS: 3

23

24 * * *

25

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, MAY 12, 2005

2

3 (WELCOME TO SCOPING MEETING)

4

5 (JON DAVIDSON GIVES PRESENTATION)

6

7 (ANDREW BARNSDALE GIVES PRESENTATION)

8

9 MS. LINEHAN: Okay. So I will go ahead
10 and call the first three speakers. You have three
11 minutes to speak. And we have the podium facing the
12 CPUC as well as the stenographer. But I think with
13 the -- actually, I'm going to turn it a little bit
14 because we have a microphone in this meeting.

15 So the first speaker will be Russell
16 Hoffman, followed by Sharon Hoffman, followed by
17 Peter Cassimatis. I hope I got that right.

18

19 (PUBLIC COMMENTS)

20

21 MR. RUSSELL HOFFMAN: Those of you who
22 are here this afternoon know I don't need a mike.

23 My name is Russell Hoffman, for the
24 record. And I'm looking at page C-37. First of
25 all, they wouldn't answer questions this afternoon,

PM2-1

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 either.

2 On page C-37, it covers the
3 alternatives - photo voltaics. They're considered
4 unsuitable for base load application because they're
5 intermittent. The sun doesn't shine at night.
6 Sometimes it doesn't shine during the day but it
7 doesn't shine at night.

8 Wind turbines. The wind doesn't always
9 blow so they're unsuitable for base load
10 application.

11 Geothermal. Just not enough of it, I
12 guess.

13 Hydroelectric is suitable, but has severe
14 environmental concerns -- severe environmental
15 concerns from hydroelectric. But they're not
16 concerned about severe environmental concerns about
17 nuclear because that's the feds. Right? Too bad
18 the feds don't control the hydroelectric. Then
19 they'd both be in the same boat. Then they could go
20 for the hydroelectric because they'd both be just as
21 dangerous.

22 Biomed. Plants can both be used for
23 base load and peaking applications and fuel cells.
24 Fuel cells are not really a power source.

25 Mr. Barnsdale, I know you're not going to

PM2-1

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 answer this question. But in terms of solar power,
2 I can't seem to find it here, but it said that it
3 would take -- let's see, requires 400 acres for
4 100-megawatt plant. So that would be 4,000 acres
5 for a 1000-megawatt plant. 4,000 acres.

6 Do you have any idea how many acres,
7 Mr. Barnsdale, Death Valley is, just out of
8 curiosity? Do you have any idea how many acres?

9 MS. LINEHAN: He's not going to answer.

10 MR. RUSSELL HOFFMANN: Death Valley is?
11 He doesn't want to answer or he's not allowed to
12 answer.

13 MS. LINEHAN: Is it it's not I q and a.

14 MR. RUSSELL HOFFMAN: Does that mean
15 he's not allowed to answer?

16 MS. LINEHAN: Don't waste your time on --
17 let's hear your comment.

18
19 MR. RUSSELL HOFFMAN: It's about 3 and a
20 half million acres.

21 So I think there's plenty of room for
22 photo voltaics. And all the other excuses, I mean
23 wind power they're going to build 4,000 300
24 megawatts of wind power in Tehachapi Pass alone in
25 the next couple of years.

PM2-1

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 According to your D-EIR. Why can't we
2 just replace San Onofre's power, that's enough to
3 replace San Onofre power and Diablo Canyon and we're
4 not generating -- what is this 250 pounds a day of
5 radioactive waste, or thereabouts?

6 MS. LINEHAN: Ten seconds.

7 MR. RUSSELL HOFFMAN: That entire amount
8 is completely ignored by you, every single day.

9 Why between now and the next hearing
10 there's going to be another couple of tons of it
11 made. But it's not going to be in any of these
12 books.

13 You're not going to talk about it.

14 Thank you.

15 MS. LINEHAN: Next speaker, Sharon
16 Hoffman, followed by Peter Cassimatis, followed by
17 Brittany McKee.

18 MS. SHARON HOFFMAN: My name is Sharon
19 Hoffman. And since we are not getting any questions
20 answered today, but there is some indication that in
21 the follow-up to this, in the mysterious
22 transformation from the draft EIR to the actual EIR,
23 some of these questions will be considered.

24 I would like to make a comment that I
25 think there should be an opportunity to ask questions

PM2-1

PM2-2

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 by the public and get them answered.

2 So that's the -- the first comment I
3 would make.

4 And I would also like to know how it's
5 possible that we're doing these evaluations where we
6 make all kinds of assumptions. We make assumptions
7 that the renewables would have various kinds of
8 impacts. We make general assumptions about other
9 projects that might have a related impact. We make
10 assumptions about the growth of the population, but
11 the single most important assumption in this entire
12 discussion from an environmental standpoint being
13 whether or not San Onofre would continue operating
14 as a result of the steam generator replacement is
15 not under consideration. That sounds like a double
16 standard to me. There are a lot of double standards
17 in the world and that sounded like one.

18 When you discuss the alternatives in
19 terms of transport of the new steam generators and
20 disposal of the old steam generators, why is there
21 no discussion of the real alternatives to not doing
22 this project? If we don't do this project, we don't
23 expose the population to the potential of a
24 radiological problem from removing the steam
25 generators. We don't potentially extend the life of

PM2-2

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 the plant, and we begin to invest that same money,
2 because, after all, the CPUC is looking at this from
3 a financial standpoint. We begin to invest that
4 same money in these renewable solutions which are
5 far better for the environment in the long run. And
6 we begin to stop creating the problem and start
7 solving the problem.

8 And I would very much like to see an EIR
9 that actually addresses the environmental impacts.

10 Thank you.

11 MS. LINEHAN: Thank you.

12 Peter Cassimatis.

13 PETER CASSIMATIS: I did not come very
14 well-prepared to speak tonight, but I just wanted to
15 address a couple of things.

16 I'm a mechanical engineer. The steam
17 generators are worn out. Either we're looking at
18 shutting the entire operation down, which I
19 personally think would be a disaster for the
20 community and really for the area at large, or else
21 we're looking at the best alternatives we can find
22 to replace it.

23 I think the worst situation is, we have
24 to go overseas to buy these steam generators to
25 replace the ones that are here. We have no nuclear

PM2-2

PM2-3

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 power. If we would have started ten, fifteen,
2 twenty years ago, with a concerted effort to put in
3 the safe, reliable, and efficient nuclear plants
4 that are available today, we would have not had the
5 situation we have had in a lot of areas.

6 The attitude that we're going to go into
7 these renewable energy systems is swell. They work
8 great for freeway call boxes. I think solar is
9 great for that. I'm considering building a home up
10 in the mountains, and if I do, I will have solar,
11 because in those cases, where you are away from the
12 lines, it doesn't make sense not to use it.

13 For here, we are based on a nuclear
14 power. We're in an electrical economy. We can't
15 get away from it. If you really believe we can put
16 in photo cells and wind tunnels up to generate the
17 power to make steel for the cars you drove in here
18 tonight in, for the building materials that build
19 these devices, I don't know -- these don't just pop
20 up. These are extremely expensive systems with very
21 low efficiency. We do have an opportunity to
22 replace the steam generators to get San Onofre back
23 up and operating at a reasonable pace. The problems
24 we're facing were political problems, not
25 technological problems. And we really appreciate

PM2-3

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 the CPUC understanding that and moving in that
2 direction.

3 There are people that are concerned with
4 hydroelectric. That's the EPA. There's only so
5 many rivers that you can dam up until you can start
6 creating lots of problems. The 77 tons of nuclear
7 waste we're talking about, that they're worried
8 about putting in Arizona, it's a large hump. It
9 will cover a football field, fifteen-feet thick.
10 Now, we're not talking a mountain. That's a lot of
11 material. And I'd be the first one to admit it, I
12 don't want to carry it out of my backyard. But at
13 the same time, this image of these huge mountains of
14 nuclear waste I think has just gotten everybody
15 upset.

16 MS. LINEHAN: Ten seconds.

17 PETER CASSIMATIS: San Onofre should not
18 be a repository for it, I agree with that a hundred
19 percent. But that is a political problem. The
20 technology for transporting it safely is available.

21 Thanks.

22 MS. LINEHAN: Thank you.

23 Brittany McKee, followed by Lyn Harris
24 Hicks, followed by George Allen.

25 MS. BRITANY McKee: Hi. My name is Brittany

PM2-3

PM2-4

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 McKee, and I just wanted to support the "No Project
2 Alternative," and support investigating cleaner,
3 safer, less expensive choices for replacing the
4 energy that we currently get from San Onofre which
5 is environmentally hazardous and a dangerous target.

6 The Sierra Club commends San Diego
7 Gas & Electric for opposing the extension of the
8 operating life of the remaining San Onofre nuclear
9 generating station reactors and proposing to replace
10 the power they provide San Diego Gas & Electric with
11 sustainable power-generation technology and energy
12 efficiency increases.

13 Furthermore, we encourage the Rocky
14 Mountain Institute as a reputable energy study group
15 to examine San Diego Gas & Electric's proposal in an
16 effort to promote the cause of energy
17 sustainabilities.

18 Thanks.

19 MS. LINEHAN: Thank you.

20 Lyn Harris Hicks.

21 LYN HARRIS HICKS: So little time, so
22 much to say.

23 I must not let this go by, the comment
24 that was made there about the San Diego
25 Gas & Electric, because it looks to me as though

PM2-4

PM2-5

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 anybody working on an EIR may solve it. An owner of
2 20 percent of this installation has determined that
3 it's too expensive to put the cost on its customers
4 and will not participate in the project. And the
5 statement was that it would be a financial morass.
6 And I don't quite understand how that couldn't be at
7 least a secondary impact. But there are so many of
8 them in this EIR that are because of the two factors
9 that have already been expressed from the podium up
10 there, that our government in the State of
11 California has bent its knees to the federal
12 government's dictate that we can't have any
13 concerns. They can't -- no, it isn't they can't
14 have any concerns, we can't regulate radiation
15 matters.

16 And I think that it's important for us to
17 stand up and say that having concerns about hazards
18 that we know are there and that the Homeland
19 Security people have said that nuclear power plants
20 are the most vulnerable targets, that we don't have
21 to address or try to measure the radiation. We can
22 just take it from the standpoint of the effects, the
23 impacts that would take place in any of these
24 scenarios of attack or any of the scenarios of
25 failure of machinery.

PM2-5

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 We have four shut-downs in the end of
2 last year. When those shut down, they do it for a
3 reason. It costs a lot of money to shut it down.
4 They're trying to protect us. And the scientists
5 are telling us that the older they become, the more
6 hazardous they become. We don't have to know how
7 much radiation it gives off by the Nuclear
8 Regulatory Commission. We can do that ourselves.
9 But we have to have it in the EIR the kinds of
10 assessments which will allow the Public Utilities
11 Commission to make a choice. There are choices
12 between San Diego Gas & Electric's renewables, the
13 clean, safe, abundant, and another ten years of
14 nuclear operation there in making the terrible waste
15 and making all of us go into denial.

16 MS. LINEHAN: Time.

17 LYN HARRIS HICKS: Thank you.

18 MS. LINEHAN: Thank you.

19 George Allen followed by Ricardo Nicol.

20 MR. GEORGE ALLEN: My name is George
21 Allen. I'm a San Clemente citizen, and I do work at
22 San Onofre. I've worked there since 1982.

23 The impact of San Onofre on the public,
24 in my opinion -- I take measurements for the Health
25 Physics Department. I use a micrometer. And around

PM2-5

PM2-6

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 the owner-controlled areas, we really have
2 background radiation. So for the public to get more
3 radiation from the plant is low impact.

4 And I am working on the project to
5 restore the spent fuel and make the spent fuel
6 containers strong enough and shield it enough so
7 there's no environmental impact at our site
8 boundary. So to me, they're in a safe -- you know,
9 working there is a safe area to work.

10 But nuclear power has been used safely
11 for the last -- since 1968. Unit I was on line. We
12 did have Three-mile Island, which was the worst
13 nuclear accident in America, and the public was not
14 impacted by dangerous radiation levels. They got
15 about a yearly radiation exposure, natural
16 background radiation, and that was all they had.

17 Okay, we need to replace power since
18 California is growing. We have, economically,
19 choices between coal, natural gas -- Sempra took
20 natural gas, but we don't want to have L&G ports on
21 our coast. We have to get natural gas here somehow.
22 So I believe taking San Onofre, which is the
23 existing site, which has transmission lines already
24 built -- it has generators -- we've replaced our
25 generators, our electrical generators, not

PM2-6

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 necessarily steam generators. And I think PUC has
2 made an economic choice that it is a good, viable
3 choice.

4 There was an article in The Wall Street
5 Journal today talking about the nuclear -- benefits
6 of nuclear power. It's low in CO2 emission. It is
7 clean to our environment. The steam you see at San
8 Onofre is just pure water. It's not radioactive.
9 So anyway, it provides about 20 percent of our power
10 right now. It provides 70 percent in France. The
11 waste right now, we're containing it and storing it
12 on site. France processes it and vitrifies it. So
13 there are other alternatives. It seems like a wise
14 decision to replace generators.

15 Thank you.

16 MS. LINEHAN: Thank you.

17 Ricardo Nicol.

18 RICARDO NICOL: Ricardo Nickel. I'm a
19 resident of San Clemente. I've been here for
20 45-some years.

21 And I was initially against the plant
22 when it was first proposed. The reason was that
23 there were no provisions for removing the nuclear
24 waste and none had been contemplated, or that
25 problem hadn't even been faced.

PM2-6

PM2-7

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 Now, to prolong the danger this plant
2 generates for an additional 20 to 30 years, it is not
3 right. We're talking about things that didn't exist
4 even when it was first built. We are talking about
5 about a level of terrorism that wasn't contemplated
6 in its brutality and cruelty. We're talking about
7 seismic hazards that weren't anticipated. Since
8 then, many offshore seismic faults have been
9 discovered. And the plant was not designed to -- as
10 much as its claimed -- to take care of problems like
11 that. Not just concrete structures they made would
12 be able to withstand it, but the systems that come
13 into the plant would not. The same goes for a
14 terrorist attack.

15 So the economic bottom line, that seems
16 to govern so many of our decisions in these days,
17 whether right or wrong, is not even there, according
18 to the 20 percent partner in this enterprise...
19 doesn't make any sense. So let's look for some
20 alternatives. This is the time.

21 Thank you.

22 MS. LINEHAN: Thank you.

23 Tatiana, we got any more cards? That
24 concludes -- okay, you want to bring it up?

25 This is Dorothy Boberg.

PM2-7

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 DOROTHY BOBERG: I just have two
2 additional things I wanted to ask about. You said
3 that the generators were made offshore. They're
4 made in Japan, I understand. And right now, they're
5 concern -- we're very concerned about the
6 reprocessing of fuel in Iran. I think it's quite
7 interesting that Japan is now making our generators.
8 And I'm wondering whether they're also going to
9 start reprocessing our fuel.

10 There's 20 years of radioactive material
11 on site. I was told by a gentleman that was here
12 this afternoon, in the industry, I assume, that this
13 radioactive material fuel cells does not have the
14 kind of containment that the reactors have. So
15 there would be even more possibility of terrorist
16 destruction of those fuel cells in which much more
17 radioactive material would be released if an
18 airplane were to hit a reactor itself.

19 Thank you.

20 MS. LINEHAN: Thank you. Okay, that
21 concludes the public comment portion of the meeting.
22 And like I said before, the project team will be
23 here. We're here until nine. We have the room
24 until nine. And if you have any questions that went
25 unanswered -- yes?

PM2-8

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 (A discussion off the record is held.)

2 MS. LINEHAN: The project team will
3 answer all technical questions and the questions
4 related to the EIR in the back of the room, near the
5 boards.

6 Thank you for coming.

7 * * *

8

9 STATEMENTS ON THE RECORD

10

11 RUSSELL HOFFMAN: I'm delivering a copy
12 of my new report called "Protecting California -
13 Preserving Our Environment for Future Generations:
14 Why San Onofre Cannot be Part of the Solution."
15 The entire book is a submission for the CPUC D-EIR,
16 A0402026 SCH# 2004101008. And I would like to draw
17 particular attention of the commissioners to the
18 page title: "Wind, Roses and Deadly Plumes," which
19 shows that a nuclear attack on a nuclear power plant
20 would be one of the most devastating events in human
21 history. And there is no way that any law will
22 absolve the CPUC from responsibility if that
23 happens.

24 MS. LYN HARRIS HICKS: Well, I'd like to
25 just go into what we were talking about back there,

PM2-9

PM2-10

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 this matter of the state's rights and the agencies
2 bending their knees to the NRC's claim that they can
3 prevent them from being concerned about the hazards.
4 And I told them -- I said I was watching CSPAN in
5 the middle of the night one night and it was
6 Jessica -- not Jessica. I can't remember his name
7 now, but he's chairman of the committee, the
8 oversight committee, for all the nuclear and all
9 that. And they were concerned about Indian Point
10 because that's right there. And that was -- they
11 felt it was perhaps a hazard to New York/Connecticut
12 both. And so they're asking questions, mainly about
13 that.

14 And they had a top-level NRC person and a
15 top-level FEMA person. And the questions that they
16 were asking, neither one of them really answered.
17 They just kind of skirted around it and avoided.
18 And finally, he was getting red in the face and he
19 said, "I'll ask you one more time...", and I don't
20 know what the question was, but something that had
21 to do with that. And they did it again.

22 And he said, "Do you understand what
23 'oversight' means?" He was taking it as an affront
24 that they were not responsive to the comments. And
25 that's important.

PM2-10

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 And then the Nuclear Regulatory
2 Commission man said, "Well...," he said, "...we're
3 not responsible for that.

4 He said, "What do you mean you're not
5 responsible for that? the safety of people around
6 the nuclear plant?"

7 He said, "That's FEMA's responsibility.
8 We're only responsible for on-site safety."

9 When they get into the corner, that's
10 what they do.

11 And then, of course, the questions turned
12 to her, the woman. And she said, "Well, yes, that's
13 true. But she said we are dependent upon this --
14 the information that we get from the Nuclear
15 Regulatory Commission to enable us to assess these
16 facts. And he almost exploded. It was -- I'm
17 trying to think what his name is. All that comes to
18 my head is Helms, and it wasn't Helms. My
19 computer's slow. It will come out later.

20 So he said, "This is an order. And it
21 carries the weight of the Congress." He makes an
22 order as the chairman of that committee.

23 He said, "You take Indian Point and I
24 want a thorough analysis of the evacuation
25 potential."

PM2-10

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 And he said, "Now, you take this one in
2 Florida..." He took one in Florida, he took one in
3 the Midwest, and then he took San Onofre, and I
4 jumped out of my seat. I said, "Wow, maybe we're
5 going to get someplace now because I've been working
6 with the Environmental Protection Agency people in
7 this state on a permit that they were supposed to
8 study and approve or not approve. And they've
9 waited about a year to try to get that information
10 from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that they
11 needed to make it be any kind of a valid study at
12 all and they never got it.

13 And the reason they waited was because
14 I've talked to people all over that NRC building
15 over back there and I found a young man that said,
16 oh, yes, they're doing something about that right
17 now. That should be out in a month or two. It may
18 have come out -- it may have come out, but it didn't
19 get to the Environmental Protection Agency people in
20 the State of California.

21 And so what they've done is they've
22 invalidated the work of the protective agencies on
23 the state level by this federal-imposing preemption.
24 So I think that's where the real battle will go.
25 And it may come now that they're giving the Federal

PM2-10

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 Energy Management Agency, to protect themselves, the
2 power to decide where the L&G goes and where the
3 different things would go because they just can't go
4 on and on without being challenged. But I don't
5 really want to start in on all that. Anyway, I was
6 explaining to him that they are so powerful that
7 they don't have to accept any governance. They
8 don't have to be accountable financially. They
9 don't have to go through a series of sessions with
10 the Congress to do anything. And lately, the last
11 few years, they've been one step after the other.
12 They're putting some of that waste -- and that's
13 considered very dangerous -- into the regular waste
14 dumps now. And the metal collectors collect it up
15 and they sell it and it's made into things that kids
16 play with...that kind of thing.

17 It's the same point we're in. We were in
18 Iraq after the Gulf War. It started going to so
19 many babies and children in the hospital with
20 leukemia. And it was "depleted," they call it --
21 they always make the term "depleted uranium," like
22 "spent fuel" or "waste," it makes it sound like it's
23 something in the garbage can. And SONGS, isn't that
24 a nice name? Anyway, there are so many of those
25 deceptions.

PM2-10

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 But to make it apply to this, I cannot
2 believe that they could have put out that draft
3 without considering any of the basic issues, most
4 vital issues, by just saying that they are not
5 responsible for that. Because they have the --
6 the material they give that commission will
7 determine what that commission decides. And the
8 commission deserves, and we deserve, the commission
9 to have a very comprehensive -- a very comprehensive
10 analysis of a variety of terrorist scenarios. A
11 variety of accident -- they don't use the word
12 "accidental," by the way. They are "occurrences"
13 and "events," And they've started using the word
14 "upset." And when the EPA man used that in that
15 document, we were sitting there chuckling because
16 we've never heard of that before. So at least
17 you'll be able to cope of any other upset. Oh,
18 dear...

19 But anyway, it's so obvious that if they
20 did consider the basic hazards and if they did have
21 their baseline present time instead of 25 years ago,
22 you can't take 25 years back of information in
23 southern California coast and expect anybody to
24 think it's anything realistic at all. I mean,
25 everybody would know that. But they don't care.

PM2-11

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 Why don't they care? Somebody told me to do it, I
2 think. That's what I think. I think they know. So
3 we'll see whether they make any changes in that.

4 But if they do, then it will be obvious
5 to the commission, I guess, this adding twenty --
6 ten -- I've been saying ten -- ten, twenty, thirty
7 years. If they keep making improvements when things
8 go bad of additional -- and I can never remember
9 the -- mostly I can never remember what they call
10 it, "significant impacts." I mean -- if you say that
11 occupying that precious beach for twenty years is
12 not of significant impact to the people there who
13 are waiting so that they can make it into a part of
14 the state park -- it's in the middle of the state
15 park, not on the beach -- and they tell me at the
16 acquisition department that the state park, you
17 cannot put a dollar value on beachfront property for
18 state park use because it's not -- what is the word
19 they used? It means it's so precious that you
20 can't -- it's not affordable. I mean, they very
21 seldom get any anymore.

22 And so that alone -- yeah, this guy
23 talked about it's cheaper -- and they always say
24 that -- they say that nuclear power costs about half
25 the renewables. And the same thing he said about,

PM2-11

PM2-12

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 oh, there aren't enough renewables out there.

2 San Diego Gas & Electric has said there
3 is, that there's an abundance. That's the word they
4 used, "an abundance." And what has happened is, and
5 this is not something official that they say, but
6 people behind the scene, say that the big ones have
7 for so long not bought it that they encouraged them
8 to bring it in. And now, since the state government
9 has put in these goals, you know, they're really
10 wanting us to make that move toward the renewables.
11 And they've made the 20 percent now, not by 10. And
12 since that happened, it just broke loose. And the
13 one that's the biggest right now is the tidal. It's
14 simple. It's like the solar. And the mechanisms
15 are simple. And the environmental impact from the
16 standpoint is visible -- is very -- is hardly
17 visible at all out there.

18 And it's very productive. It's
19 comparable to what the nuclear claims for its price,
20 about three cents. And that claim, of course, is
21 based on having all the the government subsidies.
22 And the government -- well, the site there is a good
23 example of that. They put in a nominal metal fee
24 for the plant. And one of the men out there said,
25 well, they had some kind of a recircling system. I

PM2-12

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 don't know how it worked, but we got it back. But
2 that's us. We pay it anyway. I mean, we pay for
3 that.

4 But it isn't that simple because it makes
5 it compare with the wind or the solar, or whatever
6 it is, unfavorably, because they don't -- they don't
7 have that kind of a gifting. And San Diego
8 Gas & Electric is going to put up that -- they're
9 starting a program now where, at least the rooftops
10 on big industrial buildings and schools, and put
11 their equipment on it, put their investment there
12 and they own it forever. And they say that now --
13 anything's put in now will pay for itself within ten
14 years, and so then it's all profit.

15 So it isn't a matter of that. What it
16 is...it's a matter of power and control. And this,
17 they found -- they thought of the way they can keep
18 the power and control. When I put it on my house, I
19 got that. That was mine. It's been paying it off
20 and -- although I did have an experience of having
21 to pay it off for four years, stranded investments
22 they call it, for Unit I.

23 And that's, I think, one of the main
24 reasons that San Diego Gas & Electric has both.
25 It's always the financial bottom line. You know

PM2-12

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 that. But there are people in there who are
2 really -- really also have big, high ideas about
3 what they can do for southern California to make it
4 take the lead in the renewables and so forth. So
5 those two went together.

PM2-12

6 But it is the money. It is the money.
7 Because they look at that and they think if we give
8 up 20-percent ownership, then we won't have that
9 indebtedness at the end, which is coming. So I
10 think that's what it was. They're just jumping
11 ship.

PM2-13

12 But what do we do? And that's one of the
13 things I want to ask them. What do we do to
14 persuade the Public Utilities Commission that this
15 is the time to make the jump, not to prop up Edison
16 again with allowing them to put that -- almost a --
17 almost a billion dollars into that old worn-out
18 plant that's going to -- that's going to be the
19 road, the continuous road of money, the financial
20 morass, the sinkhole. That's what Mr. Avery said,
21 "the sinkhole..." I forgot where I was going. How
22 can we -- I remember what it was.

23 In the documents, the "brief," they call
24 them, this proceeding, took charge of the money part
25 of it. And I want to interject something here.

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 Because we've been in this for so long, that we're
2 on their list. All of us are on their list. And we
3 didn't know about the scoping until about a week or
4 two before. It was all right because they gave us
5 the time to do it in writing. And we did a lot of
6 work. We put it in. But they didn't use it.
7 That's the problem.

8 But anyway, to get back to this other...
9 the demands of Edison is that not only the rate
10 payers will immediately start paying higher rates to
11 pay for this before they're getting power from it,
12 when that's ordered, but also the cost of the
13 decommissioning of the old generators. And we've
14 been paying for that since day one because it goes
15 into a fund which is strictly for that purpose.

16 And I think that's part of their vision
17 of seeing what's going to come of the end times.
18 That's a good thing to call it, end times, the end
19 years. We're entering them now, and they see that
20 they're going to have such a -- if they had that
21 much stranded investment for Unit I that we had to
22 pay four years for it, that was just a little one,
23 and these are each 150, they're going to have such
24 stranded investments. I don't know how they're
25 going to do, but they'll manage. They'll get the

PM2-13

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 CPUC to put it in the right place. And those two
2 costs were not -- they're favorite-son type of
3 dealings that enables them to say they have cheap
4 power, you know, because they give them all these
5 benefits.

6 A friend I have who has a big investment
7 and the wind, if a storm came and dashed down
8 several of their wind things, do you think that --
9 do you think the CPUC would let them put it down the
10 waste space? No, they wouldn't. So it's favored
11 treatment. And at the expense of the -- of us,
12 because we have to pay it, you know...but we have to
13 pay anyway. We have to pay it through our taxes or
14 through our rates, one way or another, because
15 they're going to give Edison that favored treatment
16 of their investors, protecting their investors, and
17 at the same time giving them a high return on their
18 money, and guaranteed. They put it right in the
19 legislation, guaranteed a reasonable return on their
20 investment and no other industry in energy has that.
21 Okay?

22 Oh, here's another one I want to put in.
23 It doesn't really have anything to do with the
24 EIR. But when Edison got the legislature to
25 guarantee the bonds, they sold bonds when they were

PM2-13

PM2-14

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 having a problem there. As soon as they got that
2 approval to sell the bonds, they raised their -- I'm
3 not sure if it's the CEO or what his title is -- but
4 the head man doubled his salary to 2 million instead
5 of 1 million a year. And that's not a terribly big
6 salary in these days, but the principle of it was
7 what got me. Because as soon as they got that
8 guarantee on those bonds -- and we're going to have
9 to pay that big return interest on the bonds when we
10 pay for the principal, too. I mean that will go on
11 our rate base, too. So that just kind of got to me,
12 that he can get an extra million a year just because
13 the legislature gave him the --

14 MS. LINEHAN: Five minutes.

15

16 (Proceedings concluded at 9 p.m.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PM2-14

Comment Set PM2, cont.
Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
 :ss
2 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO)

3

4 I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand Reporter
5 of the State of California, do hereby certify:

6 That the foregoing meeting was taken before me at
7 the time and place herein set forth; that said meeting was
8 reported by me in shorthand and transcribed, through
9 computer-aided transcription, under my direction; and that the
10 foregoing is a true record of the proceedings had at said
11 meeting.

12 I further certify that I am a disinterested person
13 and am in no way interested in the outcome of this action or
14 connected with or related to any of the parties in this action
15 or to their respective counsel.

16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed my
17 name.

18

19 Dated: _____

20

21

22

KERSTEN SONG
CSR No. 12796

23

24

25

Responses to Comment Set PM2 Public Workshop, 7:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

PM2-1 In Section C.6 of the Draft EIR, No Project Alternative, it is acknowledged that there is a potential to use alternative energy technologies to supply some of the 2,150 MW of capacity at SONGS. However, alternative energy technologies are unable to constitute the sole replacement generation for base-load facilities such as SONGS due to unique technical feasibility limitations, which are discussed further in Section C.6.1, Replacement Generation Facilities.

The handling and storage of spent fuel at SONGS is part of the baseline environmental conditions. See Draft EIR Section D.12.1, Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project, Spent Fuel Risk Baseline, and Response CC2-1 and CC2-2. The Proposed Project would not cause any significant change to the existing baseline environment related to safety and risk of upset and, thus, would not have any significant impacts. Please refer to Master Response MR-1 (Baseline).

PM2-2 Two Public Meetings were held for the SONGS Steam Generator Replacement Project Draft EIR on May 12, 2005, at the San Clemente Community Center. Each meeting began with a 30-minute workshop and informational open house, in which the public was provided the opportunity to ask the EIR preparers any questions regarding the Proposed Project. During the open house, the EIR preparers answered questions from the public. A formal presentation followed the open house, in which the status of the environmental review process and the findings of the Draft EIR were summarized. Interested parties were then invited to provide verbal public comments regarding the Proposed Project and the Draft EIR. While written comments could also be submitted during the meeting and throughout the public review period, the verbal comment period was offered as a convenience to the public to provide the opportunity for official comments to be made at the public meeting. The public had a second opportunity to ask questions to the EIR preparers following the conclusion of the meeting.

SCE has stated that it currently has no plans to apply to the NRC for renewal of the operating licenses at SONGS. Potential relicensing is in the preliminary feasibility and planning stages and, thus, does not constitute a reasonably foreseeable consequence of the Proposed Project. See Master Response MR-2 (License Renewal).

The No Project Alternative is described in Section C.6 of the EIR. It is acknowledged in Draft EIR Section D.12.5, Environmental Impacts of the No Project Alternative, that the decommissioning of the SONGS facility would have a beneficial effect on public safety. However, under either the Proposed Project or the No Project Alternative, the eventual removal and disposal of the OSGs would be necessary as part of replacement or decommissioning activities. Please see Draft EIR Section D.12.3.4, Original Steam Generator Removal, Staging, and Disposal, for a discussion of public safety impacts.

As discussed in Draft EIR Section A, Introduction, the scope of this EIR focuses on changes to physical conditions affected by the Proposed Project, as defined by CEQA. While the rate-making and cost issues associated with the Proposed Project are a component of the CPUC general proceeding, the economic and social effects of this proposal are considered in the EIR only in the context of whether or not they lead to any physical changes that would result in significant impacts to the environment (CEQA Guidelines §15131).

PM2-3 It is noted that the commenter supports the Proposed Project. The commenter also expresses an opinion regarding the infeasibility of renewable energy technologies replacing the power generated at SONGS, and does not require a response.

It is noted that the commenter does not think that SONGS should be a repository of nuclear waste onsite, but also states that this is a political issue. The Spent fuel storage is an aspect of SONGS operation through the current license periods that occurs in the environmental baseline (as described in Draft EIR Section D.1.2.1), and that would not be changed by the Proposed Project. Please also refer to Master Response MR-1 (Baseline). Also analysis of long-term storage or disposal of radioactive waste is limited by the exclusive regulation of nuclear safety by the federal government (Draft EIR Section D.1.2.5). See also Master response MR-3 (Jurisdiction).

PM2-4 It is noted that the commenter supports the No Project Alternative and the investigation of “cleaner, safer, less expensive choices” for replacement generation. Section C.6 discusses various scenarios under the No Project Alternative for replacement generation for SONGS. These scenarios include natural gas combined cycle power plants; transmission facilities; alternative energy technologies such as solar thermal, photovoltaics, wind turbines, geothermal power, biomass power, fuel cells; and system enhancements including demand-side management and distributed generation. Currently there are no alternative energy technologies available that can reliably replace 2,150 MW of base-load generation capacity prior to the timeframe in which SONGS would be forced to shut down.

Please also refer to Response PM1-2 (last two paragraphs) regarding the commenter’s opinion of SDG&E’s opposition to the Proposed Project and request to the Rocky Mountain Institute.

PM2-5 Issues related to project cost and ratepayer benefit are not addressed under CEQA, as noted in Draft EIR Section A and D.1.2.5. The ratemaking proposal and ratepayer benefit is a focus of the CPUC General Proceeding (A.04-02-026). In the General Proceeding, the CPUC must balance the environmental impacts of the Proposed Project with the economic consequences of cost recovery that would be sponsored by the SCE ratepayers.

Please refer to Master Response MR-3 (Jurisdiction). The comment incorrectly asserts that the CPUC is abdicating their responsibilities regarding radiological hazards and that the NRC is prohibiting the CPUC from presenting concerns about these hazards. As stated in Sections A.4.1 and D.1.2.5 of the Draft EIR, the regulation of SONGS by the CPUC is limited by federal laws and regulations that govern atomic and nuclear energy. See also Master Response MR-3 (Jurisdiction). A power plant that uses radioisotopes in the production of energy is required to comply with the Federal Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. Section 2011). To provide full disclosure, Section D.12 identifies the hazards and risks, including radiological, to the public and the environment in the baseline conditions and caused by the project. Section D.12.1 describes the environmental setting, or baseline safety and risk of upset, and this includes the reactor risk baseline, spent fuel risk baseline, low-level radioactive waste baseline, and information about facility security and terrorism issues. The existing vulnerability of SONGS as a terrorist target and how the Proposed Project would affect that baseline condition is discussed as part of Impact S-5, and the impact to safety caused by a possible terrorist attack as a result of the Proposed Project would be less than significant. Sections D.12.3, D.12.4, and D.12.5 analyzes the safety impacts for the Proposed Project and alternatives.

- PM2-6 It is noted that the commenter supports the Proposed Project. The commenter explains his position at SONGS, provides a brief history of the nuclear industry, states reasons why SONGS should generate power, and presents the benefits of nuclear power. These comments do not require a response. The handling and storage of radioactive materials, and plant safety and risk of radiation exposure are governed by NRC regulations and pre-empted from State-level control. These safety issues are baseline conditions that the Proposed Project would not adversely affect. The CPUC is precluded in any case from regulating in these areas. Please refer to Master Response MR-3 (Jurisdiction) for more information on the NRC's jurisdiction regarding the Proposed Project. In addition, CEQA does not address cost in the evaluation of the Proposed Project or alternatives, as noted in Draft EIR Section A and D.1.2.5. Cost issues are addressed by the CPUC in the General Proceeding (A.04-03-026) for the Proposed Project.
- PM2-7 Ongoing terrorism and safety issues at SONGS are recognized in the Draft EIR, and have been included as part of the baseline conditions of the power plant. Please refer to Section A.4.5, SONGS Security, and Section D.12.1, Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project, Facility Security and Terrorism Issues. Please see also Master Response MR-1 (Baseline). The Proposed Project would not cause any significant change to the existing baseline environment related to safety and risk of upset and, thus, would not have any significant impacts.
- The risk of seismic hazards in the vicinity of the Proposed Project is discussed in detail in Draft EIR Section D.5.1.4, Seismic Hazards.
- Please see Response PM2-2 regarding the consideration of economic effects in the EIR.
- PM2-8 As discussed in Draft EIR Section B.3.1, Fabrication and Delivery of Replacement Steam Generators, the RSGs would be fabricated by Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd., of Japan.
- Ongoing terrorism and safety issues at SONGS are recognized in the Draft EIR, and have been included as part of the baseline conditions at the power plant. Draft EIR Section D.12.1, Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project, summarizes a recent Electric Power Research Institute study, which found that a Boeing 767-400 jet traveling at 350 miles per hour would not penetrate the wall of a spent fuel pool. For further discussion of spent fuel risks and facility security and terrorism issues, please see Draft EIR Section D.12.1. The Proposed Project would not cause any significant change to the existing baseline environment related to facility security and, thus, would not have any significant impacts.
- PM2-9 The Commenter's submission of the paper regarding public safety and terrorism risks at SONGS is noted. For a discussion of potential terrorist threats and safety impacts, please see Draft EIR Section A.4.5, SONGS Security, and Section D.12.1, Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project, Facility Security and Terrorism Issues. The Proposed Project would not cause any significant change to the existing baseline environment related to facility security and, thus, would not have any significant impacts. Please also refer to Master Responses MR-1 (Baseline) and MR-3 (Jurisdiction).
- PM2-10 Please refer to Responses PM1-3 and PM2-5 and Master Response MR-3 (Jurisdiction) regarding the preemption of State regulation by NRC jurisdiction regarding radiological safety issues. The baseline activity of spent fuel storage and handling is described in Section D.12.1 of the Draft EIR, and the Proposed Project would not affect this ongoing activity.

PM2-11 Please see Response PM1-14 regarding the jurisdiction of the CPUC and the NRC, and the consideration of terrorism issues at SONGS. Please also see Master Response MR-3 (Jurisdiction).

For a discussion of the appropriate baseline to be considered under CEQA, please refer to Master Response MR-1 (Baseline).

PM2-12 CEQA does not address cost in the evaluation of the Proposed Project or alternatives, as noted in Draft EIR Sections A.5 and D.1.2.5. Cost issues are addressed by the CPUC in the General Proceeding (A.04-03-026) for the Proposed Project.

The comment presents information on SDG&E's plans for utilization of renewable energy sources and their motivation for this action. This comment does not require a response.

The comment also references the California Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) Program, which was established by Senate Bill 1078 and requires utilities to increase procurement of electricity from renewable energy sources by at least one percent per year, until 20 percent of utility retail sales are procured from renewables. In June 2005, the State's Energy Action Plan and the California Energy Commission's Integrated Energy Policy Report have communicated that the State's goal now includes accelerating the implementation of the RPS so that the 20 percent goal is met seven years earlier (by 2010) than originally proposed. All issues related to the implementation of the RPS Program are addressed in the CPUC proceeding, R.04-04-026, which is a different proceeding than the General Proceeding for the Proposed Project.

The comment suggests use of tidal generators as a replacement generation scenario under the No Project Alternative. The EIR preparers considered this option, but concluded that tidal generation is untested and not a feasible technology, especially on the scale of the 2,150 MW generated at SONGS. The City and County of San Francisco has a tidal energy pilot project. The initial project goal was to create one megawatt of tidal energy, but the project has been scaled back to 150 kW. The cost of building a 1,000 MW system was estimated to be \$600 million.¹ However, the type of tidal generator technology used and site specific characteristics would determine the impacts of the use of tidal power to generate energy. Refer to Responses CC2-1 and CC2-2, which explain why it is infeasible to specify with any greater detail what specific alternative energy sources would be implemented as part of the No Project Alternative.

PM2-13 CEQA does not address cost or ratepayer benefit in the evaluation of the Proposed Project or alternatives, as noted in Draft EIR Section A and D.1.2.5. Issues of cost and ratepayer benefit are addressed by the CPUC in the General Proceeding (A.04-03-026) for the Proposed Project. Please also see Response 19-4 for more information regarding the consideration of economic issues and ratepayer benefit in the General Proceeding.

PM2-14 This commenter provides an opinion on the appropriateness of increasing salaries at SCE just after ratepayers received a rate increase. This comment is not related to the environmental impacts of the Proposed Project and does not require a response.

¹ Llanos, Miguel. 2003. "San Francisco to test tides for energy." MSNBC website. Online at <http://msnbc.msn.com/id/3339905/>. Accessed on June 24, 2005.