MR. ANDERS: Welcome, panel members. And I would like to welcome all the public and also the people who are watching live streaming. This is the fifth meeting of the Diablo Canyon Decommissioning Engagement Panel, and the topic for tonight is facility repurposing.

Before we begin, we'd like to take a moment to discuss some safety items. So Adam, could you give us a briefing, please.

MR. PASION: All right. Good evening. Would those with preassigned safety roles, please raise your hands. Thank you.

So this evening, in the event, of an earthquake, we're just going to get down low, duck and cover as best as you can. The exits are to the rear of the room here, so you will go out those doors, to the left. You will be in the lobby and you can exit left or right to Monterey or Higuera. And there's another exit right here to the left of the dais and that's all. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: I would also like to introduce John Franke, PG&E vice president of safety and health for some opening comments.

John.

MR. FRANKE: Good evening. I'm sorry. I really want to pass on, from the company, a tremendous amount of appreciation for the panel's time. To the community, the
folks up here at the front over the last month have
dedicated somewhere in the order of 38 hours in looking at
the future land uses and possible repurposing of the
facilities out at Diablo Canyon. And both as an officer
of PG&E, I want to thank you, and quite sincerely, as a
member of the community, because your work and diligence
and the manner in which you have done it is noteworthy and
it is going to serve the public and our neighbors and the
community well in the future. So I just want to pass on
appreciation. I know behind the scenes the amount of work
you have been doing and the dedication and time, and it's
really noteworthy. And thank you for that.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, John.

I want to give a brief overview of the agenda
for this evening. For anyone from the public, if you
don't already have one, the agendas are out on the table
in front of the meeting room. I would also like to let
you know that we do have a public comment period for
tonight, and anyone who wishes to speak can pick up a blue
card over there at the back of the room, and please fill
that out and turn it into one of the PG&E folks. We want
to do that before the scheduled break.

So today -- tonight, I keep saying today too --
tonight we are talking about the facility repurposing.

And so we are going to have a couple of presentations; one
by Sara Sanders with the county, and also by Tom Jones with PG&E, that talks about the process, land use process, and other procedures that must be considered when implementing a change of use. I will talk a little bit about some of the public outreach metrics, and then we will have a 10-minute break, after which we will take public comment on repurposing and any other items that anyone wants to speak to, but tonight is focused on repurposing. We will have an opportunity for panel discussion and observations, and then introduction to the next monthly topic.

So before we begin, though, I would like to mention a new asset that the panel has. And do we have a kiosk here? Back here. There is two kiosks in the poster room. And these kiosks provide a wealth of information. You can go on these. You can look at specific maps. Just like on TV where they make things bigger and smaller, you can blow them up, and you can also make -- submit comments to the panel on these kiosks. So I just encourage everyone to take advantage of this asset and take a look at them. They are very informative and very effective.

So with that, I would like to proceed to the next agenda item, and that is the presentations for land use, and introduce Sara Sanders with County Planning.

Thank you.
MS. SANDERS: Hello, Panel. Sara Sanders, County Planning and Building. This is my third time speaking with you, so thanks for all your hard work and letting me come again. Today, I am just going to offer up some planning clarifications. I've watched your last few sessions. We just want to make some of the stuff a little bit clearer, and then also go into a little more detail when it comes to zoning.

So just to start it off, this is the property that we are talking about where -- the properties that we're talking about, just to see on the map. Now, the last few sessions, there has been a lot of talk about department priorities, especially when it comes to the decommissioning. So just to clarify that department priorities are directed by the Board of Supervisors, and the next time they will be talked about will be October 9th at the Strategic Planning Session. So the decommissioning will definitely be talked about, but as I said before, the priorities are directed by the Board and the department follows through.

So going into zoning, zoning is a tool that the county uses to govern uses, the size of buildings and also how buildings relate to the surroundings. And then our General Plan is implemented primarily through zoning, so in the coastal zone, it's Title 23, and inland portion, it
is Title 22. So we talked about that at the last two presentations. So land use categories are part of zoning, which identifies areas of similar and compatible land uses, provides a basic order of development, while allowing a range of uses. And the parcels that we are looking at today, the PG&E parcels are either zoned agriculture, rural lands or public facilities. And you can see that on the map, so the south portion is all zoned ag. And along the coast in the northern portion, in the middle is zoned public facilities. And a little bit in the coastal zone and inland to the north is rural lands.

So talking a little bit about agriculture, we are going to go into what kind of specific things do these land use categories have in common. So agricultural lands, the soils are prime. The agriculture practices are typically located on this type of parcel. So residential uses are allowed but, typically, they are for the owners and for employees, pretty much based on the agriculture production on the site. And then the parcels are also pretty large.

So some examples of allowable uses would be coastal access ways, electric generating plants, crop production and grazing. And even though that these uses are allowed on this type of land use category, they still
need to come in for a land use permit. So I am going to say that three times because there are three different categories I am going to go through.

So public facilities, the land and structures are typically committed to the public, to public facilities and public agency uses. It's intended to benefit and meet the needs of the public. And some examples of allowable uses include coastal access ways, marinas, passive recreation, harbors, crop production, grazing and camping. There is a bunch of other ones, but I am just listing a few just as examples of things that people have talked about or the public has come up with that they would like to see on these lands. And like I said before, just because these land uses are allowed, they still need to come in for a land use permit.

And finally, rural lands. Rural lands, what they have in common is low population densities with open and natural countrysides are preferred. Open space and watershed and wildlife habitat areas are maximized. Some examples of allowable uses are passive recreation, rural recreation and camping, off-road vehicle courses and energy-generating facilities.

So what is a land use permit? So it sets the conditions for the uses, establishment and operation, only entitlements the use itself, and then there might be a
So the four types of land use permits, starting at plot plan, that is the simplest land use permit you can get, and that's typically a single family home. It is just an example. And then it goes to site plan. That requires a little more project detail. That would be like a simple grocery store, a small one. And both of those, the plot plan and the site plan, are acted on by staff, whereas the minor use permits, conditional use permits and development plans are all acted on by a hearing body. So minor use permits go to the planning department for hearing, and it is decided on by a hearing officer. And conditional use permits and development plans go to the planning commission.

So there was a lot of talk in the last two meetings about a master plan, which is a great idea. But I just want to clarify in the planning room, master development plan is a discretionary land use permit. So it might not be exactly what the panel is looking for, but
a strategic action plan would probably suit better the
needs of what the commission is creating. And that
includes goals, objectives and recommendations.

And then one more just clarification, the lead
agency. A lead agency is the public agency that has
primary responsibility for approving a project during the
environmental review process. And so it's up to the
applicant, so PG&E, and the application type on who is
going to be the lead agency.

So those are just a few points of clarification,
a little bit about zoning. And that kind of concludes my
formal presentation.

MR. MEACHUM: Can we ask questions now?

MS. SANDERS: Yes, I assume so.

MR. MEACHUM: Going back to your very first
slide with the priorities directed by the Board, I
understand that completely, but if this is going to be a
priority, what are you anticipating? Are you anticipating
the Board to allow for the planning director have more
staff focused on this? What exactly are we looking for in
terms of priorities?

MS. SANDERS: I will let Trevor answer that.

MR. KEITH: So on October 9th, we are going to
the Board and recommend that we move into the Tier 1,
which allows me to allocate staffing resources onto it.
And as it grows into it for the lead agency, we will be building on top of that staff.

MR. MEACHUM: Thank you.

MS. SEELEY: Thank you, Sara. Will the meeting on the 9th, the Strategic Planning Meeting, be a public meeting?

MS. SANDERS: Yes. It's during the regular Board of Supervisors meeting, but it's focused on the strategic planning.

MS. SEELEY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Alex.

MR. KARLIN: Sara, thank you. That was a good presentation. In terms of the CEQA process, I know we have talked about who would be the lead agency, the county or the state lands or someone else, perhaps. In terms if it were the county, what kind of staffing does the county have for the CEQA process? How many people would work on staff with the county to do the EIRs, and/or how many consultants do you have to outsource that kind of work?

MS. SANDERS: I am going to field that to Trevor.

MR. KEITH: So typically, we would -- excuse me, so we would -- for the CEQA work itself, we would typically go out for a request for proposals with the consultants. So it may be a local firm. It may be an
out-of-area firm. So kind of we go through our process to
figure out the best consultant package to bring inhouse.
So typically, we would have at least one. And again,
depending on the magnitude of the project, we would need
to determine how many internal staff we would have to kind
of manage the consulting, as well as the different permits
associated with it.

MR. KARLIN: So the applicant would submit a
significant environmental report, and then you would do an
RFP for a consultant to do the actual governmental EIR, I
guess; is that right?

MR. KEITH: So the applicant would give us their
project description. Based on that, we would put out a
request for proposals, and then we would manage the
consultant moving through the process.

MR. KARLIN: Thank you.

MR. LATHRUP: Yes. Kind of shifting gears, in
reference to the land or what's out there as far as values
are concerned, it has a certain type of zoning right now,
certain use. Do you foresee anything changing in the near
future as far as the county level changing any of the
zonings, which might have an effect on the land value?

MS. SANDERS: So not that I know of, the county
is not changing any zoning. It's more like a -- for
example, Avila, the Urban Reserve Line, we might be
changing zoning through the community plan update, but
there is no community plan update. PG&E hasn't requested
to change the General Plan, which would be required to
change the zoning. So not that we know of right now.

MR. KARLIN: I'm sorry, another question. In
Wild Cherry Canyon, as I understand it, we went out there
and it was a very fascinating tour. I think you were on
that. I was surprised to learn there was a sewage
treatment plant facility on that. What is that zoned?

MS. SANDERS: That property? That property is
zoned ag, but it is a use from San Miguelito Water
Company, so they do have a lease with the landowner,
Eureka Energy, but -- so that was approved. I'm not sure
how old that treatment plant is.

MR. KARLIN: So a sewage treatment plant is okay
for an ag-zoned area?

MS. SANDERS: If it was permitted, yeah.

MR. KARLIN: Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Let's have one more question, and
then Sara will be available to answer questions after
Tom's presentation also.

So Linda.

MS. SEELEY: Just one quick, if there is going
to be an application for a change in the zoning, how would
we be notified of it?
MS. SANDERS: So it would have to go to the Board for authorization. And going to the Board requires notice, so it would be in like the Tribune or whatever the planner on staff would choose when it comes to noticing. I don't know how else people -- Trevor? The agenda. It would be online --

MR. KEITH: And typically for larger projects, we notice newspapers. And then depending on what it is, there could be additional -- the applicant may also do media as well.

MR. ANDERS: Okay.

MR. JONES: Good evening, Panel and members of the public. Tom Jones with PG&E. I'm director of strategic initiatives. Tonight my overview will cover a couple of different topics and address some of the feedback we also received from our strategic workshops on both repurposing and land use.

So first, just a step to level set on why we are all here, and we've talked about this as a group several times, the guidance from the Utility Commission is that PG&E would conduct this process as defined in this sentence. That is the guidance from the regulator, that is a public process that the Utility would run prior to making decisions for the final disposition of assets. So what we put together for the public and the panel tonight
is a diagram of how we're seeking to satisfy that, and then we'll go into the background of the assets themselves.

So this diagram is a little busy, but what you see here is on the left is PG&E and all the independent activities we do around this project. In the center is Chuck, is the blue circle, and that's your panel facilitator. And on the right is this panel. And if you look, it's like a giant molecule. You can see all of the actions and activities you take on and the different ways that we garner or earn public input into the process. So that circle on the right directly matches your public pathway slide that you helped develop, where you have public meetings, you have your website, your engagements, your tours, et cetera. So we have about 14 or 15 key tools we are using right now to get input that will be included in a separate appendix with your report as well.

And then repurposing, just for the public, we did have a specific order from the Public Utilities Commission to examine certain aspects in particular, including the breakwater, so that's been a focus. And I know folks from the Port Harbor District, the University system, and others have expressed an interest in that aspect. And I know they will be speaking tonight to the whole panel because they didn't get a chance to work with
all of you yet.

And then just a level set of what we're talking about here is the 14 miles of coastline. I will go from south to north. Mr. Karlin had referenced the Wild Cherry Canyon area. That's the yellow hatched area on the map at the southeastern edge. It's those five parcels. Just below that, you actually have the main access road to Diablo Canyon. And the purple area is leased to the Utility, and that is subject -- it's zoned ag and grazing, with the exception of the center parcel where it says "plant site." That is the area that Sara had referred to earlier that's zoned public facilities. Everything to the north is either rural lands or zoned agriculture, and those have some public access, though limited at this time.

And are you familiar with this image? This is an aerial photograph of Parcel P, and this is approximately 720 acres, and we will go into more detail on these assets tonight. This side is a little busy, so I am going to take a moment just to walk you through it. Folks have been asking, "What are the buildings, what are the square footages, and when will they become available?" So we have some estimates tonight, and we wanted to give you some context.

So for instance, on the left side, if you go
four black boxes down, it says "admin building," and you
follow that in and you see a building that's pointed
east-west on this image. That structure is a six-story
facility, and it's 151,000 some-odd square feet. For
context, the building you're in tonight is ostensibly the
biggest building in downtown San Luis. That building is
50 percent larger. This building is 93,000 square feet,
so to give you an idea of the scale and the enormity of
assets there. The warehouse up there is approximately the
same size of the San Luis Obispo Costco, and our training
buildings, again, when you put them together, are about
the same size as this asset. And they are all 200 yards
apart. So it's an intense amount of infrastructure
readily available, and that's the repurposing discussion.

We've had some analogies, discussion with the
panel, and Kara gets full credit, you know we're going to
have a mall, with everything from a yogurt shop to an
anchor tenant. And that's where these different diverse
interests actually seem to line up for us because we're
going to need somebody, if it's not PG&E, that's has the
wherewithal to operate these large assets, assuming we
retain them, right? And then complementary uses will
certainly go along with that. I think the mall analogy
works. You're going to have some large tenants, some
small tenants, and multiple complementary uses. I think
that's also true for the lands to the north and south.
The things that we have heard don't seem to preclude one
another from happening.

So this is just -- this is a document we
prepared for entities that are interested in the assets,
and what our team has done here is just done a callout.
That blue box, actually, this is a TIFF file, and we have
it printed on a 9-foot section on our wall at the office,
to give you the idea of the detail of this. But every
building has a number. So in that callout box in the
upper left corner, you can see it says "Building 104,"
well, that's the admin building. So when people look at
that and click on that, it would give the square footage,
where it is on the map, its intended use, and those type
of details.

With that, people have asked further details.
So for instance, some of the facilities folks at the
University system, they said, "Well, what's your
electrical distribution system like?" Well, they want to
know is it 4,000 volts? Is it 12,000 volts? We can
provide that information but, frankly, like our friends
from Pacific Wildlife Care probably don't care about the
voltage. They want to make sure the power works when they
want to use it as a tenant, right? So those are the
different things we will balance when we have these
different inquiries over the course of the next couple years and put those together in some form of implementation plan for us to evaluate.

We have heard a lot about used fuel and does that make some of the plant off limits or not. My suggestion is no, and we have some notable examples from across the United States, including one that PG&E operates. So here's the first example. This is our used fuel storage facility at the Humboldt Bay Power Plant. On the site itself, there is a relatively new power generation station of 10 gas units, about 150 yards from the fuel storage. And then that highlighted yellow line along the coast there to the north of the image, that's actually the public access trail that was a condition of our coastal permit. So there the public hikes within about 50 feet of dry cask storage. A person looking at dry cask storage doesn't really pose a security threat given the way they are comprised in the security plant, and conversely with the shielding components of dry cask storage, there isn't a concern for exposure for members of the public. So there you see people readily hiking by, again, 53-some-odd feet from the dry cask storage facility.

San Onofre is another good example in California and quite a busy state beach there from the corner, and
they have several million visitors a year, and it's about 130 feet from dry cask storage. So again, if you have it licensed right, you have appropriate security plan and shielding, multiple uses that don't seem intuitive can coexist, and so they do.

This is a good population exercise. This is in Illinois, Zion, their used fuel storage. There is a population of 24,000 people in a short radius from it, and the beaches there are open to the public as well.

And so lastly, just for illustrative purposes, if you look at our admin building and south on that campus, we are unique with our topography compared to these other sites, because not only is that linear distance, but it's actually around a mountain with elevation change. So you have a very different structure that if you had a campus-like environment, there are multiple tenants to the south, you can simply restrict access to that road and it's never even a pathway for members of the public or other users or tenants of the assets. So we just wanted to put that out there to address some of the comments we've heard because we want to be sure to lay that out for you.

Lastly, people have been asking when, where and what, right? So I think we've started on the where. We know the where, it's Diablo Canyon, Parcel P. The what
are the buildings. And the when, we have started to
identify from the project team. So current estimates show
that the repurposing opportunities for some of the
structures will begin around 2027. And that's pretty
good. Remember, we are still running this plant through
mid-2025. So how we do that, we are still up for grabs.

Again, we've had this concept for phased release
or phased availability, I think, for both the lands and
the structures. And then if we're unsuccessful in
repurposing the breakwater, there was some confusion on
the second green bar down, that it was a 30-year project
to remove the breakwater. That is both for the project
description and execution phases. That was for the
Environmental Impact Reports. The breakwater removal
itself is about a four-year project, so we have added that
red delineation there so folks would understand what that
demolition project would entail. So in that project there
by 2040, if repurposing didn't occur, the breakwater would
be gone, based on current estimates.

A couple of key takeaways here. Numerous
facilities, as you know, and members of the public
expressed, have the potential for repurposing. We don't
think used fuel is going to preclude that. And the
facility repurposing is going to be driven by not just
public comment, but your input to us about how we do that,
and we'll have to balance that with some of the
decommissioning goals in terms of when they are be
available and what assets will remain and which will not,
so those are what we mean by "other considerations,"
including regulatory requirements and approvals.

That was pretty quick, I'd be happy to go back
and answer any questions you have. And if you want to go
back over some of the diagrams and talk about some of the
resources available to both the panel and the public, we
can certainly do that.

Kara.

MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you, Tom.

I feel compelled to describe what the mall
analogy means. That was an analogy that Tom Jones came up
with. And I think where it came from is when it comes to
the repurposing of the facilities on Parcel P, like a
t mall, you have to have or probably should have some kind
of anchor entity, something rather large that supports the
land use. And some of the topics that were addressed and
suggested to us was like the transmission facilities for
an offshore wind project or maybe a Cal Poly research
facility. And then the analogy of the mall is there also
might be room for some much smaller activities that could
take advantage of some of these facilities. And the
entity that we talked about that might fit that role is
the Pacific Wildlife Care, and they are actually here today. So that's what the mall analogy means. Obviously nobody is suggesting we should put a mall out on the Diablo land property, for clarification. Thank you.

MR. JONES: Linda.

MS. SEELEY: Quick question. Thank you for your presentation. The used fuel or spent fuel at Humboldt, how many canisters are there?

MR. JONES: There are six casks there.

MS. SEELEY: Okay. And how many casks are there going to be at Diablo?

MR. JONES: Assuming operation of the interim license, it will be 138 casks.

MS. SEELEY: And then does Humboldt have any high burn-up fuel in their casks?

MR. JONES: It does not. San Onofre does.

MS. SEELEY: Okay. And let's see. I had another question about San Onofre. I can't remember my other question, but thanks.

MR. JONES: Mr. Karlin.

MR. KARLIN: Thank you, Tom. That was a good presentation. With regard to the footprint of the spent fuel facilities that will remain, I think your graphics were very helpful in that regard, and I think the main message is a valid one, which is the footprint will be
very small, very small compared to the 12,500 acres.

I guess I was a little confused a little bit because I was looking at the regulations that deal with the 10CFR Part 72 that regulate an interim spent fuel facilities, and they seem to say that there is 100 meter requirement for the facility perimeter. That's what's said in the reg. When you mentioned 53 feet and 100 feet, I mean it's all the same order of magnitude, is that from the fence line of the facility or is that from the casks?

MR. JONES: We measured from the cask itself in that image. The fence line actually forms the partition between the trail and the plant properties at Humboldt. It's a tiny space. I think of it as a postage stamp parcel. It's very tiny.

MR. KARLIN: Okay. I'm surprised the hundred meter provision is in the regs, and maybe I just read that wrong.

MR. JONES: I think you read it correctly. I just think sometimes the topography does not allow for that. And site control and ownership, so for instance San Onofre, the state parks have the adjacent parcel, so they can't control that.

MR. KARLIN: Okay. But the main message is it's a very small footprint, and a lot of things can happen in the immediate vicinity and it's not going to be a
radiological issue as far as NRC would be concerned.

MR. JONES: That's correct. And for future plans, we will seek to modify and add a security building, when it's a stand-alone -- remember, it's a separately-licensed facility, so assuming the plant is retired and that Part 50 license goes away, security will move up by the dry cask storage. And even with that new structure up there -- it will be a 5,000 to 7,000 square foot building -- it's hard to imagine even more than 10 acres being occupied by the used fuel storage in the future.

MR. KARLIN: Right. And the public should be aware that the decommissioning of the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant is a separate, an entirely separate, as far as NRC is concerned, matter from the decommissioning of the interim spent fuel storage facility. So those are two different things. And we are focusing -- I guess we probably want to be concerned with both, but as a regulatory matter, those casks will sit there as long as -- until the NRC comes up with some other place for you all to send them to and has you send them there.

MR. JONES: I'll have Adam bring up the time line here, just for reference. If we go by the waste confidence decision and the project time lines as well and
combine with where Diablo Canyon sits in the cue to ship, that's where we have that approval phase, remember it's a three-phase approval, starting in 2060 through 2065, and the removal and the completion of the decommissioning of the dry cask storage facility, based on current estimates, 2073.

MR. ANDERS: Scott and then Loren and then Nancy.

MR. LATHRUP: Tom, in reference to the facilities, you know, the last few weeks or so, we have heard a lot of people wanting to make use of those facilities but looking at the maps tonight, got to thinking a little bit about all the roadways, the infrastructure that actually supports those facilities. What would be the thinking to maintain that? Because typically, it's like a city, community service district or something of that nature. It seems like PG&E or somebody would have to be, you know, involved with that.

MR. JONES: That's what I mentioned in terms of someone with the wherewithal. You could have a users share agreement on that proportional to your use. PG&E will have a presence there separate from both dry cask storage and the power plant decommissioning because of that transmission asset. We intend to retain that as part of our utility service indefinitely. So think of that
never going away. That road is far better for us to access that than to bring trucks through See Canyon on some of those back roads.

MR. LATHRUP: But I'm also thinking about actually on campus, there's a lot of different internal roads. I am assuming underground power, sewer, things of that nature, so that would be all --

MR. JONES: It goes back to that mall analogy, the anchor tenant. You'll have proportional costs based on folks using those facilities. That's how it works in business parks throughout the state.

MR. LATHRUP: The only reason I bring it up is most people are coming wanting to use those facilities are probably forgetting about those ongoing costs, so it needs to be highlighted.

MR. JONES: I agree. Nothing is ever truly free.

MR. BROWN: Tom, I just had a thought here. There are several nuclear power plants being decommissioned in California. PG&E owns two of them?

MR. JONES: Three plants at two sites, correct.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Two at Diablo --

MR. JONES: Correct.

MR. BROWN: -- and Humboldt.

MR. JONES: Correct.
MR. BROWN: And looking at the overall benefit to the state of California and the people of California, is there any merit to thinking about combining the casks of the spent fuel in one location so --

MR. JONES: I will start with an answer and I'll let Mr. Karlin chime in here too. So that's a large public policy discussion. It's actually a federal policy discussion. The states can participate, but they don't drive it. It's exclusively the jurisdiction of the federal government. So there is some discussion about what they call interim regional storage or consolidated storage. So there are a couple of sites actually in New Mexico -- excuse me, East New Mexico and West Texas, across the border from each other, that have expressed some interest. And this is John's stomping ground so he might weigh in as well. And they are volunteer host communities, and they seek to do something in lieu of Yucca Mountain or in between plant storage and Yucca Mountain.

Now, while those policy discussions are going on, and I'll be the pragmatist in the room, nothing is licensed, operable or available to take our fuel today or in the near future. So without action by the federal government to complete licensing and some applicant to do this work, we plan on what we can plan on today.
MR. ANDERS: We've got time for three more questions and then we need to move on, so Nancy, Linda and Frank.

MS. O'MALLEY: So Tom, I understand that these buildings, this whole area, Parcel P, is zoned public facilities, correct?

MR. JONES: Correct.

MS. O'MALLEY: So that could be anything from a hospital, to a research center, nonprofits, but not residential and, of course, it's not ag. So there is a very wide range of repurposing potential, right, under that zoning?

MR. JONES: Correct. And I would defer to Sara and Trevor on that. I don't know if you could have mixed use of residential there in combination. I would defer to Trevor on that.

MR. KEITH: We're looking it up.

MR. JONES: They'll take a look on that.

MS. O'MALLEY: If you could just clarify what does "public facilities" mean, that zoning?

MR. JONES: So you asked -- when you asked the specific thing about residential, I wasn't certain if you could have mixed-use application with someone living on the top story and working on the bottom, so Sara is going to effort that right now. But you're right, it's an
MS. O'MALLEY: So it's the hope that you won't have to change zoning. Hopefully, most of the vision for those properties will be done within that zoning.

MR. JONES: Correct.

MS. O'MALLEY: Because if you did change zoning, then you would have to do -- what was Sara saying about a whole report?

MR. JONES: You have to do a General Plan amendment, which would go to the County Board of Supervisors.

MS. O'MALLEY: Then you come up with a General Plan. And don't General Plans take years to do if you want to change zoning?

MR. JONES: It does, but everything we are doing is going to take years. So as a complementary effort, I don't know that it would create a new barrier to success.

MS. O'MALLEY: It wouldn't add more years necessarily?

MR. JONES: I think those things happen in parallel in terms of approval processes. And I see Trevor may want to weigh in here.

MS. O'MALLEY: And then one other question I have just about the buildings. I know that a lot of people are itching to see a little more specifics, but you
started with the map there and you told us a little bit about the admin building, that it's six stories and 90,000 square feet.

MR. JONES: 150,000 square feet.

MS. O'MALLEY: 150,000 square feet. So how much square feet is there in total with all of these buildings? Maybe exclude the turbine building and then tell us that separately.

MR. JONES: Sure. So the buildings represent over 300,000 square feet, ready occupiable, training, education type facilities. The warehouse, we have a couple warehouses that add up to over 140,000 square feet. In discussion with people that do building or planning, it's like, oh, there is more square footage here than several of the cities combined would permit and bring online between now and 2025. It's massive. Again, the warehouse is the same size as Costco. Our admin building is one and a half times the size of the building we are in tonight. They are large assets with a lot of square footage that can accommodate multiple uses in each building.

MS. O'MALLEY: And then maybe for the sake of the public, if you can point out the turbine building and discuss, maybe, some of the issues with that, as that may have to go to access.
MR. JONES: Sure. So the turbine building is the brownish, rectangular building that's parallel to the coast in the center of the image. It is quite large. People asking the scale, it's over 400,000 square feet. Think of it this way, each floor in it is two and a half acres. It is a big, big building.

It is in the way of some things that we need to remove, and it's unlikely that folks would have a purpose for it because of its unique structure. And the easiest thing to do is remove that to complete the radiological remediation. It would be much more complex and challenging to both remove the containments and guarantee that we've removed all the isotopes that could be there. So we have to guarantee a clean bill of health to satisfy the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to retire our Part 50 license. And there are some specific sampling criteria we have to meet to get what's called a "free release." And so that does present a barrier to that. It's a complexity to the project. A hundred percent that it needs to come out, probably not. 98 percent, yes. And I can feel my engineering team right now looking at me that it's 99 with a few decimals to the right.

John, is there anything you would like to add to that?

MR. FRANKE: You have to remember this site when
this plant was built as an integrated unit and trying
to -- while the turbine building we know is likely to have
ever extremely low, if no radioactive contamination in it, the
piping infrastructure, the power infrastructure, the
ventilation infrastructure, it's all intertwined with that
portion of the plant that will require decontamination and
removal. So when we took a look at it, it probably would
actually cost us more to try to save the building than to
go ahead and remove it. But you know, all that is, you
know, no final decision on all that, but it would be a
challenge to try and save the turbine building.

MR. JONES: And I would also just add it doesn't
mean that you couldn't put another structure in its place
or other structures in that same footprint through this
regulatory process, remove it with something more
appropriate if it made sense.

MS. O'MALLEY: Thanks.

MR. ANDERS: Linda.

MS. SEELEY: Where is Diablo's spent fuel in the
cue for removing it when there's a permanent repository
located, you know?

MR. JONES: It's a funny answer. We're a
relatively young plant, and we're near the end of the cue.
I don't know if we are 102, 103 or 104. Alex might know,
but it's near the end of the line. Humboldt is near the
front, Diablo is near the back, and you can't swap them.

MS. SEELEY: So that indicates to me that it
will probably be here for quite a long time because it
will take -- I don't know. I will make this number up --
30 years to maybe identify a permanent repository and get
it into operation. And then if we're toward the end of
the cue, maybe another I don't know how many years, until
would it be --

John, it looks like you know.

MR. FRANKE: No, I don't. Actually, I think the
right answer is it would be difficult to know. There has
been a lot of different discussions, and Alex may know
more about what the cue really is or what the priority of
the cue is. I suspect that whatever we call the priority
1 through 103 or 105, whatever number you want to choose,
of units that need their spent fuel deposited, when that
finally gets licensed and moved, I think that priorities
may change. It may be based off of, at that time,
greatest risk, or oldest fuel, or first plant shut down.
I suspect that the final cue priority has not been
determined.

MR. KARLIN: I would concur with that. I mean,
I don't have any direct knowledge. I used to work at NRC
for 12 years before coming here. "Cue" is kind of --
there is a sequence with which plants are shutting down,
but I don't think that is how Yucca Mountain, or whatever
the place is, will sequence the order. I think it will be
more risk based -- you know, where is the highest risk,
where is the lowest risk, relatively speaking -- and they
will make some decisions. But I don't think there is a
cue that is set up right now that says, "We are number
33," or something like that, because we are talking about
20, 30 years from now anyway.

MR. JONES: The chart is accurate in that
everything we've received from the federal government and
the policies today, those are the numbers we have that
forms the 2073 number.

MS. SEELEY: And then do you think that Diablo
Canyon would be considered a higher risk location because
of the seismic vulnerability or a lower risk location
based on something else?

MR. FRANKE: I don't see the Diablo Canyon site
as a higher risk location, particularly for spent fuel
casks. And as such, I doubt it. I think no matter how we
repurpose this land, it's going to be far from any
population density, and so I really don't see anything
specific about the site creating a higher risk profile for
Diablo Canyon.

MR. ANDERS: Okay. We need to move on.

Frank.
MR. MEACHUM: The means by which you start establishing the radioactive remediation, other than the spent fuel, you are going to be testing other areas to see if there's any other type of radiation, what becomes of that and what different levels are required to either -- I'm not sure how you dispose of it.

MR. JONES: Okay. So there is four different categories, actually five. There are items that aren't affected, general debris for deposition in a normal landfill, right. Then there's Class A, Class C -- Class B, Class C, and what's called "Greater-Than-Class C." So there is different repositories that can handle those different classifications of radioactive waste, and they go to different sites. We used to use Barnwell, South Carolina. Now we use Enviro Care in Utah. There is a series of different repositories that can accept that waste.

"Greater-Than-Class C" is things like the reactor vessel where it's become activated and radioactive over time, and it's in the same category as used fuel, so it also doesn't have a repository to which it can go. So that could change our storage strategies into, let's say, reactor vessel segmentation, I believe, is scheduled around 2032, 2034, in that time frame, might have to change some of our high shielding storage capacity.
MR. MEACHUM: Would you test those areas first?

MR. JONES: Well, we know what they are.

MR. MEACHUM: You are always testing things, I'm sure. That would be first?

MR. JONES: So site prioritization is an important aspect.

MR. MEACHUM: Thank you very much.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Sara. Thank you, Tom, for your presentations and the questions and answers.

Let's move on to our final agenda item before the break. And I would recommend that anyone who wishes to speak during our public participation, public comment period, please fill out a blue card in the back and submit it to one of the PG&E representatives here. You want to do that before we break or right before we break, if possible.

So the agenda item is to discuss the workshops that the panel held last month -- or this month, actually, September 14th and 15th, on repurposing. The panel spent two full days discussing and taking public comment and listening to presentations and asking a lot of insightful questions. And I want to thank the City of Atascadero who allowed us to use their beautiful and historic city hall.

I just want to go over briefly some of the highlights and information. Again, there were two days,
fourteen hours of presentations and discussion. We heard from a range of participants. State Lands Commission kicked off the workshops with a presentation on their jurisdictions and their interest and role in the decommissioning process. We heard from Cal Poly about their interest in the site and also the CSU system. We heard from Clean Tech Incubator and how a potential incubator program may be applied. San Luis EVC talked about the types of interests small business and local businesses might have in the site and their requirements. Pacific Wildlife Care is very excited about possibly moving to this site. And we heard from Port San Luis Harbor District, who had an interest in the site as a potential possible site manager.

On day two, Cal Energy Development Corporation presented their plan for an interconnect system that would support offshore wind generation. Perryman Technologies had some interesting new technologies with regard to possible thermal storage strategies. Yak tityo tityo yak tilhini community presented to the panel and was hoping for possible set-aside for a tribal center. So a lot of representations. Each presentation was about 20 minutes, and there was about 25-30 minutes question and answer. Some of the ideas I did mention, and this is a list of some of the ideas. And again, a broad range of ideas.
And if you will hit the next slide, and some of the takeaways. There was a consistent theme to preserve and reuse the assets. And also a diverse range of requests for uses, and most of the uses seemed somewhat compatible.

Conservation of lands and reuse of facilities were felt to be complementary. There was support for collaborative discussions as the decommissioning process moves forward. And then there is a recommendation of possibly a master plan or something similar because a number of the potential tenants wanted to know when the buildings would be available, what the cost might be and so on. And so the panel had a very interesting and vibrant discussion about a planning document and what that might look like, was it a master plan or whatever. And the overall concept of a vision document from the panel was discussed, and also an implementation schedule from PG&E as a necessary element to move forward with the repurposing process. So a quick overview, give the panel, remind the panel, you know, even though it was over two weeks ago, and give the public a sense of what went on at those presentations.

I want to open it up to the panel for your observations, comments, any thoughts or additional insights that you might have.
Alex, and then Kara.

MR. KARLIN: Yeah. I would just say I think we had some very good input from the public on potential reuse and some thoughtful information and some -- I particularly enjoyed the Cal Poly presentation. Although it lacked specifics, it recognized that there are some issues about the isolation of the facility and some difficulty in Cal Poly fully using it.

But one of the challenges that I think all of the presenters were faced with, and we were all faced with, is the time frame. Because the decommissioning, the plant won't shut down until 2025, and then there will be a lot of work going on in that area for some years if PG&E decides to proceed promptly with decontamination; and therefore, some of these buildings which could be used, might not be available for 10-, 15-plus years. And so it's hard for entities to come down with brass tacks of specific reuses when you're looking at a time frame that long. A company needs space next week, or last week, or something. They are crowded now. Pacific Wildlife is a very wonderful and crowded facility. They need space right now, so it's hard for them to get down to brass tacks, but I think they did a pretty good job. And we had some input from the public, and I appreciate it.

MR. ANDERS: Kara.
MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you, Chuck.

I agree with what Alex says. It was a really great two days, lots of good ideas. We talked away feeling that the ideas were still very much in the conceptual stage, very broad and not very many specifics. And I guess that's to be expected given the time frame, but what I would say, if there are members of the community that have ideas, even something that can be more specific, we really welcome hearing those. There is a lot of ways you can provide public input, but I think we were hoping to hear more and maybe more specifics, to the extent it's even possible at this point, but if other people have ideas, I think we really welcome that input.

And the second thing, I just wanted to say a word or two about the vision document that the panel discussed. I think that was kind of an exciting part of the workshop that we came up with. As we all know, PG&E is going to be submitting a triennial report at the end of this year. And what we hope to prepare, as the panel, is at least the first cut at a vision document that could be attached to that document that PG&E presents and submits to the PUC. And what we hope to create is a document that both reflects what we heard from the community here at these meetings, at the workshops, and online, and also maybe some reflection that the panel itself might offer.
So again, if -- we are preparing a document that deals with the issues we have thus discussed thus far with the panel, if people from the community want to provide some input and some ideas about what that vision document might look like, we would be very open to that input too. So please use the public opportunity you have to submit your ideas because I think we are really interested in hearing them. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Kara.

Frank.

MR. MEACHUM: Yeah. I think the one thing that I think was mentioned when we heard the EVC come forward and speak to us was if businesses are clamoring for space and for opportunity to either expand their business or relocate their business, we didn't hear from them. And if there are the business communities that are looking for opportunities, I think the panel would really like to hear that and understand from a business standpoint what they would be looking for. That's the only thing that I didn't hear. But there are so many different, diverse requests that it makes it difficult to say, I would think from our standpoint, everybody gets a piece of the action. I don't know how that would happen. But I would like to hear from the business community about their ideas because that plays into the economics as well.
MR. ANDERS: Nancy.

MS. O'MALLEY: Well, I listened to all of them on video. I think the presentations were fantastic. And for me and, I think, as part of our role as part of the panel is to be visionaries and to really pick up on other people's visions and the visions we are hearing. I think the details and specifics, it's really impossible to know now, but to look at each of the buildings and hear people's presentations and how can we piece these together, like a jigsaw puzzle, and what's the potential there.

One of the visions that really excites me, I think, is the National Research Institute where you would have the collaborative effort between Cal Poly and probably a Ph.D. granting institution, research, innovation. And some of the topics that would make sense are marine science, because what a great asset you have with the marina and the Pacific ocean there. Also you know, clean technology, you know, it's a great area for wind energy. You already have the grid there. I mean, there is a lot of potential there in certain specific areas, you know technology.

We also heard from people saying that space, that was a recurrent theme, that a lot of businesses, as well as researchers and innovators, really need space.
They develop an idea, but they need space to develop the prototype, to be able to test it, to be able to present it to the public. And that's one thing that PG&E has a lot of out there is space, not just the buildings, but even the grounds around the buildings. You know, there is 700 acres just in Parcel P. So I thought that was really interesting.

The word collaboration came up a lot. So maybe a lot of these different entities can come together. I don't know who the lead would be at this point, but I'm sure it will hopefully be made clear. And it could be that PG&E also takes a lead in this because, you know, renewable energy is right down your alley as well. And then it was nice to contrast that with some of the nonprofits we have heard from in the last couple months and how much the Parcel P out there could be useful to them as well and that these are all compatible uses.

So I left hearing these excited and feeling like that there is just a tremendous asset out there and potential for it. And to tear it all out just seems like really a waste when so many needs can be met.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Nancy.

Linda.

MS. SEELEY: I loved the presentation from the yak tityu tityu yak tilhini tribe because they -- this was
their land always where Diablo Canyon is built. And it was taken from them, and they have never gotten any compensation for it. And they -- when they were talking, it just occurred to me that, gee, they need some of that land back and a place to hold ceremony and for a teaching center. And they were talking about how many artifacts they have, how many cultural relics and stuff and, gee, what if they had a place to put them. It would be so wonderful for our community. And I feel like it's -- you know, it would be some small way of compensating the original people who live on this land.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Linda.

We are on our break right now. Let's begin our break. For anyone in the public who wants to speak in the upcoming public comment period, please submit your cards, or bring them up here, or give them to the guy in the white shirt. And we will take a break and we will come back at 7:45. So we are adjourned until 7:45.

(Break taken.)

MR. ANDERS: Okay, everyone. Let's go ahead and find our seats. We are ready to go.

Thank you, everyone. We are ready for the public comment period. I just wanted to recognize that we actually on each of the workshops, this last on repurposing, we also had an open comment period available.
to the general public in addition to those who gave a presentation. So tonight is a continuation of that public input.

Before we begin, I would like to just go over a couple of the metrics on public outreach. I just want to point out that over the past month, we have had well over a hundred public comments submitted to the panel. Those were recently distributed to the panel for their review.

And so far, we have almost 400 — I know by now just in the last day we do have 400 total public comments that have been submitted either directly online, which is what most people are doing. We also have the opportunity to receive them by e-mail. And people have talked to the panel members themselves, and the panel members have passed those comments on to the other panel members and to the record.

So this slide shows the distribution of the topics that we have received so far. Obviously, lands, we dealt with in August, and is by far the largest interest from the standpoint of public comments. And then repurposing this last month. And then you can see the other distribution also, so keep those comments coming, everybody.

Also, just want to point out that in addition to public comments and input directly to the panel and to
PG&E, there has been a number of other outreach efforts. PG&E and has hosted a number of tours over the last couple of months, and 536 people have taken advantage of those tours and toured the lands of Diablo Canyon. The last tours are coming up this next month. There has also been a number of presentations that were made to various local civic groups and others. We estimate over 200 people have participated in those talks. And there is also -- this is an interesting number to me -- 2500 hikers on Pecho Coast and Point Buchon trails. So a lot going on, a lot of people interfacing with Diablo Canyon lands.

So with that, we want to open it up to public comment. The way we are going to do this is we would ask -- we put everyone's name that submitted a comment. We would ask that people be ready to speak when it's their opportunity. We are going to start with Chris Barrett, so there should be a line of two or three folks over at this podium and two or three folks at that podium. And again, we appreciate you limiting your time to three minutes. So our first speaker is Chris Barrett. Please state your name and your residence and speak clearly for everyone.

MR. BARRETT: Thank you. My name is Chris Barrett. I live in Arroyo Grande. I am speaking on behalf of the San Luis Yacht Club. I'm the commodore of the yacht club. San Luis Yacht Club is a private club,
200 memberships. Most of the memberships are couples, so we have about 400 people that I am representing that are active boaters. They are either sailors, kayakers, power boaters and fishermen.

It is the club's desire that the breakwater remain in place and that the harbor area remain in place and be open for public boaters to visit. Primarily, it's a safe haven for people transiting the area, but also kind of a short-term visit, excursions from Morro Bay to Port San Luis, or other areas, to come and visit. If there was a possibility of anchoring, mooring or docking there and having a picnic or some other day use, that would be valued by the yacht club members.

We also want to comment that we would sure like to see all the open space there remain as open space, if possible, and that the harbor have minimal changes. Minimal changes because it's really a haven or a sanctuary now for a lot of wildlife. So we want to see it remain that way, though I have to say that I haven't been to the harbor. As a boater, I have to stay 1 mile away from Diablo Canyon when I am on the water, but I'm anxious to be able to visit by boat. Hopefully, the breakwater will remain in place and that will be available for public boating public to visit in the future. Thank you.
this on? I do have copies of the presentation.

First of all, I'm Andrea Lueker. I live in Los Osos, but I am speaking on behalf of Port San Luis Harbor District. I am the harbor manager. And I do have a number of copies of the presentation that I gave the other day, so I can hand those out to the panel members, and I have some for the public as well.

As I say, I presented on Saturday, September 15th, at the facilities repurposing workshop that was held in Atascadero. And my presentation centered around the Harbor District's interest in repurposing and reuse of facilities, land, as well as equipment. I brought copies. And this Power Point is also on the District's website. Probably not tonight but tomorrow morning, it should be very easy for you to find on the District's website.

Prior to the workshop presentation on the 15th, our five elected Board of Commissioners held three separate meetings. And the topic of those meetings were, basically, what Diablo/PG&E assets may be of interest to the District as they relate to Harbor District operations. In addition to those meetings, the Board of Commissioners all visited the Diablo site, went on a field trip, and many of our staff also went so we would be well versed on the assets that are there on site. As a result of the
commission meetings, there was an interest list that included a combination of land assets and facilities.

The Harbor District has chosen a broad brush approach on the discussion of what assets are interesting to us that have a connection to our operations. Our list is comprehensive, as you'll see in the Power Point, and somewhat also all-encompassing. Like many others, we're looking at this as a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. We are also very interested in interfacing with local and regional partners to cooperatively work together. I think we can all agree that this could be a game changer for Port San Luis Harbor District and the county and region in general.

The assets that we have listed include various land adjacent to and near to property owned by the Harbor District, the access road to the lighthouse, the marina plant site buildings, and various equipment, as well as the PG&E education center.

As you review the handout, you can see that our interests are vast at this point. And as we continue to march through the decommissioning process, the District looks forward to honing that list in a number of ways to include future discussions on partnerships, visitor-serving opportunities, increasing coastal access and conservation. And we also intend to treat any of the
lands and water as we do our own, with care, adhering to multiple regulations and requirements, mostly environmental in nature.

Port San Luis for many years has achieved the clean marina status, and we have no plans to reduce our level of performance in that realm. We plan to move forward with care on any lands that we end up having and we look forward to doing that in an environmentally responsible and safe and well-managed manner.

Thank you for tonight. Enjoy the rest of your meeting. And Chuck, how would you --

MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

MR. BITTNER: Good evening. My name is Larry Bittner, Avila Beach. You all have a copy of the letter I sent to Congressman Carbajal, and I also sent a similar letter to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs trying to educate them and make them aware this facility may potentially be available. I could reiterate what I said in the letter, but I'd just to share with you kind of my passion of why I think the veterans should be highly considered for any type of reuse of the buildings that we have available.

In 1966, when Johnson was trying to get 450,000 to 500,000 guys in Vietnam, I guess I'd watched too many John Wayne movies and joined the Marine Corps. Well,
luckily, I was probably one of the luckiest marines around because I didn't end up on the wall and I didn't up damaged from being in the war. Today, we have a different type of military. It's all volunteer. Less than one-tenth of one percent of our population are in the military. And those patriots, if we didn't have the medical facilities in the field and the doctors, our wall -- the wall on terror would be a whole lot more than the 50,000 we have the Vietnam Wall. The problem with that is we have a lot of people coming back with missing limbs, burns, PTSD, brain injuries, et cetera, that need veteran services. So I don't know if the Veteran's Administration will have an interest in this, but if they do, I'd like you all to be receptive to it.

In the short-term, because the facilities at Diablo Canyon are long-term, we have a small facility here in San Luis Obispo. It's in the center of town. It's a small office and limited parking, and I would encourage PG&E to maybe talk with the VA and see if that facility could be moved to the community center. It's larger. It's right off 101. It has great parking and it could be a great improvement for the veterans. We have too many people, because our facility is so small, that have to go to Los Angeles. Some of these people in lots of pain, it takes them 12 hours, 14 hours for the round-trip to get a
couple shots for pain. So trying to keep this presentation -- I have 29 seconds left -- short. If the Veterans Administration has interest, I would sure like you all to be receptive.

Congressman Carbajal's office is very excited about this idea. They called me, actually, the day after they got the letter, so we will just see what happens, but keep an open mind for the vets. They deserve all we can share with them. Thank you.

MR. FRANKE: I have to say thank you for your service.

MR. MILLER: Good evening. My name is Clint Miller. I'm a resident of Pismo Beach. Full disclosure, I do work at PG&E Diablo Canyon Power Plant. I've been the radiological waste program monitor for 33 years there.

I am talking tonight as a citizen of Pismo Beach. I have been to several of the workshops. You have probably seen me. I was interested to hear from the residents of Avila and their concerns about traffic post decommissioning when it becomes a tourist mecca. My question was what about the traffic jam during decommissioning? Do people at large know it is going to be an 8- to 10-year traffic jam from Avila to Pismo rail yard? I mean, when it's car show weekend, I don't leave the house.
So one of your charges, I think it's No. 2, is to help communicate with the public. Do they know that that traffic jam is coming? And as PG&E said, they are going to have this estimate to go to Greenfield and tear everything down and then in reality, a lot of us, we have already heard, is to the leave things behind, what can be left behind, and not taken away. The way I think to reduce that traffic jam is to remove less stuff.

As you've already heard tonight, I would ask you not to give up maybe on leaving some facilities behind inside the radiological tools area and focus more on the decontamination than the demolition. That may take more time. It may take more interest, but what is that balance point between extra traffic and removing less material? And remember, there is really nothing for PG&E to gain to go out and say, "Oh, we're just going to leave that behind." I mean, the blowback on that would be, "You don't want to do the work," but that's not what it's about. It would be, get that balance. I'm not sure how you are going to obtain that.

You know, we heard Cal Poly is, maybe, hesitant to move into the facility right now, But maybe Cal Poly would be used to help poling, crowd sourcing to get that sense. The people coming to these meetings, we are advocates. That's not the people in the community who are
at home doing laundry, getting homework to the kids. In fact, I have to get back and help my kid and turn on the dishwasher tonight so I can get the low energy price, and then I can unload in the morning. But you know, really to get that sense of the community, would they be willing to leave things behind? And for instance, if the dome were left behind, we already heard one entity say, "Hey, there could there be national monument there." So would that be a repurposing?

And the one other point is how you remove that stuff. Right now, thousands of trucks is going to be the estimate. I would say don't give up on barging. It would be a push to get there, but we didn't hear that being vetoed by either the Lands Commission or the Coastal Commission. And the new generators came by barge. Fukushima has taken out a lot of stuff by barge. So those things I ask you to consider. Thank you for your time.

MS. NEWTON: Good evening. My name is Lisa Newton, and I'm a resident of Avila Beach. I'm here as a citizen, not representing a group. First of all, I would like to thank the panel for serving, being volunteers. It's quite a large responsibility for the future of our area.

My reason for being here, there is a desalinization plant at the site of Diablo, and I
understand that the output of that desalinization plant
could be as high as 100,000 acre feet of water. Right now
in Avila Beach, we use 100 acre feet of State water and 65
acre feet of Lopez water. So if we had that much water
available, not just to Avila, that would also serve the
entire South County and could even be part of San Luis
Obispo. And right now, we are in a drought. And so I
understand this is years away, but we have to plan for the
future and for generations to come. I probably won't even
be around after all this happens, so I think it would be
important to consider that making pipes available from the
plant all the way down to where the Lopez water pipes are,
which would be costly, but it would be well worth our
while.

And then secondly, I wanted to address
Ms. O'Malley's comment about public lands. You know, you
could use public lands for a prison. So you know, I was
thinking -- I have to kind of chuckle, because it could be
isolated and it would be private and the prisoners would
have a lovely view of the ocean. Something to think
about. Thank you.

MR. NELSON: Good evening. My name is Dr. Gene
Nelson. I am the government liaison for Californians for
Green Nuclear Power Incorporated. We are an adverse
intervener before the California Public Utilities
Commission, and we are opposed to the wasteful closure of
Diablo Canyon Power Plant.

We were at the BOEM meeting last week in
Sacramento, the Trident winds project. We are told by
military staffers that they appreciated the 24/7,
365-day-a-year availability of Diablo Canyon's abundant
power, which accounts for 9 percent of California's
in-state generation. California's 39 military bases
depend on Diablo Canyon's reliable power for performing
their mission and for maintaining operational readiness.

Diablo Canyon is the only dispatchable generator in
California that operates independently of any outside fuel
or energy source because the energy is stored inside the
core. This is not an attribute that's shared by
60 percent of California's in-state generation, which is
powered by natural gas, which is vulnerable to the aging
infrastructure. We have aging thousands of miles of
natural gas pipeline and compressor stations. Think San
Bruno is a place to start.

So what we looked at and we are asking the
applicant to pay attention to are some NERC Reliability
Reports, dated November 14th, 2017, May 25th, 2018, and
August 15th, 2018, and a DOE draft report dated May 29th,
2018. All these reports highlight the reliability risks
associated with California's overreliance on natural
gas-fired generation. Excerpts of these reports will be supplied to the applicant.

The important national security rationale is an additional factor that should be considered by applicant PG&E as CGNP prepares to take this proceeding to the State of California appeals court system. CGNP anticipates prevailing on merits. All CPUC decisions must be for the benefit of the public which benefits from Diablo Canyon's safe, dependable, abundant and emission-free generation.

Diablo Canyon's generation is economical, undercutting the cost of California's in-state fossil-fired generation and is far less expensive than the cost of unreliable solar and unreliable wind generation when their substantial taxpayer-funded subsidies are removed.

Another CGNP concern is the impropriety of PG&E failing to obtain approval for a change in intensity of use from the California Coastal Commission prior to commencing the CPU's proceeding. This is one of the factors that we will be litigating against the applicant on. Thank you for your attention.

MR. POWERS: Hi. Ed Powers, Nipomo. I'm a representative of Port San Luis Fishermen's Association. And I am here tonight to talk to PG&E. Since 9/11, they put up a buffer zone in some of our prime fishing grounds. And I have already talked to a few people in PG&E, and
we're here tonight and we're trying to seek a letter to
take to State Lands to let us back in that area to fish
and see what we can work out. I mean, we won't have to
wait 10 years. We're asking to get in there by sometime
next year. And we operate with little, small boat
fishery, and we would like to see if we can get in there.
It has been a long time now, and it's time for us to get
some of our fishing grounds back. Thank you.

MR. KIRK: Hi. I'm Dave Kirk. I am also from
Port San Luis Fisherman's Association. And I'll try not
to repeat the same thing that Butch just did, but
San Onofre didn't have an exclusion zone, and we don't see
any reason why. And if you don't see any reason why this
zone should be there, we would ask that you give us
something in writing to start the process to open this up
to us.

And just so you know, that two largest marine
protected areas in the state of California are north of
our port and one south of our port. And those encompass
all the hard bottom, which is your best habitat and your
best fishing area. And then out front, we have the RCA,
which is a federally -- it's considered the slope, which
is -- that's also real good habitat, and that's closed.
It's been closed for 15 years.

So we don't have much area left to fish. Most
of the area left in front of our port is soft bottom. And it would be a great help to us as a business entity in this community and as people who are trying to raise families, and we have suffered a lot of abuse from regulatory agencies. I have a tracker on my boat. I have to take a federal observer with me when I go. And all of these costs, it makes it awful hard to make a living. And I don't want to cry to you and tell you how tough it is to be a commercial fisherman, but if you are thinking about it, don't do it.

So one last thing I would like to bring up that we have been battling for a couple of years now is this marine sanctuary. And if that happens -- which it's on the shelf right now. Congressman Carbajal has sent letters recommending it go forward. This entity we are dealing with, the Sierra Club and their spokesperson, Fred Collins, is adamant on these sacred grounds from this ancestral site, which will more likely lead to more closures, so we are not looking forward to seeing that happen either. So we would like to see some fishing grounds opened up and we would probably like to see more fish available to eat on your table, and we would like to bring them to you. Thank you.

MS. SWANSON: So I'm Jane Swanson. I am San Luis Obispo Mothers For Peace. I claim no expertise, and
I'm not making any predictions with my comments, but I wanted to mention some possible risks to having building uses within spitting distance of a dry cask facility. My information comes from a National Academy of Sciences report, the title of which is "Safety and Security of Commercial Spent Nuclear Fuel Storage." It's a public report. This report -- don't worry, I won't summarize the whole thing, just mentioning a couple of things, but the report does point out that the casks are designed for safe storage, but they are not immune from terrorist attack. One potential type of terrorist attack would be that imposed by a large aircraft. As strong as the casks are, they could definitely be breached by a large aircraft. And the big danger there would be if the cladding on the fuel rods were damaged, that would release radioactive substances into the atmosphere, and that would be a very bad day. Add to that the potential of burning jet fuel, and you've got a mess.

So I bring up this unpleasant topic because I think it's important that this risk, small as it is, be recognized as this panel and PG&E consider repurposing buildings and the repurposing of the lands on the 12,000 acres.

Now that I have made myself very popular, I do want to become my more cheerful self. I'm actually pretty
cheerful. I want to express my appreciation to this panel of hard working, dedicated citizens. I know you are volunteering your time. And I am pretty sure it's a lot of time and a lot of heavy thought.

I also would like to complement PG&E. This is a very informative, educational process, and their slides are just primo. I always look forward to their slides being uploaded on the website so I can study them after the meeting. So thank you all for your work. And I'm sorry to be such a downer.

MR. TOMAN: Good evening. My name is Bill Toman. I live in Los Osos. Pleased to be with you again. To continue with the comments earlier, it really is an amazing process here with the stakeholder panel. I've followed the retirements of nuclear plants throughout the country, and I'm unaware there is a process as well informed and as well executed as this panel providing so much time for the right amount of information to be input and decisions made on that basis, as opposed to a very compressed, rushed process that leads to perhaps less-than-best decisions. So this has really been an amazing process that will continue on for several more months, so thank you very much for the opportunity.

I'm here to say that it is important that the assets at Diablo Canyon be considered to be available for
repurposing for renewable energy activities, and in particular to offshore wind off of California. I am back from last week's meetings in Sacramento with the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management and the California Intergovernmental Task Force on Renewable Energy, as well as meetings with the Department of Defense in Oregon the past week regarding offshore wind. And the consensus is that while the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management is looking at instituting a process for implementing seabed leases for offshore wind developers probably sometime in 2019, the Department of Defense is still very uncomfortable with what we would call utility scale, several hundred wind turbine offshore wind farms anywhere south of Monterey Bay, including the Central Coast.

A potential solution is to have a small pilot project of two or three floating wind turbines off the Central Coast area that most likely would interconnect with Pacific Gas and Electric's system. And I would like to follow up with PG&E later with proposals for collaborations for implementing pilot wind projects in order to inform the Department of Defense of the acceptability ultimately of offshore wind farms that would ultimately repurpose assets at Diablo Canyon. Thank you very much for your time.

MR. MITCHELL: Good evening. I'm Bob Mitchell
with the California Energy Development Company. Marty Weakley and I thank you for the opportunity to present our transmission project that will go into Diablo Canyon last Saturday. We left your meeting and presentation that day to go to Sacramento and go to the meeting that Bill just mentioned with the state/federal task force.

The night before we met with Trident Energy, Trident Wind Development Project, to talk about our project and introduce the opportunity for them to connect to the transmission project that we are developing. And without speaking for them, just say that I think we struck a nerve, and there's a lot of interest in talking further.

At the state/federal task force meeting, our local county supervisor, Bruce Gibson, raised probably one of the most interesting questions of the day when he asked the Navy, "The ocean is kind of large out there. Is it not possible that you could conduct some of your exercises and your experiments in an area other than what BOEM would like to designate as the area for the wind zones to be developed?" I will say it's no surprise that the Navy did not exactly respond to his question, but it was a very pointed and very good question for him to ask.

Marty and I met with the BOEM staff down in Camarillo this morning and was pleased to have them share with us that by the end of the year, they plan on
announcing a call for projects. And this is a terrific
first move to get the process going, to actually
establishing wind zones in the area off the Central Coast.
So we are delighted with that.

This afternoon, I had the opportunity to meet
with Greg Haas, with Congressman Carbajal's office, and
pleased with the interest on the part of the Congressman
and Greg to help promote the development of offshore wind
and transmission. So just wanted to give you a little
update and to thank you for the opportunity to present to
you last Saturday. Thank you.

MR. OWENS: Good evening and thank you all for
your service. I didn't intend to actually speak on this
item, but since my name showed up, I might as well. A
potential use that occurred to me because of the existing
infrastructure and assets that are in this area is that of
a data center or data centers, also known as "server
farms." They require a lot of intense power. They also
require fiber optic connectivity. And if I am not
mistaken, there's a major fiberoptic trunk that comes from
the Pan Pacific and empties into California right at the
MBO, just a few miles north of us.

I live in Los Osos. I come from the Silicon
Valley in which I was a power -- I have a worked for a
power utility that powered the data centers of Silicon
Valley, and I saw the direct impact on the economic development in the development of information technologies firsthand over the years that I spent working there. And as we look into our future, the Internet of things, autonomous vehicles and artificial intelligence are all going to require more and more and more square feet of data center space. Data centers don't employ a lot of people, which is a downside for economic development, but on the other hand, they empower the community to move forward in the high-tech world, especially within a 90-mile radius because of the latency factors. So just wanted to bring that up as a potential use for the property.

MR. ANDERS: Thank all the commenters very much. I appreciate your comments. Now we have time set aside for some panel discussion about what you've heard from the public or any other follow-up discussion regarding the workshops and repurposing.

So Sherri, start us off.

MS. DANOFF: Okay. So I certainly think the last input was good for a data storage center, along with so many other interesting technology proposals. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Anyone else?
Kara, and then Lauren.

MS. WOODRUFF: I have a question for PG&E and then a couple of comments. I was just curious if you could talk about the history and the status of this no-fish zone after 911.

MR. FRANKE: I think in conclusion, Tom is going to speak to that.

MS. WOODRUFF: Okay.

MR. JONES: So that was an action taken by the federal government immediately after 911, and it was just decided and enacted. We reviewed it a few times, and it is not pertinent to our security plans. We will take a fresh look at it after tonight. But previous to that enactment of the exclusionary zone, which is a little over a 1-mile radius from the plant, we would make the port available if there was a mariner in distress or something like that. Now, the coast guard enforces that area, and we also communicate with any craft via Channel 16 to advise them of the area. But it's not a security driver for us, so it's certainly worth a fresh visit.

MS. WOODRUFF: Yeah. I think if you can look into it, no reason not to. Thank you.

MR. FRANKE: I think part of the point here is we will look into it, but that is not our purview. We don't control the access to the ocean in that area.
MS. WOODRUFF: Second quick comment about the proposed pilot project for the wind energy facility. I think that's kind of interesting. I mean, I think that one of the presentations we heard about wind energy. There may be some challenges that that project could face because of the deep water levels we have in this region, and a pilot project seems like something interesting to explore.

I wanted to make a comment about the breakwater in the marina. We have heard a couple of comments now from Chris Barrett and others that if the breakwaters are kept in place, that could be a good area where, maybe, sailors or fisherman could use for recreation. I think that's an intriguing idea. And I think what I've heard even from the environmentalists is that keeping the breakwater in place is valuable. And I've been out there on the marina and I've seen otters and California sea lions and harbor seals, and it clearly looks like a very rich area of wildlife. I know there has been a lot of study there too. So I think it would be very interesting to explore keeping the breakwater and preserving that ecological region.

And I guess I would hope that if the breakwater is intact and we do allow it to be used for some recreational uses, it would be really balanced in a way
that the richness of that ecological area wasn't undermined and destroyed. I don't think we want to see a lot of boat storage and slips and overuse of this really small area. If we could come up with good balance where people use it for recreation but keep the resources intact, especially the marine resources, I think that would be a good outcome.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Kara. Lauren, and then Linda.

MR. BROWN: I just wanted to thank the audience for a number of brand-new ideas we hadn't heard of before tonight. The idea of the VA facility, the idea of the data center and a couple other, thank you all for that input. I hope that we continue to receive from the public more ideas like this. We are not preparing our final report for another six weeks or so, and there is time for the public to forward more ideas, which we will take into consideration.

I had one question, perhaps somebody could tell me. I see Bob Mitchell here. Who is BOEM? You had a meeting with BOEM, I believe?

MR. MITCHELL: Yes. Thank you for asking, and I apologize for giving you an acronym. It's the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, and it is the agency within the Department of Interior that is responsible for selecting
the areas where the wind zones can be developed. And this is really significant, and I will just, with this opportunity tell you a funny story from the Monday State Task Force.

The Navy was making a point, "Well, we are not sure what we will agree to," and the tone of it was, "We are not going to agree to anything." And the acting director of BOEM shot a shot across the bow by saying "Well, it's actually the Secretary of Interior who makes the decision about where the wind zones will be." And at that meeting, they did share a map, which I don't have electronically here tonight, that showed three potential wind zones that BOEM is looking at. One is just off of Big Sur but only about 12, 13 miles offshore. There is no way that offshore wind farms are going to be developed 12, 13 miles off the coast from Big Sur.

The second area is the area that Trident has been working on, which is just on the southwest corner of the marine sanctuary, the Monterey marine sanctuary. And the third area, which we had not expected, is directly west of Diablo Canyon, and it's a large area, 400 square miles. Our consultants, military consultants, think that that is going to be an extremely difficult area for the Navy to give up, but BOEM is intent on exploring that. And what I failed to say earlier when I said
they were going to do a call for projects by the end of
the year, that kicks into a process of 19 months for them
to make a selection as to who can develop wind farms
within these wind zones. So mid-2020 would be the time
zone that they would be looking at. And you know, there
is certainly lots of hurdles to jump here, but the idea of
being able to target maybe 2026, a year after the plant
shuts down, to be able to have a transmission line come
into Diablo Canyon and to the substation and to have the
wind farm start their process of development is not out of
line at all.

MR. BROWN: I have got one more question, if I
could. The gentleman who made the presentation in favor
of keeping Diablo Canyon open, as I understand it, this
decision to close by PG&E was rather forced on them by
action of the legislature, which has determined that
nuclear power doesn't count toward the renewable power.
So I am wondering, are you making this presentation to the
legislature?

MR. NELSON: So CGNP has been an adverse party
to SB1090, and have testified repeatedly within the
California state capital in both assembly and senate
committees regarding the impropriety of this bill as it is
putting the cart before the horse. The issue is not fully
litigated. If you go to the PUC website, you will find
that this issue is marked as reopened, if you look for A1608006. This is not a final decision. And that’s been one of our gripes all along is that there seems to be a desire to try to rush this process along, and this is a really significant issue. And of course, as we’ve heard tonight, from me, it is tied to national security. California has 39 bases. Those bases need 24/7 power. That doesn't come from gas. It doesn't come from solar. It doesn't come from wind. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Okay. Linda, and then Frank.

MS. SEELEY: I have got two concerns. One, just briefly about the harbor that Kara was talking about. One thing that concerns me about a lot of development in the harbor is that if we want it to be a place where wildlife can thrive, when there are all kinds of boats in the harbor, they leave bits of petroleum products, and I don't know how to balance that out. It doesn't seem like -- it seems as though you might have to have one or the other, but I am not a hundred percent sure of that. I just want to say that.

And then the other thing I want to make was a comment about our website, the decommissioning website. A few people have told me that they have had problems with submitting. It's hard to find the button where you comment. So I had kept forgetting to say that, that maybe
that could be switched around a little bit so that it's more prominent. That's it.

MR. ANDERS: I appreciate that. And that design is being reviewed right now.

Frank.

MR. MEACHUM: Just quickly, I too have a little bit of concern on the breakwater issue, size of boats or ships that would come into there. I can't see a ship coming in there. But even when we were out there cruising around, the water gets pretty rough outside that breakwater, so coming in could somewhat be a problem for some boats. And I kind of agree that if you are going to do some type of a marine research or anything like that, it's going to be difficult to utilize that as a boat harbor as well.

The only other comment that I make is Mr. Mitchell, I wouldn't get crossties with the United States Navy.

MR. MITCHELL: I fully appreciate what you said.

MR. ANDERS: Dena, did you have a comment?

MS. BELLMAN: Yes. I have a question or comment for Bob Mitchell again.

My question is you mentioned that you were talking to -- you had discussions with Trident about their offshore generation. And I am wondering, are you talking
about tying into their current operation or were you
talking about an additional operation?

MR. MITCHELL: Well, it was a general
conversation. Alla Weinstein, who is the developer, is
somebody I have known for probably eight years or so, and
she had heard that somebody had filed for an
interconnection request at Diablo Canyon for 2000
megawatts. And the Cal ISO does not disclose who the
applicant is, so she's been wracking her brain trying to
figure out who on the earth has made this filing. So
anyway, I called her a few weeks ago to tell her that we
were engaged and so on. So that just led to us getting
together for this dinner meeting, so it was a very general
meeting discussion.

Let me just quickly say that there are a number
of advantages for a wind developer to connect to the
transmission line that we are proposing. And the main
benefit to them -- there are a couple -- is that by
connecting to our line out at sea, they only have to bear
the cost of getting from their wind farm, the 2 or
3 miles, whatever it would be, to the offshore platform
that we will have at sea that will convert the AC power to
DC power.

If we did not exist, then the wind developer
would have to build their own transmission line. And it's
called an gen-tie. And they would be fully responsible for the cost of that transmission line. But because we are proposing to build a line from Diablo Canyon all the way down to Southern Cal Edison's territory at Ormond Beach, which is near Oxnard, our line will become a part of the California ISO system. And because they are a part of the California ISO system, the cost of the transmission line gets borne by all the rate payers in California, other than immunities, the same as any other transmission line would be charged. So it's a huge benefit.

The third benefit to the wind farm developers is that power that goes into Diablo Canyon is good because the Diablo Canyon substation is so powerful, it's so strong, and the transmission lines are so robust, but the price node at Diablo -- at Ormond Beach is considerably higher than the price that they would get for sending power to Diablo Canyon. So it gives them a choice, an option, as to where the power goes by us building a line that's interconnected with the grid in two places.

And we have a study underway right now by a reputable consulting firm here in California, Z Global, and their study is not complete for us but it's pretty far along. And there are indications that the benefits of taking power all the way down to the L.A. basin and maybe going down to Redondo Beach will be so beneficial to the
overall system that the line itself may have enough benefit to pay for itself independent of the wind.

MS. BELLMAN: Okay. So let me just ask this quickly a different way. So the capacity for the area that Trident is building right now, what is that capacity to put out?

THE WITNESS: It would be 2000 megawatts into Diablo.

MS. BELLMAN: Currently, that is what they are building off of San Simeon --

MR. MITCHELL: No. Trident is looking at building 600, 700 megawatts --

MS. BELLMAN: So that does answer my question.

MR. MITCHELL: But the goal -- their goal is to build like a thousand. And there are other -- plenty of other, like four or five other wind developers, who are looking at that same area who would also like to build a thousand megawatts or so. And our thought is we would send a couple thousand megawatts into Diablo Canyon, and 2000 megawatts would go south to the Los Angeles Basin, 1,000 megawatts going into Oxnard and Ormond Beach, and 1,000 going on to Redondo. I do want to say that that's conditional. I mean, our study is not complete, so I may come back in another month and say, "I'm sorry, it doesn't quite work out."
We met with Southern Cal Edison's transmission planners yesterday, and they're very intrigued. Nobody has looked at this project the way we are looking at it. We have been in the independent transmission business for 20 years, and so we tend to take a little different look at things than maybe others have. And I can take 30 seconds more.

MS. BELLMAN: Actually, my question had to do more with the aesthetics offshore, so that answered my question.

MR. MITCHELL: The aesthetics would be you won't see it. It's 35, 40 miles. The curvature of the earth, as many of you know, is 23 miles. These towers are going to be almost as tall as the Eiffel Tower. So if you were on an elevated cliff or something and it's on a super clear day, you might see some portion of the top level of it, but visibility won't be a factor.

MR. ANDERS: David, you had a question?

MR. BALDWIN: No, just a comment.

I enjoyed all the commenters tonight from the public. And just kind of going back to our presentations from the 14th and the 15th, one of the things that came out of that was, for me at least, the panel discussed about the strategic plan. And it's tough, I think, for everybody, I know for me certainly, to get a frame of
reference to the time lines here. So you know, the old saying is, "We have a lot of work to do and a short amount of time to do it." But in this case, while we have the time lines coming up, we have a lot of work to do and a long amount of time to do it. And it's hard to keep -- I think we have to keep reinforcing that frame of mind.

As presenters came to the 14th and 15th and from some of the stuff I've heard tonight, I think it's important, maybe, for PG&E to keep reinforcing that for us, as a panel, and for the public, that I guess we don't know exactly how some things are going to come available as we move into decommissioning as far as the assets there are planned for repurposing, the order that facilities might become available or also that the site will be an active construction site and radiological site that will be under decontamination process for quite a long time.

And all of the costs that go along with the repurposing efforts that all of the presenters have brought to us, the panel had quite a bit of discussion there when I was there on the 14th about just the use of water, the only source being from the de-sal plant, and just a lot of things to consider but over a long period of time.

So I want to echo some of the other panelists in encouraging the public to keep coming with your ideas, with your proposals. They are heard. They are recorded.
The panel discusses them. And it's important that those keep coming and just happy to keep working through the process here as we pick through it.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, David.

Any other thoughts or comments?

Yes, Nancy.

MS. SEELEY: So I want to clarify a time line here. So we have six more years before the plant is no longer operational. And then if the decommissioning begins, is it possible for, you know, some industry to move in there while the decommissioning is still going on, while there is some still radioactive waste that's being taken care of?

MR. JONES: The short answer is yes. The time line we gave you tonight showed 2027, some assets being able to be released at that point, so that's very early in the decommissioning phase. David is right. I have to remind people, this is a multi-decade, multi-billion-dollar project, so we have got seven years left of operation. So the middle of 2025 for Unit 2, and then about 18 months until we think we could have guests. We could have someone on site today -- the analogy I would give you, though, and I have done this once in my life, and once only, moving into a multiphase housing tract, that's in the first phase. You're going to have noisy,
active neighbors for a long time, but you get a good deal.
That's the best analogy I can come up with. If you have a
better one, I would be happy to listen to it. Yes, 2027
is when we think that some assets would be online for
repurposing.

MR. FRANKE: It's probably worth noting also,
there was discussion earlier about the amount of traffic
during decommissioning. I would gauge that the total
amount of cars and vehicles in and out of the site will be
decreased after plant shutdown. There will be some larger
trucks, but nowhere near the amount of vehicles going in
and out of the site once the plant shuts down. When we
get in the active decommissioning phase is what I am
talking about.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you.
Any further comments, observations or thoughts?
I would like to turn it over to Tom to introduce
next month's topic of discussion.

MR. JONES: Thanks, Chuck. So next month, we
actually have two topics. We're going to be visited by
Bruce Watson, who is the NRC chief in charge of reactor
decommissioning branch. And there's some active
rulemaking that's going on at the Nuclear Regulatory
Commission right now about decommissioning. So hopefully,
with a little luck, he might be here immediately after
some new rules are hot off the presses. But he is the leader for the NRC in terms of decommissioning. He was here a little over a year ago when Congressman Carbajal hosted a town hall on decommissioning. And I know that we've made that video available on our website for any of the panelists that haven't seen it or members of the public. He's very knowledgeable and he oversees the entire -- our entire regulatory future, right? We're going to switch from an operating plant to a decommissioning plant, and he oversees that branch.

Secondly, we will be joined by the County of San Luis Obispo. Ron Alsop from the Office of Emergency Services, who will be discussing decommissioning and emergency planning. And since Senate Bill 1090 became law in the last week, there is a provision in the that deals with some funding for offsite agencies, which is the County of San Luis Obispo, to continue through the decommissioning period. So for instance, when San Onofre first closed, there was state legislation that affected how you deal with emergency planning costs with local jurisdictions. It only applied to operating plants. So when they immediately went into decommissioning, they didn't have statutory guidance. So SB1090 gives us that gap and a path of how to address that with Diablo Canyon.

I would be happy to answer any questions you
have about the next topics.

MR. KARLIN: Tom, I was talking with, I guess, Bob Rathie of the Diablo Canyon Independent Safety Committee today, and I think I mentioned that to you. Is PG&E going to be conducting an evaluated emergency exercise in October? Is that something that would be worthwhile for this committee to watch or sit in on? Or tell us about, at least, what is going on there. Maybe that will be next month at our meeting. What is an evaluated emergency exercise and what's the deal on that?

MR. JONES: As a part of our license, we demonstrate to our regulators that we can protect the health and safety of our public with our emergency planning, in combination with our off-site partners. Ostensibly, the county is the first response agency, and they help coordinate state and federal resources if there were an emergency. We do that every other year. It is not open to the public. We can have observers but we, frankly, don't like folks to get in the way. So your charter is for decommissioning, not operation. So this is an activity we do for the operating power plant. It would look very different in decommissioning space in a shorter period of time.

If the panel has interest, we can determine if we have space for observers at the facilities. When we
are fully staffed, and this is a major event, we bring in hundreds of players from both Pacific Gas and Electric Company and state and local agencies, so the place is like a really busy hospital, there is not a lot of room to observe stuff. But if the panel members have an individual interest, we can consult with our partners and our Emergency Planning Department to see if observing it makes sense.

MR. KARLIN: Thank you.

MR. JONES: Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Tom. That concludes our formal agenda. We do have one more item, and that is our meeting evaluation that's in two parts. First, what you liked about this meeting, do you want to replicate and reinforce. And secondly, opportunities for improvement, things we could change to make the next meeting better.

So first, any observations of things that you liked about this meeting, want to reinforce for future meetings?

MR. MEACHUM: We heard things that we hadn't heard before. And like David mentioned, I think we're welcoming any further comments, further ideas, take them all into consideration. So we heard some new ones tonight, and I appreciate that.

MR. ANDERS: Good. Thank you.
Anyone else?

Anything you would want to change? Any suggestions for future meetings to improve the meetings?

MR. KARLIN: I have just one little nip, and that is sometimes during the presentation, it would be helpful, maybe, to have a laser pointer so when, for example, Tom was talking about the map, he could point to the relevant buildings. Now, I know that won't be captured necessarily on the video programs, or something, but it could be helpful to us. I don't know. Is there some reason why you don't think that would be appropriate?

MR. JONES: I use a laser pointer -- it's behind you. What we have done in the past, we use the mouse, where Adam is sitting. We can use the curser, and that will also be recorded.

MR. KARLIN: Something like that, great.

MR. ANDERS: Or maybe we can get a remote mouse up here too would be a possibility, so good idea.

Anything else?

Okay. Well, thank you all for your time and your attention. Thank the public for being here.

And this meeting is adjourned.

(Proceeding concluded at 8:49 p.m.)
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>watch</td>
<td>81:7</td>
<td>WOODRUFF</td>
<td>21:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watched</td>
<td>5:5</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>40:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watching</td>
<td>2:3</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>3:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>12:11</td>
<td>worked</td>
<td>64:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watershed</td>
<td>7:19</td>
<td>working</td>
<td>28:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson</td>
<td>79:21</td>
<td>works</td>
<td>16:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>50:25</td>
<td>workshop</td>
<td>40:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ways</td>
<td>6:23</td>
<td>workshops</td>
<td>13:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakley</td>
<td>63:2</td>
<td>world</td>
<td>65:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wealth</td>
<td>4:15</td>
<td>worry</td>
<td>60:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>website</td>
<td>14:14</td>
<td>worth</td>
<td>55:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>week</td>
<td>39:19</td>
<td>worthwhile</td>
<td>81:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>week’s</td>
<td>62:3</td>
<td>wracking</td>
<td>73:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weekend</td>
<td>52:24</td>
<td>writing</td>
<td>58:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weeks</td>
<td>25:10</td>
<td>wrong</td>
<td>23:17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>