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MR. ANDERS: Hi. My name is Chuck Anders, and I am the facilitator for the panel tonight, and I want to welcome you to the fourth meeting of the Diablo Canyon Decommissioning Engagement Panel. There are four other meetings scheduled, monthly meetings, through the end of this year.

So tonight, our primary topic is lands. And before we start, I want to emphasize that there will be public comments. And we'll be handing out some blue cards in the next few minutes, and those who want to speak can fill out those cards and turn them in. The primary bulk of this meeting is actually dedicated to you because we have almost an hour and a half set aside for public comment, so everyone is looking forward to hearing what you have to say. Hopefully we will have a lot of speakers.

Before we begin, I'd like to introduce Suzanne Hosn, who will provide a safety briefing for us.

MS. HOSN: Good evening, everyone. Thank you for being here. Just wanted to let you know that safety responsibilities have already been preassigned. And we would like to thank the SLO County Sheriff's Department for being here this evening, as well as the Diablo Canyon Fire Department. In the event of an earthquake, we ask that you duck, cover and hold, and use the exits onto
Monterey Street or onto Higuera Street. And just a quick reminder that restrooms are down the hallway and to the left. Thank you.

MR. FRANKE: All right. My name is John Franke. I'm the vice president for power generation for Pacific Gas and Electric. Under my purview includes the decommissioning work in preparation for -- my mic wasn't on. I said some wonderful things.

My name is John Franke. I am the vice president for power generation for Pacific Gas and Electric. I also have responsibilities over the decommissioning activities, both active and planning decommissioning activities for the nuclear plants associated with the company. And I just wanted to welcome the community to the meeting tonight. This is our fourth meeting. The topic is one very important to us, and I just want to briefly remind folks, we have already discussed a number of different topics. And as the panel meetings go on, those topics will change, and I encourage folks to look at the schedule and come in and participate in those meetings that have topics that are important to you.

I want to thank the panel, before we get going. The last month has been hectic. It's been very busy, and the panel has done a tremendous amount of work to research and learn more about what could happen to the 12,000 acres
that currently are reserved associated with Diablo Canyon going forward. And when I say "worked hard," they've worked very hard. We've had two long days of public workshops where people with ideas and interest in the land use have come forward.

And I actually want to take a moment and thank -- I believe Sheila Blake, city councilman for Pismo Beach, is here. There she is in the back. Thank you, Sheila. We had those meetings in the city council offices at Pismo. I want to thank the support from the City for that.

One intention of the panel is to get around. The county is a large area, and we're committed to both some southern meetings and some northern meetings. I know we are going to work to get some activity up in the north in the county as well.

In addition to those two full days of workshops, including a weekend day, full Saturday, the company has reached out to the community, and we have had over 300 individuals tour the lands through a program to get a better feel for what's available out there. So tonight is important. This is going to be a culmination of a lot of research relative to land use. As we go into decommissioning, we are committed to listening to the community input. This is all part of the process. This
panel is doing great work for the community. But at the same time, we want all the voices that can be heard, you know, to step forward. And my primary job on the panel is not to speak, other than to welcome you. The rest of it is to listen. And we are going to take that information as we move forward with our decisions. So thank you for coming. And I want to thank, again, the panel for their efforts so far.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, John.

Before we begin, we want to just go over the agenda so you know it, understand, and the panel understands what's in store for us tonight. First of all, we are going to have a presentation from the County and PG&E with regard to the lands surrounding Diablo Canyon and how they are structured. Then we will have a brief discussion of the results of the workshops that the panel held a couple of weeks ago. They held two full days of workshops, and there were two full days of presentations, so we will talk about that. We will have almost an hour and a half for public comment. And then the public -- the panel will have a discussion, and then we will introduce the next topic for next month.

With regard to public comment, those who want to provide public comment, there are cards back here. And just hold your hand up and people will come around and
pass them out to you. There are blue cards. These are
the ones you want to fill out if you want to come up and
talk. And there are white cards, and these are the ones
you want to fill out if you want to make a comment and
just submit it, and we will make sure the panel sees it
and it gets inputted into the process.

I would like to recommend and suggest that if
you are part of an organization, pick a spokesman for your
organization so that everyone doesn't get up and say the
same thing. And pick a spokesman, and then the members of
the organization that support that spokesman and their
perspective, raise your hands, or stand up, or come over
and stand up by the podium so we can move forward as
quickly and efficiently as possible. Okay? Everybody got
their blue cards and white cards?

One over here. One here. Great. So that's
what we are going to do tonight.

So are you ready to go, Panel?

MR. KARLIN: Chuck, we're not getting the video.

MR. ANDERS: We've got an audio-visual issue.

MR. MEACHUM: I have got Game of Thrones on
mine.

MR. ANDERS: While he is doing that, I do want
to mention that this meeting is being video streamed live
and it will also be available to you in its entirety. We
also are actually having an official transcript of the
meeting which will also be available. And we have our
hearing-impaired sign also. So we want to be as inclusive
as possible, and hopefully everyone can see the history of
this meeting. And also, if you said, "What did he say?"
or "What did she say?" you just go back on the video and
take a listen.

Okay. We ready to go? Hold the cards up. We
will come and pick them up.

Okay. So our first presentation is on what are
these lands that people are talking about and how are they
structured. So I want to introduce Trevor Keith, the
recently-appointed planning director for San Luis Obispo
County, who is going to kick off this discussion.

MR. KEITH: Thank you, Chuck. Thank you
everybody for coming out. So tonight, on behalf of the
Planning and Building Department, I've asked one of our
staff, Sara Sanders, who will be working on the Diablo
project as it moves along for our department, to give the
presentation this evening. So with that, I will turn it
over to Ms. Sanders.

MS. SANDERS: Thank you, Trevor.

Everybody hear me okay?

So as Trevor said, my name is Sara Sanders. I
work for the Planning and Building Department. Before we
get started on -- kind of process, a higher level overview
of the Planning and Building Department does in work
meeting with PG&E, we are going to look at where the
project site is.

So the project site has been highlighted in red,
and it shows up in yellow. It's important to know that
the purple that just showed up is Eureka Energy owned,
which is a subsidiary of PG&E. It's important to know
that because it is not regulated by the CPUC, so it's good
to know, just as reference.

Now, where does the County become involved in
all of this? It's through the General Plan. It's the
State maintained -- it is required by the State that we
maintain a General Plan, and it's broken up into topic
areas. And there is seven required state-mandated General
Plan elements. Obviously, on the protection, you see the
seven and then additional elements, such as the
Agriculture element and the Parks and Rec element.

And this, we are really going to be focusing on
the Land Use element today. It is broken up into the
Inland portion and the Coastal portion. And as you will
see through the presentation, that there is a little bit
more oversight with the Coastal portion because it goes
through the California Coastal Commission. So with that
being said, in the inland area, in the Inland Land Use
element is broken up into four sections: Framework for Planning, the San Luis Obispo Area Plan, the Community Plans, and Official Maps. And then to implement that, we use the Land Use Ordinance, Title 22, and Specific Plans. In the Coastal portion, we use Framework for Planning. It's broken up into four sections too. We use Framework For Planning, San Luis Obispo Bay Area Plan, Official Maps and the Coastal Zone Policy document. And to implement it, we use the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance, which is Title 23, Table O, from Framework of Planning, which is in the General Plan, Planning Area Standards, and in the San Luis Bay Area Plan, and also the Coastal Zone Policy document, so a few more documents related to that.

As I said before, the property that we are looking at today is divided up into two area plans, which is the San Luis Obispo Planning Area, and that's the inland portion, so the yellow portion, and then the San Luis Bay Area Plan, which is the blue portion, and that's the coastal zone.

So Land Use categories, we break out the -- our zoning maps into Land Use categories. So Land Use categories, we identify similar and compatible uses and provide a basic order for development while allowing a range of uses. There are 14 Land Use categories in the
county, and three of them are represented in the property
that we are talking about today. So the three Land Use
categories are agriculture, public facilities and rural
land. So rural land is in the pink, public facilities is
the blue and agriculture is in green.

And so from there, to see if a type of land use
is compatible with our Land Use categories, we do -- we go
back to the General Plan, where we have to first see where
the property is, if it's in the Coastal zone or the inland
zone. So if it's in the Inland area, we identify the Land
Use category, obviously, and then we go to the ordinance
and we look at Table 2-2, so the Table 2-2 shows you --
it's a big Excel sheet, essentially, with the Land Use
category and the type of use, and it provides any type of
standards that are required and if those land uses are
compatible in that type of Land Use category.

And then we go and look at the standards in
Article 4 and Article 9. So if the property is in the
coastal zone, we first identify the Land Use category, and
then we go to Framework for Planning, and that's Table O,
instead of Table 2-2. In the Inland, it's Table O in the
coastal zone. And then we use the Coastal Land Use
Ordinance, Title 23, and review the area plans for
standards.

So if something if -- let's say a landowner
wants to change a land use, then we go through -- this is a very high-level process, so it first gets authorized, then goes through environmental review. So a lot of you have heard of CEQA, California Environmental Quality Act. The amendment to the General Plan goes through environmental review, and then it goes to Planning Commission for a hearing. The Planning Commission provides a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors hears the recommendation, they might change it, they might not, and then it goes into final action, and that's in the Inland area.

In the Coastal area, it's a little more complicated because from the Board of Supervisors, it doesn't just go to final action. It goes to the California Coastal Commission for hearing. They can either make amendments to their recommendation and then the board hears it again. If the board doesn't agree, then that amendment will not go through and will not be finalized. So it's really important for our department to work with the Coastal Commission in the Coastal zone, obviously, because we don't want that to happen.

So some past projects, just higher level, so the County Planning and Building Department has worked with PG&E on construction of a steam generator replacement for the plant and then also construction of storage for spent
fuel. And then right now, the department is working with PG&E on improvements to the North Ranch Road to meet county fire standards for two-lane roads. And that's currently in the environmental review stage.

So that concludes the formal presentation that Planning has. And I can take questions. And if I don't have answers for you, I will get the answers.

MR. KARLIN: Maybe I have a question, Sara. Can you talk about what triggers the Land Use process. As I understand it, it is a request from the landowner --

MS. SANDERS: Correct.

MR. KARLIN: -- to change the land use from existing land use authorization to something different, right?

MS. SANDERS: It's a formal application that comes into the department.

MR. KARLIN: So that would be, PG&E presumably would trigger the process at some point when there is a change that they are looking to accomplish or get approved from the county or the California Coastal Commission, right? Or both, I guess.

MS. SANDERS: Correct.

MR. KARLIN: Thank you.

MS. SEELEY: Thank you, Sara. My question is what would happen if there were a coastal issue and it
went to the Coastal Commission, they made changes, and
then it went back to the board and the board didn't agree
with it, what would happen? And does that ever happen?

MS. SANDERS: So it has happened. We try to
avoid that as much as possible because we don't want the
applicant or the amendment not to go through with all of
the staff resources that go into that. So we work, like I
said before, really closely with Coastal Commission and
early and often so that doesn't happen, but it has
happened before. And what if the amendment doesn't go
through, so it doesn't get changed in our General Plan.

MS. SEELEY: Thank you.

MR. MEACHUM: Sara, I have a question. If there
are several different projects that come forward based
upon the final conclusion of PG&E, can this process work
together with all of them or does it have to be an
individual project that would go through an individual
hearing and an ordinance change?

MS. SANDERS: I am thinking, I guess it depends
on the application.

Trevor, do you have a better answer for that?

MR. KEITH: Yeah. It would depend on what
actions, what PG&E would want to do and over what time
line. So it is kind of a case-by-case.

MR. MEACHUM: Okay. I'm not quite clear on
that. Because if the final application for change came with two or three different projects, would each of these projects have to go through an environmental review or could they all go as one?

MR. KEITH: It would go as one.

MR. MEACHUM: Thank you.

MR. KARLIN: Another question. This may be as well for PG&E. Just to help the audience and everyone understand, the timing of the CEQA review or the application process, I mean we are talking about several years from now; isn't that right, Tom? Maybe Tom or John could help everyone understand what the timing is, of this would be.

MR. JONES: Yes. Tom Jones of Pacific Gas and Electric Company. What we envision is we file this application, which sets the budget for the project in 2018. We anticipate that to be resolved by mid-2020. After that filing, we have our project scheduled now between mid 2020 through 2024 to obtain the discretionary permits from the County of San Luis Obispo, State Lands Commission and the California Coastal Commission, so that we can arrive at these decisions and go directly into decommissioning. So all of that work is predicated on three or four concurrent rulings.

MR. KARLIN: Thank you.
MS. SANDERS: Any other Planning and Building questions?

MR. JONES: Thank you, Sara.

So again, Tom Jones with PG&E. For the public, here's a view of the power plant from the south to the north. And tonight, we are discussing really three zones. The focus mainly will be on the northern and southern lands. The center parcel that Sara showed on her map earlier, this one showing the facility, will be the topic of our workshops in Atascadero on September 14th and 15th, followed by our meeting at the end of the month here in this room to then summarize and have further discussion about potential repurposing opportunities.

Just a little setting on why we are here. Part of our decision when we sought to retire the plant was to seek public input on the future of the properties and the facilities, and then the commission agreed to ratify that proposal on pages 60 and 61 of their staff report, saying we'll have this public outreach process. This panel is a result of it. This meeting is a result of it. And there will be an annual report from this panel moving forward.

Here is the schedule of these meetings, and tonight, August 29, we are doing the land. I just mentioned the other workshops that will be forthcoming, and then the summary meeting of September 26, so that will
be both land and facilities done by the end of next month for this year. And that as well, we were also asked to look at some specific pieces of infrastructure that can influence both land use and repurposing, and that was our breakwater that forms the marina, whether or not that must be removed or if we can pursue some discretionary actions that lead to repurposing to prevent that from going to a landfill.

The property in question is -- Sara set it up very nicely. Thank you, Sara. Here, this shows the properties in their entirety. It is about 14 miles of coastline and over 12,000 acres. Everything in the bright orange, going north and south, is owned by the Utility in fee title. That means Pacific Gas and Electric Company Utility owns that, and that defines some certain future activities for the disposition, specifically no matter what the panel or PG&E and the County agree to, the Public Utilities Commission must agree. And that's something called the 851 process. And that's how they determine how we dispose of assets, or their ultimate disposition, if they were encumbered on behalf of customers.

So then the middle area, there is a small portion that's both green and yellow. That's the power plant site itself. That's about 720 acres. That also was overlaid with the Part 50 license that is ultimately what
we seek to retire decommissioning from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. That also has some discretionary permits from the County of San Luis Obispo and the State of California.

Below that, everything that's hatched and that purple color is still leased to the Utility. We use that primarily as a buffer area. And we have some grazing and some other land management practices on there.

Finally, the yellow area that's checkered is under lease to a company called HomeFed Corporation, and that's Wild Cherry Canyon, which I know there are people here to give some input to the panel about that as well. We also have some of the properties through previous discretionary improvements that have been encumbered in some way for public access. So if you look at this map, the blue parcels highlighted in orange to the north have the Point Buchon trail system on it where the public can access that from Montana de Oro. That's over 6 miles of trail. The trail head starts from Montana De Oro, it comes down the coastline, then back up on some ridges, and that crosses three of our major parcels.

And then on the southern end, that striped area is 1200 acres. They are subject to a deconservation restriction. We're dealing with the Coastal Commission. And it's a little hard to see on this slide, but you can
see some yellow line that follows the bottom of that peninsula there. That's our Pacho Coast Trail program that accesses the Port San Luis lighthouse, goes all the way back up to Rattlesnake Canyon. That's a docent-led hike. So that's where the public currently has access. The rest of it is restricted access to either employees or folks that have a business to be out there, like the ranchers or just some other folks.

And then lastly, just to highlight where that Part 50 license is, this is the public facilities zoned area. This is approximately 720 acres about in the middle of the entire landholding. And this is the same area just with a different perspective to orient folks to where the facilities are today.

And with that, I would be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you, Tom. I wanted to follow up on something you said. So first, thank you, everybody for coming today. It's great to see this much interest. But why are you here? I think the answer to that question is, as the panel, we are here to understand what you think. We are here to hear your vision for the lands. And when we put together all the things you have to say tonight, plus the workshop presentations, plus all the comments that are
made on-line, at the end of this process, the panel is
going to prepare a report that will summarize what we
believe the community is telling us about the future use
of these lands. And then our report is going to be
attached to the PG&E report that's submitted to the PUC at
the end of this year.

So you are here today, it's not just symbolic.
We really want to hear what you have to say. And what you
say will influence what we way the form of a report by the
end of the year. And I know we want to finish and not
waste time. At the same time, this is your chance to
speak. If you have a vision, if you have a dream, use
these three minutes and come up here and tell us what you
think. We really do want to hear what you have to say.
And thank you, again, for coming.

MR. LATHRUP: I was hoping you could just
clarify for the public access that you've noted, no matter
in the future where that -- if the property lies in
someone else's hands, I would say that public access is
there forever; is that correct?

MR. JONES: Correct. Some of the management
practices could change. For instance, the restrictions on
Point Buchon could be revisited through another permitting
process. And currently PG&E, with the Port Harbor
District's docent-led tours, at times there has been
requests to have unfettered access to those trails, so
those types of issues would need to be worked out.
Ultimately, I think everyone can imagine that there's
going to be additional public access, probably phased in
over time depending on this project.

Just to set a level of expectations, we're still
running the place for seven more years, right? And then
this process, the main decommissioning activities will be
the better part of ten to fifteen years.

MR. LATHRUP: Thank you.

MR. KARLIN: Tom, could you, perhaps, show -- I
think it's the penultimate slide. One more, please.
Couple more. Almost to the end. There is a nice slide
that I think shows the NRC's Part 50 jurisdiction.

This is it, yes. And I think for the purpose of
the public it might be good to understand, and you have
mentioned this, but just to emphasize the NRC is the
federal regulatory entity and the major one that is
involved here, and they regulate the nuclear power plant.
And their regulatory gambit or jurisdiction would be this
707, 720 acres or so.

MR. JONES: Correct.

MR. KARLIN: And that's all. And when NRC goes
to the decommissioning process, radiological
decommissioning, and decides whether or not the property
is clean and clear of any potential radiological
ccontamination, that's what they will look at, and that's
pretty much all they are going to look at. And that's
properly so. That's the way they regulate these things.
But keep in mind, although NRC's jurisdiction is only a
small portion of this 12,000 acres, it is an important
portion, obviously, and that's where a big chunk of the
money will need to be spent to clean up the site and
remove materials and properly disposition things. But NRC
is only one central sort of part of this diagram.

MR. JONES: Correct. And I will just add onto
your answer or comment there that they're principally
focussed on the power block. They don't have the same
concerns about some of the ancillary facilities outside.
It's all encumbered in that land mass, but they will have
a keener focus on parts associated with that too.

MR. KARLIN: Right. And at the end of the day
even when the decommissioning is complete, but let's hope
sometime before 2085, there may still be a pad where spent
fuel is stored, and that might be a footprint of an acre
or 3 acres or 5 acres. So the footprint of the facility
of PG&E will drop from 12,000 to 720 to 10 acres, as far
as NRC is concerned at any rate.

MR. JONES: Correct.

Linda.
MS. SEELEY: Actually, do you know the exact acreage ultimately that will hold the 138 casks of spent fuel?

MR. JONES: No. What we will have to do in that case, as we've talked about in previous meetings, that 20-after-35 period, is we will have to build a new security building, and that will be subject to a license amendment request to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And that will also be subject to some discretion of the County and the Coastal Commission. So that footprint is subject to change. The dry cask storage itself sets on about two football fields. And then envision, like San Onofre, a 5,000 to 10,000 square foot building for security and support services and some additional fencing requirements. I don't expect it to be more than a doubling of the size, but there would be some parking for employees, security facility, et cetera.

MS. SEELEY: Thank you.

MR. MEACHUM: Between now and then, if there were a facility that was willing to accept the nuclear waste, that's still a possibility to transport that; is that right?

MR. JONES: Correct. And I would also add that dry cask storage doesn't preclude other uses on site.

MR. MEACHUM: Right. Thank you.
MS. O’MALLEY: So even though PG&E will be running this plant another seven years, is it possible to disposition on some of the buffer lands, the other 11,000 acres so perhaps a disposition might be made sooner?

MR. JONES: That’s certainly possible depending on the scenarios and the permits that are issued or other factors that we might hear of tonight or the panel might recommend to PG&E. I would say that the further away from the plant, the less connected to both the Utility and encumbered by the decommissioning project. So for instance, a southern parcel might be available but we wouldn’t want to give up site control and the access until we complete the project. The lands further to the east or the north that don’t have those same criteria would be evaluated differently.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you. We have a lot of public speakers tonight, so I want to do our best to keep us on time. Our next item on the agenda is a quick overview of the lands workshops which the panel held on August 14th -- or 17th and 18th. There were 12 presenters. And as you can see, there is a broad cross-section of different interests and perspectives. We also had seven public commenters. So in each workshop, we had about 50 minutes that was open for public comment, and some people took us
up on that. So next slide.

With regard to the comments that were made and the interests, as you can see, the majority, huge majority, almost everyone supported some type of a conservation of the 12,000 acres, and most with some type of public access. We had many presenters that had a particular interest. We had equestrian groups. We had mountain biking groups. We had parasailing groups, and a whole range of interests. So the general consensus was to include a marine-protected area, camping, biking, hiking, equestrian. Again, the ability for the public to have access to the land and use it while maintaining its -- protecting the land at the same time, designated open spaces, nicely designed trails and so on. So the next slide.

The key takeaways, and these are just a very few, very broad-based takeaways, and that is a broad consensus for conservation from all the presenters, a diverse range of interests and requests for compatible land use. I think that was the key word I kept hearing was "compatible uses," compatible, protecting the lands and so on. And strong support for future collaborative discussions in concert with decommissioning timetable with PG&E and other landowners.

So with that, I am going to open it up to the
public -- or the panel -- I'm sorry. And we have about
15 minutes to discuss your perspectives, your takeaways,
what you got out of the workshops and what you heard.
Anyone want to offer their observations, start
us off?

Kara.

MS. WOODRUFF: I think I agree with everything
you said, Chuck. It was a really great day of
presentations. We heard from a lot of different groups.
Overwhelmingly, people are interested in the conservation
of the 12,000 acres of land. We had heard different
opinions about what conservation means. I think most
people were in favor of public access, especially hiking,
biking, maybe equestrian use, perhaps not motorized use.
I think some of the citizens from nearby communities
expressed concern about an overuse of the area that can
cause or exacerbate traffic problems. But I think I
didn't really hear anybody say much against conservation.

The general consensus is the people love the
land. They appreciate it. They acknowledge the
resources. They want to see it and enjoy it, but they
also, at the same time, are cognizant of ecological and
cultural sites, and the agricultural resources, scenic,
and they want to keep those intact while it can be open to
the public. So I guess I am just saying I agree with your
MR. ANDERS: Lauren.

MR. BROWN: In that preparation for that workshop, one of the things that we suggested to speakers was that they not only come with their ideas about what should happen with the lands that if it is a conservation, preserving it in some manner for public use, then how can it be financed? What is the practical way that this could happen?

And I would suggest that the speakers tonight keep that issue in mind as well. I was particularly encouraged but Sam Blakeslee's presentation, which he indicated that he thought that it would be feasible to raise substantial amounts of money, maybe public-private partnerships, but I was encouraged by that. And I am coming in at this thinking yes, we can do this.

MR. ANDERS: David.

MR. BALDWIN: Yeah, I agree with the overall presentation made on the different groups that came. I thought they all did a fine job, and I am personally thankful for them taking the time to lay out the vision for the lands. But one group I don't think you mentioned that particularly stuck out in my mind was -- I'll call them YTT because I don't think I can say their name, a Native American group who made a really great presentation
that I thought encompassed both the conservation efforts
that, obviously, have come to the surface here, but also
educational that I think would really benefit the public.
And I know a lot of the other panelists seemed to grab
onto that, too, when they made their presentation. So I
don't know if they will be here tonight, but I just wanted
to point out it was a particularly powerful presentation
from them. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you. One thing I do want to
mention just for the public's benefit is the structure of
the workshop. The workshops provided the opportunity for
presenters to take one hour to interact with the panel,
and it usually included about a 20-minute presentation and
then about 30 minutes of questions and answers. So each
presenter actually made a very professional presentation,
and then it was a great opportunity of give and take, and
tough questions in many cases, on back and forth. So the
workshop structure, I thought, worked very well. And I
just want to acknowledge the panel also. The panel was
there eight hours a day on Friday and eight hours again on
Saturday to hear these presentations. We appreciate your
hard work.

Dena, do you have a comment?

MS. BELLMAN: I do, thank you.

And I actually wasn't able to be there for both
days, but I was very fortunate to be there Friday morning when we had the agency presentation, so I know a lot of other folks were able to put in a lot more hours those days.

I agree with your summary, Chuck. I think that was fantastic. Also, I agree with my fellow panel members regarding the encouraging fiscal opportunities that were provided by not only the land conservancy, but also Wild Cherry Canyon. Sam Blakeslee's presentation was excellent. I think that gave us a lot of hope that we can work something out for a conservation and recreation opportunity on those lands. Coastal Commission did a fantastic job outlining the Point Buchon Trail and their hope for the California Coastal Trail through that property. And ultimately, the California Coastal Trail ties in with the Pacific Coast Trail, so it is part of a larger production.

And I hope you have an opportunity -- it's yak tityu tityu yak tilhini, so we definitely learned that that day. And I said it to myself in the car on my way here so I'd remember how to say it again. Mona and those folks did a fabulous presentation. I think I was really also encouraged not only by the fact that they wanted to have a space for themselves, but attempted to bring that into our community in a much bigger way. So as some
people know, the Southern Chumash have a lot going on in Santa Barbara County. I think we're all familiar with that. But out Northern Chumash, for them to have some opportunity here would be really amazing as well. So it was a great workshop. And thank you for structuring it that way. And thank you all for being here tonight. We're really excited to hear from you. And thank you for spending your time.

MR. ANDERS: Alex, Sherri and Scott.

MR. KARLIN: Yeah. I thought the workshops went very well. I think that the public might want to know that the original structure for this panel was to have monthly meetings, like the one tonight, and give everyone a chance to talk for three minutes on various topics. And we decided in July, or maybe a little earlier, that for the land use and the reuse of the property, possible reuses, we need more time and the public needs more time to give a possible Power Point time of presentation. That's why we set up the lands workshops for two full days. And I think everyone gave really good presentations and they put some time and effort into it. And that was very helpful. And if you get a chance to attend the ones we are going to have in September on public reuse of the property, you might want to come to those because those presentations were pretty good and quite helpful to us.
And they were unanimous in wanting conservation and preservation of the property. And I certainly would love to see that happen and endorse that idea, but I think I know we all need to think of how that is going to be financed, who is going to pay for that. This is an extremely valuable piece of property. Actually, it's 47 different parcels of property owned by private corporations, and they have stockholders who they will have to answer to in terms of disposition of this property. And it's easy for everyone to want to say, "Oh, let's make it into a park," but the person who owns the property is going to have some say in that proposition. And I very much hope there is a way to organize the financing package of tax and state and federal and private funds that can make this happen. But PG&E has got a -- the property interest there is worth tens and tens and tens of millions of dollars.

And you know, I think we can come up with the money, but it's going to take time and effort. This panel isn't going to come up with the money, obviously, but there are people out there. And I also want to give a shout out to the Wildlands Conservancy, who was also there and gave a good presentation. And we have decided to go to visit one of their facilities in Kern County, I guess it is, in November, because we want to find out more about
that, so there are a lot of good players here and I appreciate it. I thought that was a good workshop.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Alex. And thanks for reminding me to point out to the public that the video, the full video, 16 hours -- or 14 hours of presentation for everyone to view next weekend. It's available or will soon be available on the engagement panel website.

Sherri, Scott and Frank.

MS. DANOFF: Yes. I wanted to mention in particular what I was impressed with and that was learning that two conservancies are interested. One, which said, "We have the money. We will have the money, whenever the properties are available." And the public made wonderful contributions by indicating uses that the property could be put to. And I want to express appreciation to the panelists who arranged for presentations from the two conservancies. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

Scott.

MR. LATHRUP: Yes. I was there for one day, which was the Saturday. It was interesting to listen to the different speakers and so forth as far as what their vision for the property and all, and of course, conservation was really high on the list. But as I was looking at all that and thinking about it, what I see is I
actually see PG&E with an gigantic asset out there. And so it was nice to hear that there were people coming to the mic that said, "We are willing to pay." Because I would like to keep in mind the rate payers because let's just say if there was a gift from PG&E, really you are gifting the dollars that the rate payers have to deal with. So it was nice to hear that there was a balance as far as interest in the property but maybe a willingness also pay to the fair share for it. And I think that's important for the rate payers.

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

MR. MEACHUM: What struck me was the compatibility between a lot of the conservation organizations that made the presentations. And in particular, they all talked about the public being able to access the property, the educational aspect of it and the cultural aspect of it. They were all very interested in trying to promote that, and they were also, the same that Alex mentioned, the Wildlife Conservation, very impressive presentation, and was willing to incorporate other ideas from other organizations and agencies that may want to do something along with them. So I think that's what we are kind of looking toward too, how compatible would some of these land uses be, or these projects, and will they basically answer the questions that the public is posing.
So I was very, very impressed with the two full days, and I look forward to the next ones because I think after we get through with the next two sessions and then combine that with the land use, we're going to have a pretty clear idea of some type of a direction that we want to follow. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

Nancy and Lauren.

MS. O'MALLEY: I agree with all the other panelists. It was really a very informative process -- a very informative process. I'm glad that there was some biologists there, and they really were very educational and able to give us some insights on the lands there. And as we think about how the land might being preserved, we do want to consider there are particular areas that are very sensitive habitats, particularly the inner tidal zone. And so as we think about public access, whoever takes charge of the land, we will need a very good management plan.

And I do want to give a shout out to PG&E. They have really done a great job of being good stewards of the lands that are there. And so it will be interesting to hear just more public comment. If you have ideas on if it is conserved, what are some of your thoughts on how we can do that and make it sustainable.
MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

Lauren.

MR. BROWN: I would like to underline what Nancy just said about PG&E being such good stewards of that 12,700 acres out there. We have been out there as a panel several times on tours. We have heard people talk who are biologists, environmentalists, and what comes across over and over is what an excellent and conscientious job PG&E has done as a steward, caretaker of all this land. And it is a treasure out there.

So John, our thanks to PG&E.

MR. ANDERS: Linda, you had a comment?

MS. SEELEY: Yes. Thank you.

Something I wanted to mention that hasn't been mentioned yet, that there may be a way to patch different funding sources together to make all of the land come into conservancy. I heard at the workshops, for one thing when PG&E applies for permits to -- for the decommissioning and taking things out, projects that they have to do, they may be willing or be ordered, I don't know, by the CPUC to offer land as mitigation, just as PG&E did for the Point Buchon Trail, which was part of when they built the new steam generator -- was that it? That's how the Point Buchon Trail came into being because PG&E replaced the steam generator. And then maybe from the County was that
for mitigation, I don't know how that happened, but I know that it did happen, and so there is that. And so there may be ways to patch it together.

And then, you know, there are land conservancies. The California Wildlands Trust said they could do it tomorrow if it were up for conservation, a hundred percent conservation that would be into perpetuity. And then there is also the north portion, I think that -- because I think it was paid for by rate payer funds that -- I'm not sure of this, but maybe it could be gifted back to the rate payers who paid for it in the first place. So there are lots of things that could be done with it. That's all I wanted to say. Thank you very much.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Linda.

We have time for one last comment from John.

MR. FRANKE: I just want to say, again, thank you, Panel. Tremendous amount of time. I'll tell you what I heard as a representative of the company, and we started these meetings along this line as well. What you said about the care of the lands, we really have a treasure. The 12 miles of coastline have been carefully preserved and maintained. And because of the plant, uniquely, access has been really restricted. And I think we have 12 miles of amazing, you know, seashore now that
is a legacy that the company now looks for what is the best plan going forward. And I really think we have a rare opportunity to leave something behind that is going to be a real treasure because -- interestingly enough, because that nuclear plant was there and in effect that restricted access and control by the company, has a real treasure there.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you very much.

Frank, quickly.

MR. MEACHUM: Wasn't there a tremendous amount of studies done on the PG&E lands by biologists? I think you told us this is one of the most closely-studied coastal areas in California?

MR. FRANKE: Yeah. Culturally, biologically, marine life, it's a very well-understood area. In fact, you heard from a couple of the ecologists and biologists that have been given access to the land over the years.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Panel.

We need to move on to our public comment period. Before we do, I just want to provide an overview of all the comments we have received in various forms. So there is many, many pathways to comment. And one is on the on-line website. You can go to the on-line website at PG&E.com engagement panel and fill out a comment form and that gets recorded. We also have kiosks at all the
meetings where you can sit down at a computer and type in
your comment. And all these are being looked at and
reviewed. You have the opportunity to talk with panelists
and e-mails. We have gotten almost 60 comments from you,
the panel, that you submitted based on people you've
talked to, you've run into them on the street, they have
come and sought you out to express their opinion. And so
that's a way. And then the public comment at the meeting
here today. All of these comments are being recorded,
documented, and PG&E is reviewing all of them. And in the
next few weeks, you will start to see responses to those
comments from PG&E.

So with that, I want to begin our public comment
period. Again, as I mentioned at the beginning, that's
one of the main reasons we are here, the primary reason.
We have almost an hour and a half dedicated to public
comments. Before we do, we are going to have -- because
of the number of speakers, we are going to have two and a
half minutes time period, and I just want to ask the
speakers to be ready to speak. So we have got a left
podium and a right podium, and you can see your names up
there. So there should be a line of one or two people at
each podium waiting to speak in order.

So if you would go and get ready. I would ask
that when you speak, please state your name and your place
of residence, and I would ask you, please, please be
respectful. Be focussed, be concise, and speak clearly so
everyone can hear. And we would -- I know the panel and
everyone, because the time is really tight, you do not
have to take your full two and a half minutes.

MR. MEACHUM: Chuck, you might clarify which one
is left and which one is right. The supervisor is having
a tough time figuring it out.

MR. HILL: Good evening, I am Adam Hill. I'm
from the Board of Supervisors, 3rd District, which is
where the plant resides. And I just want to start out my
remarks by thanking, once again, the panel for doing a lot
of work for the community. I know you've sat through a
lot of meetings, and you have more to go. And your work
and your recommendations are critical to this process, so
I really do thank you from our perspective.

And I am here to speak to the decisions and the
opportunities that lie ahead for our community and for our
state. We have a unique chance here to shape major policy
and investment choices in a collaborative way that can
yield significant conservation and economic benefits. The
prospect ahead of us will afford us several different ways
to strengthen regional collaboration as we work together
to transform our challenges into productive possibilities.

As you know, the Board of Supervisors has been
keenly focused on Diablo-related issues, and we will continue to intervene in the State CPUC process to ensure the county, as a whole, is represented. We have identified this process as a high-level strategic planning item and we have actively intervened in the state CPUC process to be certain that the local voice is heard. We have also worked hard on SB1090 to ensure the unintended economic consequences of state energy policy are mitigated in our local towns and cities.

It's imperative that we think very strategically and maximize the opportunity this long-planning horizon gives us. To that end, while I remain concerned about how the state will replace the energy degenerated at Diablo Canyon power plant -- meaning it would be a very bad bet if greenhouse gasses increase because fossil fuel has to be utilized until renewables can replace some of the baseload power -- however, I am excited about the renewed opportunity that the transition can provide us if we don't squander it. That is the key here.

Specifically, we should be thinking about the lands for conservation in a sequential manner, in phases. If portions of the lands are not affected or encumbered by the Utility direct ownership or the decommissioning project, I suggest to the panel that we look to be able to pursue conservation on those lands as soon as possible.
More specifically, given the changing dynamics, including that a State Park bond was recently approved by voters, I think we should remove Wild Cherry Canyon conservation effort tonight. There is no reason the lands owned by an affiliate company to PG&E that don't impact the actual decommissioning project should be tied up with and delayed by a decade or more to wait and see what happens.

As I think, as Ms. O'Malley recommended, we should seek a disposition particularly of the Wild Cherry Canyon lands. We should want to pounce on the alignment of the State Park bond funding, the new focus on this area. We can make this happen. And no one at your workshops, according to your own summaries tonight, or anyone has contacted my office over the last probably few years, has advocated for development, but rather for some form of conservation. And I have been working quietly but diligently over the course of a few years with a very small group of local leaders that can make the community's dream of owning Wild Cherry Canyon a reality.

I hope you will forcefully recommend that the Wild Cherry Canyon property be detached from the decommissioning planning now and that we be given the opportunity to own this beautiful land for public use. Thus, I also encourage the panel and PG&E to be flexible.

If a partner or partners are brought in to stretch limited
public powers for conservation acquisition with the public-private partnership, then that opportunity should be explored.

Again, we have waited a long time. And I feel confident that we have a way to make HomeFed and PG&E financially whole so the public can own this precious asset forever. It's pretty simple from my perspective. We have a great opportunity here. We shouldn't squander it or quibble over subtleties. Let's preserve this property and start the process now. And I have people in place who know how to make such a deal happen.

That leads me to concepts I have heard about for repurposing and reuse, which I know the panel will take up next month. I think it's important to be bold. We can have many things that people have been recommending to you, from a waterfront marina, to a place where renewable power, ecological, agricultural, recreational, economic and education activities can flourish together, so we can make that happen.

The County's partnership with Cal Poly has never been stronger. The County's partnership with our cities is also at a high point. Our tourism sector is fantastic and growing. Another pride and joy of my district, our airport, is booming. All signs are good that interests can be aligned.
And also, let's think about, as you move forward into that next month, a resilient water strategy for the region that includes looking at the desalination facilities at the plant. The future uses on site will need water and a partnership with the County, one we had planned for and will, again, make sense. In fact, the future of the de-sal plant continues to be the most asked-about subject by the constituents. Perhaps no other matter could be of more importance to our communities' future water security.

Finally, I want to reiterate the County's role is to be a regulator and intervener watchdog and a catalyst for the projects that could happen here, and we want to get started now. It is going to be decades to do some of these other things. It will be hundreds of small decisions that will crescendo into a very big set of plans that will benefit our community and state for centuries to come.

So I hope again, emphasis on being able to detach the Wild Cherry Canyon property from the rest of the other decommissioning properties that may be used in that, and let us have a chance to make a project happen. I feel confident that it can. And I want to thank you again for your service and for your thoughtful deliberations.
MR. FRANCO: Nick Franco. I'm the current director of County Parks. I used to be the district superintendent for California State Parks, so I am very involved in those properties and I am very personally invested. I am sorry I missed your workshop. I had to choose between that and my daughter's wedding, so I made the right choice.

So there is few areas of California coast that have the degree of wilderness that this area has. It's a critical area, and it's really an opportunity that can't be missed. And I think you've heard that over and over again, but I just want to state that up front.

So I was fortunate to be able to work with many partners, many who are in this room, on the Phase 1 acquisition of about 2000 acres that was an addition in the Irish Hills to Montana de Oro. And I say "Phase 1" because this is Phase 2. And when Phase 1 was presented, Phase 2 was identified with Wild Cherry Canyon being a bird preserve and other lands throughout there. So it's on the radar. It was out there. And these things need to follow through and you need to complete the Phase 2 and let the entire Irish Hills conservation agreement. We can't let it fall through like it did last time.

What I would recommend is don't get caught up in a specific outcome, that it needs to go State Parks, it
needs to go to a private developer with conservation
easement or whatever that is. Focus on the goals, focus
on what you are hearing, which is conservation and view
shed and open space values, some trail alignment for the
California Coastal trails, some way to connect the Montana
De Oro with Avila, some way to connect See Canyon with
Avila, some way to make sure that we have those trail
linkages, some way to conserve critical wildlife habitat
and the cultural resources out there. Those are really
the core values and there is many ways to accomplish that
through the many different partners that are out there.
And then look at those long-term opportunities, connecting
with the Bob Jones pathway, additional parking so that we
can do the Avila to Harbor Pier Trail and bikeway.
There's opportunities for private investment and
concessions and other opportunities out there.

In terms of financing, there is a lot of
partners. You've heard from lots of them. There is State
Parks. There is us, County Parks. There is Port San
Luis, the Land Conservancy, the private landowners,
Cal Poly, lots of nonprofits. And when I was with State
Parks, I did put together a budget for operating this. I
did put a budget for developing it. We would have to
escalate that for the time since 2008, but it's out there.
Those documents exist. At the time, there was a 2000 park
bond and there was 13 million allocated from that park
bond. I think that's been reallocated, but there's Prop
68 that's out there now, so there is funding available. I
think it can be financed and you need to do that.

MR. ANDERS: I just want to remind the panel and
the public that the panel will not answer or address any
questions during the presentations; however, there will be
an opportunity after the presentations for the panel to
discuss and make observations about what they heard.

MR. YORK: My name is Dan York, and I'm vice
president of the Wildlands Conservancy. And I was
privileged to be able to have the time to be able to
attend both of your workshops last week, and I got a crash
course in the history and in the proposed future uses of
the decommissioned Diablo Canyon lands.

I would like to start tonight especially
thanking the members of the panel for their time and their
dedication and their commitment. I would like to thank
PG&E for their stewardship on the land and the amazing
amount of care and resources that you put into preserving
that exquisite stretch of coast. Sally Krenn, thank you,
tremendous amount of energy and focus put into looking at
the biological, cultural and resources on the property.
And I had a privilege of going with Tom on a short tour of
the property. Magnificent.
The Wildlands Conservancy owns and operates 147,000 acres of nature preserves throughout the state of California, 15 preserves stretching from Humboldt County down to San Diego. The largest preserve is the windmills preserve, 93,000 acres in Southern Kern County, that's 20 miles of downgrade from the Los Padres National Forest. It has severed rights and a lot of oil production on the property. It has grazing operations, which we have used to focus on resource priority. It has outdoor education for kids and major restoration with several different state and federal agencies.

I just wanted to let the panel know and to let the people of San Luis Obispo County know that we are standing by and want to see a conservation outcome for all of these lands that PG&E and the county and the state and the PUC deem as possible. Whether it's in phases, as the supervisor suggested, or in one piece, we stand by and are ready to help.

And I guess my last thanks would go to the citizens of San Luis Obispo County who voted overwhelmingly, three out of four, with the Dream Initiative to see a conservation outcome of this land. Thank you.

MR. KNIGHT: Good evening panel members. My name is Randy Knight. I'm a retired physics professor
from Cal Poly, and for many years I was the director of The Minor in Environmental Studies program at Cal Poly. I'll be the first to say that decades ago when the decision was made to site the Diablo Canyon reactors where they are near Point Buchon rather than the Guadalupe Dunes, probably land and habitat conservation was not foremost in people's minds. But today, PG&E finds itself the owner of some of the most intact and wonderful habitat in the state of California. Not only is the ecology intact, but the PG&E lands are essential to the connectivity of habitat along the Central Coast. These lands are immediately adjacent to State Park lands. They are immediately adjacent to lands that are protected by the Land Conservancy. Altogether, these add up to about 25,000 acres of lands in the Irish Hills. The connections aren't perfect because of the highways, but we do know that large animals migrate from the Irish Hills up to the Los Padres National Forest in the north, and down south as far as the Dunes. Maintaining this large scale connectivity for migration is imperative for the survival of species, especially in the face of climate change, which species can be seen to migrate to areas where they haven't traditionally been found. I'm sure I don't need to remind you that it's far cheaper and easier to make sure species don't become
endangered rather than to have to deal with the consequences of a listing of an endangered species. We know from decades of biological research that preserving large and connected habitats is the most important and key thing we can do to keep species healthy.

So yes, the Diablo Canyon lands certainly have value potential to real estate. You can put a dollar figure on that. It is not as easy to put a dollar figure on the value of habitat. But I feel I can assert that in the big picture, the value of open space and habitat and connectivity far surpasses the value of possible real estate development. And yes, there are financial implications to how to make this happen. I don't have an answer to that, but where there is a will, there is a way.

So I urge you to do the right thing and recommend these lands, all of them, receive permanent protection as open space. Yes, open space with some public access, but primarily open space to protect this valuable and irreplaceable habitat. Thank you.

MR. ASHBAUGH: Hello, Panel. My name is John Ashbaugh. I got acquainted with most of you. I didn't get a chance to meet the panelists Dena Bellman or Trevor Keith 10 days ago at Pismo Beach City Council chambers, but I did want to take just a minute here to reacquaint you with the proposal I am advancing that would be one
source, among many, of funding that can be made available
in order to acquire these very special lands, and that
would be creating a national seashore.

Why a national seashore? To embrace the lands
beyond Diablo, but potentially also the State Park, the
Harbor District's lease on the lighthouse. To me, what we
need to think about -- in this community as a whole, we
often get very insular. We forget some of our own
history, and that history includes this plant, enlarging
its significance to a national scale. The history of this
power plant, in fact, involves controversy, a great deal
of it, so much, in fact, that the vast number of arrests
that were made back in 1980, '81, protesting the licensing
of the plant was, in fact, more so than any other protests
since the Vietnam War or the Civil Rights Movement. That
alone should be anthem in the eyes of the public. There
is a national investment. People were coming from all
over the country concerned about the impact of that plant.

Today and through 2024, '25, we will be able to
look back at that point on, I am confident, the record of
successful operation of this nuclear power plant. We will
have to deal with the long-term, very long-term storage of
nuclear waste on that site, but with that exception,
everything else is open for the kind of collaborative
corveneration that we are having now. And I look forward
to having many of those conversations with you and with many of the people in this room in advance of the proposal for a Pacho Coast national seashore. I would look forward to making a presentation as I did for you folks, many of the groups that are represented here tonight, including people from Los Osos, Avila Beach, all the affected communities. And actually, I am considering -- I would like to have some help in compiling a book that would represent what the significant values are of these very, very special lands and structures. Thank you very much.

MS. DETTMAN: Hi. I'm Kaila Dettman, executive director of Land Conservancy of San Luis Obispo County. And I want to first off say thank you to the panel and to PG&E for hosting this process. It's really important for us to be heard and I'm grateful for that.

Our land trust is your local land trust. We work throughout the County to protect special places here. And you all heard from my colleague, Daniel Bowman, at the workshops. And I simply want to say tonight that we encourage PG&E to consider conservation of these lands. We want to serve as a resource and hope we can help make that happen moving forward into the future.

It has been said here many times tonight, it's an incredibly special place, amazing resource and a treasure. And there are opportunities now that's already
been mentioned. We have had a recent passage of Prop 68. We are seeing more money flowing from the private sector towards conservation of the lands because millionaires and billionaires are out there investing in the future of our community. So I think there is a real opportunity to make something really amazing happen here. And I hope that the panel will make a recommendation that conservation be a part of the future of these lands. So thanks so much.

I'll keep it short and sweet.

MS. REDDEN: Kathy Redden, and I am a member of the Atascadero Horsemen and The Trail Alliance of San Luis Obispo County. I also was able to speak at the workshops, and I appreciate that opportunity. Thank you to everyone for your service.

So our vision is definitely public access with multiuse trails for those of us who walk and ride on the dirt. We believe trails can be designed to protect cultural resources and flora and fauna. State Parks already has a magnet system in place at Montana de Oro, and covenation of those lands would make this an amazing jewel in the crown for State Parks. Funding sources, as discussed, are very much available in land conservancy. They pulled off a great thing with the Pismo Reserve, and I think that's a great example. Thank you.

MR. WALLER: Good evening, Panel. I am Richard
Waller. I live in Arroyo Grande. I'm the recent past president of Back Country Horsemen of California, a 3,000 member organization, the only statewide organization dedicated solely to trails. Tonight I am representing the Back Country Horsemen of California, Los Padres Unit, 250 members here on the coast. And we are just a small fraction of the number of equestrians that love to ride trails.

I followed the process of putting the power plant in this pristine coastline instead of the Nipomo Mesa, as first proposed by PG&E back in the 1960s. That location was successfully blocked and the section of coast almost no one knew of was selected. I say "almost no one." My grandfather farmed sweet peas on those benchlands on the way out to the power plant back in the 1920s and 1930s. He leased the land. He knew the land.

As can be seen from the sea or from nearly any viewpoint in our area, the Irish Hills are a scenic resource of world-class beauty. Preserving this land for public access, environmental protection with a network of trails and campsites is the right thing to do.

The question of how to replace the economic benefit of the parkland hangs over every discussion regarding the area. Preserving this landscape as a park -- and I use the "park" in a generic sense -- will have
positive economic benefits for our county. My wife and I, we travel overseas. We take long hikes in Switzerland, or Italy, or Portugal, or Spain, and we spend our dollars. This park will bring people in who will spend their dollars and pounds and euros and yen here in our county. The economic benefits of parks extend beyond tourism. The greatest value of natural amenities and recreational opportunities often lie in the ability of protected lands to attract and retain people.

People move to our area to work, whether they are doctors, or lawyers, or contractors because of the scenic and open space opportunities that we have in our county. Substantial percentages of counties in California get income per capita based on public lands and visitors to those areas. Over 15 percent of the jobs in San Luis Obispo county are directly related to tourism. That number would only go up if this area becomes a natural resource for tourism.

I know you are not going to answer the question, but I have a question. I trust the transmission lines and the towers that stretch out across our county will also be removed as part of the decommissioning process and we won't have those. Thank you.

MR. McGIBNEY: Thank you, Panel. My name is Patrick McGigney. I'm the CEO of Biodiversity First, a
local 501C3 nonprofit organization. We work to preserve
and protect the wildlands and species upon which we depend
for our own physical and spiritual survival. Biodiversity First recommends that all 1200 acres of lands around
Diablo Canyon be held in a public trust and into
perpetuity. Because we value the rich diversity of
wildlife and vegetation on this site, we recommend that
human access be limited to prescribed hiking trails,
parking at the entrance, no public roads, one coast trail
and one ridge trail that can connect to Montana de Oro
State Park, much like the Buchon Trail does. We recommend
that the Coast Trail have handicapped access.

We also recommend that the important wildlife
corridor that runs from Diablo Canyon lands to Montana de
Oro into Los Padres National Forest, remain undisturbed.
Mountain lions, bear, gray fox, bobcats, Black Hills deer,
wild turkey, possums, coyote, cottontail rabbits, and many
other species, thrive in this diverse ecosystem, and their
survival depends on our protection.

The Diablo Canyon lands are sacred to the
Chumash Nation, and Biodiversity First recommends that
every identified indigenous site be restricted from public
access. This beautiful land is one of the last
undeveloped swaths of coastland in California. And
residents of the Central Coast and all of California have
had to live with the danger of the nuclear power plant
built on earthquake faults for the past 30 years.

Biodiversity First recommends that PG&E donate all of the
land into a public trust, possible State Parks, for
perpetual conservation. Thank you.

MS. CONWAY: Good evening. My name is Cheryl
Conway. I'm from Cayucos, where we've learned a thing or
two in the past decade about conserving the land. I am
here tonight to speak on behalf of the Democrats of
San Luis Obispo County club and, as of 30 minutes ago, as
our chair could not be here, the Cayucos Citizen's
Advisory Council. As we passed virtually the same
resolution, I don't see that as any kind of conflict.

We want to thank PG&E for being a great steward
of that land for the last 50 years. I have no doubt, if
there hadn't been a power plant there, there would be a
constant battle against development of that. As it is
now, we have pristine ecosystems zones.

Back in 2000, The Nature Conservancy recognized
these lands as the highest conservation priority. They
were joined in that by California state agencies,
including the Wildlands Conservation Board, the Coastal
Conservancy, Parks and Rec, the Coastal Commission,
Caltrans, the State Water Board, and the Regional Water
Quality Conservation Board. Many of those have already
demonstrated a willingness to support conservation efforts for this land.

What we would like to ask is that PG&E and others ensure that all of the Diablo Canyon lands, including Wild Cherry Canyon, and with the exception of the requisite decommissioning zone while needed, are conserved in perpetuity for public access and resource protection. I'd like to thank you for your time.

MS. WARD: Hi. My name is Sheila Ward, and I am from Los Osos, and I would like to thank PG&E and this panel for the opportunity to speak to you. I want to speak to an issue that's very near and dear to my heart, and that is the multiuse trails.

I was one of the people that helped construct the trails on Pismo Preserve. I was one of the people that originally laid the plan for Bloody Nose Trail on Montana de Oro. And what I find so unique in our county is the cooperation among all the trail user groups -- the trail runners, the hikers, the mountain bikers, and the equestrians. And I think it's very appropriate to set aside a part of these lands for multiuse trails. It would take up a pretty small footprint.

I am a member of Coast Mounted Assistance, and we are putting on a poker ride next month. I posted that on Facebook. And I just was kind of going through the --
we are looking through those who are interested in this
ride as far away as South Dakota, so I do think you have
an interest of bringing money into the county with tourism
from establishing a multiuse trail.

I really give a shout out to Central Coast
Concerned Mountain Bikers for their efforts in
establishing such a rapport among all of our user groups
in this county. Thank you.

MS. VUJOVICH-LABARRE: Good evening. My name is
Mila Vujovich-Labarre. I am speaking tonight as a private
resident. I'm a 35-year teacher in San Luis Coastal
Unified School District. So first and foremost, I would
like to thank PG&E for all the funds that they have given
our school district the last several years, in addition to
all the charitable grants that you've given to the
community.

As for tonight, although my comments are going
to be majority on preservation of this wonderful land,
there are two commercial developments or residential
developments that are near and dear to my heart. First of
all, I think that there should be some acreage on all of
these acres for a tiny home complex. And I would like
somewhere between 250 and 500 tiny homes to be allotted
somewhere here. And I would like the housing to be given
to veterans who have served our country. The housing
crisis is incredible. It's throughout California, but I think if we could set aside some precious acreage for tiny homes for our veterans, it would be a wonderful gesture.

In addition to that, as a teacher who has been a long advocate in substance abuse prevention and intervention programs and helping teens, there is an immense hole in our county for serving teens with mental health, eating disorders and drug abuse, and the time is now to address those. I'd like to see somewhere on the property be three different facilities to house approximately 30 beds. Insurance normally pays about $10,000 per bed, and we would be able to serve teens throughout our county. Most of those teens right now have to go out of our county, and it would be innovative and really important to meet that need.

Lastly, I ran for city council two years ago. I'm proud to say I was the only city council to be endorsed by the Sierra Club. I am an outdoor advocate, a tree hugger, and I see this land, and I am so happy to hear the comments of all the other people who have spoken here tonight. This land should be preserved as much as possible. It is an area for triathletes, for families, for seniors, for young people, for Cal Poly students, for our Native Americans to treasure for years to come.

It sounds like we have the financial ability to
make that happen, so I am hoping that the commission and the community will vote to do the right thing and preserve a majority of this land an open space and not only for conservation, but for public use. And as far as funding, you could definitely charge a pass. I think most people that go out there would gladly fund a $20 to $30 annual pass to have access to that land. Thank you very much.

MR. KUNZE: Hi. My name is Paul Kunze. I represent SLOSA, San Luis Obispo Soaring Association. We're essentially a large group of hang gliders and paragliders. We are one of the chapters under USHGA which is a nationwide organization of paragliders and hang gliders. One of the things we are proposing is a flight park out there. The reason why we are proposing a flight park, besides the fact that we want to fly, is the fact that it's scalable. It does bring in tourist dollars. It's also compatible with just about every other use that everyone has proposed here. It could be as simple as a launch pad, which is a 50-by-50 patch of grass, and then a landing area, which is a 100-by-100 patch of land. It could be anything from that on up to what we have at Torrey Pines. I will get into that in a second here.

Flight parks do attract tourists. There's tandem flights for people who know nothing about flying. Essentially get connected to the front of a paraglider and
off they go. And then you also have visiting pilots. Pilots will actually go to a location specifically for the flying. I believe Point Buchon is going to be one of those locations. It has the potential to just be fantastic flying out there. It is compatible with, as I said, hang gliding, paragliding, potentially remote control flying. Horse riding attraction, a ranch, I would love to see a like SLO Ranch. Mountain biking, hiking, frisbee, golf, camping are compatible with all these uses.

Other flight parks have been done in the past -- in the U.S. in the past with great success. Torrey Pines is the go-to example down in San Diego. If you haven't visited there, at least take a walk out there. You've got a little bit of everything. You've got a shop, a restaurant. You've got remote controllers flyers. You've got paragliders, hang gliders. You've got pilots, glider pilots, and then just tourists that go out there and enjoy the view.

Kings Mountain, Idaho, would be another good example. Lookout Mountain, although it's a lot more than I would ever want to see developed out there, that is a phenomenal example of what happens when you get a large group of pilots together to essentially create the ultimate flight park. Yosemite Valley even as a flight park they allow hang gliding in the valley in the
mornings, just to take a nice tour of the park.

Thank you very much for your time. And I hope you take this into consideration. Oh, thank you very much to PG&E. I've had the opportunity to be out there to work and they do take great care of the place. Thank you.

MS. ALLEN: Hi. My name is Denise Allen. I'm on the Avila Advisory Council with Adam Hill and a See Canyon representative. Around 17 years ago, I had the privilege of riding my horse in Wild Cherry Canyon. It's is a beautiful, beautiful place. As time went on, I had friends that were living in a little trailer there. They were Bellevue family with me. As time went on, I started noticing all these trees were disappearing. There were trees along the road where you would have to widen it for development. My friends that were living there, it was being done secretively on weekends and nights, and the trees were completely disappearing.

When I asked what was going on -- actually, my friends came to me. They were really upset. They were renting there. And Centex Homes was going to do a bunch of development, and they were removing the trees because it was just agriculture. I came to the County and said, "How can somebody be removing these huge, huge 200-year-old trees all over the place?" And they said, "Well, it's agriculture. There is no development. There
is nothing." And I go, "Well, you can look at it." They
go, "How can you prove it?" I go, "Well, there is aerial
sites. I mean, Diablo has tons of aerial photos of all
the years. Every year they do aerial photos." But
because there was no development, the recession hit,
Centex went away and HomeFed came around. And, again,
roads started widening, things started happening. I was
able to go to the Monday Club, see what HomeFed was going
to do, and it's pretty grandiose on a scale of
development.

So you need to know that the developers have put
a lot of time and money and energy into Wild Cherry Canyon
preparing it for development. And they have been very
actively involved. You may not see -- there might be some
representatives here. I have talked with their traffic
person. I have talked with their vice president,
different people, and they have big plans. They are
developers.

I recently took the walk from the lighthouse to
the Rattle Snake Canyon, and it was amazing. It was like
Pismo Beach 200 years ago. I really hope we can preserve
this. I hope that we can find a way to keep this land.

And I just want you to know that the developers do have a
lot of money and they do have a lot of energy and a lot of
invested interest, and so people need to know that because
at least everyone I hear is talking conservation, but
there is that dynamic that is real, and there is money,
like some of you had said. So I hope we can figure it out
because I know the community overwhelmingly wants
conservation. Thank you.

MS. MILLER: Hi. My name is Vita Miller, and I
live in Los Osos and I'm a long-term resident of this
county, and I am the only person that is going to say I
was an activist protesting the siting of the Diablo Canyon
Nuclear Power Plant, and my family and I marched several
times. And having said all that, I do want to thank PG&E
for having been good stewards of the land these years.

My main concern in the beginning was always
about the storage of nuclear waste, and as you can see,
that remains a continued concern within our county. I am
here to advocate for the conservation and protection of
these precious lands, and I think they need to be kept in
the hands of people who share that goal. So whoever takes
over the overseeing of it, I hope that they have the same
goal. I would like to see Native Americans involved in
that. I would like to see some kind of a learning center,
perhaps, artifacts and restoration of Native American
lands and, perhaps, students could be brought there to
learn more about the Native American history in our
county.
I also want to advocate for the protection of the Wild Cherry Canyon preservation and best land use should be agreed upon. I do advocate for public access, but I really want to say that I agree with what Mr. Knight, Randy Knight, said about habitat corridors. And I think that's a really important thing that needs to be considered here. In fact, all living organisms need to be considered, not just human organisms. We need to think of plant species and we need to think of nonhuman organisms.

That's pretty much what I had to say. I am an advocate for keeping this in perpetuity in its natural state as much as possible. Thank you very much.

MS. SISNEROS: Hi. My name is Nicole Sisneros and I'm here speaking on behalf of ECOSLO, local nonprofit environmental conservancy. It's very exciting to hear everybody's calls for conservancy. ECOSLO, as well, is in support of protecting and preserving at least a significant portion of the 12,000 acres as a biologically and culturally significant land that benefits all the people of San Luis Obispo County.

Any development that happens with any of these proposals, even just a parking lot, should follow the current best practices for environmentally responsible building, use of renewable energy and energy efficiency.
We also recognize that the lands provide ecosystems, such as habitat for bees that pollinate our crops. The animal corridors have been spoken of, and that these values must also be a central part of any discussion moving forward. And thank you for your time.

MS. GORTON: Good evening. My name is Charlotte Gorton, and I live in San Luis Obispo. My career was in parks and recreation, and I served on the Cal Poly Advisory Committee on Recreation, Parks and Tourism for more than the last 10 years.

I feel this is a golden opportunity to preserve the pristine lands of Wild Cherry Canyon and PG&E property surrounding the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant for generations to come. The positive benefits to our community will be a long-lasting legacy we can be proud of. It would be wonderful if the majority of the land can become park land with some conservation, as we've been speaking about tonight, with public access to trails, campgrounds and other recreational amenities. The buildings and facilities of the power plant could be donated to Cal Poly University to be used as a learning center with labs and classrooms, including a marine center. That would be after they have become safe, obviously.

I would love to also see the desalination
facility retained to provide additional community water resources. This beautiful coastline would greatly enhance our existing park inventory, particularly joining Montana De Oro and the Irish Hills, those large open space areas. If developers are allowed to take it over just to build expensive homes and lay down lots of concrete, this golden opportunity will be lost forever. Thank you.

MS. ANDERS: Hi. My name is Teah Anders, and I am owner of Gentle Touch Pet Training in Arroyo Grande, and I am here on behalf of the dogs. I have heard of wonderful things for multiuse trails and camping, from mountain bikes, hiking, equestrian, all of that, and I think it is all fabulous. No one has mentioned a dog once that I know of, and I would like to be here on behalf of San Luis Obispo County and our dogs.

I've personally trained over 9,000 dogs in this county. There are many, many families that have dogs, and there really are not that many places where we can hike with our dogs in this county. And conservation, I'm all about. I have worked in the environmental field for a large utility long before I ever did dog training, which I've been doing for 20 years, but I can tell you that there are many, many families, they love to recreate with their dogs. And so I am simply here on behalf of -- if some land is put aside for public use for multipurpose, I
would love to see those also be dog friendly, in addition to everything else. Thank you very much.

MR. ANDERS: Our agenda calls for a 10-minute break right about now, so let's take a 10-minute break and we will reconvene at 8:50.

(Break taken.)

MR. ANDERS: So let's start our public comment period again. So our next public speaker.

MR. BLAKESLEE: Greetings. My name is Sam Blakeslee. I appreciate all the time and effort you have invested in allowing the public to engage you because you are the public engagement panel. And you have heard testimony, I think, from a broad swath of representatives from this community covering virtually every interest you could possibly imagine, and they have said things more eloquently and more forcefully than I ever could. So rather than try to restate some of the arguments you have already heard, what I wanted to do was maybe bring a slightly different perspective.

And it was that we have these very rare moments in each of our lives where we can do something that will echo through history. It doesn't happen very often. Some of us never get that opportunity, if you get two or three opportunities. This is without a doubt one of those opportunities where the right decision made here will have
consequences and impacts that will not last five years, ten years, thirty years, but generations in perpetuity.

I have been a participant in many hearings and committee involvement that tries to determine what will happen. The doors are thrown open, the public steps up and they speak for hours and hours and hours, three minutes at a time. And what happens to all that testimony, nine times out of ten, it is dropped into a report, it disappears, and there is no action taken on it.

I bring that up because we are speaking to you as our representatives because only you can speak on our behalf. Now, can you adjudicate the final solution of this? No, you can't. Your recommendations will go to Pacific Gas and Electric. They have obligations and duties to their shareholders and to the rate payers of California. They will make arguments that will go to an administrative law judge as to what they believe should happen with regard to these known assets. An administrative law judge will hear testimony from forces all across the state of California who will argue for every possible outcome, other than the ones that you've heard here today. And ultimately, the Public Utilities Commission will make a decision, and all the voices that were heard here will disappear. And ultimately, that Public Utilities Commission will make their decision. And
just as they ignored the committee impact mitigation program that we all fought for, they could do that again.

So I bring this up because you have one moment to paint with bright colors -- red, blues, purples, greens, not shades of gray. If you nuance your recommendation with 15 shades of gray of what could have, would have, should have, you will lose that opportunity to have this lifelong impact. And that is your moment to have that impact by speaking for us because we cannot.

So I would just ask that as we reach the conclusion of public comment and this discussion comes back to this panel, to think about what can you say and do that will have a lasting impact on this process, which by definition will attenuate every comment you make progressively until even the loudest shout will be a mere whisper in front of the PUC.

So I just importune you and beg you to use this moment to speak clearly for the public that you have heard. I'll recite the three recommendations we made 10 days ago at your hearing which you graciously invited us to participate in. And those three recommendations are:

One, urge PG&E to not convey fee title to Wild Cherry Canyon to any entity that has a purpose other than a conservation outcome; two, advocate for the conservation of the entirety of the Diablo Canyon lands and oppose
development efforts that are not consistent with the conservation outcome allowing only those activities that are necessary for consistent decommissioning of the facility; and three, because we do need to raise some tens of million of dollars, advocate for the establishment of a blue ribbon panel of conservationists and community stakeholders to immediately begin that process so we can bring a proposal forward that has a chance of succeeding, just as we brought proposals forward in the past, with real money attached to it.

I ask that on behalf of the community. And I thank you so much for your public service.

MR. TAIT: Good evening. My name is Doug Tait, and I too have a connection to this land. I think a unique perspective, for I have worked for five years on the Point Buchon trail in the trail management of that land for Central Coast Trail Management. I am speaking on my behalf tonight.

The word that comes to mind when I think of this land is wildness. Thoreau wrote, "We need the tonic of wildness. We can never have enough nature." That was from his 1854 book, On Walden Pond, and I'm convinced Thoreau's words are more important now than ever. We all need places to go outside to sit quietly, perched on a rocky outcropping above the blue Pacific and stare into
its depths. Our senses become sharpened so that we are one with where we are and we can hear the life around us. Sounds erupt all about -- the low puffy blow of the gray whale passing by, the shrill of the Peregrine falcon as it speeds overhead, and through the waves crashing on the jagged rocks, the distinct loud whistling weeps of the black oyster catcher as it searches for mussels. Little by little, more of this environment creeps into our awareness. We begin to understand wildness.

This special lens for wildness, I believe, still reigns as the Chumash, who occupied these lands for thousands of years, remind us all life is a gift. These wild places give us so much. We are the lucky ones who have seen and felt the wildness this place has to offer. Now is the time to return the favor. These lands need us to find ways that will not only be there for our children and grandchildren, but will remain wild. The decisions made on this land are critical to keep wildness in its place.

We should consider the land's highest value, the value it possesses in its own right for what it is. I believe the land's highest value is that it offers people from all walks of life opportunities to enjoy nature for renewal, discovery and learning; however, opening it to the masses would be its downfall. We have loved too many
places to death. In California, the wilderness and spectacular beauty of its coastline and coastal bluffs is a rarity, and that has been relatively untouched by humans. PG&E has recognized that access must be managed to protect and preserve the resources and character of this land. Continuing with the likes of PG&E's land stewardship program of managed public access has kept this place so special and may just keep the Pacho Coast unspoiled for future generations, a place where wildness still reigns. Thank you.

MS. ALCON: Good evening. My name is Sylvia Alcon. I'm a long-time resident of Avila Beach. I sure appreciate you coming and listening to all of us. Sometimes it feels as though we are not heard, but I feel as though you are hearing us.

Last month I visited friends in Marin County. Their family home is in Inverness, located on Tomales Bay. It's amazing to look across that bay or to drive to Drakes Bay, the lighthouse, places I went to as a child, and to find that they look today very much as they did those many years ago. This is thanks to the passage of Point Reyes National Seashore Act that in 1962 protected some 71,000 acres from development. Certainly involved working with the large dairy ranchers and many people whose economic interest would be affected.
And back in 1959, a Pacific Coast Recreational Survey of the Diablo Canyon area, before the nuclear power plant was built there, found data and I take a quote from that survey, recently referenced in the New Times article by Andrew Christie, quote, "This large unspoiled area possesses excellent seashore values and should be acquired for public recreation and conservation of its natural resources." It's not too late for us. We can create a national seashore here which would be maintained by the National Park Service and be a place for generations to use and to enjoy. Thank you.

MR. CONESTO: Hello. My name is Don Conesto, and I'd like to thank you for your time and your efforts in this endeavor. I am the director of the Ken Norris Rancho Marino Reserve up in Cambria, California. I work for the University of California Natural Reserve System. The Natural Reserve System has 39 reserves throughout the state and manages over 150,000 acres. Our mission is to contribute to the wise understanding and management of the earth, and we do that by facilitating university research and education throughout many different habitats in this state.

Been lucky, our 2 miles of coastline and 500 acres sort of parallels on a smaller scale the Diablo Canyon area. It has coastal grasslands as well as the
Monterey Pine Forest and the Bishop Pine Forest. I had the pleasure of seeing Diablo Canyon lands with Bob Blanchard, the rancher, and Sally Krenn, the biologist, and have worked with Tenera folks, who is a marine biologist by training. Anyway, I just want to put out there that the University of California Natural Reserve System may be a very good group to help with this management of the lands of the Diablo Canyon when you finally make a decision.

And I'd also like to invite you on a tour of the reserve. So if you can get in touch with Sally, or anybody, if you look at the reserve system, I'm there, and I can show you how it works on a small scale at our place and talk more about the whole system. But it's an option for land management that differs from any other organizations and has quite a bit of experience and expertise statewide. So thank you very much for your time and keep up the good work, and I look forward to seeing it all resolved.

MS. PEREZ: Hi. Thank you, everyone. It's late. I know you guys are ready to go, probably. Just a few more of us to speak. My name is Kimberly Perez and I'm associated with Pacific Wildlife Care, and I am the president. I just want to thank all of you for your time, and again, PG&E for bringing the community into these
negotiations to review and recommend for future use of 
those lands and facilities.

So we attended the first day of the presentation, and it was exciting to hear the unified response to conservation of those lands. We are advocates for wildlife, Pacific Wildlife Care is. And so the critical envirohabitat is very important for their survival. We see firsthand the effects of wildlife that's affected through development day to day, just every day in our facility. So keeping these lands wild to the extent possible with some public access is a really good plan.

We are very interested in the facilities, and so we hope to give a presentation in September, but I want to thank everyone again. I'm not going to take much more time. Thanks.

MS. LYON: My name is Debbie Lyon. I live in See Canyon. I'm an equestrian. I am pretty passionate about horses and wilderness. And in all that's being said about conservation, there is kind of an overtone of the balance between protecting the land and the species out there and the habitat and all of that and the need for public access. And I'm also in the mental health field, and I feel that access to wilderness, particularly for children and teenagers, is essential to their mental health.
And I believe that a well-designed and planned trail system is the best way to balance public access and protection of the land because when you have impacts of public access, it's usually because there is development or there are people just everywhere. But when you have a well-designed trail system that plans where people will go, people stay on the trails and they have minimal impact on the land and on the wildlife, at the same time as being able to be out there in the wildness and experience it.

Thank you.

MR. CORDES: Good evening. My name is Red Cordes. I'm a Oceano native and I do sustainable, edible landscaping. My overall concern is I would like to see, overall, the land under conservation easement, specifically Wild Cherry Canyon preserved in its entirety, as well as public access trails, ecotourism type stuff, what everybody else said.

I would also like to see the main PG&E facility surrounding the plant -- I can see it conformed potentially to be used for renewable energy, keeping some of the transmission lines and using solar panel energy, some wind energy, as well as creating a satellite campus for Cal Poly and Cuesta to do biology classes, marine biology studies, also clean energy, like studies to learn about clean energy because this is our future. And I
would also like to see some limited development for the
Northern Chumash tribe as well. And also some restoration
of some of the coastal lands, ecological restoration. I
would also love to see some stable forestry on some of the
lands as well. Thank you very much.

MR. HERTEN: My name is Jeff Herten. I am a
physician. I have lived in See Canyon for the last
40 years. I am married to Debby Lyon, you just heard
from. We've spent thousands of hours of our time building
and maintaining the trails to Montana de Oro for both
running and riding. I'm a trail advocate. Bob Jones was
a patient of mine and a friend, very good friend. And I
am here for him tonight because I know what he would say,
and he would say that we have this incredible, rare
opportunity to do something beyond anything we will ever
be able to imagine, and I think we can do this.

Debbie and I sit on the board of the Western
States Trail Foundation, which maintains a 100-mile trail
from Squaw Valley to Auburn. It's a historic trail. And
about 10 years ago, a timber lease -- our trail crossed a
timber lease, and although we have prescriptive rights,
they were going to sell this timber lease. We were faced
with the possibility that we couldn't put on our hundred
mile ride and the trail would be lost. Through concerted
effort with conservation groups, we were able to raise $13
million and buy that timber lease and turn it over to the American Wildlife Conservancy, and it will be preserved the forever, for us to enjoy that trail and for our children. And I hope that we can do the same with this beautiful, beautiful piece of coastline. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Do we have any other speakers? Is that everyone?

Well, thank you and thank all members of our community who came here to speak. We do have one person who submitted a card and asked that that card be read, so Suzanne is going to read that card and the comment.

MS. HOSN: Delaney Wells had asked that we read that PG&E should sell each zone or section individually at the time each section is ready to speed up the process and make the land more accessible for other parties who wish to use it.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

That concludes our public comment period. We had 26 speakers and one submission. So again, just remind everyone here from the public that you can comment more than once if you want. If you think of something else, don't hesitate to jump on the website at PG&E.com engagement panel and give the panel your thoughts. Those comments are being compiled and looked at. So appreciate everyone's thoughts and comments.
Now is the time for the panel to discuss what you heard and your observations. So we have about 20 minutes, Panel, to talk about what you’ve heard, what you think, talk amongst with each other, however you want to use the time.

So anyone have any observations or comments and want to kick things off?

Dena.

MS. BELLMAN: Well, I wanted to specifically thank Supervisor Hill and County Parks Director Nick Franco, but everyone who was here tonight. It is encouraging to hear everyone so passionate about the opportunity, and really so thoughtful about both the opportunities, the challenges and how they benefit our economy while protecting these resources.

In the same spirit that PG&E is approaching the decommissioning, I believe we can strategize collaboratively to phase or structure a plan optimizing the opportunities over time as can be permitted. We heard that overwhelmingly tonight. And I'm inspired by that commitment from our county representatives, so that was very good to hear tonight.

Thank you Sam Blakeslee for the reminder about the significance of what is at stake. So just thank you everyone for sharing your thoughts.
MR. ANDERS: Any other comments or thoughts?

Kara.

MS. WOODRUFF: This panel was formed for multiple purposes. I guess the aim was to bring some idea of what the community wants with respect to the decommissioning of the power plant. But probably our most important charge that was delineated by the administrative law judge is that we provide input regarding the future uses of the 12,000 acres Diable lands including Wild Cherry Canyon. So that was their primary objective. And PG&E is working very at putting together a triennial report that is due at the end of the year. And in that report it must contain a report back on what we learned as a panel, and what the public process generated, what were the opinions of the community. That's an essential part of PG&E's filing. And mentioned earlier, attached to that filing is a report by the panel itself.

And we were posed with many questions as a board, but really the number one question is, what does the community want to do with the 12,000 acres Diablo lands, including Wild Cherry Canyon? And we had about a dozen workshops over a two-day period. We have had well over 200 on-line comments. We have had 26 speakers here tonight, and three-quarters of the people who voted in 2000 on the Measure A, also called "the Dream Initiative,"
also answered this question. And so the question is, "What do we want to do with the Diablo lands?" The people have spoken. I am hearing conservation, conservation and conservation, and public access too, consistent with resource protection.

So I think I just want to make it really clear after these workshops, all these comments made on-line, dozens of people that have come and talked to all of us, if not more, we are hearing a strong consensus that you rarely hear in the public arena, especially in these divisive times. We're not hearing division; we're hearing consensus. If you want to know the answer to the question what to do with the Diablo lands, I am just going to say it again, the people of San Luis Obispo County have spoken, and their answer is conservation. I hope that we are prepared to take very aggressive, radical action in presenting that recommendation to the PUC. It's a clear as a bell. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you. Any other?

Nancy.

MS. O'MALLEY: I just agree with what Kara said. I just wanted to say someone mentioned tonight if there is a will, there is a way. And I think the people have made their will very clear. And the will is overwhelmingly they are for conservation. And they've stated eloquently
well the reasons for that. And I think the next step will
be what is the will of PG&E and, you know, how can we all
come together. And someone mentioned a blue ribbon panel.
I don't know if that's the right word for it but, you
know, there are certainly a lot of avenues for
collaboration where we can get these wills together and
come up with a creative, innovative plan where people are
represented. And at some point, we would love to hear
from PG&E and they're what their will is. I don't know
what the next step is.

When it comes to Wild Cherry Canyon, I also
appreciate Adam Hill and his sense of urgency that maybe
we don't need to wait and, you know, maybe we can take
incremental steps. And maybe the first step would be just
getting an appraisal of the land and see where we go from
there, what is the value of the land and where can we go
for that next step.

MR. ANDERS: Alex and then Linda.

MR. KARLIN: Yeah. I think we've had tremendous
input and information from the community today and
throughout this process. And it has been very civil and
positive and constructive and helpful. I would caution, I
guess, to say that this panel is an advisory panel that is
a conduit. It is intended, I think, to be a conduit of
information about the decommissioning process, what the
The community wants and expects and is concerned about and what PG&E needs to do and what it will be doing. And it's a two-way conduit that we are trying to facilitate.

Now, we have a role in addition to that to make some recommendations or -- if we can come up with them, and certainly to the powers that be, what we think the community wants, even what we think we would like to see happen. But the power to make it happen is out there with you all and with PG&E. We are not regulators like the County, or the State Coastal Commission, or the State Lands Commission, or the NRC. They are going to make a lot of decisions over many years, and you all have to stay involved. We all have to stay involved because we can make a recommendation. We will, I hope, but the power and the money and the will power is going to come from the community and from PG&E. We are an advisory committee.

And let us also put in context that we are focusing on lands. It's very important to this community. Everyone who has come to this process wants the lands to be conserved, and I do too. But the people who want to develop the lands, they didn't come here tonight. They don't want to be ridden out of town on a rail tonight. This is a self-selection process. There are people out there who like to see the land developed, and probably attempt to do it in a conscientious way. And over the
years, those people may be heard from, unless somebody can come up with the money and make preservation happen and talk to the regulators when the CEQA process begins and PUC begins.

Sam Blakeslee said, "We make a crucial decision." Well -- or a recommendation. And I think we have a role to play, but you can intervene in the process at the PUC. You can intervene at the NRC. You can intervene and participate at the California Coastal Commission and the County Board of Supervisors level. And I bet most of the people in this room will participate in those things, so stay involved. We will try to do what we can, but the power is really out there with you and with the regulators and with PG&E. And I hope we can help everyone reach a good decision. That's all.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Alex.

Linda, Lauren and Sherri.

MS. SEELEY: This has been a wonderful meeting. I really appreciate the intelligence and the passion and the will to move this forward and to preserve the land. It's very inspiring to me. So we've had three days -- two days of workshops on the land. And next month we are going to have two days of workshop on like people's vision of how to repurpose the facility. And then we will have an evening meeting like this with people's ideas on how to
repurpose the facility. The month after that, we are having a meeting about the emergency planning after decommissioning, about what kind of emergency services are we going to have after this plant shuts down. And the month after that, we are going to have a meeting about the irradiated fuel storage on site. If -- to me, the issues of the lands and the facility will be moot if we do not make sure that we store the irradiated fuel in the safest way humanly possible.

Last night, I attended a Nuclear Regulatory Commission meeting. They were here last night and they informed us that the irradiated fuel that's there right now is stored in very thick canisters, and so on. But that is not -- and we do not know how long the fuel is going to be there. There is lots of ideas about it. But they made a rule at the NRC a few years ago called -- oh, gee, I can't remember the name of it, but what they said is that it can be stored on site safely up -- for the next up to 120 years, I think it was, meaning that it's a possibility it could stay there. There isn't a place to move it to now, and we don't know when there is going to be a place to put it somewhere else.

So in my opinion, we need to have a couple of workshops about the irradiated fuel, just as we have had about the lands and the facilities, so that we can look at
that issue as closely and honestly and responsibly as we are looking at these issues around the land and the facility. And I hope that happens. I don't know. We haven't decided yet if that's going to happen but to me, it seems logical that that would come into play in November.

So you know, I was very inspired by what you said, Sam Blakeslee, about there are times in our lives when things come together and we can see a vision for the future. And I think that we do have that opportunity now as a community to come together and make a beautiful future for this thing. And you know, PG&E has been absolutely terrific in this process so far, and I am extremely grateful for how this is working so far. So I look forward to serving on this panel as long as I can.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Linda.

Lauren, you had a comment.

MR. BROWN: Yes. I want to just underline the broad purpose of this panel in terms of what's asked of us to help PG&E in their total decommissioning process. The land is just part of it. And I think that needs to be underlined. The other part of it is what is going to happen to the billions of dollars of infrastructure that exist out there. That's a big question too. It is not just the land.
Next month, we have got two more workshops. And I hope many of you will attend those workshops too and listen to the presentations that are going to be offered. That also is going to have a huge impact on the directions that the total decommissioning takes. And those workshops, the dates and stuff, will come up shortly, but I would like to mention, I don't think all the slots are filled. There may be some opportunities for more presentations on how the land should be utilized going forward. So if you didn't get a chance in the workshops that we just had, think about adding your voice there as well. Thanks.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Lauren.

Sherri, you had a comment.

MS. DANOFF: Yes. I am very appreciative of everybody's comments tonight and do think, of course, that the panel should very forcefully present information from the community. One particular presentation is something I think we should follow up on, and that was made by Adam Hill. It included separating out Wild Cherry Canyon from Public Utilities Commission oversight. And I think that's something that we need to explore carefully. I think we need a lot of details about the proposal, but I certainly would like to see us explore it. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Frank.
MR. MEACHUM: I am going to go back to the purpose of the panel. And I can remember one of the questions that was asked of us when we applied, "Why are you doing this? Why are we here?" And I think that the underlying motive for all of us is think about the generations ahead of us. We're not going to be around in 2060, '70, when all of this land is finished up. We are going to be gone, but I think we are charged with trying to make a determination so that future generations can enjoy that. And I think that what I have heard in the last several meetings that we've had is all about conservation, and I agree. What is that going to look like? That's what I am struggling with. How is that going to be established? What will it look like? How will it be taken care of? How can we be assured of that for generations to come?

So I think that we greatly appreciate the input. I've sat up in this seat for a number of years as a supervisor and listened to folks over time. Rarely do you get a consensus from everybody that they would like to see it to go in one direction, so this has been very positive to hear. Everybody seems to be moving in the same direction. But again, what is that going to look like? And how will it be managed? How will it be taken care of? Those are the questions that I am looking for. But
greatly appreciate all the input.

We're going to have a couple more meetings where we will hear more, I am sure, and we will move from there. But I think the underlying thing for me is the decisions that I make, I think about my grandkids, my great-grandkids. We've got on my mom's side of the family, 12th generation Californian. So this is important to me, and that's why I sit up here and work with these folks because I think their hearts are in the right place. We want to see what happens here, and we will do the best we can.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Frank.

Lauren.

MR. BROWN: I have one more thing I wanted to mention. You know, part of this process is being educated about what's out there on the Diablo Canyon lands. It has been such an education for me. And one of the things that I have learned is how many resources are out there that relate to the heritage of the Chumash Native Americans. There is a lot of stuff out there. And it means a lot to this population. The population of Chumash Indians who are left is very small. Their voice is soft, but it's an important voice. And I think we ought to think about listening to that voice and how we might respond to the requests that they have put before us that somehow some of
these lands, some of what this means to them. And it's not just a dozen generations. It's some hundreds of generations. We ought to think about that.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

Any further comments?

Kara.

MS. WOODRUFF: I think a lot of questions have been raised about what is our role and what is our purpose and whether we have any power. And since we have asked the community to give us their opinion and since they have generously offered their opinion, given us a lot of time and knowledge and education, I think our power is that we have received all this information and now we can take that to a higher level, the Public Utilities Commission, for example, and express the will of the people.

So in some ways, 11 of us, do we have any power? Not really. We're not elected. We don't have any particular constituencies. But we have asked people to come forward with their input, and I think not only do we have a lot of power as being in that position and to carry that message to higher levels that make decisions, we also have a responsibility. And I, for one, and I am sure many of you will join me, I am listening to what everybody has to say. I am reading all the comments. I listen to the workshop. And I will be damned if PUC doesn't know about
that, and anybody else who will listen. Thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

Trevor.

MR. KEITH: I just want to say thanks for coming out to everybody and all the speakers. It gives the panel a lot more to talk about, so I really appreciate that. And being a regular here, I just want to reiterate what Alex said. This is going to be a long process, so stay tuned and stay involved. That's how we get this done. So thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Okay. Thank you very much.

John, you had a comment.

MR. FRANKE: I'll speak at the end. Everyone had a chance to speak up?

You know, I just want to reiterate from Pacific Gas and Electric, and Nancy said, "I want to hear from you." Well, ultimately you've heard. You will continue to hear.

You know, I say our goal and our strategy is really pretty simple. We intend to operate this unit and this site responsibly and safely to the end of its final years. Subsequent to that, we plan to decommission in a responsible manner. And what I mean "in a responsible manner," I mean financially responsible to the customers that are paying for the decommissioning. It means
environmentally responsible.

And I would also like to say very clearly that it is our intent to be responsible to the wishes of the community. This is our community too. You're our neighbors. You know, I live in Pismo Beach. The company -- you know, all our employees live in this state and we are an entity of the state, so we are going to be responsible to that as well.

So nothing that I have heard tonight is contrary to the wishes of the company. It is a complex issue, and I really recognize that a lot of speakers recognize this. There are a lot of stakeholders. There is the community. There are the customers that have, you know, some control to the CPUC with the rights of how this land is disposed, but we have shareholders. And there are a number of agencies that do have regulatory power, not just the CPUC, over the disposition of these lands. But I assure you we've heard you tonight, and we think we're going to continue to operate safely, and we will decommission responsibly.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, John.

Our next meeting, as Linda mentioned, is dealing with repurposing of facilities. And we have two workshops on September 14th and 15th. That's a Friday and a Saturday. They begin at 8:00. And again, the public is
welcome to attend those meetings, and the public will be
given an opportunity to make comments at those meetings;
however, they will follow the same format as our previous
workshops where an hour will be dedicated to a particular
organization or speaker, that is the panel selects, and
then there will be an opportunity to give and take. And
then a following public meeting on the 26th of October,
again.

So Tom is going to introduce the topic for those
workshops and that discussion.

MR. JONES: Thanks, Chuck. I think you did it.

So I think we have heard from five or six
different groups, which are here tonight, just observing
this process. And they were thankful others got to go
first and have their time at the mic. We'll hear from the
California State University system. We will hear from
some folks interested in offshore wind energy. We're
going to hear from our friends at the Pacific Foundation.
And we're going to hear from San Luis Harbor District, and
a couple of others are starting to debate whether or not
they are going to participate and will bring themselves
together.

So again, we mentioned a two-way conduit
earlier. We ask you to push out again. And the panel had
also reserved that if there was additional land
discussions that you wanted to have, that we could include those in those workshops, too, as a manner of overflow. So we still have a couple of slots left, and you might hear from different folks here who have an oar on each side of the canoe and who might consider putting that in as well.

I will give you an update here on some of our outreach efforts. Nancy is in this slide. This is when we did the dry run to the tour. We have taken over 300 people out. We had a tour today since we made the slide. And all the tours through the remaining month, through the month of September, are booked up as well. So we will contemplate how we fold in additional tours this year and in the remaining years. We will likely make those fair-weather tours and probably won't do that during the rainy season because of the size of the vehicle that's involved in that.

And lastly, for those of you who have been on that tour, we did some incredible video footage. John Lindsey has some on his Facebook page, but we are also in publication mode right now for a short five- to seven-minute video with that footage for folks that can't go out. And it also has footage of some areas that you simply can't get to. The drones went up on the mountain peaks and things like that. So it's spectacular footage.
and we were lucky to have some local partners help us with that. So that will be coming on coming on-line in, I think, the next 30 days.

So that concludes my part. If you have any questions about that, I would be happy to address them. Chuck?

MR. ANDERS: Tom, I apologize for stepping on your presentation.

MR. JONES: Keep it moving.

MR. ANDERS: Well, that concludes our public meeting but as we have made a practice, we want to take a moment and do an evaluation of this meeting so we can make the next one even better.

So two processes, what did you like about this meeting? What would you like us to keep doing?

Sherri.

MS. DANOFF: I think everything the same. I think we were very encouraging of input, and that was super. Everything except for the break. I have heard a multiple comments. One person wanted that we just stand up for a moment. Another wanted no more than 10 minutes. Everything else was just perfect.

MR. ANDERS: Okay. Thank you.

Anyone else?

Frank.
MR. MEACHUM: Just a suggestion. I would suggest we do the poster board thing for a half an hour and then come in here at 6:30 and get started because most of the folks start milling around out here waiting to get in anyway. And if we could get in here a half an hour earlier, we can get out of here a half an hour earlier.

MR. ANDERS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. SEELEY: I second that.

MR. BROWN: I like having this much time for the public input. I want to make sure that we allocate that much time next month when we were talking about the repurposing.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you.

And recognizing that, we did extend the public input time and want to appreciate the panel's willingness to, if we had that many speakers, stay until 10:00 because we did extend the meeting.

What would you like to see different? How can we improve? No comments?

Sherri.

MS. DANOFF: Shorter break time.

MR. ANDERS: Shorter break time.

MS. DANOFF: Yes. And I support, too, what Frank said, half hour for the poster session.

MR. ANDERS: Okay. Any other thoughts,
Okay. John, do you want to close the meeting?

MR. FRANKE: Just thank you to the community, for the involvement, the engagement, the willingness to come and share their thoughts and, of course, with the panel. I am and continue to be just really energized and amazed at the collaborative and professional manner in which this panel of very diverse backgrounds, opinions and ideas continue to come together to the benefit of our community. And I just wanted to pass on my own personal appreciation and appreciation of Pacific Gas and Electric for the manner in which -- the real manner in which you are executing a very important role for us, so thank you.

MR. ANDERS: Thank you, Panel. Thank you all the members of the public and everyone travel safely. We are adjourned.

(Proceeding concluded at 9:30 p.m.)
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