

RCNFPP Draft Minutes 11/21/2013 Meeting

Committee Members	
David Asti	Southern California Edison (SCE)
Melissa Jones	California Energy Commission
Mark Krausse	Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)
Jim Caldwell	Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies
Sepideh Khosrowjah	California Public Utilities Commission
Peter Von Langen	Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
Rochelle Becker	Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility (A4NR)
Staff in Attendance	
Jonathan Bishop	State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
Shuka Rastegarpour	SWRCB
Marleigh Wood	SWRCB
Mariela Carpio-Obeso	SWRCB
Paul Hann	SWRCB
Marie Hoffman	SWRCB
Public in Attendance	
Dan Williams	Bechtel Power Corp.
Doug Dismukes	Bechtel Power Corp.
Bryan Cunningham	PG&E
Joan Walter	California Energy Commission
John Geesman	A4NR
Kathy Jones	PG&E
Eric Wilkins	California Dept. of Fish & Wildlife
Perf Peterson	Diablo Canyon Independent Safety Committee
Daniel Hirsch	College Ten University of California, Santa Cruz
Victoria Davis	University of California, Santa Cruz
Damon Moslen	Friends of the Earth
Dave Freeman	Friends of the Earth
Bill Powers	Powers Engineering

Joe Dillon (call in)	NMFS West Coast Region
Peter Henderson	Pisces Conservation Ltd

Welcome, Introductions and Updates -

Chumash Tribe follow-up concerns

Marie Hoffman: The Tribe will respond to provide any information, documentation of maps, etc.

Bechtel: We have money allocated for a consultant to do archeological surveys.

Review and approve Meeting Notes -

November 4, 2013 meeting minutes **approved**

August 13, 2013 meeting minutes **not approved**, still some edits needed to be addressed.

Friends of the Earth Review of Bechtel's Draft Final Report Presentation -

Damon: Economic numbers were inflated and significantly larger than expected. Chart in the power point shows a significant difference between the Bechtel cost estimates, PG&E cost estimates, and the TetraTech cost estimates. Friends of the Earth (FOE) Review of the Bechtel Report was contracted to Power Engineering and Pisces Conservation Ltd.

Peter Henderson: Fine Mesh Traveling screen proposal is converting entrainment effects to impingement effect. This technology is not effective. FOE opinion is that the wedgewire screens are not protective enough; they foul and usually work in rivers and are also not an effective technology due to the slot size limitation. Bechtel indicated that a site specific test program as described in the Draft Final Report would be undertaken to assess the effectiveness of the wedge wire screens prior to their adoption.

Bill Powers: Salt Water Cooling Towers are effective and are commonly used. Bechtel proposes the wrong site for the cooling towers and needs to re-evaluate the parking lot option as a site for consideration before choosing to spend the \$3 billion dollars for removing a mountain. There are not enough air credits available for PM10.

Jim Caldwell: It's not possible for a Salt Water Cooling Towers to be as effective with so little cycles. The water is too salty for closed cycle cooling to be feasible.

Bechtel: It doesn't appear that the FOE have seen the Phase I Report. Phase I evaluated the options with respect to feasibility, and Phase II covers cost and schedule. Bechtel's responsibility was not to make a recommendation on the preferred technology. Bechtel has spoken to San Luis Obispo County during Phase 1 and was told that there were 31 credits available for PM 10. With respect to the cooling towers:

Bechtel is using the round wet Mechanical draft freshwater towers and did detailed evaluation of the location, spacing, and drafting. Parking lot was declared as not a suitable location. This configuration was selected for this technology base on the vendor recommendation due to the enhanced efficiency and smaller footprint.

Jonathon Bishop: Bill cites \$3.5 billion dollars in contingencies, is there an explanation for this?

Bechtel: We developed estimates per AACEI industry guidelines. There is a 15% to 25% contingency on costs. This contingency is added to account for unknowns that are inherent in an estimate developed based unknowns with preliminary. A Class 3 estimate is typically provided to permit funding requests for large capital projects.

Jonathon Bishop: Would like Bechtel to look at the information from FOE and respond to the comments in the Bechtel Report if they have not already been addressed in the Report.

Bechtel: Would like a compiled list of the comments and concerns that Friends of the Earth has to make sure that we don't miss any comments.

Action Item: Friends of the Earth will send the list to Water Board to send to Bechtel.

Action Item: Water Board and PG&E will speak to Tenera regarding the intake screens.

Public comments –

Daniel Hirsch: The basis of the Tenera report shows that the screening technologies are ineffective. Bechtel says that they've done analysis of the tower location; but that analysis is not available at the meeting.

Bryan Cunningham: We need to put things in to context; need to look at the issues around the facility.

Mark Krause: Maybe the placement of the towers in parking lot needs to be re-evaluated, are they really infeasible? We should have Bechtel review the feasibility of the parking lot site and get a cost estimate of the option.

Bechtel: Will respond within a week whether the parking lot option needs to be re-evaluated. If so, will work to get a concrete answer for feasibility of the tower location for both sites, and will develop cost estimates if required.

Group: If Bechtel needs to re-evaluate parking lot option, the meeting in December will be cancelled.

Next meeting (group)/ next steps

Next Meeting planned for December 18, 2013 unless Bechtel finds the parking lot option feasible.

Adjourn

DRAFT