

Once Through Cooling - Nuclear Review Committee  
March 28, 2011

- Goal: Objective information and alternatives for Board to choose from
- Review committee will have role in 3<sup>rd</sup> party contractor selection
- Later: have NRC (Nuclear Review Commission) come to present/speak to committee
- Safety element: would alternatives be safer or more vulnerable than OTC?
  - Bring back up in scoping (Tsunami, Seismic)
- Trying to find funding for NGO Travel
- Committee has 10 official members – some have alternates
- Bagley Keene: copies distributed at meeting.
  - Nuclear Review Committee is a state body, established by Water Board in an open process
  - Notice meetings/publish agenda 10 days in advance of meetings
  - Not act on items not on agenda
  - Public must be able to attend and comment
    - if participants call in to meeting, the satellite location must be publicly noticed
    - Encourage face to face meetings
  - No outside discussions on agenda items
  - Written materials available also to public
  - Ex parte communication prohibited
  - Decisions should only be made based on information provided at meetings
  - **ACTION ITEM – Will post letter on website explaining Bagley Keene**
- Consider addressing radioactivity in water in light of Japan
  - Goal of committee is to come up with recommendations for options other than OTC
- Permits are enforced by Regional Boards to make sure nothing is released that harms the environment
- How could alternatives such as cooling towers possibly have impacts?
- State Board will be doing renewal of NPDES permits
  - Emphasis on discharge side
  - Hearings will take place at regions (w/ State Board Members present)
- **ACTION ITEM – Vote for chair at next meeting**
  - **Decide on how to vote**
- Committee Tasks/Steps:
  1. Decide on scope of work for contractor
  2. Contractor takes year or so to complete study
  3. Committee reviews and gives recommendation to Board
  4. Board may use recommendation to amend policy
    - OTC Policy allows a recommendation, does not require it
- **Parking Lot Issue:**

- **How to deal with cooling of spent fuel in future when plant shuts down**
- Public Comments
  - Bob (So Cal Edison)-Clarifications of scope of 316 (b)
    - does it include little pumps (used for safety)
      - Legally, yes
- Selection Process
  - By 10/1/11 group must report on studies
  - Consider extent of reliability of existing studies
  - Good starting point for independent 3<sup>rd</sup> party
    - Or independent 3<sup>rd</sup> party could determine what should be in study before reviewing
  - Is it one study that captures both or separate studies for each locations?
    - Some site specific issues
    - 2 consultants? Or 1 consultant doing 2 separate reports?
    - Policy envisions another study to be done
      - Could be a peer review of existing studies
- Committee should decide what questions should be addressed-Scoping
  - Feasibility, Cost, Environmental Impacts of solution/compare to OTC
- If 2 studies: Diablo/SONGS
  - Make sure assumptions allows for comparisons later (\*State Board Exec Director decides)
- Collaborative list of potentially acceptable firms (\*focus 1<sup>st</sup> on review)
  - Did not perform any existing studies
    1. Bechtel
    2. Sargent and Lundy
    3. Shawstone and Webster
    4. URS-WA Group
    5. Fluor
    6. Burns and McDonnell
- **ACTION ITEM – Committee wants to review selection process**
  - **Post electronically**
- Input from group on what questions should be:
  - Cost
  - Feasibility
  - Environmental impacts compared to baseline
  - Whether any given alternative increase/decrease seismic impacts
  - Permitting issues
  - Other alternatives?
  - Hybrid Approach?
  - Consider retirement as an option?
    - Still need to address existing fuel
- Next Meeting
  - 10 day notice

- Will use Meeting Wizard to set date