Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Augmented Inspection Team Exit Meeting

with Southern California Edison Company

DVD 4/4

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: San Juan Capistrano, California

Date: Monday, June 18, 2012

Work Order No.: NRC-1798 Pages 1-20

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC. Court Reporters and Transcribers 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 234-4433

1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	AUGMENTED INSPECTION TEAM EXIT MEETING WITH SOUTHERN
5	CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
6	+ + + +
7	MONDAY
8	JUNE 18, 2012
9	+ + + +
10	SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO, CALIFORNIA
11	DVD 4/4
12	+ + + +
13	The meeting convened in the Community Hall
14	at the San Juan Capistrano Community Center at 25925
15	Camino Del Avion, San Juan Capistrano, California, at
16	6:00 p.m., Richard Daniel, presiding.
17	NRC STAFF PRESENT:
18	RICHARD DANIEL, Facilitator
19	THOMAS BLOUNT
20	ELMO COLLINS
21	GEORGE CRAVER
22	EMMETT MURPHY
23	JOHN REYNOSO
24	JOEL RIVERA-ORTIZ
25	GREGORY WARNICK
ı	

		2
1	PRESENT: (CONTINUED)	
2	GREGORY WERNER	
3		
4	ALSO PRESENT:	
5	PETER DIETRICH, Southern California Edison Co.	
6	DOUGLAS BAUDER, Southern California Edison Co.	
7	THOMAS PALMISANO, Southern California Edison Co.	
8		
9		
L 0		
1		
.2		
L3		
4		
L 5		
L 6		
L 7		
L 8		
L 9		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
- 11		

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(2:23 p.m.)

MR. WERNER: Actually, the steam generators -- and Emmett might be able to help me too -- the original steam generators had what they call a square bend. The new steam generators have a U bend, and so they are actually shaped like a U. The other ones were more a square type arrangement.

As far as the whistle blower, I'm not aware of -- you have to give me a little more details. I'm not aware of a whistle blower.

PARTICIPANT: In the press a while back, there was a whistle blower who came to light and I don't know what he whistle blew. I'm wondering if those concerns were generated in way on any of these issues?

MR. WERNER: I don't have any knowledge of the individual that you're talking about or what the concern was. I'm sorry.

MR. COLLINS: And I would add, by policy and I think for good reason, when people bring us concerns, we protect their identity in that process to the maximum extent we can. And so if we did know of it, I don't think I would be able to convey that to you in a way that might connect it to -- and confirm that someone had brought us concerns.

MS. MAGDA: Thank you. I'm Marnie Magda (phonetic) and I appreciate, Mr. Collins, you being here, again. I did hear you last September. And that's when I got the most frightened because you said 7.0 protection against earthquake was adequate.

So now that we look at this steam generator problem and you're telling us that it's only guaranteed at a 7.0 earthquake, and we look at the way in which I hear the language sometimes "I think" or "It's my understanding," and I remember Toni Iseman standing there giving us a quote of a man who said, "These are going to be the best. They will be wonderful." And the response from one of you was "Well, that was before my time."

So, my question is who is ultimately accountable? Whose name goes on this forever that we can all say, "This name, this person said that these were safe," because there is not a person in this room that has confidence in people with the nuclear regulatory system or Edison. The language -- I already knew when you said tube-to-tube, you were hiding something. You do this to protect yourselves and I guess to make us feel comfortable. None of us feel comfortable.

We -- the latest concern of these steam generators -- not just an earthquake could ruin things.

NEAL R. GROSS

We haven't even talked about firestorm that could come through 140 homes in Laguna Beach, that every September, we go against firestorms that could put all of the men working and women working at San Onofre at stake.

And what if we have at the same time steam generator pipes that start to crack? What are -- what is your back up for all of these possible contingencies, and who ends up -- whose name goes on this for the history of the world if we go to Fukushima? Whose name is saying this is safe?

FACILITATOR DANIEL: Thank you.

MR. COLLINS: There was a lot in your question. I think we've already talked about seismic. Size of the earthquake, I think, is translated in ground motion at the site. That's what it's designed for.

We are requiring all licensees to reasses that seismic hazard with the latest scientific information that's available, and update it if necessary. So, more work to be done on seismic to make sure that we have a facility that's built the way it needs to be built.

With respect to whose name goes on -- okay,
I licensed Southern California Edison. That is the name
on the license. They are the ones that primarily take
the responsibility for safety, to make sure the

regulations are met, and to make sure that the facility is operated as it is supposed to be operated.

And for this specific issue, you know, I'm looking to make sure that when steam generators are changed that it's done properly, and the design objectives are met.

And so that's what -- that's my job as a federal regulator, and we conduct inspection programs and assessment programs to check that, to check that along the way, so, within the law and within our procedures and our guidelines.

But it's the name on the license that bears the responsibility for safety. So --

FACILITATOR DANIEL: All right. Thank you, Elmo. Charles has a question about the steam generator.

MR. MURRAY: It's Charles Michael Murray (phonetic) from Laguna Beach. Am I understanding that the new generators that have gone in both reactor Unit 3 are unique, that there is one that is kind of similar someplace else, but they are unique, and there isn't anything identical on the planet that we can compare and contrast to, so the situation is unique and we are being exposed to this. Am I understanding this correctly?

MR. WERNER: You're correct. These generators are the only type of generators in the world. There are similar generators at Palo Verde, Waterford, ANO, Fort Calhoun, St. Lucie. But again, these specific generators designed by Mitsubishi, these are unique generators, here at -- yes, the size-wise. MR. MURRAY: If that's the case, how did they get approved to be placed in an environment with eight million people? MR. WERNER: Again, as we discussed earlier

they were -- they did go through the 50.59 review process and we are still reviewing that process, but at this time we have not identified anything that would have required a License Amendment, other than those two items I talked about earlier that did go through the License Amendment review.

FACILITATOR DANIEL: Thank you Greg. Gene.

MR. STONE: Residents Organized for a Safe Environment would like to ask that before the plant is restarted, that a cost analysis be done by the California Public Utility Commission to determine whether it is cost-effective for the citizens to have the plant reopen, and within that investigation, it should be considered the twice-through cooling that is required by state law,

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

but both nuclear power plants in California are only doing once-through cooling and have been given a three-year extension because they say it is too expensive to do.

But the law is -- and they have closed coal-fired plants for this and gas-fired plants for this once-through cooling, and why shouldn't California Edison and this be considered into the cost benefit analysis?

MR. COLLINS: Ιf Ι understand your question, it's about -- you requested that information be provided to the California Public Utilities Commission and then the cost, implementation of the cooling that's employed.

I don't know if Pete or anyone from Edison would want to tackle -- I'm not cognizant, the NRC does not have purview over the interactions with the California Public Utilities Commission. So I guess I'm unable to be responsive to your request.

FACILITATOR DANIEL: All right, folks. It's getting a little late and I promised one gentleman that I would get back and let him finish, so I'm going to do that. And I'm not done yet, okay?

MR. HEADRICK: Thank you very much. There's been some great questions asked tonight, much

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

more analytical. I tend to be more, just, going with the analogy of the intervention. And so I thought it was important and I just want to finish up my final conclusion.

It has been mentioned a little bit tonight and I know there's some questions, gray areas of jurisdictions and stuff, but it's a real, human question and I just want to finish my thought please.

It has been a rewarding game for some and we are grateful, especially considering Japan's fate, that we have not lost everything in one bad bet. Nature holds the wild card where anything is possible. And so far she has been kind to us.

We are here to tell you it is time to take your winnings and go home. Don't even ask to place one more bet. That would only confirm your gambling disorder and codependent relationship.

This is the time for introspection and reconciliation. We look forward to getting to a place where everybody wins, embracing the future with a healthy, renewed perspective. Thank you.

FACILITATOR DANIEL: Thank you, Gary.

(Applause)

FACILITATOR DANIEL: Folks we are going to take three more questions and then I'm going to ask that

NEAL R. GROSS

you submit any remaining questions on those feedback forms that I spoke of earlier. They are out in the lobby on the table.

So, we are going to have three last questions and we are going to wrap it up for the night.

Do you want to stand.

MS. CUMMINGS: My name is Tara Cummings ****2:31:23 (notes have Coving but I think she says Cummings, phonetic). I'm a pediatric nurse. One of the things that has been in the news lately is that because of new information about the external and internal radiation exposures to children, the new recommendations now are that they do not receive as many or as intensive imaging because they found that they have increased the amount of leukemia and brain tumors in these children by seven times.

We have a number of children that live close to San Onofre. There is a direct proportional increase in risk for leukemia and other things and the amount of time living near a nuclear reactor.

We have lots of different radiation exposures that continue to fall upon us. Some are being released by San Onofre. Some are coming over through the jet stream from Fukushima. Some of it has been here since the nuclear testing that went on in the '50s.

NEAL R. GROSS

Who is adding up the total exposure for our Some of these radioisotopes can stay lethal, area? harmful for hundreds of thousands of years. adding up the total and measuring the total amount of radiation exposure in our population and determining what level of risk. and how information -- what were you guys calling it, learnings -- the new learnings about the true risks to human life being implicated into the testing that's being done and the regulations that are being used to determine the risk assessment on this nuclear power plant?

(Applause)

FACILITATOR DANIEL: Thank you Tara.

MR. WERNER: I share your concerns about children with radiation. I have a six-year-old. And actually, up until about a year and a half or two years ago, I didn't realize how much radiation a CAT scan, that's the study that you're talking about, I actually heard that the other day.

For perspective, a CAT scan, a whole body CAT scan, gets -- you get between 2,000 to 5,000 millirem for each whole body CAT scan. And again, for a child that has to be weighed, that's something you talk to the medical doctor to see if the benefit outweighs the risk. You're absolutely correct. As compared to like

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

what the plant released last year, like I said, it was around 0.1, 0.1 millirem versus 2,000 to 5,000 millirem.

I think as Greg indicated, naturally occurring radiation is about 360 millirem, and then from other sources about 600, 650 millirem per year.

MS. CUMMINGS: (Off-mic)

MR. WERNER: Again, those actually, those -- the radiation was measured here along the coast, again, very low levels. But yes, actually, it does all add up. But again, still very low levels as compared to, for instance, the CAT scan. They are talking, you know, thousands of more times of radiation due to CAT scans as what you get naturally.

MR. COLLINS: I'd like to add a few thoughts. Your question about who adds it up, and who takes a look at the total picture, I think it's well established, I think, you know, and the NRC believes, you know, there is no threshold linear relationship, and any, any exposure to radiation has the prospect.

Now at the levels we're talking about, it is practically negligible and incalculable. But there are many other sources of radiation. For who, for NRC-licensed material, which is the nuclear power plant and most medical uses, you know, cobalt therapies and many of the diagnostic treatments, you know, we look

NEAL R. GROSS

1 at those, look at those radiation exposures. In terms of risk to people off-site at San Onofre, we are engaged currently with the National 3 Academy of Sciences to propel another cancer study to see what the data does show with respect to that. previous study did 6 7 correlation of increased cancer with respect to exposure from the nuclear power plant, but we are engaged again 8 9 to redo that study. It's a very difficult study because when 10 you take a 0.1, perhaps, calculable dose and compare 11 12 that to two rem, five rem, you know, from CAT scans and other radiation, how do you tease that out in the study. 13 And that's what the National Academy of Science is 14 15 struggling with that right now, how they are going to do that and what data they are going to get. 16 So, we are serious about that and we want 17 to complete that study and get the best data we can. 18 19 So, we'll see where it goes. MR. COLLINS: You're potentially referring 20 to the EPA radiation network -- potentially. 21 (Off-mic) 22 MS. CUMMINGS: FACILITATOR DANIEL: We wouldn't be in a 23 24 position to --25 just don't have MR. COLLINS: Ι the

information on that, so --

FACILITATOR DANIEL: We are going to hear from Lyn Harris-Hicks here.

MS. HARRIS-HICKS: I live two miles from San Onofre. I have lived there for most of my life, and my children and grandchildren are living in the radiation that you put forth.

And we know that it has raised what they call the natural background. There is no natural background of radiation. It is a man-made poison. It is the worst poison that we have every discovered how to put out, to kill people.

And it is being used to kill people in the countries overseas in the armaments. And we just can't keep on doing this. And so when you sit there and talk about -- you have to look a little more to see what happened on this one or that one, and you don't have any idea whether when you -- once you start it again, that the next week it might be all over again in different ones of those tubes, because the truth of it is that the metals are the basic fault here, and that won't be mentioned because that's the way the nuclear industry has gotten all of its -- and I shouldn't say all, never say all -- the nuclear industry has gotten its guarantees, loan guarantees, because without the loan

guarantees they couldn't build anything.

And they waited a generation. Oh now, I mustn't get off on that. The point is that when you know you have not been able to create an alloy which can resist the terrible destructive action of this terrible technology, why do you go ahead looking for the little bits of fragments of what might have influenced making it worse, or less worse, when our lives are in the -- our lives, eight million, right of us -- and probably a lot more than that, because we are learning every day about, from Fukushima, that that radiation is coming over us and it is making more and more people, and particularly the children -- how can you do that?

FACILITATOR DANIEL: Thank you, Ms. Hicks.
(Applause)

FACILITATOR DANIEL: Charles.

MR. COLLINS: Well, I'd like to just comment. And you know, there is really probably nothing I can say to say Ms. Hicks, you know, except I do appreciate her sentiment and her challenge to us as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to make sure we do our job with respect to safety.

And on these particular issues, I'll just tell you, we are committed to make sure that we understand

NEAL R. GROSS

1 this, with the best science and engineering that is available right now, and San Onofre is not going to run 2 again until we are satisfied. So, thank you for your 3 comment. 5 FACILITATOR DANIEL: All right. It's 6 going to be -- Elmo? 7 MR. COLLINS: Well, I'm just doing a time 8 check. We have to be out by 10. 9 FACILITATOR DANIEL: Okay. This is going 10 to be our final question. Charles. 11 MR. GRIFFIN: My name is Charles Griffin 12 (phonetic). I'd like to speak about the tubes. My wife just passed away in December from lung cancer. 13 that interesting. Okay. 14 But about the tubes, and you've learned 15 tonight that this is a different design, and I've learned 16 tonight that it's quite a bit different design than what 17 was originally there. 18 19 And why didn't it trigger -- I initiated 20 the California Environmental Quality Act in 1970. was passed by Nixon and Governor Brown passed the 21 California Environmental Quality Act. 22 Why isn't there an Environmental Impact 23 Statement for the National Environmental Protection Act, 24

and why haven't we got an Environmental Impact Report

2	And because it involves looking for
3	alternatives, and certainly we have cheap, natural gas
4	and that's certainly a workable alternative, we just
5	built a natural gas facility at John Wayne Airport.
6	So, we can build local ones. We can put
7	them out in the desert. We don't have to cover our desert
8	with solar cells. But we also can build an alternative
9	utilizing hydrogen and boron and make a fusion reactor
10	there that's the size of a bathroom and you can put in
11	any substation and diversify this with a smart grid.
12	Thank you.
13	FACILITATOR DANIEL: Thank you, Charles.
14	MR. COLLINS: I want to make sure I
15	understand the question.
16	MR. GRIFFIN: We need an Environmental
17	Impact Report. Why haven't we got it?
18	MR. COLLINS: Yes, okay, good. Thank you.
19	Federal law tells us when the Environmental Impact
20	Statement
21	MR. GRIFFIN: (Off-mic)
22	MR. COLLINS: I'm sorry. I stated that
23	poorly. That wasn't what I was trying to convey. First
24	of all, Mr. Griffin, let me express my condolences on
25	the loss of your wife. I'm sorry to hear that.

for the tubes on this?

But the licensee, I mean the NRC in the implementation of our provisions, you know, has those in our regulations about when an Environmental Impact Statement should be triggered.

And we believe we followed those

regulations in this instance, but we also acknowledge because of the prospect for a License Amendment which might trigger additional reviews or additional federal actions, and at least a statement of no significant hazards determination.

We have got to go back and do our inspection and review and make sure we got this one right. It's actually a question we're asking ourselves, as well, and we haven't arrived at the answer yet. So, thank you.

FACILITATOR DANIEL: Ladies and gentlemen,
I'm sorry. The night is wearing long. Please give us
your questions on those feedback forms, but before you
go, I want to thank you for the thoughtful questions
and comments that you have all come out and asked.

And I want to thank you again for your time.

You have been a wonderful audience. Thank you very
much. And I am going to let Mr. Collins have the last
word here.

MR. COLLINS: Yes, I just want to -- Rick

NEAL R. GROSS

So

already said what I wanted to say and that's my personal appreciation for you taking the time to come out. Your questions, we have done our best to try to answer your question and be forthright with it. And just to restate what we've indicated a number of times, we're not satisfied yet. A lot of work has to be done for this difficult technical issue. We are going to have more meetings and we are going to continue to talk about it before NRC makes So I expect I am going to get to see you a decision. again and we'll get to talk about this some more. thank you very much for your attendance tonight. (Applause) (Whereupon, at 2:44 p.m., DVD 4 ended, marking the end of the meeting)

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

5

6

8

NEAL R. GROSS