

Comment Set PM1  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF SCOPING MEETING

RE: SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION  
STEAM GENERATOR REPLACEMENT PROJECT DRAFT EIR

SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA

MAY 12, 2005

REPORTED BY KERSTEN SONG, CSR NO. 12796

**Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005**

1                   REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF SCOPING MEETING,  
2 commencing at the hour of 3:05 p.m., on Thursday, May 12, 2005,  
3 at 100 North Calle Seville, San Clemente, California, before  
4 Kersten Song, Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State  
5 of California.

6

7

I N D E X

8

9

10 WELCOME TO SCOPING MEETING                   PAGE

11

12 Karen A. Linehan, Facilitator                   (Untranscribed)

13

14

15 STAFF PRESENTATION:

16

17 By: Jon Davidson   (Untranscribed)

18

19 By: Andrew Barnsdale                                       (Untranscribed)

20

21

22 PUBLIC COMMENTS:   3

23

24

25

\* \* \*

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, MAY 12, 2005

2

3 (WELCOME TO SCOPING MEETING)

4

5 (JON DAVIDSON GIVES PRESENTATION)

6

7 (ANDREW BARNSDALE GIVES PRESENTATION)

8

9 MS. LINEHAN: So when I call your name,  
10 please come up to the podium, state your name  
11 clearly, and you'll be given three minutes to speak.  
12 I'll call -- here comes somebody.

13 Thank you, ma'am.

14 You'll have three minutes to speak. I  
15 will call the first three cards, and I'll keep them  
16 coming so you know when your turn is next.

17 The first person I would like to call is  
18 Billie-Pinnick Lovmark.

19

20 PUBLIC COMMENTS

21

22 MS. BILLIE-PINNICK LOVMARK: Do I face  
23 you or the audience?

24 MS. LINEHAN: Face the Project Team so  
25 they can hear your comment.

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1                   MS. BILLIE-PINNICK LOVMARK: Will the  
2 audience hear me, too?

3                   MR. JON DAVIDSON: Hopefully.

4                   MS. BILLIE-PINNICK LOVMARK: I'll try and  
5 project my voice. And I guess this is my reward for  
6 getting here an hour early, being first.

7                   I just want to establish that I had  
8 property in San Clemente, as probably many of you  
9 have, since 1955, so I was here to watch the  
10 facility being built. And I've been to a lot of  
11 meetings, since many of you in the audience must  
12 have, over the years on safety and all the events  
13 that have been happening. Many of us who lived here  
14 in San Clemente have met over the years workers who  
15 work at the facility and have heard kind of  
16 off-the-cuff comments about safety, how it was built  
17 and so forth. And so, you know, I just have a lot  
18 of concerns.

19                   I also spent a Saturday as a guest of the  
20 Edison Institute, going through the facility so I --  
21 I feel I'm knowledgeable. And yet, why do I not  
22 feel safe when I'm sitting on the beach and an  
23 airplane goes by that looks like it might be close  
24 or getting closer? I have the fears of terrorism. I  
25 have the fears of, is it really secure? And these

PM1-1

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 are the things that are always in the back of my  
2 mind, besides the problems that we have today.

3 I had a coffee klatch at my house after  
4 the article that came out in the Sun Post. And  
5 thank goodness that the Sun Post keeps us informed  
6 and the people at the coffee klatch were very  
7 concerned about the tax payer picking up a bill. So  
8 I'll contact you by phone on that. You said we  
9 could.

10 But my real concern right at this point  
11 is that I don't feel you have sufficiently met the  
12 problem of the Camp Pendleton residents. They're  
13 just within a mile of your facility. Every time I'm  
14 at a meeting, I don't really feel that they have a  
15 safety project. And so I would really like to have  
16 you speak to that.

17 And I also want to note...I have in my  
18 notes here that there wasn't a really good  
19 discussion in your staff -- and I'm going to give  
20 you the initials I know --CPUC staff, on what you  
21 are providing for accidents. I know that you've put  
22 out a lot of information, but I just don't feel that  
23 it's practical or that people who live in the  
24 area -- for instance, how many people in the  
25 audience know that they're immediately supposed to

PM1-1

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 go and close all openings in case there's a  
2 disaster?

3 MS. LINEHAN: Nine seconds.

4 MS. BILLIE-PINNICK LOVMARK: And how many  
5 people are not able to hear the siren where they  
6 live?

7 Thank you.

8 MS. LINEHAN: Thank you.

9 I'm sorry, I'll call more names and let  
10 you know who's upcoming.

11 David Perlman will be next, followed by  
12 Dorothy Boberg, followed by Russell Hoffman.

13 DAVID PERLMAN: Greetings. My name is  
14 David Perlman. I am chair of the Orange County  
15 Conservation Committee of the Angelis Chapter of the  
16 Sierra Club. And as far as I'm concerned, the key  
17 environmental impact of a steam generator  
18 replacement is that it will enable a dangerous  
19 operation to continue. Everything else is  
20 continued -- kind of side comments.

21 The generation of electricity by nuclear  
22 power, as we all know, is a dangerous technology.  
23 And any of us here can think of a dozen reasons why.  
24 If a serious mistake is made, the site in the  
25 surrounding area for miles around will be

PM1-1

PM1-2

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 permanently uninhabitable, and thousands will be  
2 doomed to death or cancer or other disease caused by  
3 radiation. If no other source of clean energy was  
4 feasible, perhaps nuclear energy, decades of  
5 planning for solutions with all of its problems, can  
6 be considered. But clean and sustainable energy is  
7 feasible now, and the dangers of nuclear power do  
8 not have to be confronted.

9           We don't have to extend the life of this  
10 machine. Not to worry, say some. Nuclear power is  
11 safe because the NRC is a competent oversight agency  
12 and inspects its many layers of safety. But the  
13 NRC's history contains more overlook than oversight.  
14 As an example, on May 1997, United States General  
15 Accounting Office, GAO, released a report on its  
16 investigation of NRC actions at the troubled  
17 Millstone, Salem, and Cooper nuclear power plants.  
18 The Salem plant was shut down for over two years.  
19 The NRC had a list of 43 items that had to be fixed  
20 before the Salem plant could be restarted. The GAO  
21 looked at that list and discovered that 38 of the  
22 problems had been known to the NRC before the plant  
23 was even operating.

24           The GAO asked, "How problems which were  
25 so serious that Salem could not be safely restarted,

PM1-2

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 could possibly be not so serious when the plant was  
2 running?" It is the sacred policy of the Sierra  
3 Club, as most of our responsible environmental  
4 organizations, such as the Union of Concerned  
5 Scientists and the Physicians for Social  
6 Responsibility, to oppose the construction and  
7 operation of nuclear power/electrical-generating  
8 facilities. The Sierra Club, therefore, commends  
9 SDG&E for opposing the extension of the operating  
10 life of the remaining SONGS reactors and proposing  
11 to replace the power they provide SDG&E with  
12 sustainable power-generation technology and energy  
13 efficiency increases, and further encourages the  
14 Rocky Mountain Institute as a reputable energy study  
15 group to examine the SDG&E system proposal in an  
16 effort to promote the cause of energy  
17 sustainability.

18 Thank you very much.

19 MS. LINEHAN: Thank you.

20 MS. BILLIE-PINNICK LOVMARK: I'm past my  
21 parking so I have to leave.

22 MS. LINEHAN: Let's hope you didn't get a  
23 ticket.

24 Dorothy Boberg.

25 MS. DOROTHY BOBERG: Back in the early

PM1-2

PM1-3



Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

PM1-3

1 1970s, I was the research associate for Another  
2 Mother for Piece, and we wrote a study entitled,  
3 "Nuclear Power and Radiation Monitoring in  
4 California."

5 MS. LINEHAN: Can you speak up a little?

6 MS. DOROTHY BOBERG: All right.

7 This study was used as a basis for  
8 intervening against Units II and III right before  
9 they were built. I think Mr. Barnsdale's indicated  
10 that the people working on this were accountants,  
11 lawyers -- and who?

12 MR. BARNSDALE: People I work with are  
13 accountants and lawyers, folks I've hired.

14 MS. DOROTHY BOBERG: And accountants,  
15 okay.

16 Well, I don't think they really know  
17 about the environment. That's a whole different  
18 thing. If you're going to talk about the  
19 environmental impact, you need physicians and  
20 sociologists and biologists, and some of the other  
21 social scientists.

22 One of the things that's been mentioned  
23 that the NRC has total authority over nuclear  
24 radiation and safety. Well, the CPUC is not --  
25 should not be involved in this, because that's the

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 major danger. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has  
2 a responsibility for the things that are most  
3 dangerous. So I don't see how the CPUC can even say  
4 that they're doing an environmental impact study  
5 without considering these issues.

6           There was an explanation of where the new  
7 generators would be moved up the coastline and where  
8 they would be unloaded, but there was no stress on  
9 where the old generators are going to go and the  
10 problems of decommissioning the old generators and  
11 going to where? They didn't tell you where they  
12 were going.

13           I was told in the back of the room that  
14 there are disposal places in Washington, North  
15 Carolina, and three in Utah. And I asked whether  
16 the ones in Utah were on Indian reservations. I  
17 think one of them at least is. So why don't we know  
18 where that's going? That's important to know, as  
19 part of an environmental impact report.

20           The new United States energy budget  
21 indicates that the taxpayers are going to pay half  
22 the cost of new nuclear power plants. Now, I don't  
23 know what the taxpayers are going to pay some of  
24 this or not as part of that budget, but it would be  
25 interesting to find out.

PM1-3

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1           The governor of Nevada is very strongly  
2   opposed to having the Yucca Mountain site open so we  
3   don't have anything going as far as the ultimate  
4   destination for the nuclear rods that are going to  
5   be removed before this project is considered on its  
6   way.

7           I think we need to not do anymore in the  
8   nuclear industry unless and until we solve the  
9   problem of nuclear waste. And I'd like to comment  
10   that Russell Hoffman has done a better job on his  
11   study than the Edison Institute has done on it, in  
12   my opinion.

13           Thank you very much.

14           (All clap.)

15           MS. LINEHAN: Russell Hoffman is next,  
16   followed by Sharon Hoffman, followed by Lyn Harris  
17   Hicks.

18           MR. RUSSELL HOFFMAN: I don't know where  
19   to begin. My name is Russell Hoffman, for the  
20   record.

21           Andrew, I sent you a letter last week.  
22   You sent me a letter and you said you have no  
23   responsibilities towards the nuclear safety issues.  
24   And I responded and I said that that's not true,  
25   that you can't show me the document that says that,

PM1-3

PM1-4

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 because what the document actually says is -- he  
2 doesn't look like he's listening, does he?

3 A VOICE: No, He doesn't.

4 MR. RUSSELL HOFFMAN: Well, the document  
5 says it's wrong, as the federal government safely  
6 handles the regulation of nuclear materials. Safely  
7 handles it. That we give them the right. They  
8 didn't take it. We gave it to them. But they're  
9 not handling it safely. And I think almost everyone  
10 in this room, with the exception of those in the  
11 front here, seem to know that. And you're well  
12 within -- not only well within your rights, but it's  
13 your responsibility to take those -- those rights --  
14 to take those rights, take those responsibilities  
15 back. Otherwise, you're abdicating the safety  
16 issues.

17 I remember you mentioned earlier today  
18 about some of the other energy solutions that you,  
19 the CPUC is responsible for safety. Well, when did  
20 that stop? Why does the 145-pounds or 250 pounds,  
21 or whatever it is -- Ray, what is it? per day that  
22 San Onofre generates at each nuclear reactor of  
23 high-level -- why spend fuel, vulnerable to  
24 tsunamis, to earthquakes, to guy with an RPG, with a  
25 rocket grenade, to a guy with a 50-caliber machine

PM1-4

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 gun? Why are you not responsible for any of that?  
2 After it melts down, are you going to say it wasn't  
3 my fault; those feds had all the responsibility; I  
4 didn't have any responsibility? is that what you're  
5 going to say, that you just don't care? because you  
6 don't have to know about it? You said there aren't  
7 any low-level radiation experts. Well, I've put  
8 together a pamphlet. There's information here.  
9 Hopefully, by next week, the commissioners will have  
10 a better awareness of radiation issues and what  
11 we're going to do with that 145 pounds or 250  
12 pounds -- what is it, Ray Goldman? -- a day that San  
13 Onofre creates. Do you have any idea how much it is  
14 opposed to up in Nevada, the idea of bringing all  
15 that fuel there? They don't want it. So what are  
16 we going to do, leave it here? And every pound  
17 that's created after today is your fault, because  
18 you abdicated the responsibility. You told all  
19 these people, and me, that that's okay, that you  
20 don't have to be responsible because the feds have  
21 taken responsibilities. Well, show me the document.

22 MS. LINEHAN: Ten seconds.

23 MR. RUSSELL HOFFMAN:: Every one I've  
24 seen, it doesn't look like that. Ignorance is no  
25 excuse in the eyes of the law. So stop acting like

PM1-4

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 you're ignorant, because I don't think you really  
2 are.

PM1-4

3 Thank you very much.

4 MS. LINEHAN: Thank you.

5 Sharon Hoffman.

6 SHARON HOFFMAN: My name is Sharon  
7 Hoffman. I'm a resident of Carlsbad. And there are  
8 a lot of people who've spoken about the general  
9 dangers of nuclear power. I think that that is a  
10 given, a known fact. Any thinking person recognizes  
11 that nuclear power is a dangerous way to do a simple  
12 task. But I would ask the folks from the Aspen  
13 Group. You are charged with the environmental  
14 impact statement for this particular steam generator  
15 replacement, and I hear you spend 85 percent of the  
16 time you have to present this to the public, talking  
17 about the impact of transporting the new generators  
18 across Camp Pendleton.

PM1-5

19 Frankly, I don't care. What I care is  
20 the impact of the used steam generators which are  
21 very radioactive, the impact of opening the dome at  
22 San Onofre, and you will, without comment or  
23 explanation, say that's going to be repaired. Have  
24 any of you ever repaired something and found the  
25 integrity of that repaired thing to be the same as

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 the original? That's a very rare situation. I also  
2 do not hear anything about what is going to happen  
3 to those irradiated parts, and you do a complete  
4 abdication of the question.

5 By replacing the steam generators, you  
6 are intrinsically extending the life of San Onofre,  
7 whereas we should be looking just the other way and  
8 saying what can we do to shut it down and replace  
9 it? We've replaced that much energy. We've  
10 replaced it repeatedly in the past few years. There  
11 are plans on the books in the State of California to  
12 add more replacement-generating capacity than all of  
13 the nuclear reactors that currently exist in  
14 California. So I ask you, why are we trying to  
15 extend the life and mitigate the environmental  
16 impacts of something that should not happen anyway?

17 Everybody who has thought about the  
18 problem of nuclear energy, as several people have  
19 said, has recognized that it's not a safe way to  
20 generate energy. And I don't understand how you can  
21 put the word "environmental impact" on a report and  
22 disregard the dangers of generating energy, of the  
23 existing waste, of the steam generators as waste  
24 themselves, simply because the NRC says they are  
25 responsible for that.

PM1-5

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 MS. LINEHAN: Ten seconds.

2 SHARON HOFFMAN: Thank you very  
3 much.

4 MS. LINEHAN: Thank you.

5 Lyn Harris Hicks is next. And she will  
6 be followed by Kathryn De Russo, followed by Doris  
7 Andersen.

8 MS. LYN HARRIS HICKS: At the risk of  
9 being a little repetitive, I think that we might  
10 have drawn the attention to the fact that when  
11 people continually say the same things in different  
12 ways, that it means it must be something that's very  
13 important to them. And I'm sure that everybody who  
14 really sits down and thinks about it knows it's very  
15 important to us.

16 MS. LINEHAN: Excuse me. Can you speak  
17 up just a little so our court reporter can hear you?

18 MS. LYN HARRIS HICKS: Those of us who  
19 live here have become, long ago, in denial. We have  
20 to live in denial in order to stay here. And so  
21 when we get into a report like this and it doesn't  
22 really touch on the most important or most viable  
23 issues, we sort of glance over it and say, well,  
24 that's nice. They're going to make it safe for us.  
25 And I think that we need to let this Aspen Group

PM1-5

PM1-6



Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 know that we want them to talk to our Public  
2 Utilities Commission...an honest, comprehensive, and  
3 unbiased reporting of what the choices are.

4           When we talk about alternative, we're  
5 talking about choices. And if they are going to  
6 make a choice between continuing and extending this  
7 monstrosity for another ten, twenty years, then they  
8 must also consider the benefits of taking the clean,  
9 safe, energies that we have abundant out there now  
10 in place of it. And I think it should be the role  
11 of the Aspen Group to present all the information so  
12 that the role of the CPUC, which is to protect us,  
13 can take place. And they can persuade Edison, and  
14 they have lots of ways of persuading, that that's  
15 not in the best interest of us all. And that's the  
16 key of it, isn't it? Is whether it's in our best  
17 interest. And when we hear vice president of the  
18 San Diego Gas & Electric saying that he's out to get  
19 the bids and get them in for several rounds because  
20 he's planning to have renewables on a small scale of  
21 distributive energy so he doesn't have to have the  
22 problems that San Onofre has, it makes us realize  
23 that we're not alone in thinking about this.

24           And we want Aspen to include that in,  
25 because when -- when you're talking about talking

PM1-6

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 about hazard, for example, hazard isn't just money,  
2 but what we have to pay if something happens and so  
3 forth --

4 MS. LINEHAN: Five seconds.

5 MS. LYN HARRIS HICKS: Wait a minute. I  
6 got off on that...I'm sorry, I'm so old.

7 We have three -- we have five areas that  
8 we'd like to have strengthened in this EIR and one  
9 is the -- the principal that we feel is faulty which  
10 says that we can -- we don't have to do a thorough  
11 EIR because it's already been done in the licensing,  
12 and something that far back is not obvious -- that's  
13 not realistic anymore.

14 MS. LINEHAN: Thank you.

15 MS. LYN HARRIS HICKS: We ask it to be  
16 realistic.

17 And let me just give the main points.

18 MS. LINEHAN: Can I ask you to come back  
19 up and give those points after everyone has had a  
20 chance to speak?

21 MS. LYN HARRIS HICKS: All right. All  
22 right.

23 MS. LINEHAN: That's okay. You can come  
24 back up. We just want to make sure that everybody  
25 gets the same opportunity to speak.

PM1-6

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 MS. LYN HARRIS HICKS: Thank you.

2 MS. LINEHAN: Kathryn De Ruso, followed by  
3 Doris Andersen, followed by Wendy Morris.

4 MS. KATHRYN DE RUSO: Well, first of all  
5 I want to thank Lyn Harris Hicks for telling me  
6 about this. I know she's been here in this  
7 community a lot longer than I have, and, in her  
8 soft-spoken, way has been fighting to give those of  
9 us who are residents here some power.

10 Now, we're talking about power, aren't  
11 we? And I think we need to talk about the lack of  
12 power that those of us who live here feel we have.  
13 Power over our own destiny, power over what's  
14 happening in our own community. I don't know how  
15 many of you live here or live in a community,  
16 whether it's a nuclear power plant -- perhaps you  
17 do, perhaps you don't. But I can't agree with her  
18 more, that we have to live in denial when we live  
19 here.

20 Again, Lyn mentioned, it is my feeling,  
21 that this is going to happen because of entrenched  
22 interests. Entrenched interests. It's not our  
23 interests, but entrenched interests, who really  
24 aren't concerned about whether or not they're making  
25 the right choices, but whether or not they're making

PM1-7

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 the choices -- and I would say Southern California  
2 Edison here -- the choices that are most profitable  
3 for them. And if we deny that we're living in an  
4 age of profiteering here in California, boy, we're  
5 all in denial.

6           You take that billion dollars, whatever,  
7 and you put it into the renewable -- you know, it  
8 says here in some information I have, and I'll try  
9 to keep this brief, that back when this thing was  
10 put in place, kids used to put their feet underneath  
11 x-ray machines to see if their shoes fit. I'm one  
12 of those kids, and I remember doing that. We were  
13 told that was okay. I'm 59 years old, so I guess  
14 I've denied -- I've made it. I've been one of the  
15 lucky ones. But why are we making the same mistakes  
16 over and over again? Why aren't we learning? Why  
17 aren't we applying as human beings? Why aren't we  
18 evolving? There are better ways. Sure, we need  
19 energy, and sure we have a population explosion, and  
20 we need to face realities. But why aren't we using  
21 our minds? And the minds that are there, they are  
22 brilliant people.

23           Take your billion dollars, Edison -- the  
24 way it looks to me like San Diego Gas & Electric is  
25 willing to do it -- they're a corporation. How come

PM1-7

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 they're willing to do it? You know, maybe because  
2 they only own 25 percent of it instead of 80 percent  
3 of it, or whatever, you know. And like this lady  
4 from Carlsbad said, just really quickly, when you  
5 take those old things off, they're going to have,  
6 what do they call it, a shine, the gentleman told  
7 me, and nobody else wants that shine. We want the  
8 sun to shine here, not those old steam reactors.  
9 Please. You know, think a little bit about what  
10 it's like to be us and think about the State of  
11 California and maybe the state of the world.

12 Thank you.

13 (All clap.)

14 MS. LINEHAN: Thank you.

15 Doris Andersen.

16 DORIS ANDERSEN: I came to one of these  
17 meetings about three years ago or so. I live in San  
18 Juan Capistrano. I thought I was out of the  
19 ten-mile area, and I saw a map up here and I said  
20 "Uh-oh, where I live in San Juan Capistrano, I'm  
21 within that area." And I wasn't too happy about it.  
22 And then I heard a lot about potassium iodine  
23 tablets were going to be available. And I expected  
24 within a few months I was going to call and get  
25 them. Anytime I asked for something, nothing was

PM1-7

PM1-8

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 there. Should there be a nuclear incident, the  
2 health concerns would be catastrophic. The  
3 potassium iodine tablets, if they're not given to  
4 children, terrible things will happen to them.  
5 There are young children, preschools, child care,  
6 all of them, they need them, because they're very,  
7 very susceptible to having terrible things happen to  
8 them.

9           There are studies from our country, from  
10 good institutions, and from other nations that show  
11 that children that are very young with even low  
12 levels of radioactivity exposure can get thyroidal  
13 problems. And the risk of thyroid cancer is  
14 inversely related to age. So that's only one  
15 instance of the problem. And not only children, but  
16 adults need it, too. After Chernobyl, we found out  
17 that the magnitude of cancer and everything in  
18 people have been going on for years and years and  
19 years, and the same thing with people, if they do  
20 not get potassium iodine.

21           Here, we have a working reactor near us,  
22 and this has been known for some time. The people  
23 would pull together to work this out and set it up,  
24 and, still, about three years later, nothing. And  
25 this has slowed the area works. I think this is not

PM1-8

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 only true of our area here, but wherever there is a  
2 nuclear plant in this country. And accidents have  
3 happened. Hopefully we will be spared that. But I  
4 think it's not the best way, by any means, to get  
5 our power. And we're so power-hungry and population  
6 is growing so much in this area, one of the best in  
7 our country, we need to have other sources.

8 Thank you very much.

9 MS. LINEHAN: Thank you.

10 Wendy Morris.

11 MS. WENDY MORRIS: Good afternoon. My  
12 name is Wendy Morris, and I'm a member of CREED, and  
13 I'm the liaison between CREED and the Surfrider  
14 Foundation in the Orange County chapter.

15 I'm against the replacement of steam  
16 generators at SONGS. The replacement was served to  
17 extend the life of the facility, and California  
18 should be replacing extremely hazardous nuclear  
19 energy technology with clean renewable abundant  
20 energy production. And I agree with SDG&E and other  
21 owners of SONGS that the \$680 million price tag to  
22 extend the life of nuclear energy of SONGS is too  
23 expensive. The money will be much better spent on  
24 renewable energy production.

25 And I have other reasons -- the money

PM1-8

PM1-9

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 will be much better spent on renewable energy  
2 production. I also have other reasons for wanting  
3 to end the nuclear facility at SONGS. One is,  
4 currently there is no facility to accept the nuclear  
5 waste from SONGS. So the radioactive waste that is  
6 stored at the site -- and one of the things is that  
7 the site would be a prime target for terrorists. In  
8 case of an accident, a terrorist attack or an  
9 emergency, the adjacent residents could not evacuate  
10 the area. I think the evacuation plan that's in  
11 plan is a total joke.

12                   Number three. The harm to the  
13 environment that is going from the day-to-day  
14 operations of using 2.4 billion gallons of seawater  
15 per day needs to end sooner, not later. I object to  
16 the EIR using the current environmental condition as  
17 a baseline to compare the project. That comparison  
18 is misleading. That comparison should be made to  
19 the environmental condition of the area previous to  
20 the building of a nuclear power plant. What they're  
21 doing is they're shifting the baseline. The  
22 continued damage to the environment has cumulative  
23 impacts and these impacts should be included in the  
24 comparison with the potential renewable energy  
25 alternatives.

PM1-9



Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1                   Number four. There are many -- there are  
2 now many warnings about eating fish in higher levels  
3 of the food chain. And is this a result of the  
4 release of small amounts of toxic chemicals,  
5 partially from this nuclear power facility? So I  
6 ask an assessment of chemical toxic waste streams in  
7 which zero tolerance toxic chemicals are disposed of  
8 into the ocean needs to be addressed.

9                   This solution contends that large  
10 quantities of water can delete lethal chemicals  
11 acceptably. And I think this is a dilution of  
12 dilutions. And the quantities of these chemicals  
13 are small, but they still exist. And as they enter  
14 and go up the food chain, they concentrate, thereby  
15 the quantity in the food chain ever increases. As  
16 an example, mercury in the food chain through fish  
17 population may be a result of this deceptive policy.  
18 That's just one example. And there's other  
19 chemicals out there.

20                   Thank you very much.

21                   MS. LINEHAN: Thank you.

22                   Lyn Harris Hicks. Lyn Harris Hicks will  
23 be our last speaker.

24                   Does anybody else have an interest in  
25 providing comments?

PM1-9

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1                   MS. LINEHAN: We're allowing Lyn. We  
2 might as well allow you.

3                   LYN HARRIS HICKS: I can make it fast,  
4 because Wendy just took one of the points that we  
5 think is very important, that the EIR doesn't have a  
6 very complete analysis of the significant impacts of  
7 the ocean procedures that are carried out.

8                   When we went through this, we wanted to  
9 encourage a comprehensive treatment, not just a  
10 comment that some -- some of -- that the ocean does  
11 some damage to the -- I mean, that the -- the  
12 process does some damage to the -- to the ocean  
13 creatures, but we think that the commissioners  
14 deserves to have some delineated specifics, facts to  
15 the judge. Because every time you point out  
16 something like that, that does a vast damage to our  
17 ocean site. It's on the other side of benefit. On  
18 the benefit side, I think your calculations have  
19 further comparison of the renewable energy, which  
20 don't do any of that. And I think you should take  
21 each one of these negative impacts and put right  
22 along with it the fact that renewables don't have  
23 it. Because that's the only way to make a  
24 comparison. You can't just mention that there's a  
25 problem there. But so what? you know.

PM1-10

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1                   Now, I'm sorry, I didn't want to get into  
2 that one at all. But we had first base -- the  
3 problem of taking a baseline --

4                   MS. LINEHAN: One minute.

5                   LYN HARRIS HICKS: -- and the  
6 vulnerability to the terrorist attack. And for you  
7 to say we can't get the material, I understand that.  
8 Every protective agency in the state has gone  
9 through the same thing. We just went through it  
10 with the Environmental Protection Agency. They held  
11 up their report for a year because they couldn't get  
12 the information they needed from the NRC and FEMA,  
13 and they just gave up. And their report sounds  
14 ridiculous because they didn't consider anything  
15 that has to do with the most serious impact. Okay?

16                   Oh, this matter of saying we're just  
17 replacing the reactor generators, that's very  
18 flimsy --

19                   MS. LINEHAN: Ten seconds.

20                   LYN HARRIS HICKS: Anybody who knows that  
21 can see that it's like saying I'm going to replace  
22 my car battery because it needs a new battery. And  
23 I take it out and I put the other one in and that's  
24 it. That's the mitigation. We have to figure out  
25 how to take the old battery to the proper place, and

PM1-10

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 that kind of thing.

2 MS. LINEHAN: Lyn, time's up. Come up  
3 and speak to the stenographer. She will be happy to  
4 take all your comments.

5 MS. LYNN HARRIS HICKS VOICE: I'll do it  
6 tonight. I'll finish it tonight.

7 MS. LINEHAN: Thanks.

8 Russell Hoffman.

9 Anyone else who would like to sit down  
10 with the stenographer after the meeting, you're more  
11 than welcome to.

12 RUSSELL HOFFMAN: I'd like to ask just a  
13 couple of questions.

14 MS. LINEHAN: Can you step up to the  
15 podium, please? I just want to make sure she can  
16 record it.

17 RUSSELL HOFFMAN: Have you ever heard of  
18 Dr. Helen Caldicott?

19 MS. LINEHAN: That's not a question so --

20 RUSSELL HOFFMAN: What does that mean?  
21 He's not allowed to answer? He's not allowed to  
22 answer?

23 MR. BARNSDALE: No, I'm allowed to. I  
24 just don't. I want to hear what you have to say.

25 MR. RUSSELL HOFFMAN: Have you ever heard

PM1-10

PM1-11

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 of this book by Bennett Ramberg, "Nuclear Power  
2 Plants as Weapons for the Enemy and Unrecognized  
3 Military Peril"?

4 This one talks about the effects of  
5 atomic weapons from 1950s. I didn't hear about that  
6 one either. Never mind.

7 The biggest tsunami that I could find,  
8 the biggest -- the only mention of it that I could  
9 find was that it was a six-foot tsunami, was what we  
10 expect around San Onofre.

11 In December there was a tsunami. There  
12 were reliable reports of 60-foot waves throughout  
13 the Indian Ocean. 30-foot waves were on video all  
14 over the place. How did you decide a 60-foot  
15 tsunami was the biggest there could be?

16 And my last question is, you keep -- when  
17 you talk about other energy sources, the renewable  
18 ones, you just said a lot of them because they're  
19 not good for baseline, like solar energy, there's no  
20 sun at night so solar can't be used as a baseline,  
21 what makes you think San Onofre is a good baseline,  
22 considering, on average, it's only operating with  
23 both reactors less than six days a week, and it's  
24 prone to sudden shutdowns, and we lose a whole  
25 thousand megawatts in a heartbeat? People's lights

PM1-11

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 flicker all over for 30 miles around. Why do you  
2 think San Onofre is a baseline power supplier?

3 Thank you very much.

4 Let the record show that Mr. Barnsdale  
5 would not answer the questions.

6 MS. LINEHAN: Speaker?

7 A VOICE: I didn't fill out a card.

8 MS. LINEHAN: State your name for the  
9 stenographer.

10 MR. DON RITCHIE: Don Ritchie.

11 Well, I'm probably all by myself here  
12 today. But I live in San Clemente, and within sight  
13 of the two nuclear plants, so I've been watching  
14 little red lights blink off and on for 13 years I've  
15 been in my house, and I haven't had the tiniest  
16 concern about it.

17 And I know I've heard a lot of things  
18 here, and I haven't gone into it deeply in a study,  
19 50 years ago, when I was in college, I wrote a paper  
20 on nuclear energy. And over the years, I saw it  
21 develop. As far as I'm concerned, if they want to  
22 put in a Unit III down there, it would be all right  
23 with me. I just have one more blinking light to  
24 look at.

25 As far as power goes, I want -- I like

PM1-11

PM1-12

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 power. I like power from my refrigerator, for my  
2 lights, my TV, operating my furnace, whatever it is.  
3 So as far as I'm concerned, they can put in these  
4 replacement generators they're talking about,  
5 because it's not directly inside the loop of the --  
6 of the nuclear action. That water has gone through  
7 and it's going through that there, but I don't  
8 think -- it's not like the rods, the other things,  
9 so I don't think -- it's not that serious of a  
10 concern.

11 So that's my comment.

12 MS. LINEHAN: Thank you.

13 Okay, that concludes this portion of the  
14 meeting. We have the room for about 13 more  
15 minutes, and the project team members are still  
16 available to answer your questions during that time.  
17 Like I said before, if you would like to speak to  
18 the stenographer, you may not like a public comment  
19 atmosphere, please feel free to come up and speak to  
20 her and provide your comments in that manner.

21 Thank you.

22 RUSSELL HOFFMAN: And I would like to  
23 note that it's ten minutes to four, ten minutes  
24 before the meeting was supposed to end, and Andrew  
25 Barnsdale has left the building, and abdicated his

PM1-12

PM1-13

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 responsibilities to the people of the State of  
2 California for thousands of generations to come.

3 Thank you very much.

4

5 \* \* \*

6

7 STATEMENTS ON THE RECORD

8

9 LYNN HARRIS HICKS: Well, let's see.

10 What did I last -- what can I say in two minutes.

11 I've been working on this for most of my life.

12 It's difficult for me to... well, I think  
13 that I would have liked to have spent a little more  
14 time urging the Aspen Group and the CPUC people to  
15 pursue this matter of being told that they can't  
16 consider it because it invalidates the entire  
17 document when they cannot consider the most serious  
18 issue...and particularly now with the terrorists.

19 And when they say they can't go into  
20 that, that radiation hazard things, I think that  
21 they ought to take it from a different angle and  
22 take it from the standpoint of the effects -- they  
23 don't even have to say, because of the radiation,  
24 they don't have to say that. Because everybody  
25 knows they can say that the hazard, what they're

PM1-13

PM1-14



Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 looking for is the beneficial and the negative  
2 impacts.

3           So if they just hold on to the impacts,  
4 the impacts of that plant being there, don't even  
5 mention the radiation, but the impacts of the plant  
6 being there on people in the area, that's the  
7 crucial thing, I think. Because if they don't  
8 consider the potential of a catastrophic accident,  
9 either from terrorists now or from mistakes that are  
10 made or from machinery failing, which we're getting  
11 more and more now with it being so deteriorated, if  
12 they can't assess those things, at least in a  
13 thorough analysis, the report isn't worth anything.

14           And I think that they need to make their  
15 protest. They need to stand up to the federal  
16 people and say that our constitution gives our state  
17 a right, a basic right, to protect its citizens, and  
18 that you are not enabling us to protect our citizens  
19 when you won't give us the information that we need  
20 to assess.

21           And I think this is something that's  
22 going to have to be done in the legislatures of all  
23 the states who are concerned about this, because  
24 it's a matter of states' rights, and it invalidates  
25 the protective agencies' efforts and

PM1-14

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 responsibilities.

2 Thank you.

3 (Proceedings concluded at 4:00 p.m.)

4

5

6 \* \* \*

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PM1-14

Comment Set PM1, cont.  
Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
 :ss  
2 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO )

3

4 I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand Reporter  
5 of the State of California, do hereby certify:

6 That the foregoing meeting was taken before me at  
7 the time and place herein set forth; that said meeting was  
8 reported by me in shorthand and transcribed, through  
9 computer-aided transcription, under my direction; and that the  
10 foregoing is a true record of the proceedings had at said  
11 meeting.

12 I further certify that I am a disinterested person  
13 and am in no way interested in the outcome of this action or  
14 connected with or related to any of the parties in this action  
15 or to their respective counsel.

16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed my  
17 name.

18

19 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

20

21

22

\_\_\_\_\_  
KERSTEN SONG  
CSR No. 12796

23

24

25

## **Responses to Comment Set PM1**

### **Public Workshop, 2:00 p.m. May 12, 2005**

PM1-1 Existing and ongoing terrorism and safety issues at SONGS are recognized in the Draft EIR, and have been included as part of the baseline conditions of the power plant. Please refer to Section A.4.5, SONGS Security, and Section D.12.1, Environmental Setting, Facility Security and Terrorism Issues. Please see also Master Response MR-1 (Baseline). The changes caused by the Proposed Project related to these issues have been analyzed as part of Impact S-5, for possible terrorist attacks on the OSG onsite storage facility under that alternative, and the Proposed Project would not cause any potentially significant impact. While terrorism and safety issues are discussed in Draft EIR Section D.12, the CPUC has no regulatory jurisdiction over radiological safety issues at nuclear power plants. Please see Master Response MR-3 (Jurisdiction).

Accident and public safety issues during replacement of the steam generators are discussed in detail in Draft EIR Section D.12.3, Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project. The public safety analysis pertains to residents of MCBCP as well as residents of the City of San Clemente. Emergency response procedures are also established as part of the baseline conditions of the nuclear power plant and would not be changed by the Proposed Project.

PM1-2 Please see Master Response MR-2 (License Renewal) and MR-3 (Jurisdiction). The purpose of this EIR is to evaluate the potential environmental impacts expected to result from the Proposed Project, which is the replacement of steam generators in SONGS Units 2 and 3, and provide this information to decision-makers. Section D.1.2.2 of the Draft EIR acknowledged that the replacement of the steam generators could provide an incentive for license renewal. However, license renewal and plant operations beyond the current license expiration dates are not reasonably foreseeable consequences of the Proposed Project, and therefore are not analyzed in this EIR. Please also see Response 13-1 for more information regarding the purpose of the project and the reasons that license renewal is not analyzed in this EIR. In addition, the safety of SONGS operations is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the NRC, as noted in Draft EIR Section D.1.2.5 and Master Response MR-3 (Jurisdiction).

The commenter supports the use of sustainable energy over the current use of nuclear power at SONGS. Section C.6.3 of the Draft EIR discusses various alternative energy technology scenarios under the No Project Alternative. See also Responses CC2-1 and CC2-2. These scenarios include power generated by solar thermal, photovoltaics, wind turbines, geothermal resources, hydroelectric resources, biomass, and fuel cells. Currently there is no alternative energy technology available that can reliably replace 2,150 MW of base-load generation capacity in the intervening time period before SONGS would need to shut down.

The commenter also presents an opinion on NRC's competency regarding oversight of nuclear facilities, which does not require a response. It is also noted that the commenter supports SDG&E for opposing the replacement of the steam generators at SONGS. However, SDG&E policy and system proposals regarding energy efficiency are not within the scope of the Proposed Project nor before the CPUC for consideration. It is also noted that the commenter supports the Rocky Mountain Institute to examine the SDG&E proposal.

PM1-3 The Proposed Project consist of the replacement of steam generators at an existing power plant, duly licensed to operate until 2022. As stated in Section A.4.1 of the Draft EIR, the NRC has sole jurisdiction over nuclear and radiological safety issues associated with permitting, construction, and operation of SONGS, including the replacement of steam generators. Although the CPUC cannot regulate radiological safety issues associated with the Proposed Project, an analysis of system and safety issues, including the spent fuel risk baseline in Section D.12.1, was conducted to provide full disclosure of the potential environmental safety impacts. While the CPUC does not have jurisdiction over safety issues with respect to SONGS operations, it may impose safety-related mitigation measures that are applicable only to the project and that do not directly impact safety or operations issues. The EIR does not identify any mitigation measure that the CPUC does not have the authority to implement, and the Draft EIR identifies measures to ensure public safety and/or safe work practices in a manner that does not conflict with or impinge upon NRC's jurisdiction over radiation hazards or nuclear safety. Please see Section D.1.2.5 for more information on the issues for which State regulation is preempted by the NRC. Please see Master Response MR-3 (Jurisdiction).

Section B.3.4.5 of the Draft EIR states that while SCE has not specified a disposal location, the likely destination would be Envirocare of Utah, Inc. in Clive, Utah. Per Section B.3.4.5, potential impacts would be similar regardless of disposal location.

Issues related to project cost are not within the scope of CEQA, as noted in Draft EIR Section A and D.1.2.5. The ratemaking proposal is a focus of the CPUC General Proceeding (A.04-02-026). In the General Proceeding, the CPUC must balance the environmental impacts of the Proposed Project with the economic consequences of cost recovery that would be sponsored by the SCE ratepayers. Therefore, if the Proposed Project is approved SCE's ratepayers would fund the project through increased rates.

PM1-4 Draft EIR Section A.4, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and Section A.5, CPUC Jurisdiction, discuss the jurisdiction of the NRC and the CPUC in the permitting, construction, and operation of SONGS. Please also refer to Master Response MR-3 (Jurisdiction).

Please see Response PM1-1 regarding ongoing terrorism and safety issues at SONGS.

The issue of spent fuel storage part of the existing baseline environmental conditions at SONGS. Please refer to Draft EIR Section D.12.1, Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project, Spent Fuel Risk Baseline. Please also see Master Response MR-1 (Baseline). The Proposed Project would not produce any significant safety impacts.

Disposal of the OSG is discussed in detail throughout the Draft EIR. For a discussion of available LLRW disposal facilities, please see Draft EIR Section A.4.4, Waste Transport Offsite. For a discussion of public safety impacts during OSG disposal activities, please refer to Section D.12.3.4, Original Steam Generator Removal, Staging, and Disposal; and Section S.12.4.2, OSG Disposal Alternative.

PM1-5 The issue of safety impacts during the steam generator removal and replacement is discussed in detail in Draft EIR Section D.12.3.4, Original Steam Generator Removal, Staging, and Disposal. Public safety impacts resulting from transport and disposal of the OSGs are also discussed in Section D.12.3.4 and Section D.12.4.2, OSG Disposal Alternative. The EIR identified mitigation measures to reduce all potentially significant public safety impacts to a less than significant level (e.g., Mitigation Measure U-2a to maintain adequate emergency

vehicle access during transport). Please also see Master Response MR-3 (Jurisdiction) regarding exclusive jurisdiction over storage, handling, and disposal of nuclear waste material.

For a discussion of possible future relicensing of SONGS, please refer to Master Response MR-2 (License Renewal).

Draft EIR Section D.12.1, Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project, discusses the baseline safety and risk of upset conditions at SONGS, in addition to the low-level radioactive waste baseline. Please see also Master Response MR-1 (Baseline).

PM1-6 For a discussion of possible future relicensing of SONGS, please see Draft EIR Section G, NRC License Renewal. Please also refer to Master Response MR-2 (License Renewal).

Replacement transmission facilities and the use of alternative energy technologies to replace SONGS generation are discussed in Draft EIR Sections C.6.2 and C.6.3. Response PM1-2 above addresses SDG&E's use of alternative energy. Please also see Responses PM2-4, CC2-1, and CC2-2.

Public safety issues are discussed in detail in Draft EIR Section D.12.1, Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project. For additional discussion of the existing environmental conditions at SONGS, please see Master Response MR-1 (Baseline). Please also see Responses PM1-5 above, and Responses CC4-14, CC5-35, and CC5-38.

PM1-7 It is noted that the commenter believes that private citizens have no power over the events happening in the community, including the Proposed Project. However, because the comment does not raise issues with respect to the potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Project, no specific response is necessary. The general proceeding (A.04-02-026) addresses environmental issues in conjunction with economic aspects of the Proposed Project, and public involvement may occur throughout the decision-making process. In particular, CEQA does not address cost in the evaluation of the Proposed Project or alternatives, as noted in Draft EIR Section A and D.1.2.5. Cost issues are addressed by the CPUC in the General Proceeding for the Proposed Project. Section I of the EIR describes the efforts for public involvement during the CEQA process.

PM1-8 It is recognized that accidents may occur at nuclear power plants. For a discussion of baseline safety and risk of upset conditions at SONGS, please refer to Draft EIR Section D.12.1, Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project, and Master Response MR-1 (Baseline). The Proposed Project would not cause any significant change to the existing baseline environment related to safety and risk of upset and, thus, would not have any significant impacts. Please also see Responses CC5-34, CC5-38, and CC6-23.

PM1-9 It is noted that the commenter opposes the Steam Generator Replacement Project at SONGS, and suggests that nuclear energy technology should be replaced by generation using renewable energy sources. The purpose of the Proposed Project is to replace the steam generators at SONGS Units 2 and 3, and under the No Project Alternative, renewable energy sources could be implemented. License renewal and plant operations beyond the current license expiration dates are not reasonably foreseeable consequences of the Proposed Project. Please see Response PM1-2 and Master Response MR-2 (License Renewal) for more information on the potential for license renewal at SONGS. The Proposed Project would not cause any significant change to the existing baseline environment related to marine resources.

Existing impacts to marine resources from thermal plume, impingement, and entrainment are recognized in the Draft EIR, and have been incorporated as part of the baseline conditions at SONGS. For a discussion of these impacts, please see Draft EIR Section D.3.1.5, Existing Marine Resource Issues. Please also refer to Master Response MR-1 (Baseline).

Issues related to project cost ratepayer benefit are not addressed under CEQA, as noted in Draft EIR Section A and D.1.2.5. The ratemaking proposal is a focus of the CPUC General Proceeding (A.04-02-026). In the General Proceeding, the CPUC must balance the environmental impacts of the Proposed Project with the economic consequences of cost recovery that would be sponsored by the SCE ratepayers.

The ongoing operations of SONGS, which includes the production and storage or disposal of spent fuel, the use of seawater in the cooling water system, and the discharge of waste to the ocean, are part of the environmental baseline. The environmental baseline in the Draft EIR is appropriate and remains unchanged. Sections ES.1 and D.1.2.1 state that the environmental setting, or baseline, is based on the environmental conditions that existed in the project area in October 2004 at the time the notice of preparation was published. Please see Master Response MR-1 (Baseline).

- PM1-10 Replacement transmission facilities and the use of alternative energy technologies to replace SONGS generation are discussed in Draft EIR Sections C.6.2 and C.6.3.

The baseline risk of terrorism as a result of ongoing plant operations has been addressed in several locations throughout the Draft EIR. Please refer to Section A.4.5, SONGS Security, and Section D.12.1, Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project, Facility Security and Terrorism Issues. Please see also Master Response MR-1 (Baseline). The potential for a terrorist attack on the onsite OSG storage facility, under that project alternative, would cause a less than significant safety impact, as noted in Impact S-5. The Proposed Project would not cause any significant change to the existing baseline environment and, thus, would not have any significant impacts requiring mitigation as part of the Project EIR. Please also see Response PM1-9.

Disposal of the OSG is discussed in detail throughout the Draft EIR. For a discussion of available LLRW disposal facilities, please see Draft EIR Section A.4.4, Waste Transport Offsite. For a discussion of public safety impacts during OSG disposal activities, please refer to Section D.12.3.4, Original Steam Generator Removal, Staging, and Disposal; and Section S.12.4.2, OSG Disposal Alternative.

- PM1-11 It is noted that the commenter references a book, “Nuclear Power Plants as Weapons for the Enemy and Unrecognized Military Peril” by Bennett Ramberg.

Section D.5.1.4 of the Draft EIR states that the anticipated wave height for a tsunami caused by a local offshore fault is six feet. This is based on the minimizing effect of the broad continental borderland on distantly generated tsunami waves, thereby making local offshore fault zones as the most likely generators for significant tsunami waves at SONGS and along the transport route. Therefore, by using an approximate 7-foot vertical displacement of the sea floor at a distance of 5 miles from the shore, a wave height of six feet is anticipated. The text in Section D.5.1.4 of the Final EIR has been changed to clarify this issue. Tsunamis in the project area are addressed in Section D.5.1.4 and the impact of a tsunami is evaluated in Impact G-3 (Temporary effects of earthquake-induced tsunami could

endanger worker safety). This impact is less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measures G-3a (Protect workers from temporary effects of tsunami), which includes receipt of warning notifications from the Pacific Tsunami Warning Center, and G-2a (Protect workers from temporary effects of earthquake shaking), which includes a protocol for workers to follow in the event of a tsunami.

The comments regarding renewable energy and its relationship to the baseline are unclear, and therefore a targeted response can not be provided. Use of renewable energy sources to generate power is not part of the environmental baseline. The baseline, as stated in Section D.1.2.1 of the Draft EIR, is based on the environmental conditions that existed in the project area in October 2004 when the Notice of Preparation was published. The Proposed Project is not operation of the existing power plant, which is part of the baseline, but rather steam generator replacement. As such, a discussion of renewable energy sources as alternatives to the Proposed Project is not appropriate and not warranted. Renewable energy sources, as well as other replacement energy sources are discussed, where appropriate, as part of the No Project Alternative. Responses CC2-1 and CC2-2 provide more information on the level of detail of the No Project Alternative. Please also see Master Response MR-1 (Baseline).

PM1-12 It is noted that the commenter supports the Proposed Project.

For a discussion of the process used for nuclear power generation at SONGS, please refer to Draft EIR Section A.1.1, Nuclear Power Generation.

PM1-13 The comment does not raise any environmental issues; therefore, a response is not required.

PM1-14 Draft EIR Section A.4, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and Section A.5, CPUC Jurisdiction, discuss the jurisdiction of the NRC and the CPUC in the permitting, construction, and operation of SONGS. Please also refer to Master Response MR-3 (Jurisdiction).

It is recognized that accidents may occur at nuclear power plants. For a discussion of baseline safety and risk of upset conditions at SONGS, please refer to Draft EIR Section D.12.1, Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project, and Master Response MR-1 (Baseline). The Proposed Project would not cause any significant change to the existing baseline environment related to safety and risk of upset and, thus, would not have any significant impacts. Please also see Response PM1-10 regarding potential terrorism at SONGS.