

1

2

Appendix B

3

Notice of Preparation, Comments on NOP, and Index to Location Where Each Individual NOP Comment is Addressed in EIR

4

5

6

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

This page intentionally left blank.

INDEX TO NOP COMMENTS

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
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

COMMENTOR: San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA)

COMMENT: The SDCWA is in the very early stages of assessing desalination facility siting opportunities at SONGS. The option of future reuse of the offshore conduits would be crucial for a regional desalination facility.

RESPONSE: This issue is addressed in the Executive Summary, Project Description, the No Project Alternative, and the Artificial Reef Alternative.

COMMENTOR: Municipal Water District of Orange County (MWD)

COMMENT: The Proposed Project should reserve the option of future reuse of the offshore conduits for a regional desalination facility.

RESPONSE: This issue is the same as the issue raised by SDCWA. The issue is addressed in the Executive Summary, Project Description, the No Project Alternative, and the Artificial Reef Alternative.

COMMENTOR: Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton

COMMENT: Camp Pendleton indicated that is was aware that the desalination facility was under consideration, and the Base stated that it was not opposed to consideration of such a facility on the Base.

RESPONSE: This issue is the same as the issue raised by SDCWA and MWD. It is addressed in the Executive Summary, Project Description, the No Project Alternative, and the Artificial Reef Alternative.

1 COMMENTOR: California Native Heritage Commission
2
3 COMMENT: The Proposed Project should conduct a records search and
4 address the potential for the occurrence of cultural resources in the
5 project area, and address the potential adverse effects on cultural
6 resources from project implementation.
7
8 RESPONSE: This issue is addressed in Section 4.10, Cultural Resources.
9
10
11 COMMENTOR: California Department of Toxic Substances Control
12
13 COMMENT: The Proposed Project should address the potential for previous
14 contamination from nuclear power plant operations and/or
15 contamination from previous spills of toxic materials.
16
17 RESPONSE: This issue is addressed in Section 4.9, Hazards.
18
19 COMMENT: The EIR should address the mechanism for investigation or
20 remediation of any contaminated sites.
21
22 RESPONSE: There are no known contaminated sites in the project vicinity.
23
24 COMMENT: The Proposed Project should address lead-based paints and
25 ACMs.
26
27 RESPONSE: This issue is addressed in Section 4.9, Hazards.
28
29 COMMENT: Land disposal restrictions may apply to project excavation.
30
31 RESPONSE: The project will not involve disposal of excavated soils, and there is
32 no contamination in the project area.
33
34 COMMENT: Sensitive receptors, including humans and marine flora and fauna,
35 should be protected from releases of hazardous substances.
36
37 RESPONSE: The project include an Oil Spill Response Plan, Marine Safety Plan,
38 and a Diver's Safety Plan to protect sensitive receptors during
39 project implementation.

1 COMMENT: Hazardous wastes must be managed in accordance with the
2 California Hazardous Waste Control Law and Hazardous Waste
3 Control regulations, and a permit will be required from DTSC, the
4 local CUPA, or the RWQCB.
5

6 RESPONSE: No hazardous wastes will be generated by the Proposed Project;
7 see section 4.9, Hazards.
8
9

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

This page intentionally left blank.

Comments Presented At July 1, 2004 NOP Scoping Hearing
Bob Yamada, San Diego County Water Authority

- The San Diego County Water Authority is the regional water wholesaler for SD County. We provide 75% to 90 % of the water used in SD County to over 2.8 million SD County residents. We serve 23 member agencies including the City of San Diego and MCB Camp Pendleton.
- As a regional water agency, one of the Water Authority's responsibilities is to ensure a safe and reliable water supply not only today, but well into the future.
- The Water Authority believes that the key to future water supply reliability is the diversification of that supply. As such, over the past 5 years, the Water Authority has been engaged in a regional water facility master planning process that analyzed various supply and facility alternatives. As a result of this process, the Water Authority Board concluded that the centerpiece of our water supply diversification strategy should be the development of a new water supply from the west, seawater desalination. This diversification strategy also includes aggressive water conservation, water recycling, agriculture to urban water transfers.
- The Water Authority anticipates that seawater desalination will make up between 6 and 15 percent of San Diego County's water supply in 2020.
- As you may know, the Water Authority is currently preparing an EIR for a regional seawater desalination facility at the Encina Power Station in Carlsbad. In addition, the Water Authority is studying desalination sites in the southern end of the SD County.
- In addition to these two sites, we are in the very early stages of assessing the desalination facility siting opportunities in and around SONGS. We are considering the potential to develop a regional seawater desalination facility that could serve not only SD County, but also Orange County and MCB Camp Pendleton.
- As intake and discharge are critically important to the cost and permitting of a desalination facility, one of the key reasons we were attracted to the SONGS site was the potential availability of the existing Unit 1 intake and discharge tunnels. The tunnels could be potentially used for ocean intake and concentrate discharge from a desalination facility.
- As I mentioned, we are still in the early stages of our desalination feasibility analysis at SONGS, and do not want to hinder this process. We hope to continue to work with State Lands Commission and Southern California Edison on this issue as this environmental process proceeds.

5700
CPLO
15 JUL 04

Mr. Stephen Jenkins
California State Lands Commission
100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South
Sacramento, CA 95825

Dear Mr. Jenkins:

This letter is submitted in response to the State Lands Commission Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) associated with the decommissioning of Unit 1 at the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS). More specifically, as stated in your Notice, the purpose of this Draft EIR is to evaluate the environmental effects of that part of the Unit 1 decommissioning process related to removal of various vertical structure sections of the Unit 1 offshore intake and discharge conduits. Southern California Edison, the project applicant, is proposing to leave the largest portion of the offshore intake and discharge conduits (approximately 3,000 feet of the horizontal sections which are buried below the ocean floor) in-place and “plugged” on both ends with concrete grout.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton has no objection to this project regarding the disposition of Unit 1's offshore intake and discharge conduits nor with the State Lands Commission decision to prepare a Draft EIR to evaluate the environmental effects of this project. We do want to submit for the record, however, a comment regarding our recommendation for the ultimate disposition decision with respect to these Unit 1 offshore conduits. While we recognize that neither this Base nor the Department of the Navy has any legal jurisdiction over the ocean floor land areas where the Unit 1 conduits lay buried offshore, please be advised that it's our preference to see these two conduits be allowed to remain in place and not completely removed, as could be required by the Lands Commission and/or the State PUC.

We view these two offshore conduit pipes as potential assets that could support intake and discharge requirements for other southern California infrastructure needs in the future, such as a water desalination facility or possibly a wastewater treatment facility. This Base has already been approached by several local water agencies interested in evaluating the possibility of establishing a desalination facility somewhere in the vicinity of the SONGS complex; and if this kind of facility were to ultimately be pursued, the existing Unit 1 offshore conduits may prove to be a great asset for such a desalination operation. Use of these conduits to support a future Camp Pendleton wastewater treatment facility at the northern end of the Base would also prove beneficial for the same reason. Thus, it's our recommendation that the intake and discharge conduits be authorized to remain in place, as has been proposed by SONGS. These facilities may provide a capability for serving other “public good” utility needs in the future.

Should you have any questions or require additional information with respect to this Camp Pendleton opinion, the Base's primary point of contact on this matter is Mr. Ed Rogers, the

Camp Pendleton Facilities Manager at (760) 725-6451. In closing, we'd like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on this Notice of Preparation of a Draft EIR.

Sincerely,

L. D. RANNALS
Community Plans & Liaison Officer
By direction of the Commanding General

Copy to:
Chief of Staff
AC/S Facilities
WACO
SONGS (Mgr, Site Support Services)

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

915 CAPITOL MALL, ROOM 364
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
(916) 653-4082
(916) 657-5390 - Fax



July 1, 2004

Mr. Stephen L. Jenkins
California State Lands Commission
100 Howe Ave., Suite 100-South
Sacramento, CA 95825-8202

Re: Notice of Preparation; Disposition (full or partial removal) of SONGS Unit 1 Offshore Intake and Discharge Conduits
SCH# 2004061092

Dear Mr. Jenkins:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above-referenced Notice of Preparation. To adequately assess the specific related project impacts on cultural resources, the Commission recommends the following actions be taken:

- Contact the appropriate California Historic Resources Information Center for a record search. The record search will determine:
 - If a part or all of the area of project effect (APE) has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
 - If any known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE.
 - If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
 - If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.
- If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
 - The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure.
 - The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional archaeological Information Center.
- Contact the Native American Heritage Commission for a Sacred Lands File search of the project area and information on tribal contacts in the project vicinity who may have additional cultural resource information.
 - Please provide U.S.G.S. location information for the project site, including Quadrangle, Township, Section, and Range.
 - We recommend that you contact all tribes listed on the contact list to avoid the unanticipated discovery of sensitive Native American resources after the project has begun.
- Lack of surface evidence of archeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence.
 - Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archeological resources, per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5 (f). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American, with knowledge in cultural resources, should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
 - Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the disposition of recovered artifacts, in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.
 - Lead agencies should include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains in their mitigation plan. Health and Safety Code §7050.5, CEQA §15064.5 (e), and Public Resources Code §5097.98 mandates the process to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

Sincerely,

Carol Gaubatz
Program Analyst
(916) 653-6251

CC: State Clearinghouse

July 14, 2004

Mr. Stephen Jenkins
California State Lands Commission
100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South
Sacramento, California 95825

**NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR
SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION (SONGS) UNIT 1 DISPOSITION
OF OFFSHORE CONDUITS PROJECT (SCH# 2004061092)**

Dear Mr. Jenkins:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has received your notice of Preparation (NOP) for a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) document. Based on the review of the currently submitted document DTSC has comments as follows:

- 1) The EIR needs to identify and determine whether current or historic uses at the Project site have resulted in any release of hazardous wastes/substances.
- 2) The EIR should identify the mechanism to initiate any required investigation and/or remediation for any site that may be contaminated, and the government agency to provide appropriate regulatory oversight. If hazardous materials/wastes were stored at the site, an environmental assessment should be conducted to determine if a release has occurred. If so, further studies should be carried out to delineate the nature and extent of the contamination, and the potential threat to public health and/or the environment should be evaluated. It may be necessary to determine if an expedited response action is required to reduce existing or potential threats to public health or the environment. If no immediate threat exists, the final remedy should be implemented in compliance with state regulations and policies.
- 3) All environmental investigation and/or remediation should be conducted under a Work Plan approved by a regulatory agency that has jurisdiction to oversee hazardous waste cleanup. Previously submitted assessment reports, sampling results of related and site related documents should be summarized in the EIR.

- 4) Since the subject property was used as a nuclear power generating plant, onsite soils could contain nuclear or power generation-related waste residue. The site may have contributed to soil or groundwater contamination. Proper investigation and remedial action, if necessary, should be conducted at the site prior to any new development.
- 5) It is stated in 1.2.2. Project Objectives that : “the objectives of the proposed Project are to: 1) remove the vertical structures ...3) install a “plug” of lean concrete grout between the mean lower low water boundary and the tsunami gates...” Section 1.3 Setting states: “The SONGS Unit 1 circulating intake and discharge conduits are constructed of 12-foot inside diameter steel-reinforced concrete pipe. They extend horizontally from the onshore plant site...below the ocean floor.” If building structures and pipe structures which contain concrete are planned to be demolished, an investigation should be conducted for the presence of lead-based paints and asbestos containing materials (ACMs). If lead-based paints or ACMs are identified, proper precautions should be taken during demolition activities. Additionally, the contaminants should be remediated in compliance with California environmental regulations and policies.
- 6) The project construction may require sand, soil or other related excavation and sand, soil or concrete filling in certain areas. Appropriate sampling is required prior to disposal of the excavated soil, sand or other media. If the soil, sand or other media is contaminated, properly dispose of it rather than placing it in another location. Land Disposal Restrictions (LDRs) may be applicable to these soils. Also, if the project proposes to import soil to backfill the areas excavated, proper sampling should be conducted to make sure that the imported soil, sand or other media is free of contamination.
- 7) Human health, marine flora and fauna, and the environment of sensitive receptors should be protected during the construction or demolition activities. A study of the site should be conducted to provide basic information for determining if there are, have been, or will be, any releases of hazardous substances that may pose a risk to human health, marine environment or the other related environments. Section 3.0 Potential Environmental Effects, Hazards. States: “The proposed project has the potential to release hydrocarbons into the marine environment from the project related vessels...A project specific oil spill response plan will be evaluated.”
- 8) If it is determined that hazardous wastes are, or will be, generated by the proposed operations, the wastes must be managed in accordance with the California Hazardous Waste Control Law (California Health and Safety Code,

Mr. Stephen Jenkins
July 14, 2004
Page 3

Division 20, chapter 6.5) and the Hazardous Waste Control Regulations (California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 4.5).

- 9) If it is determined that hazardous wastes are or will be generated and the wastes are (a) stored in tanks or containers for more than ninety days, (b) treated onsite, or (c) disposed of onsite, then a permit from DTSC may be required. The facility should contact DTSC at (818) 551-2171 to initiate pre application discussions and determine the permitting process applicable to the facility.
- 10) Certain hazardous waste treatment processes may require authorization from the local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA). Information about the requirement for authorization can be obtained by contacting your local CUPA.
- 11) If the project plans include discharging waste water to surface water, you may be required to obtain a waste water discharge permit from the local overseeing Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- 12) If during construction/demolition of the project, soil or sediment contamination is suspected, construction/demolition in the area should cease and appropriate health and safety procedures should be implemented. If it is determined that contaminated soil or sediment exist, the EIR should identify how any required investigation and/or remediation will be conducted, and the government agency to provide appropriate regulatory oversight.

DTSC provides guidance for preparation of a Preliminary Endangerment Assessment (PEA), and cleanup oversight, through the Voluntary Cleanup Program (VCP). For additional information on the VCP, please visit DTSC's web site at www.dtsc.ca.gov. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Ms. Teresa Hom, Project Manager, at (714) 484-5477.

Sincerely,

Greg Holmes
Unit Chief
Southern California Cleanup Operations Branch - Cypress Office

cc: See next page

Mr. Stephen Jenkins
July 14, 2004
Page 4

cc: Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse
P.O. Box 3044
Sacramento, California 95812-3044

Mr. Guenther W. Moskat, Chief
Planning and Environmental Analysis Section
CEQA Tracking Center
Department of Toxic Substances Control
P.O. Box 806
Sacramento, California 95812-0806

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

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
FOR PROPOSED PROJECT DISPOSITION
(FULL OR PARTIAL REMOVAL) OF SONGS UNIT 1
OFFSHORE INTAKE AND DISCHARGE CONDUITS

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, JULY 1, 2004, 4:08 P.M.

100 NORTH CALLE SEVILLE
SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA

Reported by:
Gail E. Kennamer, CSR 4583
Hutchings Number 68332-OC

1 APPEARANCES:

2

3 For STATE OF CALIFORNIA:

4 STATE LANDS COMMISSION

5 DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

6 BY STEPHEN L. JENKINS

7 100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South

8 Sacramento, California 95825-8202

9

10 For SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON:

11 BY DAVID W. KAY

12 AND

13 DAVID BREVIG

14 2244 Walnut Grove Avenue, Suite 331

15 Rosemead, California 91770

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CHANDRASHEKAR BASAVALINGANADODDI, State of California
2 ROBERT R. YAMADA, San Diego Water Authority
3 KARL W. SECKEL, Municipal Water District of Orange
4 BARRY SNYDER, AMEC
5 GIRHARD JANSEN, Continental Shelf
6 TOM MURPHY, Aspen Environmental
7 DAVID FREYTAG, Jones & Stokes
8 BETSY A. LINDSAY, UltraSystems Environmental
9 RUEY LAI, RJL Associates
10 DOUGLAS DIENER, MEC Analytical Systems
11 C.T. MITCHELL, MBC Applied Environmental
12 TOM LAUKIN, EDAW
13 JANE SMITH, Public Land Negotiation Specialist with Land
14 Management Division
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA

2 THURSDAY, JULY 1, 2004, 4:08 P.M.

3 ***

4 MR. JENKINS: We're going to go ahead and convene
16:08 5 the meeting. It's approximately 4:10 on Thursday,
6 July 1st.

7 My name is Steve Jenkins. I am assistant division
8 head of the Environmental and Planning Division of the
9 California State Lands Commission.

16:09 10 We are transcribing the meeting today just so we
11 have a record of any comments, and that is so that we
12 can share it with people who may not be able to attend
13 this meeting.

14 What I would like to do is start with a few
16:09 15 introductions. Make sure that everyone from the public
16 has signed in in the back on the public sheet and all of
17 the consultants that are here have signed in on the
18 consultant sheet.

19 We will talk a little bit about what this
16:09 20 project -- the purpose of this meeting is, then
21 introduce Mr. Kay from Southern California Edison, who
22 will talk a bit about the project from a PowerPoint
23 presentation.

24 Then we will open it up to public comments. If
16:09 25 there are any public comments, we'd be happy to receive

16:09 1 those either now or before the close of our public
2 comment period, which is mentioned in our Notice of
3 Preparation. You have copies of that in the back, by
4 the way.

16:10 5 And then at the close of the public comment portion
6 of the meeting, we will adjourn this meeting. We will
7 then convene a prebid conference for the consultants who
8 may be bidding to prepare the Environmental Impact
9 Report for the project.

16:10 10 We will go through another presentation and not so
11 much on the project, because you're all here, answer
12 questions and then we'll adjourn that.

13 And then at 6:30, we will convene another public
14 scoping meeting and go through the first part of the
16:10 15 discussion here, my introduction, as well as Mr. Kay's
16 presentation on the project.

17 The reason that we have two meetings is that we
18 found in the past that public agency people tend to like
19 to come to these things when they are on agency time and
16:10 20 the public likes to come after dinner so they don't have
21 to take off from work. So we try to expand our
22 outreach.

23 As far as introductions, I already mentioned
24 David Kay from Southern California Edison.

16:11 25 With us also from the State Lands Commission in the

16:11 1 very back is Jane Smith. She's a public land
2 negotiation specialist with the Land Management
3 Division. She will be the one that negotiates the
4 actual lease of this project with Southern California
16:11 5 Edison for presentation for -- to our State Lands
6 Commission at a future meeting date.

7 Then Chandra in the back row is our engineer with
8 our minerals resource management division, and he will
9 be looking over some of the technical details of this
16:11 10 project, engineering details and that. He's also here
11 to listen in and potentially answer any questions.

12 With that, I would like to -- Does anyone have any
13 questions at this point? Okay.

14 What I would like to do is go through a little bit
16:12 15 of background about what this meeting is.

16 Now, first of all, can I have a show of hands of
17 the members of the public that are here. Not trying to
18 put you on the spot. Just so I have an idea.

19 Of the members of the public, sometimes people come
16:12 20 so that they can learn more about the project and
21 sometimes people come -- they already know that they
22 want to make comments at the meeting, or sometimes you
23 come and you don't know if you are going to make
24 comments and you make comments after the hearing.

16:12 25 Could I ask of those here in the audience, is

16:12 1 there -- of the public members, how many already know
2 that they want to make comments today? There are two in
3 the back row.

4 This will be very informal. We don't have a
16:12 5 speaker's list or anything like that

6 When you get to the public comments section, we'll
7 just invite you one at a time to come up and ask your
8 questions.

9 The purpose of this meeting is not to address the
16:13 10 merits of whether this project should be approved or not
11 approved at this point. That will be for future
12 meetings when we have a staff recommendation that is
13 ready to go to our commission.

14 The purpose of this meeting is to identify issues
16:13 15 and concerns that the public and agency members may have
16 that they would like to have addressed in the
17 Environmental Impact Report for this project.

18 For some housekeeping items, are all of you
19 familiar with the CEQA process? Is there anyone not
16:13 20 really familiar with the CEQA process?

21 Everybody pretty much knows, so I don't really need
22 to go into that.

23 Edison has a lease from the State Lands Commission
24 to construct a couple of conduits and other things,
16:14 25 12-foot diameter pipes that go out of Unit Number 1 at

16:14 1 San Onofre to either suck in saltwater for the cooling
2 of the plant or to discharge heated water.

3 With the activation of Unit 1, the lease that we
4 have with them requires that they remove those old
16:14 5 conduits. And they are prepared to do that if they
6 are -- you know, if that is deemed to be what the State
7 Lands Commission and members of the public would like to
8 have them do.

9 However, because those conduits have been in the
16:14 10 seabed for a long time, there is a potential that
11 removing them may cause more environmental damage than
12 leaving them in place. So that is why we're here.

13 We have decided that because there are many
14 different alternatives to outright removal of the
16:15 15 conduits, we need to do an Environmental Impact Report
16 that addresses the potential environmental effects of
17 those alternatives.

18 The first step in the process of preparing an
19 Environmental Impact Report is to release a Notice of
16:15 20 Preparation that says -- and we have copies in the back
21 for anyone who would like that -- this NOP basically
22 describes the project, and then it says we have
23 identified several issues that we feel need to be
24 addressed in this Environmental Impact Report.

16:15 25 We also describe the alternatives that we have

16:15 1 identified, along with the applicant, that will be
2 addressed. This is our preliminary listing of those
3 issues. And it may be as a result of your comments that
4 we have missed something or there are additional issues
16:15 5 that we would like to have addressed.

6 So just because it's on the list doesn't mean
7 that's it. If you know you have other comments or
8 suggestions, that is the purpose of this meeting.

9 On June 17th, we provided copies of this Notice of
16:16 10 Preparation to the State clearinghouse that is required
11 by CEQA, California Environmental Quality Act, and then
12 we mailed it to a mailing list that we generated based
13 on our understanding of people, organizations, agencies,
14 that might be interested in this project.

15 If you know of people that are not here that would
16 like to be on this list, please let me know. Put a note
17 on the sign-in sheet or something like that, because we
18 are interested in outreach. But we did the best we
19 could at the time of understanding who might be
16:16 20 interested.

21 This Notice of Preparation is out for public review
22 and comment, but comments need to be returned to me at
23 the address listed in the Notice of Preparation by
24 Monday, July 19th.

16:17 25 You don't need to make comments today. You can

16:17 1 still submit written comments by July 19th. Or you can
2 do both.

3 We have also noticed the availability of this
4 Notice of Preparation in the Orange County Register,
16:17 5 again as a way of providing outreach.

6 So that is basically what our process is.

7 Does anyone have any questions at this point about
8 why we're here or the process?

9 Okay. With that, what I would like to do is
16:17 10 introduce David Kay from Southern California Edison, one
11 of the partners, I guess, for the SONGS Unit 1 project,
12 and have David make a presentation, as you will, that
13 basically describes what it is that we are proposing and
14 any kind of comments that you would like to make.

16:17 15 Again, we're not seeking -- I don't like that, you
16 know, "We're opposed to this project," that type of
17 thing.

18 On the other hand, if you have questions of what it
19 is that is being proposed, I will entertain those. So
16:18 20 just raise your hands.

21 Would you like to have that at the end of your
22 presentation or during the presentation?

23 MR. KAY: They can interrupt me anytime, that is
24 fine. Keep it informal.

16:18 25 MR. JENKINS: As far as the consultants in the

16:18 1 room, if you can make a note of your comments, we will
2 address those in the prebid conference after the scoping
3 meeting.

4 With that, let me turn it over to David Kay.

16:19 5 Thank you.

6 MR. JENKINS: Real briefly, if you do have comments
7 or questions, because we are transcribing this meeting,
8 if you could just say your name. And if it's hard to
9 spell, like it's not Smith, just have a spelling of your
10 name. Thank you.

11 MR. KAY: Can everyone see the screen?

12 Well, good late afternoon. I am David Kay. I am a
13 project manager at Southern California Edison in the
14 Corporate Environmental Health and Safety Division, and
15 I support the environmental and project organizations at
16 San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station.

17 I will just give you a very general overview of
18 this project.

19 Dave Brevig, manager of the project from the site
16:20 20 is here. If you have any highly technical questions, I
21 will probably refer them to Dave.

22 And as I said before, just feel free to raise your
23 hand and interrupt me at any time if you have a
24 question.

16:20 25 This is San Onofre Unit 1 (indicating), if you are

16:20 1 not familiar with it. This photo was taken September
2 2002 by the fellow who established sort of a private,
3 nonprofit web site. I guess he's a helicopter pilot
4 part time and self-made millionaire, and he just flies
16:20 5 his helicopter along the coast. And he has cataloged
6 pretty much from San Francisco Bay all the way to the
7 Mexican border every section of the California coast.
8 He took this picture.

9 He also took a picture of Barbara Streisand's house
16:21 10 in Malibu, and Barbara Streisand sued him saying that
11 the photo of her home on the public web site represented
12 a terrorist threat. Barbara lost the suit and the court
13 recently ordered her to pay him 180,000-and-change in
14 legal fees. Kind of an interesting cycle.

16:21 15 Anyway, this is Unit 1. And this was, as I said,
16 not quite two years ago. It was decommissioning of --
17 Unit 1 was already underway. You can see the large
18 crane here (indicating). This was used to remove large
19 components, such as the reactor pressure vessel and
16:21 20 steam generators from the reactor complex itself.

21 This sphere enclosure building here (indicating),
22 this concrete cylinder has been partially removed at
23 that point. So decommissioning has advanced quite a bit
24 since this picture was taken.

16:22 25 The focus of this project are the offshore intake

16:22 1 and discharge conduits for cooling water, and they
2 are buried roughly in this location right here
3 (indicating).

4 The conduits were used to provide and remove ocean
16:22 5 water from the plant. The ocean water conduits removed
6 heat from the steam condensers and returned that water
7 to the Pacific Ocean. And at the time it was operating,
8 the temperature of the water leaving the plant was
9 anywhere between 20 and 25 degrees Fahrenheit warmer
16:22 10 than the intake.

11 Each of the conduits is a foot thick of reinforced
12 concrete, 12 feet inside diameter, and buried under at
13 least 4 feet of seabed.

14 The larger of the two conduits -- The longer of the
16:22 15 two conduits, the intake is about 3200 feet long, the
16 discharge conduit is 2600 feet long.

17 Each of the conduits has a vertical structure, a
18 riser off of the end of it extending 16 feet above the
19 seabed. Of course, on the intake pipe, the riser was
16:23 20 used to draw seawater in. On the discharge pipe, just
21 the opposite, seawater out.

22 And at 500-foot intervals along the conduits from
23 the terminal structures, there are manhole risers for
24 maintenance access that extend just a few feet above the
16:23 25 seabed.

16:23 1 This is an overhead view (indicating). If you
2 squint real hard, maybe you can make out some of the
3 details of the conduits.

4 Here is the plant here onshore (indicating).
16:23 5 Conduits extend offshore and at each of these lines is a
6 manhole location.

7 This is the discharge conduit location right here
8 and the intake conduit location at this point
9 (indicating).

16:24 10 And an elevation view, the top of the conduit at
11 this point, the elevation of the seabed at this point
12 (indicating), so it's nominally 4 feet below the seabed.
13 The discharge structure location and the intake
14 structure location. Cross-sections of the conduits,
16:24 15 12 feet high deep, reinforced concrete pipe.

16 This is a diagram of the intake terminal structure
17 (indicating). You can see its sections of concrete
18 extending both below the seabed and, I think -- what did
19 I say? -- 16 feet nominally above the seafloor.

16:24 20 The intake structure only has what's called a
21 velocity cap, a flat top on the top of the conduit with
22 openings on the side here (indicating).

23 That was used to direct seawater into the pipe
24 horizontally rather than vertically, because fish can
16:25 25 perceive horizontal movement better than vertical

16:25 1 movement and so they -- at least the adult fish can
2 avoid being drawn into the intake.

3 This is a typical section of one of the manhole
4 risers that are spaced at 500-foot intervals.

16:25 5 Seafloor is right about at this level (indicating).
6 And you can see it's attached to the top of the larger
7 horizontal conduit.

8 Why are we doing this? The unit was retired in
9 1992 after a number of years of operation. So the
16:25 10 conduits are no longer required for the plant.

11 And decommissioning, as I mentioned, is in
12 progress. On Unit 1, taking apart the plant piece by
13 piece and the scope of that decommissioning includes
14 doing something with the intake and discharge conduits.

16:26 15 As Steve Jenkins mentioned, we entered into an
16 easement contract with the State Lands Commission
17 beginning in 1964, which initially required -- or does
18 require Edison to completely remove the conduits when
19 we're done with them, and that we must obtain written
16:26 20 permission from the State Lands Commission before we
21 actually undertake that removal or any other related
22 action.

23 How we got to where we are today with what we're
24 proposing is, as Steve mentioned, we discussed with the
16:26 25 State Lands Commission staff various alternatives for

16:26 1 dealing with the conduits, and we all recognize that
2 completely removing the conduits would be rather
3 disruptive to the marine environment out there compared
4 to other alternatives that were possible.

16:27 5 And so we have proposed what we believe is the
6 least environmentally disruptive alternative and that is
7 what will be evaluated in this Environmental Impact
8 Report, along with other alternatives per California
9 Environmental Quality Act.

16:27 10 Our stake in the proposal, ultimately how these
11 conduits are handled, whether it's partial removal or
12 full removal or no action. We will implement whatever
13 is the preferred disposition that comes out of the
14 Environmental Impact Report.

16:27 15 We have a rate-payer-funded decommissioning trust
16 fund that pays for all elements of decommissioning of
17 Unit 1, and there are sufficient funds in that trust
18 fund to cover any of the alternatives we're considering,
19 including complete removal.

16:28 20 So the proposed scope for the offshore section of
21 the conduits is to remove only the vertical terminal
22 structures, the intake and discharge risers and the
23 manhole risers. And, you know, obviously this would
24 minimize disruption to the seabed flooring because you
16:28 25 are not having to excavate and remove 2600 to 3200 feet

16:28 1 of 12-foot-in-diameter conduit.

2 We'll eliminate the navigation hazard that exists
3 with the risers, which currently need to be buoyed and
4 identified. And after the risers are removed, we expect
16:28 5 marine life will continue to inhabit the ends of the
6 conduits and perhaps some of the manhole riser openings
7 until overtime those openings gradually infill with
8 seabed material.

9 We'll also install barriers on the intake and
16:29 10 discharge openings that are left after the risers are
11 removed, as well as where the manhole risers are
12 removed, in order to prevent human entry into the
13 conduits.

14 Very briefly, we did a survey of the environment in
16:29 15 the vicinity of the conduits and, in summary, it was
16 just a number of transections along the length of the
17 conduit by diver and for the -- in general, the benthic
18 habitat.

19 It's typically a soft bottom for Southern
16:29 20 California near-shore environment. It's very sandy.
21 And in the interstitial area, there are few species.
22 That is mostly dominated by clams and worms.

23 Some of the habitat is limited to just a little bit
24 of cobble in a few locations among this sort of broad
16:30 25 expansive sandy bottom.

16:30 1 And there is, of course, rock riprap or stone
2 riprap near the location of the risers and sub-tidal
3 habitat. It actually serves a sub-tidal habitat.
4 Marine organisms are inhabiting that riprap.

16:30 5 The proposed project would only effect the benthic
6 habitat and the sub-tidal riprap right near the risers
7 that are being removed, and no activity in the areas of
8 the horizontal conduit sections.

9 Onshore that is the -- as you get to the beach area
16:30 10 and you go up into the plant where the conduits actually
11 terminate east of mean low low water, those are on Camp
12 Pendleton property, not on State property.

13 And our scope of work proposed for those portions
14 of the conduits are to fill them with grout between the
16:31 15 mean low low water level and appoint about 15 feet
16 inside the plant seawall, which is right at the boundary
17 of the plant.

18 This will provide a physical barrier going in or
19 going out, and it also prevents the potential for future
16:31 20 collapse of the conduit under the beach section, which
21 is a public beach and accessible to the public.

22 MR. QUIGLEY: Is that area also 4 feet below
23 surface level where it crosses the beach?

24 MR. BREVIG: It's much deeper. They are about 25
16:31 25 to 30 feet below the surface just as you are inside the

16:31 1 plant. So they are close to that just on the west side
2 of the seawall.

3 And then as you move west toward the mean low low
4 water line, the depth below the surface is about 8 to
16:31 5 6 feet.

6 When you are getting into the surf zone, it's a
7 nominal 4 to 7 all the way out.

8 Where they were originally constructed and sent a
9 different team in that Dave talked about, we determined
16:32 10 exactly where they were below the surface and they are
11 essentially where they were when they were put in.

12 MR. KAY: Very stable.

13 MR. JENKINS: Can the first speaker please identify
14 yourself.

16:32 15 MR. QUIGLEY: Ken Quigley.

16 MR. JENKINS: Ken Quigley?

17 MR. QUIGLEY: That's correct.

18 MR. JENKINS: The second speaker, can you identify
19 yourself, please.

16:32 20 MR. BREVIG: Dave Brevig, Southern California
21 Edison.

22 MR. KAY: Any other questions about the project in
23 general?

24 Okay. Thank you very much.

16:33 25 MR. JENKINS: Would you mind getting the lights.

16:33 1 Thank you, Dave.

2 At this point, I am going to open it up for any
3 comments that people would like to make, if you have
4 any.

16:33 5 Again, we are looking for public input to help us
6 prepare an Environmental Impact Report that is
7 comprehensive and addresses all of the issues that need
8 to be addressed so we don't get a lot of comments back
9 on the draft EIR and have to respond to them later. We

16:33 10 want to make sure this document is prepared as best we
11 can to address the issues.

12 So with that, is there anyone that would like to
13 come up and present comments? I think there were two in
14 the back.

16:33 15 Is there anyone else? Okay.

16 Why don't you come on up. And if you have a copy
17 of your presentation, if you wouldn't mind leaving that
18 so that we can give that to the reporter. If not, that
19 is fine.

16:34 20 If you can just give your name and then go ahead.

21 MR. YAMADA: Good afternoon. Thank you for the
22 opportunity to speak to this process here today.

23 My name is Bob Yamada. I am the Seawater
24 Desalination Program Manager for the San Diego County
16:34 25 Water.

16:34 1 MR. JENKINS: Spell your name.

2 MR. YAMADA: Y-a-m-a-d-a.

3 As most of you know, the water authority is a
4 regional water wholesaler for San Diego County. We
16:34 5 provide 75 percent to 90 percent of the water used for
6 2.8 million people that we serve in San Diego County.
7 We serve 23 member agencies, including Camp Pendleton.
8 And as one of our responsibilities as a regional water
9 wholesaler, we are looking to ensure water reliability
16:34 10 both now and into the future.

11 One of the keys, we think, to ensuring that
12 reliability is water supply purification. And over the
13 past five years, we have been engaged in a master
14 planning process that looked at various supply and
16:35 15 facility alternatives.

16 As a result of that process, we concluded that the
17 centerpiece of our diversification strategy going
18 forward is going to be development of a new water supply
19 from the west, seawater desalination.

16:35 20 We also, as part of that strategy, are including
21 our efforts to conserve and develop water recycling and
22 agricultural and urban water transfers, and both are
23 imported resource supply reliability.

24 As you know, the Water Authority is currently
16:35 25 pursuing an EIR for a regional desalination facility in

16:35 1 Carlsbad and looking for desalination opportunities in
2 the southern part of San Diego County.

3 In addition to these two sites, we are in the very
4 early stages of assessing desalination facilities,
16:35 5 siting opportunities in and around the SONGS site.

6 We are considering the potential to develop a
7 regional seawater desalination facility that could serve
8 not only San Diego County, but Orange County and
9 potentially Camp Pendleton.

16:36 10 As intake and discharge are critically important to
11 the cost and permitting the desal facility, one of the
12 key reasons we are attracted to the SONGS site is the
13 potential availability of the existing Unit 1 intake and
14 discharge tunnels. These tunnels could potentially be
16:36 15 used for ocean intake and concentrate discharge from a
16 desal facility.

17 As I mentioned, in closing, we're really in a very
18 early stage of this process and we don't want to hinder
19 this EIR process. We hope to continue to work with
16:36 20 Southern California Edison and State Land Commission on
21 this issue as this process unfolds over the next few
22 months.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. JENKINS: Can I just ask for one point of
16:37 25 clarification.

16:37 1 MR. YAMADA: Sure.

2 MR. JENKINS: When you talk about system
3 flexibility and that, would it be your preliminary
4 desire to keep those conduits intact in their current
16:37 5 state, or do you know at this point?

6 MR. YAMADA: I don't think we know enough to
7 presume as to what the right disposition is.

8 We know that we're looking at them to utilize
9 them potentially for a desal facility, but I think
16:37 10 there is more discussion yet to be held with you all
11 and with Edison to talk some more about how that might
12 work.

13 MR. JENKINS: Okay.

14 Thank you.

16:37 15 MR. SECKEL: Good afternoon. I am Karl Seckel with
16 Municipal Water District of Orange County. First name
17 K-a-r-l, S-e-c-k-e-l. I am assistant manager with
18 Municipal Water District of Orange County. We're an
19 agency that is similar in nature to San Diego County
16:38 20 Water Authority, only we're north of the border for
21 Orange County.

22 A number of the things that Bob mentioned -- I will
23 keep this fairly short. We are working on similar types
24 of projects as San Diego County Water. Actually, we're
16:38 25 working in conjunction with them on the potential for

16:38 1 siting an ocean desal facility in and around the SONGS
2 site. So I just wanted to go on the record as being on
3 record with San Diego County Water Authority with
4 respect to that.

16:38 5 And, once again, I think our interests in this is
6 to work with the State Lands Commission and Southern
7 California Edison in the process as this proceeds and as
8 we get further along in our planning for facilities on
9 the Orange County side of the border.

16:38 10 Thanks.

11 MR. JENKINS: Is there anyone else that would like
12 to make comments?

13 Again, you don't have to come up here and face the
14 audience. If you prefer to sit in your chair and make
16:39 15 comments, that is fine as well.

16 Seeing no one else, I hope everyone has had an
17 opportunity -- you had the opportunity, I hope everybody
18 signed in on the sheets.

19 And with that, I am going to go ahead and adjourn
16:39 20 this meeting, close this public comment period.

21 And we're going to reconvene the prebid conference
22 for the consultants. Members of the public can sit
23 in on that as well, if you want. But, again, the
24 purpose is to discuss things with the potential
16:39 25 consultants.

16:39 1 And then at the close of that, we will then
2 reconvene another public comment period or public
3 scoping meeting at 6:30.

4 Thank you all for attending and we look forward to
16:39 5 your continued participation.

6 (The proceedings concluded at 4:39 p.m.)

7 ***

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA) ss

2

3 I, Gail E. Kennamer, CSR 4583, do hereby declare:

4

5 That the above foregoing twenty-five (25) pages
6 contain a full, true and correct transcription of the
7 proceedings.

8

9 I further declare that I have no interest in the
10 event of the action.

11

12 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws
13 of the State of California that the foregoing is true
14 and correct.

15

16 WITNESS my hand this _____ day of
17 _____, _____.

18

19

20 _____
21 Gail E. Kennamer, CSR 4583

22

23

24

25