Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Diablo Canyon Nuclear Plant

Docket Number: 50-275-LR and 50-323-LR

ASLBP Number: 10-900-01-LR-BD01

Location: (teleconference)

Date: Wednesday, September 19, 2012

Work Order No.: NRC-1869 Pages 612-629

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

	612
1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD PANEL
5	+ + + +
6	PREHEARING CONFERENCE CALL
7	
8	x Docket Nos.
9	In the Matter of: : 50-275-LR and
10	PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY : 50-323-LR
11	(Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power :
12	Plant, Units 1 and 2) : ASLBP No.
13	x 10-900-01-LR-BD01
14	
15	
16	Wednesday, September 19, 2012
17	
18	BEFORE:
19	ALEX S. KARLIN Chairman
20	NICHOLAS G. TRIKOUROS Administrative Judge
21	DR. PAUL B. ABRAMSON Administrative Judge
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES	:
2	On Be	half of Pacific Gas & Electric Company:
3		TYSON R. SMITH, ESQ.
4	of:	Winston & Strawn, LLP
5		101 California Street
6		San Francisco, California 94111-5802
7		(415) 591-6874
8		trsmith@winston.com
9		and
10		JENNIFER K. POST, ESQ.
11		Pacific Gas & Electric Company
12		77 Beale Street, B30A
13		San Francisco, California 94105
14		(415) 973-9809
15		
16	On Be	half of San Luis Obispo Mothers for
17	Peace:	
18		DIANE CURRAN, ESQ.
19	of:	Harmon, Curran, Spielberg, and Eisenberg
20		1726 M Street, N.W., Suite 600
21		Washington, D.C. 20036
22		(202) 328-3500
23		dcurran@harmoncurran.com
24		
25		

			614
1	On Be	half of the Nuclear Regulatory	
2	Commission:		
3		LLOYD BRIAN SUBIN, ESQ.	
4		MAXWELL C. SMITH, ESQ.	
5	of:	Office of the General Counsel	
6		Mail Stop - 0-15 D21	
7		U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission	
8		Washington, D.C. 20555-0001	
9		(301) 415-1988	
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
Į.	I		

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

(2:00 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Good afternoon, everyone. This is Alex Karlin. So, with a court reporter, we now go on the record please.

PARTICIPANT: We are on the record, Your Honor.

CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Thank you. I know that we have representatives of all of the parties present, and in a moment we will have them introduce themselves.

But just for the record, we want to reflect that this is a prehearing conference call in the matter of Pacific Gas & Electric Company, and a challenge to PG&E's application to renew its license for the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant located in California.

The Docket Number is 50-275-LR and 50-323-LR, and the ASLBP Number, for the record, is 10-890-01-LR-BD01.

This conference call is being held pursuant to a notice that this Board, the ASLBP Board, sent out on August 9th of 2012. And today's date is September 19, 2012.

We are conducting this call

1	telephonically. The parties are participating
2	telephonically. Two of our Judges are on other lines,
3	and some of us are here in person in Rockville. Also,
4	there is a public listening listen-only line which
5	we have made available, and it may be that some
6	members of the media or public are listening in on
7	that line as well, but they will not be able to speak.
8	Like a court proceeding, only the lawyers and the
9	litigants are entitled to address the Board at this
10	time.
11	So let me go from that to the
12	introductions. For the Board, I would say here in
13	Rockville, in our ASLBP offices, we have Jon Eser and
14	Onika Williams, who are lawyers and law clerks helping
15	this Board out; Sara Culler has been our
16	administrative assistant; and Tywana Ellis Twana
17	Ellis will be here also, and she is going to be an
18	administrative assistant helping with this matter.
19	Over the phone we have Dr. Abramson.
20	You're there, Dr. Abramson?
21	ADMIN. JUDGE ABRAMSON: Unfortunately.
22	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Unfortunately, yes. And
23	Nick Trikouros. Judge Trikouros?
24	ADMIN. JUDGE TRIKOUROS: I am here.
25	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Okay. So we are all

1	here. Could we have the parties introduce themselves?
2	I will start with Ms. Curran, representing the Mothers
3	for Peace.
4	MS. CURRAN: Hello. Good afternoon. This
5	is Diane Curran, representing the San Luis Obispo
6	Mothers for Peace. I'm on the telephone in
7	Washington, D.C.
8	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Okay. And do you have
9	anyone with you on the line?
10	MS. CURRAN: No, I don't.
11	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Okay. Fine. For the
12	Applicant, I believe Mr. Tyson Smith are you on the
13	line? Could you introduce your team, please?
14	MR. SMITH: Yes. That's correct, Judge
15	Karlin. This is Tyson Smith, on behalf of Pacific
16	Gas & Electric Company. And with me I have Jennifer
17	Post, who is an attorney at PG&E.
18	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Okay. Great. And for
19	the Staff, Mr. Subin, I heard you on the line. Is
20	there anyone else with you?
21	MR. SUBIN: Yes, yes. Lloyd Subin. We
22	have Maxwell Smith
23	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Okay.
24	MR. SUBIN: for the Staff.
25	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Great. Welcome. Okay.

This is essentially the 12-month status conference for this case. Our last conference call was September 20, 2011, almost a year ago. And a goodly amount has happened since then, but most of that does not need to be something we need to talk about in this call.

But we do want to cover a couple of things in the background is -- first, on August 3, 2012, the regs NRC amended its Part that deal adjudicatory hearings, and on August 27th the parties submitted a joint proposal or response to our request for their suggestions as to what changes to the scheduling order might be appropriate in light of those amendments to the Part 2 regs. So that is one item on the agenda.

And the other things perhaps to note for the purposes of this call is on August 16th of 2012 the staff filed its most recent status report, and that is relevant here. I understand that your next status report is due tomorrow, so we will be asking you about that. And on September 11, 2012, PG&E filed its status report regarding the seismic study.

So the purpose of this call is to, you know, check in with the parties to see if there is anything on the horizon that they are aware of that would be relevant to the management, the efficient

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

management of this case, that would help us in that regard, and just to assess the status of the case.

I talked about this with my colleagues, and I think our agenda is pretty short. One, we'd like to ask PG&E to advise us about its schedule, particularly for the 3D seismic study. Two, we'd ask the Staff to assess its schedule and just confirm where it stands. And, three, we would talk about the -- briefly about the Part 2 amendments and how that might affect our scheduling order.

There are no motions pending and nothing else pending before us that I'm aware of at this point, so that is all we have got -- one, two, and three. Do the parties -- do any of the parties have any other item that they think should be added to the agenda?

(No response.)

Okay. Hearing none, this is going to be a short call I think, but could we ask Mr. Smith for -- on behalf of PG&E, or perhaps Ms. Post, to give us -- I see that your 9/11/2012 status report indicates a 10-month delay in the final seismic study report going from -- previously you had it at November 2013, and now it's September 2014. Could you talk a little bit about that, explain what is going on with that

report?

MR. SMITH: Certainly. And as you mentioned, the latest schedule we've got is that September 11, 2012 schedule. And as you noted, the takeaway is the issue of the final seismic report has slipped somewhat.

And what that is really due to is if you look a little bit further up on the section on 3D, high energy marine studies, is that we are getting a little more clarity on what our permits are going to look like, and it's looking now like there is going to have to be two phases to those studies.

One is going to be performed this winter, in November and December, and then the second phase will likely need to be performed the following year. And that is due to some of the permit restrictions associated with environmental impacts and also the availability of the research vessel that does the studies.

And so as a result of, you know, that split into multiple phases, that is going to push back the final report.

CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Okay. So does the -- do the Mothers for Peace or the Staff have any questions about that change in schedule?

1	MS. CURRAN: I was just this is Diane
2	Curran. I was just curious, was this because my
3	understanding was there was concern about the impacts
4	on whales of the study. Is that it?
5	MS. POST: Yes. It was due to needing to
6	get permits it was due to they turned it into
7	two phases to mitigate impacts actually on harbor
8	porpoises and sea otters.
9	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: That was Jennifer Post
10	speaking.
11	MS. POST: Yes, it was. I'm sorry.
12	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: No problem. Okay. All
13	right. That's fine.
14	Now, turning to the Staff's schedule, the
15	last report you submitted was August 16th, and now you
16	have one due tomorrow, Mr. Subin. Does the 10-month
17	delay in the final seismic study report translate into
18	some delay associated with the
19	MR. SUBIN: Yes.
20	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: final EIS?
21	MR. SUBIN: Yes, that's correct. We will
22	probably have to extend our dates another 10 months
23	from what you saw last month. That's probably what
24	you will see in tomorrow's filing.
25	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Okay. So it's sort of

1 day for day, month for month, there is noopportunity to compress that or, you know --2 Not at this point in time. 3 MR. SUBIN: 4 CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Okay. And the -- as you 5 see it, the final seismic study report is the -- what I might call the trigger date for you, for the Staff 6 7 to be able to do the draft supplementary EIS. 8 MR. SUBIN: Correct. 9 CHAIRMAN KARLIN: All right. Okay. Okay. Well, that pushes us back, you know, considerably --10 10 months -- straight forward. It still is, I might 11 note, within the 52-month timeframe that we had 12 originally noted to the Commission, because in PG&E's 13 14 original letter to the Commission of April 10, 2011, you had -- it seemed to me that you had said the 15 possibility was that report would come out in December 16 17 2015, and you are still beating that date. Is that correct, Mr. Smith? 18 19 MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor. CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Okay. All right. 20 So it is what it is, and this proceeding cannot go to an 21 evidentiary hearing on the environmental issue until 22 that is done, I suppose. So we will just have to have 23 24 you do your thing, and when those things are completed

we can proceed with our adjudication on those issues.

1	I will turn to the
2	MS. CURRAN: Judge Karlin, this is Diane
3	Curran. I have a question.
4	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Yes?
5	MS. CURRAN: I guess my question is for
6	the Staff. The Commission has issued a Staff
7	Requirements Memorandum establishing a two-year
8	deadline for revised for preparing a new waste
9	confidence EIS. And I just wondered if the Staff has
10	if they expect that to be resolved before or after
11	the seismic issues, and how that is all going to be
12	integrated into the EIS for Diablo Canyon.
13	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: That is a legitimate
14	question. I was thinking about that myself. I'm glad
15	you reminded me. I assume that 24 months is already
16	covered within the timeframe that we have here, but
17	what is your reaction on that, Mr. Subin?
18	MR. SUBIN: We would hope that to be
19	resolved. We are not waiting to do these sites
20	because of that. The only thing that is holding it up
21	is, as we said, the seismic studies.
22	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Is there any
23	contemplation that a site-specific supplemental FEIS
24	will be done, or a DEIS will be done here to deal with

the waste confidence decision?

1	MR. SUBIN: No. If one is necessary, it
2	would probably be done before then anyway, or part of
3	this. But we're not contemplating one at this point
4	in time.
5	OPERATOR: Excuse me. This is the
6	operator. I apologize. I have someone who is still
7	sitting in the main conference on music hold. Did you
8	want them to join you?
9	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Well, Operator, members
10	of the public are on a listen-only line, and
11	presumably they have been they should be in enable
12	listen.
13	OPERATOR: No, they no, I was not given
14	any direction to join them yet. So
15	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Well, okay. Please join
16	them, then.
17	OPERATOR: Okay.
18	PARTICIPANT: But not in a speaking
19	capacity.
20	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Yes, but not in a
21	speaking capacity.
22	OPERATOR: Right. A listen-only mode.
23	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Are they okay.
24	Please join them.
25	OPERATOR: All right. One moment.

1 CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Hello? Operator, are you on the line? Operator? 2 PARTICIPANT: I don't think we have 3 4 contact with her unless she interrupts us. 5 CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Okay. Well, let me just say, this is Judge Alex Karlin. 6 I'm with the Atomic 7 Safety and Licensing Board. We have been conducting a prehearing conference call with the parties to the 8 9 adjudication in the Diablo Canyon matter. The operator was -- there is a listen-only 10 line that we arranged to have for members of the 11 public to listen to this proceeding, and to listen to 12 this call, and the operator just informed us that they 13 14 -- the public, members of the public on that line, 15 were only patched in a moment ago. I apologize for the delay associated with that, but we are going to 16 17 continue to proceed. For those of you who were -- you know, 18 19 members who were not able to hear at the beginning of this call, please note that a transcript of the call 20 will be made available on NRC's public website within 21 about a week or so, and you can look at that first I 22 guess 10 minutes of the call and listen to that. 23 So it's -- but we apologize for the delay, 24

and we are now talking about the schedule.

25

I quess we

1	were still talking about the Staff's schedule and the
2	whether or not the waste confidence rule decision
3	in New York v. NRC how that might impact the
4	schedule here. And I believe, Mr. Subin, you are
5	saying you don't think it will impact the schedule
6	here. Mr. Subin, for the Staff, is that correct?
7	MR. SUBIN: That's correct. That's what
8	I said.
9	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: And I had asked whether
10	or not the Staff was contemplating doing a site-
11	specific environmental impact analysis of the waste
12	confidence issue for Diablo Canyon. And, Mr. Subin,
13	your answer is?
14	MR. SUBIN: I said no, we were not
15	contemplating it at this point in time.
16	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Right. Okay. And that
17	I think brings us up to date to the one third item
18	on the agenda, really, which is just to talk about the
19	August 3, 2012, amendments to the NRC's regulations
20	governing adjudicatory proceedings.
21	As we know, those new regs went into
22	effect in early September, and they don't change
23	anything we have done in the past, but going forward
24	the new rules are to be applied to disputes that might

arise in the conduct of this proceeding. And so with

that in mind, we, the Board, ask the parties to submit to us suggestions as to whether -- how we should change our scheduling order.

We have an initial scheduling order that was issued in September 2010, the governance proceeding, and whether these amendments to the regulations warrant any changes in that scheduling order. You submitted something to the parties, jointly submitted some proposals to us on August 27th of 2011. We have looked at them.

We think -- I'm trying to speak for my colleagues on the Board -- that conceptually you are in the right mode. We are going to make some of those changes. We may not adopt your precise wording, but we will adjust the scheduling order to reflect some of the changes in the regs.

And we may delete some of the provisions that have become obsolete, but -- you may not see everything exactly the way you proposed it, but I think the gist of it will be there. And we are also going to change -- there was an ultimate deadline set for motions for summary disposition associated with environmental matters, and that needed to be revised, and so we are going to revise that.

But we don't really need to discuss that

1 at this point unless there are any questions that the parties have. You will probably be seeing something 2 3 from us in the next couple of weeks, I hope, that is 4 a revised scheduling order that reflects that. 5 With that, unless Judge Abramson or Judge Trikouros has anything -- just hold on a second. 6 7 (Pause.) 8 CHAIRMAN KARLIN: All right, everyone. 9 We're back on the record here. And I think Judge 10 Trikouros had one question that he wanted to ask. ADMIN. JUDGE TRIKOUROS: Yes. This is for 11 During the course of these studies, do you 12 Ms. Post. see any opportunity for -- to make up any lost time in 13 14 the schedule? 15 Given the approach that we are MS. POST: required to take under the permit that was issued by 16 the California State Lands Commission, I don't see an 17 opportunity change the 18 to we can't 19 November/December timeframes where we're collecting the data. And that is due to different requirements 20 with regard to whether and with regard to 21 different species that -- and other environmental 22 impacts that we are having. 23 24 So we certainly, in terms of trying to

process the data, we might be able to -- we might be

1	able to compress some time there. But we are, at this
2	point, married to performing the collection of the
3	data in two phases, in November and December of 2012,
4	and then again in November and December of 2013.
5	ADMIN. JUDGE TRIKOUROS: All right. Thank
6	you.
7	CHAIRMAN KARLIN: Okay. Anything else
8	from the parties?
9	(No response.)
10	All right. I appreciate the status
11	conference. It was short, but sometimes it's helpful
12	to pulse the parties and to find out if anything is on
13	the horizon that we should know about that would help
14	us manage the case. It sounds like there is a lot of
15	studying going on, and that's fine and good, and we
16	will await the results of that information, so that we
17	can have our adjudicatory hearing once the study is
18	complete, and the EIS is then complete.
19	We may have another conference call in six
20	to 12 months, depending on the level of activity in
21	the case. But, otherwise, I appreciate your time, and
22	we will just close the record.
23	Thank you.
24	(Whereupon, at 2:00 p.m., the proceedings
25	in the foregoing matter were concluded.)