

RCNFPP Draft Minutes 11/21/2013 Meeting

| Committee Members | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| David Asti | Southern California Edison (SCE) |
| Melissa Jones | California Energy Commission |
| Mark Krausse | Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) |
| Jim Caldwell | Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies |
| Sepideh Khosrowjah | California Public Utilities Commission |
| Peter Von Langen | Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board |
| Rochelle Becker | Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility (A4NR) |
| Staff in Attendance | |
| Jonathan Bishop | State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) |
| Shuka Rastegarpour | SWRCB |
| Marleigh Wood | SWRCB |
| Mariela Carpio-Obeso | SWRCB |
| Paul Hann | SWRCB |
| Marie Hoffman | SWRCB |
| Public in Attendance | |
| Dan Williams | Bechtel Power Corp. |
| Doug Dismukes | Bechtel Power Corp. |
| Bryan Cunningham | PG&E |
| Joan Walter | California Energy Commission |
| John Geesman | A4NR |
| Kathy Jones | PG&E |
| Eric Wilkins | California Dept. of Fish & Wildlife |
| Perf Peterson | Diablo Canyon Independent Safety Committee |
| Daniel Hirsch | College Ten University of California, Santa Cruz |
| Victoria Davis | University of California, Santa Cruz |
| Damon Moslen | Friends of the Earth |
| Dave Freeman | Friends of the Earth |
| Bill Powers | Powers Engineering |

| | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Joe Dillon (call in) | NMFS West Coast Region |
| Peter Henderson | Pisces Conservation Ltd |

Welcome, Introductions and Updates -

Chumash Tribe follow-up concerns

Marie Hoffman: The Tribe will respond to provide any information, documentation of maps, etc.

Bechtel: We have money allocated for a consultant to do archeological surveys.

Review and approve Meeting Notes -

November 4, 2013 meeting minutes **approved**

August 13, 2013 meeting minutes **not approved**, still some edits needed to be addressed.

Friends of the Earth Review of Bechtel's Draft Final Report Presentation -

Damon: Economic numbers were inflated and significantly larger than expected. Chart in the power point shows a significant difference between the Bechtel cost estimates, PG&E cost estimates, and the TetraTech cost estimates. Friends of the Earth (FOE) Review of the Bechtel Report was contracted to Power Engineering and Pisces Conservation Ltd.

Peter Henderson: Fine Mesh Traveling screen proposal is converting entrainment effects to impingement effect. This technology is not effective. FOE opinion is that the wedgewire screens are not protective enough; they foul and usually work in rivers and are also not an effective technology due to the slot size limitation. Bechtel indicated that a site specific test program as described in the Draft Final Report would be undertaken to assess the effectiveness of the wedge wire screens prior to their adoption.

Bill Powers: Salt Water Cooling Towers are effective and are commonly used. Bechtel proposes the wrong site for the cooling towers and needs to re-evaluate the parking lot option as a site for consideration before choosing to spend the \$3 billion dollars for removing a mountain. There are not enough air credits available for PM10.

Jim Caldwell: It's not possible for a Salt Water Cooling Towers to be as effective with so little cycles. The water is too salty for closed cycle cooling to be feasible.

Bechtel: It doesn't appear that the FOE have seen the Phase I Report. Phase I evaluated the options with respect to feasibility, and Phase II covers cost and schedule. Bechtel's responsibility was not to make a recommendation on the preferred technology. Bechtel has spoken to San Luis Obispo County during Phase 1 and was told that there were 31 credits available for PM 10. With respect to the cooling towers:

Bechtel is using the round wet Mechanical draft freshwater towers and did detailed evaluation of the location, spacing, and drafting. Parking lot was declared as not a suitable location. This configuration was selected for this technology base on the vendor recommendation due to the enhanced efficiency and smaller footprint.

Jonathon Bishop: Bill cites \$3.5 billion dollars in contingencies, is there an explanation for this?

Bechtel: We developed estimates per AACEI industry guidelines. There is a 15% to 25% contingency on costs. This contingency is added to account for unknowns that are inherent in an estimate developed based unknowns with preliminary. A Class 3 estimate is typically provided to permit funding requests for large capital projects.

Jonathon Bishop: Would like Bechtel to look at the information from FOE and respond to the comments in the Bechtel Report if they have not already been addressed in the Report.

Bechtel: Would like a compiled list of the comments and concerns that Friends of the Earth has to make sure that we don't miss any comments.

Action Item: Friends of the Earth will send the list to Water Board to send to Bechtel.

Action Item: Water Board and PG&E will speak to Tenera regarding the intake screens.

Public comments –

Daniel Hirsch: The basis of the Tenera report shows that the screening technologies are ineffective. Bechtel says that they've done analysis of the tower location; but that analysis is not available at the meeting.

Bryan Cunningham: We need to put things in to context; need to look at the issues around the facility.

Mark Krause: Maybe the placement of the towers in parking lot needs to be re-evaluated, are they really infeasible? We should have Bechtel review the feasibility of the parking lot site and get a cost estimate of the option.

Bechtel: Will respond within a week whether the parking lot option needs to be re-evaluated. If so, will work to get a concrete answer for feasibility of the tower location for both sites, and will develop cost estimates if required.

Group: If Bechtel needs to re-evaluate parking lot option, the meeting in December will be cancelled.

Next meeting (group)/ next steps

Next Meeting planned for December 18, 2013 unless Bechtel finds the parking lot option feasible.

Adjourn

DRAFT