SPENT FUEL SOLUTIONS AND SAN ONOFRE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PANEL JOINT MEETING – SOLVING THE U.S. NUCLEAR WASTE CHALLENGE: A DIALOGUE ON THE PATH FORWARD

Via Zoom

TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

June 4, 2026

SPENT FUEL SOLUTIONS AND SAN ONOFRE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PANEL JOINT MEETING – SOLVING THE U.S. NUCLEAR WASTE CHALLENGE: A DIALOGUE ON THE PATH FORWARD

Transcript of video-recording meeting via Zoom commencing at 5:30 p.m., Thursday, June 4, 2026.

MEETING SPEAKERS:

DAN STETSON - (CHAIR OF SONGS COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PANEL)

MIKE LEVIN – (U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, CA-49)

CHRIS WAHL – (EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF SPENT FUEL SOLUTIONS)

ALLISON MACFARLANE – (FORMER NRC CHAIR AND MEMBER OF THE PRESIDENT'S BLUE-RIBBON COMMISSION ON AMERICA'S NUCLEAR FUTURE)

LAKE BARRETT – (FORMER DOE SENIOR OFFICIAL IN THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR ENERGY)

TOM ISAACS – (INDEPENDENT ADVISOR TO SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON FOR NUCLEAR WASTE)

FRED BAILLY – (VICE PRESIDENT OF GENERATION AND CHIEF NUCLEAR OFFICER AT SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON)

MARK MORGAN – (MANAGER OF NUCLEAR REGULATORY AFFAIRS AT SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON)

MANUEL CAMARGO – (WITH SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON)

DAN STETSON: Good evening.

Welcome, everyone, and thank you for joining us this evening.

Tonight's panel discussion is a joint meeting of the SONGS Community Engagement Panel and the Spent Fuel Solutions Coalition.

My name is Dan Stetson and I am the volunteer chair of the CEP.

As you know, this last Tuesday was California Primary Day.

I want to send a huge thank you to everyone who stepped up to run, win or lose, putting your name out these putting your name out there these days to serve our community take serious guts and dedication.

And I'm sure I join many of you who deeply appreciate your commitment to make this country a better place.

Thank you.

Please note that tonight's meeting is being recorded.

Our focus topic for this evening is “Solving the US Nuclear Waste Challenge, a Dialogue on the Path Forward.”

And I'm pleased to announce that we have 4 guest

speakers who have joined us here in person this evening to provide their perspectives and expertise regarding the nuclear waste challenge.

The panel discussion tonight comes to the most interesting time with respect to spent nuclear fuel.

As many of you know, the DOE's RFI on nuclear lifestyle innovation campuses drew responses from 26 states.

Here to help inform a discussion on the state of the play, our leading experts, Allison Macfarlane, Lake Barrett and Tom Isaacs, thank you so much for being here tonight.

Over the years, each of you have been a mentor to many and especially to me.

To facilitate tonight's discussion, we have Chris Wahl, who serves as the Executive Director of the Spent Fuel Solutions Coalition and will facilitate the dialogue during the meeting.

I will ask Chris to more formally introduce our panel in a few moments.

I also want to thank our CEP members and SCE leaders who are here with us on the panel and joining us online this evening.

Welcome.

The draft presentation was posted on the SONGS

website a week ago.

Before we dive into the main topic, let me make a few brief announcements.

First of all, our meeting will include a single focus topic, a one-hour public comment period, and read only updates.

Second, we have also changed the public comment format so that for this meeting, as our panelists, our guest speakers, they may respond to the questions after each question regarding their area of focus as they are asked.

So we'll be doing this instead of collecting questions and then asking them all at the end.

We'll be responding to the questions 1 by 1.

Questions on other topics will be addressed later in the general public comment period.

Third, for people who wish to ask a question or provide a comment using their phone, SCE provided new instructions for public comments via phone under the materials list on today's meeting webpage.

Please note you must still submit the CEP comment form with your name, question, and last four digits of your phone number to be called upon to speak and we will open the microphone via Microsoft Teams.

Finally, a reminder that the slides in the Read

Only appendix at the end of the presentation include many updates on the CEP community updates, the Spent Fuel Solutions coalitions, SONGS, Big Picture, and many other things.

So trimming, so there's a lot of things back in the appendix.

We had them in the the general area for tonight's meeting, but we just have so many things that we want to cover tonight.

We needed to move them back into the appendix.

Let me thank Ace January for advancing the slides for us.

Next slide, please.

Now it is my honor to introduce Representative Mike Levin who represents the Congressional District that includes San Onofre.

He is joining us from Washington, DC.

The congressman has been a leader in working to safely remove the spent fuel from SONGS.

He last participated in a CEP meeting in 2024 when he introduced the Nuclear Waste Amendment Act.

Tonight, he will deliver opening comments.

Congressman, welcome.

The floor is yours.

Do we have the congressman?

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: He's waiting till 540.

DAN STETSON: Let's see.

Do we have him in the in the presenters?

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: 5 minutes ahead?

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: Yeah, we're 5 minutes.

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: Yeah, we don't see him.

DAN STETSON: Congressman, are you there?

Daniel?

Are you checking on?

DANIEL: I'm not logged on.

DAN STETSON: Not logged on.

Ok, well, we'll give it a quick moment.

And while we're working to get the the congressman on, why don't we go ahead and move forward a little bit.

We have a quick meeting and if he, if we're able to get him, we'll we'll bring it back on.

So let's go ahead and move to the next slide, please.

Here you see our agenda and speakers.

Fred Bailly, SCE Vice President of Generation and Chief Nuclear Officer, will provide introductory marks.

Next, Mark Morgan with SCE Nuclear Regulatory

Affairs will provide an update stemming from a recent NRC inspection at SONGS.

Then we will dive into our focus topic for the evening.

For CEP members, we will work in your presentations after each individual presenter.

So I was in error when I sent out an earlier e-mail that we would wait till all presenters make their presentation.

So you have after you after.

For instance, after Allison's presentation, if you have a question for her, please let us know and then we'll move forward with the next one.

Following the presentations, we'll take a short break and dedicate an hour to public comment.

Manuel Camargo of SEU will support tonight's Q&A.

Next, I'm going to turn it over to Fred for his comments regarding the agenda, Fred.

FRED BAILLY: Thank you, Dan, and good evening.

As as a reminder, SCE’s decommissioning is guided by safety, stewardship, and engagement with always safety first.

On behalf of SCE, I want to thank our guest panelists, Lake, Allison, Tom, and Chris Wahl would be facilitating this this discussion tonight and the panel

members.

I hope we we can get and connect with the Congressional Congressman, Mike Levin.

I wanted to share that tonight offers a rare opportunity for the panel and the public to engage with nationally recognized experts in nuclear regulation, spent fuel management and policy.

Mark Morgan, our manager for for a nuclear regulatory affair will also review the results of a recent NRC inspection including a low-level violation.

Let let me be clear, even though it's the lowest level violation with with the the NRC, any regulatory noncompliance is is unacceptable and corrective actions are in place to prevent recurrence.

I'm also pleased to share that we're planning and we're going to be performing improvements to the beach access walkway at San Onofre State Beach this summer to maintain the north to South public access.

Additional details as Dan mentioned is available in the read only section of the presentations.

We welcome your comments.

We welcome your questions during the the public comment.

And with that, back to you Dan.

DAN STETSON: Thank you, Fred.

Let's try once again and see if Congressman Levin is here.

I think we've opened a microphone for Michael.

Congressman Levin, are you there?

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: We don't see him online.

So he's not online.

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: Yes.

So if he's not online, I say that we move on.

I placed a couple of calls to see if we can get Representative Levin on the call.

But I think for now, Dan, I would just proceed with the rest of the meeting.

And if we can just plan to interject.

And given the time difference between here and his DC office, which is where where he is today.

DAN STETSON: OK, let's go ahead and move on to the next slide then.

Thank you.

As we all know, a lot of things happening in Washington, DC right now and then things probably are changing by the minute.

Here you see a list of the volunteers who serve on the CEP.

As you can see, the CEP represents a cross section

of local stakeholders from business and organized labor to schools, environmental groups, local elected officials, and Native Americans.

Although our CEP member alternates are not listed here, they also play a vital role and actively stay informed about SONGS activities.

Each of you are very important to the fabric of the CEP.

I want to say special thanks to Victor Cabral, our Vice Chair and Secretary, Martha McNicholas, and also recognize Marni Magna, who is here and Marni is represents the Sierra Club.

She's been on the panel for as long as I can remember and she is retiring after tonight's meeting.

So Marni, I think we all owe you a debt of gratitude and thank you for your many years of active participation on the CEP.

You will be missed.

[APPLAUSE]

MARNI MAGNA: I will miss all of you, hard working.

DAN STETSON: So I know you're going to go spend a lot of time with your grandchildren.

Can't think of a better thing to do.

OK, so next slide please, reminder on our public comment.

Here you see the directions for participating in public comment.

As always, members of the public had the opportunities to submit comments and questions in advance.

Comments may be submitted by e-mail to nuccomm@songs.sce.com and that address is available on the meeting webpage.

During the meeting, folks can also submit written comments or sign up for oral comments using the online CEP form.

For members of public joining us in person, please complete a CEP Question Comment card available at the entrance and we will add your question to the list in the order that they are received.

If you, if you wish to speak, fill out the same card and we will add you to the queue for the public comment and you will be called upon to speak.

For CEP members here in person, please wait as I mentioned before, after each guest panelist and have completed their presentation and then you may ask your questions.

Then please turn your tent card up like this and Chris Wahl will be…

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: He's on.

DAN STETSON: OK. We have this, we have the congressman here.

So let's go ahead and shift to him.

Congressman Levin.

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: On his photo there.

There you go.

Yeah, I can see him.

Yeah.

DAN STETSON: Yeah, I can see you.

We're almost there.

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: We can see you, we just can't hear you.

You need to make him a presenter.

DAN STETSON: Can We can see you, but we can't quite hear you yet.

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: Have we elevated him to a presenter using Microsoft Teams?

Ok, so we need to get something on the congressman's side.

That's correct.

Mr. Levin, if there's a different way to use your audio, I'm assuming you can hear us.

REP. MIKE LEVIN: Hello.

DAN STETSON: Oh, my goodness.

MIKE LEVIN: Did it work?

DAN STETSON: We can now see and hear you.

Thank you for your perseverance.

MIKE LEVIN: Thank you for your patience.

I just got off the floor where we were just voting on some fairly important stuff.

So I'm very grateful to, to be back and I, I can jump right in.

I promise to be brief.

I really want to thank Dan and thank everybody on the CEP for everything you're doing as well as the Spent Fuel Solutions Coalition.

I'm really grateful for all of the engagement.

And you know, the work you are doing is just really, really important as we consider spent fuel issues.

And I wanted to provide just a brief update on some important spent fuel work that is happening here in Washington, DC, and I promise not to take too long to do it, but I wanted to to update you first on the DOE's nuclear life cycle innovation campuses.

This is a new effort that began in January of this year when DOE released a request for information inviting different states all across our country to express interest in hosting what they're calling Nuclear Life Cycle Innovation Campuses.

And what they're intended to do is to support the full life cycle of nuclear energy, including enrichment, generation, reprocessing, storage, and disposition at the back end of the fuel cycle.

The deadline for RFI responses was April 1st and DOE hopes to announce candidate sites in July of this year and potentially break ground on the 1st facilities in 2027.

When I was in the energy and water appropriations hearing with Energy Secretary Chris Wright, I specifically asked him this, is last month, about these campuses and about more details with regard to who applied and or who responded I should say to, the, to the RFI.

There were 28 responses, including 26 states interested in hosting one of these campuses, and it's since been publicly reported that at least four different states are interested in hosting a disposal site as part of being a Nuclear Life Cycle Innovation Campus.

I have been pressing the Secretary and his team on the need to prioritize permanently shut down sites for spent fuel removal once those campuses are up and running, and I am genuinely encouraged by the steps that DOE is taking here.

They're engaging in the States in a collaborative

approach.

In that regard, it's not dissimilar from what the prior administration did with collaborative siting because ultimately as we all know from our many years of work and engagement, you cannot have a top-down approach and expect a different outcome from what we've experienced with Yucca Mountain in Nevada.

I will say that while the campuses are a very positive development for the the spent fuel program, I still do have some concerns about DOE's ability to do this right.

And I plan to work with DOE to ensure that the effort is successful in removing waste from our community, from SONGS, and to push them there, a push, push to ensure them that they're engaging in a very robust community building process so that it is not perceived as a, a top down effort akin to what didn't work in years past.

I am very pleased to see this administration focused on this objective.

And, you know, I think it's very important that as we move forward that we do all we can to build mutual trust in this process.

I do have concerns about some of the lack of clear details that have been shared with the public and

frankly, have been shared with Congress.

I, I will give you 1 anecdotal personal example of this.

We had the Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy, Ted Garrish, to, to my office to discuss the nuclear life cycle innovation campus program.

And we discussed what would need to change in federal law in order to effectuate this, what changes would be necessary to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act?

And also, how could we focus on sites like ours, shut down plants, and and make sure that we're at the top of the list in the waste removal queue.

And they hadn't necessarily met with a whole lot of other offices.

I think we were, we were the very first one that that they had met with.

Now they have some very ambitious targets as it pertains to legislation.

We're going to do everything we can to be supportive.

And I know my team, both in Washington, DC and in in Southern California will do all they can in this effort to work collaboratively.

And the other thing that I think it's very important for you all to know is that for a number of

years we've been discussing whether the DOE itself is really equipped to handle spent nuclear fuel across the United States.

And I've now been working on bipartisan legislation.

Many of you have been, you know, instrumental in helping to to push that legislation and support that legislation that would create a sole purpose entity to administer spent nuclear fuel as opposed to DOE.

And the idea there is that you need to depoliticize the process to a degree, because as we've seen, you'll have different administrations with different ideas every four years, every eight years.

And ultimately this is going to require stability and certainty of policy for a number of decades in order to really be pulled off successfully.

So I think you're going to be hearing from Allison and Lake, Allison Macfarlane and Lake Barrett and their path forward report.

That group is outstanding.

Allison and Lake are two great leaders in spent nuclear fuel and policy for decades spanning both Republican and Democratic administrations.

So I'm eager to to get your thoughts once you've heard from them.

And their path forward report shares many objectives and and also they reach many of the same conclusions as we have, as we've sought a new nuclear waste entity, sole purpose entity, and I'll let them explain their conclusions.

I wanted to share two more updates before I turn it back over to Dan.

First is our work on House Appropriations.

As I mentioned, I sit on the Energy and Water Subcommittee and I'm proud to tell you that we advocated for and and we're successful in securing $112 million in nuclear, in the nuclear waste management program, as part of the 2027 bill.

That is the most that we've had in a greater number than we had last year.

And of course the bill passed the House of Representatives.

That, it became unfortunately more partisan bill than I would have wished.

It passed through committee, I should say.

We need to pass it through the full House floor and through the Senate and then ultimately have a conference and then finalize the bill just as we did last year.

The the final product last year wound up with I think right around 400 votes once all was said and done.

And we were able to secure a lot of money in there for spent nuclear fuel.

And we will again.

So the last thing I'll mention is I've been working with my friend Mike Lawler of New York on a bipartisan bill called the Radiation Health Research Act that would direct the NIH, the National Institutes of Health, to design and implement a program to study the health effects of nuclear radiation on women and girls.

The legislation requires the NIH to specifically examine the effects of radiation on pregnant women, adolescent girls, and pre-adolescent girls, while providing for long term monitoring of participants over a period of not less than 10 years.

We really do need more research to understand better the disproportionate impact that this may have on women's health, and we need to prevent exposure and develop the tools to do that.

So it's a bipartisan bill.

It invests in important research that'll help us understand all of this.

And I'm very grateful to my friend Mike Lawler from New York to to work with me on this and hopefully to move this forward through the legislative process in the months ahead.

So with that, I'm very grateful again to everybody for their engagement, everybody for their work, and particularly to my friend Dan Stetson.

And I'll turn it back to him to introduce 2 amazing people in Allison and Lake.

Dan, back to you, my friend.

MIKE LEVIN: Thank you very much, Congressman.

DAN STETSON: We greatly appreciate your leadership and focus in these areas, have a good evening.

MIKE LEVIN: You too, take care everyone.

DAN STETSON: And if we could go back to the, thank you, just to review after each panelist, if a CEP member would like to ask a question, just go ahead and pop your cart up like this.

And for those CEP members joining us online, if you have a question or comment, use the raised hand icon under Reactions at the top of your screen so that we can identify you and make you a presenter.

For CEP members who join us late and may not be able to see their name on the list and change their status from a guest to presenter and thereby allow them to open and close the microphone.

In that case, CEP members will have to use the raised hand icon for us to see their name and make them a presenter.

For CEP members calling in on the phone and audio only, two things to note.

1st, to raise your hand, use *5.

Second, to open and close your microphone, please use *6 and keep yourself muted until you wish to speak.

You may refer to the new instructions for speaking via phone on the meeting web page.

For general questions on general topics, Manuel Camargo will lead and keep track of those questions and assign them to the appropriate SCE staff member to answer.

Next slide please, Ace.

Thank you.

Now let's move on to Mark Morgan with the NRC update.

Mark, the floor is yours.

MARK MORGAN: Thank you very much.

Can you hear me?

DAN STETSON: We can hear you.

MARK MORGAN: Outstanding.

So I appreciate this opportunity to address the panel.

I'm going to talk a little bit about the results of our most recent inspection.

The NRC was out here in late March of this year.

You can see the dates.

You can also see there's a reference there at the bottom of the page to the publicly available version of the NRC's inspection report.

It's within their Adams database on the their website, nrc.gov.

In that inspection report, the NRC did identify as severity level 4 non-cited violation.

And as Fred mentioned, that is the lowest severity level that's documented by the NRC in an inspection report and it's usually associated with what they described in their guidance as no or inappreciable actual or potential consequences.

But I want to echo what Fred said.

We don't consider any violation of regulatory requirements to be acceptable.

It's not consistent with our site and our project values.

It's not consistent with our corporate values.

And as your Regulatory Affairs manager, of course, this is all near and dear to my heart.

So we we don't consider this level of performance to be acceptable and we have entered this issue into our corrective action program.

We performed a formal cause evaluation and we've

identified corrective actions that I'll talk about at the end of the slide.

So what did happen though?

This involved a low-level shipment of radioactive waste to the low level disposal facility in Clive, Utah that's run by Energy Solutions.

And there were 255-gallon drums that were characterized as solid waste.

And when they were opened by Energy Solutions in Clive, they discovered that there was liquid within the containers that was greater than the 1% limit that's outlined in regulations.

So essentially what happened is we mischaracterized this waste.

We should have shipped it as liquid waste.

Now, I imagine the thing that's most important to members of the public who may be listening is that there were no actual or potential consequences to the public health and safety or the environment.

The obvious concern with liquid in a shipment is potential for leakage during transportation.

In this case, there was no leakage from the drums.

They were intact when they were and when they arrived at Clive and when they were open by Energy Solutions.

And in the worst case, you know, if you want to talk about potential consequences, any potential leakage would have been contained by the box that they were in called an intermodal.

It's the box that we place these drums in before we place them on a rail car.

So I'll repeat it again.

There were no actual or potential consequences to public health and safety or the environment.

Now in terms of corrective actions, we did take a look at our procedures.

We've strengthened our procedures for the handling of mixed and hazardous waste as we prepare for storage on site and we focus those changes on positive verification of the contents.

Now in addition, there were later points in the process of preparing this waste for shipment where we could have caught the fact that it had been mislabeled in the 1st place.

And, and we look at those as missed opportunities to identify the problem.

And we have provided training to the waste package certifiers on the causes and the corrective actions and the need for procedural compliance again to the waste package certifiers.

So I will stop there and I'll take any questions from the panel.

DAN STETSON: Thank you very much, Mark.

Let me look around and see if we have any questions from our CEP members here.

OK, I don't see any questions at this time.

So thanks once again for your for your update on report.

MARK MORGAN: Thank you.

DAN STETSON: If I might have the next slide, please.

Now I have the pleasure of turning this portion of the meeting over to Chris Wahl, Executive Director of Spent Fuel Solutions Coalition, who will facilitate the focus presentation and dialogue.

Chris, the floor is yours.

CHRIS WAHL: Thank you, Dan, and good evening, everybody that's both here and also online.

I'm excited to be here today.

I'm excited to speak about spent nuclear fuel and some of the progress that's being made around the country.

In fact, Congressman Levin actually stole a little bit of my thunder, so I'll adjust my comments.

So please bear with me.

I'd like to thank, excuse me, I'd like to thank Representative Levin for his role and all of the speakers here today, the engagement panel and of course the members of the public.

I'd also like to acknowledge Supervisor, San Diego County Supervisor Jim Desmond, who's here with us tonight, as well as Orange County Supervisor Katrina Foley.

They serve as Co-chairs of our Coalition for Spent Fuel Solutions.

And as Dan said, my name is Chris Wahl.

I'm the executive director of the Spent Fuel Solutions Coalition, and we have more than 300 local governments, elected officials, utilities, environmental groups, labor leaders, Native American leaders, business organizations and other communities and members in 18 different states around the country.

We've grown significantly since we were formed in 2021, and we're proud of what we've accomplished to advocate for a permanent repository for spent fuel.

And today's speakers bring considerable insight into the potential solutions that we're considering, many of which were outlined in the landmark new title report, The Path, The Path Forward for Nuclear Waste in the United States.

The report, which was released by a group of nuclear experts in January, outlines recommendations to break the current stalemate and address spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste management and disposition.

The report could not have come out at a better time given the momentum that we're seeing in the country.

As Representative Levin mentioned, the Nuclear Life Life Cycle Innovation Campus initiative has gained a lot of traction and interest.

Excited to hear that more than half of the states in the United States garnered responses, more than, as I mentioned, 20, as he mentioned, 26 states that are potentially interested in hosting a nuclear life cycle, Life cycle innovation campus.

The response to the RFI is encouraging, yet the path forward is not entirely clear.

As we know there are many other alternatives that merit a national discussion as recommended in the Path Forward report.

Today's discussion is a part of that conversation.

We're going to hear different perspectives from three leading experts with extensive experience in the policy considerations around used fuel storage and disposition.

Dr. Allison Macfarlane, one of the Path Forwards

Report's lead authors will provide background information about the report and its recommendation.

Doctor Macfarlane currently directs the School of Public Policy and Global Affairs at the University of British Columbia.

She is the former chair of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission and served on the Blue-Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future.

Lake Barrett, the other lead co-author of the report, will discuss the broader landscape, including where we've been in our efforts to dispose of used fuel and where we seem to be headed during this window of opportunity.

An independent consultant in the energy field, Mr. Barrett previously served as the Principal Deputy and Acting Director of the Office of Civilian Nuclear Waste Management and held multiple roles at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Finally, Tom Isaacs will share his perspective on legislations.

What are the must haves, the nice to haves and the deal breakers?

Tom serves as an independent advisor to Southern California Edison for nuclear waste.

He has been a senior executive in the Department of

Energy, was the lead advisor to the Blue-Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future, and for over 20 years helped guide the Canadian Nuclear Waste Management Organization, including as Chair of the Site Selection Review Group that oversaw the process leading to the successful siting of Canada's repository.

He also serves as a member of the Spent Fuel Solutions Policy Committee.

Ok, as Dan said, each of our speakers will make a 10-minute presentation and we'll pause to take questions from the CEP members at the end of each presentation.

I'm going to try my best to keep us on on track.

We have a tight agenda today, so hopefully we'll limit it to two questions after each of the presenters' presentations, but we'll do our best to accommodate everyone's thoughts.

We will then have a facilitated discussion and I've got some prepared questions that I'll ask the panelists that I think are right on point based upon the path forward plan.

So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Doctor Macfarlane to kick us off with her presentation.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Great, thank you, thank you everyone.

Waiting for the slides to come up, but in the

meantime, it's, it's been a minute I think since I've been here in front of the CEP, like maybe 11 years or something.

But it's fantastic to be back in San Clemente and, and to, to see what's going on and catch up what's going on with with with SONGS.

So two years ago, Lake, two years ago or so, Lake contacted me and said, look, we've got to do something about nuclear waste.

It's not, we're not making any progress in the US.

It's it's time, you know, there was a report out in 2018, but nothing has happened since then.

We need to do something.

And then Lake's estimation, this was a good moment.

So of course I listen to Lake and, and so we worked hard and pulled together a, a, a report.

What we did, next slide, is we pulled together a bipartisan group, a small group, but with hundreds of years collectively of experience on nuclear waste issues.

And it was a very broad group in terms of representation and political representation.

You know, we had all the way from the left to the right.

So we felt that it was balanced and we were putting forward our best efforts at what we thought would help to

move the US forward in actually really grappling with this this problem now.

And So what I'm going to talk about tonight briefly are our top two recommendations.

And I'm happy to answer questions from the CEP and Spent Fuel Solutions and and also from the the general public in the room and and online of course.

So with no further ado, let's take the next slide.

And our top two most important factors to make progress is the United States needs a new organization to implement, a new implementer, the nuclear waste process.

OK, that means both the transportation and the final disposal of the waste.

And I'll talk about that more in a second.

And we also need to fix the funding and I'll first explain how the funding situation is completely broken and our advice on how to fix it working with our new implementer.

So first turning to the new implementer, the next slide.

All right, so what we don't have right now in the United States is a trusted, funded, single focus organization to manage the nation's spent nuclear fuel and high-level nuclear waste.

The Department of Energy, which was designated by

law as the implementer, lacks public trust and is constrained by political processes.

In other words, it is run by a political appointee who is often changed out every few years.

Each new Secretary of Energy has a different set of visions and foci.

And and the Department of Energy doesn't just handle nuclear waste, of course it is the Department of Energy.

It handles energy programs for the nation, but it also handles the nuclear weapons complex.

So it is pulled in many directions.

When I and Tom were on the Blue-Ribbon Commission, everybody we heard from, everybody we heard from, pro-nuclear, anti-nuclear, everyone said not the Department of Energy.

And so we believe that we need a new organization.

On our Path Forward group, we looked at what other countries have been doing because actually a number of other countries are much further ahead now than the United States.

Finland will open their deep geological repository before 2030, OK, they are deeply, no pun intended, into the construction of it.

Sweden is starting to construct their repository.

Canada selected a repository in 2024.

They are already into their licensing process.

France is into the licensing process.

Switzerland has selected a repository and will finalize that selection by 2031 etcetera.

And what most of these countries had in common was their implementer was an independent corporation established by nuclear reactor owners, and in the case of Switzerland also the government.

So that led to our suggestion of a NuCorp, a nuclear reactor-owner-led corporation.

So let me explain a little more about what we mean by that, next slide.

So we've envisioned that and this would be we imagine, put into law that the NuCorp would manage, transport, store and dispose of commercial spent nuclear fuel.

This is all the fuel that is covered under the current contract that exists in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

They of course could, if they wanted to, contract with any new reactors that are actually developed in the United States for disposal of their waste, but their waste is not covered by the contract in the existing legislation.

They would be obligated to dispose of Department of Energy owned high-level waste and spent nuclear fuel, subject of course to a mutually acceptable contract.

And by law, the new NuCorp would be required to use a collaborative consent-based siting process and enter into a hosting agreement with the state and affected local government or Indian tribe if if an Indian tribe is is in fact going to be one of the hosts.

We imagine that the NuCorp would be run by a board of directors similar to how any corporation operates.

And the board of directors would be selected by members of both operating and decommissioned nuclear power plants.

And the board would basically have fiduciary responsibility.

They would determine if there were any future disposal fees needed etcetera, that kind of thing.

Now you're all saying, well, wait a minute, who's going to oversee them?

And we imagine in law, an established oversight process.

Next slide, Next slide, right.

Thank you.

We are there.

So we imagine an advisory committee that would be

established in law, OK.

The advisory committee would oversee NuCorp's activities.

It would have regular meetings.

It would be required to report regularly to Congress and to the public, and it would have a diverse membership.

It would have technical expertise, social science expertise, expertise in siting facilities.

It would have representatives from affected states or local communities or tribal communities as needed.

And we didn't limit that membership.

It could, it could expand beyond that.

And of course, the NuCorp would, of course, for any facility that it sited, if it were going to site a repository or some kind of storage facility that it would be required to get a license from the nuclear regulator, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

OK, and so that's how we imagine the oversight would work, next slide.

So I also mentioned fixing the funding because the funding is broken.

So let me explain how it's broken.

You may be aware, the Nuclear Waste Fund, which was established by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, is now at

$50 billion.

This was money paid by electricity customers, paid by ratepayers at a cost of 1/10th of a cent per kWh.

So you folks here paid into that.

But Congress has unfortunately treated this money as if it were tax dollars.

And so it's subjects any appropriations of this money to arcane rules like the Grand Redmond Hollings Act.

And so it's made it, Congress has made it so it is almost impossible to actually appropriate money from this fund that is not taxpayer money.

And so as a result, money from this fund has not been allocated to nuclear waste disposal since 2010, so 16 years.

And currently, this money is being used by Congress to offset the federal debt.

Really not what it was intended, OK.

There's also a breach of contracts.

So in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, the government, the Department of Energy, established a contract with all the reactor owners that said that they would begin to take nuclear waste away by 1998.

Of course, that never happened.

And so all the nuclear reactor owners sued the

federal government for breach of partial breach of contract, and they won.

And so money is being paid out of the judgement fund, the same fund that you've been hearing about for other reasons lately and to date, and that's taxpayer money, by the way.

And so to date, $12 billion of taxpayer money has been paid to reactor owners to help manage their spent fuel and we're on the hook for $40 billion more of taxpayer money.

So this is a broken financial system.

And So what we suggest the solution is, next slide, is that of course NuCorp needs funding when it needs it.

So we suggest that we start with the interest from the existing $50 billion nuclear waste fund that should go to NuCorp on an annual basis.

It's annually that would be almost $2 billion.

If NuCorp doesn't use it, they will put it into an escrow account, a real escrow account which they can draw from when needed.

Eventually all the monies would have to be, from the waste fund, would have to be transferred.

But this gives time to to figure that out.

And we also felt, all of us felt that it was essential that money from the nuclear waste fund be used

solely for the purpose of waste disposal and preparation for disposal, OK, not for reprocessing or recycling.

I'll make that clear right now, next slide.

We also addressed a potential linkage between any kind of temporary storage and a permanent repository.

So we said that because there are so many sites that are like San Onofre, like SONGS that are shut down, permanently shut down in the country, they're actually 17, that NuCorp should be allowed to operate if they have feel they have enough money to do so, a temporary storage facility.

And that temporary storage facility would only be able to accept a limited amount of waste so that it doesn't become a de facto permanent repository.

And so that's how we've dealt with any kind of linkage between temporary and permanent storage.

Next slide.

CHRIS WAHL: Macfarlane.

Oh, this is the last slide.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: OK.

So we feel we've all benefited from electricity produced by nuclear power.

We really have to act, as you all know, to make progress on moving the spent fuel to a safe and permanent deep geologic repository.

I think we've proven over the last 44 years that the old method is not working and we need a new one.

And so we feel that those who already manage the waste be the ones who continue to align financial and other incentives to dispose of spent fuel.

So we suggest a NuCorp and we suggest new legislation is needed to establish this in law, ok.

CHRIS WAHL: All right, thank you very much.

That was super informative.

Is there are there a question or is there a question or two?

I should say yes, sir, Victor.

VICTOR CABRAL: My, my question, I'll reserve my, my judgment about about NuCorp, but the last administration…

CHRIS WAHL: Closer, please, closer to the mic, please.

VICTOR CABRAL: OK, I'm looking out in space, but that's all right.

The last administration had a policy, it's called consent-based siting.

And that consent-based siting they decided to spend, I don't know, $23 to 26 million to, to not ask the industry, but to ask professors, communities, minority groups what the best solution is for this.

And that was their strategy.

And I understand that.

I still haven't seen a, a report on that.

Maybe there is one, but I, I, I never saw the results even though we spent $26 million on it, it's quite significant sum of money.

We probably will never hear back on, on that report, but that was a strategy of the Biden administration.

We have a new administration now that has has a philosophy that we're going to get into these life cycle campuses and they've already studied many of them.

As you saw, there's one in Clive, Utah and others that they are saying we're going to work with a partnership with States and counties and figure this out, which is really the way it should be done.

So my concern is about legislation.

I worked 25 years in, in DC, I did the crime bill.

I, I six major pieces of legislation.

This legislation is at least five years in the making in my view, maybe longer.

So why do, why would we spend our time and effort on pursuing that avenue instead of just saying, let's get behind this administration and figure out how we find the right place right now?

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Well, I think in some ways

you've already answered the question because you pointed out that the Department of Energy under the Biden administration was doing one thing.

And now the Department of Energy under the Trump administration is doing another thing.

And so in 2028, if we have a a new president and a new new leadership in the Department of Energy, we may be doing something even different.

So that's why, and this is something that the Blue-Ribbon Commission said, you need continuity.

This is a long-term project, siting a repository, OK.

And so you need an organization that can exist for many, many decades, OK, and has leadership that is going to last a long time, not change every two years or every four years.

And so I think we've proven that if we keep going with this government agency model, especially Department of Energy model, we're going to be having this conversation in another 20 years, the same conversation.

CHRIS WAHL: Doctor Macfarlane, thank you.

I think that was a great answer.

I'm going to move it along to Lake so he can jump into his presentation.

LAKE BARRETT: OK.

CHRIS WAHL: Oh, there's another question.

I'm sorry, ok, I, I do want to, I don't want to be the, the bad guy here, but we, we're already well behind our pace, so…

UNIDENTIFIED CEP MEMBER: Just a quick one.

CHRIS WAHL: Sure, great.

UNIDENTIFIED CEP MEMBER: I just question the, how do you overcome the distrust that the public has, for the nuclear generator folks, by allowing them to be now the the trusted entity that will take care of the waste.

I'm curious that it seems like just the for-profit question, a tough one.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: It's, it's a great, it's a great, it's a great question because it's, it's true.

I mean, there's many places in the country where there is a lot of distrust of the nuclear industry, but there are also other places in the country where there's a lot of trust.

And those folks are where we can learn, OK, those folks have a lot to offer in terms of leadership and how you generate trust with your local community.

And so I, I you know, I'm not going to characterize the situation here, but the in in there plan, plenty of places where that trust exists and I think you can draw from that.

UNIDENTIFIED CEP MEMBER: OK, thank you.

CHRIS WAHL: Thank you.

OK, Lake, we're going to turn it to you.

LAKE BARRETT: Ok, if we could start the slide deck then I'll try to address some of those questions as I go through this.

Allison described our report and it is heavy to lift legislation as your point is, but there's opportunities coming, working with the States and with private industry where it can fit together.

So next slide, please.

These are going to be rather busy, but I'm not going to go through them, but we'll come back if people wish to.

But basically back from 1983 to 2010, we thought we're going to have a geological repository in this country.

That failed from the top down, as Congressman Levin said.

So basically, next slide, that didn't work.

So the fuel sits where it was made and SONGS is the prime example of that.

This is not an acceptable situation.

This has been what's been going on from 2010 until now.

Now maybe it's going to continue, but this is what we've had.

So now this administration, next slide, please, is coming, is changed, changed quite a bit, OK.

Their nuclear life cycle innovation campuses is a completely different cultural change.

It's now to shift from the government having a job to the private industry and the States and the locals are together with leaders.

So it's business driven.

We all know about AI centers, the need for electricity.

Things have changed, drastically changed, the last few just a few years.

So this is driving a new need for electricity.

Nuclear electricity is now really what's going to carry a lot of that.

Yes, wind and solar and others will play a role, But as far as for heavy duty lifting of these 24/7 AI centers, you need nuclear.

But anyway, so this needs a fuel cycle to support the nuclear energy and that includes the back end and being responsible in our generation to dispose of our own waste.

OK, so but is as the states now have an interest in

the nuclear energy world in these campuses and that is put together in a total package which includes the back end of a disposition and geologic disposal.

Now also these 26 states came back, they are very interested in recycling, OK, recycling may assist us in this for waste disposal, but recycling is an independent issue from waste disposal.

But it's an important part in finding a bottoms up state community driven hosting arrangement which is critical.

Next slide please.

So this is what it looks like if we go into this type of approach.

Fuel, fuel goes from reactors into receiving facility and it goes into some direct disposal.

Some may go to be reprocessed.

Some of these new advanced reactors require reprocessing because they're special different types of technical fuel different from the old LWR fuel.

We can go into this if you wish later, but this is the concept that is being looked at by the DOE at this time.

Next slide, exactly which is going to be where they're, they're talking about maybe 3 or 4 campuses.

It's going to be split up.

It'll be very dynamic and it really is driven by the states and the communities on what they're willing to do and also the private industry.

Will the money flow from private industry to support the fuel cycles that's needed to produce the electricity?

As we all know, there's billions of dollars being invested by private corporations to drive the AI world, and we think some of that needs to go into responsibility for dealing with the waste that we currently have like at SONGS and the waste that they're going to produce in the future.

Next slide, please.

So a little bit about what's likely to happen in the future, along what Congressman Levin talked about earlier.

OK, first, the DOE is engaging with States and communities and private companies and all the government agencies to put together a general agreement.

Their goal is to come out with memorandums of understanding in July.

They're, that's their target.

Will they make it or not?

I don't know, but they're working hard to do that.

And states have responded promptly in a short

period of time and so they're working on it.

Now how these are going to work out, we don't know yet, but these are complex, social, political, legal, economic, financial amongst these parties.

And then, and it depends on all the parties, the three, you know, the government, the the DOE, the private industry and the host state and communities, they have to trust each other and they have to perform.

Not on promises with some of these private industry things, they've got to actually perform.

Next slide please.

So the second step will be once there's this general understanding about who's going to do what where, then you have to come up with the actual hosting agreements, performance agreements.

They have to be legally sustainable.

They have to withstand many administrations.

Can't be the next president changing his mind, or the next governor changing his mind or her mind.

So these are going to be complex, sustainable multi organizational partnerships that have to be put together that mutually works for everybody.

And it needs to maintain a passive geologic disposal capability at the very end point.

But there's a lot of flexibility in how you put all

these pieces together.

They can meet the needs of a host state so this is not another top-down failure.

Next slide, please.

The third step is really where Congressman Levin is, is a leader is when this comes forward to Congress, Congress needs to act on it.

So Congress I don't think is going to take our report and and go work that and make that happen in absence of real progress, a real state and a real situation.

So it has to get real.

So when the proposal comes forward, it's agreed upon by the governor, the community, the private industry is going to put the money into it, and the DOE then you start to put together the sustainable legal things, which will likely change, require changes to the legislation such as the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

But these have to be sustainable durable agreements that have to be bipartisan because we're not going to do this we're just one party or another.

Not when it's countries like it is.

Next slide, please.

So the final policy step where Congress is going to work this and have contracts and legal settlements and

figure out how we can fix the funding.

This is where I feel our path forward report will have a lot of impact to that.

Because one of the things that all the parties are going to say, I need to have trust from you other two that you're going to do what you say you're going to do.

And I think when you're on the federal government side where DOE is constantly bombarded by the 2, 4 and 6 year federal election cycle, there's always an election 2 years away and it's always critical.

My party has to maintain whatever, OK?

And every electoral vote is fought over tooth and nail.

Every senatorial seat is fought over tooth and nail.

We've got to minimize that negative impact that has hurt us historically for decades and will continue to hurt us.

And I think if you have a real agreement, partnership agreement, the party's going to demand that it have stability to it.

It's sustainable.

And that's where I think our report will come in and will actually take place.

When will this happen?

We don't know.

I will tell you that nuclear waste policy amendments happen during lame duck sessions.

They always have.

The original 82 act was lame duck, 87 amendment was lame duck.

We have a lame duck coming up in January and the Feb in Christmas, December of 26th and it'll be one in 28.

Some people think this can be done for this lame duck this this coming fall, the coming Christmas.

I would be amazed if that could happen.

It can happen.

So I say go for it.

OK, let's get it on the table.

Let's have a dialogue.

Let's look at the actual proposals, the actual contracts and make some real progress.

And even if some parts of it you don't like or do like, get it on the table and let's work as a nation and solve our problem.

Next slide, please.

So this is the dialogue that's going to be going on.

Your Congressman Levin, I think is the leader with

this.

I, I loved him.

His interaction with Secretary Wright here in the in the hearing a few weeks ago, it was very positive.

And here you have a Democrat and Republican working for the nation.

So this administration is very aggressive on this.

I hope they have disposal at the right balance.

We will see.

We have many new private industry players.

These are big players with big money and and big needs, so can they do half the things they, some of them claim to do?

I don't think so, but I want to be open.

I would never have thought Elon Musk could do the things he did.

Maybe these people can, but I think they're going to have to prove it and do it if they ever want to get paid for something.

We're not going to use the nuclear waste fund for R&D purposes and great ideas.

OK, if we have good start, 26 states have responded, wide variation, some of them I don't think are very critical, but if we can get 3, 4, 5, 6 that are serious, I think that's great progress, more than we've

had in 16 years for sure.

So I think we have promising opportunities.

I think SONGS can be a big part of that in the going into the staging facility initially.

It may not be the first ones recycled or anything like that, but I think they can be a great value here.

And it's going to take everybody pulling together to make this happen.

And I think that the Spent Fuel Solutions group here and and SONGS and Congressman Levin being a leader, I think is going to be a big part of us making this work and not be 5 more years of nothing.

CHRIS WAHL: Thank you very much.

Very interesting.

Who has questions?

OK, Victor’s got one.

VICTOR CABRAL: It's a question about what you said.

I agree with the everything, everything you said.

Do you see any problem or issue with a dual track though that is pursuing this NuCorp and simultaneously looking at what this administration is doing and saying there's a window of opportunity here that exists and we need to as an organization get behind that, see, see if we could push that along, push them both along simultaneously?

What's your reaction to that?

LAKE BARRETT: I think they're going to merge.

I mean, I think we are the path forward report is a way to have the DOE, you know, the implementer, be a better implementer that can fit into a successful community, state driven solution.

So I see them merging.

I don't see them as independent.

I don't think our path forward alone could sustain congressional action, ok.

VICTOR CABRAL: OK.

CHRIS WAHL: Any other questions?

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: Chris, there's one online.

CHRIS WAHL: One online.

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: OK, we have a Jim over here, Jim Desmond.

CHRIS WAHL: Oh, sorry, Supervisor.

SUPERVISOR JIM DESMOND: You're ready.

OK, you almost skipped me Chris.

The, the, I think this is a great presentation and yeah, I'm really, this is forward thinking and I appreciate you bringing this forward.

And as as Mayor Taylor had mentioned earlier, I'm still stuck on this $26 million thing.

We were going out and we're, we're getting going to get some sort of input from communities about their willingness to, to at least look into it.

When did this go out and when did this go out to the to, Maybe you said it, but the…

LAKE BARRETT: Well, the Biden administration had the $26 million thing you're talking about.

I think that had value in getting communities to understand it better.

It was an educational process.

And yes, it was at the lower levels.

It was at the local communities, different groups, constituencies, but there were business people involved and it did help develop states to understand nuclear waste and their role because it, they became understand they're part of the solution.

They're not just being, Washington, is just not doing it to them, OK.

JIM DESMOND: So when, when did this RFP or whatever that go out from, I guess the current administration?

LAKE BARRETT: They put this out in, in January.

JIM DESMOND: Of this year?

LAKE BARRETT: Of this year yeah.

I mean, it took them a little while to put it together.

They had to get their people in place.

But yes, this is a strong initiative by them.

And also the AI world has changed.

I mean, you know, things have changed.

The stars are aligning to an opportunity we have and I think the administration is seeing that.

I think some of it may be overdone and some of the vendors are pumping up their stock and this kind of thing, but you, there are safeguards for that and you know, they have to perform.

So a lot of these are going to drop off and I think the real ones I think can survive.

JIM DESMOND: Well, I liked your presentation so much.

This is the second time I've seen it.

Or you you didn't put up your generic conceptual plan.

LAKE BARRETT: The the the wrongs.

That's this was the one that was here was the last word, wasn't the most current version.

There was a picture I had.

JIM DESMOND: Yeah.

LAKE BARRETT: Of the parts.

JIM DESMOND: Yeah, I got it here.

LAKE BARRETT: Oh, you have it there.

But this one is not the right one.

JIM DESMOND: I know, but you didn't include it in this one.

I thought that one...

LAKE BARRETT: I would.

I meant to, but it wasn't there, I'm sorry.

JIM DESMOND: Well, because I think that conceptual plan is, well, it's not there.

But it was nice that you, you know, you had all the energy producing and and recycling and, and even a data center located on the same site, which is, you know, kind of one of the challenges we have, you know, with these data centers coming in and eating up a lot of energy and electricity.

It'd be nice if if they were were colocated.

So I'm very encouraged.

I know this this is kind of the 30,000 foot level.

It's still at this point in time.

There's a lot of things to work out.

But I guess for Allison, since Chris Wahl was in a hurry, I didn't get my question in the…

CHRIS WAHL: Sorry, we're still in a hurry supervisor.

JIM DESMOND: OK, The, one of the things that you'd said is that the, the there's guardrails on the $50

billion for disposal and that's all it's ever going to be.

It's not going to be used for repurposing or recycling.

And to me, I kind of question that, just say, well, if repurposing and recycling is getting rid of the spent nuclear fuel or using some of that spent nuclear fuel, then there's a possibility that that would be just as good as disposing it somewhere or someplace else.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: But it's not.

I think you've got I, I anyway, I know, I think, reprocessing, the industry calls it recycling, but it's just reprocessing.

You know, you just take your spent fuel, you'll dissolve it, you extract your uranium and plutonium.

You never reuse your uranium because it's contaminated with isotopes that make it difficult to reuse.

So you only would reuse the plutonium that you extract and that's 1% by weight of the spent fuel, OK.

And then you would potentially in theory use that in for light water reactors in a mixed oxide fuel.

But no light water reactors in the US use mixed oxide fuel and it would cost money to…

JIM DESMOND: Well, how about the uranium part?

The you can't reuse that?

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Yeah, you can't.

You won't reuse the uranium.

So you still end up with high level nuclear waste, which say, France does this, they turn that high level waste into a glass, but they still need a repository.

That's why France has developed…

JIM DESMOND: Does it reduce the amount?

ALLISON MACFARLANE: It reduces the volume, but volume is not the relevant unit of measure for a geologic repository size.

It is heat production and composition of the waste, depending on the geology that you're using.

JIM DESMOND: But for recycling and reusing, to me, I, I get, I'm not, you're, you're much more technical than I am at this.

But it seems like if we're repurposing or recycling what we've got, that is a, a potential, you know, not a disposal, but reusing that to me, that might be a potential for using some of those dollars.

But I guess I would, I'd like to see an open mind.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Unfortunately…

JIM DESMOND: I'd like to finish.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Sorry.

JIM DESMOND: And I'd like to see an open mind on

those particular to potentially using maybe some of those dollars for the repurposing and or the recycling.

I see you're shaking your head, but probably 50 years ago they say we'd never be at this point today.

So I'd like to at least have open minds on the technology is going to advance and hopefully we have that potential.

I agree we need to get rid of it, but if we can repurpose it and recycle it and reuse it and technology advances as it has, I mean, in the last 50 years, I mean, the, the San Onofre was like 70s technology.

So I'd, I'd like to think that we'd have open minds and, and not just say, no, this is the way it's always going to be moving forward.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: I, I have an open mind, but I've also, I also know quite a bit about the technology, ok?

JIM DESMOND: You do, OK, I appreciate that.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: And I can tell you that countries that have reprocessed have stopped it because it's so expensive and uranium is plentiful.

I'm, I'm a geologist.

I've written peer reviewed papers on uranium resources.

Uranium is plentiful and so it will be cheaper for

at least 100 years.

So there will not be any financial reason to do this.

The United States did go down the reprocessing road in the 1960s and 70s and they stopped because it was too expensive.

It also creates vast quantities of low-level nuclear waste and intermediate nuclear waste that you then have to dispose of and find a place to dispose of.

All right, and you still need your deep geologic repository.

So because you still need…

JIM DESMOND: I'm not saying you still wouldn't need it.

CHRIS WAHL: Oh, OK, can I, can I just interject?

I think I think you've made your point.

LAKE BARRETT: Allison and I don't agree 100% on this.

We we agree we need disposal and we agree you shouldn't be taking the waste fund to go do recycling.

But I believe that there are advantages of the recycle concept, especially in getting the governor to agree to have the facility, including disposal in his state.

It's, the governor is an elected official and has

to deal with social opinion and recycling is a lot easier than saying it's a waste facility.

CHRIS WAHL: Supervisor Desmond, do you have any other questions or did you get those addressed?

JIM DESMOND: No, I'm good.

Thank you, though, thank you.

CHRIS WAHL: Well, that's good discussion.

That's why we're here.

FRED BAILLY: Chris, ok, just just a quick, quick comment.

CHRIS WAHL: OK, I think John, our mayor was next.

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: Do you want to do you have a quick comment, Fred, that you wanted to make?

CHRIS WAHL: I'll let Fred go and and we'll come back to you.

And there was also someone online too.

FRED BAILLY: It's just just just a quick comment.

I, I, I appreciate the, the input, but with, with my background, having spent 25 years in a company that does recycling and, and reprocessing, the, the French have been doing it for decades.

Yes, the Brits have stopped.

The Japanese are still going after to do it on a commercial scale and and the French are investing in the next generation of reprocessing plants.

So they are committed to it for a fleet of 56 reactors.

They are using reprocessed uranium in a couple of reactors, not not all of them, but basically 10% of the electricity is coming from recycled fuel.

So just yeah, so mention that.

CHRIS WAHL: That's great.

That's good, good, good perspective, OK.

UNIDENTIFIED CEP MEMBER: And just a quick question, what is the benefit of AI in all this dialogue?

LAKE BARRETT: AI needs tremendous amounts of electricity that we don't have.

UNIDENTIFIED CEP MEMBER: OK.

LAKE BARRETT: That that base, so it's driving electricity needs.

China puts out, you know, 10, twice as much electricity as we do.

They're going to become the leaders and we're going to be following.

So we have got to get electricity from whatever source to support that and that's what's driving nuclear growth right now.

UNIDENTIFIED CEP MEMBER: I see.

I, I was thinking that maybe there's, there was AI was part of the solution to this problem…

ALLISON MACFARLANE: No but there is a mismatch between how soon the electricity could be delivered from nuclear versus how soon it's actually needed for data centers.

And I think it's kind of a massive mismatch.

CHRIS WAHL: OK.

I think I, I think it is a, a good comment though.

I mean, I just know in my own reading and I'm not a nuclear scientist, but we do need some way to generate more electricity to meet that power.

And we're in a national or an international competition with countries around the world.

And whoever wins this, there's some people that think whoever wins this AI race is going to be leading the, the world.

So it's definitely a relevant issue and topic.

I do think we have someone online, right?

Manuel?

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: Ted Quinn.

CHRIS WAHL: Ted, please.

Thank you for your patience.

ACE JANUARY: We can open Ted's mic.

TED QUINN: OK.

Can you hear me ok?

ACE JANUARY: Yes.

TED QUINN: Good.

I wanted to thank Lake and also Doctor Macfarlane for their leadership in this.

The 2 points I wanted to make is precedent and and crafting legislation.

Lake do you see that any precedent from the organization you ran, the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management or from say the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations, from a business perspective, are there lessons learned that we could, we could take advantage of and, and can it help us with perhaps crafting a legislation that we need for Congressman Levin and others to, to actually writing the legislation to incorporate those lessons learned?

LAKE BARRETT: Yes, I do.

I, I think there's a lot we can learn from, from all the parties, you know, focusing in on our congressional approach to, to change the legislation.

So yes, I do.

CHRIS WAHL: Was there a second question?

TED QUINN: Oh, thank you.

Yeah.

CHRIS WAHL: OK, thank you for that.

OK, I see we have one other comment or one more question online, if I'm not mistaken.

We'll let them go first and then we're going to make sure we have enough time for Tom Isaacs as well.

And we're running a little behind, but I think everyone's engaged, so we're going to keep going here.

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: It's from the CEP.

CHRIS WAHL: Oh, from…

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: If it's from a CEP member online, yeah.

CHRIS WAHL: Oh, OK, and is it not?

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: I don't know.

CHRIS WAHL: How do we know?

I I see it's green.

Do you wanna wait?

Is that person?

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: What's your name?

CHRIS WAHL:Who?

Who?

What's the name of the person that's got the question?

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: Back of the room.

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: I'm trying to, Al somebody.

CHRIS WAHL: Al.

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: Can I do here?

S Snyder?

No.

Yeah.

CHRIS WAHL: OK.

I think maybe Manuel keep going.

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER:We do have an hour reserved for questions later in this meeting for questions that should be adequate for all, all members of the public to engage at that time.

CHRIS WAHL: Yeah, and that's right after our break.

Right, OK, great, so apologize for making you wait online, but there'll be ample time to do that if you could just be patient, thank you.

OK, Tom, you're up.

TOM ISAACS: Thank you and hello, everybody.

I'm biting my tongue because I have strong views about this reprocessing question, but I'm not going to use my 10 minutes on it.

I will tell you that when the Blue-Ribbon Commission, which was a robust group of commissioners, discussed all the issues that were in that report, the most contentious issue by far was coming up to a single point of view on how to talk about reprocessing and recycling.

It is not an easy issue, but I don't want to talk about that right now.

But if you want to ask me a question, I have lots of thoughts.

I want to start by saying that I think Allison and Lake and their colleagues have done a great job by putting forward this report, bringing light once again to the fact that we need action if we're going to solve this problem and if we're ultimately going to get the spent fuel off of the site at San Onofre and other plants around the country.

I will tell you that by my count, it is at least the fifth report, starting with the Blue-Ribbon Commission report, which started when they stopped the program.

At least the fifth report to look at what we need to do.

All five of which have come to basically the same conclusion, which is that you need to take this out of the Department of Energy and you need to give the new entity access to the funds it needs in order to do that job.

What we need is, and we should be clear eyed about this, is legislation in order to get this program back on track, we need to articulate the need for this program.

It is too easy and has been too easy for people to do nothing to just push this down the road.

But eventually doing nothing has consequences and we will wind up paying for it.

We need to effect the sense of urgency behind this program.

What I want to do, I just want to quickly talk about three things.

The first one, I want to talk about some of the qualities that need to be there in order for this program to be successful.

It's not enough to have legislation.

The second thing I want to do is talk about the legislation itself and how we might think about it.

And then third and last, I just want to talk a little bit about this issue about whether we should have a storage facility and a repository storage being temporary in place of ultimate disposal, then have a disposal facility and whether there needs to be some linkage.

Right now in law there is.

We need to talk about how to fix that if we're going to be successful.

So what are some, some of you know what, some of the key qualities that are important here and have been discussed.

The more independent this new entity is, the

better.

The most rare sentence that you will hear in Washington, DC is my predecessor did everything right.

I'm just going to continue to do what they do.

That never happens in Washington, doesn't matter if it's the same party or another party.

People need to feel that they're putting their imprint on things.

And yet, as you've heard, this is a program that will last generations.

I've been working closely.

I'll reflect a little more on this.

With the Canadian program, they were able to come up from a standing start to a site that's approved and it took them 20 years and that was really quick.

They did a really good job.

So if we're going to be successful, the program like this has got to be buffered from elections, buffered from administrative changes, buffered from elections and those kinds of things.

The second thing is the fewer demands on the program, the better.

I used to tell the Canadians when I spoke to them that you should go slow to go fast.

They translated that into Canadian.

So they said go slow to go far.

But what it basically means is if you're going to be successful in this program, you need to take the time to do the thing right.

You need to engage with all the political entities, with the communities are going to be involved, with the transportation corridors and build and earn a sense of trust and partnership for this kind of thing to work.

I've I managed the international program for 10 years in the Department of Energy in this area.

I've been to all the places that are there, the places that are successful all do this.

They all are committed and they all have the right kinds of people to do this.

Not everyone can do this kind of a job.

There are certain very special techniques and capabilities that it takes for people to be able to go into a community, to go into a political circumstance, to deal with all of the many things that will adjust over time and keep your eye on the ball, but be adaptable enough to meet the changes that will occur inevitably over time.

That Lake reflected on a bit earlier.

Economics will change, values will change, political circumstances will change.

All of that requires you to keep your focus on the bottom line, which is getting spent fuel off of these sites into temporary storage and ultimately disposed of, and at the same time doing it in a way that builds trust and partnerships so that these communities are going to be willing to deal with it.

The first time I went to Finland and visited their program, Allison talked about Finn...

I came back and I walked into the senior management meeting in the Department of Energy.

I said, you know something, they're smarter than we are.

And what?

And then I wrote a paper about it because.

And everybody was very unhappy to hear that they thought the United States was the best at everything.

And of course, from science and technological point of view, we're as good as anybody on the planet.

But they understood the job.

They understood what it took to be successful here, whether they were the technical leaders or the institutional leaders in that program, we're dealing with society.

They knew how to engage people and engage communities in a way that built trust over time.

They demonstrated that they were competent.

They demonstrated that they were well-intentioned.

They listened to people's concerns and didn't say we're the government or we're the scientists, trust us, they said if you're concerned, we're concerned.

And they dealt with it and they dealt with it over and over again.

They made promises and they delivered.

They made promises and they delivered.

That's how you build trust, and it takes time and it takes energy.

And if you think that's taking away from your schedule, you're going to fail.

And that's why the idea that somehow we have these demands for progress in a sort of a fast way undermines the ability to be successful.

So what are some of the key features that are going to be required for this organization?

You've heard a bit of this already.

They need to be stable over long periods of time.

I once did a calculation looking at the leaders of the waste program in the Department of Energy.

At that point in time, the average tenure of a leader, half of the time it was Lake Barrett in an acting capacity.

The average tenure was 19 months.

Every year and a half we had a change in leadership.

I've been dealing with the Canadian Nuclear Waste Management Organization.

They're now 23 years old.

They're still on their third president in 23 years and she's still in the job and I imagine will be in the job for some period of time.

The stability, the ability and by the way, the people that they pick change their characteristics with time.

When you're in the siting mode, which we were for much of those 20 years, the kind of person you need leading that organization, the first one was a totally non-technical person.

She walked on water as far as I was concerned, but she was a event, originally a school teacher from Saskatchewan, but she had the magic.

She understood how to deal with the social and the political as well as the technical issues.

So it's very important that we get to the place where this program is able to be stable.

You, as I already mentioned, you have to be able to recruit and pay the right people if you're going to be

successful.

The people, again in Canada, but also in Finland and Sweden that we've heard about, those people are true professionals When it comes to the director of communications, the manager of communications.

These people are seasoned, outstanding people for leading communications.

When they come to the manager of engagement, these people have extreme expertise and experience in how to engage with these kinds of difficult, controversial facilities and so forth.

We already talked about the fact that you need to keep your eye on the mission, but you need to be adaptable.

Things change with time.

We see it in programs in the United States and we see it in programs overseas.

Sometimes what a community wants is not what you think they want.

You think they want money and what they want is something else.

And I don't have time right now, but some of the examples that made a difference in places like Finland and Sweden were amazing.

One of the things that happened in Sweden, I'm

sorry, in Finland was they built an a home for their senior citizens in the middle of the city.

That's what the community wanted.

The program didn't say, well, that's not our problem, that's your problem.

They said, if that's the compelling problem in this city, let's work together to make it happen.

And then what did they do with the old facility for the seniors?

They turned it into their office in the town.

That's the kind of creative thinking that's required.

They must be unambiguously motivated and incentivized to do the job.

And that's where I think there's a question about how to formulate this new organization.

My own view is, and the Blue-Ribbon Commission had a slightly different recommendation than the one that the Path Forward report did.

It's a question as to whether or not the utilities are the right entity to solely manage this program.

The utilities in this country, there are far more and they're far more diverse than they are in countries like Finland and Sweden and Canada, which only have one or two utilities to deal with.

And they're very homogeneous and they're dealing…

In this county, they're very diverse.

And so they have different objectives and different priorities in those utilities.

And some of them are in the money-making business.

And this is a program for the public good.

It's got to be done cost effectively, but it's reason for being is to solve a national problem.

And not only does whoever run this program have to be credible and focused on doing the right thing, they have to be seen as credible and doing the right thing.

And there may be some issues there.

The money that you put into this program came from the utilities.

They're no longer putting money into that program.

They're getting money from the rate, from the taxpayer, from us to manage the spent fuel because the Department of Energy didn't meet its obligation.

So there may be some perception that the utilities are perfectly happy with the things going on just the way they are.

They're no longer putting money in to pay.

They're getting money from us to manage.

That's an issue.

The second issue is some utilities didn't put money

in at the beginning to pay for the waste that was created before the law was passed.

They were given an option to pay upfront or to pay later.

There are certain utilities right now who have not paid who, if the program gets back on track, will owe a lot of money back into the federal government.

These are perception issues that I think need to be fully complicated out in the open so that people can discuss what's the right way to formulate this.

With regard to siting, it's true that the utilities are the the experts on the nuclear activity, but with regard to siting, the nuclear is important, but it's not the most important part of siting.

Most important side of siting is what I call the ologies, geology, hydrology, climatology, volcanology to make sure that when you pick a place and put the waste in the ground, it stays there.

And so that's a very a different set of skills than the nuclear community has.

And the second thing in addition to the ologies is the socio-political engagement aspects.

And there are lots of folks out there who are experts in this.

And I'm not so sure that the nuclear community

alone is the best to do this.

I don't say this because I think what the Path Forward report is recommending is wrong.

I say it because I think we need a robust discussion of how to formulate this entity because you're going to get one bite at the apple, and that apple needs to be done in a way that's going to last for generations.

So my last comment on that is that when legislation comes, like Lake Barrett says, it comes in a session that's very condensed and very quick and you need to be prepared.

And so I recommended that we have 3 buckets of things to prepare.

One, what do we need to have essentially in new legislation when the debate comes?

And the things that need to be there are the things that Lake, Allison and their committee have recommended.

The second thing is what are things that are desirable but you're not going to fall on your sword over, but things that you very much would like to have in the legislation so that when the dialogue and the debate comes, you've got that there.

And the third one, what things can you absolutely not have in there that are essentially poison pills that will keep you from being successful?

The linkage that's in law between building a temporary storage facility and building a repository makes the temporary storage facility essentially not useful.

That one sentence in there was put in there without understanding, I believe fully the implications of what they did.

So it made for the last decade, 20 years, 30 years, the idea of building a storage facility with the current legislation and the current law not useful.

We need to be prepared to make sure that that none of those things creep in.

I think I will stop there, Chris.

I know we've been going over and take any questions.

CHRIS WAHL: Thank you Tom, you know, it's so unfortunate that you're not passionate about this issue.

I've had the benefit of working with Tom for for five years now and I see it all the time so we're very fortunate to have Tom here as a part of it and have his expertise.

OK, did anyone have any questions on the panel for Tom? Yes, Sir.

UNIDENTIFIED CEP MEMBER: Yes, I'm just, does Canada and Finland have the same type of independent corporation

that they that's what they're doing that too, yeah, OK.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Canada, Finland, Sweden, Switzerland…

TOM ISAACS: Yeah, they also, but they also have one utility or two utilities.

And those utilities are all of alike, right.

And frankly, the culture in those countries is that they feel an obligation to solve this problem, and they feel that nobody in those communities would ever threaten the health and welfare of the people in that community because they're raising their families in those communities.

And they're also very proud of their science and technological progress.

So when you look at the circumstance, you have to understand the broader context of those things.

Those people are running wonderful programs.

They're very successful.

We need to learn from those programs.

We need to adapt them in a method that will be successful, I think in this country and we need to have a discussion about how to best do that.

UNIDENTIFIED CEP MEMBER: Thank you.

LAKE BARRETT: Ours, our country is much more complicated.

We can still do it.

Canada, you know, all the fuels in a 90% of it's in Ontario and it's Ontario Hydro is a government utility, but it's still same type of thing.

But Finland is too, you know, we have 30, you know, so ours is more complicated, but we can do the same kind of thing and we can learn from them on all the points of time.

CHRIS WAHL: Martha, I think you have a next question.

MARTHA MCNICHOLAS: I mean, I, I think I agree with trying to pull it out of the DOE, but has this country ever successfully done that, take an operation that's under a federal department and tried to basically privatize it?

And I don't think the post office is a good example, but yeah.

Has that ever been done?

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Yes, we have.

We have the thing first thing that comes to mind, something else hopefully will come to your mind.

USEC, same thing, United States Enrichment Corporation, Uranium Enrichment Corporation was government run and then it was turned private into the centrist corporation.

Maybe that was 10-15 years ago.

LAKE BARRETT: Yeah at least.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Yeah or more OK, 20.

LAKE BARRETT: But yes, it's not common, but yes, it's been done.

It's not easy.

MARTHA MCNICHOLAS: I, I have one more question while I have the microphone, I understand the, the idea of the innovation campuses might end with the push with the current administration.

My worry is there's a lot of maybe focus on reprocessing, recycling because that's the new and shiny and and people want to do it, but are we going to lose in, in that it kind of goes back to the 28 people states or 26 states that we're interested in in it, but only four interested in being a repository.

OK, that narrows the I'm worried that the disposable and repository is going to get lost, yeah, in some of the new and shiny.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: I personally think that that is a completely legitimate concern, especially the way that the RFI was worded.

It was not clear in the wording of the RFI that this came with an obligation to dispose of spent fuel.

You know, there was some vague language.

You probably know what it is like.

LAKE BARRETT: But this position.

Yeah, a new word.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Yeah, it's, so I think it's a legitimate concern.

LAKE BARRETT: You're correct.

MARTHA MCNICHOLAS: One more question.

And I know you've both talked about a deep geological repository and boreholes or whatever we do.

Is it OK to bring up he who should not be named in Yucca Mountain?

Is there a chance that that, I mean, that's already half done already.

Is that a possibility?

It's a possibility if the state is willing, certainly it's on a table.

If the state is not willing, it's not on the table.

So if the state of Nevada, who was not one of the 26 states wants to come forward, I'm sure the federal would love to talk to him, but at this stage they're not.

So what could happen in the future, we don't know.

MARTHA MCNICHOLAS: Thank you.

CHRIS WAHL: OK, any other questions from the panel of the CEP?

MICHAEL BALSAMO: Thank you for the presentation

that you're all kind of we're on the similar theme.

I, I'm trying to understand that you talked about a steady stream of funding and, and using some of the money that's already there, But what, what I, I need to understand more clearly what the incentive is for this corporation to execute it.

If, if there isn't a, a, a business element, how is it any different than government?

How is it going to be more efficient, effective?

I, I understand that the changing political tides, but it just…

ALLISON MACFARLANE: So there are a couple of motivations.

I mean, the, the nuclear industry I think recognizes that they do have to manage this material.

They do have to, you know, SCE realizes you, you don't want to, you don't want to be holding the ball forever for decades, right?

I mean, you want this to be managed and disposed of.

OK, so that's one thing.

But there is a money-making opportunity in here.

If you decide that you want this corporation to be a for profit corporation, when you have when, if any new facilities are created, new nuclear power plants or your

reprocessing facilities, they can contract with the NuCorp to dispose of their waste.

Of course NuCorp is going to charge them.

They don't work for free, right?

And they, the NuCorp will also work with the Department of Energy.

So they will charge the federal government to manage their waste.

So there is a way to turn this into a for profit entity if you want to.

LAKE BARRETT: I, I would say you have a good point that it's been very difficult in this country.

And I, I distinguish that from what I told you about my experience in other countries.

In, in other countries they see an obligation here, they see a moral obligation.

They created the waste, they benefited from the power.

It's not going away.

I don't care what you do.

If the waste is going to be there and it has to be handled and they feel a moral obligation and the country supports that to come up with a solution.

It's not easy, it's not quick, it's not cheap, but they feel that this country, I, I my own personal point

of view is you are so lucky to have Southern Cal Edison here at the forefront of this.

Because as I look around the country at very few utilities that have leaned forward in solving this problem.

They talk about if they would like to have it solved, but they don't lean forward in this because it's not something and it's it's not a popular thing.

You're not going to win the Miss Congeniality contest by being in favor of nuclear waste management.

So it's very difficult.

We need an organization put together that has that as its responsibility, that has it as its priority and that feels an obligation to solve it because they're going to get hit in the face when they try to do this.

There's no way around it.

It's a social political challenge in this country.

CHRIS WAHL: OK, Any other questions, Dan?

Oh, Dan, Dan does.

He's been laying in wait there.

DAN STETSON: I've been holding my tongue and I appreciate that we're that we're running over time.

But number one, I'm just so proud, many members of the CEP in terms of stability have been on this panel for more than a decade.

And I really want to thank them and appreciate their service on it.

But my question is, as a CEP as a community, what can we do to to try to move a solution forward?

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Good, good question.

I mean, my advice is you really have to keep the political screws on.

I mean, it's a lot, it's going to take a lot of political pressure to make progress, you know, and the more that you can do what spent fuel solutions does is work together with other, other communities.

Now there are a lot of shut down plants, OK, There are a lot of communities that don't want to become the permanent de facto repositories for this material.

And so there's, you know, that the more political pressure we can build, the better.

And there and there are folks, you know, Congressman Levin is an example of folks who in Congress who know that this is an issue that they do have to act on.

So we just need more pressure.

I think you guys have other ideas.

LAKE BARRETT: You spread, you spread the word.

I mean need more Congressman Levin's like that to make something happen.

So you need to you need to go out and talk with other states, talk with other utilities and help make it happen.

And you and you can you have influence.

TOM ISAACS: So one of the things I, so I agree with what Allison and and Laker are saying, one, one of the things I think we don't do a very good job of is, is actually describing the fact that for many communities, being a host of a facility like this can be a great benefit.

We see this around the world.

We see it in the United States at a place called Carlsbad, New Mexico, which has had an operating repository for defense, radioactive waste, I forget how many years more than…

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Since 1998.

TOM ISAACS: Yeah, it's a long time.

The community there is absolutely happy with that that facility being there, they'd like to expand the responsibilities there.

They benefited in all kinds of ways.

If you go to Eurajoki, Finland, the people there are wildly happy with hosting their repository program there.

If you go to Forsmark, Sweden, the people there are

wildly happy.

They competed against another community.

And I mean, it was a real competition.

They both wanted the facility because they saw all the benefits.

It's not just money, it's in in vibe, it's vibrant.

Vibrant makes the community vibrant.

It brings the world class scientists and technologists and educators and and infrastructure in a future.

That's what happened in Canada.

The community in Canada that chose this facility called Ignace, it's a little community of 1000 people really in a remote area.

Their community, like many of these communities, it was a forestry and mining community and it like they do, they went bust.

And now you're sitting there and the young people have no future, and the people see that their kids are going to move away, and here's a facility that has the opportunity to bring a vision of a future that they can all believe in.

In fact, the Canadians gave money to these communities to do what they call visioning, which is to figure out themselves what they wanted their future to

be.

And if it didn't include a nuclear facility, fine, that's fine.

But if it helped them achieve their vision, that was something that the community could volunteer to learn more about and get engaged and make a decision.

And ultimately Ignace and the First Nation, the Wabigoon Lake Ojibway Nation, they're both there, agreed to host this facility and they're very happy.

CHRIS WAHL: Thanks, Tom.

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: Chris, there is a another CEP member online, Michelle Anderson, that has a question.

CHRIS WAHL: OK, great, Michelle, you're up.

MICHELLE ANDERSON: Thank you everyone.

Can you hear me OK?

CHRIS WAHL: Yes.

MICHELLE ANDERSON: OK, perfect.

So my name is Michelle Anderson.

I serve as Orange County's Emergency Manager and I want to thank the panel for their presentation.

And my question is really focused on, as we're writing the legislation for this potential corporation, really trying to emphasize the role of local emergency response in the area where this corporation eventually

operates.

Orange County benefited over the years, I think San Diego County too, from the previous requirements when San Onofre was an operating plant of having FEMA graded exercises that really brought jurisdictions and a different first responder disciplines to the table to train, exercise and really equip for responding to incidents at San Onofre.

However, once they began the decommissioning process, we were fortunate that Edison stayed at the table and continued to do training and exercises with us.

They didn't have to do that.

And in the future, right, if this corporation gets off the ground, one of my concerns is that the future corporation not may not be that accepting of local government, local responders.

And so I would ask the panel, are you guys putting in the regulations considerations for local government and local populations to have an active say and an active role in how emergency response surrounds potential sites?

LAKE BARRETT: I'll, I'll, I'll start.

I mean, I think you want to spend the money no matter who it is proportional to the risk, OK?

And you want to have good relations with the community.

So there's two factors there.

From our community relations point of view, I can see some of it OK being done, from a risk point of view, this fuel is old and cold and it doesn't really go over.

It has nothing to drive it anywhere.

So as far as emergency response, it's minimal from a risk point of view.

And I don't think like the waste fund should be spending monies where it really isn't needed, but you need to have good community relations.

Utilities all do that all the time with their with their neighbors.

And so you want to appropriately support.

So, but as far as put it into a legislation, I personally don't think it belongs.

If you want to have good community relations that is in there.

But as far as defining you have to pay money for emergency response, I personally don't think so.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: I guess what the way, the way I, if I can just add my own view on that.

This is Allison.

I, I think that the emergency response and community needs and state needs can be covered in the agreement, the hosting agreement that would be required

in law.

So if you really wanted to specify in law, you could say you know the NuCorp has to enter a legally binding hosting agreement with the state and the local community or tribe and that binding agreement should include something about emergency response etcetera.

FRED BAILLY: If I may add just one quick point, there will be a need for a response around the transportation piece of the fuel.

I agree not the same risk in terms of disposing of it, but when it's going to be few getting to the location, there's going to be just like today the regulation specifies that the need for some some response.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: No, that's a great, great point.

CHRIS WAHL: Thanks Fred.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: I mean that that the regulator would hopefully require you know emergency response training in the regulations, yeah.

CHRIS WAHL: Are there any other questions of the panel?

MICHELLE ANDERSON: And so if I could, can I just summarize then what I heard?

CHRIS WAHL: Sure.

MICHELLE ANDERSON: And I apologize because I'm going to be very blunt.

So what I heard is that we're trying to create a corporation around nuclear waste storage that has little oversight from local communities in order to get away from people during elections being able to voice concern about how administrations are behaving.

CHRIS WAHL: Well, I'm not, I'm just the facilitator here, but but I'll comment first.

I don't think that's what I heard today.

In fact, I think that what I heard Lake say was, is that the communities need to be on board and that there needs to be some consent process, which was sort of the the foundation of all of this discussion, but do I need to?

MICHELLE ANDERSON: But that's only at the outset.

And so there won't be any requirement for training, exercising interoperable communications or working with the local community once they've accepted this private entity that may or may not be for profit within their communities.

CHRIS WAHL: Yeah.

I, I, I'm not sure I heard that either, but it's a fair point and it's like that's why we're here is having a robust discussion.

I, I, I have to think that any kind of long term process that involves the removal, disposition and relocation of, of spent nuclear fuel is going to be a, a very robust process and community engagement if what we're doing here today is any indication of that, you know, maybe one of our panelists, me, Lake or, or yeah.

Yeah, would anyone like to comment on it?

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: The TEP program, in particular the transportation and emergency preparedness program, the which program the emergency is.

CHRIS WAHL: So I think the comment was…

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: Transportation emergency preparedness program that the Navy uses for its spent nuclear.

I've always envisioned to be a a template for what you might do on the utility side.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: So transportation of spent fuel is regulated by a number of different entities.

One is the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, one is the Department of Transportation and States and localities also have a role.

It's actually quite a complex situation and that is in part where emergency training comes in.

But again, each organization, whether it's the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or the Department of

Transportation will have regulatory requirements for emergency response training and security training, etcetera.

And again, you could also include something like this in your hosting agreement.

So I think that this could all be specified.

TOM ISAACS: Yeah, if I could just reinforce what Allison said.

I mentioned in some of my remarks about the fact that the organization has to be a trust building organization.

It has to operate in a way that earns trust over time.

And when we look at examples of where that's happened, one of the things that happens, the organizations that's responsible for running the program wants to engage with the people and the communities are going to be affected.

And not just tell them what they're going to do, but have a dialogue over time to understand what the interests and concerns of a community are and do something about it.

Now that do something about it doesn't necessarily translate into you tell me what you want and I'll do it every time.

It's a dialogue so that the community and the implementer over time learn to trust each other and build in programs that directly respond to the concerns of the community.

So I think the commenter, and I'm only getting about 50% of what you're saying, I apologize, but I think the commenter has a good point.

It's important that if, if a community is going to host these facilities, they're in it for the long haul and there has to be relationships for the long haul that stand that test of time, whatever changes will occur over the many years that this will occur.

CHRIS WAHL: Thank you, Tom.

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: One more online.

Gary.

CHRIS WAHL: OK.

UNIDENTIFIED EVENT TEAM MEMBER: Gary Brown online.

CHRIS WAHL: Gary.

GARY BROWN: Yes, thank you.

I really enjoyed the presentations.

I, I think they're a milestone.

I heard a little bit of of the this more conceptually last year in, in Denver at a conference.

As much as we've reused the word trust, I probably don't think we've used it enough.

When you look at, at at Finland and Sweden.

One basic thing that hasn't been mentioned is the people there have far more trust in their government and what their government tells them then we have here, if anything, our government and our country, we're at an all time low in trust.

And so with that in mind, when, when you kind of quickly say, and, and I understand it, we're going to let the, the, we're going to privatize this.

I can see all the benefits of that.

But so many times in this country when we've let industry become its own regulator, things have quickly gone off a cliff.

And so I think more attention and, and maybe sensitivity to saying, let's just privatize this.

And I know you brought up the advisory, but you know, I don't think that has been vetted enough because trust for what we're trying to do in this country is going to be not only a long-time effort, but we're going to have to change so many of of things.

And the only way we can do this, I think it's to start over with like NuCorp or something like it, because all we've experienced is 44 years of abject failure with the DOE.

And I don't see that really, you know, maybe the

current administration has some new ideas, but another administration will have new ideas and we'll get nowhere.

And so I think this is a great concept, but I think the trust has got to be more thoroughly vetted and, and how we not only develop this, but how we explain it.

Maybe you can comment on that.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Yeah, it's a great point.

I think it's an excellent point.

Nothing is going to really go forward without trust.

And if you all have ideas on how to increase trust with what we've come up with here, I'm, we're all ears.

I mean, we'd love to hear your ideas on how to improve the idea of the advisory committee, for instance.

So, yeah, send them along.

GARY BROWN: Thank you.

CHRIS WAHL: OK, I think it's been a great discussion.

We're only about 30 minutes behind here, so it's been obviously a robust discussion.

I had a few questions, but they've all been addressed.

So I think I'm going to call the questions here and be done and turn it back to you, Dan, thank you.

DAN STETSON: Gosh, what a robust discussion.

I, I think this is exactly what we hope for for this meeting.

So I want to thank the CEP members and the members of our panel for this.

And this discussion is going to continue shortly with members of the public being able to make their comments and ask their questions.

So if we could move on to the next slide, please and the next slide after that.

So here again are the directions for public comment.

The CEP comment form link is available to submit a question or sign up to speak online.

The names of the individuals who signed up to speak will be displayed on the slide.

Manuel will facilitate the Q&A and call your name when it's your turn to speak.

3 minutes per person, please.

A countdown timer is on the screen.

We have one hour dedicated to public comment segment of the meeting, after public comments Manuel will facilitate the public dialogue generally addressing questions in the order that they are received.

We will first cover questions for the panelists on the topic that we're discussing tonight.

Then if time is available, we'll address questions related to other general topics presumably for SCE to answer.

And with that, we are going to take a quick and a 10 minute break.

So please return in 10 minutes, no later.

[10 MINUTE BREAK]

OK, thank you so much.

As as I mentioned, we that was a spirited robust commentary by everyone and I'm I'm sure that it will continue.

So now we're set up for public comment.

We now welcome public comments and questions.

The CEP form link is on the slide if you wish to sign up and speak or submit a question.

Names are listed.

I see a number of them on the left side of the speaker queue in the order received.

We will begin with members of the public who are with us and are at the casino this evening and then move to the online questions.

Manuel will facilitate the public comment, Manuel you're going to take it from here.

MANUEL CAMARGO: Thank you, Dan and thanks everybody, agree very good discussion this evening.

It is a panel discussion as the title suggests.

George, you have can you approach the lectern?

We have George.

ROGELIO HERNANDEZ: That's Gerry, Gerry Phillips.

MANUEL CAMARGO: Say it again?

OK, not seeing Phillips.

So second is Ronald Askeland.

Askeland.

And give me, pronounce your name for me, please.

I butchered it, I'm sure.

RONALD ASKELAND: Hello, I'm Doctor Ronald Askland from San Diego.

MANUEL CAMARGO: Thank you.

You have 3 minutes.

RONALD ASKELAND: Thank you.

So I have a PhD in chemistry and 35 years of industrial experience and I've done some radioactive tracer studies and neutron activation, so I know a little bit about nuclear chemistry.

I had a chance to talk to Lake over the break, and I wish he could convince me that it's nothing to worry about, but I'm very, very concerned about the deadly radioactive nuclear waste at SONGS.

I think it's one of the most important problems we have in Southern California and contamination, the

failure that releases this deadly waste, would be catastrophic to our economy, to human health and the environment.

We have 3.6 million pounds of highly reactive spent fuel stored in corroded steel canisters never meant to last beyond 25 years, located 108 feet from the beach in the middle of a tsunami zone, right next to the Newport-Inglewood earthquake fault, in an area that's susceptible to terrorist attack.

Action must be taken now to address this threat.

Reprocessing San Onofre's nuclear waste is a false solution.

It's too expensive and actually creates larger volumes of waste.

We can't wait for a long-term federal depository for high level nuclear waste to be established.

We need immediate action must be taken.

We need to relocate the waste to a facility that's federally designated, geologically stable, away from population centers and coastlines.

We need to replace the existing canisters with thicker, more durable alternatives designed for long-term resilience.

And we need to provide continuous radiation monitoring conducted by independent scientists.

The time to act is now.

We don't want to be remembered as the generation who allowed Southern California to be turned into a nuclear radioactive wasteland for thousands of years.

Thank you.

MANUEL CAMARGO: Thank you.

And so Dan, I think your intent is to is your intent to answer each question as they are opposed.

DAN STETSON: I'm sorry, can't hear Manuel.

MANUEL CAMARGO: Is your intent that we answer each question is posed?

I think that you're looking for a revision as compared to prior.

Yeah, so I'll, I'll start by answering this particular question then on behalf of SCE.

Yeah, so thank you, Ronald for your question, multi part question, I'll do my best to, to cover it.

So, so yes, spent spent nuclear fuel is, is does need to be isolated from the biosphere as it is now in the, in the independent spent fuel storage installation.

Just a couple of things that I picked up.

You know, maybe maybe it's details, but these are a lot, many of these, the topics that you covered have been discussed here in prior CEP meetings, all of which are on songscommunity.com and there's a wealth of resources on

there.

Some things like the lifespan of the canisters, the canisters are actually per the Nuclear Regulatory Commission good for 100 years or more with a sort of a healthcare maintenance program, an aging management program as it's called by the the NRC.

And, and yeah, so it does need to be relocated wherever, it is designed, by the way, for the current conditions, including the Newport-Inglewood fault, that is the most relevant fault to the site.

And the site is designed in the ISFSI, the independent spent fuel storage installation is designed to withstand all natural and manmade hazards, including earthquakes and tsunamis.

But I appreciate your concern.

We're not complacent.

We at SCE, we are actively working to compel the federal government to provide the facility that customers paid for, and so we remain very active in this space.

If you want to help advise that you can, one way that you can help us is to join the Spent Fuel Solutions Coalition.

There's no, no cost to join as a, as an associate member, a supporting member, it's called.

And you know, we don't, we don't need your money,

but we really need your voice and we need your support in order to move forward on off site, off site storage and disposal.

OK, so next up is Rudy, Rudy Salazar with the Ransburg Project.

RUDY SALAZAR: Good evening and thank you to the community engagement panel and, and Southern California Edison and all it’s participants and the guests here.

Mr. Lake, I saw online in Washington with Dan Stetson in 2024, I guess that was and, or I thought it was this past year 2025, but time flies.

It was my, my name is Rudy Salazar and I am the founder of the Randsburg Project.

I own 58 acres property in Eastern Kern County, California that is being evaluated for potential inland site for, for California's future nuclear fuel management needs.

And that's obviously it's being evaluated by me primarily.

This is my initiative and I'm pushing it and, and, and just making noise from the hilltops about this.

And the US Department of Energy, as we all know is, is doing this NLIC and I am proposing to put an Li, an NLIC framework together for the governor.

And I'm, I'm hoping that I could get the utilities,

the three utilities here with the in California to, to acknowledge it and hopefully get the governor to sign on to get a seat at the table for this discussion before it's too late.

So I just wanted to say hi, introduce myself to the public.

And it's 58 acres out in Ransburg.

It's and we can move the 291 spent fuel canisters off the coast and take it up to a more responsible site.

My initial initiative was was plan A is just me doing this and trying to get this off the coast.

But now with this nuclear life cycle, innovative campuses, this is now possibly a new avenue, that hopefully we get a seat at the table and California gets gets part of this whole plan somehow, someway and with Mr. Desmond's help, I'm sure we can get this happening.

Thank you.

MANUEL CAMARGO: Thank you, Rudy.

Appreciate your comments.

Any response to more of a comment than a question.

Yeah, and we've chatted, we've chatted offline as well about the the nuclear lifestyle called innovation campuses with Mr. Salazar.

So next we have Bart Ziegler with the Samuel Lawrence Foundation.

BART ZIEGLER: Thank you panel.

Nice to meet you.

Thank you for your time and service.

Nice to meet you Professor.

I'll read a quick note with the Samuel Lawrence Foundation.

We are focused currently on San Onofre and the spent nuclear fuel sitting in a precarious place.

We also work with art, science and education form communities of concern.

Once NuCorp has its Advisory Board that can veto or shape initiatives, what mechanisms exist so that outside stakeholders, especially those that become at risk later in the process due to transportation or new studies and developments are represented, will will they have any meaningful legal recourse if the NRC rubber stamps NuCorp's initiatives, especially if the site selected for the campus or repository is on DoD lands that have fewer civilian oversight avenues?

And with that, thank you.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Great.

You want to start?

MANUEL CAMARGO: Thank you, Bart.

So question is about the NuCorp.

LAKE BARRETT: Yeah, good, good question.

You know, the, the NuCorp would be like DOE would be would go to the NRC and it'd be the NRC processes for approvals.

So rights of all that would still be the same if it was NuCorp or if it was or if it was DOE, the NuCorp would be implementing the Nuclear Waste Policy Act Nuclear Policy Act itself has requirements in it to to work with the local people all right as well.

So for example, transportation, there's a Section 180-C, it says train the local folks with transportation corridors and that sort of thing.

So those kind of requirements would still be there no matter who it is.

And NuCorp would be, as we said, reactor owner run, but reactor companies, you know, do have good relationships in most of the, in most of around the United States.

Maybe here it's been a little rocky, but I mean, basically they're well respected and, and as they are in Sweden as as you heard examples there as well.

So I think the NuCorp wants to have good relations with its neighbors wherever it is, OK.

And it's going to want to reach out and, and, and treat people fairly and be a good neighbor.

All right.

So I think that process is going to be there.

And you still have the fall back of the requirements of the NRC and also the advisory committee that Allison went through in some detail, which is an important part of of having good relationships and maintaining their hosting agreements.

And it'd be hosting agreements where the host communities can put in what they want in, in that.

And that would be a, a legally binding agreement between the NuCorp, you know, and, and the, and the local people and the state as well.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: So, yeah, I mean, I, I think one way to get stakeholders voices into the oversight process is through the advisory committee.

But I also understand that you can't have everybody and their brother on the advisory committee, right.

So I'm going to turn the question back to you.

So how would you suggest getting stakeholders voices to NuCorp?

BART ZIEGLER: I'm familiar with your work with Rod Ewing.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Yeah.

BART ZIEGLER: I guess 10 years ago he had the.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Can you talk a little closer to the microphone?

BART ZIEGLER: Yeah, What, 10 years ago he published that paper, I think.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Right, the reset report.

BART ZIEGLER: Yeah, Yeah.

Said you have some people from the right, the corporate interests, some people from political interests, some of the community members and then include scientists, right.

I think that balance would provide a good advisory Board.

It would be a above approach.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Yeah, thank you.

BART ZIEGLER: Also want to thank you for the paper with Leslie Crawl.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Oh, of course.

MANUEL CAMARGO: Thank you, Bart.

Thank you, Lake.

Thank you, Allison.

So next question is from Daryl Gale.

Darryl, 3 minutes.

DARRYL GALE: Hello.

These remarks are aimed at a lot of anger towards Edison, not the people who work here in the in the room, but Edison in general.

Edison, you made a terrible, deadly mistake in

2019.

Our beach is not your waste dump.

Did you ask the citizens of Southern California if you could dump it on our beach?

Did you ask the indigenous peoples who have lived here for millennia?

No, you just asked the captured, coerced Coastal Commission, convincing them that it was all right to do it.

Did you ask our state legislature, the governor, the local mayors?

It was a big, deadly mistake in 2019.

I was there.

I was there in Chula Vista in 2019 and I've gone to all the meetings I could.

But here's how you can rectify it.

Go buy or borrow some hot cells from the Navy, from Europe, build your own, I don't care.

And then get up some big industrial cranes and get it up and off the beach without scraping it anymore.

And then we can worry about getting the DOE or the DOT or somebody to take it away, to take it to Idaho, take it to Hanford.

They're already contaminated like crazy.

Take it across the street or this gentleman's

place.

We can take it here, but just get it off the beach before a tsunami or an earthquake comes.

That's all.

MANUEL CAMARGO: Yeah, thank you, Darrell.

Thank you for being here and taking time from your evening to join us.

I I do appreciate that.

And we chatted a little bit earlier, so I appreciate your frustration.

Yeah, we are, we're, we're the stewards of the spent nuclear fuel.

We are doing our absolute best to keep that spent fuel on site in a safe condition until the federal government performs.

In the meantime, things like hot cell, we've we've covered that in previous meetings.

The hot cell would not be needed at this time.

And again, the canister systems as I mentioned is a little bit earlier are good for 100 years or more and we have an aging management program.

So that aging management program allows us to make sure that we are inspecting these canisters on a periodicity to make sure that they are remaining in good shape and continue to perform their containment function.

But but once again, you know we are working to very hard in order to get the spent fuel off site.

We do recognize there are a number of good reasons to get the spent fuel off site.

It's what our customers, what retail customers paid for in terms of the contributions to the nuclear waste fund.

And we appreciate that the communities around San Onofre never consented to the long-term storage of spent fuel in their community.

So yeah, you have our commitment.

We're working hard on this issue.

We are, you know, we are encouraged by the current approach, but we really do need to make some of this happen whether it's in in legislation, in a lame duck session as was was mentioned earlier or other in order to really get on a, a more durable path for the spent fuel program.

But once again, I thank you for your comments.

Going back to is, do we have the only other card I have is from George Phillips.

Do we have George Phillips in the room?

If not, then we'll transition to other questions that we have in in writing.

OK, so we have three questions from Van Snyder.

The first, so I'll, I'll I'll read these off.

The first question from Van is what are sorry, was there a comment?

Question from Van Snyder is what are NRC and SONGS and CEP and Spent Fuel Solutions doing to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act?

I think he means to say so that it's funds can be used for spent fuel processing instead of funds being required for Yucca Mountain.

So, so there, I guess what I would say with regard to the nuclear waste fund is it's already been addressed to a a degree, large degree in this panel discussion.

But you know that those funds at least at present can only be used for disposal.

But as was discussed earlier, there are some who suggest that perhaps part, at least part of that fund could be used for to support reprocessing.

You know, so we're we're aware of all this.

It does appear that we're trying to head toward a place where here in the US we are reprocessing and recycling used nuclear fuel.

But this is definitely the matter of the Nuclear Waste Fund.

Those funds were built on contributions from customers, including those in the communities around

SONGS who paid for electricity produced by SONGS.

So we are are very mindful of of that and continue to to track this issue very closely regarding the Nuclear Waste Fund and and how it is used in to ensure as much as we can to make sure that that is used appropriately.

Next question also from Mr. Snyder is what methods to reprocess spent nuclear fuel.

So he he basically goes into the the fact there are a number of different ways to reprocess spent nuclear fuel.

There's pyro processing, aqueous, there are a variety.

There are also a number of different companies that are working with the entities that have responded to the RFI.

So there are a variety approaches of approaches here and it's not clear exactly what might be done here in the United States, whether it's one or more of those.

Some of them are being done at sort of the R&D level at the national labs, some of the national labs here in the US.

So you know, so we'll continue to, we'll continue to monitor this.

There may be some reprocessing that gets done at least in the pilot stage by 2030 or somewhere in that

time frame.

And but that it sounds like Mr. Snyder has a decent handle on the on, on the range of reprocessing technologies that that are currently in either employed elsewhere in the world or in R&D here in the US.

No, Allison?

ALLISON MACFARLANE: It's not.

You won't see anything by 2030, I promise you, like 1000% promise you, you know.

MANUEL CAMARGO: I'm not sensing a lot of wiggle room there.

OK, appreciate that, Allison.

OK, so next question also on reprocessing, Yeah, so just challenging the fact that you know if you call it so there's terminology matters here.

So traditionally we've we've considered spent nuclear fuel that's been through the reactor is spent fuel and you know the and the plan for a long time in the US is that it would go directly into disposal.

But if you are going to recycle or reprocess, you know, the the current terminology and the more appropriate technology in that framework is used fuel.

So just you know, Mr. Snyder, I, I, I recognized that yeah, there is a difference and and that is part of the national dialogue.

OK, there was a question here that perhaps one of our the three member panel might want to comment on.

There was a question about weapons, weapons proliferation, but you know anything about proliferation of nuclear material that come back that that might be able to come as a result of separating the plutonium from uranium?

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Yeah, absolutely.

MANUEL CAMARGO: That anybody on the panel would like to address.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: 100%, when you reprocess spent fuel, you separate plutonium from the rest of the material.

And that is a proliferation hazard because that plutonium could be directly used in a nuclear bomb.

And that is why after India in 1974 exploded their first nuclear bomb by diverting material from a Canadian supplied reactor with US supplied fuel, that by reprocessing that used fuel to get that plutonium, that then President Ford and then President Carter indefinitely deferred reprocessing in the United States to set an example for the rest of the world, because it is a proliferation risk and a great hazard.

We do not need more nuclear weapons in the world.

And so that should be a serious consideration

before anybody every reprocesses spent nuclear fuel.

LAKE BARRETT: I'll add with that, that yes, it is certainly a risk and yes, it is something we have to be very careful with as a society.

But since 1974, there is a, a, a large degree of requirements for proliferation control under the NRC rules, which any recycler would have to abide by on how you would do that.

I mean, the French do that today and, and others, so the Japanese.

And so, yes, it's a risk, yes, it's something that's very important.

It doesn't necessarily mean you can't do it, but it is something that has to be addressed, so.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Yeah, you would, you would at least have to add expensive safeguards, expensive safeguards to any kind of reprocessing facility and expensive security measures to any kind of reprocessing facility to ensure that nobody stole this material and diverted it for nuclear weapons.

And just a side note on money, OK, seeing how there's been a lot of attention on reprocessing here, the Japanese have been building a reprocessing facility since 1997.

It is 2026, OK, this reprocessing facility is not

complete.

The last number that I saw reported for the cost of the reprocessing facility was more than 10 years ago and it was around $25 billion.

So one imagines that this reprocessing facility is now closer to the order of 40 or $50 billion.

That is the amount of money in the spent fuel fund.

And you you still need a deep geologic repository.

So Japan is still looking for a site for deep geologic repository.

Reprocessing is a management option for nuclear waste.

It is not a final disposal method.

TOM ISAACS: Yeah, I don't even think of it as a management option, frankly.

It's it's an an option to do something, but it in first order doesn't really change in, in, in kind of the nuclear waste issue.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Right, correct.

TOM ISAACS: The proliferation issue is, is quite complex.

I mean, we're already a nuclear weapons state, so reprocessing it seems in this country from a security point of view, why don't why do you care, right?

We already have all the weapons that we need.

But the point is it, it sets a a standard of acceptability around the world if if we can do it and why can't other countries do it?

And many countries would like to do it.

Some maybe because they think there's additional benefits in terms of extending the resource usage of the uranium and the produced plutonium.

But some of them probably want to do what's called laden proliferation.

And what laden proliferation means is countries want to get as close as they can to having everything you need for a nuclear weapon without raising your hand and saying I'm going to build a nuclear weapon.

That's kind of the concern that's been with Iran right now is that Iran has been doing things that while they claim they don't want a nuclear weapon, they are walking, talking and cracking like they want a nuclear weapon.

They're enriching uranium the higher and higher levels that get you closer and closer to the material.

You can make a weapon with high enriched uranium or plutonium.

Plutonium comes out of a reactor, high enriched uranium comes out of an enrichment plan.

Either way, these countries get closer and closer

so that the gap between what they have and having a serviceable weapon gets smaller and smaller.

And so it takes would take them less time, less money, less detectability to get to the place where if they decided to have a nuclear weapon, we would have less and less certainty to detect it and less and less time to stop them.

So there is a definite proliferation concern here.

It's not theoretical, it's real.

And and it's true not just in Iran, but it's been true in many other concerns with other countries as well.

It's interesting to note, Allison mentioned that India detonated a nuclear device, I think in 1973, somewhere in there.

Years later, they detonated another one and Pakistan detonated 5 in response.

So it's leads not just to proliferation, but it leads to regional instability and if my neighbor who I don't trust has one, I want one as well.

So it can lead to great instability.

So it's a real concern.

FRED BAILLY: If, if, if, if I may to, to some extent your concerns also apply to enrichment.

TOM ISAACS: Yes, absolutely.

Maybe even worse.

FRED BAILLY: And we are not stopping enrichment in the US because we want to set a precedent for the rest of the world not to enrich uranium.

So that's, that's another, another angle that we can look at things.

MANUEL CAMARGO: Thank you.

Thank you for the answers.

Appreciate that.

The next question is from Doris Fisk, so Doris Fisk, pardon me.

Doris Fisk is frustrated, clearly.

So she's concerned about the removal of the spent fuel.

She'd really like to know when the waste will be removed.

There is awareness of the timeline, but you know, temporary to a better location and a permanent disposal site.

We're tired.

We're we're done hearing it.

So, so Doris is clearly frustrated, certainly on behalf of SCE I guess I, I can say that we appreciate the frustration.

We've talked a lot tonight about the, the level to which the DOE and the federal government are behind plan.

That's why we're active in this space.

In terms of the timing, I think at this point it's shifting now.

You know, in in the last couple of years I've heard DOE personnel talk about perhaps consolidated interim storage being available in the mid to late 2030s, but but that's not certain.

And then deep geological repository takes a lot more time because of all the ologies as Tom mentioned earlier.

So that would be much further off into the future.

But but yeah, stay tuned in because you know, we will watch closely what happens with these innovation campuses because at least with those states that included storage or disposal on site, that may be a path, near term path forward.

OK, so Jerry Phillips, so while we don't have Jerry Phillips in the room and I guess was expected to sign up and speak in person, the the question was about are states currently open to hosting disposal sites?

So, so I I can take that one and and perhaps panel can can weigh in if they have further information.

But my understanding is that at present there are four states that that well, they are 26 states, of course, that replied to the RFI.

There are 4 where they were really responsive to the part of the perhaps vague part of the RFI that was related to disposal.

And so those four, as I understand it, are Tennessee, Utah, South Carolina and Nebraska.

My understanding is that there is a fifth state that chooses to, you know, state maintain a low profile at this point.

But those are those are the four at least that I'm aware of that that have been open about accepting spent nuclear fuel for disposal.

Any clarification? Lake?

LAKE BARRETT: Not much, but there's there's a there's a range.

I mean the states, many states said they would be interested in discussing deep borehole disposal, didn't name a site, particularly Tennessee talked about a region said they would be interested in discussing the Cumberland Plateau.

That's basically, you know, western Appalachia for a potential disposal site.

Utah expressed the interest they would consider discussing salt domes in in Utah.

So they were as far as a specific site per SE, maybe in some of the proprietary ones they had it, but

others did discuss about low level waste in in existing like in Utah and Clive, which is a low level waste disposal site.

So there's some discussion about those things.

But as far as a specific deep geologic repository site, I'm not aware of any other than what Utah did.

There may be some.

MANUEL CAMARGO: OK, thank you for that.

OK, Next up.

So Charles, are you looking to participate in comment?

CHARLES LANGLEY: Yeah, I would like to comment and ask a question. May I please?

MANUEL CAMARGO: 3 minutes.

CHARLES LANGLEY: Sure, I'd like to thank Lake Barrett and Allison Macfarlane for coming out here.

And and I think this has been a really terrific community engagement panel meeting.

And I am particularly concerned about the report of the nuclear waste leaking out of the 55-gallon drums.

And I'm hoping you can tell us what the date was on that so we can look up the event report that at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or perhaps Edison could make the event report on this public that would have been filed with the NRC.

I also want to comment on, echo Miss Macfarlane's comments regarding plutonium reprocessing.

It's a really bad idea because plutonium the the only real use for plutonium in my opinion is for nuclear weapons.

It was the justification for building many nuclear power plants in the 1st place.

The electricity was literally a byproduct of nuclear power in order to get plutonium.

And then finally, a question for Mr. Barrett, you said that the fuel was old and cold.

And when I first started participating in these meetings, the original gentleman, Doctor David Victor, was referring to, the storage is cold and dark.

So I was really surprised when I learned that if you touched one of these canisters they'd probably fry your hand off because I, if I recall correctly, the fuel rods were, you know, 1700° or something inside a stainless steel canister and you'd probably be dead within a few hours of getting close to one of these canisters.

And so I looked up the cool down period for high burn up fuel and it says it's 452° after 15 years.

So you know, that's hot enough to combust paper spontaneously.

So I'm wondering when we're talking about old and cold and cold and dark, when is this stuff really cold?

I mean, do we have to wait 50 years or 100 years?

Maybe you could give us some guidelines on that.

Thank you very much.

LAKE BARRETT: Sure, I mean, basically relative to when a reactor is operating, OK, I mean, there's a lot of heat coming off those fuel assemblies.

It makes the steam, but after decades, like most of your fuel here, the heat load is low.

I don't know what the numbers are in the canisters, but I mean, we're talking four or five, maybe 10 hair dryers, OK.

This is not going to burn.

All right, now, is it still high radiation?

Absolutely, OK, you don't go next to the fuel assembly or next to one of these canisters.

But as far as any energy, as the lady from Orange County and emergency plan, it's this very little energy is going to drive that off site.

Now, could it be a terrorist attack and if somebody hit it with a high explosive armor piercing something rather than be some local type of thing, yes, but there's no energy like like a Fukushima or something like that where you're going to drive things off site, not going to

get high enough to have hydrogen gas and that kind of thing that you could have, you know, metal oxidation.

So you're not going to get it when it's old and cold.

My probably inappropriate words, but none the less, as far as cold and dark, I don't know what that one has to do with it.

Like, no, that's like no electricity, OK, but as far as the risk of, of old fuel is nowhere near as high as risks are when it's when it's young or when it's operating as far as energy is concerned.

But there's still a risk and it's still important.

That's why millions and millions of dollars are spent at it to keep it safe and at low risk, right?

Safe is the word I try to avoid because it's, there's a risk and everything, every breath you take is a risk.

OK, you know, I accept that because I want to live.

But I mean, you, you, you know, there's all kinds of safety is your perception of risk.

But the risk of dry storage, passive storage is fairly low from an emergency planning point of view, which is what the lady was, I thought she was asking for.

TOM ISAACS: If I could just mention because it's come up a couple times tonight there, the CEP several

years ago did one of these sessions dedicated to the security risks of the waste on site.

I was one of the people who talked.

There was a panel of people who talked about what those risks were, what the NRC requirements were, what the potential damages were.

And so for those of you who are interested in learning about the security risks of terrorism, for example, there's a, I'll assume it's available on the site and you can get a lot of information about that.

MANUEL CAMARGO: Thank you, thank you for the question.

So there was a multi part question with respect to the shipment, that question we have Mark Morgan, if we can unmute Mark Morgan, he's going to deliver that part of the answer.

MARK MORGAN: Yes, So the the drums were opened at the Clive facility.

We were notified of that on March 17th and I believe they were open, you know, within 24 hours prior to that.

But I want to reiterate, you know, the the question implied that there was leakage from the drums.

There was not leakage from the drums.

And in part based on that, it was not a reportable

event at the time.

So the bet again, the best information that's in the public venue if you want to find out more about it is the inspection report and the Adam's number was listed in the slide as part of the deck.

MANUEL CAMARGO: Thank you, Mark.

OK, any so is there a comment?

So OK, so thank you Charles and Charles, I don't think I mentioned so Charles Langley is with public watchdogs.

CHARLES LANGLEY: I I do have a follow up question.

And so this was I I thought I heard the word leak.

So was it a radiation leak or no?

MARK MORGAN: So the the issue at hand was we shipped it as solid waste and then when it arrived at Clive and they opened the drums, they realized that there was liquid in the drums beyond the limit for what's allowed for the shipment of solid waste.

There were no indications of leakage though.

MANUEL CAMARGO: OK, OK, thanks for that.

So then online we have Carl Perez.

So I think Carl Perez has some questions.

Can we unmute Carl and allow Carl to ask his question, questions.

CARL PEREZ: Yes, hello.

Can can you hear me?

MANUEL CAMARGO: Yes loud and clear, go ahead.

CARL PEREZ: Perfect yes just wanted to to thank all the panelists for coming for a very informative discussion on, on you know where we're headed on the path forward for for nuclear waste disposal.

And frankly, I, I used to be anti-nuclear and and also anti-reprocessing.

My father actually protested against the construction of nuclear power plants in, in France.

And I've really revisited my opinions once I started, you know, really understanding the, the facts and, you know, relying less on opinions.

And I think being able to use these public engagement panels for, for sources of, of really, you know, factual information is really important.

And so, you know, I, I definitely want to point a couple of questions to, to, you know, Doctor Macfarlane and I tried to really limit the questions to, to be easy yes or no's.

But, but I guess the first one is, you know, in the spirit of open minds, reprocessed uranium, contrary to, to what you previously said on this panel, is in fact used to power 4 units of 900 megawatts in France at, at the Cruas facility.

MANUEL: Carl, Carl, I'm sorry to cut you off.

So can you get closer to your microphone, please?

It's difficult to hear you in the in the room here.

CARL PEREZ: OK, let me try again.

It is now better, yes.

OK, So again, I'll, I'll just keep it short, but I, I think information is really important for, for these public meetings.

And I really wanted to direct, you know, four yes or no questions to, to Doctor Macfarlane.

And you know, in the spirit of open minds, reprocessed uranium, contrary to, to what you previously said on this panels in fact used to power 4 units of 900 megawatts of reactors in France at the Cruas facility.

It's also been used in the Netherlands, Germany, Japan, India, Canada, you know, Switzerland amongst many other countries.

Would you like to correct your earlier statement for the record that reprocessed uranium cannot and will never be used during your exchange with Supervisor Desmond?

ALLISON MACFARLANE: No, my statement is correct.

CARL PEREZ: That that you cannot use reprocessed uranium?

ALLISON MACFARLANE: No, my my statement was

reprocessed uranium is not used very much at all because it is contaminated with uranium 232 and 236, which you don't want to put into your reactor so you have to remove the 232 or 236 or dilute it enough, and there aren't many centrifuges around the world, except maybe in Russia that would accept that dirty uranium for enrichment.

And so therefore it's very expensive to reuse and therefore it's not used.

CARL PEREZ: So the, the facility of Framatome and Romans-sur-Isère that I visited 5 weeks ago looking at reprocessed uranium being fabricated into fuel to go into the four reactors was, you know, pure, pure imagination I guess?

ALLISON MACFARLANE: The, the French have looked at this.

I'm looking at Fred because he's, he's knowledgeable, more probably firsthand knowledge.

But that the the French have looked at this and they've done a little, but they haven't done a lot with reprocessed uranium because it's expensive.

And guess what, you know, regular uranium, uranium-based fuel is just a lot cheaper.

TOM ISAACS: Yeah, likewise it's, it's worth mentioning that the French do.

And Fred, please feel free to come in.

The French do reprocess, but the idea that we would have sequential reprocessing and overtime convert more and more of the uranium into plutonium and then the plutonium would be used as a fuel is very, very difficult.

The French are only reprocessing once for very much the same kind of reasons that Allison just mentioned, that other isotopes of the plutonium build in to the plutonium, and they make the use of it as a fuel very inefficient, so…

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Exactly, exactly, so it's called monocycling, what France does, yeah, and and so you can read about this in National Academy of Sciences report from 19, sorry from 2022 called the "Merits and Viability of Nuclear Fuel Cycles…" etcetera.

I mean just look at national, Google National Academy of Sciences merits and viability.

This report will come up.

FRED BAILLY: So I do, I do, I do confirm that yes, there are 4 units in France that do run with reprocessed uranium.

Just want to mention that the French when they went into the the using MOX fuel, it was in part to bridge the gap to the Gen 4 reactors and they were on the path to definitely closing the fuel cycle when political changes

put a stop to to their approach to it.

So it is feasible.

It is more expensive to re-enrich reprocess uranium than natural uranium, but it doesn't mean that you can't have cascades of enrichment that could be dedicated to that.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: The the other on reprocessing, again, the other issue we haven't talked about is that all countries that have reprocessed civilian spent fuel for reuse as MOX fuel now have massive stockpiles of separated plutonium that they have not been able to keep up with using.

And so I think France's stockpile is now about 70,000 metric tons, which is a problem.

TOM ISAACS: That wouldn’t be that much, maybe 70 metric.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Oh, sorry, 70 metric tons.

Yes, sorry.

TOM ISAACS: Japan has about 46.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Yeah, The UK has over 100 metric tons so.

MANUEL CAMARGO: OK, so thank you and thank you for the answers.

Thank you for the questions Mr. Perez.

Moving to the next person online, that is Jeremy

Pearson, so if we can unmute his mic.

Do we have Mr. Pearson?

OK, not hearing whether we have Mr. Pearson and not hearing him come.

JEREMY PEARSON: OK, Sorry, Manuel, can you hear me now?

MANUEL CAMARGO: Yes.

JEREMY PEARSON: OK. OK, Thank you, Manuel and thank you to the panel.

This is Jeremy Pearson with Utah Office of Energy Development.

And I, I don't have a official statement prepared on behalf of our office, but I just thought it would be worth the jumping on for a second just to say hello and to thank Chairwoman Macfarlane and, and, and, and Lake Barrett for their report.

And it's, it's great that we have, we're summarizing all the thought over the last decade, 15 years.

It’s useful for states like ours who have submitted the innovation campus proposal.

And so just wanted to let everyone know that we we have indeed submitted a proposal and and while it is very recent and new to a lot of people, we lived and breathed it for the last three months that we were working on it.

And our proposal’s available on the Utah Office of Energy Development's website for review.

And, and the Chairwoman Macfarlane's comment that you made earlier that that, that some applicants may have not understood that that storage of fuel was, was the center motivation of this, this RFI.

Just wanted to say as, as our state was submitting a response, this was our understanding from the very beginning and that we're very much interested as a state in working with other States and on finding a solution to this problem, so love to, for you to reach out to us, review our RFI and, and continue the conversation, and well done to CEP and Southern California Edison, everyone in California that's been working on this site.

I did my I'm grew up in Southern California, did my PhD at UC Irvine when San Onofre was being shut down and went to multiple meetings there with Southern California Edison, went to the waste confidence hearings and even went to DC with some students and, and, and, and met you, Allison, with the nuclear engineering student delegation.

And so just really know the concerns that you, that you have down there and, and really understand those concerns and looking forward to working together with you to, to find out a wonderful solution moving forward here.

So thank you.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: That's great, thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Jeremy, I just want to thank you and the state of Utah for Clive Utah and accepting so many shipments from SONGS.

MANUEL CAMARGO: An early thank you, OK, thank you Mr. Pearson and thank you Allison for the support on the answer.

OK, moving, moving on. We do have a question from Peter Jones.

Can we unmute Peter?

You're still online?

PETER JONES: Yes, Can you hear me now?

MANUEL CAMARGO: Yes, go ahead, Peter.

PETER JONES: Good evening and I am Peter Jones.

I work with SLF and I was lucky enough to attend the Mike Levin sponsored meeting last week.

And as it just so happens, was in communication with a few staffers on the Hill and talked about, you know, Doctor Macfarlane's and Lake's proposal.

And they were more interested than I would have expected out of the get go.

And they, you know, had the, more concrete questions than I expected.

So they, they were wondering what would be a good template for NuCorp and you know, something that you

alluded to earlier, the consortium that eventually became a private company in 2010 selling uranium.

So I was just wondering if there were entities, legislation, or any type of template that you could point me to.

And you know, as we look for partners to start building out this legislation is like Sematech is that, you know, aside from the need to have local and state partners on the board and NRC oversight, it's is, you know, the semiconductor public private partnership that was aimed at, you know, catching up America's semiconductor industry in the 80s.

That was a public private partnership between semiconductor industry and government and, you know, had a slow phase in, in terms of funding from, you know, being entirely the US government to get it up to speed and then you phase into, you know, funding for from the industry.

Is something like that a good place to start from or what would you recommend as we're actually trying to build more concrete proposals?

Like how fleshed out is the proposal in terms of the legislation that it would take, the design of the entity proposed?

Yeah, I'm just very interested and there's more

interest and momentum than I than I ever would have dared to hope.

So thank you.

You know, the panel, the speakers are fantastic, Southern California Edison template, what do you have for me?

LAKE BARRETT: Well, thank you.

That's that's that's encouraging what you what you've said.

I'll give you a couple of models.

There's no perfect one, but I'll as far as a partnership, there was back in the 1960's the West Valley reprocessing plant in New York.

Now, it technically didn't work out very well, but nonetheless, it was a state of New York, NYSERDA, which is New York State Energy and Research and Development, I believe, and Getty Oil, where the original companies put together a partnership where it was on state land and all that.

So I mean, that was a business model.

Now the approach with the with life cycle campuses, it's privately driven for a business point of view.

So I mean, there was a model there.

They did that.

Now it didn't, didn't pan out well, technically

speaking and economically speaking and and you know, the safety risk situation changed with time, But I mean, that was a model.

Another, another model is you look at the United States Enrichment Corporation, which was split off from DOE, which was legislative.

I don't think the federal government had to change much as far as laws in the case of West Valley, but they did have to do to put out the, the, USEC model out from DOE.

But I mean, that didn't go so well for other reasons.

But nonetheless, as far as legislation, I think when you start looking at hybrid of of the public service corporations, which we talked about a little bit in our report, you start looking at things like the Port Authority of New York, New Jersey, Metropolitan airports of DC.

You're starting the TVA to some degree.

But TVA is federally controlled, you know, where presidents appoint people and fire people and that sort of thing.

To me, it's a little too close to the, to the federal government.

So I don't like the TVA model particularly, but it

is single purpose and it's probably better than DOE.

But I mean, I think though, it's in reverse.

I don't think you start looking at what's the corporate entity look like, the NuCorp look like until you have the state, the whole state sitting down with private industry, that said, this is what we want to do in my state.

How do I, how do I do that with a federal government without this going belly up when it when it when it changes, you know, it's getting out of the two, four and six year election cycle.

So starting with a state proposal, OK, and a governor saying we and, and private industry stepping up and saying, I will bring this money in and I will do these things.

And, and the state, it's got wide open eyes on how credible what they're promising and they have guard rails on it.

That's when you start.

So we have a host state, you have a DOE that says, this sounds reasonable to me.

Then you start putting together the legislation.

OK, so without a, without a host state and that this MOU that DOE is trying to work on, hopefully this summer, I mean, that would be the basis where a governor

says I will do this and the community says I'll do that.

And then it starts to go together.

And then the, the, the top, the Congress will follow the state and follow the private industry and, and, and DOE will be part of the catalyst bringing that together because the, the, the new entity will be implementing the Nuclear Waste Policy Act responsibilities of the secretary.

So it goes from the secretary to the NuCorp.

But the details of that, and there's lots of devils in the details.

I mean, there's things about who's going to pay the fee, when you going to pay the fee?

How you transition these things, how you get to corpus, all of these things.

And then you have to pass the legislation and you're going to deal with pay go and a whole lot of other little arcane things.

You got to get 60 votes in the Senate.

All of these kind of things work into it.

But starting with just the legislation alone for the entity, I think it's hard without a host state saying here's the, here's the plan.

ALLISON MACFARLANE: Just to add or contrast, I, I, I think I mean, clearly you need to amend the Nuclear

Waste Policy Act.

If you were looking at ways to do that again, you really have to solve both the financial problems and the implementer.

If you want to use a NuCorp as an implementer, Canada did this in 2002ish.

And so just look at what Canada did.

That's the law isn't very long.

It's very easy to read and you can adapt from there.

MANUEL CAMARGO: You know, thank you, thank you for the and thank you for the question.

OK, moving on to the next person online, we have Kalele Walker.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just from curiosity.

Are we at the hour mark soon?

MANUEL CAMARGO: Yes, we're over.

We're I think we are on over on time proceeding tonight.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How long are we proceeding tonight?

DAN STETSON: We're about to wrap it up are we?

MANUEL CAMARGO: Yes, as Dan would suggest we're about to wrap it out.

KALELE WALKER: Hello.

Can you hear me?

MANUEL CAMARGO: Yeah, sorry.

Should we have one last one last question from Kalele?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So we have one last question.

KALELE WALKER: Hello.

MANUEL CAMARGO: Yes, go ahead.

Go ahead, Kalele.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 3 minutes.

KALELE WALKER: OK, So I found it interesting that Lake Barrett's Slide 24 said complex social, political, legal, economic and financial interactions, blah, blah, blah will be necessary.

I'm wondering when the technical issues will be addressed.

It's so quick to say it's a political issue, but when you look at the technical stuff it becomes a real situation.

I attended numerous nuclear waste technical review board meetings and NRC technical meetings regarding canister degradation, fuel degradation in storage, in the problems with the higher burn ups.

Anything above 35 gigawatt-days per metric ton of uranium, all of a sudden all the hydride rate and the cladding and you have the radial hydrides and you have

the duct tailed ductile to brittle, so the stuff becomes more brittle and it, you know, then you kept cladding failure.

All of these things are very real and there's a lot of research that's been done on it, but none of this is being addressed at all at San Onofre or any of the other storage facilities.

And yes, it's been discussed, but only a one way conversation.

Like with the, if I ask a question tonight, you'll answer it, but usually my mic is is shut off.

So you can never do a follow up conversation.

We've never had a a thorough dialogue regarding canister degradation.

This is very serious because we know we have canisters that were stainless steel canisters that were gouged against carbon steel and we have carbon embedded into the canisters in certain cases.

This could lead to pit, pit corrosion, right?

I would, I think that the fact that, that Edison and the NRC and everybody with their inspection management plan that got approved by the Coastal Commission, you're not really, really, really taking this storage facility seriously.

So what is the canister degradation rate and what

are the consequences of canister failure?

You know, when the Garden Grove incident happened up there, you know, a few weeks ago and 50,000 people got evacuated, you know, because they thought it might blow.

There is absolutely 0 contingency plan for any kind of abnormality with a canister.

So I'm, I'm wondering who in this panel or who is willing to have a, a technical follow up conversation with the public with someone like myself.

Thank you.

ALICE MCNALLY: Dan, Alice McNally is waiting to speak.

MANUEL CAMARGO: Yeah, sorry.

Hold on here a second.

So that was Kalele, right.

I'm missing my name, yeah, OK, so Kalele Walker.

So Kalele, yeah, so I clearly you're frustrated.

We, I would, I would just say that we have had quite a bit of spent quite a bit of time overtime talking about canisters, canister integrity, aging management program, the related IMP inspection and maintenance, maintenance program.

I would, I would point back to the October 2025 special meeting that we had with a third-party expert, Doctor Jimmy Burns, who's with the Electric Power

Research Institute and a true expert in this space.

So, you know, we've tried real hard to to be clear about the the durability of these canisters, the duration of these canisters.

At the same time, yeah, these canisters are not designed for permanent, they're not, it's not a permanent solution and that's why we're talking here tonight about permanent solutions to the disposition of spent nuclear fuel.

So with that, Dan, I think, I think I, I have to apologize to a couple of folks on online who we did not get to, we did not get to…

DAN STETSON: Well Manuel, with, with all due respect to everyone, I, I think we're already over three hours.

And for those who might want to save their questions for our next meeting, we're certainly welcome to them.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

DAN STETSON: So I, I want to thank everyone for participating.

Victor has a…

VICTOR CABRAL: My brief comment.

DAN STETSON: OK.

VICTOR CABRAL: Thank every all, all the panelists,

but insightful discussion that the legislation approaches it's it's a viable one.

It's going to take a long time I think in my view and I think the the, the alternative that I mentioned earlier is that we've got to look to and, and it may be after five years of legislation that we end up where we are in administration, where they're moving and there's an option, there's windows that that open every once in a while.

I think there's a big window that's open right now.

I think we have to get behind this administration, see what they're doing, see if there's a way to push and use this committee's efforts to say this is how it can happen.

This is will, will what will make it happen right now and quicker and that's what we have to look at as a committee.

DAN STETSON: Thank you, thank you, Victor.

And I want to thank everyone for their comments on this marathon meeting.

Fred, I want to turn it over to you for some closing comments.

FRED BAILLY: Yes, I'll be quick, just want to thank everyone who joined.

Of course, thank you to to the panelists who who

joined us tonight.

I'm really encouraged by the growing momentum around spent fuel management.

We're certainly actively monitoring these developments.

We're positioning SONGS to be ready when the opportunity to ship our fuel materializes someday.

In the in the interim, our fuel remains safety safely stored and we'll continue inspection and monitoring of our canisters under our management spent fuel aging management programs.

We've had you in person and hybrid engagement.

We remain committed to transparency and we'll continue to engage with the community and we had one slide that refers to probably the next slide, songs.community.com is a great source for decommissioning update and please visit the site and reach out with with any questions, and with that, I'll turn it back to you Dan.

DAN STETSON: Thank you, Fred.

First, I want to thank all the participants in tonight's meeting.

Thanks to the technical team, everyone in the back of the room making this happen.

Thanks to the SCE leadership.

Chris, thanks for your excellent panel discussion.

Of course, special thanks to Allison, Lake, and Tom for your participation in this meeting.

You could have just done this virtually, but instead you made the trip, you showed up in person to meet the members of the local community, to look them in the eye, to address their concerns, and for that we sincerely thank you.

We learned a lot about the path forward it, from what I can understand, there is a number of elements in this.

Number one, we really need a new implementer, not subject to election cycles, to manage the transportation, storage, and disposal of spent fuel.

Number two, we need reliable funding.

Of course we do.

And all of this, this path must be built on a foundation of trust.

And this trust must be earned through demonstrated competence, a belief that the plans are made with the community's best interests in mind, and listening to and responding to the community's concerns.

Next slide, please, one more, next slide please.

Here you can see our schedule for 2026, so please mark your calendars.

Our third quarter meeting will be on August 27th and we'll tentatively focus on the Department of Energy's Canister monitoring demonstration project at SONGS.

I'm really looking forward to this.

I remember talking with Paul Murray about this a long time ago, so I'm glad it's coming to fruition.

Details for the meet next meeting will be posted on the CEP meeting web page, next slide.

Thank you again for this marathon meeting.

Thank you for productive and an engaging and most of all, a civilized meeting.

Every voice is important.

While we may not agree on everything, we all want the safe storage of the spent fuel while it remains at SONGS and we all want it safe and we all want it safe and timely removals.

Safe travels everyone, good night.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sir.