

NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING CITIZENS ADVISORY PANEL (“NDCAP”)

Monday September 22, 2025

Hybrid Meeting (in-person and virtual)

Meeting Minutes

NDCAP MEMBERS PRESENT

- Pat O’Brien, Director of Government Affairs and Communications; Representing Dave Noyes from Holtec International (in-person)
- Joe McDonough, Acting on behalf of Joe Moylan; Holtec International (in-person)
- Kelly O’Brien, Representing Local 369 (in-person)
- Curtis Liddle, Plymouth Board of Selectman (in-person)
- Mike Fortini, Senate Minority Leader Appointee (in-person)
- Pine duBois, Speaker of the House of Representative Appointee (in-person)
- Kevin Canty, NDCAP Chair; Vice Chair Plymouth Select Board; Representing Plymouth Select Board (in-person)
- Mary Lampert, Senate President Appointee (in-person)
- Barry Potvin, Member of the Plymouth Board of Health Senate President Appointee (in-person)
- Greg Wade, Representing Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities Appointee (in-person)
- David Bryant, Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency (virtual)
- Mary Waldron, Executive Director Old Colony Planning Council (virtual)
- James Lampert, Speaker of the House Appointee (virtual)
- Jack Priest, Division Director of the Radiation Control Program for the Department of Public Health; Appointed by Commissioner Goldstein for Department of Public Health (virtual)
- Kevin Canty makes additional comment that Andrew Gottlieb asked for the NDCAP panel to be informed that he is unable to attend tonight’s meeting due to the observance of Rosh Hashana.

14 CMR 188.00

- First agenda item read by Kevin Canty; an act to promote energy diversity. Kevin Canty begins the meeting with a reading of the enabling statute, outlining the purpose,

responsibilities and duties of the Nuclear Decommissioning Citizens Advisory Panel. This statute will be read out at the beginning of each meeting going forward.

- Minimum of four public meetings/year.
- Written report being provided annually to the Governor and to the Energy Committees of the General Court.
- Serve as a conduit for public information and education.
- Receive reports on the Decommissioning Trust Fund.

Pat O'Brien (Holtec) provides an update:

SWIM LANES UPDATE

- Waterfall schedule; nothing has changed since the last meeting,

PILGRIM SITE MAP

- The usual overview of the site. The red buildings are the ones that have been removed. The blue ones are proposed to stay. The process buildings in the orange color. And the active demolition is the little yellow building on the PowerPoint slide.

ONGOING DEMOLITION UPDATE

- Review of Interior Demolition Slide.
- Holtec has been doing a lot of work internal to the building:
 - ❖ in the process of currently removing the Hydrogen Modular Skid; abatement and disposal as well.
 - ❖ PO development condenser bay TSI removal
 - ❖ Power Block de-energization (Cold and dark); removing systems no longer needed during the decommissioning.
- ❖ Review of External Demolition Slide. Holtec is working through wastewater treatment abandonment.
 - ❖ Conceptual design to transition to Title V complete
 - ❖ Pre submittal conference with MassDEP completed- 6/23/25
 - ❖ Submit for approval to MassDEP- 10/7/25
 - ❖ DEP approval target date- December 2025
 - ❖ Contract approved installer- February 2026
 - ❖ Begin construction- April 2026
- Review of upcoming demolition activities:
 - ❖ Abandon Diverse and Flexible (FLEX) Coping Strategy water wells, direct openings to the aquifers.
 - ❖ Remove and dispose of Condenser Bay Thermal System insulation
 - ❖ Dispose of Drywell Equipment Hatch concrete shield blocks
 - ❖ Remove and salvage Emergency Diesel Generators (proposed)

MASSACHUSETTS CONTINGENCY PLAN ACTIONS UPDATE

- Phase II Comprehensive Site Assessment Report and Risk Characterization submitted April 2025
- Holtec continues with quarterly sampling
- PERA-3 PCB soil pile removal on schedule (3rd-4th quarter 2025)

REACTOR VESSEL SEGMENTATION ACTIONS

- Removal of In-Core Monitor Housings
- Reactor Vessel Radiological Waste Characterization
- Reactor Vessel drain down
- Reactor Vessel segmentation
- PowerPoint slide depicts drained down and coded reactor vessel cavity

REGULATORY UPDATE

- License Termination Plan submission delayed until March 2026. The changes are based on Oyster Creek which Holtec submitted earlier this year. The schedule changes do permit the full development of Derived Concentration Guideline levels (DCGL's) for all pathways and incorporate lessons learned from NRC feedback on other plant submittals. Delay does not impact downstream milestones for Final Status Survey or Partial Site Release.

SITE SOURCE TERM REDUCTION

- Holtec continues to make good progress with moving of source term at the site. In 2025, Holtec removed about 644 curies of activity; 25,000 cubic feet of material from the site and safely transported to; the majority to our partner in West Texas (WCS)

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS FOR PAT O'BRIEN (HOLTEC REPORT)

- James Lampert asks a question. One of the early slides you displayed on the Internal Demolition. Is that low-level waste? Joe McDonough confirms that the majority by volume is but he does not have breakdowns; approximately 90% would be dry active waste.
- Dr. Barry Potvin has a question. Do you have an update on the water volume that remains. Joe McDonough replies, they are tracking 835,000 gallons. Barry Potvin asks, that's currently all in the torus. Joe McDonough replies, no, it's in the Spent Fuel Pool.
- Mary Lampert asks a question. How many vents or hatches are there in the torus? Joe McDonough replies, there are 2 primary hatches. Mary Lampert confirms, so, there are only 2 hatches. So, during evaporation, there are only 2 egress routes. Joe McDonough replies, there are 2 egress routes, is correct. In fairness, the dry well communicates with the torus. Mary Lampert replies that she is looking for information regarding venting for evaporation. Joe McDonough replies, theoretically, it could leave through the manways, through that interface with the dry well and then where it ties into the ventilation system. Jack Priest replies, but there is no heat source or driving force for evaporation in the torus, correct? Joe McDonough replies, nothing installed. It would just depend on whatever ambient conditions exist. Mary Lampert replies, is it correct that it didn't seem to be a great difference if the heaters were on or not in the rate of evaporation. Is that correct?

Joe McDonough replies, no, that's not correct. The ambient temperature if it's forced convection would have a much higher evaporation rate. James Lampert replies, how much higher? Joe McDonough replies, it would depend on conditions with respect to surface area of the volume of water. It has a velocity wind across the surface impacting it. Then largest degree would be whatever moisture contents in the air. So, essentially humidity. Whatever the surrounding ambient conditions can remove. James Lampert replies, if you go back and look at all the figures that Dave Noyes has given us over the past few months. I think you will find that Mrs. Lampert is correct that the evaporation rate or at least the loss of water, which is the only way I know to measure, how much is evaporated, did not change much relative to summer versus with a month that the heaters were on. Could you verify that information and get back to us? Joe McDonough replies, yes, we will. Over the last week, we tracked what we lose on a weekly basis. Over a seven-day period, it was just over 600 gallons for that week.

INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP (IWG) REPORT

- MassDEP Southeast Office Regional Director Gerard Martin provides an update to the NDCAP panel.
- As far as asbestos is concerned. Asbestos abatement is completed of the seal condenser, condenser bay, hydrogen skid condenser bay and auxiliary boiler room. MassDEP is working with Holtec on upcoming asbestos abatement projects including the CIV's turbine deck, the turbine truck lock and the condenser bay.
- In regard to a wastewater update, what Holtec reported on previously is pretty much what MassDEP would have provided as an update. MassDEP is working with Holtec to get this squared away soon.
- MassDEP is looking for a Title V plan, as well as a report on how to decommission and abandon the existing wastewater treatment facility. Once received, MassDEP will issue the Title V plan. It will be reviewed and approved, possibly with conditions, and we will provide comments on the abandonment plan.
- As far as the MCP is concerned, Holtec mentioned that Phase II was complete. MassDEP did take a look at that and conducted an initial review. It does look like it fits the requirements of the regulations. It is a little tricky because it is going to be a little bit of a moving target, as they continue to take buildings down; additional sources may be identified which will have to be folded into the existing Phase II report through addendums and things like that. It looks like what Holtec has done so far, fits the requirements of the MCP.

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS FOR MASSDEP SOUTHEAST OFFICE REGIONAL DIRECTOR

GERARD MARTIN

- Pine duBois has a question. As far as Title V plan, that is a plan for decommissioning the septic. Do you know what future date that might be? Gerard Martin replies, I think we are looking at this Fall to go through the process. Pine duBois replies, so that is just an approval of the plan. When will, the decommissioning won't happen. I'm thinking of the guards that are there, the spent fuel pool situation. That there still needs to be some sort of treatment there. Right? Gerard Martin replies, yes. Holtec will submit a plan to decommission the

existing wastewater treatment plant. MassDEP will review and provide comments. Once MassDEP comments on that, Holtec can then move forward on that.

- Mary Lampert has a question. Has it been completed, doing a radiological survey on the land from Rocky Hill Road to 3A. Gerard Martin replies, I'll turn to Jack for that. Jack Priest replies, that is a question for Holtec. Joe McDonough replies, all the surface scanning has been completed. But the reporting phase remains incomplete. Mary Lampert replies, when will it be available? Joe McDonough replies, I can bring the date back to the panel. I don't have it on me on hand.

DISCUSSION TO PREPARE FOR NRC PRESENTATION AT NOVEMBER MEETING

- Kevin Canty and Mary Gatslick have been contacted by a member of the NRC. They were also in touch with a commissioner who would like the NRC to present on an annual basis to the NDCAP panel. Kevin Canty confirms that the NDCAP panel would like that if it were possible.
- The NRC has a number of topics that they would like to present on including inspection results. Kevin Canty did request that they also address topics that were provided in an email regarding a number of topics. Kevin Canty provides a summary of the topics that will be included at the November meeting. The NRC did confirm that they will not cover the topic of environmental justice which had been requested by the NDCAP panel.
- The November meeting will include both the NRC presentation and Q & A session. The NRC estimates that it will take approximately 45 minutes for their presentation and at least 15 minutes for questions and answers.
- Mary Lampert has a couple of comments regarding procedure. She makes note that there are too many topics for only an hour. She would hope that it could be extended or the NRC could be requested ahead of time to spend a longer period of time. Mary Lampert asks, who specifically did you contact? Kevin Canty confirms that the contact at NRC is Doug Tifft. Mary Lampert also recommends that during the Q & A, the public follow the panel which will be better for the flow of dialogue. And that way the NRC wouldn't have to stay and listen to the minutes. James Lampert comments that this is a procedure that they have followed before. Kevin Canty suggests that the panel make adjustments to some items on the agenda in light of the NRC being in attendance. Mary Lampert would also like to request that the NRC address the issues in a site-specific way as opposed to their comments being of the generic type. Their environmental statement is old and it's generic. Kevin Canty confirms that their presentation is their presentation, but the panel will have the opportunity to ask them any question that they want.
- James Lampert has a few questions. You mentioned the departure of environmental justice. The NRC issued the Federal Registry Notice in April that said in response to the President's directive, they had basically taken that out of their agenda. They got rid of what they wrote years ago. That is why that's gone. Second, do we know who is going to be here? Kevin Canty replies, we were not given the names. We were just told that they will be members of the NRC Inspection Team. James Lampert is raising a question on that. The NRC has a number of divisions and it strikes me that the two divisions we want would be the Decommissioning and the Spent Fuel Management. James Lampert comments that the Inspection Team may not be as well versed as the Division heads and their people. He further states that he would

hope that the NDCAP panel would get presenters from those two divisions. Kevin Canty replies, understood.

- Curtis Liddle has a question. If it is appropriate, can we get some of these issues addressed in writing before their presentation. Some of them seem generic like the site release standards. I don't think these are going to be specific to Pilgrim. They will be standard from the NRC as one example. Kevin Canty replies, we can invite them to provide written responses if they would like. But obviously it is up to them what they provide to us but we can ask.
- James Lampert makes a comment. The NRC has its own release standard. Under the settlement agreement, Holtec is required to do its best to meet the lower standard. So, we really have two standards in play here.
- Mary Lampert makes a comment. On spent fuel, I noticed that one of the main issues was missing and that's security. And I would like to see that added. Kevin Canty confirms, security of the dry cask onsite. Mary Lampert replies, correct. Certainly, a lot could be said as illustrated with Gordon Thompson, that you don't have to have certain classification. But it certainly can be discussed. I think in my mind, security, corrosion and offsite storage are the three main items. As far as corrosion, I would hope they would be asked the status of hot cells and the capability to fix a cracked cask. Like in Switzerland, they have inside, a dry process where you can take the bad exterior off and put them in a new canister. Hot cells are not in existence in the United States. And therefore, you cannot properly fix a cracked cask. So, it is to our interest and the rest of the country, that this capability be fast-tracked. Kevin Canty replies, o.k.
- Pine duBois makes a comment. I appreciate the work that you put into this because I think it's good. I would just include the climate resilience in the regulatory site release standards as well. I think the cleanup has to do with, we are very vulnerable and there is a lot that will be happening over the next ten years in regard to sea level rise. So, I think that we need to address that in each and every corner of our efforts. And I think that you have it in number six in the spent fuel pool but we need it in the regulatory site release standards, as well. Kevin Canty replies, o.k. Pine duBois further states that she appreciates what Mary had to say. I think we are talking about an assessment of security, right? Is everything covered, basically. Mary Lampert replies, and we know what exists now. Many of us see the vulnerabilities of current security and therefore, do they have any plans to make it more secure. Pine duBois replies, and what is the window for this. Mary Lampert replies, exactly and has an additional question for Holtec in regard to this. The ISFSI is high up, what altitude? Pat O'Brien replies, 75 feet above mean sea level. The previous one was 25 ½. Mary Lampert replies, so what period of time would there be a threat from sea level rise. Pat O'Brien replies, the one thing I would add for the whole panel to know. DOE, and I know this because Holtec has been one of the consortiums working around the country on regional collaborative-based siting for spent fuel. DOE plans to put out an expression of interest for communities to continue to be educated. So, this is their Phase II of a three-part process. That should come out now that Ted Garrish has been appointed which happened last week, sometime between now and February. So, I'm just giving you a heads up. DOE is moving forward with that process to site the regional facilities. It does include interim storage and reprocessing. Pat O'Brien references Arkansas and the Mountain West and that they are very interested, as well.

- Mary Lampert makes an additional comment. I would like the NRC and perhaps this panel consider, is it more realistic to keep together interim with permanent. One of the downsides to hosting an interim, is that you see, you aren't kidding us. We are in essence, going to be a permanent. And so, if the emphasis were more to finding a permanent. It would make sense to have the interim be attached there. So, you do not risk the double transportation. Pat O'Brien replies, to your point, DOE is looking at three things. One is just an interim storage facility by itself, one is interim storage with reprocessing, and one is what they were calling interim with a cooling off period for permanent geological. So, it was 3 potential facilities each having a different path in the process. That's what they are going to put out. Mary Lampert replies, what do you mean by cooling off. Pat O'Brien replies, so basically, even if you get it to a permanent repository site; there is a period of time before you can put it in the deep geologic. So, it would be interim into the deep geologic. So, that's the way they are phrasing it. At least from everything we've been told, at a high level, what's coming from DOE. Mary Lampert replies, part of it is language.
- Pine duBois asks, if there is a web link on that particular aspect of DOE and if you could send that to us. Pat O'Brien replies, yes, when it comes out. I can definitely do that. We are waiting. We have heard a timeframe from October to February.
- Mary Lampert has an additional question. I understand DOE produced a site map (in the 80's or 90's) with their criteria, and they colored in the map where throughout the United States, where the siting criteria listed could be met. Is there anything of that sort updated now? Pat O'Brien replies, I haven't seen that. I guess the best way it's been described to me. the EOI is going to do a year. And if a community wants to short track and say we're interested, they will go to the front of the queue. And then they'll do the site specific, area specific evaluation, for whatever criteria they have. I don't know what the criteria are. But I'm assuming it's geologic, seismic and all the other things you would need for that. That's what we've been told. I haven't seen it in writing.
- James Lampert makes a comment. Basically, from a meeting sponsored by DOE, a couple of weeks ago, we understood DOE is working on siting criteria now. This was a group that DOE asked to look into; how do you get cooperation potentially to have a site somewhere in the civilian world. But they are working on it. The question is, and one of the fears always expressed is, why- don't you have to get that out first before you start looking at sites. Because otherwise you run the risk of criteria being adjusted to fit the site.
- Curtis Liddle has a question. The NRC, if we are asking about reprocessing policy. Is that appropriate for the NRC? Kevin Canty replies, I think it's still something. They said they could cover it. So, apparently, they think it's appropriate. Pat O'Brien replies, I assume they are just going to tell you what DOE is doing.
- Kevin Canty makes a comment. So, they are looking to do at least 45 minutes of presentation and 15 minutes of Q & A. So, in order to keep our agenda reasonably manageable and not erode the quality of any of our work. I would propose that a few items that are traditionally on our agenda be waived for that one meeting and then restored back to the regular agenda in January. Kevin Canty reviews items to keep or remove for the next meeting agenda and asks the NDCAP panel for any feedback. NDCAP panel agrees with the agenda adjustments for the November meeting.

- Mary Lampert would like a point of clarification regarding open meeting law. Can I submit documents to all members of the panel without commentary. Kevin Canty replies, well, it would depend if any of the documents contain a statement of opinion, than no. Mary Lampert replies, statement of opinion by whom? Kevin Canty replies, if you are sharing an opinion with the panel. Mary Lampert replies, no, just a document. Kevin Canty replies, right, but documents is a category of things. So, documents can contain opinions. So, if you, as a panel member are submitting something that contains an opinion to a quorum of panel members; than that is potentially violate of the open meeting law. James Lampert replies, I think that's open to some question, Mr. Chairman. Kevin Canty replies, you may but I do not. James Lampert replies, that is not how I read the open meeting law. Mary Lampert replies, well, in other words, let the AG describe and decide. Mary Lampert replies, I have a lot of materials on spent fuel, for example. Kevin Canty replies, I understand that. But, we are not a reading club. Mary Lampert replies, you don't have to read it. Jack Priest makes a suggestion. If Mary wanted to send an email to members of the panel with a link where she has those documents without an opinion. I don't believe that would violate the open meeting law. James Lampert replies, I agree. Kevin Canty replies, it would really depend and it would be a factual based inquiry on what, if there are opinion related documents or statements in it, it could be. There have been issues with the dissemination of materials in the past. So, it's difficult to make a blanket statement as to whether disseminating materials in the way you are suggesting, could or could not. I definitely think it could violate the open meeting law. Whether it would necessarily, would be based on the contents of the individual publication which I, at this point, am unprepared to comment on. So, I would just give you that level of guidance. Jack Priest replies, alternatively Mary, if you in this meeting presented the panel in the meeting, your hyperlink where those documents are located. That would not violate the open meeting law. Kevin Canty replies, you could read out your hyperlink at a meeting. You could do that. Mary Lampert replies, I'm going to think more on this. Kevin Canty replies, o.k. Pine duBois asks for additional clarification regarding the water topic that will be given as part of the NRC presentation. Kevin Canty replies, that the Q & A will allow time for any additional questions or clarifications needed.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

- Review of meeting minutes including edits and corrections from July 28, 2025 meeting. Mary Lampert makes motion to approve the minutes. Curtis Liddle seconds the motion.
(13 approve, 0 opposition, 1 abstention)
- The proposed meeting minutes approved of July 28. 2025.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

NDCAP has allotted thirty minutes on the agenda for public questions and comments for the panel. Each citizen that would like to participate is given five minutes at the podium.

- First citizen Rosemay Shields, League of Women Voters of the Cape Cod area. And number one, I thought Seth Pickering was coming to this meeting. The panel informs Rosemary that Seth has retired. In the last meeting, wasn't it said that Seth Pickering was going to come to this meeting or was that a joke. Kevin Canty replies, I have no recollection of that. I would

like to thank Mr. Gerard Martin for being here. And I'm glad to hear that there was an asbestos abatement and you guys are working with Holtec for the asbestos abatement. But I just want you to know that I've attended these meetings since 2018 and two years before that, they kept talking about asbestos abatement and everything was going great. And next thing we know, Holtec was then fined \$200,000 because they didn't take care of the asbestos. And I just want to make sure, you said that you had asbestos abatement and everything was going o.k. And I would like to acknowledge that and make sure that in the future; if all of a sudden we find out that you guys said yeah we are doing asbestos abatement, but suddenly you aren't. I suggest that Holtec then get fined \$200,000 for every time that they said that they were doing it but they weren't. I just want to put that on the record. So, sorry. The second thing I wanted to talk about is a couple of meetings ago. David Noyes asked that the Clapp report on cancer be presented and talked about in this committee. And I've been waiting to hear about that. Are you guys putting that on the agenda or not? David Noyes recommended it and it was all accepted. You guys did a vote and everything else. So, are we going to hear about the Clapp report? Kevin Canty replies, that is in the queue for potential future agenda items if we can find a speaker. That is in the queue, yes. Rosemary Shields replies, o.k. I didn't realize that you didn't have a speaker. Maybe we could help you find one. Mary Lampert replies, how about Dr. Clapp? Kevin Canty replies, we are working on trying to secure that. Mary Lampert replies, I have his contact information. Rosemary Shields comments, finally the Environmental Engineering Science magazine published a Harvard study that collected samples from indoor home dust and surface soils; 46 original samples from houses near the plant. And they found detected Cesium-137, Lead-210, Thorium-234 and traces of Cobalt-60 and Uranium-235. These were all radioisotopes that they found were being released by the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station. And they were found in the soils around these houses and in their homes. And I would just like this report, I would like to give it to NDCAP and put it in the minutes that there is this report. Because I know at the end of the year, you take your minutes and you give it to the Governor. And I would like the Governor to be aware of this. Kevin Canty replies, so you can submit them online. Rosemary Shields replies, I will submit these online. And then it will be put in the minutes? Kevin Canty replies, yes. Rosemary Shields replies, thank you. Pine duBois asks, can you say when the date of the report is? Rosemary Shields replies, it just came out. I have it here. I can show it to you after the meeting. Mary Lampert comments, I circulated it. Barry Potvin comments, I believe it was August 2025.

- Second citizen Diane Turco, Cape Downwinders. Thank you for the opportunity to speak again. Last meeting I presented the NDCAP with public safety concerns that have been concerns for years and years now. And I was directed to come here by the DPH when I asked them if they would look into the whistleblower letter and the serious health and safety allegations that were in that letter that they also received. So, I brought it to the NDCAP and found out that these cannot be addressed. Our request that the NDCAP advise Governor Healey to initiate an independent investigation into the serious allegations in that letter. That the NDCAP address the serious public safety concerns regarding the security at the Pilgrim site and also that the NDCAP make a statement regarding the sixteen towns plus the town of Duxbury town meeting that voted for the Governor and the state to enforce state laws that would prohibit the evaporation of the radioactive wastewater. As I understand from the rules

now, that this has to be submitted. My letter of request to discuss these serious public safety and health concerns must be brought forward by a member of the panel. And so, I'm here to ask if any panel member would take this on and present it on behalf of the public to address our serious concerns. So, would a member of the panel consider presenting this as a member. So that we can have an open and transparent discussion. Kevin Canty replies, thank you, do you have anything else? Diane Turco replies, I'm waiting for an answer. Mary Lampert replies, my question would be, the second was security. The fact this will be brought forward in the public and talked to the NRC. Would that be satisfactory? Diane Turco replies, well, I was suggesting that it be brought to the state to consider. The NRC has done nothing. We have already addressed the NRC multiple times on this issue and we have addressed the state on this issue. The public needs some response. These are serious situations that are in our neighborhoods and in our communities. And no one is addressing them. So, we are coming to the NDCAP and asking that someone here bring this up and have a discussion. So, there can be a road to resolution. We have gone to the NRC and we have gone to the state. We don't know where else we could go. Mary Lampert replies, both security and the fact of all the various towns including Plymouth, overwhelmingly voted in opposition to evaporation and for the state to take action. I think our two topics that are worthy of bringing forward so I would be a messenger for that. And as far as evaporation, I certainly think Rosemary Shields discussion of the recent study by Dr. Kaltofen and the Harvard School of Public Health underscores the importance of evaporation and the state perhaps stepping up. And this would be an appropriate discussion and then what comes out of it, of this group, to go forward to the Governor. Because we do make advice. We have the authority to advise the Governor. Kevin Canty replies, thank you. Diane Turco replies, so I'm asking if somebody from the NDCAP take this request from the public and bring it forward as an NDCAP member. So that these serious issues that we've been bringing up for years and years, will be addressed. There was also a public advisory question to twenty towns regarding the dry casks and the seriousness of the lack of security at that site. And I submitted a photo of where people have been able to get up, right next to the casks on that driveway. So, my question is, is there somebody on the NDCAP who will take this petition and address it via the NDCAP for open discussion and transparency with the public. Mary Lampert replies, I'm not sure what I'm supposed to do. I am interested in the last two. I wasn't interested in the first. Diane Turco replies, I'm asking that you take this whole, that the public has been addressing for years, to be brought forward for discussion for openness and transparency on the NDCAP board. Kevin Canty comments that the five minutes are up. There will be a discussion later in the agenda where Diane can see if one or more members of the panel propose one or more of her suggestions at that time. Diane Turco replies, the silence to the response to this public issue is deafening. Kevin Canty replies, thank you. Diane Turco replies, that is why there is no one here.

- Third citizen Brian Campbell, retired electrical engineer. I strongly support discharging treated water from Pilgrim Nuclear Station into Cape Cod Bay. I've reported after dilution 80 gallons of discharged water would equal the radiation dose received from eating a banana. Google AI reported that there are over two million tritium exit signs in the United States alone. And that the average sign has about twenty-five curies of tritium or about half the amount of tritium or less than a milligram in mass. Remaining in Pilgrim, approximately eighty thousand

gallons of tritiated water. The presentations by Holtec to this panel shows Holtec to be a good corporate citizen performing the Pilgrim Decommissioning in a truthful and open manner that should be commended. Massachusetts is heavily promoting solar power as part of its plan to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. The state's aggressive strategy involves massive expansion of solar and wind capacity along with significant incentives and policies for utility companies, businesses and residential property owners. Virtually all of the solar panels are likely to come from China for the foreseeable future. That's because China dominates every single segment of the solar panel supply chain globally. It makes 97% percent of the solar panel wafers, 85% of the solar cells, 79% of the poly silicone and 75% of the solar panel modules. Chinese authorities have created concentration forced labor camps for Uyghur muslims where one of the main products they make are solar panels. An open mic exchange between Russian President Putin and Chinese leader Xi took place in Beijing on September 3rd where these leaders discussed organ replacement leading to life extension for 150 years. China's murder for organs industry has 60-100,000 so called organ donations from China's death row political prisoners per year where people from all over the world travel to China and finance this billions of dollars industry. Reuters censored its coverage of this open mic moment. Why Massachusetts is counting on China's genocidal solar panels to achieve its 2050 net zero goals. But reality and physics prevent this. Once more, as people become even more moderately literate on nuclear power versus industrial solar and particularly wind. It will be game set match for these hugely inefficient boondoggles that do not meet the needs of any modern society in which completely failed unless supported by reliable base flow power of which nuclear is the most efficient and least harmful to the environment. Google has stopped claiming carbon free since 2007. Since renewable energy credits indulges us, can't do AI artificial intelligence. The tech rows and China know this which may be why Governor Healey is suddenly open to more gas pipelines and nuclear power. Maybe the AI industry tech rows have enough money to overpower the 2.3 billion dollar per year anti-nuclear Sierra Club like NGO cabals and USA will start building new nuclear power again. In the new AI world, U.S. Secretary of Energy Chris Wright reports watts=intelligence. 2025 is the time to build new nuclear power in the United States. AI tech leadership and not to concede AI tech leadership to our enemies should be our priority and our national security priority. Thank you. Kevin Canty replies, thank you Mr. Campbell.

- Fourth citizen Richard Rothstein, virtual participant. I have a question for Mr. Priest and a question for our Chair Mr. Canty. My question with Mr. Priest has to do with meteorology considerations and my question for Mr. Canty has to do with Mrs. Lampert's comment about dissemination of materials for the panel. But first Mr. Priest, I know that the on-site meteorological tower was dismantled sometime ago. I'm curious if the DPH is still operating offsite real time meteorological network. I think there are three sites offsite within the ten-mile plume EPC when that was applicable. And I believe Duxbury is also operating a fourth site, on the tip of Duxbury too, as part of that network possibly. A quick status of that, is it still operational, then I will explain why I'm concerned. Jack Priest replies, thanks for the question, Rich. Yes, that real time monitoring system is still in operation and being supported. I believe that the MET tower that was on the gurnet was relocated to the Harbor Masters office because of difficulty in maintaining and servicing that equipment out at the gurnet. Richard Rothstein replies, thank you. This is my question, not so much even about

the dry cask storage in the unlikely event of a radiological emergency, per se. But I would like to steer everyone on the panel, particularly those that live in Southeastern MA also in the Plymouth pine barrens region. That the Plymouth Independent local newspaper online over the last two weeks, has two impressive articles about wildfire history, past and even close to present, in our region. And the town of Plymouth along with the Fire Chief and also DCR, they're in the process right now of trying to develop evacuation plans. I'm kind of sensitive to what you can do to be fire wise where you live and in the region. The evacuation planning is something I was pretty in tune to when I was on the nuclear matters committee as well as the NDCAP. So, I just want to bring this to everybody's attention there. And it's possible that those operating DPH entities, particularly if you can have wind shifts flow reversals happening that can impact the evacuation planning. Certainly wildfires, you aren't going to necessarily shelter in place, obviously you want to get out of there, nothing like a radiological emergency. But I just want to bring that to everybody's attention. And there is also a survey form on the second article that appeared this week where the town and the state agencies are looking for input from residents on what their knowledge is, what their concerns are and what they would be looking for. My other comment and question I would say has to do with. I know over the years, and I was very in tune to the open meeting law that to get the materials out in time; even when we were meeting monthly. We never seemed to run into issues in terms of disseminating publicly available documents to panel members, either on the NDCAP or on the NMC. That could save a lot of time not having to present it at the meeting there, this is available, then waiting another month to be able to talk about it later there. I appreciate what Mary was bringing up, which brings up a question if we are going to be sedantic about that aspect of open meeting law about disseminating publicly available materials there. I wonder how we were able to get out our annual reports over the years when we were communicating internally on draft reports and information as reports were being prepared. I think I made my question and point clear. I just wanted to bring up a little history and raise my considerations and concerns. I'm done. Kevin Canty replies, alright, thank you.

PROPOSED FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS FROM PANEL MEMBERS

- NRC Presentation- November 2025 Meeting
- Dry Cask Storage Discussion- January 2026 Meeting; Dr. Barry Potvin & David Noyes
- Clapp Report- waiting for MassDEP Seth Pickering's Permanent Replacement
- Study by Marco Kaltofen and the Harvard School of Public Health- Mary Lampert would like this circulated to the panel and wondering if members of the state agencies are able to vote yes/no. Mary Lampert asks question to Kevin Canty, did you circulate it? Kevin Canty replies, no, but the state agency staff stated that they no longer have that requirement anymore. Mary Lampert replies, o.k., that's good to know. Mary Lampert comments, there was a report in the scientific journal August 2025 of a study by Dr. Marco Kaltofen and the Harvard School of Public Health, what they did was sample soil and house dust close to Pilgrim (less than a mile out to 8.1 miles) In it, what they found from the dust and soil was that the greatest readings came less than one mile. They detected uranium, anthurium which confirmed that radioactive particles were power plant origin. They also found highest activities of Cesium-137 and Lead-210, the closest to Pilgrim. Testing of soil and dust collected less than one mile showed up to 20x the background

activity of Cesium-137 and Lead-210, elevated thorium, cobalt and uranium were also detected. So obviously, I think this study is an important study, small but important. And it was particularly important in regard to two items. One is its relation to evaporation and the concerns of people who live close to Pilgrim. And they were able to determine by the half life of the isotopes whether these were due to previous releases or recent releases. And so, I think it would be interesting from that point of view and important from that point of view to add the importance to Diane's recommendation to continue looking at evaporation. Also, I think it's important because the town is interested in acquiring if possible, the land less than one mile from Pilgrim. And so therefore, that's why I asked the question to him, how thorough has the analysis been of radionuclides in the soil. Because clearly you want a clean bill of health before the town, if that be an option, takes it over. And so therefore, I think it would be important. You mentioned that David Noyes would like Dr. Clapp's study, it's an old study, 1990 study. And also the re-review of that study that was done by the Boston Edison industry and then the report from that study. You could marry the two on the same date; have Clapp's study and Marco Department School of Public Health. So, that's my recommendation. I think it would be of benefit to the panel, benefit to the public, and I think it is taking our responsibility to provide this information to the Governor and others of interest. Kevin Canty replies, so are you looking to have the author of the study Dr. Marco Kaltofen as a presenter? Mary Lampert replies, yes, and maybe he would share the presentation with the doctors from Harvard School of Public Health. Kevin Canty replies, o.k., and it would be in relation to evaporation, soil, indoor radionuclides related to Pilgrim from evaporation. Mary Lampert replies, yes. Pine duBois comments, so was the conclusion in the study that it was from evaporation. Mary Lampert replies, no, the conclusion of the study represents a potential source of internal radiation dose to people in the surrounding area. Because in the dust, if you read the study, in the dust that gets kicked up and they inhale it. Pine duBois replies, but you said that it was from evaporation. Mary Lampert replies, no, I didn't. Pine duBois replies, oh o.k. so they're not sure what the source is. Mary Lampert replies, they are sure that the source is Pilgrim and from the half life of the radionuclides. Pine duBois replies, so some sort of exhaust from the plant likely. Mary Lampert replies, that is likely. Pine duBois replies, there was no explosion over there, right? Joe McDonough replies, no, that's correct. Pine duBois replies, is there anything other than exhaust that you can imagine would cause something like this. Joe McDonough replies, so the 2024 offsite dose report has been put out, it's on the internet (NRC website). We have reported instances of cobalt and cesium-137. So my question would be, is the findings bounded by that? I would be interested to see what dose equivalency is and compare that to our offsite dose report. Mary Lampert replies, well that's why it would be important to have them come here and explain. Pine duBois replies, and then there could be a discussion. Mary Lampert replies, and then there could be a discussion. Pine duBois replies, I think that would be great. Mary Lampert replies, yes. And you can circulate the report. Kevin Canty replies, yes, if it's an agenda item. Whatever the presenter wants included whether it's a slide deck or both or whatever. So, I would ask, you mentioned pairing it with the Clapp report item which may or may not be possible. So, just based on availability of say both speakers, for example. So, do you think it could stand on its own, if necessary? Mary Lampert replies,

yes. It would be just like a health study extravaganza. Kevin Canty replies, o.k. I just wanted to clarify. Barry Potvin replies, I believe by virtue of the fact that I'm somewhat of a public health expert. That I'm knowledgeable. I've already read the study. I'm familiar with it. I'm also familiar with the DPH's every five-year report on standardized cancer incidences in not only Plymouth but surrounding towns. So, I think what Mary is suggesting probably would fit in with someone else's suggestion that at least one agenda item should actually focus on public health and especially cancer in the surrounding area. And I certainly can provide some information about that. I can also find additional speakers for it. Kevin Canty replies, so that sounds like a different item than what Mrs. Lampert is proposing. Because she is talking about this specific study related to soil samples and dust. Barry Potvin replies, it is related to elevated cancer risks. Kevin Canty replies, well, we can take that up as a separate proposal, but I do think that is separate from what Mrs. Lampert is suggesting. I mean you could make an inference; I suppose from the data there. But I would take that as being a separate item. Barry Potvin replies, the paper makes no reference to where or how exactly the exposures to those materials has come from the plant. They just state that there is a geographic sort of centering where the problem is the greatest and the source. Because of the nature of the radioactive materials they are finding, it's certainly from fission reactions. Kevin Canty replies, o.k., we can have a separate vote on that item, if you would like. But, I think that is separate from what Mrs. Lampert is proposing. Barry Povin replies, do you agree it is separate or is it strongly related? Mary Lampert replies, I think it's related but it's separate. Pine duBois replies, may I ask a question, Mr. Potvin, do you think that what you are suggesting and what Mary is suggesting would expand the decommissioning to a wider area because there is evidence of health threats that should be cleaned up. Barry Potvin replies, what I'm suggesting is that there is a standardized incidence rate for cancers and there are quite a few of them that are well above the state average in the immediate vicinity of the nuclear power plant. Pine duBois replies, well, so what I'm trying to figure out if there is a past event that cancers are related to or if it's an ongoing thing that requires cleanup. Because the cancers are still happening, people are still being affected by the residual whatever. Barry Potvin replies, yes. The nature of cancer is that after exposure, it often takes ten years for the cancer incidence rates to go up. So, it's the result of something that's happening since 1982-1984. Ten years prior to that is when the nuclear power plant went in to service. Pine duBois replies, right, that's what I'm trying to figure out. So, if it's a historic event that created a problem that is still persistent and needs to be cleaned up. Can we get to that knowledge? Barry Potvin replies, it's an ongoing problem. The cancer incidence rates are still elevated. Mary Lampert replies, to Pine's question, it clearly relates to cleanup. Kevin Canty replies, we are the decommissioning phases not the incidences while Pilgrim was operating. Mary Lampert replies, to cleanup any association which would be important to ask the doctors. To evaporation, for example. Then would be related to decommissioning because it is one process that they are using to get rid of the water. But I think the issue is, they've discovered in the soil and in the dust, and there would be questions perhaps from Holtec. We could go into more detail of the methodology that was used and accepted obviously, the scientific journal. But, it

would be worthwhile. Kevin Canty replies, thank you. Kevin Canty asks the panel if there are any other future agenda items to be discussed.

- Pine duBois replies, I'm talking future. I would like to take up the Department of Energy reprocessing idea for regional. And to really be able to focus on pulling together some people that have been thinking about it for awhile that know a great deal more than any of us, if that's possible. So, I don't see it in the next few sessions or anything. But, if Holtec is willing to work with me on that. Pat O'Brien replies, sure. We have nothing to do with reprocessing. I can provide a contact. Pine duBois replies, I recognize that the Feds and Carter made it illegal. I read somewhere that then Congress took action in the early 90's and made it legal for reprocessing in the country. Nobody seems to have acted on it. But my sense of SMR's and my ignorance of the whole process, is that if we reprocessed the nuclear waste we could have less of it, we could do less uranium mining. And we could cleanup our environment better and still be able to take advantage of technology that isn't as cancer ridden as the old technology. And might be better off for it. So, I would love to be able to work with some people to do that in the future, at some point. And I don't know how long it would take me but it's not going to be in the next few sessions. Kelly O'Brien replies, the reason why Carter banned it, was the fact that end result was even worse than what we started with. Pine duBois replies, well I know that Carter did it because there was a terrorism threat but that threat has been exceeded by many dimensions. Kelly O'Brien replies, I'm saying as far as the end result of reprocessing, the by-product that comes out of the reprocessing process. Pine duBois replies, that is why I would like to have a conversation. I would like to understand the full threat and whether the deep geological is the only option. Because I do think we need to get on a track where we are not looking at the stuff on the hill. Kevin Canty replies, so in terms of that. Holtec has expressed that they don't do reprocessing work themselves. So, who would we bring in, would you imagine for this agenda item. Pine duBois replies, well, I think what Pat said before was DOE is going to be talking about it. And that's what I would do. I would reach out to those kinds of people. But I would like to have an open mind on the panel in terms of figuring out what we are going to do with all of that stuff that's sticking up on the hill. Curtis Liddle replies, I would just like to add, doing a little research today with DOE and their site selection for interim storage. They are looking for communities' input, like ours. The interim storage and possibly reprocessing. Because that would influence our community as far as the ability to have interim storage and/or reprocessing. Pine duBois replies, right, so I think having a conversation with them, would help. Kevin Canty replies, o.k. Mary Lampert replies, may I suggest that you have both good cops and bad cops. Because there is a large segment of people who are very much opposed to the reprocessing. Princeton University, Union of Concerned Scientists in Washington and I can go on and on. So, I think what we want, are the case control method, if you will. If you have the proponents and then you have those who are opposed, they each present their opinion. Through questioning, I think we would learn the most. Kevin Canty replies, o.k. Jack Priest replies, respecting my fellow panel members, reprocessing and discussions of reprocessing have nothing to do with our charter advising the Governor on the decommissioning of the Pilgrim station. So, interesting topic. I understand people want to have discussion on that information. That is not within the charter of the NDCAP.

- James Lampert replies, I just raise a question, Jack. Would you agree that the spent fuel management is part of our charter. Jack Priest replies, I didn't disagree with spent fuel management. Our focus needs to be on the safe, efficient decommissioning of the existing facility. Interim storage facility and those issues. I, personally, don't think that's part of the scope. But if members of the panel want to continue to have that discussions about safeguard and security of the interim storage that is presently part of the dry field storage, at Pilgrim. So, that's fine. We can talk about that. I strongly disagree that having discussions about reprocessing, future siting, and involvement with the DOE is well outside the scope of the charter. And I'll let the Chairman review that and make a decision. James Lampert replies, I believe that the argument certainly could be made, that reprocessing could dramatically decrease the amount of spent fuel at Pilgrim. I think the other comment if I understood Ms. DuBois, this is an area in which she would like to have considerable discussion and learn a lot hopefully and be prepared for some time in the future to actually move this to an agenda. But, she was not doing so at this point in time. Am I right Pine? Pine duBois replies, right, it will take awhile to get it together and my point is not taking on reprocessing. It is to understand it so that we can try and help facilitate getting the spent fuel out of town. James Lampert replies, do I understand that you are not tonight moving to make this part of an agenda item. Pine duBois replies, I am not moving to make it a part for the foreseeable future agenda item. We can wait. As long as I can bring it up again later, that's fine with me. Kevin Canty replies, you may. Kevin Canty asks the panel if they have any other suggestions for future agenda items.
- Mary Lampert replies, as a courtesy to the member of the public who asked that items that you brought forward be considered. I would bring forward on her behalf well my half, evaporation and security. To be voted on. Kevin Canty replies, evaporation, expand on that. Mary Lampert replies, what do you mean in regard to evaporation. Mary Lampert replies, as a means and practice being followed to get rid of the chemical in radioactive water that is necessary to take down the building. Kevin Canty replies, so, as a means of disposal. Evaporation as a means of disposal. Mary Lampert replies, yes. Kevin Canty replies, and then security. Expand upon what you mean by security. Mary Lampert replies, based on the discussion by Dr. Gordon Thompson that we had here and based upon walking trips on the property that were described. What can be done about the vulnerabilities to reduce access to the ISFSI. I think I've got that right. Kevin Canty replies, o.k. and asks the panel if they have anything else to discuss. Barry Potvin replies, just informational. What is on the schedule for January. Dr. Gerald Frankel, who is a distinguished professor in materials science and engineering, has agreed to participate in our meeting remotely in January. I did inform him that there would be a limit of 15 minutes on presentation. And that there had to be time for discussion. And I wanted to check with Holtec to make sure I was correct because he asked me about Holtec's storage units, the dry casks. I told him that to my knowledge, the ones in use are called high storm 100. Is that correct? Pat O'Brien replies, yes, high storm 100. There is a variation, one of them is metamic basket and the other one is not. I forget the nomenclature. But yes, they are high storm 100's. Barry Potvin replies, because he obviously has a lot of information about structural integrity of a variety of different metals and things that are used in dry casks. Pat O'Brien replies, understood. We also make our

own materials that are proprietary. Kevin Canty replies, o.k. So, I count four items that have been brought up. So, we will take a vote on each of the four separately, which will require a majority vote of the entire panel. So, that would require, 11 would be the magic number, in the affirmative. James Lampert, replies, may I ask a question. My question is whether the state is prepared to vote on these. Because if not, I would suggest we put it off until the next meeting so the state can take a position. Otherwise, what has happened, in a number of instances, because an abstention is technically a no, it's proved essentially impossible to get 11 votes even though a clear majority of those who actually took a position, wanted to talk about the subject matter. So, I guess the question is for Jack. Jack Priest replies, so at this time, the state members would abstain because we haven't brought it back to the Interagency group to have a review and discussion and come back and vote whether in the affirmative or negative. James Lampert replies, then I would suggest that we defer this until the next meeting so the state has the time to take a position. And we are not hamstrung by legislatively imposed voting procedure. Jack Priest replies, right, so, I thought what we had agreed to previously, was to bring these agenda items up and would basically leapfrog. We would bring them up, take them back to the Interagency, have a discussion and have a decision at the following meeting. Kevin Canty replies, I thought you had indicated at a prior meeting that you didn't need to do that any longer. Jack Priest replies, I don't believe I said that, Kevin. Kevin Canty replies, o.k. Barry Potvin replies, Jack, I do remember you saying that at the previous meeting. Jack Priest replies, I think that was for that particular vote and topic at that time. Barry Potvin and Kevin Canty reply, o.k. Mary Lampert replies, I concur. It's o.k. with me. Because I brought that one forward. Kevin Canty replies, well, you brought three of them. So, if you are o.k. with your three and Dr. Potvin, are you o.k. with holding off on your one? Barry Potvin replies, sure. Kevin Canty replies, so the next time we will bring these up will be at the January meeting. Jack Priest replies, I don't think it would take a lot of time if we come back to just do a vote and waive the reading of the agenda item, and put on the agenda at the next meeting, a vote to approve agenda items for the January meeting. That's up to you, Kevin. But it's just a suggestion. Kevin Canty replies, so, I can include a segment where we would vote only on these four items. We will be spending a lot of time at the next meeting on the NRC topic. So, I will do that. Mary Lampert replies, that's great.

ADJOURN

- Pat O'Brien makes motion to adjourn. Curtis Liddle seconds the motion.
(14 in favor, unanimous vote)