## Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Public Meeting on Pilgrim Post-Shutdown

**Decommissioning Activities Report** 

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Plymouth, Massachusetts

Date: Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Work Order No.: NRC-0051 Pages 1-122

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

	<u> </u>
1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	PUBLIC MEETING ON PILGRIM POST-SHUTDOWN
5	DECOMMISSIONING ACTIVITIES REPORT
6	+ + + +
7	TUESDAY,
8	JANUARY 15, 2019
9	+ + + +
10	PLYMOUTH, MASSACHUSETTS
11	+ + + +
12	The meeting was convened in Room A, Hotel
13	1620, 18 Water Street, Plymouth, MA, at 6:00 p.m.,
14	Bruce Watson, chairman, presiding.
15	NRC STAFF:
16	DONNA JANDA, Facilitator
17	BRETT KLUKAN, Facilitator
18	JOHN LAMB, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
19	BRUCE WATSON, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and
20	Safeguards
21	
22	ALSO PRESENT:
23	ANNETTE VIETTI-COOK, Secretary of the Commission
24	MARIAN ZOBLER, General Counsel
25	

	2
1	CONTENTS
2	Call to Order and Opening Remarks
3	Bruce Watson
4	NRC's Decommissioning Experience 5
5	Bruce Watson
6	Pilgrim Decommissioning
7	John Lamb
8	Mandy Halter
9	Andrea Sterdis 20
10	Comments from Elected Officials,
11	Representatives of Elected Officials, or
12	Representatives of Federally-Recognized Tribes
13	Jessica Wong 27
14	Rory Clark
15	Michael Jackman
16	Seth Schofield
17	Mary Lampert 40
18	Jim Lampert 43
19	Rebecca Chin 45
20	Sheila Lynch-Benttinin 46
21	Public Comments
22	Closing Remarks
23	Adjourn
24	
25	

	PROCEEDINGS
2	6:02 p.m.
3	MR. WATSON: Good evening. I'm Bruce
4	Watson, Chief of the Reactor Decommissioning Branch in
5	the Division of Decommissioning, Uranium Recovery, and
6	Waste Programs, and will be chairing tonight's
7	session.
8	Our purpose is to obtain your comments on
9	the Entergy Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities
10	Report and the Holtec license application and the
11	related Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Report
12	associated with it.
13	I would like to highlight NRC's mission to
14	protect public health and safety, promote the common
15	defense and security, and protect the environment, and
16	our current work related to the regulatory
17	requirements during the decommissioning of power
18	plants.
19	I would like to introduce a few of the NRC
20	staff who will be here to listen to your comments.
21	And hopefully, we, the staff, can collectively answer
22	questions on the decommissioning process. If we
23	can't, we'll do our best to get back to you.
24	So, you've met Brett, our Region I

Counselor, who will be facilitating tonight's meeting,

along with Donna Janda, also from Region I. Also in attendance is John Lamb, the current Project Manager for Pilgrim. Amy Snyder is here, who will be the Decommissioning Project Manager when the plant shuts down and is transferred over to our organization.

Also in attendance is Mike Dusaniwsky, our Senior Economist; Jason Piotter, Senior Engineer in our Spent Fuel Management Group; Jessie Quintero, our Environmental Review Specialist, and Ray Powell, our Region I Branch Chief that will be inspecting the plant during the decommissioning process. We also have some additional folks in the audience that, if we need to, we can call on them to help us with comments or questions.

Next slide, please.

This is an NRC Category 3 public meeting to obtain comments on the Entergy PSDR and the Holtec application and their supplemental PSDR that's with it. These documents were made publicly available for comment.

The meeting is being transcribed and will be made available for the public to review. There will also be a meeting summary published for the meeting.

We have a planned short presentation by

John Lamb, who will discuss the PSDR process and the license review process. Then, Entergy and Holtec will be giving short presentations. Speaking for Entergy tonight is Mandy Halter -- she is the Director of Nuclear Licensing -- and Andrea Sterdis from Holtec, who from also the Comprehensive Decommissioning International, who is a Vice President of Regulatory Programs, Environment and Safety.

After those presentations, we will turn the meeting over to Brett and Donna, who will begin the process to allow speakers to provide comments. It is my full intention, if we can, to end this meeting at 9:00 p.m.

I also want to emphasize that this meeting is to discuss the upcoming permanent shutdown of the Pilgrim Plant and the decommissioning process associated with it.

Next slide, please.

Now I want to just discuss a little bit of our decommissioning experience. We have many years of decommissioning experience. We have over 21 years' experience with current decommissioning our and have completed over regulations 80 material decommissionings and terminated those all been released for licenses. They have

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

unrestricted use by the owner. So, they can be used for any future purpose. And included in that 80 is 10 nuclear power plants.

Next slide, please.

On this slide is a picture of Yankee Rowe. It's located here in Rowe, Massachusetts. It's one of the 10 plants that was decommissioned. We terminated the license in 2007. Pictured on the left is the plant when it was in operation. Pictured on the right is where the plant was greenfielded by the utility associated with the requirements set up with the State. The NRC does not require site restoration as part of our process.

One of the things that I want to point out to you is that, on the picture on the right there is a hydroelectric dam that's been there for over 100 years. As you note, the nuclear plant operated, was decommissioned, and is gone. However, on the hill in the center there is a picture of the dry fuel storage facility that is still located on their site and under license, and will continue to be inspected by our inspectors. Of course, the spent fuel is there awaiting the final disposition of the high-level waste disposal, either interim or final repository, here in the U.S.

Next slide, please.

I wanted to just briefly discuss the two decommissioning options discussed in the November 2008 submittals. Regardless of the option chosen, preparation of the decommissioning takes about one to two years to remove the radioactive waste stored onsite, remove filters, resins; drain systems to allow the dismantling to begin and be done safely or placed in storage. After the decommissioning preparation period, the licensee can go into either DECON or SAFSTOR.

DECON, or a prompt decommissioning, the licensee begins the decommissioning activities and usually transfer the spent fuel to dry storage. Past experience has shown that decommissioning typically takes seven to ten years to complete.

With SAFSTOR, the plant is placed in storage -- we like to call it, it's cold and dark -- until the licensee decides to dismantle and decommission the plant. In SAFSTOR, the NRC will continue to inspect the plants at least annually and more frequently when decommissioning activities are performed.

Regardless of the decommissioning option chosen, the NRC regulations require that the

1 decommissioning be completed in 60 years. Next slide, please. 2 3 A few reminders. We are here to listen to 4 your comments on the Pilgrim decommissioning. This is part of the process we've set up and it's intended to 5 hear your comments, so we can consider those in our 6 7 review of both the PSDR from Entergy and, also, the 8 license application and the PSDR that supplements it from Holtec. 9 The meeting, again, is being transcribed, 10 and the transcript will be publicly available. 11 summary will be published and would meeting 12 publicly available. 13 14 And we will do our best to answer your 15 questions, where we can. There's going to be possibly some that we can't answer, but we do our best to get 16 17 back to you. I'm going to introduce John. John Lamb is 18 19 going to sit down and speak. 20 MR. LAMB: Yes. MR. WATSON: Okay. Thank you. 21 Hi. Good evening. My name is 22 MR. LAMB: I am the Project Manager for Pilgrim at 23 John Lamb. 24 NRC Headquarters in Rockville. I've been working for the NRC for 19 years, and prior to that, I worked 15 25

1 years in the power plant. Next slide, please. 2 In accordance with the NRC regulations, a 3 4 Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report, or 5 PSDAR, must be submitted to the NRC, and a copy to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, prior to or within two 6 7 years following the permanent cessation of operations 8 of Pilgrim. Entergy submitted the Pilgrim PSDAR on 9 November 16th, 2018. A PSDAR must contain a description of the 10 planned decommissioning activities, along with a 11 schedule for their accomplishment and a site-specific 12 decommissioning cost estimate, including the projected 13 14 cost of managing irradiated fuel. The NRC staff uses a Regulatory Guide that 15 16 provides guidance on the content and format of PSDARs. 17 The Regulatory Guide is available to the public as noted on this slide. 18 19 Decommissioning activities must endanger the public health and safety or result in 20 significant environmental impacts not previously 21 reviewed. 22 Next slide. 23 A PSDAR must contain a discussion that 24 concluding 25 provides the for that the reasons

environmental impacts associated with site-specific decommissioning activities will be bounded appropriate previously-issued Environmental Impact Statements. Therefore, during the environmental review of a PSDAR, the NRC uses various previous staff reports to determine whether the environmental impacts from decommissioning are bounded by these reports. For instance, for Pilgrim, the NRC staff will use a generic Environmental Impact Statement regarding decommissioning and will also look at previous Environmental Impact Statements developed specifically for Pilgrim, such the Environmental Impact as Statement developed for the renewal of the Pilgrim operating license. The NRC staff will also rely on findings from its inspection program.

Next slide, please.

The request for comment and meeting notice for the Pilgrim PSDAR was published in The Federal Register on December 21st, 2018. The 90-day comment period ends on March 21st, 2019.

The NRC staff will notify the licensee if the staff needs additional information to support its review of the PSDAR. The NRC staff will document its PSDAR review in a letter to the licensee and will address the comments received during the comment

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

period.

After the submission of the Pilgrim PSDAR, the NRC regulations require that Entergy shall notify the NRC in writing and send a copy to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts before performing any decommissioning activity inconsistent with or making a significant schedule change from those actions and schedules described in the PSDAR.

Next slide, please.

By letter dated November 16h, 2018, Entergy and Holtec submitted a license transfer application requesting that the license for Pilgrim be transferred from Entergy to Holtec. Before this transfer may be completed, the NRC must determine that Holtec is qualified to be the holder of the Pilgrim license.

In order to make this determination, the NRC staff reviews the following five areas: financial qualifications; decommissioning funding assurance; foreign ownership, control, and domination; technical qualifications, and insurance and indemnity. If the NRC finds that Holtec is qualified in these areas, then it would approve the license transfer by an order and issue a conforming license amendment.

Next slide, please.

License transfer applications are noticed in The Federal Register, and the public can request a hearing and/or provide comments on the application. The program license transfer application is ready for publication in The Federal Register. However, The Federal Register is currently impacted by the partial federal government shutdown. Therefore, the Pilgrim license transfer federal registration notification will not be published until after the partial federal government shutdown ends. Once this Federal Register notice is published, there will be a 20-day hearing period, and then, a 30-day comment period.

License transfer applications typically contain proprietary information. A redacted, nonproprietary version of the Pilgrim license transfer application is available to the public and can be found online through the NRC's electronic library called ADAMS. The proprietary version can be requested using a process that will be described in The Federal Register notice.

Next slide, please.

By letter dated November 16th, 2018, Holtec submitted a proposed revised PSDAR for Pilgrim. The Holtec PSDAR is a supplement to the license transfer application, and therefore, is part of the

license transfer application action, and not part of the Entergy PSDAR action. The Holtec PSDAR is contingent upon the approval of the licensed transfer application and the equity sale closure. For purposes of this public meeting, the NRC will be accepting comments on both the Entergy PSDAR action and the license transfer application, which includes the proposed Holtec PSDAR.

Next slide, please.

Holtec also submitted a request for an exemption from the NRC's Decommissioning Trust Fund requirements in an enclosure to the license transfer application. If this request were to be granted, then Holtec would be allowed to use the Pilgrim Decommissioning Trust Fund not only for radiological decommissioning expenses, but also for related to spent fuel management activities and site restoration activities. Like the Holtec PSDAR, this exemption request is contingent upon the approval of the license transfer application and the equity sale closure.

Next slide, please.

Comments regarding the Entergy PSDAR can be submitted on regulations.gov website under Docket ID NRC-2018-0286 until March 21st, 2019. Comments

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 regarding the license transfer application can 2 submitted during tonight's public meeting. Once the 3 license transfer application is noticed in The Federal 4 Register, then comments can be submitted on the 5 regulations.gov website under Docket ID NRC-2018-0279 for a period of 30 days for comments, and a hearing 6 7 can be requested for a period of 20 days. 8 Next slide, please. This slide shows where to mail comments 9 10 regarding Entergy PSDAR or the license transfer Please remember to use the Docket ID 11 application. associated with each application. 12 That concludes my presentation. I'll turn 13 14 it back over to Bruce. 15 Okay. Our next speaker is MR. WATSON: 16 Mandy Halter from Entergy. 17 MS. HALTER: Good evening. My name is and I'm the Director Mandy Halter, of Nuclear 18 19 Licensing for Entergy Nuclear. With me tonight is Mike Twomey, the Vice President of External Affairs 20 for Entergy Wholesale Commodities. I appreciate the 21 opportunity to be here tonight 22 to provide information on Entergy's plans to decommission the 23 24 Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station.

2019 is a significant year for Entergy,

for Pilgrim, and for this area. On May 31st of this year, Pilgrim will permanently cease power operations. In June, we will certify to the NRC that the reactor is permanently shut down and defueled. Also in June, Pilgrim will complete its first staffing reduction, as we transition the organizational structure to support Pilgrim's SAFSTOR decommissioning plan. Throughout the final months of plant operation, and as we transition to decommissioning, we remain committed to safety, health, and security of the plant, its employees, and you, the public.

Next slide. Next slide, please. Thank you.

The Entergy Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report, or PSDAR, was submitted to the NRC on November 16th, 2018, and outlines our plan to use the SAFSTOR decommissioning strategy. Our PSDAR was prepared by a team of experts, in accordance with regulations, NRC guidance, and a thorough review of PSDARs submitted to the NRC by plants in decommissioning.

The Pilgrim PSDAR contains a description of our planned decommissioning activities as well as a schedule for their completion, an estimate of the cost, and a discussion of the environmental impacts of

these activities. And I will provide more information in the following slides.

Next slide, please.

The majority of the dormancy period of our SAFSTOR plan will involve all spent fuel in dry fuel storage. This slide shows our plan to achieve the dry fuel storage storm and sea state by the end of 2022. Along the way, Pilgrim will make adjustments to its staffing levels and the emergency plan, in accordance with appropriate regulatory approvals, based on the status of the fuel and the corresponding decreasing risk of offsite radiological consequences from an accident.

Next slide, please.

Under the SAFSTOR methodology, we will maintain and monitor Pilgrim in a dormancy period to allow for the radioactive decay of the plant, followed by the dismantlement and decontamination to permit NRC license termination within 60 years, as required by regulations. Under Entergy's plan, radiological decontamination and dismantlement will occur safely by the year 2079. We plan to restore the site following license termination.

Next slide, please.

In accordance with regulations, we

developed a site-specific estimate of the costs for the planned SAFSTOR decommissioning activities Pilgrim. This cost estimate was developed by a leading expert using up-to-date and best available data. In addition to estimating the costs associated with license termination, we also estimated the cost associated with spent fuel management and site restoration. Our SAFSTOR decommissioning estimate for Pilgrim is included as an attachment to the Entergy PSDAR.

Next slide, please.

The site-specific decommissioning cost estimate submitted to the NRC in November 2018 was reported using 2018 dollars and up-to-date 2018 pricing information. The total estimated cost associated with license termination as well as spent fuel management and site restoration for Pilgrim is \$1.66 billion. We will periodically update the decommissioning cost estimate throughout the SAFSTOR period, in accordance with regulations.

It is very important to note that we are required by regulation, as the owner of the plant, to demonstrate reasonable assurance that there are adequate funds available to cover the cost of license termination. We provide this funding for Pilgrim

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

through a Nuclear Decommissioning Trust Fund, which, as reported to the NRC and the PSDAR, was funded at \$1.05 billion at the end of October 2018. Accounting for the growth of these funds over time, as permitted by NRC methodology, the Pilgrim nuclear balance decommissioning trust does not provide financial assurance for the decommissioning costs of our SAFSTOR plan.

Next slide, please.

We have concluded that the environmental impacts associated with planned SAFSTOR decommissioning activities at Pilgrim are less than, and are bounded by, impacts addressed in previously-issued Environmental Impact Statements. A more detailed discussion of the reasons for our conclusion is included in the PSDAR.

Next slide, please.

In November 2018, we filed an updated Pilgrim Spent Fuel Management Plan with the NRC which outlines our intent to store all spent fuel on a new, larger, independent spent fuel storage installation pad which will be located at a higher elevation on the program site. This pad, which we plan to construct by the end of 2020, will store a total of 61 casks, including the 17 casks that are on the current pad, as

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

well as 44 additional casks which are needed to store the fuel that is currently in the reactor vessel and the spent fuel pool.

Next slide, please.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In November 2018, Entergy and Holtec submitted a request to the NRC to transfer the control of Pilgrim's plant and ISFSI licenses from Entergy to Holtec. If approved by the NRC, the license transfer will allow for prompt decommissioning under Holtec's plan, which is different than Entergy's Specifically, Holtec plans to decommission Pilgrim using a DECON or immediate dismantlement strategy by approximately 2024. Additionally, Holtec intends to move all spent fuel to dry fuel storage on the new pad by the end of 2021. Following this presentation, Andrea Sterdis will provide more information on Holtec's decommissioning plans for Pilgrim.

A major benefit of decommissioning under Holtec's plan is that it will allow for earlier release of portions of the Pilgrim site for reuse. We have requested that the NRC review and approve the license transfer application by May 31st of this year. We know that this is an aggressive review schedule for the staff and we are certain that the NRC will conduct a very diligent review, and we expect nothing less.

intent behind this requested timeline is 1 The provide certainty to the plant employees and to the 2 3 citizens of Plymouth and the surrounding areas on 4 plant ownership as well as the decommissioning plan 5 and timeline following plant shutdown. Next slide, please. 6 7 More information about Pilgrim's plans for decommissioning as well as our related submittals that 8 9 we have provided to the NRC are publicly available on our website, www.pilgrimpower.com. 10 I thank you for your time. And a number 11 of us are here from Entergy, and we look forward to 12 answering your questions later in the evening. 13 14 you. 15 MR. Thank WATSON: for you your 16 presentation. Our next presentation is by Andrea Sterdis 17 from Holtec International and CDI, I believe it's 18 called. 19 Thank you, Bruce. 20 MS. STERDIS: Good evening. I really appreciate the 21 opportunity to provide you all with a brief overview 22 of the Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report 23 24 that has been prepared to show the Holtec plan for

decommissioning

initiating

plant

25

NRC

following

approval of the license transfer application, execution of the license transfers, and completion of the sale closure.

Next slide, please.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On this slide, you can see that I am up here providing the presentation. I'm Andrea Sterdis. I'm the Vice President for Regulatory Programs, Environment and Safety for Comprehensive Commissioning International. I am joined tonight by Joy Russell, Senior Vice President for Holtec International.

Next slide.

On November 16th, 2018, Holtec submitted a revised Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report, or PSDAR, based on their plan to initiate PSDAR for DECON includes a prompt DECON. Our description of the planned activities, specifically the activities that are required to initiate that prompt DECON and complete it. It also includes a planned DECON decommissioning schedule and a cost estimate reflecting that schedule and the DECON plan. Lastly, it includes a discussion of the environmental impacts for the specific activities that will be performed during the execution of the dismantlement and the waste removal from the site to complete the radiological decommissioning.

The PSDAR was prepared in accordance with NRC regulations and addresses NRC guidance. prepared by a team that is experienced in planning, estimating, and executing nuclear power plant decommissioning. It was also informed by a review of previously-submitted PSDARs, as well as particularly a review and an alignment with the assumptions that were provided and used in the Entergy SAFSTOR PSDAR. The DECON PSDAR is contingent upon NRC approval of the license transfer, execution of the transfers of the license, and completion of the sale.

Next slide, please.

The DECON PSDAR reflects Holtec's plan to promptly start decommissioning activities following the license transfer and sales closure. The schedule reflects the project goal to achieve partial site release within eight years.

The decommissioning cost estimate reflects

DECON activities and schedule for completing

radiological decommissioning, managing the spent fuel,

and completing site restoration activities.

The environmental evaluation considers the DECON activities and provides evidence that those activities are bounded by the existing Environmental Impact Statements that are applicable to the Pilgrim

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

site, including the NRC generic Environmental Impact Statement for Decommissioning as well as the Pilgrim Site License Renewal Environmental Impact Statement.

If you look at the SAFSTOR PSDAR and compare the decommissioning cost estimate with that provided in our PSDAR for DECON, you will see some differences. Those differences are primarily driven by two reasons. First, the core business for Entergy in the current time is to provide and generate power/electricity. The core business for Holtec, including CDI, is managing spent fuel and executing decommissioning projects. And therefore, the Holtec the latest technology, the engineering team has expertise, and the project management expertise to time-effective methods apply costand for decommissioning, resulting in a difference in the decommissioning cost.

In addition, the DECON plan eliminates the transition to the dormant state, maintaining that plant dormant state for almost 40 years, and the transition to reactivate the plant and complete the dismantlement and waste removal activities about 40 years down the road.

It's important to note that the SAFSTOR dismantlement and waste removal schedule and the DECON

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

dismantlement and waste removal schedule are similar in duration. The difference is the prompt DECON one modeled in our PSDAR is initiated immediately after license transfer in 2019 and completes in approximately five years.

On the next slide, please.

The schedule provided in the DECON PSDAR assumes that the NRC will approve the license transfer application in time to support a July 31st transfer of the licenses and sale closure. This slide provides some key assumptions that drove the schedule that's included in that PSDAR, starting with the fact that we've assumed an initiation of decontamination and dismantlement activities in 2019 following the license It also assumes that the newest ISFSI pad transfer. construction is completed and the pad is available for use in 2020. It assumes that the offloading of the spent fuel transitioning the site from a combined wet and dry spent fuel storage site to a dry fuel storage site only occurs by the fourth quarter of 2021.

Similar to the SAFSTOR PSDAR schedule submitted by Entergy, our DECON PSDAR schedule assumes that the DOE completes the spent fuel removal from the site in the 2062 time period. The DECON PSDAR schedule shows radiological decommission, except for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the independent spent fuel storage installation, ISFSI, is accomplished within approximately five years following the license transfer and sale closure. It also assumes that site restoration activities, which are not required for the partial site release approval by the NRC, are continuing beyond that approximately one year.

Next slide, please.

The Holtec DCE, or decommissioning cost estimate, that's included in the DECON PSDAR results in approximately \$1.134 billion cost in 2018 dollars. The Nuclear Decommissioning Trust Fund for Pilgrim is currently valued at \$1.05 billion as of October 31st, The cash flow analyses that were submitted as 2018. part of the license transfer application as well as the DECON PSDAR and decommissioning cost estimate demonstrate that the Pilgrim Nuclear Decommissioning Trust Fund contains sufficient funds to cover our plan radiological decommissioning, fuel spent management, and site restoration.

It's important to note that, pursuant to NRC regulations, we will be required, as the licensee, to prepare and submit an annual report that provides the Nuclear Decommissioning Trust Fund status, including expenses and activities executed in the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

previous year, the remaining NDT balance, and showing 1 2 financial assurance that the balance can address and cover the remaining costs of all the activities 3 4 required to complete the license termination. This is 5 a public report and is made available each year by the NRC. 6 7 With that, I'd like to thank you for your time, and I'd like to thank the NRC for this meeting. 8 9 Thank you. 10 MR. WATSON: Thank you, Andrea. Before I turn the meeting over to Brett 11 and Donna to facilitate the comment session, I would 12 any elected officials 13 invite 14 representatives Native American tribe or any 15 representations to make statements if you're available 16 So, if you would, those that are interested, 17 please come up to the microphone and state your name for the record. 18 19 MR. KLUKAN: So, we actually have a couple who have preregistered with us, and we are going to go 20 down through that list. And then, we'll open it up to 21 those who did not preregister. 22 So, first up, we're going to have Ms. 23 Jessica Wong from the Office of Senator Elizabeth 24

Warren.

MS. WONG: Good Evening. Thank you. As Brad said, my name is Jessica. I am from Senator Elizabeth Warren's office, and I'm her Regional Director.

So, Senator Warren reiterates her deep concerns with the consistently poor public safety record at Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station and Nuclear Regulatory Commission's pattern of ignoring critical discrepancies in Entergy's safety measures that put Massachusetts residents at risk. This cannot continue, especially as the NRC reviews the license transfer for the decommissioning from Entergy Holtec International. To date, she has sent six letters to the NRC expressing these concerns, most October, following recently in the reports unplanned shutdowns due to problems with equipment.

Entergy cannot continue to use the summer's planned shutdown as an excuse to avoid much-needed safety upgrades that protect our communities. Senator Warren urges the company to prioritize the people of southeastern Massachusetts over its profits.

Similarly, the NRC can no longer shirk its responsibilities to establish and enforce proper safety standards. The Senator, once again, calls on the NRC to require Entergy to immediately comply with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

federal safety standards, and if they refuse to do so, 1 then the NRC must take necessary steps to shut down 2 the plant. 3 Thank you. 4 5 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you very much. Next, we will have Ms. Rory Clark from the 6 Office of Senator Ed Markey. 7 Thank you for having me. 8 MS. CLARK: 9 you said, I'm Rory Clark. I'm Senator Markey's 10 Regional Director. I'll be reading a statement on Senator Markey's behalf. 11 "I've long been concerned about Pilgrim's 12 safety and operating record and its management's 13 14 history of cutting corners at the expense of increased risk to Massachusetts residents. 15 As we turn our attention now to the details of the Post-Shutdown 16 17 Decommissioning Activities Reports submitted Entergy and Holtec International, I must remind the 18 19 Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Entergy, and Holtec that the people of Massachusetts will settle for 20 nothing less than the most stringent safety measures. 21 "As the federal regulatory body overseeing 22 the decommissioning process, we all expect the NRC 23 24 will review both Entergy and Holtec's proposed

decommissioning plans with the utmost of care and

caution. The safety of Massachusetts residents demands this thorough review.

"Plans for the ownership and decommissioning of Pilgrim must prioritize safety ans security. The NRC must evaluate both Entergy and Holtec's PSDARs to ensure that each provides a comprehensive accounting of how that owner will assume responsibility for safe operations, improve upon the abysmal safety record at Pilgrim, and finance the complete decommissioning process.

"I understand that it's common practice for the NRC to issue exemptions that would limit the required emergency planning zone when the plant begins the decommissioning process, but I must urge the NRC to require Pilgrim's owner, be it Entergy or Holtec, to work with local communities to maintain and fund the significant emergency planning zone and ensure that local communities are prepared for any eventuality.

"Last year I was proud to cosponsor the Safe and Secure Decommissioning Act which would prohibit the NRC from issuing waivers or granting exemptions from complying with safety and emergency preparedness regulations put forth in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 until nuclear fuel had been

transferred to spent nuclear fuel dry casks. I will continue to push for all parties involved in the decommissioning of Pilgrim to abide by such standards.

"As we are all aware, this region is home to fierce nor'easter storms and rising tides, posing safety concerns that other nuclear facilities around the country do not have to contend with. Especially given this region's harsh environmental conditions, the NRC should ensure the completion of a full National Environmental Policy Act analysis that would exam the effect of the proposed decommissioning plans on the environment and allow for additional public involvement.

"Furthermore, any Pilgrim licensee should provide thorough plans for communicating regularly with the public and local stakeholders throughout the decommissioning process. This communication is essential to ensure that all members of the community understand how Pilgrim will be safely decommissioned and foster confidence that security measures satisfy federal safety standards and community expectations.

"I was proud to be an original cosponsor of additional legislation in 2018 entitled `The Nuclear Plant Decommissioning Act,' which would ensure the states and local communities have a meaningful

role in the crafting and preparation of decommissioning plans for retired nuclear plants located in our community. This bill also requires the NRC to publicly and transparently approve or reject every proposed decommissioning plan, which it currently is not required to do.

"I will be introducing the Dry Cask Storage Act this session, which would ensure every nuclear reactor operator must be compelled to comply with an NRC-approved plan that would require the safe removal of spent nuclear fuel from spent nuclear fuel pools and placed that fuel into dry cask storage within seven years of the time that the plan is submitted to the NRC. This bill would further provide funding to help reactor licensees implement these plans and would expand the emergency planning zone for all noncompliant reactor operators to 50 miles.

"As we consider tonight the shutdown process for Pilgrim, Entergy and Holtec must provide conclusive proof that there are sufficient funds available in the Nuclear Decommissioning Trust to decommission Pilgrim in a safe and secure manner. It will be unacceptable for Entergy or Holtec to demand additional money from Massachusetts ratepayers to complete the decommissioning process at Pilgrim.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

There can be no second chances here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"Historical data NRC quidelines and indicate that the decommissioning costs are likely to increase faster that inflation. Entergy and Holtec must each account for that fact or find a way to currently clearly rebut it. Given the amount available in the Trust Fund, the NRC must carefully assess if the proposed decommissioning timeline is achievable in a safe and secure manner and require there is reasonable public assurance of available funds for the totality of the process. Additionally, as the proposed license transfer will further strain the NRC's resources, it is imperative that the NRC assign additional staff to work on these issues and charge the licensees for their salaries.

"In the recent past, I have also expressed concerns to the NRC regarding the draft my decommissioning rule currently awaiting review, which is intended to provide clear quidelines for all plants that are undergoing the decommissioning process. This proposal falls far short of the NRC's stated goals of and efficient a safe, effective, providing for decommissioning process for nuclear plants. current form, this fails to propose a comprehensive set of decommissioning and cleanup regulations, would

1	result in the automatic approval of facilities'
2	exemptions from safety, security, and emergency
3	planning regulations, and would continue to
4	rubberstamp the industry's Post-Shutdown
5	Decommissioning Activities Report. I continue to urge
6	the NRC to reject this draft and, instead, write a
7	rule that will affirmatively guide plants and
8	communities through the decommissioning process.
9	"Thank you."
10	MR. KLUKAN: Thank you very much.
11	Next, we will have Mr. Michael Jackman of
12	the Office of Congressman Bill Keating.
13	MR. JACKMAN: Thank you.
14	I do have a statement from the Congressman
15	I'd like to read, but before I do that, I have just
16	some housekeeping questions. The slide presentations
17	that were made tonight, are those available online or
18	will they be available online?
19	MR. KLUKAN: For the record, yes, they
20	will be available online on the NRC's website.
21	MR. JACKMAN: Okay. Only because I think
22	if people want to make comments both on the PSDAR and
23	the license transfer, there's a lot of good
24	information in there. Thank you.
25	"Thank you for the opportunity to address

you at tonight's public meeting. Unfortunately, the House voting schedule prevents me from being here in person, but I wanted to restate my opinion that, as we draw closer to the cessation of operations at Pilgrim, the rigorous scrutiny of the operations at the plant must continue. Entergy must not be allowed to languish in column 4, representing the minimum level of operational safety for the remainder of its life as a power generating plant.

"In addition, the NRC must scrutinize Entergy's and Holtec's Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Reports to ensure that the health and safety of Massachusetts residents is not at risk. The NRC must enforce its regulations and require the licensee to adhere to the most stringent standards for facility security, cybersecurity for all the plant systems, structural integrity of the onsite dry cask storage system, and mitigation of environmental hazards.

"In addition, decommissioning activities must be fully funded by the licensee, and the NRC must do all it can to ensure that taxpayers, be they residents of Plymouth, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or the United States of America, are not left to shoulder the burden of the cost of the

cleanup of the Pilgrim site.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"Given the real prospect of ongoing nuclear waste storage here in Plymouth, incumbent upon all levels of government to work together to ensure the safety of our residents. It is imperative that those residents and residents of all affected communities in Plymouth County, the Cape, and islands are included in the discussion the decisions involved with the decommissioning process.

"The Plymouth Town Select Board, the State legislative delegation, the Nuclear Decommissioning Citizens Advisory Panel, private groups like Pilgrim Watch and Cape Downwinders, and many other concerned individuals and groups, all have been engaged in this vital discussion over the years, and they all deserve to have their input heard and incorporated into the have decisionmaking process. Ι am proud to cosponsored legislation, which I've already referred to, the Nuclear Plant Decommissioning Act, that will do just that.

"I applaud all those preset tonight for sharing their perspectives, and I will continue to fight to make sure that your voices are heard. Thank you."

MR. KLUKAN: Thank you very much.

Next, we will have Mr. Seth Schofield from the Massachusetts Attorney General's Office.

MR. SCHOFIELD: Thank you, Brett.

Good evening. I'm Seth Schofield, Senior Appellate Counsel and Assistant Attorney General in the Energy and Environment Bureau of the Office of Attorney General Maura Healey.

First, I'd like to thank the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for coming to Plymouth tonight, so that the public has an opportunity to voice their thoughts and concerns about the power plant and the proposed plans to decommission the plant following its shutdown this spring.

From the Attorney General's perspective, the proposed sale of Pilgrim and the related transfer of Pilgrim's operating license from Entergy to a Holtec subsidiary raise significant health, safety, environmental. financial and for the concerns Commonwealth and its citizens. We appreciate the potential benefits of accelerated decommissioning that forms the basis for the sale and license transfer application, but we currently have serious concerns about whether Pilgrim's Decommissioning Trust Fund contains sufficient funds to cover the performance of all necessary decommissioning, site restoration, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

spent fuel management activities on an indefinite basis.

As currently proposed, neither Holtec, Pilgrim, LLC, the proposed licensee, nor Holtec Decommissioning International, LLC, the proposed licensed operator, will generate any revenue or bring with them any new assets that could be used to fund and complete site decommissioning, restoration, and management activities at fuel the Holtec-Pilgrim and Holtec Decommissioning International's only planned source of funds are the funds currently existing in the Pilgrim Trust Fund, and as currently proposed, there exists no quaranteed add to the parent company of those two single-purpose limited liability companies to compensate for any funding shortfall in the Trust Funds. If there are insufficient funds in the Trust Fund, Holtec would likely default on its obligation and likely leave the Commonwealth and its taxpayers with those obligations, both as the payer of last resort and the party responsible for protecting public safety and the environment for an indefinite period.

Based on our preliminary review of the license transfer application and the revised Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report, we have

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

reason to believe that a Trust Fund shortfall could very well occur. For example, Holtec's estimate of what it will cost to decommission, restore, and manage spent fuel at the site is only \$3.615 million less than the total amount of money expected to be in the trust. That means there would be insufficient funds to cover any cost overrun in excess of \$3.6 million.

Past experience, however, including decommissioning experience at other sites in New England, demonstrates that the potential discovery of previously unidentified radiological and nonradiological contamination, potential unanticipated work delays, and other potential problematic events could well drive costs significantly beyond preliminary post-shutdown decommissioning cost estimates.

For example, the discovery of strontium-90 during decommissioning at Connecticut Yankee doubled the anticipated decommissioning cost there. The discovery of highly contaminated groundwater during decommissioning at Maine Yankee also increased costs beyond those anticipated to decommission that site. And the discovery of PCB contamination/radiological groundwater contamination during decommissioning at Yankee Rowe, similarly, caused significant and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

unanticipated cost increases.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Holtec and its partner, SNC-Lavalin, have poor track records on other projects at other sites around the country, which amplifies the Commonwealth's concerns about the potential for cost overruns, delays, and other issues that will both imperil public safety and our environment, while at the same time enhancing the risk of a Trust Fund shortfall that would make matters even worse. For example, the NRC just recently issued a Notice of Violation related to Holtec's mishandling of dry cask loading and transfer operations at San Onofre Nuclear Generation Station in California, and its failure to timely report that matter to the NRC.

Because of the significant risk to the Commonwealth embodied by the pending license transfer proposal, we implore the NRC to join us in closing scrutinizing the proposal's terms and ensure that substantial financial assurances exist to ensure that those risks are fully addressed. To that end, the intends, behalf Attorney General on of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to intervene in the pending license transfer proceeding to articulate these and other concerns for evaluation by Commission and the imposition of protective safeguards

1 and other conditions with respect to any license 2 transfer. 3 Thank you. 4 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you very much. 5 up, we have several authorized representatives from the Board of Selectmen of the 6 7 Town of Duxbury. 8 MS. M. LAMPERT: Good evening. I'm Mary Lampert, speaking tonight on behalf of the Duxbury 9 Board of Selectmen. 10 The town is very concerned the site will 11 not be properly cleaned up due to reliance on a GEIS 12 written in 2002 and an SEIS written in 2006 that are 13 14 outdated, incomplete, and ignore new and significant information, and the failure of NRC to require a NEPA 15 analysis, as required by federal law and legal 16 precedent, into insufficient funds in the DTF. 17 With respect to the GEIS and SEIS, Duxbury 18 sees no rational basis for NRC to assume that the 19 environmental impacts are bounded by these documents, 20 nor that environmental impacts will be small or that 21 the site is essentially clean. 22 It is not. examples: 23 24 SEIS incorrectly denies that National Academy's Biological Effects of Radiation 25

Report, 2006, denies to provide new and significant information from the 1990 report. The 2006 report found mortality rates for women exposed to radiation was 37.5 percent higher than its 1990 report and the impact of allowable radiation standards on workers was twice that estimated in 1990. Therefore, allowable doses need to be reduced from the 25 millirem a year to less than 10 millirem a year, as the State has requested, and reduction in allowable doses to workers. You are obligated to follow the latest scientific information, not go back to 1990.

Second, contamination onsite must be updated. In the GEIS and SEIS, NRC didn't lift a shovel. You just relied on the licensees' reports. Their conclusions cannot be relied upon. Pilgrim opened with bad fuel and no off-gas treatment system, and blew its filters in 1982.

Where did the contamination go? Hazardous waste is buried onsite, including on the property off the access road. Construction has occurred at the site and the soil buried. What's in that soil? There's a crack in the reactor's torus floor. Soil outside the reactor, beneath it, must be analyzed. The source of tritium levels of monitoring wells is unknown. Other slower-moving radionuclides also are

likely to be there, not yet picked up by the monitoring wells. Also, what is leaked from seismic gaps and the condensate system? Again, who knows? It's not in the 2002 report. It's not in the SEIS written in 2006.

NRC's 2014 continued storage rule that the waste may be stored onsite indefinitely has to be considered. The PSDAR's assumptions that spent fuel will be offsite by 2062 cannot be accepted by NRC. Entergy relied on DOE for its projections, but DOE qualified its projections. Entergy and Holtec did not.

PSDAR cost estimates and plans to ensure the long-term integrity of the casks must be revised to provide a contingency fund for long-term storage.

NRC's Mark Lombard stated that there is no technology to find cracks in Holtec casks. They're made of steel and subject to corrosion. Dr. Kris Singh, the President of Holtec, said that it's not feasible to repair Holtec's sealed canisters.

These facts cannot be ignored. Casks must be better protected, monitored for heat, helium, and temperature, and funds for mitigation included in cost estimates because the fuel, as NRC has said, could remain here indefinitely in an environment subject to

1 corrosion, moisture, and salt. 2 The GEIS and SEIS found socioeconomic impacts small. 3 Again, not so. A University of 4 Massachusetts Amherst study commissioned by the Town 5 of Plymouth found that the economic impact on Plymouth alone would be almost \$500 million and that there 6 7 would be more than \$100 million impact on the rest of 8 the region, including Duxbury. therefore, it's clear that 9 Conclusion: 10 the GEIS and SEIS are totally inadequate and do not bound the environmental impact. The NRC must require 11 a comprehensive environmental analysis 12 includes shovels and testing, made public, quite 13 14 obviously, at the beginning of the decommissioning 15 process and a NEPA analysis. This is a major federal reaction. 16 17 cannot pretend it is mere oversight to wiggle your way out of the requirement. You gave the license and you 18 19 will terminate the licenses. That is a major federal action. 20 And thank you very much. 21 22 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you. MR. J. LAMPERT: I'm Jim Lampert, and I am 23 24 also here representing the Duxbury Board of Selectmen.

And I'd like to speak briefly on just one aspect.

The Selectmen in the Town of Duxbury have concerns about the financial aspects serious decommissioning. You heard Senator Markey's representative, Senator Warren's representative, Representative Keating's representative, and Attorney General's Office refer to these.

Holtec's PSDAR, like Entergy's, says there is enough money in the Decommissioning Trust Fund to accomplish the job. Putting aside all of the things the PSDAR doesn't talk about, and Mrs. Lampert just listed, that assumption by Entergy and Holtec rests on a further assumption that future costs in decommissioning will not be more than future increases in general inflation. That assumption is highly questionable.

According to Callan Associates that annually puts together a report on decommissioning costs for the nuclear industry, decommissioning costs increased at an annual rate of about 5.8 percent between 2008 and 2016. This increase in cost is about 4.5 percent above inflation. For a benchmark, the NRC and the PSDARs assume that the Trust Fund will grow at a rate of only 2 percent of the general inflation.

The NRC's own questions and answers on decommissioning financial assurance say that, over a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 20-year period, there will be an annual increase in decommissioning costs of between 5 and 9 percent. 2 Again, well over both inflation and 2 percent above 3 4 inflation. If the NRC's statements are correct, and 5 Callan's reports of actual past history correct, it seems highly unlikely that there's going 6 7 to be enough money in the fund to accomplish the job. 8 Which leads me to a fundamental question 9 of the Board of Selectmen: if there is not enough 10 money, what law or regulation requires a licensee, particularly a limited liability corporation like 11 Holtec-Pilgrim, or any of its parent or associated 12 entities, to pay the shortfall? Can you tell me if 13 14 there is such a regulation? And if so, tell me what 15 it is. And if you cannot do now, can I ask that you tell us all tomorrow night at the decommissioning 16 17 panel meeting to give you the time to get the answer? MR. KLUKAN: Thank you. 18 Rebecca Chin for the Town of 19 MS. CHIN: Duxbury. The Selectmen asked me to speak on public 20 safety this evening. 21 And we urge you to retain the current 22 offsite emergency planning funded by the licensee 23 24 until the spent fuel pool is emptied and continue

licensee-funded offsite emergency planning

1 reduced level until all the fuel leaves the site. 2 Entergy has currently filed for a license exemption to end offsite and reduce onsite funding, 3 4 and this should be denied by the NRC. You cannot 5 expect mutual aid with no funding. The second is on monitoring. 6 Mass 7 Department of Public Health should continue to expand offsite radiological monitoring and onsite tritium 8 9 The licensee should continue to provide monitoring. 10 Mass Department of Public Health with its funding. needs to be required of the licensee. 11 12 Thank you. 13 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you. 14 MS. LYNCH-BENTTININ: Sheila Lynch-Benttinin in Duxbury, speaking on behalf of the Board 15 16 of Selectmen. I would like to address one issue. 17 Forty years ago when community safety was being addressed, 18 19 telephone poles and speakers were the technology of the time. Currently, in our Town of Duxbury, which is 20 within the 5-mile zone of Pilgrim, we have an Old 21 Colony network, digital network, of public safety 22 addresses. I would like Holtec, if they are going to 23

departments and the Old Colony system of current

engage the

next

July,

to

24

25

regional

1	digital notification to be engaged in community safety
2	and planning during the three very important years,
3	especially after what just happened in California with
4	the accident. If there's an accident during the
5	Holtec time, if they're given the license, and you're
6	not up-to-date with the current fire department
7	technologies in the region, it will be a very tragic
8	day. So, I encourage Holtec, if they're given the
9	license in July, to reach out to the regional fire
10	departments and the emergency notification system,
11	which has been greatly upgraded since 40 years ago.
12	Thank you.
13	MR. KLUKAN: Thank you very much.
14	Are there any other elected officials or
15	representatives of elected officials or
16	representatives of federally-recognized tribes who
17	would like to introduce themselves this evening before
18	we move on to the public comment portion?
19	(No response.)
20	All right. Hearing none, I would like to
21	introduce Donna Janda, and we will proceed with the
22	public comment portion.
23	MS. JANDA: Thanks, Brett.
24	Good evening, everyone. As Brett said, my
25	name is Donna Janda, and I'll be facilitating

tonight's meeting along with Brett.

For those of you who registered to speak, you should have received a ticket, the other half of which Brett has in a container over here. And the speaking order is going to be determined by the numbers that are pulled from the container. And the intent of this is so that the speaker order is just random.

So, I do want to emphasize there is no prohibition against donating your ticket to others. You are free to do so. However, both individuals should be present at the time that number is called, and the donation must be announced at that time.

In addition, if an individual has already spoken during the meeting as a result of someone donating their ticket, and then, that individual's ticket is called, that individual may not use that ticket, but they can donate it to someone else. This is just to give opportunity to everyone to be able to speak.

So, when your number is called, please queue up to the microphone that's in the aisle, in the center aisle right there. And if you need to have a microphone brought to you, just let us know, and Brett will take care of that for you.

Just so you have some advanced warning of when it's your turn to speak, Brett's posting the numbers right now as I'm speaking, and we're going to just go down them in sequential order there.

In an effort to give everybody the opportunity to speak tonight, please limit yourselves to three minutes when we speaking. We do have a clock here on this table in the center here, in front of the podium, and we'll count down those three minutes. And after the three-minute mark, I'll politely ask you to conclude your remarks.

For your awareness, the meeting tonight is being recorded, and there is a transcript that will generated after the meeting. Both the audio and the transcript will be posted to the NRC website. So, in light of that, I would ask, when it's your turn to speak, that you please identify yourself. And I would also ask, for the sake of the audio recording, that people not speak over each other.

I would also ask that we keep this area clear in front of the stage. If there is something you would like to give to the NRC staff, you can give that to Brett and he'll take care of that.

And now, just some basic groundrules to go over. While recognizing many of you have strongly-

1 held opinions concerning the matters that were discussed tonight, I ask that you, nonetheless, adhere 2 3 to civil decorum, that you respect each other. 4 please do not disrupt each other. Just as you 5 wouldn't want to be interrupted during your three minutes at the microphone, please respect the speaking 6 7 time of others. Any threatening gestures or statements 8 will under no circumstances be tolerated and will be 9 10 cause for immediate ejection from the meeting. If you feel you've been threatened, please let me know or 11 please tell one of the NRC security personnel or 12 police officers in the room, and we will try and 13 14 address that. 15 The one thing that I do want to also note -- and I haven't heard any tonight -- but please 16 17 make sure you silence your cell phones, so that doesn't disrupt the meeting. 18 19 And I think we are ready to go at that. So, the first number on the list is No. 2. 20 I've already spoken. 21 PARTICIPANT: Would you like to 22 MS. JANDA: Okay. donate that ticket to somebody else to speak? 23 24 MR. KLUKAN: Would anyone who didn't sign up yet to speak like to speak right now? 25

l		(No	response.
---	--	-----	-----------

All right. So, let's break this down.
This system is designed I actually just experienced
this at a Westinghouse meeting in South Carolina where
we didn't have that many numbers. So, this is
everyone. This is everyone who signed up to speak.
So, we have 14 people who signed up to speak. There
will likely be some opportunity at the end, after
these individuals have spoken, if you haven't signed
up to speak, or if you decide after hearing comments
to speak then.
So, the plan is just to move through these
numbers, and then, again, open it up after that. I'm

)

numbers, and then, again, open it up after that. I'm still going to keep people to the three minutes. And then, if people have additional things to say after that, once we've gotten through the list, and whether there's any additional people who would like to speak, then we can add on a second round, as time permits. Okay?

So, did anyone want to use the No. 2 ticket?

(No response.)

If not, we will move on to the No. 12 ticket.

Pass? All right. Look at the time we are

1 making this evening. 2 (Laughter.) 3 The No. 1 ticket. Do you want to go? 4 MS. LAMPERT: Yes. All right, go. All right. 5 MR. KLUKAN: 6 MS. LAMPERT: Mary Lampert for Pilgrim 7 Watch. I just want to amplify the concern of our 8 9 town and other speakers of maintaining licensee responsibility for offsite emergency planning in full 10 force, as it is now, whatever it is, until the pool is 11 emptied, and then, ratcheted-down until fuel leaves 12 the site. 13 14 What is not properly considered by NRC or the licensees is our acts of malice. We know there is 15 a heightened threat environment, and we know that the 16 17 spent fuel pool is а vulnerable target, as demonstrated by an expert for our Attorney General, 18 19 Dr. Gordon Thompson, during relicensing. 20 We know, also, that even in a cask they are vulnerable to acts of malice by a shoulder-launch 21 missile, for example, and then, in the hole, putting 22 in an explosive. This is described in excruciating 23 24 detail, again by Dr. Thompson, both in hearings in the

United States, recent ones, and in Canada.

1 So, you have to consider it. The fact 2 that the probability may be low, you can take an arithmetic view to it because of the consequences 3 4 being so great as they are. 5 And consider also, we are very glad the ISFSI pad has been moved to higher ground. 6 7 unfortunately, it wasn't moved to the Manomet side. It was moved more towards, I'd say, the Duxbury side. 8 9 And it is very, very close to Rocky Hill Road. 10 So, we have gained a great deal by not having it subject to climate change effects, but we 11 on security. Therefore, 12 have lost need we reinforced barrier or some measure, a building or 13 14 something, to provide the security we need, because the threat is not going away and each cask contains 15 over half the cesium-137 released in Chernobyl. 16 17 Thank you. Thank you very much. MR. KLUKAN: 18 MS. JANDA: And the next number is No. 3. 19 20 PARTICIPANT: Pass. PARTICIPANT: I'll take it. 21 It's important to hold the 22 MR. KLUKAN: physical copy of the ticket. I'm just kidding. 23 24 Could you state your name for the record? My name is Dan Wolfe. 25 MR. WOLFE: I'm

1 from Harwich on Cape Cod, and I also serve on the 2 Nuclear Decommissioning Citizens Advisory Panel. I'll see you all tomorrow night, and I appreciate your 3 4 being here. 5 In case there are people that can't be there tomorrow night that are here tonight, we have 6 7 heard expressed by numerous folks from our legislative delegation, the Attorney General's Office, a real 8 concern that there isn't sufficient funds. 9 10 could go back and forth on that. It's conjecture. It's based on certain assumptions relative to economic 11 returns on what's in the Trust Fund. 12 So, I quess I have a really specific 13 14 question. And that is, what happens if there isn't? 15 What happens if there is not specific funds? Where 16 does the burden go? 17 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you. The short answer is MR. WATSON: the 18 19 remains responsible for completing licensee decommissioning and providing the funds that 20 necessary to do that. So, would 21 that responsibility that, if we were to grant the license 22 transfer to Holtec, they would be responsible for and 23 24 for complying with the requirements.

Could I ask a

MR.

WOLFE:

25

followup

1 question to that, please? 2 MR. KLUKAN: You have like two Sure. 3 minutes left. 4 MR. WOLFE: Okay. Thanks. 5 So, I quess question would be, is there any precedent or is there an ability to hold the 6 7 original licensee liable in addition to Holtec? There are layers of sort of corporate creation here that I 8 9 think limit and insulate from liability. 10 question would be, is there a mechanism, is there a precedent, is there a way to keep Entergy potentially 11 liable or the investors in Entergy potentially liable 12 if the funds are insufficient? 13 14 Because our concern is it goes to that 15 entity, and, of course, the well is dry. And by the 16 way, that is by design. That is by corporate design as far as how this is being constructed. 17 Thank you very much. 18 19 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you again. 20 To the best of knowledge, we MR. WATSON: don't have any precedent. We have had some sites go 21 bankrupt, and we've worked with the trustee of the 22 Trust Fund to complete the decommissioning. 23 24 there's no -- once we complete our review, and if we

were to transfer the license, there would be no going

1 back to Entergy for the funds. So, it's either they're going to be qualified to do that and accept 2 3 that responsibility or not. 4 MS. JANDA: The next speaker will be No. 5 4. Diane Cape 6 MS. TURCO: Turco with Downwinders. 7 Being a good neighbor means taking care of 8 each other and making decisions for the common good. 9 Entergy has advertised itself as a corporation that is 10 a good neighbor -- as long as there is money to be 11 made. Now the plug will be pulled in June and the 12 coffers will dry up. Entergy is running for the exit 13 14 door and leaving their legacy mess behind. Entergy's PDSR calls for SAFSTOR, making 15 Pilgrim a radioactive holding tank for 60 years. 16 Holtec for DECON, prompt decommissioning using the 17 Decommissioning Trust Fund with exemptions. 18 best for the community should be the priority of both 19 their plans, but it is not. 20 We all agree that prompt decommissioning 21 is the best, but it must be done responsibly and 22 safely. The following are our standards to meet the 23 24 good neighbor requirements: With the ISFSI holding tons of radioactive 25

1	waste, there's still a potential for offsite release.
2	The PSDR must include emergency plans based on low-
3	probability, high-consequence incidents, such as
4	terrorists attacks, and be included in the
5	Environmental Impact Statement.
6	Location of the ISFSI pad must consider a
7	technically-defensible onsite storage location.
8	That's not what we have now.
9	Dry cask must be improved with quality and
10	be able to be inspected, monitored, repaired, and are
11	retrievable.
12	Procedures must be in place for transfer
13	of waste from any cracked or damaged canisters or
14	casks which may mean keeping the pool.
15	Procedures and training for fuel transfer
16	with certification of completion by the NRC prior to
17	moving any fuel from the pool.
18	Residual radiation levels must match EPA
19	standards and inclusion of independent oversight.
20	Finally, we ask for an AGO inspection into
21	Holtec and its subsidiaries before any license
22	transfer. As LLCs, this looks like a house of cards
23	with no guarantee that available funds will be
24	available to complete the job.
25	The citizens of Massachusetts must have

paying off the mess Entergy has left behind. 2 3 Looking at Holtec's record from recent 4 events at San Onofre near San Diego, confidence in 5 their ability to make decisions based on protection of the public is questionable. An NRC special inspection 6 7 report of a near drop of a full canister cited poor 8 training, not following procedures, equipment 9 problems, and mismanagement. Sound familiar? 10 management, poor training, poor procedures, et cetera, has kept Entergy's operation at Pilgrim as the least 11 safe in the U.S. still. This is like going from the 12 frying pan into the fire. We don't need another 13 14 corporation here with a poor safety culture that puts 15 profit over public safety. are concerned neighbors 16 17 support a responsible and safe decommissioning plan that protects our communities. If Holtec is setting 18 19 the standard at SONGS, Cape Downwinders cannot support the transfer of license from Entergy at this time. 20 You need to go back to the drawing board 21 and do better for our communities. 22 23 Thank you very much. MR. KLUKAN: 24 MS. JANDA: The next speaker will be No. 9. 25

clear assurance that the taxpayers will not be left

MR. ROTHSTEIN: Good evening. Richard Rothstein, Town of Plymouth resident and a new member of the State Nuclear Decommissioning Citizens Advisory Panel.

I asked the question during last week's webinar regarding Entergy's PSDAR for SAFSTOR about the anticipated timeline for when the NRC would allow the onsite meteorological towers to get dismantled during the decommissioning process under SAFSTOR. The NRC couldn't answer that question, only because it's a little bit too early in the process. So, I just wanted to rephrase my question.

Why is it important to have the onsite meteorological towers? They're important because of emergency planning purposes. In the event of a radiological emergency with the plant still operating or once the plant is permanently shut down, but spent fuel in the pool, before it gets transferred, and even dry casks onsite, if there with the were radiological emergency, а release, emergency responders would need to have that information to be able to make determinations of shelter in place versus emergency evacuation determinations there. This need doesn't disappear simply just because the plant is permanently shutting down.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	So, to rephrase my question from last
2	week, I'd be interested in learning about other plants
3	that have decommissioned or are in the process of
4	decommissioning, most using SAFSTOR, but some are
5	probably going to use DECON, and when the NRC allowed
6	a licensee to dismantle the onsite meteorological
7	towers. I don't expect you would have an answer
8	tonight, but certainly in the next few weeks I'd be
9	very interested in learning more about that history,
10	so we can see what circumstances did NRC require those
11	towers to stay up longer or other circumstances where
12	they allowed a licensee to dismantle them sooner than
13	later.
13 14	later. Thank you.
14	Thank you.
14 15	Thank you.  MS. JANDA: All right. Thank you.
14 15 16	Thank you.  MS. JANDA: All right. Thank you.  The next speaker will be No. 10.
14 15 16 17	Thank you.  MS. JANDA: All right. Thank you.  The next speaker will be No. 10.  MR. WALLEN: Hello. My name is Stan
14 15 16 17	Thank you.  MS. JANDA: All right. Thank you.  The next speaker will be No. 10.  MR. WALLEN: Hello. My name is Stan  Wallen, a resident of the Town of Plymouth. And I'll
14 15 16 17 18	Thank you.  MS. JANDA: All right. Thank you.  The next speaker will be No. 10.  MR. WALLEN: Hello. My name is Stan  Wallen, a resident of the Town of Plymouth. And I'll  disclose that I'm a retiree of Pilgrim Nuclear Power
14 15 16 17 18 19	Thank you.  MS. JANDA: All right. Thank you.  The next speaker will be No. 10.  MR. WALLEN: Hello. My name is Stan  Wallen, a resident of the Town of Plymouth. And I'll  disclose that I'm a retiree of Pilgrim Nuclear Power  Station.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Thank you.  MS. JANDA: All right. Thank you.  The next speaker will be No. 10.  MR. WALLEN: Hello. My name is Stan  Wallen, a resident of the Town of Plymouth. And I'll  disclose that I'm a retiree of Pilgrim Nuclear Power  Station.  I have one simple question for Holtec.

You have 105 now. If you're in the business to make

1 money, where are you going to get an additional almost 90 million? 2 One moment. 3 MR. KLUKAN: MS. STERDIS: This is Andrea Sterdis. 4 5 And the cash flow analysis that included in both the license transfer application as 6 7 well as the PSDAR for DECON demonstrate that the costs will be distributed over time, and it does accurately 8 9 reflect the regulations regarding the Trust Fund 10 increases over time. So, I'll just quote 11 MR. WALLEN: I see. a former presidential candidate, that we're working 12 with, "voodoo economics". 13 14 Secondly, this whole situation here almost 15 looks like it's down pat that Holtec will get a 16 license transfer. What is the consequence of the NRC 17 not approving a license transfer? We're going to have Entergy try to decommission and take 60 years. 18 Is 19 there a method or order or compulsion that can happen to have Entergy accelerate the process? Are we stuck 20 with that if the license transfer is not approved? An 21 NRC question. 22 MR. WATSON: Okay. Yes, first of all, we 23 24 are in the process of reviewing the Holtec application

and the associated financial and technical information

been

1 has been provided. So, there's no 2 conclusion on that. Should we deny the application and not 3 4 allow the transfer to take place, yes, Entergy would 5 remain the licensee and be responsible for maintaining the plant in a safe condition. So, we would continue 6 7 to inspect as we will if the license were transferred 8 the facility to ensure it's maintained safely, and 9 regardless of the DECON option or SAFSTOR option they But the bottom line here is the licensee 10 11 would be, continue to be Entergy, and their they have requirement is that complete 12 to decommissioning in 60 years. 13 14 MR. WALLEN: Thank you. 15 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you very much. Would it be beneficial to people if we put 16 17 back up the slide with one of the numbers instead of just looking at "Thank you," which I'm sure is very 18 19 useful to all of you? Maybe either the Pilgrim numbers, or the Entergy numbers or the Holtec number, 20 one of the two? Okay. Thanks for doing that. 21 22 MS. JANDA: Okay. The next speaker will be No. 14. 23 24 MS. CONSETINO: Good evening, everybody. I'm Henrietta Consetino, resident of Plymouth and, 25

that

also, Chair of the League of Women Voters Nuclear Committee.

And I thank you for coming tonight. We appreciate it. It's very important.

I also want to say I appreciate greatly the speakers who came from the offices of our elected officials. It was very helpful to have their comments.

I have a question, but I'll save it for last. My first is just a comment in total laymen terms. We have two possibilities right now. On the one hand, we have Holtec proposing to decommission in a very short amount of time, and for cheap, and phenomenally. It just sounds too good to be true, particularly if you start to pay attention to the nature of the dry casks that are being proposed and the fact that these very same dry casks have been tremendously troublesome at San Onofre and probably in other places, too, all of them scratched, being subject to erosion from saltwater, being stored on the beach.

At least in San Onofre, the plan was it's now suspended for a time, but the plan was to put these faulty casks in a vaulted system. Here in Plymouth, there is no proposal for any kind of

1 vaulting, any kind of hard cover for these very vulnerable casks that could be subject to terrorism. 2 3 We appreciate the moving of the ISFSI, and 4 that was important to us, but there is much more that needs to be done if Holtec is to have the license. 5 It's also very disturbing that Holtec is requesting 6 7 waivers for a certain amount of regulations, just as 8 Entergy has been granted waivers for the computer 9 security that was required for all of their plants in the wake of Fukushima, waiver from the kind of hard 10 valves that would make it safer. So, this 11 disturbing. 12 On the other hand, if we go with so-13 grotesquely-called SAFSTOR, 60 years of 14 called, decommissioning, this is surreal. We will all be gone 15 16 60 years from now, every single one of us in this 17 room, unless there is a very young person. And many of our children will be gone, too. And I wonder who 18 19 exactly is going to be in charge, what they will have been told, and so forth. 20 Have I reached my limit? Okay. 21 there then. 22 Thank you very much. 23 MR. KLUKAN: 24 MS. JANDA: The next speaker will be No. 8. 25

1 MR. GARLEY: Hi. I'm John Garley. I'm from Hingham. 2 3 I have an NRC Information Notice 2012-20 that says that chloride-induced stress corrosion 4 5 cracking of austenitic -- right? You got the right word? -- stainless steel in dry cask storage systems. 6 7 And there's a couple of times that it happened in San 8 Onofre, St. Lucie Nuclear Power Plant, Turkey Point, 9 and through the wall at Koeberg Nuclear Power Station. Are these casks made out of this austenitic steel? 10 That's a question for Holtec. Austenitic. Are you 11 going to answer the question or? 12 PARTICIPANT: Austenitic. 13 MR. GARLEY: Austenitic? Thank you. 14 these casks made out of that? 15 Because this document says that they're cracked from being near saltwater. 16 17 Do you need to hit a button or something (referring to microphone)? 18 19 MR. KLUKAN: I'm just going to phrase it. Would someone from either Entergy or Holtec like to 20 answer that question? 21 MR. GARLEY: Well, my concern is that the 22 CEO says that, if there is a crack, you couldn't fix 23 24 it, right? And you might not be able to find it. if there's no fuel pool, what do you do with that 25

1	cask? So, that's a question for Holtec. Do we have
2	a solution if there's a cask leak, and what are you
3	going to do with it?
4	MS. J. RUSSELL: My name is Joy Russell.
5	I think that Andrea did introduce me at the very
6	beginning.
7	First, I would like to say that your
8	information about canisters is incorrect. There are
9	no leaking canisters in the United States. Holtec's
10	canisters do not leak. There has been no
11	MR. GARLEY: The steel has corroded.
12	MS. J. RUSSELL: That is incorrect, sir.
13	I have
14	MR. GARLEY: Okay. Well, that's an NRC
15	information docket number. So, you might want to
16	check with them. I'm just going by what they have.
17	MS. J. RUSSELL: Okay. Holtec's canisters
18	have no evidence of stress corrosion cracking.
19	MR. GARLEY: Really? All right. Well,
20	you might want to talk to them because they're putting
21	stuff online that says they do. All right?
22	And then, the Sierra Club put a letter to
23	the NRC as well it's Event No. 51134 that Holtec
24	filled the Diablo Canyon canisters incorrectly in half
25	of them. Is that incorrect as well? Because there's
ı	I and the second

1	stuff online you might want to cancel.
2	MS. J. RUSSELL: Sir, I beg to differ with
3	you; that is also incorrect.
4	MR. GARLEY: Again? Okay.
5	MS. J. RUSSELL: The Diablo Canyon
6	canisters, which were loaded by Holtec on behalf of
7	Pacific Gas and Electric, were all loaded correctly in
8	accordance with our Certificate of Compliance.
9	MR. GARLEY: Okay. Well, somebody's got
10	some bad and the last thing is with NRC. Are you
11	considering deep isolation technology as well, besides
12	just Holtec's stuff? Because, I mean, we're getting
13	one option here or two that sound pretty bad to me.
14	MR. WATSON: Well, let me just state that
15	there is
16	MR. GARLEY: It just stopped my number
17	(referring to the tickets for order of speakers).
18	MR. WATSON: There is a need in the
19	country for permanent repository of the spent fuel.
20	MR. GARLEY: Uh-hum.
21	MR. WATSON: The Department of Energy is
22	responsible for developing and finding that site and
23	using the proper technology. So, it's really up to
24	our policymakers in Washington to fund those
25	activities and to allow them to do their work in
	I

1 identifying and developing а site and what 2 technologies will be used with that. 3 I think everybody is aware that there was 4 some work-in-progress at the Yucca Mountain site in And so, that came to a halt. 5 And so now, it's up to the policymakers to reinstate the need or 6 7 the promise they made for disposing of this material. 8 MR. GARLEY: Okay. And my last question 9 for Holtec is that you have sent an application to the 10 NRC for interim storage in Lea County, New Mexico. Does that mean you want to move this waste to New 11 Is that on your plan? Mexico? 12 MS. J. RUSSELL: 13 Sir, you're correct, 14 Holtec has submitted a license application to the 15 Regulatory Commission license Nuclear to а consolidated interim storage facility in southeast New 16 17 Mexico. And if the facility is constructed, it is the possibility of moving the fuel from here to that 18 19 facility in New Mexico. That is correct. MR. GARLEY: All right. So, the DOE says 20 there's 5,000 train car incidents a year. 21 think that could be dangerous with stuff that's 22 corroded from the ocean? 23 24 MS. J. RUSSELL: Sir, if I understand your question correctly, you're asking for my opinion --25

1	MR. GARLEY: Yes.
2	MS. J. RUSSELL: if I think
3	transportation of spent nuclear fuel is safe. Yes, I
4	do. The industry does it on a regular basis. We have
5	transported more than 1380 shipments by rail, all
6	safely, without any release of radioactive material.
7	MR. GARLEY: Okay. Thank you.
8	MS. JANDA: Thank you.
9	MR. KLUKAN: Thank you very much.
10	Before we move, since we do have some
11	time, we kind of left that hanging there, that
12	question. So, just to clarify, so the members of the
13	public don't go away potentially confused on this.
14	Are the casks made out of this kind of
15	steel, or if they're not, could we just state that for
16	the record? Because we kind of moved on to the second
17	question without answering the first. I just want to
18	make sure, because it seemed like there was some
19	confusion about that amongst the crowd.
20	MS. J. RUSSELL: Yes, the canisters are
21	made out of austenitic stainless steel.
22	MR. KLUKAN: All right. Thank you. I
23	appreciate that.
24	MS. JANDA: The next speaker will be No.
25	11.

1 MS. MILLER: Hello. My name is Claire Miller. I'm the lead organizer with Toxics Action 2 3 Center. We're a public health and environmental 4 nonprofit founded in 1987. 5 And while I don't consider myself to be an extremely young person, it is conceivable that I could 6 7 live to 93. And I'm a community organizer, but I also 8 9 happened to grow up -- I was born and raised in 10 Duxbury, Massachusetts. And so, I want to speak a little bit more from the heart tonight. 11 At Toxics Action Center we've really seen 12 over our history that corporations go to very great 13 14 lengths to avoid cleaning up their messes. And as a 15 teenager, I have a lot of memories hearing about 16 Pilgrim Nuclear Power Plant. It's not every childhood 17 that you learn your home could be in a nuclear meltdown. 18 19 My father is a curious man. He took tours of the nuclear power plant before they stopped doing 20 that after 9/11. He told me stories about how the 21 folks would say, "Oh, don't stand there. That spot's 22 23 hot." 24 We also had a family friend who worked at

like a landscaping company. And I remember my father

and them joking about, you know, how the site was -there are hidden mysteries. And my distinct
impression was that they weren't kidding, even though
they were talking in a funny manner.

So, it really disturbs me that this isn't

So, it really disturbs me that this isn't proceeding with extreme care to the data. And I want to say that it's extremely important to me that there's a comprehensive environmental analysis done on the entire site. We have to know really what's there.

The second piece here is that, as corny as it may sound, we're in Hotel 1620. I am actually descended from a pilgrim, and that's 15 generations of my family. And I have an intention to do well by this place. You know, my descendants haven't always done well by this land, and I'd like to see 15 more generations. But that's only possible if we do an extremely good job. So, it's very important to me that we honor the Commonwealth's desire for a cleanup standard of no less than 10.

And the third thing that I am really sitting on as we're here is really around drinking water. It's so precious. And once it's contaminated, it's extremely difficult to fix.

Toxics Action Center is working with countless communities across the region who don't have

1 access to clean drinking water. And so, as this continues, as the NRC oversees the future of the site, 2 3 we have to ensure that there's clean drinking water 4 and we must meet the EPA's own standard of no less 5 than 4 for the drinking water. 6 Thank you. 7 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you very much. 8 MS. JANDA: The next speaker will be No. 7. 9 10 MS. CORRIGAN: Hi. Joanne Corrigan. live in Plymouth. I can ride my bike to the power 11 12 plant. I've got a couple of questions. First of 13 14 all, that beautiful slide they showed of Yankee Rowe, 15 how pastoral it looked after the decommissioning, 16 where are the spent fuel casks? Is that airbrushed or 17 Photoshopped? (Laughter.) 18 19 MR. WATSON: No, that's an actual picture. The dry fuel storage facility is located above the 20 river there on the hill. 21 MS. CORRIGAN: Because Plymouth will never 22 look like that. First of all, we have that nasty 23 24 jetty that's ripped the sand off Priscilla Beach. And apparently, that's staying there, even though the 25

1 slides are saying how it goes back to the natural state in the environment. Is that right? 2 3 Holtec going to leave the jetty there? After the 4 reactor cools, I know --5 MR. WATSON: I quess Holtec can maybe answer. 6 7 MS. STERDIS: It is our plan to leave the 8 jetty there. 9 MS. CORRIGAN: Okay. My other question --10 and I agree 100 percent with Mary Lampert that you're moving the casks now. Finally you figured out it's 11 You didn't need a study. 12 too close to the ocean. Just come down to Priscilla Beach during a full moon 13 14 when there's a nor'easter, and you'll see the waves 15 come crashing onto the street. Why they put those 16 first ones so close is beyond me. 17 Now where they're going to move them, they're right out in the open of Rocky Hill Road. And 18 19 what's to prevent, say, a dump truck with about 10 terrorists with RPGs or AR-15s with armor-piercing 20 bullets from stopping there, jumping up, and not 21 shooting at 100 casks, shooting at one cask? 22 the chance of that being compromised and breached and 23 24 releasing radiation?

MS. J. RUSSELL: Again, Joy Russell.

1	In November, we presented at the Citizens
2	Advisory Panel a very lengthy discussion I
3	personally did that with one of my colleagues about
4	the safety and security that's offered by the Holtec
5	HI-STORM 100 System that's in use at Pilgrim. In that
6	discussion, which you can go back and I believe see it
7	online, I presented a long discussion about the casks'
8	ability to withstand even an aircraft crash. So, the
9	system is very robust and it can withstand what you
10	have just described as beyond-design-basis scenarios.
11	MS. CORRIGAN: I see. Well, my third
12	comment is, when Pilgrim was up and running and
13	actually made money, Entergy still couldn't get them
14	out of the column 4 degraded column, didn't want to
15	spend the money, didn't have the expertise, didn't
16	have the enthusiasm, all of the above.
17	What makes you think we are going to
18	believe, after the NRC gives them a pass on the
19	cybersecurity, the everything, that now, all of a
20	sudden, they're offline, they're not making money, and
21	they're going to put in the resource of the money to
22	keep us safe? I don't believe that for a minute.
23	Thank you.
24	MR. KLUKAN: Thank you.
25	MS. JANDA: The next speaker will be No.

1	5.
2	MS. CONSETINO: Now I'll finish my
3	comment, but I'll make it very quick.
4	I wanted to follow up on the comments
5	I'm sorry. Henrietta Consetino.
6	MS. JANDA: Thank you.
7	MS. CONSETINO: Plymouth resident, League
8	of Women Voters.
9	I wanted to follow up on the many
10	questions about finances, and go back to Jim Lampert's
11	question. Where is the regulation that actually holds
12	the licensee responsible, should the fund, the
13	Decommissioning Trust Fund, be inadequate? And along
14	the way, what happens if the stock market crashes, and
15	1.05 billion turns into 900 million, or something of
16	that sort? What happens then? What is the state of
17	the Trust Fund right now?
18	MR. KLUKAN: Thank you.
19	MR. TWOMEY: Mike Twomey, on behalf of
20	Entergy.
21	We provide a periodic update on the value
22	of the Trust Fund, and we do not have an up-to-date
23	number available this evening.
24	MR. KLUKAN: Just to follow up, so we

don't leave it like that, when do you provide these?

1 So, October was the last one. When would you provide 2 the next one? 3 MR. TWOMEY: Well, we at least provide a 4 number in March of every year as part of our annual 5 disclosure to the NRC. I don't know if we will be 6 providing one before March. And it's actually a March 7 I think it actually comes out in April. 8 MR. KLUKAN: Okay. Thank you. 9 MS. CONSETINO: It's worrisome because 10 we've had some very serious major plummets in the market since October. 11 to go back to the 12 want first But Ι question and make sure you don't forget that Jim 13 14 originally asked, is there a regulation that holds the licensee to its financial responsibilities? 15 16 so, what is that regulation? 17 MR. KLUKAN: Again, thank you. MR. WATSON: Let me respond. I'm sorry. 18 19 The regulations for the decommissioning funding are spelled out in 50.82. The actual requirement, if 20 you're going to accept or apply for a license with the 21 NRC, means that the licensee will be responsible for 22 providing the decommissioning funds to restore the 23 24 site and have the license terminated. Those are in,

When a licensee applies for a

I think it's 50.2.

1	license, there's something called the Common Defense
2	Clause, which means you are accepting that
3	responsibility when you apply for a license, and that
4	you will be radiologically and environmentally
5	responsible for cleaning up the site when you've
6	completed the work.
7	PARTICIPANT: What if they go bankrupt?
8	MR. WATSON: They're still responsible for
9	providing the funding, and that would be part of the
10	process we would go through for getting the assets of
11	the company and continuing the completion of the
12	decommissioning.
13	MR. WATSON: We have two more, and then,
13 14	MR. WATSON: We have two more, and then, we can potentially do a second round. But the
14	we can potentially do a second round. But the
14 15	we can potentially do a second round. But the question that was posed on the floor, to which Bruce
14 15 16	we can potentially do a second round. But the question that was posed on the floor, to which Bruce responded, was, what happens if they go bankrupt? I
14 15 16 17	we can potentially do a second round. But the question that was posed on the floor, to which Bruce responded, was, what happens if they go bankrupt? I just wanted to make sure we capture that for the
14 15 16 17	we can potentially do a second round. But the question that was posed on the floor, to which Bruce responded, was, what happens if they go bankrupt? I just wanted to make sure we capture that for the transcript.
14 15 16 17 18	we can potentially do a second round. But the question that was posed on the floor, to which Bruce responded, was, what happens if they go bankrupt? I just wanted to make sure we capture that for the transcript.  So, next up will be No. 13.
14 15 16 17 18 19	we can potentially do a second round. But the question that was posed on the floor, to which Bruce responded, was, what happens if they go bankrupt? I just wanted to make sure we capture that for the transcript.  So, next up will be No. 13.  MR. GUSTAFSON: Good evening. My name's
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	we can potentially do a second round. But the question that was posed on the floor, to which Bruce responded, was, what happens if they go bankrupt? I just wanted to make sure we capture that for the transcript.  So, next up will be No. 13.  MR. GUSTAFSON: Good evening. My name's Scott Gustafson. I'm a Plymouth resident.

transfer to Holtec because of their technical

expertise.

As a representative of the Laborers'

International Union of North America, our union has
worked extensively with Holtec and their subsidiaries
around the country, successfully, safely, efficiently.

I don't know if some of the references to Holtec tonight are accurate, because we've always worked closely with them. It's always been safe. It's always been very efficient.

I have a brother and sister who are working down at Pilgrim now, or have worked on the last two projects with Holtec down there. I don't hear anything about unsafe conditions. I hear that the job is going great; they're moving the fuel correctly, and they're very comfortable, and they're making a great living while they're doing it. The plant has always been an economic benefit to our town, and decommissioning this way will also be a strong economic benefit.

I also want to say that Holtec works extensively with our International Union and has helped us develop a state-of-the-art rad worker training program, and we train workers in our state-of-the-art facilities here in New England, in Hopkinton, in Pomfret, Connecticut. And over the

years, our members have decommissioned Maine Yankee, 1 2 Connecticut Yankee, and the Yankee Rowe Plant, which 3 I actually go rafting up there, tubing up there in 4 that river. It's a beautiful site. I go up there 5 every year. It doesn't bother me at all. 6 I'm happy that it's going to be the 7 expedited decommissioning and return that site back to 8 its beauty that it once was for the Town of Plymouth. 9 So, thank you very much. 10 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you. And the last speaker on the 11 MS. JANDA: list will be No. 6. 12 MS. CARPENTER: My name is Susan Carpenter 13 14 with the Cape Downwinders, and I live in South Dennis 15 on the Cape. I have a comment, and then, I have two 16 17 questions. At one of the Nuclear Decommissioning Citizens Advisory Panel meetings, Holtec spoke and 18 19 said that they have an impeccable safety record. the other hand, the fact that that near-drop on the 20 West Coast occurred kind of defies their claim that 21 they have an impeccable record. And not only that, 22 but it was a whistleblower that brought this to public 23 24 attention. is it a conflict of 25 My questions are:

1 interest for Holtec to buy Holtec casks to store the nuclear waste? 2 3 MR. WATSON: I quess that's a commercial 4 thing that the NRC would not get into, but I don't see 5 any real issue with it. It is what their product line is and what they're offering. And I assume that they 6 7 will use that, do the work safely and compliantly with 8 license requirements for the Certificate of 9 And we'll be there to inspect to make Compliance. 10 sure that they are. 11 MS. CARPENTER: Okay. And my other question sites Holtec 12 was: how many has decommissioned? 13 And by that, I don't mean as a 14 contractor. Excluding that, how many sites has Holtec decommissioned? 15 MS. J. RUSSELL: Holtec International has 16 17 not decommissioned any sites. However, that said, we have hired Comprehensive Decommissioning 18 19 International, CDI, which is a company that includes 20 SNC-Lavalin, and they have а rich history decommissioning nuclear plants and other nuclear 21 facilities. 22 MS. CARPENTER: Thank you. 23 24 MR. KLUKAN: Again, that was Joy Russell of Holtec, just for the purposes of the transcript. 25

1	All right. We've now exhausted, as you
2	can see this is really good handwriting for me.
3	I'm going to pat myself on the back for this. We've
4	now opened it up whatever, I'll take what I can get
5	to people who have not yet spoken this evening.
6	So, we don't have an established order,
7	but I think Pine raised her hand first. And then,
8	we'll just go around. Okay?
9	So, again, we'll do three minutes apiece,
10	and then, if we have enough time left over, people may
11	get to do a second round. But let's go first with
12	people who have not yet had an opportunity to speak.
13	So, I turn it over to you.
14	MS. DUBOIS: Thank you, and thank you all
15	for being here.
16	I want to state clearly that I hope Holtec
17	succeeds. I hope Entergy is happy, and I hope the NRC
18	finally wraps its head around sea-level rise, which
19	you are not doing, and that is pretty plain with your
20	reliance on the SIEC and the GEIR.
21	There is no basis at all for you to accept
22	Entergy's proposal to wait 60 years to clean up the
23	site. That's plainly a fraud.
24	Take a look at the Fourth National Climate
25	Assessment that was released in late October-November.
J	I and the second

You will be chapter 18 in the Northeast. You will see that our worst-case scenario is, by 2100, we have sealevel rise of 11.5 feet. That's the new estimate, but daily things are changing so fast and the scientists are learning so much, that that adjustment continues.

It is important to the public trust that you regulators and you contractors and Entergy -- oh,

Lord -- takes care of us and looks at that. Cleaning up the site does not mean letting it wash into Cape Cod Bay, and in 60 years that's what's going to happen.

Even if there's not inundation on the site, the groundwater level will be so high that you will not be able to safely and effectively get the contamination out of the ground. If it goes into the environment, the NRC is failing in its mission to protect the environment and the people. So is Holtec, as a reputable company, I will say. So, is Entergy, as a reputable company. You need to address this. The PSDAR for Entergy does not. The Holtec PSDAR does not. And if they run out of money and the cleanup is delayed, we're all in a stew.

So, please, NRC, take another look at your regulations. Give it a try at updating that. Call in those scientists that work for the government that

1 wrote that report, and get on the reality page. 2 living with it here. Stick around on Sunday. Sunday, 3 Monday, Tuesday, stay here. Go down to the plant then 4 and see what happens. 5 Thank you very much. 6 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you. 7 Again, that was Pine duBois. 8 Just please state your name for the record 9 before you begin. Pine duBois with NDCAP. 10 MS. DUBOIS: So, Pine duBois with NDCAP. 11 MR. KLUKAN: 12 Thank you. I'm Ed Russell, 13 MR. Ε. RUSSELL: 14 elected town meeting member in Plymouth. 15 When businesses as well as governmental 16 agencies engage in big contracts, they usually see to 17 it that there's a bond produced that will guarantee the performance of the contract. And so, I'd like to 18 19 know why that isn't possible here. 20 MR. WATSON: Performance bonds are used frequently. If we deem that there's sufficient funds 21 to do the decommissioning, we have no need to require 22 I think in the recent VY transfer, Vermont 23 them. 24 Yankee sale, asset sale and license transfer, one of

the conditions we put on -- or the agreement that we

1	got from NorthStar was to provide additional financial
2	assurance. I think it was along the lines of \$30
3	million to make sure there was sufficient funds. If
4	it's not required, then they're not required. So,
5	it's up to the agreement between the sales, also, to
6	come up with the proper financial information and
7	guarantees.
8	MR. E. RUSSELL: That's your version of
9	risk assessment, but we citizens here have a different
10	assessment of the risk. And when you do have a
11	contract that's just barely enough to cover, and could
12	well exceed the funds available, I would say a prudent
13	entity would look for a bond. And if there is, as you
14	say, a low risk, then the bond should not be that
15	expensive. So, I'd like to see that happen.
16	MR. KLUKAN: Thank you.
17	MR. KELLERMAN: So, my name is Bruce
18	Kellerman.
19	I have a question. What happens to the
20	1200-acre site? Who owns it and are there plans for
21	development? And if so, where can we find those and
22	what are their elaborate schemes?
23	MR. TWOMEY: This is Mike Twomey, on
24	behalf of Entergy.
25	When you say the 1200 acres, I assume you

1 mean the 1200 acres of undeveloped property across Rocky Hill Road, correct? 2 3 MR. KELLERMAN: Yes. 4 MR. TWOMEY: That property currently is 5 owned by Entergy. It is included in the sale to And if the license transfer application is 6 7 approved and the transaction closes, Holtec will become the owner of the 1200 acres. 8 And I have not 9 heard about any specific plans for development of that site at this time, but they would be the owner of the 10 land after the transaction closes, if it closes. 11 MR. KELLERMAN: Does Holtec have plans for 12 the development of the site? It will be paying -- I 13 14 assume it will be paying property taxes going forward. 15 MS. STERDIS: No specific plans for that 16 property have been defined at this time. And, yes, we 17 will be paying the appropriate property taxes on that site. 18 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you for your questions. 19 Yes, I'm 20 MR. DELAFIELD: Lawrence Delafield. I'm a resident of the Town of Plymouth, a 21 town meeting member, and the President of the Six 22 Ponds Association, which is a local organization very 23 24 close to the site. And of course, my concern is this: 25 we.

live in an area that will be in danger until this 1 material is totally removed from the site. Why do we 2 3 have to wait that long? How can we possibly get that 4 moved up, so that it's removed quicker, or at least 5 provide a major incentive to remove all items from the site? Because we will not be safe until that happens. 6 7 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you. 8 Okav. Is there anyone else who has not 9 yet spoken who would like to speak this evening? 10 (No response.) Going once, going twice. All right. 11 12 there anyone who has spoken this evening who would like to speak again? 13 14 MR. LAMPERT: Jim Lampert, resident of 15 Duxbury. 16 I'd just like to spend a moment 17 comments, and if I'm wrong, I would ask that the NRC, Entergy, and Holtec correct me. My understanding of 18 19 the transaction, as described in the license transfer application, is that Holtec-Pilgrim will be the owner 20 of the site and will be the one who owns the 21 Decommissioning Trust Fund. 22 In Holtec's license transfer and PSDAR 23 24 applications, it says that, quote, "The existing Decommissioning Trust Funds provide the appropriate 25

basis for the financial qualifications of Holtec-Pilgrim." It also says that Holtec, quote, "Holtec-Pilgrim will be required to pay for HDI's cost of post-shutdown operations, including all decommissioning costs at Pilgrim." Close quote.

It seemed very clear from that that the only potential financial responsibility of Holtec-Pilgrim -- and that is the only one we need to focus on because they are the only licensee -- depends entirely on the Decommissioning Trust Fund.

It also seems clear, listening to Mr. Watson, that a statement in a regulation that a licensee that, frankly, has no money and is bankrupt is, quote, "responsible," close quote, provides absolutely no assurance that that licensee will pay. It, frankly, doesn't have any money. And that, unless I missed something that Mr. Watson has said -- and I asked the question earlier -- there is absolutely nothing in NRC rules, regulations, or pertinent law that would permit the NRC to enforce the licensees' and their parents' responsibility to pay for what they caused. Am I correct?

MR. WATSON: I will try and respond a little bit here. We owe you a response to your question on the ownership. The only comment I can

really make at this point, we will be responsible with the responsible regulations. I have to go to our Office of General Counsel for that.

MR. LAMPERT: No, no, I would appreciate your doing that, though.

MR. WATSON: Yes. No, we have to do that.

The other issue is that we are currently reviewing the license application or plan to start on that very soon. So, we really can't pass any judgment other than the general process we're using and the general requirements for the decommissioning funding and how they would apply to the license transfer. It's we're still doing our review. So, we haven't concluded anything. And so, your comments are valid to that review. And so, I'm sure the staff will take that into account.

MR. LAMPERT: Yes, and I would ask that, if in the review or in further conversations with Holtec, the NRC or its staff discovers any way in which there, in fact, is an enforceable commitment or an agreement, that people who have the money will set that money up to pay for the shortfall. I would like to hear about it, and it's quite clear that the Massachusetts Attorney General would also like to hear about it.

1 MR. KLUKAN: Thank you again. 2 Yes, if I may briefly, Mr. MR. TWOMEY: Lampert introduced his remarks by saying that, if we 3 4 didn't say anything, it meant that we agreed with him. 5 And I can't agree to that, just at least on behalf of On behalf of Entergy. 6 Entergy. 7 MR. KLUKAN: Okay. Richard Rothstein. 8 MR. ROTHSTEIN: 9 Two questions. One for Dr. Watson and one 10 for our Holtec representative, Joy. Dr. Watson, can you qualitatively explain 11 or define, for purposes of releasing the site license, 12 site restoration, what basically is included; what 13 14 would not be included in the case of the Entergy site? 15 So that people don't get false expectations one way or 16 the other. 17 MR. WATSON: Yes. The Decommissioning requirements Fund from the NRC for the 18 are 19 radiological decommissioning. So, once we would terminate the license after verifying the radiological 20 conditions of the site -- we have an independent 21 contractor we use in many cases to help us with the 22 and verify radiological 23 surveys the residual 24 radioactive levels at the site -- we would terminate

If the site restoration is not in the

25

the license.

requirements by NRC, because there's a number of approaches you can take to decommissioning -- many of them take into account removing the buildings and turning it back into greenfield. If they submit that to us in their license termination plan, then that's the plan they follow because it's a license amendment.

If they choose to do things which some of the other power plants have done, such as Trojan or Rancho Seco, where they actually terminate the license, but leave buildings and stuff still remaining on the site, that's their choice. And after that, it's up to the owner of the facility or the licensee -- and at that point they're no longer the licensee, but the owner of the property -- and the state, to determine when and where they should do the final decommissioning and site -- I should say final site restoration and what those requirements are.

MR. ROTHSTEIN: Okay. Thank you.

I had the pleasure of sitting in the Holtec predecisional enforcement conference last Wednesday, I believe it was, the four-hour -- and more nuts and bolts were discussed than I could fit in my car.

But I wanted to commend Holtec on its dry cask presentation to the NDCAP last fall. I thought

it was very informative, and I believe it's on the NDCAP website.

Just expanding upon Ms. Lampert's comment earlier about cracks not being able to be fixed in the multipurpose canister at this day and age, one thing I was envisioning, given that premise, has Holtec, for purposes of future design considerations to remedy that kind of unsolvable problem at the moment, considered constructing a larger multipurpose cask there to go over the cracked cask? And then, of course, that slightly larger cask could be filled with helium gas as a coolant and sealed. And then, that larger cask would then -- or that larger multipurpose cask with the cracked inside of the other cask, multipurpose cask, getting to a larger overpack, if it need be, with the air vents, too. So, is that a possible design solution that may be on the drawing board from Holtec?

MS. J. RUSSELL: That's a very explanation. It's very close to what we've actually designed for recovery of a canister in the event the inspections were to show that there has been a degradation. So, indeed, that is the approach, is to put it into another overpack, but an overpack, not necessarily the canister as you've described. So,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	you're on the right track, sir. It is definitely an
2	additional overpack that we are going to use.
3	MR. ROTHSTEIN: I'm glad to hear that.
4	Can you tell me who I write to at Holtec to get some
5	royalties?
6	(Laughter.)
7	MS. J. RUSSELL: Right. Royalties and to
8	get on the patent.
9	MS. M. LAMPERT: Can a canister be shipped
10	under current regulations?
11	MR. KLUKAN: Ma'am, are you asking, just
12	so we get it on the transcript, are you asking whether
13	the current canister or the overpack can be shipped?
14	MS. M. LAMPERT: (Off microphone.)
15	MR. KLUKAN: Okay. I just have just given
16	you the microphone.
17	So, essentially, can a cylinder which has
18	been or a canister which has been compromised or
19	degraded, do the regulations allow it to be shipped,
20	is the question that was posed by Ms. Lampert.
21	MS. J. RUSSELL: The regulation question
22	I defer to the NRC.
23	MR. WATSON: I ask Jason Piotter, who is
24	our Senior Engineer for Spent Fuel Safety, to come up
25	and give you an answer for that.

MR. PIOTTER: The regulations are performance-based. And so, if you had a canister that had a demonstrated flaw like you're talking about, there would have to be an engineering analysis that was done to determine what the best way to mitigate that particular flaw would be. I can't answer the question right now whether or not it would be allowed to be shipped because we don't have any scenarios where there are flaws such as you describe. So, it's case-by-case basis, depending upon what situation is for the canister that you're talking But it would have to be evaluated prior to I couldn't just be put into a transport transport. overpack and sent. So, it would have to be an engineering analysis prior to that activity. MR. KLUKAN: Thank you.

MS. TURCO: I just want to go back to the Holtec in San Onofre because it could be our future.

Diane Turco with Cape Downwinders.

At San Onofre, they've been loading, Holtec has been loading canisters in underground vaults on the beach. The sea-level rise is eventually going to leak into the bottom of those vaults. They have been loading them and scratching them. And there was a special inspection by the Nuclear Regulatory

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

_	Commission and it sounded almost like Entergy's
2	special inspection report, pretty much the same.
3	So, I want to know. And the people in
4	California have said, "Let them know the public in
5	Southern California is asking the Holtec System to be
6	recalled." It's a lemon, and Holtec is making loading
7	errors due to mismanagement and bad engineering design
8	that the NRC admits it cannot fix. So, that's what's
9	happening out in California.
LO	So, I have two questions. No. 1, how can
L1	you come to the NDCAP meeting and say that Holtec has
L2	an impeccable safety record when this was all exposed
L3	by a whistleblower?
L4	And No. 2, would you conduct an
	And No. 2, would you conduct an environmental impact study, including sea-level rise
L4 L5 L6	
L5	environmental impact study, including sea-level rise
L5 L6	environmental impact study, including sea-level rise and acts of malfeasance on the spent fuel pad?
L5 L6 L7	environmental impact study, including sea-level rise and acts of malfeasance on the spent fuel pad?  MS. J. RUSSELL: Can you repeat the first
L5 L6 L7 L8	environmental impact study, including sea-level rise and acts of malfeasance on the spent fuel pad?  MS. J. RUSSELL: Can you repeat the first question again?
L5 L6 L7 L8	environmental impact study, including sea-level rise and acts of malfeasance on the spent fuel pad?  MS. J. RUSSELL: Can you repeat the first question again?  MS. TURCO: Let me try it this way: how
L5 L6 L7 L8 L9	environmental impact study, including sea-level rise and acts of malfeasance on the spent fuel pad?  MS. J. RUSSELL: Can you repeat the first question again?  MS. TURCO: Let me try it this way: how could you with a straight face tell the NDCAP that
15   16   17   18   19   20   21	environmental impact study, including sea-level rise and acts of malfeasance on the spent fuel pad?  MS. J. RUSSELL: Can you repeat the first question again?  MS. TURCO: Let me try it this way: how could you with a straight face tell the NDCAP that Holtec has an impeccable safety record when we know
115   16   17   18   19   19   19   19   19   19   19	environmental impact study, including sea-level rise and acts of malfeasance on the spent fuel pad?  MS. J. RUSSELL: Can you repeat the first question again?  MS. TURCO: Let me try it this way: how could you with a straight face tell the NDCAP that Holtec has an impeccable safety record when we know what's going on at San Onofre?
15   16   17   18   19   20   21   22   23	environmental impact study, including sea-level rise and acts of malfeasance on the spent fuel pad?  MS. J. RUSSELL: Can you repeat the first question again?  MS. TURCO: Let me try it this way: how could you with a straight face tell the NDCAP that Holtec has an impeccable safety record when we know what's going on at San Onofre?  MS. J. RUSSELL: I appreciate the

1	impeccable safety record. And the issue that happened
2	at San Onofre, which was reported by the licensee who
3	is the Southern California Edison Nuclear Plant, they
4	went through their process. So, Holtec does have an
5	impeccable safety record. I absolutely can
6	emphatically say that.
7	MS. TURCO: Did Southern Edison report
8	this incident when it happened to the NRC?
9	MS. J. RUSSELL: Those questions are
10	best
11	MS. TURCO: Okay. No, they did not.
12	MS. J. RUSSELL: to the Southern
13	California
14	MS. TURCO: And you can look up on the
15	record they did not. No. Actually, the NRC initiated
16	the special inspection, right, Mr. Watson?
17	MR. WATSON: From what I understand, the
18	licensee was a little late in responding to
19	MS. TURCO: Yes.
20	MR. WATSON: the requirements. And so,
21	based on that, we escalated our inspections to
22	MS. TURCO: Thank you.
23	MR. WATSON: evaluate the situation.
24	MS. TURCO: Thank you. It was a
25	whistleblower.

1 MR. WATSON: But it was not а 2 whistleblower that submitted the complaint. This is Mike Twomey, 3 MR. TWOMEY: 4 behalf of Entergy. 5 One thing, I think, just to clear up any confusion for those who don't know as much about the 6 7 issues as some of the recent speakers. One thing 8 that's important to note here is that, if Entergy 9 remains the owner of the facility, we will be using the Holtec dry fuel storage system. If Holtec becomes 10 the owner, they will be using the Holtec dry fuel 11 storage system. So, the license transfer will have no 12 impact on what system is used at Pilgrim for storing 13 14 spent nuclear fuel. It will be the Holtec dry fuel 15 storage system that we use or they use. And I don't know how that relates to the 16 17 scope of this particular proceeding, but I do want to make sure that people understand that it's not an 18 19 "either/or". It's not like, if Holtec becomes the owner, that's the only circumstance under which the 20 Holtec system will be used. That very same system 21 will be used if we remain the owner. 22 just wanted to clear that up 23 24 anybody who may not understand that. Right. 25 MS. TURCO: Yes. Thank you.

1	Right. Because the point is it's both mismanagement,
2	poor equipment, ongoing problems.
3	But the second question was, would an
4	environmental impact study include sea-level rise and
5	acts of malfeasance on the ISFSI pad?
6	MS. J. RUSSELL: First, I want to
7	emphatically state that the system that's in use at
8	San Onofre is markedly different than the one that's
9	in use at Pilgrim. You're comparing apples to
10	oranges. It is correct. It's an above-ground system
11	versus an underground system.
12	MS. TURCO: Oh, no, no. That's not my
13	question.
14	MS. J. RUSSELL: And not the dry storage
15	system.
16	MS. TURCO: That's not my question.
17	MS. J. RUSSELL: And therefore
18	MS. TURCO: That's not my question.
19	MS. J. RUSSELL: there isn't a
20	probability of an issue as you have at San Onofre with
21	water collection in the bottom of the system.
22	MS. TURCO: Okay.
23	MS. J. RUSSELL: It can't happen because
24	they are two different systems.
25	MS. TURCO: Right. But what I'm asking
	1

is, would you include sea-level rise for the property, 1 2 as Pine spoke about, and storm surges, and acts of That's my question. 3 malfeasance? 4 MS. J. RUSSELL: So, the dry storage 5 systems are licensed under Part 72, and they're deployed under Part 72 currently. And they're already 6 7 being deployed in accordance with the regulatory requirements. There's no additional investigation or 8 9 analyses that need to be performed for the dry storage 10 systems. MR. KLUKAN: I gave the women a back-and-11 forth. But, if you know you're going to keep talking, 12 just, for the sake of our poor transcriptionist -- he 13 14 is not the object of your concern. So, let's make his life easier. So, just speak into the microphone when 15 you're asking questions. Okay? 16 17 And the question there was, would you include sea-level risk and acts of malfeasance in an 18 19 environmental assessment or impact statement? MS. J. RUSSELL: We'll 20 meet. the regulations. The dry spent fuel storage system is 21 already deployed and it will continue to be deployed, 22 no matter whether this license transfer application 23 24 occurs or not. I don't understand the question of the need for additional environmental studies related to 25

1 dry storage. 2 MS. TURCO: You're building a new storage 3 facility there, a brand-new storage facility. 4 now, you can drive onto the property, pass the "no 5 trespassing" signs, and eyeball the dry casks. you're moving them closer to Rocky Hill Road. We need 6 7 to be assured that there's going to be some increased security there. So, that's just a question. Are you 8 9 going to be looking at acts of malfeasance when you do 10 the new pad? MS. J. RUSSELL: The security that's 11 already at the nuclear plant, I allow Entergy to talk 12 The security of the dry storage system, under the 13 14 license under Part 72, has already been established. There's no additional requirements that need to be 15 16 addressed. MS. HALTER: 17 This is Mandy Halter, on behalf of Entergy. 18 19 The independent spent fuel storage installation facilities are required to be secure. 20 And with the newly-located pad, there will continue to 21 be a physical barrier behind an intrusion detection 22 system, and monitored 24/7 by armed security. 23

And that's correct; that's all I can talk

about, due to safeguards.

24

1 MS. LYNCH-BENTTININ: Sheila Lynch 2 Benttinin, Duxbury. I have a question about regional public 3 4 safety. In the last 40-plus years, Entergy was 5 required to do a regional public safety plan, they've applied with their PSDAR to abandon that 6 7 regional planning. And we are concerned about Holtec 8 taking over. What is your plans for notifying 9 regional safety folks, like firemen, et cetera, on safety, particularly with the expedited four-year plan 10 that you presented tonight? 11 MS. STERDIS: This is Andrea Sterdis. 12 We will continue to comply with all NRC 13 14 regulation. And I want to emphasize that it Holtec's top priority to maintain the health and 15 safety of the public. 16 17 MS. LYNCH-BENTTININ: But what I'm asking, in particular, is, what is your plan to reach out to 18 19 regional safety folks, like firemen and regional coordinators, as your expedited four-year plan is 20 ongoing? 21 MS. STERDIS: And again, I will emphasize 22 that we will maintain the health and safety of the 23 public, and we will be complying with all regulations. 24 25 MS. LYNCH-BENTTININ: And my second

question is, can NRC add to their PSDAR another level 1 regional safety outreach public 2 to officials? 3 4 MR. WATSON: If I understand your question correctly, there's no need to add anything. 5 the site is still going to maintain an emergency plan 6 7 emergency response capabilities, along 8 security response plans, which have those 9 communication tools in them that they're required to So, they're going to continue those things 10 until the decommissioning is complete. So, there's 11 really no need to change those plans. 12 Now I can't specifically talk to the 13 14 regional plan. I'm not familiar with it. It was not 15 an NRC requirement that I know of. But there are 16 requirements for notification and security/police 17 support; also, fire protection and fire response, medical emergencies and medical responses to the site. 18 19 And so, those things all stay in place. MS. LYNCH-BENTTININ: 20 But Entergy has requested that they be discontinued in the regional 21 22 capacity. MR. WATSON: All I know is they have to 23 24 meet the minimum requirements for the NRC, which means they will maintain the ability to talk with, 25

1	notification of the response capabilities from local
2	and state law enforcement. They will continue to deal
3	with, communicate with the local fire departments and
4	rescue squads.
5	MS. LYNCH-BENTTININ: Would they be
6	required to coordinate
7	MR. WATSON: The regional, there's no NRC
8	requirement for a regional response plan.
9	MS. LYNCH-BENTTININ: Okay.
10	MR. WATSON: There is one for the
11	immediate location around the plant.
12	MS. LYNCH-BENTTININ: Thank you.
13	MS. MILLER: Claire Miller from Toxics
14	Action Center.
15	I'm getting really agitated because this
16	really matters a lot to me. And if I understand what
17	Diane is bringing up correctly, and your response, Ms.
18	Russell it's kind of hard to read your name tag
19	from here; sorry if I got that wrong it's that we
20	have rapidly upchanging data on climate change, the
21	impacts of sea-level rise that are getting worse every
22	time they're updated. We have someone in the White
23	House who's changing world politics and dynamics
24	rapidly, and we are living in an age in which

terrorism is ever present. And we want to know, are

you willing to go above and beyond, if necessary, or are you only willing to do as much as -- like the floor of what's required?

Because what I hear Diane asking is, are you willing to go above and beyond to protect our health, our community? And what I hear you saying back is, "We're doing with it what's written. We're just going to do what's necessary, what the law is."

Am I understanding correctly? You're committing to the floor?

MR. WATSON: I just want to respond to that, and that the NRC regulations fully provide for safety for the people working at the plant, the public, and the environment. And so, complying with those is one demonstration that the plant is maintained safe, and we'll continue to inspect that plant against those requirements.

MS. MILLER: I have no doubt that the NRC is doing the best that it can to protect the health and safety of my community. I also know that we're in a rapidly-changing world. And I am interested to know if Holtec is committing to the floor of what the NRC -- like where we're at the last time those laws were passed, those statutes, those regulatory processes we went through, those elaborate commenting periods, or

1	if they're committing to respond to an ever-present,
2	fast-changing world of climate change and terrorism.
3	MS. J. RUSSELL: I think what you're
4	asking me is, am I confident that our dry spent fuel
5	storage system is safe.
6	MS. MILLER: No, that's not what I'm
7	asking you at all. It's not what I'm asking you at
8	all.
9	MS. J. RUSSELL: I am personally convinced
LO	I am a nuclear engineer. I am part of the design
L1	team that designed this dry storage system. And I am
L2	confident in its robustness. I'm confident that we
L3	have gone above and beyond to ensure that we selected
L4	materials
L5	MS. MILLER: I am
L6	MS. J. RUSSELL: that we've selected
L7	the methodologies, and we have done the absolute
L8	utmost we can to ensure the health and safety.
L9	MS. MILLER: I have no doubt that you're
20	sincere
21	MS. J. RUSSELL: May I please finish?
22	I live by these nuclear plants as well,
23	and I am confident that, when I go to visit these
24	plants I live by these plants; I live by where our
25	dry storage systems are deployed I am personally

confident that my company has done everything it can 1 go above and beyond. And therefore, I have 2 3 answered your question. 4 MS. MILLER: That wasn't my question in 5 slightest. I do believe you're 100 percent 6 sincere when you say that. I also believe that the 7 engineers who worked on Chernobyl, Three Mile Island, and Fukushima were also really sincere in believing 8 9 that their plants were safe as well. 10 I just want to say for the record you didn't answer my question. 11 MR. KELLERMAN: So, Bruce Kellerman again. 12 My question is to Holtec. As I understand 13 14 the fund, it can go up and down. It's like a 401(k), 15 It's an investment vehicle. What happens if right? it goes down? And also, could you, would you sue the 16 17 Department of Energy, as others have done, for failing to take the waste offsite? Would you plan to do that? 18 19 Are you? MR. WATSON: Well, let me respond to the 20 first part. Yes, there are market changes. The Trust 21 Fund is in an independent trust with an independent 22 trustee. Most of them are with Mellon Bank of New 23 24 So, the trustee has certain requirements on 25 them to make conservative investments to protect the

fund.

Secondly, all the licensees that are storing fuel -- I'll say broadly "everyone" -- has the ability to request or sue, if they have to, the Department of Energy to get the cost back for the storage of the nuclear fuel. So, I'm sure Entergy has done that in the past for their plants. I'm sure Holtec will do the same to recoup the costs. Those costs are, then, available for doing other activities at the sites. And so, that's part of the agreement with the federal government.

MR. KELLERMAN: Thank you.

MS. LAMPERT: Two points. NRC is giving exemptions. So, the DTF can be used for spent fuel management costs. Now go back. The Decommissioning Trust Fund was established when we were a utility structure -- Boston Edison was the owner -- by ratepayers. Since that time, it's grown from investments. Entergy didn't put a dime in it. Holtec won't put a dime in it. Okay?

Then, they will sue DOE to recoup what they've spent on spent fuel management costs, okay, what they've spent by taking it out of the Decommissioning Trust Fund. But, then, when they get the money out of DOE, there's no requirement to put it

back. If there is, please correct me and give me the regulation. Instead, they put it in their pocket. And that's, you know, if I were Holtec, I'd say, "I'm going to make a pile of money doing this." And that's part of the incentive to take over the license.

It would seem to me that the NRC would get on the stick and make some sort of requirement/regulation that it goes back into the Decommissioning Trust Fund to refurbish what they have taken out. Because there's no requirement? Correct that.

And then, I just want to sum up by saying, the points brought forward on sea-level rise, the points brought forward on the increased risk of terrorism, of cyberattack -- now that's a big one when you think of the spent fuel pool. All these new and significant information that you should be responsible, NRC require that they do a NEPA review, and then, not say what is blatant foolish. It's a lie to say the 2002 Generic Environmental Impact Statement and the 2006 Impact Statement done during relicensing bound environmental impact, so we can all skip along and say it's a clean site; we've done our job. they really don't have to spend a dime, and all the Dilution is stuff can go in Cape Cod Bay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	solution.
2	MR. KLUKAN: Thank you.
3	MR. WATSON: I just want to make one
4	comment, that the Decommissioning Funds that are or
5	excuse me the spent fuel funds that are recuperated
6	from the Department of Energy, I think it's 50.82,
7	Mike, in the regulations, the fund. The money goes
8	back into the fund. No? It doesn't? Okay.
9	PARTICIPANT: It goes to the company.
10	MS. LAMPERT: No, it's a good thing for
11	them to make money.
12	MR. WATSON: Okay. Well, I'm sorry. I
13	appreciate the comment then. We have to look at that.
14	MR. KLUKAN: Before you begin, is there
15	anyone else in the audience who has not yet had an
16	opportunity to speak who would like to do so?
17	(No response.)
18	Okay, please. Would you mind letting her
19	go first? Okay. Thank you, sir.
20	Your name for the record, please.
21	MS. GARRY: Joanne Garry. I live a mile
22	from the plant. I've been here since I was 16. So,
23	I saw it built by people that shouldn't be building
24	it. But that's not my question.
25	My question is twofold. First of all,

1 Entergy owns it, correct? Got the license. Owns all the property. How much is it worth? 2 What's the 3 property worth? What did Entergy get or might get 4 from Holtec, the cost, the dollars? Are you selling 5 it for money? So, there's no money exchange? Entergy walks away. Holtec, if it gets the license, walks in, 6 7 correct? 8 So, why does Holtec want this? Well, 9 that's my question. Why does Holtec want this really 10 horrible thing to fix? We've got thousands of people on the line. So, what's the deal? Why are you doing 11 this? 12 No answer? MS. STERDIS: This is Andrea Sterdis, and 13 14 I will make this a personal response. 15 mother of two children and As 16 grandmother of four children, I am committed to us 17 doing in this industry what is right. And that is to take care of our plants when they're past their 18 19 operational life expectancy and to turn that property back into a useful piece of property in the community. 20 So, that is my personal reason for being involved in 21 this project. 22 MS. GARRY: But it's in it for the money. 23 24 the money, you're going to own 12,000 acres.

25

Twelve hundred acres.

You've got a big hill there

1 that hasn't been developed. Why not move all this terrible spent fuel to the top of the hill? If you're 2 3 going to move it; move it, move it away from the ocean 4 or bury it in the hill -- I don't know -- a better 5 solution than moving it next to Rocky Hill Road, which I go by every day. So, I mean, it just seems simple 6 7 If you can't move it away, move in a safer 8 area. 9 But, again, you're going to be making big 10 bucks here. So, we want to be safe. That's all I have to say. 11 MR. KLUKAN: Before we begin, because we 12 do have -- I'm sorry for interrupting you again, sir. 13 14 Just because we do have extra time -- I don't usually 15 I think there's intervene like this, but 16 confusion out there regarding what's the financial 17 arrangement between -- and I'm not asking in specific terms -- but what's the financial relationship between 18 19 Holtec and Entergy? And I think the question was asked like, 20 how would Holtec benefit from this transaction? And 21 I think if we could answer that, that would go a long 22 way to clearing up some of the confusion in the 23 24 audience.

MR.

TWOMEY:

25

This is Mike Twomey for

1 Entergy. I'll address the specific question of the way the transaction is structured. 2 only 3 Entergy is receiving nominal 4 consideration. And I have to say I don't have the 5 number in front of me. We just recently closed the transaction, 6 Vermont Yankee and the nominal 7 consideration there was a thousand dollars. And we receive nominal consideration. 8 9 Holtec receives title to the plant or they're actually 10 buying Entergy Nuclear Generation Company through an They get that company which owns the 11 equity sale. plant, has the Decommissioning Trust Fund and the 12 liability for the decommissioning. 13 14 So, what Entergy gets of the out transaction is a thousand dollars. 15 And we are no longer involved in the decommissioning of the plant, 16 17 in the same way that Boston Edison is not involved in the decommissioning of the plant. All right. 18 19 going to transfer that responsibility to Holtec, and Holtec will receive the project, the plant, 20 Decommissioning Trust Fund, and the work associated 21 with it. 22 And I'll let Holtec describe why they 23

would be willing to take this work on, as other

companies have taken it on in other parts of the

24

country.

MS. J. RUSSELL: Again, this is Joy Russell from Holtec.

Holtec is, and has been for 30 years, an industry leader in safe and secure storage of spent nuclear fuel. We also have other business endeavors such as designing a small modular reactor. And as we've pointed out this evening, we also have submitted an application to establish a consolidated interim storage facility in southeast New Mexico.

Holtec is committed to the nuclear industry. And unfortunately, part of that also includes the safe decommissioning of nuclear power plants.

We recently built our third manufacturing facility here in the United States. We now have 1.4 million square feet of manufacturing here in the United States. We're the largest exporter of nuclear products. And again, that's a demonstration of our commitment to the nuclear industry.

So, that is Holtec's reason for taking the next step and to acquire shuttered nuclear plants and to safely decommission those; and to take the ownership of the spent nuclear fuel, which is also our core expertise, and to manage that as it remains

either onsite or is moved to New Mexico. 1 2 Thank you. MR. KLUKAN: And thank you, sir, for indulging me for 3 4 that minute. 5 MR. ROTHSTEIN: I've got all the time in the world. 6 7 A final question for Dr. Watson. I was hoping that NRC's proposed revised decommissioning 8 9 regulations were going to come out last November, as originally envisioned, and that final promulgation 10 would have taken place sometime in the first half of 11 Notwithstanding the current government 12 this year. is NRC's for 13 what ETAwhen 14 envisioning getting these proposed and final 15 regulations out? And a second question is, licensees who 16 17 have submitted their PSDARs, even if they're in the process of being evaluated, or the NRC said, okay, 18 19 enough, they're good SO you can start decommissioning process once the plant is permanently 20 shut would existing licensees 21 down, in those circumstances get grandfathered separate from the new 22 regulations for decommissioning? Or would it be like, 23 24 for example, a post-Fukushima, where the NRC says,

okay, we've come up with this and the new regulations;

therefore, all licensees must do blank, blank, blank for decommissioning, regardless of what was in your PSDAR?

MR. WATSON: Let me respond to the

rulemaking schedule. The proposed decommissioning rulemaking that's been in progress over the last few years, the staff made its scheduled requirement to submit to the Commission the proposed rules and the basis for those proposed rules back in May. As many of you may know, we also had two new Commissioners appointed by the Administration. And based on that, they've been taking care of the backlog of information or voting issues that they have on their plate.

So, the staff is waiting for the Commission to do their job. So, it's the Commission's priority to address their work at their own schedule. So, the staff is waiting for the Commission to vote on it. We have not received a schedule of when that vote is to take place. And so, we are basically at the mercy of the Commission for meeting the time limit requirements they had originally placed on us to have these rules in place by the end of 2019.

So, we will, hopefully, resolve the issue with a Commission vote. That will give us the direction on how we are to proceed with the proposed

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

rules.

One of the proposed evaluations was looking at the PSDARs. If there is a change in the regulations that the Commission wants concerning the PSDARs, then we will issue the regulations and the guidance with that. And anybody that would come out in the future would have to comply with the new regulations. Since the plants that are already in decommission have submitted their PSDAR, if they were to revise that, we would believe they would have to, at least I would believe that they would have to comply with the new requirements.

So, I think I answered both questions.

But we're at the mercy of the Commission and their vote scheduling. And apparently, they have more pressing issues than the decommissioning rulemaking.

MR. LAMPERT: Jim Lampert, Duxbury.

I've spent a lot of time thinking and trying to figure out the answer to the question why would Holtec get into this. And in addition to the fact that it's your business, I think the obvious answer is they expect to make a profit.

And if you ask yourself on what basis do they expect to make this profit, a number of things that I think are fairly clear, if you look at the

1 whole picture, come to mind. And to the extent anybody, Holtec disagrees with me, and you think you 2 3 can, consistent with the limitations of what you can 4 say, correct me; please do so. 5 The first is they obviously think they're a great deal more efficient at doing this type of 6 7 thing than Entergy ever will be. 8 The second is they want to get 9 decommissioning done early to avoid the risk of could 10 drastically-increasing costs that "destructive" is a nice word -- if they waited the 11 period of that Entergy was planning to wait. 12 The third is that I was told by a Holtec 13 14 representative that their profit is included in the 15 costs you see in their PSDAR. And last, just talking to various people 16 17 in the industry, my understanding is that, before someone will get into something like this, they really 18 19 need a fairly clear path to what they see as a 25- to 35-percent profit. 20 Thank you. 21 MR. KLUKAN: MS. CARPENTER: Susan Carpenter with Cape 22 Downwinders. 23 24 This has nothing to do with money, but it has to do with ethics. Recently, I know that Holtec 25

1	changed the design of its casks for San Onofre and did
2	not notify anyone, and that it really took Southern
3	California Edison and Entergy by surprise. And I'm
4	wondering if Holtec, having basically gotten away with
5	it because it was eventually approved, if they feel
6	that they can do that here or if there's a likelihood
7	they'll do that in the future, and we'll end up with
8	something different than what we've negotiated for.
9	MS. J. RUSSELL: The statements that you
10	just made I need to disagree with. They're incorrect.
11	I'll correct them.
12	The design of the system was not changed
13	for San Onofre.
14	Actually, the amount of time it would take
15	me to actually correct all of your statements is going
16	to exceed the time we have, and I would hate to do
17	that, so that other speakers to have an opportunity to
18	speak.
19	I'd recommend that you go and listen to
20	the NRC's PEC Conference that was held last Wednesday,
21	the 9th of January. It explains the entire process.
22	But you've incorrectly characterized that.
23	MS. CARPENTER: May I send you the article
24	where I got the information?
25	MS. J. RUSSELL: I didn't hear what she

1	said.
2	MR. KLUKAN: May she send you the article
3	where she learned of this information?
4	MS. J. RUSSELL: Absolutely.
5	MS. JANDA: Just to clarify for the
6	transcript, the PEC video I hope I'm not restating
7	this is available on the NRC website. I think it's
8	video.nrc.gov, will be the quickest way of getting
9	there.
10	MS. CARPENTER: This is the Orange County
11	Register. The title is, "NRC and Holtec to Face Off
12	Publicly Over Redesign of Spent Fuel Canisters at San
13	Onofre Plant".
14	I wonder if, are they wrong in their
15	headline?
16	MS. J. RUSSELL: I'm sorry, re-read the
17	headline again?
18	MS. CARPENTER: "NRC and Holtec to Face
19	Off Publicly Over Redesign of Spent Fuel Canisters at
20	San Onofre Plant".
21	MS. J. RUSSELL: The headline is
22	misleading. We didn't redesign the canister for San
23	Onofre. And again, it's a lengthy discussion, and
24	it's all captured in a video from the PEC Conference

on January 9th, where Holtec had a meeting at the NRC

1	Headquarters.
2	MS. CARPENTER: From what I understood,
3	they have a difference in the canisters. But it was
4	aware of, down at the bottom there were bolts added,
5	and that design was only discovered when one of the
6	bolts was loose in the canister.
7	MS. J. RUSSELL: Again, you're making
8	misstatements, and we could go back and forth all
9	evening on this. I recommend that you get your facts
LO	from this PEC video from the January 9th meeting.
11	MS. CARPENTER: Okay. And I will recheck
L2	with the newspaper as well.
L3	Thank you.
L4	MR. KLUKAN: Thank you.
L5	MR. DELAFIELD: This is Lawrence Delafield
L6	again.
L7	I didn't really get an answer to my
L8	question. So, I'd like to restate it in a slightly
L9	different way.
20	The question and it was a question
21	is there any way at this point in this process that we
22	could require that the material be removed and put in
23	a secure facility someplace else, such as you're
24	talking about doing in New Mexico, and get it away

from the community? Because we will not be safe until

that happens. Or, if that's not the case, is there any way to give an incentive so that it gets removed faster and moved to another location? I did not receive an answer to that. So, I'd appreciate getting an answer.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. TWOMEY: This is Mike Twomey, on behalf of Entergy. I'll answer that because we're the current owner of the facility.

I believe what your question is when you talk about the material, you're referring to the spent And the answer to that is, the United nuclear fuel. States Federal Government is responsible for removing the spent nuclear fuels from the Pilgrim site and every other nuclear site in the country. And the government has repeatedly breached obligation to do so. And many of us have required, not personally, but Entergy has required to sue the federal government for failing to fulfill its obligation.

So, the only answer I can give you is that
-- I know there were some representatives of some
federal Congressmen here tonight -- it is to talk to
them about when the federal government is going to
fulfill its obligation to remove spent nuclear fuel

1 from the Pilgrim site as well as the other sites in the U.S. 2 3 MR. KLUKAN: All right. So, it's 8:47. 4 We're scheduled to go to 9:00 p.m. 5 Is there anyone who would like, who has not yet spoken who would like to make any additional 6 7 comments before we close this out? 8 (No response.) 9 Going once, going twice. All right. Before I turn it over to Bruce to close 10 out the meeting, I would just like to thank all of you 11 for attending, personally from the facilitators, and 12 say, out on the registration table there are 13 14 feedback forms. Donna and I would greatly appreciate you filling those out. We use your feedback in trying 15 16 to make these meetings better in terms of public 17 process. So, please take a couple of minutes to do so. And with that, I'll turn it over to Bruce. 18 19 Thank you. MR. WATSON: Well, the first thing I want 20 to thank you for is coming out tonight. I know this 21 is an important issue to many of you. 22 Your comments will inform the staff on the 23 24 NRC's review of the PSDAR. I heard some very good comments for our consideration. And then, when we 25

1 look at the license transfer request and the application and its PSDAR, those comments can also be 2 3 taken into account there. 4 As a reminder, you could provide written 5 comments, I believe it's through March 21st. We will be publishing The Federal Register notice on the 6 7 license transfer when the rest of the federal 8 government goes back to work. The comment period, 9 again, is going to be 30 days for that and 20 days for hearings. So, you're hearing about it early before 10 the notice is published. So, we look forward to your 11 comments. 12 I want to thank you for your 13 comments and questions. We will be, at least I will 14 be, and a couple of the other NRC will be, at the 15 Decommissioning 16 Massachusetts Nuclear 17 Advisory Panel tomorrow evening. So, I'm sure we'll be having some more discussions on the topic. 18 19 So, with that, I would thank our panelists and our presenters for their presentations and in 20 answering questions where we could. 21 With that, I would adjourn the meeting. 22 Thank you very much. 23 24 (Whereupon, at 8:49 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.) 25