

NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING CITIZENS ADVISORY PANEL (“NDCAP”)

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

**Plymouth Community Intermediate School (“PCIS”), Little Theatre, 117 Long Pond Road,
Plymouth, MA
Meeting Minutes**

Meeting called to order at 6:30 p.m. by NDCAP Co-Chair Sean Mullin.

NDCAP MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Jessica Casey, President of the Senate Appointee
- John Chapman¹, Executive Office of Housing and Economic Development
- Pat Ciaramella, Representative of Old Colony Planning Council
- H. Joseph Coughlin, Member from Plymouth Nuclear Matters Committee
- Pine duBois, Speaker of the House Appointee
- John G. Flores, Appointee of Governor Baker
- David Johnston², Department of Environmental Protection
- Richard Grassie, Minority Leader of the House Appointee
- Robert Hayden³, Department of Public Utilities
- Robert Jones⁴, Executive Office of Health and Human Services
- Heather Lightner, Representative of the Town of Plymouth
- John T. Mahoney, Representative of the Town of Plymouth
- Sean Mullin, Minority Leader of the Senate Appointee (Co-Chair)
- David C. Nichols, Governor Baker Appointee
- John Ohrenberger, Representative of Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station
- Kevin O’Reilly, Speak of the House Appointee
- Jack Priest, Department of Public Health, Radiological Control Program
- Kurt Schwartz, Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency (Co-Chair)
- Paul D. Smith⁵, Representative of UWUA Local 369
- Michael Twomey, Representative of Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station
- Senator Dan Wolf, President of the Senate Appointee

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF July 19, 2017 MEETING MINUTES:

Co-Chair Mullin observed that a quorum was present, and that the first order of business was to review the minutes from the July 19, 2017 meeting. Regarding members present, Ms. duBois noted an inaccuracy regarding the list of members present, and that same individual’s mistaken identity at other points in the minutes. Ms. duBois also requested a clarification in the minutes regarding potential confusion between Vermont Yankee and Yankee Rowe nuclear power plants. Co-Chair Mullin called for a motion to approve the minutes as amended. The motion passed by a unanimous vote of the panel members present.

¹ Designee of Secretary Ash (Executive Office of Housing and Economic Development).

² Designee of Secretary Beaton (EEA).

³ Designee of Angela O’Connor (DPU)

⁴ Designee of Secretary Sudders (Executive Office of Health and Human Services).

⁵ Designee of Richard Sherman (Representative of UWUA Local 369).

1 **ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATE:**

2 Co-Chair Mullin noted that microphones are live and cannot be turned off, and that any comments on
3 them would therefore be recorded. Second, Co-Chair Mullin requested that speakers make sure that
4 microphones are in front of them, and, if not, to move microphones before speaking for better
5 recording. Because of time constraints, Co-Chair Mullin requested that the planned legislative update
6 discussion be postponed until the next NDCAP meeting. Co-Chair Mullin also stated that Bruce Watson,
7 chief of the reactor decommissioning branch of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (“NRC”), would
8 attend the next NDCAP. Mr. Watson will provide an overview of the NRC’s decommissioning process,
9 which is consistent with the NDCAP’s goal of educating the public and keeping the focus on
10 decommissioning.

11
12 Co-Chair Mullin then mentioned that the November NDCAP meeting would be focused almost entirely
13 on the location of casks used for dry cask storage. Co-Chair Mullin mentioned that today’s meeting
14 would include a brief presentation from Entergy on this topic, but that the November meeting would
15 explore the subject in greater detail. Co-Chair Mullin informed the panel that he would be on vacation
16 during the October NDCAP meeting, and that he would therefore miss it.

17
18 **WORKING GROUPS UPDATE:**

19 Co-Chair Mullin reviewed a list of the names he had received requesting to be on each working group.
20 Co-Chair Mullin requested that anyone interested in participating in a working group not on the list
21 should notify him and he would update the list. Co-Chair Mullin noted that the logistics of organizing
22 five working groups and their meetings would not be easy and that he also does not want to create a
23 separate bureaucracy of meetings, but that the first meetings need to be scheduled. Co-Chair Mullin
24 mentioned that the PCIS has appropriate space for these meetings, and that he reserved the rooms
25 starting on October 11. Co-Chair Mullin requested that they keep to his schedule for the first round of
26 meetings so that administrative tasks, such as who will chair, and what the scope of inquiry for each
27 group will be, can be settled.

28
29 Co-Chair Mullin then opened the subject for discussion. Hearing no comments, Co-Chair Mullin
30 commented that Entergy requested a seat on each of the working groups. As appointed members of
31 the NDCAP, Co-Chair Mullin noted that is not a problem, but stated that the process underpinning
32 representation required by the statute could be cumbersome. Mr. Twomey responded that he does not
33 anticipate Entergy having several different representatives, that changing the representation would not
34 pose a problem, and that he would send letters on representation to the Co-Chairs.

35
36 Ms. duBois stated that she had a conflict for an upcoming working group meeting. Co-Chair Mullin
37 recommended that she address that conflict with the other members of that working group, and that
38 other panel members should do the same in the future with regard to any conflicts.

39
40 Senator Wolf asked a clarifying question regarding appointing designees at working group meetings.
41 Co-Chair Mullin stated that it is a requirement that the letter appointing designees come from the
42 designating authority. Co-Chair Schwartz stated that the PSDAR and Decommissioning working group
43 had only three members, and that more could be beneficial. Co-Chair Mullin stated that two
44 amendments were proposed by Mr. Nichols: (1) the scope of each inquiry should go to the main NDCAP
45 panel before it goes to the working group; and (2) deleting the requirement that the working groups
46 must meet six times per year.

APPROVED AT 10/18/17 MEETING

1 With regard to scheduling, Co-Chair Mullin stated that these meetings will be compliant with the open
2 meeting law, meaning that there must be notices/agendas and minutes. Co-Chair Mullin requested that
3 an agenda for the first working group meeting be available by a week in advance. Co-Chair Schwartz
4 stated that a standard agenda for the initial working group meetings would suffice.

5
6 Mr. Nichols asked a qualifying question regarding communications that could violate the open meeting
7 law. Specifically, Mr. Nichols inquired how many individuals could email and about what subjects. Co-
8 Chair Schwartz explained that emails discussing procedural matters are allowable, but that substantive
9 discussions would be a violation.

10
11 Co-Chair Mullin also explained that in certain instances panel members cannot reply to emails from the
12 public because of the open meeting law. Co-Chair Schwartz discussed the open meeting law and
13 working group meetings. Co-Chair Schwartz stated that all these meetings are public meetings that
14 must have a quorum present, agendas posted, and meeting minutes. Mr. Coughlin and Co-Chair
15 Schwartz discussed the logistics and requirements of recording minutes in a small meeting setting. Co-
16 Chair Schwartz stated that it would be up to the members of the working groups to keep their own
17 minutes. Co-Chair Schwartz stated that he would provide further information regarding open meeting
18 law requirements.

19
20 **WEBSITE UPDATE:**

21
22 Co-Chair Schwartz noted that a website is live and linked from the Executive Office of Energy and
23 Environmental Affairs site. The site has a “contact us” button that would allow the public to send emails
24 to the panel, and it would be monitored by Co-Chair Schwartz and EEA. Second, Co-Chair Schwartz
25 stated that the URL was too long, and that he had it shortened which caused some delay to the site
26 launch. Co-Chair Schwartz described the layout of the site. Co-Chair Schwartz stated that meeting
27 notices would be posted on the new site in the future.

28
29 **WORKING GROUP ON SECOND SPENT FUEL CASK LOCATION:**

30
31 Mr. Joseph Lynch from Entergy presented. Because of the interest in dry fuel storage, Mr. Lynch
32 provided background on Pilgrim’s status. Mr. Lynch explained that Pilgrim currently has one operational
33 independent spent fuel storage installation (“ISFSI”) pad that has capacity for 40 casks, but that Entergy
34 limits it to 38 casks for ease of moving them around the storage area. Mr. Lynch stated that the current
35 pad has 8 multi-purpose canisters, each with 68 fuel assemblies. Mr. Lynch noted that there are
36 currently 3,000 fuel assemblies in the spent fuel pool and 590 fuel assemblies in the reactor, and in
37 order to move all the spent fuel, Entergy will need a second pad. More fuel will be loaded into casks in
38 2018.

39
40 With a second pad, Mr. Lynch explained that Entergy would need to go out to bid for design and
41 construction, but that they do not yet know how large a pad is needed. He continued that siting the pad
42 is important to the decommissioning process and that there are several considerations. Mr. Lynch
43 stated that there will be a siting study, security requirements, NRC regulatory approval, permitting,
44 environmental considerations, and siting impacts on decommissioning.

45
46 Entergy proposed to provide an update at a future meeting that would provide an opportunity to
47 address any questions, and that there might be an opportunity to either form a new working group or
48 discuss it within one of the existing working groups. Co-Chair Mullin stated that opportunity for public

1 discussion with regard to the second pad would be beneficial. Mr. Lynch replied that he would follow
2 town permitting requirements.

3
4 Mr. Coughlin asked Mr. Mahoney about the permitting process and whether the selectmen would
5 discuss the pad siting. Mr. Mahoney replied that permits do not come from the Board of Selectmen, but
6 that there would possibly be discussions.

7
8 Mr. Lynch stated that it would be he and possibly others from Entergy presenting at the November
9 meeting. He also stated that there would be similarities to the first pad process. Senator Wolf stated
10 that infrastructure planning is crucial, and has to account for unpredictable weather events, such as the
11 hurricanes of 2017. He requested information on weather related assumptions going into pad planning.
12 Co-Chair Mullin agreed that this is an important topic. Ms. duBois stated that it would be useful to know
13 the various options that contractors would offer. Mr. Lynch replied that there is a small universe of
14 options available and that there would therefore not be a wide variation of options by different
15 contractors.

16
17 **PILGRIM STATION SITE TOUR FOR NCDAP MEMBERS:**

18
19 Mr. Lynch stated that Entergy would like to offer a site tour to the panelists and that Entergy is
20 evaluating possible dates. Mr. Lynch explained that because of security concerns, groups can be up to
21 five people. He continued to explain that everyone on a tour will have to fill out a background form
22 including a social security number, that visitors need to be able to walk around the site, and there are
23 requirements for footwear. Mr. Lynch also stated that visitors must also disclose any medical
24 procedures involving radioactive materials and that invitations will be sent to the Co-chairs who will
25 forward them to the panel.

26
27 Co-Chair Mullin acknowledged the responsiveness and cooperative nature of the panel's relationship
28 with Entergy. Due to time constraints, Co-Chair Mullin postponed the planned discussion of the
29 November 17 meeting to allow Ms. Kate O'Connor's presentation to begin.

30
31 **Vermont NDCAP Presentation:**

32
33 Co-Chair Mullin introduced Ms. O'Connor as Chair of the Vermont NDCAP, Chairwoman of the
34 Brattleboro Select Board and Executive Director of the Brattleboro chamber of commerce. Ms.
35 O'Connor explained that she is happy to lend her experiences in decommissioning Vermont Yankee
36 ("VY") with the panel, particularly to those who, like her, had no prior experience in nuclear
37 decommissioning.

38
39 Ms. O'Connor explained that the VT NDCAP first met in 9/2014, and that VY went offline in 12/2014.
40 She stated that Entergy's initial plan was to put VY in SAFSTOR, and that it would remain in that state
41 until 2067. She explained that the VT NDCAP proceeded under that assumption for two years, until
42 11/2014, when Entergy sold VY to North Star, who planned an accelerated decommissioning. Ms.
43 O'Connor explained that the VT PUC has to approve the license transfer, as does the NRC. She stated
44 that the VT NDCAP has been discussing the proceedings reviewing the potential sale at both the state
45 and federal levels at its recent meetings. Ms. O'Connor stated that substantive decommissioning
46 discussions have been on the back burner while attention is focused on the pending sale.

1 Ms. O'Connor stated that the VT NDCAP began with no model or certainty about how to proceed. Ms.
2 O'Connor explained that the 12/2014 PSDAR was an unknown entity, and that the VT NDCAP did not
3 understand how important it actually was, and she therefore encouraged the MA NDCAP to get to know
4 as much as possible about it as early as possible.

5
6 Ms. O'Connor stated that the VT NDCAP's primary purpose is to inform and educate the public. She
7 stated that the VT NDCAP has published advisory opinions, and that those can become contentious,
8 which has both pros and cons. Ms. O'Connor mentioned that there were sources of frustration for the
9 VT NDCAP. She noted that issues often arise when the VT NDCAP wants to have a say in matters in
10 which they are unable. She also stated that whenever the VT NDCAP made requests at the NRC, they
11 were rebuffed, but that the MA NDCAP should nevertheless try because it gets information out.

12
13 Ms. O'Connor stated that the MA NDCAP should comment on the PSDAR even though it may have no
14 effect at the NRC. She also stated that there are things that the panel will want Entergy or the NRC to
15 do that will not happen, but that the requests should always be made. She noted that her main
16 message is not to be discouraged, and that efforts should be made even if they did not work in VT. She
17 recommended watching the process unfold in VT, and indicated that Entergy may try to sell Pilgrim, and
18 that what happens in VT sets precedent. She recommended that, even if Entergy files a PSDAR for
19 SAFSTOR, preparations should still be made for accelerated decommissioning in the event of a sale.

20
21 Ms. O'Connor mentioned two issues: one is whether there is enough money to decommission the plant;
22 and the second is whether there is enough information characterizing the site, which impacts how much
23 money is needed for decommissioning. She stated that North Star claims that \$600m to decommission
24 VY, which is equal to the funds available in the decommissioning trust fund, whereas Entergy had
25 claimed it would cost \$2.2B. She stated that the VT NDCAP cannot receive detailed financial information
26 from North Star because that information is confidential. She stated that line item expenditures are
27 available only to the VT PUC.

28
29 Mr. Grassie asked to what extent the VT PUC is depending on the VT NDCAP's input. Ms. O'Connor
30 replied that it is unclear how much the panel is listened to. Ms. O'Connor explained that the chair of the
31 VT PUC is on the panel. She also stated that the panel submits comments to both the VT PUC and NRC.
32 Mr. Grassie asked who has the liability in case the cost of decommissioning exceeds the money available
33 in the trust fund. Ms. O'Connor responded that the licensee is liable. Ms. O'Connor stated that people
34 in VT rely on the panel to get information out, and that this is the primary consideration for the panel
35 when making planning decisions.

36
37 Mr. Priest stated that Ms. O'Connor's information is particularly important as the working groups take
38 shape. Ms. O'Connor replied that an important item is the PSDAR, which is a large document that
39 documents the timeline and money involved in decommissioning. She stated that the NRC does not
40 have to approve a PSDAR. The VT PUC asked Entergy questions on the NRC docket about the PSDAR
41 that Entergy was not required to answer.

42
43 Senator Wolf asked whether VT has retained experts in this matter. Ms. O'Connor replied that the VT
44 NDCAP has relied on resources that do not have a cost, including government resources. She stated that
45 a speaker would be coming to speak about rubblization. She also stated that they have not had to ask
46 for experts. Senator Wolf followed up by asking whether the VT NDCAP has been able to use experts to
47 analyze the PSDAR. Ms. O'Connor replied that they have not and that they have not prioritized such
48 expenditure because the NRC does not make judgments on the PSDAR. She stated that in 2019 the NRC

APPROVED AT 10/18/17 MEETING

1 will have new rules regarding decommissioning. She stated that VT entities have submitted comments
2 on the rulemaking including a proposal that the PSDAR should have an approval process. She stated
3 that although there is no approval process, review is important.

4
5 Mr. Coughlin asked what impact the VT NDCAP has experienced from the public as they keep them
6 informed of their recommendations, and how the public reacts to those recommendations being
7 ignored by the NRC. Ms. O'Connor stated that the state has been responsive. She also stated that the
8 public is frustrated by the process as is the panel, but that they appreciate the opportunity to ask
9 questions at panel meetings. Mr. Coughlin followed up by asking whether public involvement in the
10 process is valuable, to which Ms. O'Connor replied that it is valuable.

11
12 Ms duBois asked about the validity of North Star filing a revision of the PSDAR and whether the old one
13 is moot when a new one is filed. Ms. O'Connor replied that the revised PSDAR is a requirement and
14 something the NRC considers while approving a license transfer. Mr. Grassie asked how North Star
15 would bill money during decommissioning. Ms. O'Connor explained that the licensee bills itself through
16 the trust fund. Mr Grassie followed up by asking whether there is oversight over how they spend the
17 funds available in the trust fund. Ms. O'Connor stated that this is a contentious issue, and that in VT the
18 licensee has to report how much money they bill the fund, but not with specifics. Mr. Grassie asked
19 who makes decisions if the trust fund is exhausted prior to decommissioning being complete. Ms.
20 O'Connor replied that the NRC would have oversight over those decisions.

21
22 Mr. Smith asked whether the VT panel learned much from other nuclear decommissionings in New
23 England. Ms. O'Connor replied that a Mass DEP representative who had worked on the Yankee Rowe
24 decommissioning provided good insight on how state and federal resources can work cooperatively and
25 that VT NDCAP members had taken a trip to CT Yankee to see a decommissioned plant.

26
27 Mr. Nichols asked what the top three areas are where the VT NDCAP has had the greatest impact. Ms.
28 O'Connor responded that entities within the VT government have listened and adopted the VT NDCAP's
29 position on certain issues. She also explained that despite a change in administration during the VT
30 NDCAP's existence, both administrations have been supportive. She explained that the six citizen
31 members of the panel have worked collaboratively and have taken on a larger role in representing
32 members of the public. She stated that she has worked collaboratively with representatives
33 decommissioning Yankee Maine and Yankee Rowe.

34
35 Mr. O'Reilly thanked Ms. O'Connor for appearing at this meeting and for her assistance in prior
36 collaborative efforts. Senator Wolf asked what the VT NDCAP would do, without financial constraints,
37 relative to the PSDAR. Ms. O'Connor replied that the VT NDCAP would hire experts to review the
38 PSDAR, and that the VT NDCAP would also hire experts to review financial aspects of the
39 decommissioning. Senator Wolf stated that a report from experts would be a valuable tool even if it
40 would have little effect before the NRC. Ms. O'Connor responded that she agreed, and stated that the
41 NRC would be conducting a public meeting in Vermont at a later date.

42
43 Ms. Lightner asked whether Ms. O'Connor had advice for better engaging more members of the public.
44 Ms. O'Connor replied that keeping legislators informed of the NDCAP's goals and asking them to spread
45 the word can help, and that televising on public access TV is important. She also mentioned that press
46 coverage typically follows their meetings.

1 Mr. Coughlin asked what how much time should be reserved for reviewing and commenting on a
2 PSDAR, and opined that it could be included in the annual report. Ms. O'Connor replied that a licensee
3 has two years from the closure of a plant to file a PSDAR, and that Entergy filed its PSDAR two months
4 after closing VY. Mr. Coughlin followed up by asking how much time is needed to review and respond
5 after a PSDAR is filed. Ms. O'Connor replied that the NRC has a procedural timetable, and that the VT
6 PUC submitted questions in response to the VY PSDAR. She stated that the MA NDCAP should react as
7 quickly as possible once it is released.

8
9 Mr. Smith stated that experts at various levels set the standards that the plant must meet. Ms.
10 O'Connor responded that this can be a problem because there is fear that there is not enough money in
11 the trust fund to complete decommissioning. Mr. Smith followed up by asking Ms. O'Connor to confirm
12 that she does trust state and federal experts with regard to health standards. Ms. O'Connor replied that
13 she does trust them to set site restoration standards. Senator Wolf commented that it does not have to
14 do with trust but rather that process determines outcome, because a report is produced by an entity
15 with an interest in a certain outcome reviewed by government entities with fewer resources. Therefore,
16 Senator Wolf stated that he understands that the process is not objective, and the NDCAP needs to
17 ascertain how to make the process as objective as possible in the face of an asymmetrical funding
18 situation. Ms. O'Connor offered that the VT NDCAP evolved from not understanding their role at first to
19 having a stronger grasp on the subject matter. She stated that VT government entities have intervened
20 in the NRC proceeding to request a public meeting in VT on the license transfer issue, and that the VT
21 NDCAP is grateful for support from the state government.

22
23 Co-Chair Mullin asked Ms. O'Connor to explain the VT panel's experiences with the subject matter of
24 each of the NDCAP's working group subject matter areas.

- 25
26 1. Safety and security: Ms. O'Connor stated that the emergency planning zone is under the
27 purview of the NRC. She stated that VT asked the NRC that the zone be kept wider, but was
28 denied by the NRC. She noted that there was discussion between entities in MA, NH, and VT
29 which resulted in Entergy providing more funding for preparedness. She emphasized that
30 knowing the scheduling is important.
- 31
32 2. Financial and economic impacts: Ms. O'Connor stated that the town of Vernon's only industry
33 was VY and they had to cut the town budget as a result of the closure. Brattleboro, 10 miles
34 away, has not been harmed by the closure economically because it has a diversity of industries,
35 but stated that the town of Vernon has experienced frustration in this area. Mr. O'Reilly asked
36 about money negotiated between the state and Entergy. Ms. O'Connor responded that
37 Vermont and Energy negotiated a MOU to allow Entergy to run VY one additional year if Entergy
38 paid \$10m into an economic development fund for Windham County. Ms. O'Connor stated that
39 this was a unique situation that was the result of special circumstances. Mr. Grassie asked
40 whether decommissioning provided entrepreneurial opportunities, such as subcontracting. Ms.
41 O'Connor responded that Entergy has used local contractors. Mr. Grassie followed up by asking
42 whether North Star's deal includes provisions to use local contractors. Ms. O'Connor responded
43 that such an issue is within the state government's purview, and that the needed contractors
44 are highly specialized and short-term, and therefore not likely to employ many locals. Mr.
45 Grassie asked whether there is a proprietary security force, and Ms. O'Connor responded that
46 security is contracted. Mr. Grassie asked whether the minimization of the storage pad would
47 mean fewer security jobs, to which Ms. O'Connor replied that she was unable to provide an
48 answer.

- 1
2 3. Site cleanup and restoration: Ms. O'Connor stated that the VT PUC approves site restoration
3 standards and that North Star has requested that the VT PUC provide that approval concurrent
4 with its approval of the sale of the license. Ms. O'Connor stated that the town of Vernon has
5 been trying to determine what to use the site for in the future, and that future use determines
6 how clean it needs to be and how much money needs to be allocated to its cleanup. She stated
7 that the licensee owns the property, and that how it is cleaned up drives how it can be used in
8 the future. Mr. O'Reilly mentioned that the site cleanup level will also factor into budgeting.
9 Ms. O'Connor agreed. Ms. Dubois asked whether the state has any interest in owning the site
10 so that it could have ownership over the cleanup. Ms. O'Connor replied that it did not, and that
11 the type of license transfer taking place with VY, right before decommissioning, has never
12 happened before. She stated that North Star would own the property in perpetuity, and that in
13 other instances where license transfers have occurred before decommissioning, the
14 decommissioning entity has transferred the license back to the original owner at the conclusion
15 of the decommissioning. With VY, North Star will maintain the license even after
16 decommissioning is complete and will be responsible for the spent fuel storage. Mr. Lynch
17 volunteered that The VY site is about 177 acres.
18

19 **PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER:**

20
21 Mr. Chuck Adey noted that he has been a member of the nuclear matters committee in Plymouth for
22 several years and was involved in the decommissioning of the Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant in Long
23 Island. As part of the settlement with the governor, Mr. Adey explained that the Long Island Power
24 Authority was formed, that the plant was sold to the Long Island Power Authority, and that it still owns
25 the plant. Mr. Adey related that when the LIPA sought the license from NRC, they were denied due to
26 inexperience and instead entered into a management agreement. Mr. Adey explained that this sale of a
27 decommissioned plant is similar to that of VY.
28

29 Mr. Richard Rothstein commented that he finds it inconsistent that the NRC maintains standards for
30 maintaining facilities but has not yet developed a rule for the PSDAR. Mr. Rothstein asks whether the VT
31 NDCAP asked the NRC why this is the case. Ms. O'Connor stated that they have been unable to receive
32 a satisfactory explanation for why there is no approval process for the PSDAR, but in her position that it
33 should have an approval process. Mr. Rothstein encouraged the MA NDCAP to ask the same of the NRC
34 representative at the next panel meeting. Mr. Rothstein informed Senator Wolf that Entergy submitted
35 a revised flood hazard report to the NRC two years ago that may be useful to the panel.
36

37 Ms. Elaine Dickinson of the Cape Downwinders commented that Massachusetts differs from Vermont in
38 that it deregulated its energy industry, and she wonders how this difference might affect
39 decommissioning in the two states. Co-Chair Mullin acknowledged that Massachusetts may not have as
40 much authority over the potential sale of Pilgrim at the state level as Vermont due to deregulation.
41

42 Mr. Jim Lampert spoke regarding getting information to the public. Mr. Lampert commented that not
43 only is the open meeting law relevant to these meetings, but the public records law also applies. Mr.
44 Lampert stated that the public records law likely includes email correspondence and other
45 communications of the NDCAP. Mr. Lampert stated that he hopes that the website provides an
46 opportunity to provide public records and he hopes to hear at a future meeting what the NDCAP's plans
47 are for making those records available to the public.
48

1 Ms. Mary Lampert stated that she looks to Vermont for lessons learned, and one lesson is that Vermont
2 was late in setting cleanup standards. Ms. Lampert states that states have the authority, and she asks
3 the panel whether the panel intends to make recommendations regarding cleanup standards. She
4 noted that the state government has the authority to make decisions on economic matters, and could
5 grant money to MEMA, as well as the EPC communities. Ms. Lampert also questioned what the funding
6 source will be for DPH to perform environmental monitoring for radiological issues, and whether the
7 state has the authority to require this. Ms. Lampert contended that litigation could provide a bargaining
8 chip in dealing with Entergy over these matters. Ms. Lampert also questioned the shrinking of the
9 security force for the ISFSI, and she stated that the panel should look into these security issues. Ms.
10 Lampert also noted that she expects that the PSDAR for Pilgrim will be substantially similar to that of VY,
11 and that the panelists should therefore familiarize themselves with it. Ms. O'Connor stated that site
12 restoration standards have been a frustration with the VT NDCAP because it is a matter between the
13 state and the licensee.

14
15 Senator Wolf asked whether the decommissioning funds are eligible to be used for researching post-
16 shutdown uses for the VY site. Ms. O'Connor responded that she does not know whether they use
17 those funds for that purpose. Senator Wolf followed up by asking whether the VT NDCAP has petitioned
18 the NRC to use decommissioning funds as a resource for the VT NDCAP. MS O'Connor responded that
19 VT has a process whereby it can bill back Entergy for certain expenditures and there have been
20 discussions regarding whether or not VT can bill back for getting the VT NDCAP experts. Ms. O'Connor
21 stated that such billing back would come out of the decommissioning fund.

22
23 Mr. Nichols commented that the panel should consider involving the Attorney General's Office. Ms.
24 O'Connor commented that the VT Attorney General has been a useful resource to the VT NDCAP, and
25 that the MA NDCAP should also involve legislators at the federal level, and that involving their staff
26 would be helpful.

27
28 Mr. Coughlin commented that as an educational hub, there is likely to be expertise available within
29 Boston's academic community to serve as a resource to the panel. Ms. O'Connor commented that the
30 VT NDCAP will have guest speakers at their next meeting from the New Jersey Institute of Technology
31 who are experts on brownfields, and that they will present on potential uses for the site in the future.

32
33 **WRAP UP AND ADJOURN:**

34 Co-Chair Mullin thanked Ms. O'Connor for her time and generosity. Co-Chair Mullin also reported that
35 he had spoken with Dr. Moniz at MIT, who also put him in touch with other individuals there. He
36 suggested asking representatives from MIT to join the panel as guests, and asked whether there would
37 be interest in pursuing a joint venture with MIT. Co-Chair Mullin suggested that this type of venture
38 could raise the NCDAP's visibility.

39
40 There was a motion to adjourn and it was seconded.

41
42 ***Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:34 p.m.***

43
44 **DOCUMENTS USED AT MEETING:**

- 45
- Entergy presentation on second spent fuel cask location and site tour
 - Draft List of Possible Sub-committees and Ground Rules and sub-committee members
- 46