

NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING CITIZENS ADVISORY PANEL (“NDCAP”)

Thursday, April 26, 2018

**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:

- Pat Ciaramella, Representative of Old Colony Planning Council
- H. Joseph Coughlin, Member from Plymouth Nuclear Matters Committee
- Pine duBois, Speaker of the House Appointee
- Richard Grassie, Minority Leader of the House Appointee
- Robert Hayden¹, Department of Public Utilities
- David Johnston², Department of Environmental Protection
- Robert Jones³, Executive Office of Health and Human Services
- Heather Lightner, Representative of the Town of Plymouth
- Joseph Lynch, Representative of Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station
- 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, Speaker of the House Appointee
- Kurt Schwartz, Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency (Co-Chair)
- Paul D. Smith⁴, Representative of UWUA Local 369
- Senator Dan Wolf, President of the Senate Appointee

NDCAP MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

- Jessica Casey, President of the Senate Appointee
- John Chapman, Executive Office of Housing and Economic Development
- John G. Flores, Appointee of Governor Baker
- Jack Priest, Department of Public Health, Radiological Control Program

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 21, 2018 MEETING MINUTES:

Ms. duBois expressed concerns with the February 21 meeting minutes’ description of the discussion of physical layout of Pilgrim, buoys near Pilgrim, and the intake canal. Co-Chair Mullin suggested the video of the meeting be consulted to determine precisely what was discussed at that meeting, to which the Panel agreed.

REVIEW AND DISCUSS DRAFT NDCAP ANNUAL REPORT FORMAT, TEMPLATE, AND SCHEDULE:

Co-Chair Mullin explained that the purpose of tonight’s meeting would be to discuss what the Panel has learned, what the working groups have learned, and what the public has learned up to this point. He

¹ Designee of Angela O’Connor (DPU)

² Designee of Secretary Beaton (EEA)

³ Designee of Secretary Sudders (Executive Office of Health and Human Services)

⁴ Designee of Richard Sherman (Representative of UWUA Local 369)

APPROVED AT 7/17/18 MEETING

1 stated that there would be votes this evening. He stated that after tonight's votes, he would distribute
2 information via email, and repeated that follow-up deliberations could not be conducted via email due
3 to the Open Meetings Law. He also stated that he has laid out the framework for the Panel's annual
4 report, and would share it with the Panel by next week. He noted that the layout for the working group
5 sections is the same as the main Panel's section.

6
7 With regard to upcoming meetings, he stated that the May meeting would be an opportunity to discuss
8 whichever topics are not voted on at this meeting. He explained that, by the June 20 meeting, the Panel
9 will have had three opportunities to edit, discuss, and vote on issues, and will then try to get a final
10 report done.

11
12 Co-Chair Schwartz noted that the move to voting on recommendations might be happening too quickly,
13 and that the working groups were established to focus on substantive areas of importance, and he
14 suggested that the Panel look to the working groups to form recommendations if they are ready to do
15 so. He stated that tonight's draft recommendations are not necessarily coming from the working
16 groups. He suggested that if there are recommendations that have merit, it would be appropriate to
17 discuss them tonight, and to wait to vote on them until the next meeting. He stated that he does not
18 feel compelled to include a list of recommendations in the June report.

19
20 Mr. Smith asked whether the recommendations can be amended or whether they need to be accepted
21 as drafted. Co-Chair Mullin replied that the Panel would discuss the recommendations. He also stated
22 that votes would be taken by name, and that it is not a secret ballot. He stated that it would take 11
23 votes to pass, and that everyone's vote would be on the record.

24
25 Mr. Lynch explained that Entergy would require additional time to evaluate the recommendations prior
26 to voting on them, and he agreed with Co-Chair Schwartz that more time to evaluate and discuss the
27 recommendations prior to voting on them would be appropriate.

28
29 Ms. duBois noted that, with just one year until Pilgrim ceases operations, the Panel should continue
30 making progress, and that voting on recommendations at this meeting does not preclude voting on
31 additional recommendations at future meetings. Therefore, she disagreed with Co-Chair Schwartz that
32 all votes should be postponed, and she asked the Panel to vote on the items it was prepared to vote on.

33
34 Mr. Coughlin stated that the PSDAR working group has met and developed recommendations. He noted
35 that he welcomes a discussion on those recommendations.

36
37 Mr. Grassie agreed with Ms. duBois that the Panel should focus on the recommendations and vote on
38 them. He stated that the Safety and Security Working Group has completed its mission statement, and
39 that its next step is to develop the findings and recommendations that would be submitted to the Panel.

40
41 Mr. O'Reilly noted that the Panel has a mandate and that the Panel should start moving forward by
42 voting on the recommendations that are ready to be voted on.

43
44 Senator Wolf noted that, if the recommendations related to more substantive subject matter, it could
45 be appropriate to move more slowly. However, because most of the recommendations are related to
46 process and procuring resources related to that process, he suggested that the Panel should start
47 making progress. He also noted that the Panel needs to refine and improve the process to ensure the
48 best outcome.

1
2 Mr. Mahoney indicated that he expects to meet again after the June meeting. Co-Chair Mullin stated
3 that he recommends further discussion and edit up until there is final agreement. He also stated that, if
4 votes are taken, a volunteer would be needed to record the votes. Mr. O'Reilly volunteered. Co-Chair
5 Mullin stated that he disagreed with Co-Chair Schwartz, and stated that it is time to make progress by
6 voting. Mr. Ciaramella agreed that it is time to start moving forward, especially with the legislature
7 involved in the budget process. Co-Chair Mullin also stated that the legislation does not preclude the
8 panel from voting on recommendations throughout the year.

9
10 **REVIEW, DISCUSS AND POSSIBLY VOTE ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION BY LEGISLATIVE DELEGATION**

11
12 Co-Chair Mullin noted that representatives from the offices of Senator Warren, Senator Markey, and
13 Representative Keating's offices provided statements at the previous NDCAP meeting, and also that the
14 members of the Southeastern Massachusetts state congressional delegation appeared personally and
15 provided a list of five recommendations. Co-Chair Mullin updated the Panel that the recommendations
16 were not included in the House of Representatives' budget, but that they have been included in the
17 Senate's version. He asked whether the Panel would like to discuss the five recommendations.

18
19 Mr. Nichols explained that the Government Affairs working group had met to discuss the
20 recommendations. He stated that although the working group lacked a quorum, there was consensus
21 that the Panel should respond to the delegation as quickly as possible.

22
23 Mr. Grassie requested clarification about different legislation regarding Pilgrim that was previously
24 before the House, and what the status is for those three bills. Senator Wolf responded that these bills
25 would have to be acted on by May 9.

26
27 Mr. Nichols offered to make a motion that the Panel vote to support the delegation's letter containing
28 the five recommendations. Co-Chair Schwartz clarified that the letter did not offer a piece of
29 legislation, and that proposed legislation was offered, but it did not come before the Panel. Mr. O'Reilly
30 further clarified that the motion was to show support for the letter from the delegation. After back and
31 forth on the precise language of the motion, Co-Chair Mullin defined the motion as follows: "the Panel
32 will take a vote on whether it wants to communicate with the delegation that the Panel generally
33 supports the letter, subject to modifications, and would like to work with the delegation to revise the
34 letter."

35
36 If approved, Co-Chair Mullin suggested that the Panel's response would be in the form of a letter from
37 the co-chairs to the delegation, and that the letter would restate the motion. Mr. Lynch asked how the
38 Panel's vote would be communicated. Senator Wolf requested clarification whether the Panel would be
39 voting for the entire letter, or whether it would vote recommendation by recommendation. It was
40 determined that the vote was for general support for the letter rather than for its individual
41 recommendations.

42
43 The final version of the motion is as follows: "A motion made by David Nichols, seconded by Pat
44 Ciaramella to express support for the concepts in the letter received from the legislative delegation
45 dated April 11, and to commit to work with the legislature on modifications."

46
47 Pat Ciaramella: Y

48 Joseph Coughlin: Y

APPROVED AT 7/17/18 MEETING

- 1 Pine duBois: Y
- 2 Richard Grassie: Y
- 3 Robert Hayden: abstain
- 4 David Johnston: abstain
- 5 Robert Jones: abstain
- 6 Heather Lightner: Y
- 7 Joseph Lynch: N
- 8 John T. Mahoney: N
- 9 Sean Mullin: Y
- 10 David C. Nichols: Y
- 11 John Ohrenberger: N
- 12 Kevin O'Reilly: Y
- 13 Kurt Schwartz: abstain
- 14 Paul D. Smith: N
- 15 Senator Dan Wolf: Y

16
17 Mr. O'Reilly counted the votes, as 9 yes, 4 abstain, and 4 no. Co-Chair Mullin stated that the motion
18 does not carry and is not approved. Mr. Mahoney asked whether it would be possible to make a motion
19 to approve only one of the recommendations, to which Co-Chair Mullin responded that it is possible to
20 do so.

21
22 Co-Chair Mullin then made a motion to extend the end time of the meeting from 8:30 PM until 9:00 PM,
23 which passed with one dissenting vote.

24
25 Ms. duBois asked whether the Panel members representing state agencies were required to abstain
26 from votes involving state agencies and legislation. Co-Chair Schwartz responded that there is no
27 legislative requirement that they abstain. Ms. duBois followed up by asking whether there is a policy
28 that they abstain. Co-Chair Schwartz responded that for votes of this type at this meeting, it is likely
29 that the state employee representatives would abstain.

30
31 Mr. Coughlin noted that the working groups would be likely to produce recommendations similar to
32 those in the delegation's letter, and stated that they should be given thorough discussion by the Panel at
33 that time.

34
35 Mr. Mahoney proposed a motion to support the delegation's third recommendation, which is support
36 for a 10 millirem unrestricted release limit at Pilgrim. Co-Chair Mullin requested a show of hands from
37 the Panel for whether they would like to pursue a discussion on this topic.

38
39 The next motion was as follows: "A motion made by Mr. Mullin, seconded by Ms. Lightner, to
40 determine whether to consider individual sections of the legislative letter dated April 11 for votes."

- 41
- 42 Pat Ciaramella: Y
- 43 Joseph Coughlin: Y
- 44 Pine duBois: Y
- 45 Richard Grassie: Y
- 46 Robert Hayden: abstain
- 47 David Johnston: abstain
- 48 Robert Jones: abstain

- 1 Heather Lightner: Y
- 2 Joseph Lynch: abstain
- 3 John T. Mahoney: Y
- 4 Sean Mullin: Y
- 5 David C. Nichols: Y
- 6 John Ohrenberger: N
- 7 Kevin O'Reilly: Y
- 8 Kurt Schwartz: abstain
- 9 Paul D. Smith: N
- 10 Senator Dan Wolf: Y

11
12 Mr. O'Reilly tabulated the votes and counted 10 yes votes. Co-Chair Mullin announced that the vote did
13 not carry.

14
15 **INTRODUCTION, DISCUSSION AND PANEL VOTES ON PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

16
17 Co-Chair Mullin stated that he would like to start discussing the recommendations he had distributed
18 two weeks prior. He stated that he would open up the recommendations to discussion

19
20 Draft finding #1: Mr. Smith stated that, in the case of the decommissioning of Yankee Rowe, oversight
21 by DEP was adequate, and that it would not aid Plymouth or Pilgrim to add another layer of
22 bureaucracy. Mr. Coughlin disagreed, and stated that the Panel lacks authority as an advisory panel,
23 but that the Executive branch has authority. He stated that an interagency working group is not
24 redundant because it would have different authority than an advisory panel, and would be
25 complementary to the NDCAP, if implemented properly. Senator Wolf noted that the interagency
26 working group recommendation came about from learning about Vermont's experience, where it was
27 helpful. He stated that there will be issues that EEOEA will not be prepared to weigh in on and will defer
28 to other members of the interagency working group. He stated that the interagency working group
29 represents a comprehensive approach and provides a wide net, and that the interagency working group
30 should include these groups.

31
32 Mr. O'Reilly noted that Vermont's advice had been that interagency cooperation is essential to the
33 decommissioning process. Mr. Smith responded that these organizations are already in place and
34 already work together, as at Yankee Rowe. He stated that an additional organization could not improve
35 that process. Ms. duBois stated that an interagency working group would have a mandate to approach
36 the Pilgrim decommissioning in a unified way, whereas the state agencies currently do not focus on the
37 same issues at the same time. Therefore, the interagency working group would expedite the process of
38 decommissioning by increasing efficiency and institutional knowledge.

39
40 Mr. Lynch noted that Vermont does not have an interagency working group presently, but rather a
41 monthly meeting among agencies that has no feedback mechanism for making recommendations. He
42 stated that an interagency working group would therefore not be modeled on a system in place in
43 Vermont.

44
45 Mr. Nichols stated that he would be more comfortable making the interagency working group
46 recommendation without directing the Governor to implement it through an Executive Order, because
47 there are different ways for the Governor to implement it. He stated that it could alternatively be the
48 legislature that creates the working group. He suggested amending the recommendation to eliminate

APPROVED AT 7/17/18 MEETING

1 that the working group be created through an Executive Order. Co-Chair Mullin stated that this type of
2 discussion is productive, and that the Panel should discuss any desired edits to the recommendation in
3 this forum.

4
5 Senator Wolf noted that a process that is working in Vermont may not be adopted in Massachusetts it is
6 mandated, and Vermont's monthly interagency meeting is not likely to be replicated in Massachusetts
7 without a legislative or Executive mandate. He noted that it is the Panel's role to make
8 recommendations based on what is taking place in other states.

9
10 Co-Chair Mullin asked whether there is a motion from a Panel member to approve Co-Chair Mullin's first
11 recommendation as written. Senator Wolf made a motion and it was seconded.

12
13 Mr. Ohrenberger noted that the recommendation calls for the Governor to create an interagency
14 working group, and then managing pre- and post-shutdown decommissioning activity. He stated that
15 this would be bad for Pilgrim, for the state, and for the Governor.

16
17 Co-Chair Schwartz stated that two aspects of the recommendation should be changed. One is that the
18 Panel should not mandate that the Governor issue an Executive Order, and that the Panel should state
19 that the NDCAP recommends establishing an interagency working group within the Executive branch.
20 Second, the state will not manage the shutdown and the decommissioning, and the recommendation
21 should therefore state that the interagency working group would manage the state's role associated
22 with the shutdown.

23
24 Co-Chair Mullin raised Jim Lampert's suggestion, which is to state that the NDCAP recommends that the
25 Governor issue an Executive Order creating an interagency working group to monitor and work with the
26 licensee during the pre- and post-shutdown decommissioning process. Senator Wolf stated he would
27 accept this revised language as his amended motion.

28
29 Mr. Ohrenberger stated that Entergy has not had adequate time to review these recommendations to
30 be able to vote on them. Co-Chair Schwartz stated that, with more time, the state might be able to vote
31 on these recommendations at a future meeting. Co-Chair Mullin disagreed that Panel members have
32 not had adequate time to review the recommendations.

33
34 Mr. Nichols recommended striking the mention of an Executive Order to state that the Governor may
35 create the working group by any means under his authority.

36
37 Co-Chair Mullin repeated the motion that was currently on the floor, as follows:
38 "To accept finding 1 and recommendation 1, as amended, the first sentence of which now reads: 'The
39 NDCAP recommends that the Governor form an interagency working group to monitor and work with
40 the licensee during the pre- and post-shutdown decommissioning process at the Plymouth Nuclear
41 Power Station .'"

42
43 Mr. Johnston asked why it is necessary to recommend that the Governor be responsible for creating the
44 working group, to which Co-Chair Mullin responded that others have mentioned that the Attorney
45 General should do so instead. Mr. Johnston recommended therefore striking any mention of the
46 Governor in this recommendation.

APPROVED AT 7/17/18 MEETING

1 Co-Chair Mullin stated that through the Panel’s iterative process, he has learned that a successful
2 decommissioning requires the creation of organization with a single point of contact that works directly
3 with Entergy. Although the Panel should not be overly prescriptive to the Governor, it should be clear
4 that resources need to be developed.

5
6 Mr. O’Reilly stated that the Governor is the chief executive of the Commonwealth, and if he declines to
7 take the recommended action himself, he can appoint someone else to do it.

8
9 For clarity, O’Reilly restated the motion, as amended by Mr. Coughlin and seconded by Ms. duBois:
10 “The NDCAP recommends that the Governor form an interagency working group to monitor and work
11 with the licensee during the pre- and post-shutdown decommissioning process at the Plymouth Nuclear
12 Power Station, in conjunction with the NDCAP.” The motion also strikes all references to an Executive
13 Order.

14
15 Mr. Nichols moved to vote:

16
17 Pat Ciaramella: Y

18 Joseph Coughlin: Y

19 Pine duBois: Y

20 Richard Grassie: Y

21 Robert Hayden: abstain

22 David Johnston: abstain

23 Robert Jones: abstain

24 Heather Lightner: Y

25 Joseph Lynch: abstain

26 John T. Mahoney: Y

27 Sean Mullin: Y

28 David C. Nichols: Y

29 John Ohrenberger: N

30 Kevin O’Reilly: Y

31 Kurt Schwartz: abstain

32 Paul D. Smith: N

33 Senator Dan Wolf: Y

34

35 Mr. O’Reilly tabulated the votes and counted 10 yes votes.

36

37 Co-Chair Mullin asked whether it would be worthwhile to continue going through the list of findings at
38 this meeting. Senator Wolf recommended tabling the discussion as it appeared that no vote would
39 receive the 11 votes required to pass.

40

41 Co-Chair Schwartz suggested that a discussion of the 16 remaining findings and recommendations would
42 be valuable to allow the Panel to prioritize them and possibly have a different outcome at the next
43 meeting. Mr. Johnston agreed that it would be productive to continue to discuss and modify them.

44

45 Ms. Lightner asked whether the abstaining voters would be able to vote at a future meeting, and Mr.
46 Lynch stated that, from Energy’s perspective, more time is needed before voting. Although discussing
47 these recommendations at this meeting could be productive, Mr. Lynch stated that eight days is not
48 enough time for Entergy to determine its future. Co-Chair Mullin asked whether a vote at the May

APPROVED AT 7/17/18 MEETING

1 meeting would provide adequate time, to which Mr. Lynch stated that it would. Co-Chair Mullin next
2 asked the state appointees whether they would be ready to vote at the May meeting. Co-Chair
3 Schwartz stated that tonight's meeting did not provide enough time, and that it might be valuable to
4 discuss and prioritize recommendations.

5
6 Mr. Coughlin stated that all recommendations be sent to the co-chairs, and that a package of
7 recommendations be sent by the co-chairs to the Panel, and, at the next meeting, all panelists come
8 prepared to discuss the entire package of recommendations. Co-Chair Mullin noted that Entergy has
9 stated that the next Panel meeting in three weeks would be sufficient. Mr. Coughlin recommended
10 holding an extra meeting that is not currently scheduled for the express purpose of reviewing and voting
11 on the recommendations, which could be consolidated into a draft report, and hopefully make the late
12 June target.

13
14 Co-Chair Mullin asked whether there is interest among the panelists with regard to a second May
15 meeting. Mr. Mahoney and Ms. Lightner stated that they would support scheduling an extra meeting to
16 discuss recommendations.

17
18 Co-Chair Schwartz stated that his preference is to defer to the working groups, and he asked whether it
19 is necessary for the full Panel to vote on the working group recommendations, rather than producing an
20 annual report stating that the Panel has created six working groups, and would include the working
21 group recommendations. Of all the working group recommendations, the full Panel could act on a
22 certain number of the more significant working group recommendations. He stated that it may not be
23 possible to individually consider each recommendation given the volume of working group
24 recommendations. Co-Chair Mullin stated that it is likely that there will be some overlap and/or
25 duplication in the recommendations between working groups. To the extent that there is conflict or
26 overlap between the working groups, the annual report would need to be clarified to avoid confusion.

27
28 Senator Wolf expressed concern that members of a working group of which he is not a member will
29 develop recommendations he is comfortable. He stated that the Panel lacks scientific expertise, and the
30 interagency working group's purpose would be to serve as an entity with the expertise and resources to
31 productively engage in the decommissioning process. Co-Chair Mullin responded that his drafts have
32 kept recommendations to a high level.

33
34 Co-Chair Mullin introduced a discussion of planning for an additional meeting. He explained that the
35 purpose of the extra meeting would be to discuss findings and recommendations after the state and
36 Entergy Panel members have had sufficient time to review them, and to have votes on specific language
37 for the findings and recommendations that will be included in the report.

38
39 Co-Chair Schwartz questioned how the working group recommendations would factor in to the Panel's
40 decision making, because some have provided recommendations but others have not. Senator Wolf
41 noted that scientific recommendations from a Panel that lacks scientific expertise might lack credibility
42 that an interagency working group would have, because state agencies have in-house expertise and also
43 would have the resources to hire outside experts. He stated that the working groups' recommendations
44 could lack the type of expertise that would lend them credibility.

45
46 Ms. duBois supported holding a second meeting, stating that she disagrees with Senator Wolf in that the
47 recommendations should be more about process than science. Senator Wolf responded that there
48 needs to be a defined relationship between the Panel and an interagency working group.

1
2 Co-Chair Mullin suggested holding the extra meeting on June 6, with the previously scheduled meeting
3 still to be held on June 20. He was uncertain whether the room would be available, however. He asked
4 whether there was a motion to look into June 6 as the date for the additional meeting. The meeting was
5 made and seconded, and passed.

6
7 Co-Chair Mullin stated that he would postpone further discussion on recommendations until state
8 agency and Entergy representatives have more time to review them. Mr. Lynch stated that he agreed
9 with this approach, and recommended that the next meeting be focused on Co-Chair Mullin's six draft
10 recommendations, and that the following meeting could be used to review the working group
11 recommendations. Ms. Lightner asked whether the Panel would be voting at the next meeting, to which
12 Co-Chair Mullin responded that the discussion would focus on his six draft recommendations.

13
14 **PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER:**

15
16 Richard Rothstein offered a recommendation based on his experiences working in power generation and
17 waste management. He termed his recommendation "Entergy Proactiveness for Pilgrim
18 Decommissioning." He recommended that all cognizant parties to the Pilgrim decommissioning must
19 adhere with applicable NRC regulations. He stated that the cognizant parties include Plymouth,
20 surrounding towns, Massachusetts, Entergy, and the NRC. The NRC regulations identify minimum
21 requirements. He recommended that if better standards are available than the NRC standards, and if
22 they are possible, commercially available, and technically and economically feasible, then it should be
23 done to enhance safety and security during decommissioning. He stated that this concept was discussed
24 in a report submitted by the Plymouth Nuclear Matters Committee in April 2015. He suggested that, if
25 everyone has copies of working group findings and recommendations with issues pointed out, Co-Chair
26 Mullin should compile that for the Panel ahead of time to have a robust debate.

27
28 Jim Lampert noted that recommendations and compilations of recommendations, which can include
29 opinions and potentially violates the Open Meeting Law. He stated that the Supreme Judicial Court
30 allowed for entities to post publicly such information when it is distributed. He suggested that this could
31 increase the efficiency of meetings. Next, he cited the NRC as an example of how to encourage
32 discussion. He noted that the NRC acknowledges receipt and often provides a substantive response, and
33 often posts these communications on its website. He recommended that the Panel meet this standard.
34 Co-Chair Mullin responded that as a volunteer group with no actual funding, it is challenging to
35 accomplish certain recommendations. Co-Chair Schwartz noted that no compilations have been sent
36 out thus far. With respect to working group recommendations, Mr. Lampert noted that this is not a
37 strong idea because their recommendations are unlikely to be approved by the Panel. He stated that it
38 would also be a mistake to include them in a report as a recommendation.

39
40 Mike Fortini provided comments on the two NRC documents associated with the PSDAR. He asked how
41 best to provide his comments to the Panel, and Co-Chair Mullin responded that hard copies are fine, and
42 electronic copies should be sent to the co-chairs as well. Mr. Fortini explained that he is a retired
43 engineer and a licensed power plant operator. He stated that he worked for 25 years for an EPC firm
44 designing and constructing nuclear power plants, and after that for 18 years providing controls to
45 existing nuclear plants and grassroots plants in China. Mr. Coughlin stated that the next big milestone
46 after the annual report is the NRC's notice of proposed rulemaking that is expected before the end of
47 2018. Mr. Coughlin noted that the Panel would have an opportunity to comment on it. He stated that

1 the Panel has to review that document and determine a plan for what to do with it. He suggested that
2 Mr. Fortini could serve as a resource for that effort.

3
4 Mary Lampert offered a preview of a recommendation she would send later that week. She stated that
5 it is important that the state has a voice in determining the date the licensee assumes the spent fuel will
6 leave the site, because this will affect the cost analysis and decisions of sea level rise and how it will
7 impact the dry cask pad locations. She recommends that Pilgrim's licensees' decommissioning plans and
8 cost estimates should not assume that the projections put forth by DOE for offsite storage in 2013. She
9 stated that this is not scientific, and that it is important because DOE represented that it would begin
10 operations of a pilot interim storage facility by 2021, that licensing of a large interim storage facility will
11 be available by 2025, and that they will make progress on a geologic repository by 2048. She stated
12 that, in Vermont, Entergy and Northstar relied on this. However, DOE also stated that full
13 implementation of this program would require legislation to enable the deployment of this program.
14 Therefore, she recommended that licensees should not rely on this optimistic target, but a more realistic
15 one, to ensure that the proper planning takes place. She stated that she would send her findings and
16 recommendations to the Panel.

17
18 **WRAP UP AND ADJOURN:**

19
20 There was a motion to adjourn and it was seconded.

21
22 ***Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:25 p.m.***