

**NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING CITIZENS ADVISORY PANEL (“NDCAP”)**

**Monday November 24, 2025**

**Hybrid Meeting (in-person and virtual)**

**Meeting Minutes**

**NDCAP MEMBERS PRESENT**

- Brian McWilliams, Designee for Pat O’Brien from Holtec International (in-person)
- Joe McDonough, Designee for John Moylan; Holtec International (in-person)
- Kelly O’Brien, Representing Local 369 (in-person)
- Pine duBois, Speaker of the House of Representative Appointee (in-person)
- Mike Fortini, Senate Minority Leader Appointee (in-person)
- Mary Gatslick, Senate Minority Leader Appointee (in-person)
- Kevin Canty, NDCAP Chair; Plymouth Select Board (in-person)
- Barry Potvin, Senate President Appointee (in-person)
- Jack Priest, Department of Public Health; Appointed by Commissioner Goldstein for Department of Public Health (in-person)
- Andrew Gottlieb, Appointed by Governor Healey (in-person)
- David Bryant, Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency (in-person)
- Mary Lampert, Senate President Appointee (virtual)
- Mary Waldron, Old Colony Planning Council (virtual)
- Greg Wade, Representing Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities Appointee (virtual)
- Kris Callhan, Representing Executive Office of Health & Human Services (virtual)

**14 CMR 188.00**

- First agenda item read by Kevin Canty; an act to promote energy diversity. Kevin Canty begins the meeting with a reading of the enabling statute, outlining the purpose, responsibilities and duties of the Nuclear Decommissioning Citizens Advisory Panel. This statute will be read out at the beginning of each meeting going forward.
- Minimum of four public meetings/year.
- Written report being provided annually to the Governor and to the Energy Committees of the General Court.
- Serve as conduit for public information and education.
- Receive reports on the Decommissioning Trust Fund.

Joe McDonough (Holtec Project Director) provides an update:

### **PROJECT SWIM LANES UPDATE**

- Waterfall schedule: next milestone will be LTP (License Transition Plan) to be submitted March 2026. That will then kick off 2-year review period with the NRC followed by the final site survey.
- Building demo would best be described as internal focus; working on de-energizing electrical infrastructure, abandoning pneumatics at the site, source term reduction which is equipment removal and then environmental remediation with the large majority of that being asbestos removal. And that work is being supported by Waste Management.

### **PILGRIM SITE MAP**

- The site aerial map has not changed since the last meeting held. All site buildings have been demolished to original pad or foundation with the exception of what intends to remain in blue, and in orange, the process building.

### **ONGOING DEMOLITION UPDATE**

- Review of Ongoing Demolition Slide.
- ❖ Flex Water Supply Wells Abandonment- there are 3 onsite. Holtec is working with an environmental consultant and licensed well abandonment crew to remove those and ongoing this week.
- ❖ Soil piles on Powerhouse Road having low levels of PCB so working on remediation of that. Holtec is currently putting that project under contract and anticipated to complete by the end of the year.
- Review of Upcoming Demolition Slide
  - ❖ One of the larger upcoming demolitions; the condenser bay. It is a little over 30,000 square foot is the footprint. Large amount of TSI (Thermal System Insulation) which is asbestos containing Holtec is putting this project under contract right now. It is anticipated to mobilize before the end of the year. Between 6-9 months would be the duration for that project. Holtec will work closely with MassDEP in development for non-traditional work plans and approach to remediation. Holtec anticipates that waste stream will be both mixed ACM or asbestos and radiological.
  - ❖ For vessel segmentation, Holtec is finalizing lower vessel cleanup right now. That activity is namely vacuuming up cutting debris and components. The plan is to drain the reactor vessel down to the torus; anticipated to be in December. The volume is approximately 121,000 gallons. That will join the current inventory in the torus. It will be very similar fashion to what Holtec did with the dryer separator pit and reactor cavity. Holtec will drain down and apply encapsulant to help with contamination control.
- Onsite Water Volume Update
  - ❖ Water volume onsite effective 11/21/25= approximately over 808,300 gallons remain.
  - ❖ Heaters are installed in Spent Fuel Pool and energized 10/27/25 to support heating of the reactor building. It mirrors what Holtec has done in previous years.

## **REGULATORY UPDATE**

- MassDEP Office of Appeals and Dispute Resolutions sent a recommendation to the MassDEP Commissioner advising her to uphold the agency's decision to deny the amended discharge permit. That recommendation is still under review by the Commissioner and no date for the final recommendation has been established at this time. Holtec is awaiting the Commissioner's final decision and will then evaluate next steps.

## **SITE SOURCE TERM REDUCTION**

- Just exceeded 42,000 cubic feet (year to date; 2025)
- 5% of that being A, B & C. The other 95% dry active waste.

## **FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS FOR JOE MCDONOUGH (HOLTEC REPORT)**

- Barry Potvin has a question. Could you give us some information about the temperature that the submersible heaters are set to maintain? Joe McDonough replies, up to 125 degrees Fahrenheit. Right now, bulk average temp is around 97 degrees Fahrenheit. Barry Potvin replies, how are those temperatures arrived at? Joe McDonough replies, we are creating a forced hot water system. As ambient temperatures would fluctuate, we would fluctuate the temperatures of the pool to meet our demand. Barry Potvin replies, because obviously you can't let the water go down to a freezing temperature, that would cause major damage. Joe McDonough replies, yes, an additional benefit is freeze protection. Barry Potvin replies, at the moment, it is mostly for comfort? Joe McDonough replies, correct.
- Pine duBois has a question. The 3 flex wells that you closed. A.) What is a flex well? And how deep were they? Joe McDonough replies, so flex is an initiation that happened post Fukushima. It is a design to make up with the vessel. In a scenario that you might have an extended loss of power. The wells are about 75-80 feet. Essentially the design is a 6-inch diameter stainless steel sleeve. What they're doing is grouting them from the water table up and then we collect and sample the water that's displaced with the grout. Pine duBois replies, so they were on the site proper? Joe McDonough replies within the protected area. Yes, in the vicinity of the reactor building. Pine duBois replies the second question was, you estimate all the amount of waste that has been transported off-site. Do you know ballpark, how much remains? Joe McDonough replies, I can tell you what likely remains would be in terms of curies. So, to date, we have shipped roughly 2,500 curies. Now, we do have in storage, what we call BC waste. Negating that, those amount of curies. I don't have an exact number for you. It's roughly equivalent to what's shipped through 2019-2025. Pine duBois replies, o.k. alright, thanks. Joe McDonough replies, just to clarify something, so flex well was an initiative that Holtec took. The purpose was that it is a direct access to the aquifers. So, before we got into any subsurface demo, we wanted to eliminate the risk, the potential risk to contaminate the aquifer. Hence, filling them with grout and just eliminating that potential.
- Andrew Gottlieb has a question. So, I noticed both Holtec reps are different than what we are accustomed to. Joe McDonough replies, I'm designee for John Moylan and I've been here for the last three meetings. John is a panel member and I'm a designee for him. Brian

is a designee for Dave Noyes. There hasn't been a change in panel membership. Andrew Gottlieb replies, so, should we expect to get presentations from you in the future or is Dave coming back? Joe McDonough replies, I'm filling in for Dave this meeting. Andrew Gottlieb replies, thank you.

- Mary Lampert has a question. I have two questions. First, you mentioned you were going to remediate PCB's. How are you doing that absent removing the soil? Joe McDonough replies, yes, we will physically be removing the soil. It will be a non-radiological effort; disposition will be through an approved TOSCA landfill. So, we will work with our licensed site professional, our sub-contractor, and state remediate to the TOSCA landfill. I don't have an abundance of details because we are just getting that under contract right now. So, we will be owed submittals from the sub-contractors and have a little more transparency on how that project is going to unfold. Mary Lampert replies, o.k. Second question, if there is a crack in the spent fuel canister, how are you going to fix it? Joe McDonough replies, if there is a crack in the spent fuel pool canister? Mary Lampert replies, not pool. In the ISFSI, in the cask. If there is a crack in the canister, how are you going to fix it? Because if there is a crack, there would be a release into the atmosphere. So, the question is, how are you going to fix it? Joe McDonough replies, any impairment or emerging issue, we would evaluate against the technical Certification of Compliance. We would follow our tech specs and our corrective actions, verify cooling paths, consult with our technical manuals and address as appropriate. Mary Lampert replies, are you planning on an overpack because that was really just a lot of verbiage to me. Are you planning on an overpack? Are you going to try to get hot cells when they are ever developed? So, I assume you are planning on an overpack. Is that correct? Joe McDonough replies, we follow the aging management process. And that is one option that we do have available at a fleet level. I don't have a lot of details to provide you. I can take your specific question back and respond through the Chairman. Mary Lampert replies, yes, please do. Because it is absent in detail. And if you are planning on an overpack, how long would it take to get one on-site and what are you planning for temperature control? Because if you have an overpack, you don't have the opportunity to release air which provides cooling for the interior. These are important unanswered questions both in your certificate and on your website. And I think we deserve to know specifically the answers to these questions. So, I really appreciate you getting that information. Joe McDonough replies, I can take the question back and get you a little more information. We are kind of talking two different things as far as temperature control; that would be through the passing cooling through the vent system. Mary Lampert replies, yes, but if you have an overpack, you don't have that. The overpack cuts that off because you have cracks. You do not want to have venting in through the atmosphere. So, you put on an overpack and then you lose your cooling capability. Joe McDonough replies, I would rather not speculate. I will get you a little more information and we will distribute that. Mary Lampert replies, o.k. that's great. Appreciate it.
- Barry Potvin has a question. So, most of the water will be in the torus, correct? Joe McDonough replies, the majority would be in the torus. The majority is in the torus now and it will soon take the 120,000 additional gallons from the reactor vessel. Barry Potvin replies, o.k. And how is the structural integrity of the torus evaluated? Joe McDonough replies, it's a former tech spec. It was designed to absorb all of the pressure from the vessel. So, it's very

robust. Bary Potvin replies, o.k. And I think at the last meeting, we were told that at the moment, there are no plans to put submersible heaters into the torus water. But it was sort of left as an open question. Joe McDonough replies, and I think it remains an open question to be honest with you. We are kind of evaluating everything that's been going on with the surface water discharge report. And I would say that it remains open. Barry Potvin replies, so at some point in the future, it might actually be the case that submersible heaters are put in there too. Joe McDonough replies, I wouldn't want to speculate but it remains an option. Barry Potvin replies, o.k. thank you.

- Mike Fortini has a question. So, you still have over 300,000 gallons in the spent fuel pool, right? Joe McDonough replies, just under, yes. Mike Fortini replies, and those are going to remain there, I would assume for a while as long as you have Class B or C waste in the pool, right? Joe McDonough replies, it certainly will remain while Class BC is in the pool. Right now, some of the further out projects would have spent fuel pool cleanup towards the end of next year. And we wouldn't clean the pool until the BC was removed and put into dry fuel storage. So, that water volume will remain at least through the majority of 2026. Mike Fortini replies, o.k., thank you.
- Kelly O'Brien has a question. So, on the question about the crack on the dry cask storage canisters. Exactly, how are those constructed with respect to the internals of that, the canister itself. Joe McDonough replies, was the question, how do they inspect the internals? Kelly O'Brien replies, how was it constructed with respect to the crack itself on the outside concrete. Joe McDonough replies, I think the question was on a crack on the canister. I can't think of an initiating event in review of what they are designed for. But I don't believe the intention was to have this superficial crack on the concrete. I think it was evaluated on the canister. I don't know what that event would be. I don't believe there is a credible event that that could occur. But nonetheless, we will look at what the potential corrective actions could be. Kelly O'Brien replies, thank you.

#### **INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP (IWG) REPORT**

- MassDEP Southeast Office Regional Director Gerard Martin provides an update to the NDCAP panel.
- MassDEP Office of Appeals and Dispute Resolutions sent a recommendation to the MassDEP Commissioner advising her to uphold the agency's decision to deny the amended discharge permit. That recommendation is still under review by the Commissioner and no date for the final recommendation has been established at this time.
- Asbestos: a few things are going on. MassDEP received a close out report for the station service red line, the waste storage area for asbestos containing materials and rad waste. And the new non-traditional work plan for 2026 this week and they are under review. Abatement of a small area of paint to install a door closing mechanism in DR4 area is being conducted. MassDEP inspected the area on November 17, 2025. MassDEP is waiting for the submission of the asbestos removal application to start abatement of the condenser bay. Once a notification has been submitted to MassDEP, we will perform a walk-thru with the contractor to discuss phasing and methodology.
- Wastewater: the Title V plans were received by the Department in early October, and they are under review.

- Removal of the PCB contaminated soil from PERA-3 area; my understanding is that Holtec will submit a release abatement measure plan when they are ready to do that work. It will be uploaded on our website for all to take a look at. At that time, MassDEP will review it as well to make sure it conforms with the regulations. That plan will outline how much soil and where the soil is being disposed of, and everything we need to know.

## **FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS FOR MASSDEP SOUTHEAST OFFICE REGIONAL DIRECTOR**

### **GERARD MARTIN**

- Pine duBois has a question. How will we know that the report is out, and we should look at the MassDEP website? Gerard Martin replies, there is really no notification on that. It just gets uploaded. So, we check the site fairly often and you can do that, as well. Pine duBois replies, can you send a notice to the NDCAP, and we can try to figure out how to be more useful? Gerard Martin replies, yes, we can do that.

## **APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES**

- Review of meeting minutes including edits and corrections from September 22, 2025 meeting. Mary Gatslick will send list of action items to Kevn Canty to keep track of stated intentions and commitments.
- Mary Gatslick makes motion to approve the meeting minutes with discussed edits. Pine duBois seconds the motion.  
**(13 approve, 0 opposition, 2 abstention)**
- The proposed meeting minutes approved of September 22, 2025.
- Kevin Canty makes comment that the NRC team was planning to provide a presentation at this meeting. They contacted shortly after the government shutdown to inform us that they could not attend because they didn't have time to prepare. So, we will have to push that to January. We have 45 minutes for them to present and 15 minutes for panel Q & A. And they have been invited to stay for the public questions and comments afterwards and it will be up to them whether they choose to do that.

## **PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS**

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

- First citizen Diane Turco, Cape Downwinders and Save our Bay. Recently Senator Dylan Fernades filed legislation and so did Representative Badger and Representative Hadley from my district. This bill would stop the evaporation of the airborne pollution and initiate a study that would look into what's happening in our environment. The Plymouth Independent recently wrote an article on that. Pat O'Brien at Holtec said that "using fear of radiation something naturally occurring daily on this planet in everyday life is akin to putting aside years of the facts of science to study what is already known as no impact" I want to ask the Holtec reps here, do you agree with that statement. Holtec rep replies, yes. Diane Turco replies, is tritium, cobalt, plutonium and cesium- is that naturally occurring or is that man-made? Joe McDonough replies, I'm not going to be able to respond if you aren't going to allow me to respond in full. I agree with it on principle. What Pat is trying to demonstrate is that we've

modeled radiation associated with tritium on the refuel floor under the most conservative of estimates. We have put workers on the floor for 40 hours/week, 50 weeks/year evaporated theoretically in a model all of the water within one year. We've recognized that that dose to that person under the most conservative assumptions would be somewhere in the ballpark of 7-8 millirem. Diane Turco replies, my question is tritium, cobalt, plutonium and cesium natural or man-made? Just one or the other. I don't need any more than that. Joe McDonough replies, I wouldn't be able to respond if I'm going to be responded for. Diane Turco replies, o.k., I'll let you know then. It's man-made. So, this statement isn't related to Pilgrim. Cobalt, Plutonium and Cesium. The statement that Holtec made is not related to naturally occurring radiation, but it looks like they are attempting to. Because the EPA, the NRC, the DOE, FDA, CDC, American Medical Association significant health dangers and long-term cancer risks from radiation. And the second thing I wanted to say is from Senator Markey's hearing that the water is not contaminated but we would not discharge it until we have consent from our stakeholders, we would not discharge it because we do not want to upset anyone. He also said we can locally evaporate the water using electric heaters that will environmentally damage as well. Holtec said they wouldn't discharge the water without consent of the stakeholders. We are the stakeholders. I have here over 200,000 people who signed a petition to say do not discharge the water. We have the vote from 16 towns that said, do not discharge/evaporate this wastewater. Senator Markey has said it, the Legislators have said it, the Massachusetts Medical Society has said it, the Greater Boston Physicians for Social Responsibility has said it. We do not consent to the release of radioactive materials into our environment. We know it's landing on Cape Cod Bay. The DEP rightly upheld that permit to not dump in the Bay but it's still getting in there. And we know that radioactive materials released via evaporation are more dangerous than surface water discharge. How will this panel move to hold Holtec accountable to the promise to the people, the stakeholders. Because we don't consent to this. And they said they would not do anything without our consent. What more can we do. But what is this panel going to do to stop it. That's my question. Kevin Canty replies, so this panel advises the Governor, the General Court so that is the extent of our authority to do anything is to advise those entities and agencies. So, we will continue to do that. Diane Turco replies, could you advise the Court to support and pass Senator Fernandes bill and Representative Badger for a study of the evaporation and what's happening in our environment and on Cape Cod Bay. Kevin Canty replies, the panel can't get involved in advocating for legislation. We only advise as to what is happening in regard to the plant and its decommissioning process to those entities. And then they can make the decisions within their relevant authorities to do or not do things as they see fit. Diane Turco replies, so what's the purpose of this panel, then? So, what are the people to do? We've gone to the Governor, we've gone to the AGO, we've gone to the people. The people are saying no. We live in a democratic republic. I've never seen such an issue be ignored when the people all behind this issue of stopping the evaporation. It's illegal. The Ocean Sanctuaries Act says liquid and gaseous materials. And nobody is pursuing the gaseous materials. And a study done after 3-mile Island; when they evaporated the wastewater after that accident, instead of dumping it into the Susquehanna River. They found that it was 300x more dangerous to the public than surface water discharge. And right now, what is happening is it's being evaporated with impunity. Does anybody have any questions? Mary, you are shaking your

head no. I don't know if you have anything to ask. Mary Gatslick replies, I'm not going to get involved.

- Second citizen Charles Hady, Plymouth resident since 1971. I moved to Plymouth as a start-up engineer for General Electric for the initial start-up of the Pilgrim plant. Since then, I've worked in construction and start up and operations and refueling outages. And subsequent to that, in later years, I've been involved with the decommissioning of the Shoreham nuclear power plant and three nuclear reactors on national laboratory site. And the one thing in my experience, it seems more relative to this discussion, is that we had a high flux beam reactor and it was heavy water cooled which has lots of tritium in it. And in fact, because of leaks and piping systems, one reactor vessel was open for refueling. The spent fuel pool would store the fuel. As a result of that, there is tritium in the air all of the time. And the individuals, everybody working inside of that plant, because of the physical processes of tritium. They all were absorbing tritium at all times, and they have a tritium burden in their body. And yet none of that, people were working years and years, had no adverse effects and were well within the standards that the NRC set for body burdens. And I just wanted to reiterate that because I think that's, in my mind, a very important feature. Getting back to the discharge limit of 20 picocuries/liter (correction: 20,000 picocuries/liter). There are countries, that's the drinking water standard. There are countries in the world that have a drinking water standard 10x that number. I think there are a couple that have even more than that with no adverse effects on their populations. We have also seen that we've been discharging tritium into the Bay since the plant began operation. And we have spent countless amounts of money on assessing the impact of the plant's operation and they have found no adverse effect from that tritium discharge for the 47 years that the plant has been operating. And the discharge as proposed at the same discharge limits as part of the decommissioning will result in the same lack of any adverse effect. And that's really all I have to say. Kevin Canty replies, o.k., thank you.
- Third citizen Elaine Dickinson, Cape Downwinders. Just a statement. The EPA has a maximum contaminant level goal of zero exposure. Kevin Canty replies, thank you.
- Fourth citizen Brian Campbell, retired electrical engineer. I strongly support discharging treated water from Pilgrim Nuclear Station into Cape Cod Bay. I've reported after dilution 80 gallons of discharged water would equal the radiation dose received from eating a banana provided you can drink 80 gallons of salt water. Google AI reported that there are over two million tritium exit signs in the USA alone. And that the average sign has about twenty-five curies of tritium or less than half the amount of tritium contained and it's less than a milligram in mass remaining in the 835,000 gallons of tritiated water. The presentations by Holtec to this panel shows Holtec to be a good corporate citizen performing the Pilgrim Decommissioning in a truthful and open manner that should be commended. Good news: Indian Point Nuclear Decommissioning. U.S. District Judge Kenneth Karas ruled that New York's Save the Hudson Act signed by Governor Hochul in 2023 was preempted by Federal laws specifically the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which grants federal government exclusive authority to regulate radioactive discharges from nuclear facilities. New York Attorney General James who has pleaded not guilty to federal mortgage fraud charges has announced her intention to appeal Karas's federal court decision. Holtec has indicated it does not plan any immediate discharges and will engage with local stakeholders. Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection denied Holtec's permission to discharge the water

into the Bay. In November 2025, a state appeals officer ruled against Holtec International in the discharge case. Holtec is right and has had to delay its overall decommissioning timeline and stated it will keep the water onsite while exploring disposal options and appealing the state's decision. Association to Preserve Cape Cod Andrew Gottlieb says "we feel very good that the records that we have entered into the appeal process will serve the defense of the Commonwealth's actions. Well, whether we end up in state or federal court in the future" Yes, hopefully federal court. With a like-minded judge like Karas. I look forward to the NRC presentation in January allowing the discharge of the treated water. Calling for utilities to lower rates. President Trump and New York City Mayor-elect Zohran Mamdani recently met and publicly called on ComEd to lower its rates arguing that lower fuel prices should be reflected in customer bills. This could potentially be applied to other utilities like ComEd. But premature closing of Indian Point Nuclear. 25% of New York City's electricity and replacing with burning gas has raised New York City's energy costs and emissions just as in Pilgrim here in Massachusetts. President Trump has called renewable energy sources like wind and solar power a scam. The scam of the century and a joke on multiple occasions. Trump argues that they are too expensive, unreliable and lead to record breaking electricity prices. He has instead advocated for expanding the use of fossil fuels. I believe in a gas to nuclear power transition which will enable 100 gigawatts, approximately 8% of our total generation of reliable electrical generation that Sam Altman reports will be needed for artificial intelligence development by 2035. 2025 is the time to build new cost-effective electrical generation. My last electrical bill was 35 cents/kilowatt hour minus the \$10 customer charge. It's time for Massachusetts to repeal its 2050 net zero scam and return to affordability. Thank you very much. Kevin Canty replies, thank you Mr. Campbell.

- Fifth citizen Joann Wilson Keenan, East Dennis MA resident. I just wanted to respond to the second speaker's comments. Going back to 1971, I don't have the answer to this question. But I certainly wonder; how many of those workers who were exposed to the discharges from the plant, were men. My concern is about women, children, embryos, fetuses who are exposed to the radionuclides coming out of the plant which include not only tritium but cesium, plutonium, cobalt and others. So, I don't think we can look at this through only the lens of how it affects men. Thank you. Mary Gatslick would like to respond. She has experience on what was commented on. Kevin Canty replies, o.k., go ahead. Mary Gatslick replies, just in response to your comment Ma'am. I worked at the plant for 31 years. I had two children while I was working at the plant, and I can tell you there was no issue. I said that I worked at the power plant. I was pregnant twice while I was there. Kids were born healthy, no problems whatsoever. My exposure there was less than one millirem the entire pregnancy for both pregnancies. So, I'm not afraid. And I was not afraid when I was working there. Joann Wilson Keenan replies, I'm pleased that that was the outcome for you and your children. But I hope that is the outcome for every woman in this community. And down the road where I live in to the Cape and beyond. Mary Gatslick replies, the best thing you can do is educate yourself and look at the regulations and do your research. Don't depend on the University of Google to give you or AI to give you an answer. That's all I ask you to do, do your research, if you would. Joann Wilson Keenan replies, thank you. I do not depend on the University of Google. Thank you. Kevin Canty replies, thank you.

- Sixth citizen Paul George. I used to spend a lot of time in Plymouth. I would like someone, anyone who feels like they want to answer this question. I believe you were talking, maybe it was the gentleman from Holtec, was talking about certain either building components or whatever, were transported away from the Plymouth site. Was that you? Joe McDonough replies, we talked about that during the presentation with the waste processing. Paul George replies, it's very hard for me to hear you. Joe McDonough replies, all rad waste is transported out of Plymouth and offsite to a facility in Texas, namely. Paul George replies, o.k., I think I heard that. So, when waste is transported out or contaminated materials are transported out; how is that done, via what means? Joe McDonough replies, both road and rail under DOT guidelines and regulated by the NRC. Paul George replies, and percentage of rail and percentage over the road. Joe McDonough replies, I don't have the percentages to give you, sir. Paul George replies, who has that information? Joe McDonough replies, I would have to consult with our waste management group. Paul George replies, I apologize, I cannot hear you. Kevin Canty replies, he would have to consult with the waste management group to get you the percentages. Paul George replies, so, can you contact them and report back? Joe McDonough replies, yes, I would be happy to give you a percentage on what leaves via rail versus road. Paul George replies, yes, tell us more about waste management. Joe McDonough replies, yes, absolutely. Paul George replies, is there anything that you are able to tell us now about the waste management group. Who are they? Joe McDonough replies, their internal to Holtec and they facilitate with our vendor in Texas. The transportation of all rad material from the site to its recipient I believe it's Andrews, Texas. Paul George replies, o.k., how am I doing on the 5 minutes? Kevin Canty replies, you are at 2. Paul George replies, o.k. So, where is the final destination? Joe McDonough replies, Andrews, Texas. So, we have a variety of classes of waste, sir. So, we have greater than class C and that is held in Plymouth, off Rocky Hill Road at our facility. We have BC waste that's in storage right now that's just waiting for licensing for packaging. And that would foreseeably go to Texas. And then we have AB and lower than A that has been and will continue to be transported whether it be via rail or road to the facility in Texas that we contract. Paul George replies, so, you appear to be sort of trichotomizing here. You have A and you have B and you have C. Would you be kind enough to defend, excuse me, define what constitutes A and why would something be in B or C. Joe McDonough replies, it's the radiological constituency of the waste that have it characterized with different levels and they have different controls and protocols per their classification. Paul George replies, could you describe the levels? Joe McDonough replies, I could not. Paul George replies, who can? Joe McDonough replies, we do that internally with our waste group. It entails a lot of characterization. It's a radiological subject matter where they would characterize subsequently classify and then would control it through DOT and NRC controls. Paul George replies, o.k. Joe McDonough replies, if you will, it's not really important for me to characterize by curie or dose, just that those are the protocols. They are available via DOT website; NRC has their own regulations. Paul George replies, well, could you explain in plain English some of the stuff for us tonight if I still have another minute or so. Joe McDonough replies, depending on the degree of dose in curie content would dictate what the classification is. And that dictates what the controls are to transport it whether it be via rail or road. Paul George replies, so, what would the curie content be for A, B and C. You are the project manager, correct? Joe McDonough replies, sir,

I have responded to that. I don't characterize and I don't have those quantities to give you. Paul George replies, o.k., that's unhelpful. I'm just trying to figure out. Joe McDonough replies, I'm sorry that you find it unhelpful. I did offer to provide more information when I regroup with those individuals. Paul George replies, o.k., I just find that your lack of knowledge. I'm not sure. If you don't have the information, who. You are putting me at a loss for words. This should be a very easy question. Joe McDonough replies, characterization is a very methodical process, and I wouldn't want to give you any false information. Paul George replies, could you describe please. I've seen in the past, the characterization of eating a banana providing some radioactivity to the human system. How much? Joe McDonough replies, you would like me to tell you the characterization of a banana. Paul George replies, I'm trying my best to respect you. Joe McDonough replies, I'm not interested in entertaining that question. Paul George replies, where is this coming from? Kevin Canty replies, he didn't make the remark about the banana. Paul George replies, I'm asking the gentleman from Holtec. He must know something about it. Joe McDonough replies, Holtec is not interested in providing the characterization for a banana. That's the answer to the question. Paul George replies, thank you for making me try to look like a buffoon. I do appreciate that. Joe McDonough replies, it wasn't the intention. I was trying to answer the question directly, sir. Paul George replies, well, what I'm asking you is, to describe in plain English to these good people. What a curie is. Thank you very much and thank you for your answers.

#### **PROPOSED FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS FROM PANEL MEMBERS**

- NRC Presentation- January 2026 Meeting.
- Spent Fuel- suggestion from Mary Lampert. And there are three issues that should be looked at. 1.) security: which we have had a discussion, but I think we could talk about where perhaps and recommendations 2.) corrosion: when I asked Joe those questions and I think it should be looked at 3.) options for offsite storage. I know in Vermont, NDCAP did a lot of studies and they made recommendations on their feelings towards interim storage. And all three of those elements' security, corrosion and security all work together. Because it is clear that there is not going to be offsite storage anytime soon. And the canisters were not designed for long-term storage in a corrosive environment. So, I think we need to look at all of those three elements. It's very important to decommissioning and there are two licenses. One is deconstruction and the other for the ISFSI. Second, I think there should be a discussion of health which would bring in this work by Marco Kaltofen and others suggested would bring in a look at the Southeast of Massachusetts health study. I think it's important that we do that for two reasons. 1.) President Trump has issued orders to the NRC to fast forward the nuclear one of which is for the NRC to look at the LNT for no acceptable dose. And I think it's important to understand ourselves what this will mean. What will it mean for exposure to workers, exposures offsite. What is the fast line that NRC will be taking. Will there be opportunity for public comment, would this group recommend comment by or whatnot. So, those are the two that I would like to see discussed. And I was disappointed somehow could not comment on Mr. Hady and Ms. Wilson's comment. I had my hand up because I would hate to think that the comment of Mary Gatslick would go unchallenged because there are many, many studies showing the harm around populations around nuclear reactors.

And there have been suits by workers during operation, some very successful. And so, I think it is important that we understand that. Thank you very much. Kevin Canty replies, so in terms of your first proposed item in regard to spent fuel dealing with subtopics of security, corrosion and options for offsite storage. Who do you envision presenting to the panel on that? Mary Lampert replies, well certainly, we could come up with people. That's not going to be difficult. Kevin Canty replies, you don't need a name per se but like would they be an employee of Holtec, would they be someone else in the industry, a professor or something. Mary Lampert replies, no, it would be independent. I think we have an ample opportunity to hear from Holtec, which we appreciate, it's important. Kevin Canty replies, o.k. Mary Lampert replies, we don't want Holtec. We want an independent expert. Kevin Canty replies, an independent expert, o.k. Mary Lampert replies, or I could say experts. I'm not going to limit it to one. Kevin Canty replies, and in terms of the other one. It's occasionally difficult to hear you, Mrs. Lampert. So, could you just briefly describe, like a sentence, the other topic. I believe it was about health. It was difficult to hear you when you started talking about it. Mary Lampert replies, health effects. Kevin Canty replies, of what. Mary Lampert replies, of exposure to radiation as it relates to the decommissioning of Pilgrim and the operations of Pilgrim. Kevin Canty replies, well, it's no longer operating. Mary Lampert replies, I know that it's not operating. But the deposition from operations are to be cleaned up. Kevin Canty replies, so, health effects of exposure. Mary Lampert replies, as Marco Kaltofen's study pointed out, are in the neighborhood. Kevin Canty replies, health effects of exposure to radiation in the decommissioning of Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station. Would that be an accurate summation? Mary Lampert replies, based on research here and elsewhere. Kevin Canty replies, and who would present to the panel in regard to that? Mary Lampert replies, well, you would have for example the authors of the study from the dust and soil. You would have perhaps Richard Clapp who was involved in epidemiology radiation control during the Southeast MA Health Study, and he has done the initial research prior to the cancer registry of Pilgrim. But that would be a beginning. Kevin Canty replies, o.k. So, we will take those in turn. A majority vote of the full panel membership is our quantum vote. Full panel if everyone is appointed, which is what the full membership is, 21 positions. So, that requires 12 votes. So, we will take the first item. The issue of spent fuel relation to security, corrosion and options for offsite storage. And that would be presented by an independent expert or experts as envisioned. Mike Fortini replies, so obviously I'm certainly in favor of a temporary or permanent repository located within the United States. Wouldn't it be more appropriate though if we broke it out where we talk about the casks themselves and then have the actual temporary or permanent repository as a separate item. Because to me, that's two different entities that would be doing the presentation. The DOE would have to somehow be involved in the temporary or permanent repository. Where a person, the entity that would be addressing the casks associated with any issues associated with the casks to me, would be a total different entity. So, it almost seems like we should break them out because I think it's going to be much more difficult in my estimation to get someone to talk about the actual temporary or permanent repository. Because the DOE for years seems to have been not available to discuss this. And they are the ones responsible for coming up with this. Kevin Canty

replies, so they are. This is Mrs. Lampert's request to do it in this way. So, that could be a reason for voting against it. Mary Lampert replies, it could be, wait a minute. Those were the topics to be discussed. They don't have to be in one setting. They could be split up in different meetings. But I think this group ought to be looking into these issues. If you make it so narrow, and I'm sorry you interpreted or I wasn't clearer. Obviously, it's going to go nowhere, and it would be worthless. So, I totally agree that you look at one aspect, you look at another aspect, and you look at the others. These should be looked at. Kevin Canty replies, o.k. So, they may be multiple presentations, I suppose. Barry Potvin replies, I would just like to point out that the planned agenda item which was for January and now is for March does cover some of the things that Mrs. Lampert is talking about; structural integrity of the casks, what has to be done in order to transport that material safely. And we already have an independent person that has agreed to talk on that subject matter from Ohio State University. Kevin Canty replies, yes, agreed. Other discussion or questions about this. David Bryant replies, I think it would be helpful to make an informed decision if we had the intended speakers to speak on these topics rather than a free for all on the back end. So, I think before we can make that informed decision. This should be an agenda item. We want to know who is going to speak on something before we get to just a general, I want to hear about this or that. Kevin Canty replies, o.k., understood. I don't think unless Mrs. Lampert has specific people in mind for these subtopics. It sounded like she had categories of people but not specific. David Bryant replies, I would recommend that we re-propose those topics once we have a speaker identified for the panel to consider. Kevin Canty replies, o.k. We will take this as one vote. In regard to the larger topic of spent fuel with subtopics of security, corrosion, and options for offsite storage to be presented on by one or more independent experts in one or more meetings. Mary Lampert makes a motion. Pine duBois seconds the motion. The motion does not carry.

**(9 in favor, 4 abstentions, 2 opposition)**

- Jack Priest makes a comment. I would like to make a motion in front of the panel that we revisit that topic and I would ask Mary as Dave said to have a specific speaker for that topic area and then that would give us a little bit more granularity to make a decision on whether we would invite that person to speak. I think just saying let's have a discussion about dry fuel storage is too broad. Kevin Canty replies, I would agree. Jack Priest replies, so my motion is to have that subject better defined by Mrs. Lampert with a candidate to provide the information to do the presentation. Kevin Canty replies, o.k. Jack Priest replies, and then we can re-vote on it. Kevin Canty replies, so Mrs. Lampert instead of potentially doing a motion. Would you just look into that and get specific people lined up and repropose at a future date. Mary Lampert replies, correct. Kevin Canty replies, so she has agreed to do it. Jack Priest replies, so we don't need a motion to do that. Kevin Canty replies, not if she is willing to do it on her own. Jack Priest replies, but we had a proposal to come in and we voted down. How many times can someone come in and make the same proposal and continue to vote it down. Kevin Canty replies, well, I guess that will be up to them and their willingness to endure the experience. Jack Priest replies, o.k. I'm just asking the question. That's why I made it as a proposal. Kevin Canty replies, yes, I understand. Jack Priest replies, I couldn't guarantee that she could come back.

Thanks. Kevin Canty replies, you're welcome. And then the second item, the health effects of exposure to radiation during decommissioning of Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station. Any particular questions on this topic. Mary Lampert replies, may I make a comment. Kevin Canty replies, yes. Mary Lampert replies, why waste time to end up where we did on the previous. So, why don't I come back with speakers. Kevin Canty replies, o.k., so you are withdrawing the request. Mary Lampert replies, yes. Kevin Canty replies, o.k., other proposed agenda items from any panel members.

- DPH Speaker: Jack Priest references the request from panel to hear from Department of Public Health regarding cancer studies. We had a discussion about that at DPH, and we can provide a speaker to come in and talk about the history of those. There are several of them and there is overlap. Even myself, trying to go back and read through what was presented and when it was published and put out. So, we talked to our epidemiologist and toxicology group. And we can provide a speaker. So, it's just going to be coordinating which bi-monthly meeting that they could come in and present since the NRC got bumped. I assume it would be subsequent to that meeting. Kevin Canty replies, yes, so we are bumping the January stuff to March hopefully. So, I guess probably the earliest would-be May. Jack Priest replies, so, if they bump again, I could ask that we be prepared if we needed to fill in for the March meeting. Otherwise, it could be May. Kevin Canty replies, o.k. Jack Priest replies, so, if you want to get some information and we get some feedback back about firming up those dates and contact me. Kevin Canty replies, o.k. Jack Priest replies, I'll work with our staff to get a speaker committed to that date. Kevin Canty replies, alright, I will do that. Thank you. Other proposed items for future agendas? Seeing none, we will move forward.

## **2025 ANNUAL REPORT UPDATE**

- Mary Gatslick makes announcement that we talked about this earlier this evening. We have some public comments that come in through the portal. My proposal to the panel is that we add an appendix to the annual report that captures all of those public comments that came in through the NDCAP panel as an attachment. And that way you can go right to them. However, members of the public, if you have spoken at previous meetings, handed materials physically, unless it comes into the portal. You should scan it and put it through the portal and request that it be added to the annual report. So, our goal for getting the report out signed. You will have a draft in front of you in January. My goal is to have it signed and submitted to the Governorship in March. So, if you have comments that you have dropped off up top, please funnel them through our comment portal so that they be included in the 2025 annual report and the deadline for that would be December 31, 2025. So, please keep that in mind. If it hasn't come through the portal, it's not going to be included in the report. Kevin Canty replies, so, just for clarification, everyone that has submitted something on the public portal so far, it will be included. Mary Gatslick replies, yes. Kevin Canty replies, so if you have done that already, it's in there and will be in the report. The public comment portal also allows you to upload documents. If that has occurred already, it will be in the report. If you want something else uploaded and included in the report, just make sure you do that by the end of the year and then it will be included in the 2025 report. Mary Gatslick replies, and if you could do me a favor that if you have presented this material physically in a previous

meeting if you could indicate which meeting it belonged to so that it can be characterized correctly as I put the comments together. Kevin Canty replies, yes. And then obviously to the extent that public comments made at the podium are recorded in the minutes. And those will also of course be in the annual report in that way. Mary Gatslick replies, that's correct. Kevin Canty replies, but for documentation it is much easier to do it through the portal and the upload process is why that was implemented. Any questions from panel members.

- Citizen Diane Turco has an additional comment and heads back to the podium. I have sent materials to the portal, but I have never gotten a confirmation. Kevin Canty replies, you don't need to get a confirmation. You sent it through, it's in there. Diane Turco replies, oh, o.k. Alright, because I don't know what was sent and what you don't have. Kevin Canty replies, right, if you sent it, it works. So, if you put something into the portal, it's there.
- Pine duBois makes a comment. If someone is unsure if they have done it correctly, can they go into the portal and see if it's there. Kevin Canty replies, I don't believe you can. Mary Gatslick replies, I don't think so. Kevin Canty replies, I think it's a drop box. Pine duBois replies, are we making a list of those things so that we would have that. Kevin Canty replies, it's in a database. It puts it automatically in a database. Anything that goes into that comment. Pine duBois replies, and you have access to that. Mary Gatslick replies, yes. Kevin Canty replies, well I get an email notification. But I can't look into it. Pine duBois replies, gotcha. So, if I wanted to check, I would have to check through you. Kevin Canty replies, you could. Pine duBois replies, o.k. Kevin Canty replies, and then of course, it will be in the report. You could check then visually. Pine duBois replies, well I know. But it might be too late then. Pine duBois replies, in theory if it was me, I would want to know now if I succeeded in getting it in there but in order to know that, I would have to check with one of you two. In order to confirm that. Kevin Canty replies, that is my understanding, yes. Pine duBois replies, o.k. Kevin Canty replies, I have no reason to believe that things submitted to it are not properly going in. Pine duBois replies, right. I know. But who knows how things work. Mary Gatslick replies, I'll look into that. Pine duBois replies, things are so easy these days. Kevin Canty replies, yes. Other questions or comments on the annual report.
- Mary Lampert has a question. You have been talking about public submissions. But what about panel submissions. In other words, if I sent a document such as the study on dust and soil. It's been talked about but if I wanted it in the annual report, the document. Then those rules apply to me also. Kevin Canty replies, if you submitted it through the public comment panel portal, yes. You would be able to submit it as a member of the public as well. You are both a panel member and for the purposes of the online portal, a member of the public. Mary Lampert replies, what I'm saying is as a panel member. Kevin Canty replies, and what I'm saying is that you have the same rights and opportunities to submit something through the portal as a member of the public. Mary Lampert replies, o.k. Kevin Canty replies, any other questions. Alright, hearing and seeing none, we will move forward.

#### **ANNUAL REORGANIZATION OF THE NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING CITIZENS ADVISORY PANEL**

- Kevin Canty makes announcement. We currently have a Chair and Vice Chair. The panel can elect a Chair or 2 Chairs which I would not advise that and then a Vice Chair, as well. So, typically we will go through. I believe we did this in November last time, there wasn't a majority. So, we delayed it until January. Now we are back on track with doing it in November.

So, my intention would be that the term of whomever is elected would start immediately and continue for the next year. Andrew Gottlieb would like to nominate Kevin Canty as Chair for the upcoming year. Mary Gatslick seconds that. Kevin Canty accepts the nomination to serve as Chair of the Nuclear Decommissioning Citizens Advisory Panel. Kevin Canty replies, does anyone wish to nominate anyone else? Mary Lampert would like to nominate Jack Priest as Chair. Jack Lampert replies, thank you Mary but I would decline. I think it's a Citizens Advisory Panel and as a state member, I would decline. Kevin Canty replies, o.k. Kevin Canty takes vote of panel members. Kevin Canty replies, I will serve an additional term as Chair of the Nuclear Decommissioning Citizens Advisory Panel. I appreciate the vote of confidence.

**(unanimous vote)**

- That brings us to the next position, which could be a Chair or could be a Vice Chair. Andrew Gottlieb would like to nominate Ms. Waldron as Vice Chair. Andrew Gottlieb replies, I'm sorry Ms. Gatslick. Mary Waldron seconds the nomination. Mary Gatslick accepts the nomination as Vice Chair. Kevin Canty replies, are there any other nominations for the position of Vice Chair of the Nuclear Decommissioning Citizens Advisory Panel? Mary Lampert replies, she would like to nominate Mary Waldron. Mary Waldron replies, I will decline but thank you very much Mary. I will decline that nomination. Kevin Canty takes vote of panel members for Mary Gatslick to serve an additional term as Vice Chair of the Nuclear Decommissioning Citizens Advisory Panel.

**(14 in favor, 1 abstention)**

#### **ADJOURN**

- Andrew Gottlieb makes motion to adjourn. Mike Fortini seconds the motion.  
**(unanimous vote)**