NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING CITIZENS ADVISORY PANEL ("NDCAP")

Monday July 28, 2025

Hybrid Meeting (in-person and virtual)

Meeting Minutes

NDCAP MEMBERS PRESENT

- David Noyes, Compliance Manager Holtec Decommissioning International (in-person)
- Joe McDonough, Holtec Decommissioning International Acting Vice-President (in-person)
- Kelly O'Brien, Local 369 (in-person)
- Curtis Little, Plymouth Selectman (in-person)
- Pine duBois, Speaker of the House of Representative Appointee (in-person)
- Mike Fortini, Senate Minority Leader Appointee (in-person)
- Mary Gatslick, Vice Chair; Minority Leader of the Senate Appointee (in-person)
- Kevin Canty, NDCAP Chair; Vice Chair Plymouth Select Board; Representing Plymouth Select Board (in-person)
- James Lampert, Speaker of the House Appointee (in-person)
- Mary Lampert, Senate President Appointee (in-person)
- Barry Potvin, Member of the Plymouth Board of Health Senate President Appointee (in-person)
- Jack Priest, Division Director of the Radiation Control Program for the Department of Public Health; Appointed by the Commissioner for Department of Public Health (in-person)
- David Bryant, Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency (virtual)
- Andrew Gottlieb, Association to Preserve Cape Cod; Governor Baker Appointee (virtual)
- Greg Wade, Representing Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities Appointee (virtual)
- Kris Callahan, Representing Executive Office of Health and 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.
- Barry Potvin calls a point of order regarding the voting rules. Kevin Canty clarifies that there are currently two vacancies (Plymouth and MassDEP) waiting to be filled. Kevin Canty states that the quantum of vote remains the majority of the entire membership.

David Noyes (Holtec) provides an update:

SWIM LANES UPDATE

- There have been no changes to the swim lanes.
- Key milestones that have been accomplished since the last meeting; to drain reactor cavity and separator pit to the torus. The next major milestone will be the submission of the license termination plan in September 2025.
- With respect to the other swim lanes demolition; it will be covered in a different slide.
- With respect to the spent fuel management, continue custodial responsibilities for the spent fuel assemblies that remain in our independent spent fuel storage installation.

PILGRIM SITE MAP

- The building demolition status is exactly the same as the last meeting. There is still active demolition being shown in the augmented off gas building (rectangular building, middle left) The process buildings remain on target for demolition beginning in 2031 and 2032.

ONGOING DEMOLITION UPDATE

- The focus being on internal demolition activities. Holtec is in the process of a major demolition activity within the condenser bay of the plant, specifically the Gland Seal Condenser. The Gland Seal Condenser was a component within the primary system that used steam that was associated with sealing the main turbine gland or seals. It was radiological steam and had components of the skid that was asbestos containing material. The abatement and demolition activities associated with the Gland Seal Condenser had to meet radiological standard and the asbestos standard including an approved non-traditional work plan with MassDEP.

MASSACHUSETTS CONTINGENCY PLAN ACTIONS UPDATE

- Holtec updated at the last meeting; the addition of 14 monitoring wells in Pera-3 and 17 soil borings in the Industrial area. Holtec has completed the quarterly sampling for the second quarter. When Holtec gets the results and has the opportunity to brief MassDEP on the results of those samples; they will present at the next NDCAP meeting.
- Holtec is planning to remove the PCB soil pile in Pera-3; directly off Powerhouse Road during the third or fourth quarter of this year.

ONSITE WATER VOLUME UPDATE

- Holtec drained the water from the reactor cavity and dryer separator pit to the torus. Water volume onsite effective 7/17/25 = 831,375 gallons.
- Heaters remain installed in the spent fuel pool but remain de-energized.

- Drained = 361,000 gallons from the reactor cavity and dryer separator pit to torus in June.
- Post drain down torus water samples taken 7/9/25, awaiting results of those samples (radiological and non-radiological constituents in the water)

REACTOR SEGMENTATION DEMOBILIZATION

- Completion of reactor segmentation demolition (depicted in photos on the slide)
- Removal of equipment from DSP and Cavity- Complete
- Reactor cavity drain down- Complete
- DSP drain down- Complete
- Detailed radiological surveys- Complete
- Application of encapsulated to wetted surfaces- Complete

REGULATORY UPDATE

- NRC 2nd Quarter 2025 Inspection Results; no findings of more than minor significance.
- The focus of this quarter's inspection with the NRC (Inspection Scope included)
    - ❖ Problem Identification and Resolution Program
    - ❖ Decommissioning operations
    - ❖ Occupational radiation exposure
    - ❖ Solid radioactive waste management and transportation (including the observation of the drain down of the reactor cavity and separator pit)
- License Termination Plan submittal scheduled for 9/24/25.

SITE SOURCE TERM REDUCTION

- Holtec currently just over 25,000 cubic feet and 644 curies of activity for the year 2025; bringing the overall project to almost 305,000 cubic feet and total activity of over 2,500 curies of activity.
- David Noyes provided James Lampert with the information requested at the last meeting (total waste shipment in tons versus volume; approximately over 8 million pounds)

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS FOR DAVID NOYES (HOLTEC REPORT)

- James Lampert has questions for David Noyes. License Termination Plan: will that be available to the panel after it has been submitted? David Noyes replies, yes. After it is formally submitted, it becomes a matter of public record. James Lampert replies, related question on the July sampling. Did DEP or DPH take part in that sampling? David Noyes replies, they did not. James Lampert replies, have they been provided with any of the samples? David Noyes replies, they were given the opportunity and both declined. Holtec will make the results of that sampling available and will post them to the webpage as soon as we get that information. James Lampert replies, does spent fuel pool have around 400,000 gallons? David Noyes replies, yes it does.
- Jack Priest has a question for David Noyes. For the panel, could you do a brief high level. What constitutes the LTP which you are submitting to the NRC in September? David Noyes replies, so there are eight chapters in the license termination plan. It establishes the final end use of the facility; the assumptions associated with the extent of demolition and

DCGL's which are the levels of constituent radionuclides that we have found so far during characterization and a plan to evaluate that and consider as we continue with demolition. It sets the NRC's up for when they eventually approve that license termination plan; it allows them to be able to determine what their final status survey plan will be and the extent to which they will come in and do alternate sampling. They will do their own completely independent sampling consistent with the sampling that we do during demolition.

- Mary Lampert has a question for David Noyes. On the sampling that you did in the torus, did you have it look simply at gamma and tritium, or did you look for the more complicated radio nuclides including transuranic? Dave Noyes replies, it was the full set including hard to detect.
- Barry Potvin has a question for David Noyes about the spent fuel pool. I assume that the water is going to remain there for some time. David Noyes replies, yes, we haven't yet scheduled. There are five cassettes with Class B, C waste that need to be transported out of the spent fuel pool either direct to be shipped offsite or to be staged onsite pending a new cask design that we have submitted to the NRC. I suspect that it will probably be a year or more that the water will be in the spent fuel pool. Barry Potvin replies, in that case, do you foresee needing to re-energize the submersible heaters during the winter months coming up? David Noyes replies, we would expect to implement the heating regime that we did last year again this year. Barry Potvin replies, maintaining the same temperature even though, are there going to be workers any longer in the building? David Noyes replies, there will be workers in the building particularly below grade. We require an amount of heat addition to prevent pipe freezing. So, yes, there will still be workers doing demolition activities within the reactor building.
- James Lampert has a brief comment for those that have nothing better to do. The NRC website has a great deal of information on it about the LTP and what is required to be in it. If you have the time to get into it and look at it just as a reference.
- Andrew Gottlieb has a question for David Noyes. Since you said the swim chart hadn't changed at all, is it fair to say that the schedule for decommissioning in the main core reactor building is predicated on the ability to discharge to Cape Cod Bay. David Noyes replies, yes, that remains the case. The schedule for demolition of the reactor and turbine building are driven by disposition of the water and a favorable decision as we discussed at the last meeting. Andrew Gottlieb replies, and is there still no plan for alternatives were that not to happen. Daivd Noyes replies, we have not calculated another plan pending the current litigation, no. Andrew Gottlieb replies, so, there is no way to estimate in the event that your permit is denied what the closure date actually might be. David Noyes replies, not at this time. If that were to happen then we would perform that evaluation and make that date available. Andrew Gottlieb replies, and do you have any predetermined route by which if you were to transport it, where it is going to go. David Noyes replies, if we were to transport liquid waste? Andrew Gottlieb replies, correct. David Noyes replies, there are two options for transport. One would be 4,000-gallon transport directly by truck to Andrews Texas. The other alternative would be 4,000 gallons by truck to a transload facility in Western Pennsylvania where those 4,000-gallon shipments could be consolidated into approximately 20,000-gallon rail shipment. We haven't decided on one or the other. Those are the two options. Andrew Gottlieb replies, we were told in the past that part of the

reason you prefer discharge to the Bay, is the transport would impact environmental justice communities, is that still the position? David Noyes replies, it is. Environmental Justice also encompasses the fact that this is the community that benefitted from the generation of the electricity for the forty years that the plant operated. So, to the extent possible and to the extent that it is environmentally responsible, all the waste should be dispositioned here. Andrew Gottlieb replies, but part of your rationale has been that the trucking route prevents risk to environmental justice communities in prior discussions, right. David Noyes replies, that is part of the decision, yes. Andrew Gottlieb replies, but when we had the hearing, you talked about in your sworn testimony that you actually haven't mapped a route. You don't know where it would go. How do we know that environmental justice communities aren't going to be impacted by the transport. David Noyes replies, we don't specifically know that. The decision with respect to environmental justice right now is leveraged more on the responsibility to disposition the waste in the area where the people benefitted from its use. Andrew Gottlieb replies, it was announced not super long ago that Holtec is going to become a public company, right? David Noyes replies, there is a portion of the company that will become public. I think specifically the small modular reactor business is slated to be a public offering. Not the entire company. Andrew Gottlieb replies, so the company is splitting and the portion that is doing the decommissioning will not be affected or part of the public offering. Is that right? David Noyes replies, I don't expect the decommissioning sites to be impacted by the public offering for the SMR unit. Andrew Gottlieb replies, that is not quite what I asked. What I'm asking is, is the ownership structure governing the decommissioning activity going to change as a result of the public offering? David Noyes replies, I don't have any indication that it will. Andrew Gottlieb replies, what assurance might this panel or the Commonwealth have that the splitting up of the company and part of it going public, does not impact the viability of the company to execute its responsibilities under your decommissioning contract license under the Commonwealth. Davd Noyes replies, well, the agreement with the Commonwealth was not only signed by Holtec Decommissioning International but was signed by representatives of Holtec and made assurances on behalf of the Holtec corporation, the larger company. Andrew Gottlieb replies, I guess what I'm trying to get at is, who is going to own continued responsibility of the decommissioning process and what method of assurance do we have, is the public going to have, that your public offering is not going to impede or take resources that would be necessary or expertise that would be necessary from the entity that is left over and transferred over to the publicly owned entity for business development purposes. David Noyes replies, I guess I'm not really understanding your question. Andrew Gottlieb replies, you are leaving a portion of it doing decommissioning and you are taking a portion of it and you just described it as the portion that would be doing modular reactor development. What is the method by which the public and the Commonwealth receive assurance that the divvying up of resources and capabilities within Holtec is not going to materially impact the ability of Holtec to fulfill its obligation under the decommissioning rule. David Noyes replies, I don't know how it could. The monies that are associated with the decommissioning of the site are dedicated to the decommissioning of the site. They are not monies that can be used for SMR development or be used as any part of public offering by any other entities. So, the decommissioning funds are the decommissioning funds. And

the NRC strictly regulates how those can be used. Andrew Gottlieb replies, right but we've not been made privy under assertion of proprietary rights, how money flows within the company. What knowledge will we be able to have about who the subsidiary is and who is the mother ship in this arrangement. Is this public company going to be taking charges from the decommissioning piece. How is money and expertise going to flow, if you have a public entity that is separate and apart from the decommissioning piece. David Noyes replies, resources of the decommissioning have to be used by decommissioning. Those resources can't be used for any other purpose and that is fully regulated and overseen by the NRC. Andrew Gottlieb replies, but you also testified at the hearing that one of the reasons you chose this method of decommissioning was because it was allegedly faster than entombment or putting in moth balls (my term) and that it had the benefit of allowing the decommissioning entity, in this case Holtec, to take advantage of the expertise of people who worked at the facility because it was happening in a near term basis. Is there going to be any kind of assurance provided that there will not be a talent or brain drain from the decommissioning side over to the new public side that is going to focus on growing the nuclear generation business. David Noyes replies, I don't know what kind of commitment we could provide. The skill sets for individuals that are involved with development and siting of SMR's are different than the skill sets of the individuals that were associated with operating the plant and now decommissioning the plant. I don't believe that any of the associates that I work with on a regular basis are individuals that are going to move into SMR development. They are lifetime area people that are committed to the work that is going on here. Andrew Gottlieb replies, is there going to be any kind of public disclosure on the initial public offering that describes what the relationship, what is going to be left over, what is the entity called that will be dealing with the decommissioning if this thing goes public. David Noyes replies, I don't think there will be any change. It will still be Holtec Decommissioning International, a subsidiary of Holtec International and the owner of the property and the owner of the material will still be Holtec Pilgrim LLC and that relationship will be unchanged. Andrew Gottlieb replies, so no impact whatsoever on anything to do with the decommissioning from your going public. David Noyes replies, from my point of view, I don't see that there would be.

- Kevin Canty makes a comment to David Noyes. In terms of the environmental justice piece, that this is the community that benefitted from the electrical generation. David Noyes replies, yes. Kevin Canty replies, I think it was back in January. The Selectboard had an opportunity to go and visit the ISO NE facility at Holyoke and view the grid of New England and how that feeds into the Quebec grid. And the New York grid, as well. So, and I'm not an energy generation or energy grid professional but my understanding is that a power plant within the grid in New England doesn't contribute specifically to the community that it's in but rather to the grid on the whole. And so, while Plymouth hosted and Southeastern Plymouth County hosted the plant. It was all of New England and by extension when in times of higher demand that they couldn't meet; places like New York and Quebec that would benefit from the existence of Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station when it was operating. Would that be fair to say? David Noyes replies, it would be fair to say. It is clear if you look at the distribution of power with respect to the effect of the ISO website that when Pilgrim was operating, that the majority of that power ISO was crediting to their operational area.

Kevin Canty replies, yes, so it's generated within the New England grid. It would be primarily used within the New England grid. David Noyes replies, that's correct. Kevin Canty replies, but that New England grid covers New England not just this area. David Noyes replies, it does, that is correct. Kevin Canty replies, I just wanted to make sure that people understood that component.

- James Lampert replies, did I understand you to say that Holtec International was a party to the settlement agreement because I don't believe that's accurate. My understanding is that the Commonwealth is, that Holtec Decommissioning Inc. is, and that Holtec Pilgrim is but Holtec International is not. David Noyes replies, no, Holtec signed the state agreement. Holtec, HDI and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts are the three signatories. And Pam Cowen signed as a representative of Holtec. James Lampert replies, but Holtec International is not a named party in that agreement. David Noyes replies, yeah, I don't know whether the International is in there or not but it was certainly the Holtec Corporation.
- Kelly O'Brien makes a comment to David Noyes. The water that you talked about in the fuel pool drained down the cavity down to the torus. Are you still using the water in the fuel pool to heat through the winter months. We did vent and drain. David Noyes replies, there are partially drained and we don't anticipate that we will run into any of those systems again but we have the ability to make up from the torus to the spent fuel pool. And to heat using the spent fuel transfer system through the spent fuel heat exchanger to reactor building close cooling water.
- Mary Lampert has a question for David Noyes. If MA Department of Public Health decided to request samples, could they get it? David Noyes replies, absolutely. Mary Lampert replies, o.k., that's my question. So the question that we would like to hear at some point from Jack Priest; their rationale for not going after samples and do what you said in the sample report that you took in 23 that before any release and we know there are releases into the air that you would take a hard look at harder to detect radio nuclides and transuranic. So, I think the public deserves an answer to that.

INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP (IWG) REPORT

- Kevin Canty makes a comment that we are not yet fully represented by all of the agencies due to Mr. Pickering not being replaced yet. Although as was alluded earlier, we are anticipating that the vacancy will be filled soon. In light of that, do we have anything to report from the Interagency Working Group? Jack Priest replies, so we are still working through the litigation and lawsuit related to the discharge of effluence and I have no update that I can comment on on that. I know that the DEP was working with Holtec on their MA contingency plan for the items through that. David Noyes spoke about the gland seal asbestos work that was overseeing with DEP and that plan was successful. And that's all I have for an update.
- James Lampert replies, just a basic question here. It's now been a number of months since we've got a report from the IWG. Jack Priest replies, it's been two months. James Lampert replies, that's a number of months. Basically, could you explain to us because I think many of us are pretty unclear as to exactly what the IWG does. Does it have a chair, does it have regular meetings, and does it invite people in. Just generally, what has it actually done and let's take it over the last four months. I think most of us have utterly no idea. Jack Priest replies, so the IWG of the state agencies. We review what was asked of the state agencies at

this meeting and request for information. We review upcoming agenda items that are requested. We are prepared to come in and present information when we are requested. We meet at least monthly and sometimes more often than that. And yes, we have a chair that is overseeing from the Department of Environmental Protection. James Lampert replies, who is the chair. Jack Priest replies, Paolo. James Lampert replies, and you talked about reviewing things to and fro this panel. Jack Priest replies, not to and fro. We look at the agenda that's provided to us. We look at those things that are very specific. James Lampert replies, o.k., you look at the agenda, but I'm still confused as to exactly what happens. You look at the agenda and there is obviously the report that Mr. Noyes gives on a regular basis and typically other reports and questions. Do you dig into that at all, the substance of it, not just simply that it is on the agenda? Jack Priest replies, right, so there are different agencies that are engaged in the activities that are going on at Holtec. So, the DEP is involved with MA contingency, they are involved with the PFAS investigation that is going on, they are involved with the asbestos work that is required as you go through that power plant. There is a lot of asbestos there that DEP is very engaged in to ensure that the material is properly handled, that the workers are safe that are managing through that. The financial items that are on that swim lane are under review by the Attorney General's office through Seth Schofield and his staff. And they will brief out to the team if there was a discussion or planned discussion. For example, tonight on the financial status of the decommissioning plan. In advance, we would discuss that at the IAG and put together some talking points so we can come in and intelligently present that information to the panel and to the members of the public that desire that information.

- Pine duBois makes a comment. I didn't hear the answer as to who is the chair of the IWG. Jack Priest replies, it is Paolo who you met. Kevin Canty replies, what is the last name. Jack Priest confirms that it is Paolo DiFabio, Deputy Chief of Staff, Executive Office of Energy & Environmental Affairs.

HISTORIC AND CURRENT TREATMENT METHODS OF LIQUID AND GASEOUS EFFLUENCE

- David Noyes of Holtec back up at the podium to give presentation. He starts the presentation with a discussion about historical water and operational treatment methods. The reason why this is important is because it is the same water. The water has essentially been unchanged. The water that was involved in the operation of the plant is now the water that is providing the shielding for decommissioning activities. So, it is important to review how that water was treated during its operational period. We had similar goals in both decommissioning and operational water treatment.
- **Slide 1**: describes the Pilgrim Water Treatment History. Operational Water Treatment Objectives; 1.) maintain an ultra-high degree of primary system water quality to prevent nuclear fuel and accelerated damage to components operating at high temperature and pressure 2.) maintain a high degree of water quality to maintain worker radiological exposure ALARA, with visual clarity, during refueling and maintenance activities. Decommissioning Water Treatment Objectives; 1.) Maintain a high degree of water quality to maintain worker radiological exposure, ALARA, with visual clarity, during refueling and maintenance activities.
- **Slide 2**: describes the equipment that was used during operation. Operational Water Treatment Systems & Equipment: 1.) Demineralized makeup water- purify Plymouth town

water for Pilgrim use 2.) Condensate Demineralizers 3.) Reactor Water Cleanup System 4.) Radwaste Treatment 5.) Torus Filtration (10 year interval) and Feed & Bleed (more frequent) to improve water quality standards 6.) Trinuclear filters during refueling and maintenance activities. They are cartridge filters designed to remove impurities 7.) Spent Fuel Pool Filtering and Demineralization System. In Decommissioning: Water Treatment System and Equipment: 1.) Radwaste Treatment (as-needed) 2.) Torus Water Treatment; we are able to continuously filter the water in the torus 3.) Refuel Floor Treatment during defueling and maintenance activities. We have a new system that has been installed with a very fine micron rating and that allows us to remove any impurities at the point at which any activities are being performed before they have the ability to degrade overall water quality 4.) Spent Fuel Pool Filtering and Demineralization System (as needed); the way we did when the plant was operating.

- **Slide 3**: describes the Spent Fuel Pool and Demineralization system: 1.) micron or fine rated filter removes particulates 2.) Demineralizer contains charcoal for removal of organics and mixed bed resins for removal of ionic impurities from the water. Flexibility of radiological and non-radiological impurities in resin/charcoal amounts 3.) Improved removal capability by system suction modifications in decommissioning; water is now being fully circulated in that Spent Fuel Pool.
- **Slide 4**: describes the Refuel Floor Water Treatment Design: 1.) Suction located where segmentation and waste loading activities were occurring to minimize the removal of impurities and maximize treatment effectiveness 2.) Fine micron particle filtration 3.) Filter element gets exchanged before loading degrades its effectiveness 4.) Filter element that was used for these activities was exchanged 13 times during our reactor vessel segmentation.
- **Slide 5**: describes Torus Water Treatment Design: we no longer need to rely on Feed & Bleed 1.) Mobile suctioning positioning 2.) Fine micron filter size 3.) Filter element exchanged before loading degrades effectiveness 4.) Future modification capability to add demineralization in addition to filtration of that system.
- **Slide 6**: describes the Radwaste Demineralizer which still exists in the configuration which it supported the plant when it was operating 1.) can accommodate varying resin and charcoal mixes based on radiological and non-radiological impurities present 2.) currently contains 10 cubic feet of charcoal and 20 cubic feet of Ion Exchange resin.
- **Slide 7**: describes the Comparison of Non-Radiological Pollutant Levels in Treated Effluent to Standards (Liquid). The proof of the system's effectiveness is in the quality of the water that it makes. The chart displayed shows the pollutant levels in the water samples that were taken and columns for EPA Aquatic Life Criteria, NPDES Permit Discharge Limits and Intake Water Concentrations (Ambient Seawater)
- **Slide 8**: describes the Comparison of Non-Radiological Pollutants Levels in Treated Effluent to Standards (Gaseous) 1.) MassDEP concluded in a letter dated 7/19/24 that HDI had accurately evaluated that a hypothetical evaporation of 935,850 gallons of water (total volume at the time of the analysis) resulted in the release of a small fraction (1.4%) of Air Quality permitting threshold for regulated pollutants and therefore did not need to be reported to the state.
- **Slide 9**: describes Radioactive Effluent Regulations 1.) Total Radiological Effluents limited to 500 mrem per year from all sources (10 CFR 20.1301) and specific isotope limits (10 CFR

20.1302) 2.) Additional NRC regulations require any dose to the general public to be maintained As Low As Reasonably Achievable (ALARA) 3.) HDI further restricts releases to less than 25 mrem/year from all sources and less than 0.6 mrem/month, 1.5 mrem/quarter and less than 3 mrem/year from liquid discharges.

- **Slide 10**: Radioactive Effluent Releases Impact 1.) Liquid Effluent Releases (based on 2015) There were 7 liquid effluent releases totaling over 120,000 gallons of water 2.) Gaseous Effluent Releases (based on 2024). This would be the worst-case radiological impact number due to the building heating performed during fall-winter and winter-spring periods.

QUESTIONS FOR DAVID NOYES: POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

- James Lampert has a question for David Noyes. I spent some time seeing what we had in prior reports that kind of showed the systems for filtering. The two that I came up with were what HDI attached to the application for a modified permit. And also, there was a presentation that you made to NDCAP back in January 2024 that shows spent fuel pool filtration. If I understand those correctly, let's start with what was submitted to DEP in your application. The water that will eventually go out of outlet 15 came from the torus into which the Spent Fuel Pool and the DSP had already. Is it true that the discharge is from the torus and not directly from the Spent Fuel Pool. David Noyes replies, it could be from either one. Right now, the flow path would be from either the torus or the Spent Fuel Pool through the Rad to a treated water tank and then that treated water is sampled prior to the discharge. James Lampert replies, and then basically from either of those, it flows through both a demineralizer and also a filter. Am I right so far? David Noyes replies, you are. James Lampert replies, what do each of those remove from the water flow. David Noyes replies, so the filter removes particulate (even fine particulate) and both radiological and non-radiological. And then the demineralizer removes impurities that have either a positive or negative charge. The resin has a specific affinity for removal of those. James Lampert replies, could you give an example of what types of impurities that you are talking about there. David Noyes replies, so it would be things like boron, calcium, chlorine. I think those are the major ones. James Lampert replies, any radiological? David Noyes replies, yes to the extent that the radiological have an ionic charge, they would be removed. Predominantly even the resins have a filtering capability. So, if it is in the form of a particulate, it would remove it as well. James Lampert replies, and on this path after the flow has gone through the filter and demineralization. Do I understand it correctly. It goes into a treated water storage tank and then goes to the outfall. And somewhere between the outfall and the discharge canal, it's diluted. Am I right? David Noyes replies, yes, that's correct. James Lampert replies, the other loop I found was in your January 24 and it appears to show a filtration loop that starts in the Spent Fuel Pool and then goes back into the Spent Fuel Pool. Is there such a loop? David Noyes replies, yeah, there are actually two of them. The AVANTech system that we were using in the cavity and dryer separator pit has been repurposed to take water from the Spent Fuel Pool run it through a five-micron filter and discharge it back into the Spent Fuel Pool. We also continue to use as needed the Spent Fuel Pool filtering and demineralization system. James Lampert replies, so in this loop there is both a filter and a demineralizer. David Noyes replies, that's correct. James Lampert replies, is there a similar loop in the torus where most of the water is now. David Noyes replies, there is a filtration loop. So, it recirculates through a filter with a two-

micron edge size and there is not a demineralizer in that torus loop currently, but prior to the discharge of that water from the torus it would be treated through the Rad demin prior to going to a treated water tank for discharge. James Lampert replies, and that would include a demineralizer in that flow path. David Noyes replies, yes, it would. James Lampert then refers to slide 5; this is where I got a little confused. My understanding was that if we are in the refueling floor of the area that gets heat, if I get those two things correct. David Noyes replies, yes, you do. Now it would only be the Spent Fuel Pool because there is no water in the cavity or dryer separator pit but still on the refuel floor. James Lampert replies, my understanding had been that the evaporation from the Spent Fuel Pool, both natural and any increase that might be due to the heating went out a vent on the side of the building. In that flow path, there was, and I assume still is, a system that can monitor the radiological particulates. David Noyes replies, yes, that's correct. James Lampert replies, and also something that can sample for tritium. Is there anything else in that flow path? David Noyes replies, no, there is not. James Lampert replies, so there is no demineralizer. If it is evaporated water, it doesn't see a demineralizer. Am I right? David Noyes replies, it does because the source water itself is demineralized. James Lampert replies, but not from the time it leaves the Spent Fuel Pool it doesn't. David Noyes replies, that's correct. James Lampert replies, and it also doesn't see a filter from the time it leaves the Spent Fuel Pool. David Noyes replies, that's correct. It sees both of those while it's in the pool. James Lampert replies, water now in the torus. I believe you said that there were four vents out of the torus and that they are typically open. David Noyes replies, there are two-man way covers. James Lampert replies, to what do those communicate. David Noyes replies, they communicate to the reactor building atmosphere. So, any evaporation that happens from the torus is released via that same reactor building vent that sees the water that is released from the refuel floor. James Lampert replies, and is this slide that I asked you to put up, is this the reactor buildng? I'm not clear about what we are talking about. David Noyes replies, so, this is the standalone AVANtech system that was initially installed for reactor vessel segmentation. So, this is an installed five-micron filter that takes suction from where we either package waste or create waste. It sends that water through a five-micron filter and discharges back to the volume of which it came out of. This is the filter element that was exchanged 13 times because of the material that was removed during segmentation. James Lampert replies, and is this evaporated water or liquid water? David Noyes replies, this is liquid water.

- Pine duBois has a question for David Noyes. You talked about segmenting a lot, but I don't know how we're segmenting. Are we taking things apart, are we cutting them? David Noyes replies, both, we have used both. Pine duBois replies, so when you are filtering it, you are filtering some of the metals. David Noyes replies, yes. Pine duBois replies, and any sort of debris that might have been attached to the stuff itself. And those filters then can trap all of that debris and then when those get clogged, you replace them. David Noyes replies, that's correct. Pine duBois replies, and you ship them to the waste disposal. David Noyes replies, facility in Andrews, Texas. Pine duBois replies, so the 13. Can you give me a sense of the size of these filters. Are they as big as you? David Noyes replies, a lot bigger than me. Pine duBois replies, that's what I thought. I'm just trying to get an understanding of what the filtration unit thing is like. Because when you said 13, I was like well that isn't very much. But it depends on the size. David Noyes replies, they are in the order of about 16 feet high and maybe 10 feet

in diameter. Pine duBois replies, and when you talk about resins. Those are, what kind of resins are we talking about. We aren't talking about pine sap. David Noyes replies, no, they are inorganic beads that are then created with both positive and negative ions attached to them. The negative ion for instance, is like a hydroxyl ion. So, it's an OH, essentially water. So, it can remove another negative impurity and give up that hydroxyl ion to the water. Pine duBois replies, so, that stuff sticks to that? David Noyes replies, yeah, it does. Pine duBois replies, and it doesn't let it go and it can build up on that. So, when it gets clogged. David Noyes replies, yes, so we monitor that a little bit differently. We look for a thing called breakthrough. So, we monitor the concentration of the ion that we are trying to remove at the outlet of the demineralizer. And as we start to see that concentration begin to rise, we know that we've used those demineralization sites and it's time to change out that resin. Pine duBois replies, have you developed any new methods when you've been doing all this nice work. David Noyes replies, well the two filtrations' systems we are using, the AVANtech systems the torus, and the one on the refuel floor are both new to us. In the past, we would use tri-nuke filters that in some cases had a 25-micron capability or 10-micron capability is like what somebody would use to filter their swimming pool. So, 2 microns is five times finer.

- Kelly O'Brien refers to an old system that has been used in the past. David Noyes replies, that we don't use that older system anymore. The primary purpose for the condensate demineralizers was for seawater and preventing seawater from making it to the reactor. So, the condensate demineralizers are no longer used to remove that resin.
- Curtis Little has a question for David Noyes. If you were to ship this liquid waste off to Texas, does it meet the criteria for shipment today? Or would it need to be purified before it goes to Texas? David Noyes replies, no, it could be shipped as it is right now. When it gets to Texas, they would solidify it and mix with a 3-1 clay mixture and then they would bury it.
- Mary Lampert has a question for David Noyes. I am wondering about micron particle filtration. You talk about fine micron particles. One has five-micron and another one has two. David Noyes replies, yes. Mary Lampert replies, which one has five and which one has two. David Noyes replies, the one that is used on the refuel floor has a five-micron capability. Because of the types of activities that were being performed on the refuel floor, five-micron was the appropriate for those work activities. Because the material in the torus was essentially stagnant. We could use a finer filter, 2-micron. Mary Lampert replies, well what radionuclides could slip through. David Noyes replies, it depends on the size of the individual radionuclide. The filter is only going to remove particulate. It is not going to remove anything that is gaseous. And it is not going to remove anything that is attached to a piece of metal that is less than the micron size. But the numbers that are in the treated water tank, the discharge limit from 2015 is inclusive of anything that has slipped through that process in the past.
- Barry Potvin has a question for David Noyes. After something passes through the particulate filter and then the deionizers that you use, I assume tritium would go right through those. David Noyes replies, it will. Barry Potvin replies, are there any other radionuclides that will likely pass through that filtration process. David Noyes replies, I don't know of any. We have tailored the resin mix and the Rad demin to maintain radiological discharge ALARA. So, I don't know of anything other than tritium that would in and of itself pass through filtration and

demineralization. Barry Potvin replies, I am wondering specifically about iodine. David Noyes replies, I'm not sure. I'm going to have to check.

- Andrew Gottlieb has a question for David Noyes. Holtec currently lacks legal authority to utilize this filtration system to discharge Cape Cod Bay, right? David Noyes replies, yes, that's correct. Andrew Gottlieb replies, o.k. so, this is really just an academic explanation or nostalgic walk down memory lane about what used to be when you were generating power and how you would filter, right? David Noyes replies, it was to directly answer the question of what means are used to filter and treat the water both in the past and currently.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

- Review of meeting minutes including edits and corrections from May 19, 2025 meeting. James Lampert makes motion to approve the meeting minutes. Mary Gatslick seconds the motion. (15 approve, 0 negative, 1 abstention)
- The proposed meeting minutes approved of May 19. 2025.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

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

- First citizen Diane Turco with Cape Downwinders. Public comment begins with a statement and request to the NDCAP panel to act on behalf of the community. Cape Downwinders received a whistleblower letter regarding radiological exposure by workers at Holtec Pilgrim. Cape Downwinders wrote to Governor Healey requesting the state to initiate an independent investigation regarding allegations of worker and public health and safety from Holtec's new practice of evaporating the radioactive wastewater under the guise of providing a warm environment for the workers; no action was taken. A written request to the NDCAP asking for action to advise the Governor to investigate the allegations was submitted in September 2023. It was not taken up by the panel until March 2024 when it then was tabled. Votes to table included DPH and DPA representatives who usually abstain from most votes on the panel. Cape Downwinders then sent a letter to DPH on 6/25/24 requesting an investigation as a formal complaint. However, MassDEP replied that they didn't license Pilgrim so they had no authority. MA DPH recommendation was to quote "share your specific concerns directly to the NDCAP" So, here we are. We are now asking for the NDCAP to advise Governor Healey to initiate an independent investigation into the serious allegations as described in the attached letter dated 8/18/23 sent to Cape Downwinders and MA DPH Jack Priest anonymously. These allegations are related to "forced evaporation of radiologically contaminated wastewater to worker public health safety due to exposure to tritium and the air vapors release of airborne radionuclides into the environment discharged up the stack" Holtec's own plant radiation protection personnel were "very critical of the proposed design and implementation" concluding that this process "presents a radiological and industrial safety concern to the refuel floor workforce". In addition, the radiation exposure to the general public releasing tritium in the form of water vapor discharged up the stack will be many times greater than the radiation exposure that would be received by the general public had the tritium contaminated water been discharged into Cape Cod Bay. We understand

there is no safe dose of radio nuclides that does not cause harm. We also ask for the plant radiation protection report from Holtec but they refuse to release it. 2.) We remain concerned about the adequate security at the Holtec Pilgrim ISFSI particularly given the recent national announcement of a terrorism alert after the US bombed Iran. Cape Downwinders has been asking for the current easy physical access to the dry cask be reviewed and improved upon. Yet even after Dr. Gordon Thompson presented to the NDCAP the real risks inherent in the current storage of the high-level nuclear waste within line of sight of Rocky Hill Road. And multiple public reports of easy access on the driveway leading right to the casks. That area remains easily vulnerable, and I gave you a picture and where that blue dot is, you can drive a vehicle up there without being stopped. An attack could result in a radiological contamination surrounding areas including Boston. This is a serious situation that should not be ignored. I recently contacted MEMA who directed me to the NRC to address these concerns which were dismissed as regulations already in place. Attached are the NRC correspondences which I will give you. However, I did ask if the NRC could issue its own order to increase security at Pilgrim and the answer was yes. So, we are requesting the NDCAP to address this serious public safety matter by requesting Governor Maura Healey order a review by MEMA and include Plymouth Emergency Responders and watchdog advocates regarding the current and adequate security situation and provide a plan with robust and protective security measures in place such as locked road gates that cannot be penetrated, visual blockage of the cans and the vents that are now clearly visible from the road and the driveway, and identify other security issues that allow vehicles or bad actors to approach and/or park within the range of easy access to the cans and the vents. The results would be included in a request to the NRC to order an increased improvement of security at Holtec Pilgrim. 3.) We ask NDCAP to advise the Governor to respond to the Supreme ballot public advisory question calling on our elected officials to enforce state laws to prohibit Holtec's illegal evaporation of the radioactive industrial wastewater. This spring, 17 Cape Cod and South Shore towns voted on a non-binding public advisory initiative calling on Governor Maura Healey, Attorney General Andrea Campbell, along with state and elected officials to enforce our state laws to ensure that Holtec immediately cease gaseous airborne discharge of radioactive and chemically contaminated industrial wastewater into our communities and the environment. The recent election results overwhelmingly supporting this initiative highlight the significant community concern regarding environmental responsibility with nearly 90% of the voters voting for the cessation of Holtec's radioactive wastewater airborne discharge. I'm surprised that it was brought to the attention that Holtec is still planning to dump into the Bay as seen from the environmental justice issue, nobody should be exposed to radio nuclides and that includes the people of Plymouth or anyplace else. Holtec could store that radioactive wastewater safely with the dry casks but they are choosing to instead attempt to contaminate Plymouth and the area. The public is not acceptable collateral damage to the profits of Holtec. The host town Plymouth voted in favor of this action to stop the evaporation 7034-656; overwhelmingly; that's what the people want but Holtec is refusing to acknowledge that. So, we ask that the NDCAP on our behalf, advise the Governor to make a statement of action regarding the public petition requesting implementation of state measures to prohibit the illegal evaporation of Holtec Pilgrim's radioactive industrial wastewater. Diane Turco ends public comment that she will submit written statement to the comment form on the NDCAP

website. Kevin Canty replies, yes, that the materials will go to the Chair, Vice Chair and support staff. Diane Turco then refers to the area where a vehicle could drive up (blue dot on map)

- Second citizen Rosemary Shields with League of Women Voters. I just need this clarified and it was something that Ms. Lampert talked about but that Holtec took out 360,000 gallons from the torus and it's now in the Spent Fuel Pool, right? David Noyes replies, that's not correct. It's from the dryer separator pit and reactor cavity and it's now in the torus. Rosemary Shields replies, and it's now in the torus, o.k., opposite. And that you took samples of hard to detect, problematic radioactivity nuclides and solid waste. And you offered it to the Department of Public Health and I just wanted to know why the Department of Public Health refused to take the samples. Jack Priest replies, we've had multiple samples that we've taken and we've seen no change in concentrations of those radionuclides. And since this was not additional activity that is going to be released; we didn't feel we needed to have an additional sample at this time. If things change, concentrations change, they change the filtration system, we are available to take additional split samples with Holtec. Rosemary Shields replies, o.k. and so that's what you decided even though they were saying that they had. I remember when we did the split samples and you just took them from the top and you didn't go all the way down. Jack Priest replies, we've been back subsequent. Our initial samples that we took, there was some concern about stratification meaning where did we take it in the tank. We had a discussion about that and the DEP and the profile we went back and were-sampled. We split those samples with Holtec, we have samples from DEP. This was an additional set of samples as they moved the water from one location to another. Rosemary Shields replies, right so you think that with the movement of the water, you might get some additional information from those. So, once it is settled, you will go down deep and get it. Jack Priest replies, so yes, there will be additional opportunities for us to go out and sample with the DEP and with DPH. Holtec has made that sampling available to us whenever we ask for it. So, that will not be the last and only opportunity for us to go in and do those samples. Rosemary Shields replies, o.k. I appreciate that, thank you so much.
- Third citizen Jonathan Lutrie; chemistry student at Bridgewater State University. I'm here today to present testimony regarding the ongoing concerns that everyone on the panel and everyone in the community and abroad has had over the wastewater issue specifically concerning the hydrogen isotope of tritium. I believe that is imperative that in addressing this issue that has been affecting the panel and affecting the community for the last couple of years that this should be a thorough and equitable process that hears all sides of the argument both the industrial side, the environmental side, political side what have you not. And through such dialogue, we can arrive at situations and solutions and prioritize the public health as well as the environmental integrity of our whole region. And the other thing I wanted to bring up also with the small modular reactors that has been proposed by Holtec. I think they should consider going forward with it, possibly in the near future after everything has settled down. It can help possibly resolve some of the energy questions that are arising across the country. Obviously there has been a ban in place for forty years as a result of Three Mile Island. Governor Healey has expressed some interest in possibly repealing that ban which can help reignite the question of expanding possibly nuclear power or possibly looking at alternatives that can help with the energy issue. Thank you.

- Fourth citizen Peter Moyer. I have been here before and I've spoken on the same issue. I'm talking tonight particularly about the evaporation of radioactive nuclear spent fuel pool water. And my question to David Noyes. I asked the same question last time and you gave me kind of a vague answer. Have we measured or I think the NRC does measure at least bi-annually what radio isotopes come out of the stack. And I think last time you said, not much but you weren't very specific as to what. Do you know by now what does come out of it. I listened to you talk about the resins and the charcoal, And I got the sense that the only thing that really comes out is an ionic isotope. I don't even really know which isotopes are; ionic, I don't know if cesium is, I don't know if cobalt is, the ones that we have seen in the water but if they are not ionic; I think we are misdirecting the public by saying we are cleaning the water. We are really not cleaning the water of isotopes. We are dealing with a particulate matter. Can you name the isotopes that are coming out of the stack particularly when we evaporate. David Noyes replies, there are small amounts of cesium that are released through the gaseous effluent flow path. The reports that are on the NRC webpage, the annual reports, provide a breakdown of all of the individual isotopes that have been measured in the gaseous release flow path. And I can show you how to get to that report if you would like to see it. Cesium, I know, we have seen in some of the samples. I'm not sure about others.
- Fifth citizen William Lynch joining virtual. Just a few comments. I believe cesium would be ionic so the resins should remove it. And also, the tritium, if I understand properly, is approximately one milligram and the total volume in the order of million gallons. That's a pretty small amount, less than a typical tritium containment exit sign. So, if one of those were to accidentally break in an accident or a fire, it would probably be released more. It seems like a small amount, at least in those two. I don't totally understand all of the other materials that could be present. And I have also heard with NRC oversight; this type of Spent Fuel Pool water has been released. I have read something from Indian Point possibly also San Onofre. They have been allowed to. So, it seems like it's not completely unusual to release it. And it just seems like the amount couldn't be very big. And the tritium. I don't know the regulations on the amounts of all these other materials and whether they can be released. The amount of tritium seems to be so small. And I only have limited understanding.
- Sixth citizen Brian Campbell joining virtual, 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 in eating a banana. 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. And I thought David Noyes presentations tonight was excellent. And it just shows that this radiation dangers that has the public so upset are minimal, are pretty much harmless. A 2022 article from Power Magazine by Paul Miller entitled accelerated decommissioning of Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, a progress report, reports the social value in accelerated decommissioning will benefit the town of Plymouth by enabling the bulk of the 1600-acre property to be repurposed helping to replace tax revenues lost when the plant shut down. The article reports a 2027 return of these 1600 acres to the town of Plymouth for development, that's not going to be met. This would have somewhat compensated Plymouth for losing 600 high paying jobs whose annual payroll was

approximately 77 million dollars including benefits. This translated to 9.8 million in state and local taxes annually. And was approximately ten percent of Plymouth's total tax revenue. The Commonwealth and this panel have done everything possible to sabotage accelerated decommissioning by delaying discharge of treated safe water into Cape Cod Bay which has been done since 1972 with no harm to anything. The way the Commonwealth works is this. Undersecretary of Climate Change David Ismay said sixty percent of the state emissions come from you; the person in the street, the senior on a fixed income, there is no bad guy left. At least in Massachusetts to point a finger at, to turn the screws on, to break their will, to stop emitting. That's you, we have to break your will, right. I can't say that publicly but he did. That's right. Your fired David. That's how the Commonwealth deals with truth tellers. The Commonwealth by unplugging Industrial Cathedral Pilgrim Nuclear shows that it is run by Industrial scale vandals' intent on impoverishing Massachusetts tax and rate payers. The 2050 net zero plans with the corrupt Mass Save and the adoption of wind, solar and battery is creating an unreliable expensive woke electrical grid that is a disaster. As we destroy our forest, farmland and open space to accommodate this corrupt green grift buildout. Solutions, stop whale killing offshore wind, increase gas line pipeline infrastructure, build combined cycle gas and nuclear power electrical generation. And change Chelsea Massachusetts gas infrastructure from an import facility to an export facility to supply our vital European allies with LNG natural gas not Russian gas which New England used to support through this facility. Thank you.

- Seventh citizen Richard Rothstein joining virtual. I was talking earlier today with Pine and a question regarding NDCAP membership roster. Pine, I think you got back to me that Mary Gatslick was going to bring up my concern with the Chair. Pine duBois replies, she was going to ask you a question, but you go right ahead. Richard Rothstein replies, Kevin, I guess right now there is no nuclear matters committee official member sitting on the NDCAP despite what was shown when I was on the NDCAP website earlier today. I think the new member from the Town of Plymouth was appointed was incorrect because it shows the nuclear matters committee representative but he is a Town of Plymouth representative. So, that being the case, a little quick history. I was a former Chair of the nuclear matters committee when it existed. I stepped down around 2018 or 16. I joined the NDCAP in 2018 and then as an NFC member. Also, then I stepped down in 2021. John Mahoney became the NFC member at the time. And then of course, he stepped down. So, right now, there is a hole in the wall as they say and my understanding is that the NFC is debunked. It never was officially shut down but the Town Board of Selectman could not get a quorum of people at the time. They were not appointing any new members so without a quorum; you couldn't have meetings. And then when the NFC wasn't meeting, the Former Selectboard Chair Jen Viveiros formed the energy working group to discuss a number of things that were kind of similar to what the NFC was doing. Of course, that disappeared when the NDCAP was formed. Right now, and the point of order earlier, there was a discussion about being able to get enough people to vote, filling all the slots. So, you have an opening here and with Plymouth being the host community for the Pilgrim plant being decommissioned there. I think it would behoove, talking with Pine, that something has to change at the legislative level when the NDCAP was formed to either give Plymouth a third member appointed by the Board or something has to give there to keep that third person slot for the Town of Plymouth. Kevin Canty replies, so I can answer that question. So, aspects of that history are correct. The Town did have a nuclear matters committee

for a number of years. My understanding is that in 2017 or 18, it became essentially a non-functional committee due to lack of a quorum for a prolonged period of time. And partly because the operation of that committee, a Town committee, predated the existence of this committee, the state committee. When the Nuclear Decommissioning Citizens Advisory Panel, this committee, was formed, this committee was given a seat that is appointed by the Selectboard that is designated for someone that is on the Nuclear Matters Committee. Because the Selectboard was unable to staff the Nuclear Matters Committee for a prolonged period of time, it made it difficult to fill that slot. So, what the Selectboard did as part of our annual appointment process was to appoint someone to the Nuclear Matters Committee with the sole purpose of them filling the slot here. Because the Nuclear Matters Committee no longer serves any purpose in the Town of Plymouth, was not able to maintain a quorum for a prolonged period of time. We, as a Town, cannot change the composition of the NDCAP and our appointment structure that would require state legislation. However, there is no minimum requirement as to how many members exist on the nuclear matters committee. So, long story short, it is correct that the member that was recently appointed and is in attendance is a member of the Nuclear Matters Committee and his only responsibility on the nuclear matters committee, as it currently is constituted is to fill a seat on the Nuclear Decommissioning Citizens Advisory Panel for the Town of Plymouth. The town will advertise the remaining seat for the NDCAP that is also appointed by the Selectboard. We have to live within this infrastructure because that is what the state statute was constituted as; changing that would require an act of the legislature which is beyond Plymouths' ability to control. Richard Rothstein replies, I understand Kevin, that at some point the town tried to appoint a new person to serve on that Nuclear Matters Committee role for a committee that doesn't exist anymore on paper if I understood what you're saying. Kevin Canty replies, well, we already did. Richard Rothstein replies, I thought the new appointee who is here tonight is appointed by the Town of Plymouth.

- Kevin Canty replies, so, the Selectboard appointed the Nuclear Matters Committee. So, we appointed an individual to the Nuclear Matters Committee, a committee of one, whose job is to be on this committee. Richard Rothstein replies, o.k., I stand corrected then. Kevin Canty replies, it is correct.

PROPOSED FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS

Public Law 188-272- FY 2024 Energy & Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act

- Mary Gatslick recommends this be a future discussion topic for the NDCAP panel. The law was passed January 2025. It actually has a section devoted to nuclear host communities such as Plymouth and within that whole bill, there are opportunities for us to write a letter to the DOE to request funding to be able to bring expert panel people to talk to us and to talk to the public about decommissioning, about its impact to the host communities. I know that it's been a bone of contention or a sore spot of this committee saying there is absolutely no funding to bring speakers in. This allows us to do it. And I would like the committee to consider exploring this further and get that letter generated. Whether that money is still there after this current administration, who knows. But it is law and there is a process to go about and request the money for the panel. And I would like the panel to consider it as an additional

agenda item. I can send the information that I have around to the panel members if that is alright with you, Chair. Kevin Canty replies, yes. Mary Gatslick replies, o.k., I will. James Lampert replies, who would be funding this? Mary Gatslick replies, this comes out of the DOE. James Lampert replies, so, basically this would be federal funded money, not state money. Mary Gatslick replies, it's federal money. Kevin Canty checks in with the state panel members to find out if they are prepared to vote on this item. Jack Priest replies, we can vote on this tonight. Mary Lampert has a question. Are there any strings attached? Are there any restrictions on what the topics can be, who the speakers can be. Is it just a blank check? Mary Gatslick replies, that's the beauty of it, Mrs. Lampert. There are no strings attached. But I would suggest that the panel, as a group, decide which speakers are coming. Just so we get our bang for our proverbial federal buck. Kevin Canty confirms that a majority of the panel would need to be in agreement in regard to this agenda item. Mary Gatslick makes motion to add this item. Mike Fortini seconds the motion. Pine duBois makes comment, I took a look at it and there is a lot of opportunity there and we would be crazy not to take advantage of it. (**16 in favor, unanimous vote)**

Briefing on potential impact and structure of the IPO for Holtec

- Andrew Gottlieb recommends this be a future discussion topic for the NDCAP panel. He thinks there is more to be discussed than what can be covered in a Q & A session, worthy of time and attention and more robust conversation. Kevin Canty replies, so, the idea is for a more formal presentation and Q & A aspect for the effect of the IPO on the operations of Holtec's Decommissioning efforts in relation to the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station. James Lampert has a question; as to when this discussion may properly take place? There is going to be an IPO. Corporate practice is not where I was. My understanding is there will necessarily be quite complete and voluminous SEC filings, etc. And until those have been put together, I think it would be premature to get into the subject matter. We aren't really going to know what the structure proposed is until all the SEC filings and they will put this out in excruciating detail. Pine duBois replies, I agree with Mr. Lampert. Andrew Gottlieb makes a motion. Jack Priest seconds the motion. David Noyes replies, I agree the discussion would be premature without even knowing what the schedule of the IPO is. Pine duBois replies, I think it is more urgent and productive to talk about what we are going to do with the Spent Fuel and the hill. We have a lot of work to do in that regard. It would be silly to waste our time with that. Jack Priest replies, would it be possible to add that to when Holtec does their meeting update; they could include, are there any updates on the IPO status. So, we are aware of any changes from the previous meeting. Kevin Canty replies, would that be possible, to update that as it goes along whether or not this agenda item passes. David Noyes replies, yes, we could include that starting with the next meeting with just general information on the structure of the IPO.
  (1 in favor, 13 in opposition, 2 abstentions)

Dry Cask Storage

- Barry Potvin recommends this be a future discussion topic for the NDCAP panel. Barry Potvin comments, I still very strongly feel and I think Pine mentioned also; that we really need more information about the dry cask storage. To discuss their ultimate disposition and even detailed structural information about the dry casks and how they are designed. I believe also there was some discussion. I think Dave mentioned that they were in the process of building a new one, of some type. Also, there has been some developments in that area. I just showed Jack an article from the April 23rd Science Magazine entitled Finland could be the first country in the world to bury nuclear waste permanently. And they are doing it by encapsulation. They have already completed the first tests this past March and they are planning to expand their underground storage facility for this stuff. So, it would be something to do with the permit. I think it's important that we understand this. I think it's important that we get the information out to the general public as well as to ourselves. We need the information. I've also identified a distinguished professor of material science and engineering that may be interested in helping us, as well. And I believe Holtec also agreed that they could provide a subject matter expert to help us with this undertaking, as well. So, we tried to do something like this in the past and it failed mostly because the IWP members abstained. I'm hoping they discussed this so now they can cast a vote. So, my motion is, I suggest cask information and Spent Nuclear Fuel rods, safe onsite storage with monitoring and prospects for eventual transport to a national long-term offsite facility. So, that's the subject that I wish to put onto the agenda. James Lampert has a question. Could we ask Mr. Priest, is the state prepared to vote on this tonight? Jack Priest replies, yes, we are prepared to vote. Pine duBois would like to ask Mr. Potvin to expand or take away the national part because it may be a regional area for holding may be more practical and more possible than a national consensus-based siting. I would like to expand it not narrow it down, if I could. Kevin Canty replies, whether it is a national solution or regional solution is beyond our control. So, transporting it is really immaterial to where you are transporting it. Its capacity to be transported is really the operative. So, the dry cask as I understand it Dr. Potvin, is the dry cask storage on the site presently, its future disposition and the possibility for transporting it elsewhere in the future. Barry Potvin replies, yes. Mary Lampert has a question. Were you talking purely about permanent deep geological storage or were you talking also about interim. I know, for example, the Vermont Nuclear Advisory Committee, had a yearlong study on interim storage to come up with a recommendation of the state to support or not to support interim storage. So, are you permanent and interim. Barry Potvin replies, hopefully it is not a restricted topic to that extent. I think we need to gather as much information as we possibly can and also entering into this is the report from June 18th of this year that nuclear waste can be temporarily stored in Texas and New Mexico according to a Supreme Court vote that was 6-3 overturning a vote that was not going to permit it from the New Orleans Federal Courts. I don't know if Dave knows of that Supreme Court action or not. But there is a lot of information here. Kevin Canty replies, again, where it would be transported to, is beyond the scope of the panel to advise or otherwise impact. So, I think all we could really realistically cover would be; the current dry cask storage as it stands now, the future of the current dry cask storage and the possibility for transport elsewhere, destination to be determined by actors outside of this panel. Barry Potvin replies, yes, the

destination is something that we can certainly not settle. That is beyond our authority. Kevin Canty replies, correct. Mr. Lampert has a question for Mr. Potvin. I'm not clear whether you are asking for an educational meeting or something that would basically lead to a recommendation. Barry Potvin replies, I think this is really based on spreading information not only to the panel members but also to the members of the public. James Lampert replies, so, you are really looking for an educational informational meeting. Barry Potvin replies, yes, that's right. Kevn Canty replies, well then obviously the information would be informative in terms of a proposed recommendation. James Lampert replies, we would then certainly hopefully have enough information to consider whether to make a recommendation. My understanding is that what he has proposed is not to make a recommendation basically an educational on what the whole picture is. Kelly O'Brien has a question. Right now, we have the dry cask canisters up on the hill. If and when we are getting them ready for shipping, the education would be to talk about how that's done. When we did those inside the fuel pool, right. We lowered the fuel bundles into the cask before we moved it out of the building. What is the process of getting that ready for shipment in the future if we don't have the fuel pool available. How would you do that. I think that would be a nice thing to know in the process to educate people on what the process is to be able to do that when it comes time to do it. Kevin Canty replies, agree. Mrs. Lampert makes a comment. I presume if we brought speakers in, it would have to be approved by the panel. Kevin Canty replies, yes. Well, if he has this individual in mind and Holtec can do it. Then that would be part of this motion. If those speakers are unavailable, and we have to expand it. Then, yes. Mary Lampert replies, so to clarify, you are asking Holtec to make the presentation. Barry Potvin replies, yes, along with possible other speakers if they agree to do so with the permission of the panel. Mike Fortini makes a comment. I'm trying to understand here. The Department of Energy is the one who ultimately has to come up with this whole program. So, what are we really trying to do here. Kevin Canty replies, so you are talking about what the dry cask storage, if this were on an agenda. What is the dry cask storage being used at the site right now. What is the future of that dry cask storage right now. And what is the possibility for transporting the materials there somewhere else, destination to be determined. Mike Fortini replies, yes, and it's not just Pilgrim. I mean, we are talking about, just down the street here. We have Millstone. We have Connecticut Yankee. Everybody has spent fuel and casks or some kind of storage. It's really the DOE that is dropping the ball here. And they are really not coming up with a way to take all of this spent fuel and either put it in a temporary repository. With the idea that it will eventually have a place for reprocessing.fuel. Or my understanding is to. Dave, you can correct me on this. Didn't already Holtec get a temporary repository approved federally in New Mexico and the local agencies or the local government have basically held that up. So, I guess I'm trying to understand what leverage we have here. To me, it makes more sense to bring someone from the DOE here. Someone that can speak intelligently as to what the plan is to actually take all of this spent fuel. Kevin Canty replies, that is why I wanted to. We have no control over whether there is gong to be a federal or regional repository for this or any other spent nuclear fuel. That is beyond the ability of this panel or the Governor of the Commonwealth who we advise or other state agencies to control. However, there is I would think, a public interest in understanding the dry cask storage on the site currently, what the

possibilities with the current dry cask storage are, and the capacity or capability to ship it elsewhere should a destination become available to receive it. Jack Priest replies, the motion from Dr. Potvin then, is to provide an educational presentation with Holtec with some to be named expert on these are the casks that are at Plymouth, this is how they were made, this is how their monitored, this is how they potentially in the future exit the site. Kevin Canty replies, yes, correct. That is the limits of what we can directly or indirectly control. Pine duBois makes a comment. DOE has been working on and will continue to work on until they run out of whatever, a consent-based siting program. And, it's worth talking to DOE and bringing them in. And getting involved in that. So that we can have, move it along because we are one of the front line on nuclear decommissioning sites that have a big stake in not wanting to see something go awry in our neck of the woods. And that we know, it's not a permanent storage site, we know that for sure. So, what are you thinking and have them tell us, what they are thinking. So that we have a way to move forward with the Town of Plymouth to be able to move forward with what you want to do next and the communities that are around here. And the rest of us get a sense of understanding of o.k., what are you going to do with the 85-90% of fuel that is still in that thing. There is a lot to know and I think we could do it within that framework. Jack Priest replies, just to add to Pine's comment. I think we could do this in two steps. We could set up a couple of agenda items. One is the education of what is onsite, what was built there, how's it monitored. And then another presentation that Pine's talking about; what is the DOE's role, what is the future of how this process is going to go, going forward. And we are already going to be reaching out to the DOE for this grant money, right. Maybe we can connect those things and see if we can get them to have a speaker come up and talk about the DOE's role. Just a suggestion. Kevin Canty replies, understood. So, bringing the DOE or any federal agency or prospective regional repository in. That would have to be a separate agenda item. I think that is beyond the scope of what the dry cask is and can it be transported. So, we can take that up next. Mr. Lampert makes a comment, just to pick up on what Pine said about consent-based siting, DOE has funded wide ranging national and international study of that. There have been a number of meetings, not only throughout the United States but some involved Europe. We are learning from there on that particular subject. There is a major meeting planned for Denver in September on that subject. That will result in a report of what a lot of people have put a lot of thought into of the pluses and minuses of consent. And I would suggest that we get into that. Perhaps the people that were responsible for the study. We don't need DOE because they basically ran it, to be included. Kevin Canty replies, o.k., let's get back to dry cask storage. Mike Fortini makes comment, who will give the presentation on the dry cask storage. Is that something that Holtec is going to do. Kevin Canty replies, Holtec would be part of it and Dr. Potvin has a prospective speaker in mind as well. That I would circle back with him and review. Obviously that person needs to be available and consent; we don't have subpoena power or anything like that. Mr. Little has a comment. We have had concerns expressed about the security at the dry cask storage. And I understand it was inspected recently by the NRC in the report tonight. So, I would like to understand with this presentation, what are the security requirements and how are they met. I'm assuming they are in compliance since they were just inspected by the NRC in the last quarter. Barry Potvin makes motion. David Noyes seconds the motion.

(16 in favor, unanimous vote)

Department of Energy Guest Speaker

- Request for DOE speaker to come in and talk about repository and long-term storage. Pine duBois would rather not take it up right now. Pine duBois suggests seeing how we progress and take it up again in the future. Because there is active work going on right now. And people that have the time and wherewithal. It is worth looking at.

ADJOURN

- Mary Lampert makes motion to adjourn. Barry Potvin seconds the motion.
  (16 in favor, unanimous vote)