

NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING CITIZENS ADVISORY PANEL (“NDCAP”)

Monday May 19, 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 Project Director (in-person)
- Kelly O’Brien, Local 369 (in-person)
- Pine duBois, Speaker of the House of Representative Appointee (in-person)
- Mike Fortini, Senate Minority Leader Appointee (in-person)
- Mary Jo Gatslick, Vice Chair; Minority Leader of the Senate Appointee (in-person)
- Kevin Carty, 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)
- Mary Waldron, Representing Old Colony Planning Council (virtual)
- Jack Priest, Division Director of the Radiation Control Program for the Department of Public Health; Representing the Commissioner for Department of Public Health (virtual)
- Kris Callahan, Representing Executive Office of Health and Human Services (virtual)
- Greg Wade, Representing Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities Appointee (virtual)
- Andrew Gottlieb, Association to Preserve Cape Cod; Governor Baker Appointee (virtual)
- Kimberly Castle, Participating for David Bryant; Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency (virtual)

14 CMR 188.00

- First agenda item read by Kevin Carty; an act to promote energy diversity. Kevin Carty 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 on the General Court.

- James Lampert suggests that the statute be sent to NDCAP members for review. There is a lot of information to digest and it is recommended that the panel read the entire statute every few months for awareness of everything that is included in it. Kevin Carty confirms that the statute has been updated to the website. The NDCAP panel and general public are able to review at any time.

David Noyes (Holtec) provides an update:

WATERFALL/SWIM LANES CHART

- David Noyes refers to a change that has been made to the swim lanes chart compared to previous submissions. There are now columns for radiological and non-radiological on the report. The project milestones (top line) remain the same. The next major milestone will be the license termination plan scheduled for September of this year. No significant change to Radiological Decon./Dismantlement column (still working toward the demolition of the Reactor and Turbine Building beginning in 2031 and continuing in to 2034)
- For Reactor Segmentation; complete with the internals of reactor segmentation and continuing with the breakdown of tooling and equipment, and clean-up of the reactor cavity and dryer separator pit anticipating drain down of the water in the cavity and dryer separator pit in early June. For radiological characterization; continue with concrete sampling and soil sampling onsite. For spent fuel management; nothing new to report.
- Holtec continues to maintain custodial responsibility for the fuel casks in the greater than Class C waste. For site restoration; this will follow building demolitions. The topic of waste management will follow in a later slide.

ONGOING DEMOLITION UPDATE

- Holtec continues with the removal of the previous emergency planning zone sirens. The siren removals will be completed this week (112 of 113 sirens removed)
- Dismantlement and recycle of the previous main transformer; this transformer was at the site and took the 24,000-volt output of the main generator and stepped it up to 345,000 volts in order to be able to support the transmission on to the grid. The transformer is no longer required and photos on slide depict the cranes that were used in dismantlement.

UPCOMING DEMOLITION ACTIVITIES

- There are two asbestos abatement activities upcoming (working on approvals with MassDEP for the asbestos abatement activities)
 - Combined Intermediate Valves (Abatement Plan submission to MassDEP; May 2025 and Commence Abatement June 2025)
 - Gland Seal Condenser (Abatement Plan submission to MassDEP; May 2025 and Commence Abatement June 2025)

PILGRIM SITE MAP

- The map has not changed since the last meeting. There is still active demolition being shown in the retube building (light yellow) toward the center left of the picture. The remaining buildings show their current status.

ONSITE WATER VOLUME UPDATE

- Water volume onsite effective 5/15/25; 831,802 gallons; reduction since the last report from 844,037 gallons.
- Heaters in Spent Fuel Pool and Reactor Cavity remain de-energized.
- Plan to drain; 382,000 gallons from the reactor cavity and dryer separator pit to torus in June; that figure was previously 425,000 gallons.

REACTOR CAVITY DRAIN DOWN

- Spent Fuel Pool (SFP) will remain filled with water to support waste processing.
- 382,000 gallons drained from Rx Cavity and Dryer Separator Pit (DSP) to Torus.

REGULATORY UPDATE

- NRC 1st quarter 2025 Inspection Results; no findings of more than minor significance.
- Holtec submitted report on the Status of Decommissioning Funding for Reactors and ISFSI's 3/31/25; David Noyes will discuss it in a separate presentation.
- Submitted Annual Radiological Environmental Operating and Radioactive Effluent Release Reports on 5/14/25; David Noyes would be happy to discuss it at the next meeting.
- Surface Water Discharge Permit Amendment Denial: appeal hearings set to begin on 6/12/25.

SITE SOURCE TERM REDUCTION

- Holtec continues to transport some Class B and the majority of Class A waste as it is generated, bringing the total 2025 (year to date) of just under 18,000 cubic feet and 110 curies of activity. The total for the project of just under 300,000 cubic feet and over 2,000 curies of activity.

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS FOR DAVID NOYES (HOLTEC REPORT)

- Andrew Gottlieb has a question: what were the findings of minor significance and how many of them were there? David Noyes replies: that is standard language that the NRC identifies in the inspection report; comments and findings of significance. There were comments given on performance basically some things that the inspector saw onsite; some positive and some negative but none that rose to the level of a violation in NRC's regulatory space. Andrew Gottlieb replies: but how many of them were there? They thought they were worth noting so how many exceptions from the standard operating protocol were there that they thought were worth noting if not significant. David Noyes replies that he does not know the exact number. Holtec conducts daily debriefs when the NRC is onsite. So, we are continually taking that kind of feedback as opportunities to improve. Andrew Gottlieb replies: don't they as a matter of practice give you a written summation of their inspection report that indicates what they found, and if that's true, wouldn't that be the place where you were told any findings of how many minor significances there were. David Noyes replies: they only document items that are more than minor. Andrew Gottlieb replies: so, there is no way for anybody to know what the nature of that conversation was then. David Noyes replies: just the people that are privy to the conversation; the plant takes the

feedback and when necessary, we put it into our corrective action program in order to be able to make necessary improvements. Andrew Gottlieb confirms that the information discussed is not information that the public and members of the NDCAP panel would be privy to. David Noyes replies: that would be true. Andrew Gottlieb then asks: why mention it then? David Noyes replies: just to give you the results of the inspection whether there are findings of significance or not. We will always report out on that. Andrew Gottlieb then refers to the Waterfall chart and the mention of 2031 as the date when final demolition of the core reactor building will happen. What magic happens in 2031 that allows that to happen then? David Noyes replies: it is assuming that we have resolution on final disposition of the water. Andrew Gottlieb replies: does it assume what the outcome of that is. David Noyes replies: yes, it assumes a positive outcome and it assumes that we are permitted to be able to discharge that water. Andrew Gottlieb replies: and what if you are not. David Noyes replies: well, then we will have to make a change and adjustments to the schedule. Andrew Gottlieb replies: so, the schedule doesn't really have any value in terms of telling us what is going to happen given that you currently have a denial, right? David Noyes replies: well, it has underlying assumptions in it and it is continually being evaluated. Andrew Gottlieb replies: so, this schedule is now a best-case scenario that has you judicially overcoming DEP's denial, right and if that doesn't happen; we are looking at something after 2031? David Noyes replies: well, there are several stages to the process not just the MassDEP appeal but other legal avenues that are also available that could be included within that 2031 timeframe. Andrew Gottlieb replies: like what? David Noyes replies: like federal court. Andrew Gottlieb replies: that's what I said. You are assuming that the DEP action is judicially overturned in order for that date to hold. David Noyes replies: yes, at some stage, yes. Andrew Gottlieb replies: so, there is no plan at this point that you are willing to share that contemplates that not happening. David Noyes replies: that is not in our current schedule or estimate, no. Andrew Gottlieb replies: there is no plan other than overturning the DEP determination. David Noyes replies: it is not in our estimate, not in the schedule that we provided; the cost estimate and the schedule for activities. Andrew Gottlieb replies: but you do have a plan. David Noyes replies: there would certainly be other alternatives. We have talked about the alternatives that would be associated with the water disposition ultimately. Andrew Gottlieb replies: but the thing you are telling the public now is predicated on a reversal of the current regulatory determination. David Noyes replies: that's correct.

- James Lampert has a question: at the last meeting you had mentioned that you could provide cubic feet into tons and provide that information. David Noyes replies: I haven't got it yet, but I do have that request. James Lampert replies: when would you expect to get it. It has been five months. David Noyes replies: yes, I should have it by the next meeting. James Lampert asks: could you circulate that information even earlier if you have it? David Noyes replies: yes, if I do, I will. James Lampert references the last meeting where Holtec was asked to provide information on how much has been withdrawn from the decommissioning trust fund to pay legal expenses. David Noyes replies: yes, we have a separate agenda item for that topic. But we are not going to provide the information of legal expenses that have been paid from the decommissioning trust fund. James Lampert replies: do you report the withdrawal of legal expenses to the NRC? David Noyes replies: we make the information

available to them at their request. We provide the same written report that is docketed that I will report out here today and the NRC chooses to provide additional inspection if they deem it necessary. James Lampert replies: have you provided them the total of legal expenses? David Noyes replies: we have not been requested and not provided them with anything after their evaluation of our 2023 submittal. James Lampert replies: you mentioned the 382,000 volume gallons that will be diverted among other things to the torus, etc. David Noyes replies: yes. James Lampert replies: when will that happen? David Noyes replies: that will happen the first week in June. James Lampert replies: you also mentioned that you have submitted the effluent release report, and I assume that is for the calendar year 2024? David Noyes replies: that's correct. James Lampert replies: will you circulate that to the NDCAP panel please? David Noyes replies: yes, as soon as the NRC acknowledges receipt, then I can circulate that to the panel. James Lampert replies: when will that be sent in? David Noyes replies: it was sent in on April 15, 2025. James Lampert replies: and they have not yet acknowledged receipt, and we are over a month out? David Noyes replies: right, they have not. But I will check with them and see if they have done everything that they need to do with it and make it available. James Lampert replies: the last question I have, following up on Mr. Gottlieb; you have a number of options for disposing of this water. How many of those will permit you to dispose of it by 2031? David Noyes replies: the only one that I know of that supports building demolition by 2031 is liquid discharge; but I don't have any data that indicates that the other options would be options that are viable or that the company would select prior to 2031. James Lampert replies: I believe Holtec said that they all are viable so I guess my initial question is, could you evaporate all of the water by 2031? David Noyes replies: we have chosen not to evaporate the water. James Lampert replies: that's not my question. David Noyes replies: could we, yes. James Lampert replies: could you ship it offsite by 2031? David Noyes replies: yes, but we have chosen not to.

- Mary Lampert has a question and follow-up: if you do choose to ship it offsite, I would note that Vermont Yankee (sister plant of Pilgrim but run by a different company) chose to ship offsite and they are now starting to take down the reactor building. And so, your choice has delayed to a considerable degree, the decommissioning process getting to site release which obviously is an impact to Plymouth and will have an impact to the decommissioning trust fund. Mary Lampert comments: we asked that you circulate this report to the panel prior to the meetings. The intent was not ten minutes prior to the meeting but in enough time so that we could see what you are going to say, to do a little research so we can come up with questions. Do you intend to send the material prior to the meeting, within a week? David Noyes replies: I will send it at least day of as I did earlier today. I sent it this morning to the Chair which is the way I had sent it in the past. I won't send blanket communications to the entire committee because of concerns of making sure that everything is done properly. Mary Lampert replies: well, you could send it to the Chair more than the morning of. It would be a courtesy appreciated and a request. David Noyes replies: all I can commit to because it does have layers of internal approvals is to make sure that we are conveying accurate and transparent information and to get it the morning of. Mary Lampert replies: also, you started your presentation saying decontamination/dismantlement of radioactive and non-radioactive material.

In your presentation, you just talked about radioactive but not non-radioactive chemical and metals. David Noyes replies; right, so there are some activities that show on the new waterfall chart specifically the removal of non-radiological underground structures that you will see on the chart. The removal of the sub grade structures for non-radiological structures scheduled for 2029 and 2030. Mary Lampert replies: next question, there is a mixture of the contaminants. David Noyes replies: that would fall under the category of radiological. Mary Lampert replies: so, if it is chemical and radiological, it is listed under radiological. David Noyes replies: that's correct. So, the demolition of the reactor building structure would be under the radiological decon./dismantlement line. Mary Lampert replies: and then there is separate, just the chemical? You are assuming that there is no radiological mix. David Noyes replies: chemical or no hazard. So, there could be underground cable vaults, concrete building foundations that have no radiological contamination associated with them. They may or may not have hazardous material. Mary Lampert replies: you can see why I was confused.

- Pine duBois has a question: were you talking about the report that was released on May 14? David Noyes replies: yes. Pine duBois replies: is that available now to the rest of us, that I can get? David Noyes replies: as soon as I know that the NRC has received the report and accepted it, I'll make it available to everybody. I did look in Adams and it is not available in the NRC's Adams database yet. Pine duBois replies: and how about the comprehensive site assessment, is that available? I thought we were going to get that, and I have been looking for it but it might not have hit my email. David Noyes replies: the Phase II report. I'll get that posted to the decommissioning sharepoint (it is a large file) Pine duBois replies: do we have a decommissioning sharepoint? David Noyes replies: Holtec does. Pine duBois replies: will you send that sharepoint around? David Noyes replies: yes. I'll send around the link to it, public sharepoint. Pine duBois replies: I think that's great. And I just want to point out something that my colleague Ms. Lampert is pointing out; how quickly Vermont Yankee got rid of its waste but that facility has a rail yard there. They are capable of doing things that we are not capable of doing. You can't make that kind of stuff happen if you don't have the infrastructure.
- Mary Gatslick has a question for Mary Lampert: at the last meeting, you referred that the DOE had a problem related to waste shipments along Route 44 and indicated that you would get back to us; can you elaborate on that? Mary Lampert replies: it was an overpass that could not accommodate the height and therefore it would be necessary to take down the overpass if in fact Route 44 was going to be a choice. So, I understand the choice then was made to head down Route 3 to the canal and go that way. Mary Gatslick replies: I was trying to figure out where that overpass was on 44. Mary Lampert replies: I think that it is the first one. Mary Gatslick replies: on the new Route 44? Mary Lampert replies: yes, the new Route 44 and confirms that the information is in the DOE report. Mary Gatslick requests that Mary Lampert send a copy of the report to Kevin Carty so that he can share with the rest of the group. Mary Lampert replies: I will look for it but also think that David Noyes has it.
- Andrew Gottlieb has a follow-up question: would like to confirm that he heard David Noyes reply to James Lampert that Holtec would be able to evaporate by 2031 if they so choose. David Noyes replies: yes, we could certainly implement a technology independent of,

without the consideration we have currently given to radiological releases to evaporate at a much higher temperature and actively evaporate the water in order to eliminate that waste prior to 2031. Andrew Gottlieb replies: I am puzzled by that in the sense that you have had numerous attempts to get an estimate of evaporation rates and we have been told consistently for reasons that I don't understand that it was impossible. So, what is different about the analysis that you took in this instance to be able to make this assertion when in past times you have been unable or unwilling at least to give an estimate of the rate of evaporation and how long that would last. David Noyes replies: so, as I've discussed before, the inability to be able to make an estimate as to how long it will take to evaporate under the current set of conditions where we heat the water in order to be able to heat the buildings, results in a temperature of approximately 90-100 degrees of the water in the spent fuel pool. The amount of water evaporated is going to be significantly dependent on a number of conditions including humidity, environmental conditions, air flow over the surface of the water. If the plant were to actively engage in active evaporation of the water using a heating system that heated the water to 212 degrees; I could tell you exactly how much time it would take in order to be able to perform that evaporation because that is under a very controlled, very specific set of circumstances. Andrew Gottlieb replies: all of the elements that are constraining; the atmosphere, humidity, how much what is exposed and what isn't exposed; those all remain factors. So, they are noble with certainty in one scenario but utterly and completely and unable to be estimated under any other scenario. David Noyes replies: they are not. The humidity and ambient conditions don't come in to play in an active evaporation scenario. Andrew Gottlieb replies: by putting in the heating elements; you are actively (at a lesser rate); you are actively inducing a higher evaporation than the ambient condition would permit, correct? David Noyes replies: we are heating the water for the purposes of heating the buildings and that does result in higher amounts of evaporation, that is correct. Andrew Gottlieb replies: so, it is all a matter of degree, literally.

- Mary Gatslick has a question: in reference to Andrew Gottlieb's comments. The company does not plan to use evaporation. What you are doing right now, now that the heaters are off, is just natural evaporation which happens with every pool. And when you are heating, the water in the spent fuel pool is for the creature comfort of the people working up on the refuel pool and the rest of the building to keep people from being impacted by colder weather. So, it is frustrating to hear people talk about Holtec evaporating when that's not the case; you are not doing it under the carpet, correct? David Noyes replies: yes, that's correct. We have been very transparent on exactly what is going on at the plant subject to NRC inspections that were published. We have made the decision not to actively evaporate water to the degree that would result in large scale evaporation because it is less predictable deposition within the community beyond the site boundary. We have made the decision not to ship the water for disposal because we believe that is a violation of social justice principles and that its disposal results in three times the volume that the disposition via liquid discharge would; and the possibility of potential accidents associated with that transfer. So, we have made that decision in answer to your question, not to use either of those two methods for water disposition. Mary Gatslick replies: thank you for that clarification. I appreciate it.

- Mary Lampert makes a comment that she would not like just the viewpoint that was just expressed to be the only part of the public record. When you talk about social justice, transporting what is called low level radioactive waste according to you; potential violation of social justice but according to Holtec; transporting extremely high level of spent fuel from around the country to a potential interim storage site in New Mexico is the ultimate. James Lampert replies: the phrase Holtec uses is the epitome of social justice. Mary Lampert replies: the epitome of social justice. I see a conflict. I also see a conflict when asked to Holtec; transportation accidents; have there been transportation accidents anywhere? Oh no, it is very, very safe. Nobody has to worry about transportation accidents. So, to have trust, to have credibility, I think you ought to get off that whole line. I think that's important because it doesn't make sense. Out of one mouth, you are saying one thing and out of another mouth here, you are saying another thing. That is just a piece of advice.
- Kevin Carty reminds the panel that they should not speak until being recognized so that the meeting can be held in an orderly manner. He has asked the panel not to interject without being recognized.
- Mary Gatslick makes a comment to Mary Lampert: when you are talking shipping dry waste versus shipping liquids; they are totally different scenarios. As you know, if you have a hazardous waste spill, it is harder to clean-up (any kind of spill) it is harder to clean-up a liquid than a solid. I'm confident and from my experience, because I was working in rad waste shipping before. I know what goes into packaging that material. I'm not worried about that stuff going down the road. I'm more concerned about water going down the road or other liquid waste going down the road (not even radioactive). If you go by tankers all the time, it's really hard to remediate a site when there is a liquid. It is easy to remediate a site when it is a solid that you can pick up, scrape up from the ground. I think that people need to understand that. The public needs to understand that there is a big difference. And they need to hear both sides of the argument not just the oh it's bad, bad, bad. These people take pride; the safety of the public is of the utmost when they are packaging rad waste shipments. They are dry active waste (all solid), easy to pick up, the transport casks are robust, they have been through impact, they have been through studies. So, it's frustrating to me to not give the whole story instead of just cherry picking it here and there. And I'm done, thank you.
- Mary Lampert makes a comment to Mary Gatslick: however, guess what; you can't get it out of Cape Cod Bay and you can't get it out of the air. So, if you are talking about getting a liquid spill granted it is difficult, but it can be done. If you drop a spent fuel pool cask or more likelihood whether it is attacked by a terrorist attack; then you are in real trouble although it is solid. So, I'm not going to get into an argument to upset you about picking up. I just want to make the point; you can't get it out of Cape Cod Bay if you dump it there and you can't get it out of the air if you evaporate it. So, I think, evaporation or dumping in the bay presents a greater problem.
- Mary Gatslick makes a comment to Mary Lampert: you realize as you are breathing in tritium, it is a naturally occurring isotope. It is out there right now in the Bay as a naturally occurring isotope. Human bodies are great; we live on a radioactive planet. They are marvelous at taking that kind of exposure and not being impacted by it.

- Kevin Carty makes a comment to David Noyes: following up on the NRC Report not being on Adams yet. He is looking for clarification that this is a database of some kind and is it accessible by members of the NDCAP panel and to the public. David Noyes confirms: yes, it is.
- James Lampert makes a comment: he would like to point out that Adams can be a horrible instrument to try to find anything. If you google the Holtec financial report, you can avoid the agony of Adams.

APRIL 25 MASSACHUSETTS CONTINGENCY PLAN (MCP) REPORT

- Presentation given by Matthew Daly (Environmental Consultant at Environmental Resources Management) joined by colleague John Grabinski who is the LSP for the ongoing MCP activities at the parcels displayed on the site map.
- MCP Phase II Comprehensive Site Assessment Report submitted to MassDEP on April 21, 2025, This MCP Phase II report summarizes the results of recent site investigation activities on two parcels of land that are owned by HDI. Those two parcels include 140-acre Industrial parcel which is the parcel where the former power plant was operating and generating electricity where there is an associated number of support buildings and parking lots. This report also documents recent investigation activities completed on the outer perimeter area number three, which is the parcel in white on the map (south/southeast) of the Industrial parcel which is along Powerhouse Road. It goes all the way as far south as State Road in Plymouth.
- This report that ERM submitted in April documents 28 new soil borings that had been advanced at both parcels over the last several years. 16 of these soil borings were drilled and installed on the Industrial Parcel to allow ERM to collect soil samples as well as soil samples from 5-8 feet below ground surface. As well as for PERA-3; there were 12 locations where soil borings were recently installed for the collection of soil samples. The report documents 9 new monitoring wells were drilled, constructed and installed (PERA-3); Groundwater Sampling at the site (over 60 monitoring wells) completed in October 2023, November 2024 and February 2025 for non-radiological constituency. Those results are all documented in this report.
- MCP Phase II Report Highlights; Eight underground storage tanks (USTs) that were formerly at the site have been removed from the Industrial Parcel; no soil impacts during removal of the tanks. The chart displays the number of tanks, capacity of gallons and removal dates. There was an LSP and Plymouth Fire Department onsite while these tanks were being removed. PFAS continues to be detected in the groundwater. The most common source of PFAS is aqueous firefighting foam. There is no history of this foam at either the Industrial parcel or PERA-3 parcel. ERM also followed up with the Plymouth Fire Department and there was no history of using aqueous firefighting foams at this site. At the Industrial parcel, variability in the individual PFAS compounds indicating the most likely source is leaching from various materials in numerous products at the site. At PERA-3; 7 monitoring wells were just sampled for PFAS and there is only one monitoring well that has PFAS in it. ERM will continue to do quarterly samples for the remainder of this calendar year (monitoring wells at Industrial parcel and monitoring wells at PERA-3)

- The next slide depicts PFAS in Groundwater- Industrial Parcel. The map displays locations of the monitoring wells and the results of PFAS that were analyzed from the monitoring wells in February 2025. The red groundwater wells depict that the level is above the MA drinking water standard for PFAS. The black groundwater wells on the site map depict that the level was found to be below the MA drinking water standard. All drinking water at the site is being supplied by the Town of Plymouth and the water division in town. The table at the bottom of the slide depicts the MA groundwater standards in relation to PFAS.
- Other constituents in groundwater are isolated to one monitoring well location or have not been consistently detected over time; Benzo(a)pyrene, arsenic, vanadium, cadmium and lead. These will be part of the quarterly groundwater monitoring for the rest of this calendar year.
- Polychlorinated biphenyls detected in three of six soil piles in PERA-3. The origin of the soil piles is unknown dumping. HDI is planning to remove the soil piles in 2025 following EPA Toxic Substance Control Act (TSCA) and MCP reporting requirements.
- MCP Interim Risk Characterizations; Interim, in that current conditions do not reflect the “end state” of the property. Risk characterization will be re-performed after all demolition activities have been complete, access for additional characterization completed, and final site restoration activities underway.
- MCP Deadlines and the Settlement Agreement; MCP includes deadlines for completing comprehensive response activities; General MCP Timelines from MassDEP including reports to complete the MCP process. These parcels started in late 2020 and continued in to 2021. First report was in 4/22 (Tier Classification; Phase I Investigation Report); Phase II report filed in 4/25; looking forward to 4/26 (Phase III Remedial Action Alternatives and Phase IV Implementation of Remedial Alternative) and 4/27 (issue a Temporary Solution Statement under the MCP process). The 2020 settlement agreement also includes additional provisions for Site Restoration and Environmental Requirements. Based on current decommissioning schedule; Partial Site Release in 2035. Years 2025-2035; continued site characterization and risk characterization as decommissioning progresses; Year 2035 Permanent Solution Statement (consistent with Settlement Agreement and MCP)

QUESTIONS FOR ERM PRESENTERS

- Mary Gatslick has a couple of questions: you indicated that you have a bunch of new soil borings and a bunch of new monitoring well samples. When will the results of those samples be available for the panel to look at. Matthew Daly replies; all of those results are in that comprehensive site assessment report; that Phase II report. Mary Gatslick replies: excellent. Second question; you mentioned PFAS. How does the level of PFAS onsite compare with the amount of PFAS in Plymouth drinking water. Matthew Daly replies: if you look at the Town of Plymouth PFAS data on their website, the Plymouth Water Division. We also took samples directly from taps at the actual Industrial parcel. So, the numbers that we have in groundwater are higher than what are coming in from the Town of Plymouth or what Plymouth is reporting on their website. But there are a number of fire water lines at the site. There has been a history of fire water testing. So, when we see very low levels of PFAS in groundwater at this site, it could be associated with town water. When we see the numbers that we had identified in red, there is something specific that is driving those PFAS

concentrations. You know operations of a nuclear power plant does not result in the production of PFAS chemicals or does not require use of PFAS chemicals to generate that electricity or transmit that electricity. And again, with no history of aqueous firefighting foam activities at the site; we are thinking that there is a lot of PFAS research going on right now across the globe. And what people are seeing is that there is no shortage of consumer product materials that are manufactured that have PFAS in them. At this site, there are a lot of buried electrical cables, buried communication cables that were designed to be in the ground for forty plus years and those cables all have plastic wrappings on the outside of them to prevent heat or corrosion. So, it is not unlikely that a lot of that buried material that was part of products to safeguard the plant and allow the safe operation of the plant; may be built with PFAS that is ultimately leaching out to the water table. Mary Gatslick replies: thank you very much. I appreciate that. Kevin Carty replies: for clarity for folks at home or in the audience that are concerned about the drinking water in Plymouth. One of the Select Boards many duties is being water commissioner so although there are trace contents of PFAS in the drinking water in this community as well as many other communities; sole source aquifer is not contaminated with PFAS; neither does the airport or the Plymouth Fire Department use PFAS in fire protection which is a common source as was alluded to taking out a fire or dealing with a fire. Airports often use them. Neither the airport nor the Fire Department uses them for viewers at home that may be concerned about that.

- Mary Lampert has a couple of questions: you started out by talking about eight underground tanks and I gather they had oil. My question: in monitoring for the tanks, are you also monitoring for the feeders from the tank? Matthew Daly replies; yes, there are all of those decommissioning activities; the removal of those tanks as well as the lines that go from those tanks into the buildings or wherever that fuel/diesel is being used. That's all removed and that's all documented in those reports. Mary Lampert replies: I understand that they have been removed; but for soil sampling and testing; whether there were leaks from the feeders. Are you testing for that in addition to leaks potentially from the tanks themselves. Matthew Daly replies; so, when they removed the tanks from the ground, you have a visual and the ability to assess the side walls in the bottom underneath where the tank was; essentially, they call it a tank grave. So, at that time, there are field meters that's used to assess if there is any contamination in the soil. There is visual assessment; fuel oils and diesels usually give a pretty strong odor. So, there is testing that is completed. And then again, we have a lot of monitoring wells around where all of these tanks were historically. And those monitoring wells have been sampled for fuels (petroleum in groundwater) and there is no detection in those water samples. So, based on the lack of observations of petroleum, diesel fuel oil in the tank graves as well as the lack of petroleum detections in groundwater in the nearby monitoring wells. The lines of evidence suggest that the tanks have not been historic releases to the environment. Mary Lampert replies: or the feeders. Matthew Daly replies: correct. Mary Lampert comments: for PFAS, it seems to be, a large assumption that it's associated with fire equipment materials. What about the use of fertilizers? I know it's not landscaping special around the plant. But there certainly is a lot of grass, mulch and that sort of stuff which has been a big issue, fertilizers. Matthew Daly replies: right, I would have to look specifically at where they have mulched, where they have put landscaping down. I'm trying to think off the top of my head to the South of the site;

that's all, most of these wells are in asphalt. If not, all of them. So, there is really not much vegetation and landscaping over where those monitoring wells are detecting PFAS. Mary Lampert replies: certainly, but the slope of the land would mean if the landscaping was upgradient; it would go down potentially to the wells. What standard are you using for PFAS because we know the standards may be changing. So, what year standard are you adhering to whether there is a problem with the PFAS or there isn't. Matthew Daly replies: we are using for a laboratory technique, we are using analytical method 1633 which is what EPA and DEP would be looking for in 2024/2025 timeframe. If you look historically, there were other analytical methods that would give you less number of PFAS actually analyzed in those water samples. So, we are using the most up to date analytical technique for PFAS and we are comparing them to the existing Massachusetts DEP regulatory standards for the three different criteria they have in the state. Mary Lampert replies: so, that has been changed. Will that be the standard or will the standard be changed as the time of site release happens. Matthew Daly replies: if DEP changes the standard, they will provide guidance to the industry such as the site, as how to move from an older standard to that new standard whether they speak the same language or whether there are steps to be involved. They would dictate that process. Mary Lampert replies: so, it could be flexible. My last question: because PFAS is a forever chemical and in talking about drinking water standards, we know that Pilgrim rests upon the second largest aquifer in the state and we also know there are private wells in properties that are on the periphery. So, how are you adjusting the drinking water standard in relation to those facts. If the PFAS is not removed to a drinking water standard, then you are potentially not being precautionary for offsite wells that would be used for drinking or potentially over a period of time; dealing with a forever chemical that it could leach down to the aquifer that may be used in the future for drinking water. That's my issue. Matthew Daly replies: those are aspects that we are going to have to work in to this next MCP report that we talked about. We are still going through characterization and understanding what's out there as far as what the final disposition of that PFAS is; that's something that will be part of that Phase III, Phase IV report and that ultimate risk characterization that I talked about. Mary Lampert replies: o.k., thanks a lot.

- Andrew Gottlieb has a question: early on you talked about the licensed tosca disposal sites. Do you know where these materials are going to be disposed of ultimately? Matthew Daly replies: so, the EPA publishes a list of tosca landfills. We haven't identified the specific one that it has to go to, but it has to go to a tosca landfill because the fact that we do not know the source of the PCB's that are in those soil piles. Andrew Gottlieb replies: how is that transported to those locations? Matthew Daly replies: that will be a truck, multiple trucks. Andrew Gottlieb replies: and are there any in Massachusetts? Or, are you going to have to travel far? Matthew Daly replies: I would be surprised if there are any in Massachusetts that are open. It is likely going to have to be New England. But we are still in the evaluation stage. What we do know is that it has to go to a tosca landfill though. Andrew Gottlieb replies: and what goes in to making your determination about where it goes and which one you choose? Matthew Daly replies: so, each landfill if they want to be certified as a tosca landfill, they have to get all of their regulations and their approvals through EPA. They have their own process through EPA. And then what HDI would do is essentially hire a transportation company to move that soil from that PERA-3 property to one of those

landfills that is regulated by EPA and has a compliant EPA tosca landfill. Andrew Gottlieb has question for HDI: is social justice going to be a criteria in deciding which trucking landfill you go to? David Noyes replies: it would. Andrew Gottlieb replies: oh good, good to be consistent. Thank you.

- James Lampert has a question: this report, which I see is dated April. Matthew Daly replies; yes, April 21, 2025. James Lampert replies: could you send a copy of that to this panel? Matthew Daly replies: yes, Dave Noyes talked about it earlier. David Noyes replies: it is too large to send. We will post it to the HDI Decommissioning webpage. James Lampert replies: because obviously DEP did not send us any information as far as I know about it. I don't think anyone on this panel without the possible exception of the Chair has seen any of the slides before tonight and that puts me and I would hope a number of the other panel members in the uncomfortable position of frankly, to listen to what you are not being told. And we have seen several examples tonight and I expect we will see more as we go forward; situations in which we simply don't get the information such as this report; in sufficient time to look at it and figure out what questions are left open. Can you do anything to help us going forward on that? Get us the information earlier before we get another presentation like this that frankly won't have the report in it. David Noyes replies: that is my responsibility. I'll make sure that any of the reports that are made to the state get posted to the webpage. James Lampert replies: having never seen the report and not even seeing the slides tonight. I, and I expect a number of people are at a serious disadvantage in understanding what is or is not there. David Noyes replies: we can certainly follow up and answer questions once you have had the opportunity to review the report. James Lampert replies: please.
- Pine duBois has a question; I just want to be sure that I have the location right in my head. Is this on the transmission line on the access road on the west side of Rocky Hill Road. Matthew Daly replies: is it on the west side of the PERA-3 PCB; is that the question. Pine duBois replies: yes. Matthew Daly replies: it is, if you are coming down Powerhouse Road; it's on the west side of that. There is an actual dirt road that I think is an easement to allow the transmission; the high-power tension line company to go out to access their equipment. And so, there is a gate currently. I don't know how long that gate has been there for but you can't get a vehicle through there, that dirt road unless you have a key to that gate. But it's down that dirt road, where those 6 soil piles are before you get to the high-power tension line (overhead power lines). Pine duBois replies: if there is any information out there (I did report this to DEP a very long time ago). Can we call you or something? Matthew Daly replies: sure. Pine duBois replies: o.k. And am I clear that you are going to remove that soil, but you aren't going to do it right away because you need to do a couple of other things first; as well as find a location. Matthew Daly replies: correct, yes. Pine duBois replies: thanks very much. And one other thing: in your report; do you have a ground watershed boundary there that might help us help you figure things out. Matthew Daly replies: we do have maps that show the direction of groundwater flow based on monitoring wells on the PERA-3 property as well as monitoring wells on the Industrial property. So, it's a map based on facts. Pine duBois replies: great. I appreciate it, thanks very much. And I'm really glad that you pursued this. It's going to answer a lot of things for a lot of people.

- Mary Lampert has a comment: I noted that you specified testing for non-radiological, but this is a nuclear power plant. So, what about the testing for radiological? Is that part of your report or is somebody else doing this? David Noyes replies: it is being done as part of the characterization process. Mary Lampert replies: you mean that Holtec is responsible for the radionuclide and this group is the non-radiological. What are you saying? David Noyes replies: that's correct. Under the NRC's jurisdiction, we are responsible for identification characterization of radiological hazards. We are also responsible for the non-radiological but through the intervention of the Licensed Site Professional. Mary Lampert replies: so even though the state has specified in the settlement agreement that the state standard should be less than 10, it's up to the licensee to determine compliance. David Noyes replies: it's up to the licensee to determine compliance and the NRC's assessment of performance to the standard. So, they will come in and do their own sampling consistent with ours and verify that the license termination plan is consistent with the results. Mary Lampert replies: I think that is an important piece of information. My second question: in Parcel 3, there has been a concern about what has been called midnight dumping in Parcel 3 of chemical waste in what is called the donut hole. It is called the donut hole because Entergy (one of the employees from Entergy) made a private contract to plant trees over where the dumping occurred. The trees died. One can assume; perhaps it didn't like the toxic material underneath it. I understand from the previous report, the only monitoring that was done was east and because nothing was seen in those monitoring wells; it was declared to be not a problem. However, that was based on the assumption that if packaging was there, it had not ruptured. So the question; is there stuff there that could rupture; five years, ten years, tomorrow; was never answered. So, what are you going to do about that? Matthew Daly replies: so, we have soil samples and monitoring wells installed in the areas that the linear trees show up on the aerial photographs. And essentially those soil samples and groundwater samples are indicating no impact. Mary Lampert replies: what are you going to do to determine whether currently intact packaging is there? There has been so much information, discussion, parking lot gossip (whatever you want to call it) and threats actually to people bringing this up. So, it deserves to be looked at. David Noyes replies: we have repeatedly asked that if you have any information regarding that, that you make that available to us. The forester tells us and the forester has been involved with the property forever. All of the plantings have been done based on fire. There has never been any planting associated with any blight or anything else that killed trees. Mary Lampert replies: well it's too bad Jack Priest isn't here because he had discussed it with us. Are you here Jack? Jack Priest replies: I agree with David. We can't act on parking lot rumors or hearsay. I default to the forester that's been associated with that property to give us the assessment of what was found on the ground or what the history is. If there is a legitimate concern about something else, then those facts need to be evaluated and assessed. Mary Lampert replies: and it's called a shovel. Someone could dig down and put the subject to sleep. David Noyes replies: how do you decide where to dig. Mary Lampert replies: where the donut hole is. It's called google. David Noyes replies: I've looked at aerial photos. I've walked the area; there isn't any area except the 6 PCB piles that I would even identify as disturbed soil. So, I don't know where we would dig. If you have information, please bring it forward. We will do whatever we have to do to investigate it. We want to make sure if there

is something there; that we identify it and we take care of it. Mary Lampert replies: I can discuss it privately because there were serious threats to people who brought it forward. Serious threats.

DECOMMISSIONING FUND UPDATE

- David Noyes provides an update with slide presentation. HDI submitted its annual trust fund evaluation report on March 31, 2025. The Decommissioning Trust Fund value (effective December 31, 2024) is \$484.7 million. There have been no material changes to milestone schedule or project cost in 2024. Assumptions Regarding Rates for Decommissioning Costs, Rates of Earnings on Funds, and Other Factors Used in Funding Projections; HDI has assumed a 2% real rate of return each year, in accordance with the requirements that are in the NRC Regulation 10 CFR 50.75 (e)(1)(i)
- Remaining Project Cost is until Spent Fuel Removed from Property which Totals: \$557 million. License Termination Cost (\$212 million); Spent fuel management (\$330 million); and Site Restoration (\$15 million)
- The current schedule has Major Decommissioning and Partial Site Release completed in 2035 with a remaining Decommissioning Trust Fund balance of \$246.9 million.
- Spent fuel is scheduled to be removed from the site in 2063. The remaining project cost in accordance with the Decommissioning Cost Estimate (DCE) and assuming a 2% real rate of return each year (2025-2063) will have a remainder of \$75.3 million in the fund when the NRC licenses (Part 50 & Part 72) are terminated.
- State Agreement; the value Prior to Partial Site Release: Project less than \$193.3 million at the point of Partial Site Release results in a triggering event for Holtec to make up the difference (HDI not projected to trigger this in 2035 with \$246.9 million in Decommissioning Trust Fund. After Partial Site Release: Project less than amount necessary for spent fuel management “Phase II” Minimum Balance (Exhibit 1 of the agreement) results in a triggering event for Holtec to make up the difference (HDI not projected to trigger this 2035-2063) Holtec confirms that there is adequate money in the fund to complete decommissioning at the plant. Through partial site release and continuation onto fuel management with the current license through 2063. Holtec meets all of the requirements; both federal and state between Holtec, HDI and the Commonwealth. David Noyes makes comment: Holtec will not be making public the amount spent on legal costs. The Chair had asked for that information to be made available at the last meeting.

QUESTIONS FOR DAVID NOYES (DECOMMISSIONING FUND UPDATE)

- James Lampert has a question: this report entitled Annual Decommissioning Funding and Spent Fuel Management Status and Financial Assurance Report. Did you provide that to this panel? David Noyes replies: I did not provide it to this panel, no. James Lampert replies: another example of what I was talking about earlier tonight. Another question: if you look at the fund balance presently \$484.7 million; there is a gap of about \$75 million between what is now in the fund and the projected cost going forward. One number is \$484.7 million, and the other is \$557 million. David Noyes replies: and that is accounted for in the 2% growth of the fund over time. James Lampert replies: that is on accounted for but what about the estimated costs. When you filed your original PSDAR, you estimated the

costs in 2019 dollars and did not provide for any inflation. Over the years, you have had to adjust those costs to account for inflation. Do you recall what adjustments you've made and what amount of inflation. David Noyes replies: I don't know what figure that we put in respect to inflation for costs. I do know that this is accurate data as of the filing. James Lampert replies: it is accurate data; that the inflation was fairly close to the increase in the Decommissioning Trust Fund based on previous reports. Obviously, the Decommissioning Trust Fund does not have a constant rate of return. On what basis do you assume that the costs of decommissioning will not increase with inflation. David Noyes replies: we continually assess those costs based on the work that we have ahead of us; labor rates, what we expect it's going to take to perform those work activities based on what it's costing other people to do similar activity. James Lampert replies: then why are those numbers and adjustments for expected inflation not reflected in the costs in the paper you filed. David Noyes replies: they are. James Lampert replies: no sir, they are not. David Noyes replies: yes, they are. James Lampert replies: these are all constant in 2024 dollars. That does not account for inflation. David Noyes replies: they are normalized to the baseline figure. But they account for the cost to actually perform the work in the current market. James Lampert replies: well, let me just give you an example. And I'm looking at spent fuel management costs. Spent Fuel Management costs, you estimate in 2036; will be \$8.2 million dollars. That number does not change up to 2063. Is your estimate saying there will be no increase in spent fuel management costs over thirty years. David Noyes replies: that is the assessment of what it's going to take to continue to maintain the spent fuel management costs. James Lampert replies: you honestly expect there will be no inflation in spent fuel management costs between 2036-2063. David Noyes replies: that's the assessment of providing adequate money to be able to complete the work. James Lampert replies: so, that's Holtec's assessment and I assume that is what the NRC requires you to tell us. I'm glad that I don't do my accounting that way. One other question: in 2063, you show no spent fuel management costs after that date, is that correct? David Noyes replies: that's correct. Mary Lampert comments: where does it go? James Lampert comments: that makes the assumption that everything will be offsite by 2063. Am I correct? David Noyes replies: it does. James Lampert replies: what if it is not. Where is the money? David Noyes replies: the fund still has a value of \$75 million at that point. James Lampert replies: and what if the fund has \$75 million in 2063, where is that \$75.3 million going to go? In the Holtec profit? David Noyes replies: if the fuel still needs to be maintained, the fuel will be maintained. Holtec will do what it has to do to maintain custodial responsibility of the fuel. James Lampert replies: so, can I take that as a commitment by Holtec that it will pay whatever spent fuel management costs are incurred between now and the date of the last day the fuel actually leaves the site. David Noyes replies: I'm sure that is going to be something that will be subject to litigation. I can't make that statement here. James Lampert replies: so, Holtec will not commit to paying spent fuel management costs after 2063. David Noyes replies: I can't make that commitment.

- Andrew Gottlieb has a question: you said the future cost estimate going forward were based on today's cost and others doing similar activity. David Noyes replies: that's correct. Andrew Gottlieb replies: is that another way of saying that you are holding those costs fixed at today's current rate. David Noyes replies: no. It means that we are continuously

evaluating them because based on technology, those costs can go up or down. We are assessing what it would take to perform that work, best estimate in the window that it's currently scheduled. Andrew Gottlieb replies: but that's based on current costs from others. How is that adjusted for future changes up or down on technology improvements or any other factors. Or is it just a space holder on what you estimated to be today in today's dollars and you will change it later depending on what happens. David Noyes replies: no. It's based on the best information available of what it's going to take to do that work when it is scheduled. So, if there is any intelligence that indicates that it's going to be more or less, that is applied to that figure. Andrew Gottlieb replies: what is the intelligence about a future base rate of inflation going forward. David Noyes replies: I don't know. We have individuals with Holtec that make those financial projections just like any other business. Andrew Gottlieb replies: o.k. but maybe you can or can't, there is a fundamental factor at a baseline that some on this committee think is a reasonable thing to be able to articulate. I'm not asking you to project what the technology changes might be; it is a simple rate of inflation that gets factored into a formula, and you can't tell us that. So, how are we supposed to evaluate for ourselves other than a trust me basis whether these assertions about long term solvency of this fund are valid. David Noyes replies: I would trust the fact that the state determined the assurance that it needed was to receive copies of the financial report using proven industry practices to assess what it's going to take to complete the job, getting copies of that report and verifying that using those accounting practices, that there is going to be adequate monies available both at partial site release and through spent fuel management in 2063. That is the assurances that the state needed. I think that should be sufficient for this committee. Andrew Gottlieb replies: so, you are saying that the state has signed off on this financial report? David Noyes replies: the state determined what level of assurance it needed. The level of assurance it needed through the state agreement was to receive this report. The state did not request independent audits. They did not request anything outside of the NRC's process to verify that there was going to be adequate money left for decommissioning. The state felt comfortable enough to sign off on the agreement. Andrew Gottlieb replies: but this report reports a conclusion without reviewing the assumptions that go into it. So, the state signed off on it because the NRC apparently says o.k. But nobody knows what the assumptions are, other than you and the NRC that resulted in saying that you met the standard. For all we know: you backed into it and your assumptions about inflation are a function of mathematics to make the equation come out right. So, you can say, everybody is good without any realistic connection to reality. So, this is a continual and repetitive shortcoming in this presentation. A fundamental question about what the assumptions are that go into the report are never provided to us. And maybe the state is o.k. with it and maybe they aren't. If they are, then I question their judgement. And I don't understand why every year this comes up and we have this conversation. We can't get underneath the most fundamental things that are the basis of making a formula come out the way you want it to come out. David Noyes replies: it happens in every business. There are accounting practices that are applied to these kind of business assessments all the time. Andrew Gottlieb replies: and I think most of the time in my personal and professional experience you say when you do assume. You talk about what your revenue cost estimate inflator is and you ask what is your assessment on the spending

side. My general experience is they have an answer. You either don't or you refuse to give it. So, sure there are basic standards. We could argue about those. But we don't know what they are. So, the outcome is some formula that nobody has any basis understanding. And we are basically told, this is what Holtec came up with and the NRC said o.k. so that should be good enough for you. Pardon me if it's not good enough for me. And I doubt it's good enough for a lot of other people. It's insulting.

- James Lampert has a comment: David Noyes says several times that the state was satisfied. I question the basis for that. You have to recognize what everybody on the panel should recognize; this was a negotiated agreement. What is in that agreement is what the state was able to get Holtec to agree to. It is a giant leap to say that the state was satisfied with all of the information that Holtec, in its judgement, was willing to give to the state. My comment is: I believe at the last meeting; there was a suggestion (it may have been by the Chair) that Holtec bring in someone who really understands all of the financials of where these came from and who can get into the detail of what assumptions did you make and what assumptions did you not. I think it is quite clear that we are not getting that information from anything that is on the paper or anything that we have heard tonight.
- Mary Lampert has a comment: I would also add there were two motions filed opposing approval of the sale from Entergy to Holtec. One by the Attorney General on behalf of the Commonwealth. And the other by Pilgrim Watch. Both focus on the insufficiency of the funds. You can read both motions online and the expert testimony, for example, that the Attorney General had pointing out all of the potential problems where they saw that there would be insufficient funds. What happened? What happened was, despite the fact that those motions both by the Commonwealth and by Pilgrim Watch had yet to be heard by NRC. NRC pulled the end game and approved the sale despite ongoing motions that had not been heard saying well, if you want to go forward anyway, after we approved it; then do so. Obviously, it would be a waste of time. So, the Commonwealth decided that they would drop their motions. And we did also. And fight the next battle the next day. But, to have the public say that the Commonwealth was all smiles and happy; is an inaccurate portrayal and I would advise you to read the motion and the expert testimony provided by the Commonwealth. David Noyes replies: please do not put words in my mouth. I didn't say that the state was all smiles. I said that the state approved the agreement because they believe that it gave them adequate financial assurance. Or else they wouldn't have signed it. Mary Lampert replies: I was just disagreeing with that conclusion. I didn't think they were smiling. That was just a phrase. Apologize if you thought that was what you thought I said. I was disagreeing with the fact that they approved and technically put their signature to the paper. Were there concerns; did that indicate their concerns were satisfied, no.

INTERAGENCY WORK (IWG) REPORT

- Jack Priest is not representing the IWG in the meeting and has nothing to add. James Lampert asks Kevin Carty if he knows the timing of Seth Pickering replacement for these meetings. Kevin Carty replies: I do not.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

- Review of meeting minutes including edits and corrections from March 24, 2025 meeting. David Noyes makes motion to approve the meeting minutes. Kelly O'Brien seconds the motion (13 in favor; 2 abstentions; the motion passes)

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 Elaine Dickinson. The statement begins by referencing the March meeting and request for the NDCAP panel to advise the Governor to enforce the state environmental laws and regulations concerning Holtec's illegal radioactive airborne pollution discharge as an alternative to dumping directly into the Bay. Considering the Town of Plymouth's election this past Saturday where 86.8 percent of the people in this Town directed the town government to communicate with the Governor, the Attorney General, the State Legislature and all other relevant authorities to employ all means available to ensure that the law is enforced and to ensure further that Holtec immediately cease the gaseous discharge of the radioactive and chemically contaminated industrial wastewater. I ask that this be put in the written report and follow through for all of us who are watching especially considering this overwhelming vote in this town for 86.8 percent for direct communication with the Governor. Many of you are appointed by people in the Legislature or by the Governor or by the Attorney General or by the Town Selectboard and so forth. I asked for that last time, 2 months ago. Has there been a reply? Did it get reported? Kevin Carty replies: the panel reports to the Governor on an annual basis; any comments that are made in the meeting minutes or submitted online are submitted in that regard and included in those annual reports. So, your comments from last time and this time will be in there. In regard to question 2 that was in the town wide ballot; that was directed not towards the NDCAP but towards the government of the town of Plymouth. And just for members of the public that may not be aware of what question 2 was, it was a non-binding citizen's petition by Save our Bay coalition that was put on the town wide ballot. Plymouth just had its election last Saturday. As the speaker said, the quantum of vote was overwhelmingly in support (6,938 voted yes; 638 voted no) on a question as to whether members of the electorate wanted to support the town government communicating with elected officials and state agencies concerning Holtec and the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station in Plymouth. In regard to communicating with the Governor, the Attorney General, State Legislature and any other relevant authorities to employ all means available to ensure that the law is enforced and ensure further that Holtec immediately cease the gaseous discharge of radioactive and chemically contaminated industrial water at Pilgrim. So, the town of Plymouth continues to have regular (we don't speak to the Governor as often as we would like), we do speak to members of our state delegation very commonly and very frequently as well as when relevant to regulatory agencies and when needed; we do speak to the Attorney General's Office. We have been doing that consistently throughout the process. We will continue to do that as issues come along but certainly the town of Plymouth takes very seriously the health and safety of our residents, our visitors and our surrounding communities as well. We realize that while we are the host community to the power station,

we also have a responsibility to the general area as well for what happens there. So, we have and will continue to do so. We also certainly recognize the overwhelming support of our electorate in terms of wanting us to do so. So, we will continue to do that. So, we (the town) are not dependent on this annual report structure. As I said, we don't get to talk to the Governor as much as I would like but when we have the opportunity to talk to any of those listed or any other relevant state or federal. We have had meetings with the NRC before too. We will continue to do that. Elaine Dickinson replies: but just the fact that the vote was so overwhelming that it should send a message to each one of you individually of how the people here feel. Never mind about all the other towns that are also voting. But just this town that hosts the plant. Thank you.

- Second 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 if you swallowed it would be equal to the radiation dose received in one banana. In March of 2023, Mr. Noyes reported that the total tritium stored in approximately 900,000 gallons is about 12 curies or equal to two exit signs; that's the amount of tritium; two exit signs. But I did a google AI into the calculations over again. There are over two million of these tritium exit signs throughout the United States. They are easy to buy online (under \$300). The amount of tritium that I calculated was about one half the amount that's still in the water. So, one half of one of those is all that is in the 900,000 gallons. That's how much tritium is in there. 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. In the 2022 article by Paul Miller entitled celebrating decommissioning of Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, a progress report, reports the social value in celebrating decommissioning will benefit the town of Plymouth by enabling the revenues; the bulk of the 1600-acre property to be repurposed; helping to replace the lost revenues of the tax base from the plants shut down. The article reports a 2027 return of these 1600 acres to the town of Plymouth for development would offset this. This would have somewhat compensated Plymouth losing 600 high paying jobs whose annual payroll was 77 million dollars including benefits, 9.8 million in state and local taxes annually and approximately ten percent of Plymouth's total tax revenue. That's what this power plant contributed to Plymouth Massachusetts. The Commonwealth and this panel have done everything possible to sabotage the celebrated decommissioning by delaying the discharge of the treated safe water into Cape Cod Bay which has been done safely since 1972 with no harm to anything. In 2021, Undersecretary of Climate Change David Ismay said saying that 60 percent of the state's emissions come from you, the person in the street, the Senior on a fixed income, there is no guy left in Massachusetts left to turn the screws on, to break their will so they will stop emitting, He said in a video that's you; we have to break your will, right? We can't even say that publicly. That's right, Mr. Ismay. That's why you are fired. That's how the Commonwealth deals with truth tellers. The Commonwealth by unplugging industrial cathedral. Pilgrim Nuclear shows it is run by industrial scale vandals' intent on impoverishing Massachusetts tax and rate payers. The 2015 net zero plans with corrupt MassSave; an adoption of unreliable expensive wind, solar and battery woke electric grid is a disaster. And my electrical bill was 35 cents kilowatt. In Tennessee, it's 12 cents. But they got more nuclear. Thank you.

- Third citizen Sean Noyes; no relation to David Noyes. East Dennis resident, on the Bay. I did have something to cover but you brought up some very good questions. One of the things I looked up and I was interested in hearing from you folks; is that towards the end 2061/2062; the funds that were supposed to be put out there for Holtec or by Holtec in that fund. My understanding is that utilities are suing the federal government over nuclear spent fuel because the government failed to provide the permanent disposal site as required by law. These lawsuits are based on breach of contract claims arguing the government breached its obligation to accept and dispose of spent fuel. The lawsuit seeks to recover the cost the utilities have incurred for storing the fuel onsite. So, I think it's well north of a billion dollars right now. Would we, Mr. Lampert, you could enlighten me on that. Or, Mr. Noyes. James Lampert replies: basically you are clearly correct in terms of lawsuits. The government, much earlier, back in the late 90's (1998), signed an agreement in which it promised to remove all of the spent nuclear fuel from all of the commercial reactors in the country. The probable hope at that stage was that Yucca Mountain would be a reality and we all know or someplace, that it was the only one that was getting any attention. Obviously, Yucca is now off the table, no fuel has been moved offsite in to there. And as of the moment, there are no offsite or interim storage sites. The utility companies have regularly sued the government to recover the funds that have been expended for spent fuel management. They typically bring a suit; roughly every five years, because that is the period the statute of limitations. They have to have spent the money first and then sue to get it back. That's the key. I don't know and maybe Dave Noyes or Mr. McDonough can inform him. Entergy has brought suits for what it's spent prior to part of the sale. I don't know whether Holtec has actually brought a suit yet; do you Dave? David Noyes replies: Holtec has brought suits. James Lampert replies: do you know what period? David Noyes replies: I do not. James Lampert replies: so, it's brought a suit and presumably as time rolls on, it will bring more suits. Mary Lampert replies: what happened to that money? David Noyes replies: we have not received any money from those suits yet. James Lampert replies: basically, the industry regularly wins these suits. We have gotten to the point of almost a lay down win. Perhaps not all the money that the utilities are after, but I think it's fair to say for the lion's share. But that's the structure on this. You spend the money and you then sue to get it back. So far all of the money that Holtec has spent, unless I'm misinformed for spent fuel management, has come out of the decommissioning trust fund. And if you go back and look at Holtec's PSDR, allocated approximately \$500 million dollars to spent fuel management. The important thing to remember on decommissioning trust fund is that to the best of my knowledge; no licensee Pilgrims ever put a cent into it. That fund is the result of monies that were conducted for rate payers back in the early 1970's and we've been growing ever since. One of the questions that obviously is important; after these monies are recovered, where is the recovery going to go? Will it go to Holtec or will it be returned to the people who basically put the money into the fund in the first place. Sean Noyes replies: that's a good question. James Lampert replies: and I don't have the answer to that. Sean Noyes replies: so that's why I was listening to the discussion that had some merit. It was also in the back of my head that I'm very aware that these lawsuits occur and what the federal government is paying for it year over year. One of the reasons why I actually do like Holtec is they were looking to put the interim storage which I think is the appropriate place for it to be, you may disagree. I respect if you have a different opinion. I think it belongs in interim storage

in New Mexico. Kevin Canty replies: you have reached five minutes. Would you like an additional minute to conclude your remarks or would you seek further time than that by an affirmative vote of the majority of the panel. Sean Noyes replies: I'll just take one minute. On non-radiological, I'm going to complement everyone tonight. The state officials, the panel, you were very civilized. I, for the life of me when it comes to radiological materials, it takes my breath away because I do not feel it is about science. I would love to debate you at some point. So, I just want to commend everyone around the presentation. I thought Holtec did a great job. When I see stuff like PFAS, all of us have pause. I've had a friend who had cancer. I'm pleased to see the remediation and pleased to see everybody take it seriously. Thank you.

- Fourth Citizen Kyle Gatslick; I have two quick ones and then a question on the PFAS which is terrifying stuff. They had mentioned that they were looking for disposal for the site in New England. David Noyes replies: the tosca facility has to do with the PCB's not PFAS. And then the other one was clarifying that Yucca was shut down in 2012. And then I want to make sure that this was covered correctly; it was only 6 percent vote for the Town of Plymouth for Item 2; that was not 86 percent of the population just 6 percent. Kevin Canty replies: I believe the speaker was referring to the quantum of the vote by the 7,992 people that showed up to the polls on Saturday not the total registered voters of the community. Kyle Gatslick replies: alright awesome.
- Fifth citizen Jo-Ann Wilson Keenan; East Dennis resident, by the Bay. Mr. Canty, I have a question for you that follows up on Mrs. Dickerson's talk earlier. Could you clarify for me and maybe you can't because this is NDCAP and not a town meeting. The role of the town clerk in certifying that vote the other day and does the town clerk send the information forward to the Governor and the Attorney General in a non-binding question. Kevin Canty replies: well, the question was about whether town officials should communicate with the given enumerated state actors and agencies. So, the town clerk runs the election, certifies the results, sends that to the Secretary of the Commonwealth. In regard to the election, the town clerk would not be charged with communicating with the Governor or the state legislature of anything like that. It would be through your Select Board here, the town manager, the Department of Public Health here, those actors and entities would be the individuals communicating with the state delegation and the state executive branch (officials and agencies). Jo-Ann Wilson Keenan replies: and that happens as a formal procedure. Kevin Canty replies: well, it happens as part of the ordinary conduct of business within the community and about the community. So, we have, sometimes we have planned meetings with our state delegation for example. Sometimes we just see them at events and talk to them about certain things. We also, I know, have their contact information that we can reach out to them. I do not have the direct contact information for Maura Healey unfortunately. The Select Board does have a meeting with the Governor about general topics. We only have an hour with her on June 11. So, that's where only a couple of us can go to the open meeting law and things of that nature. But there are various channels and methods in which we communicate with state actors and agencies, as relevant. Jo-Ann Wilson Keenan replies: o.k., thank you very much. Mary Lampert has a comment: it depends on the wording of the resolution. In Duxbury, which passed overwhelmingly on the same subject. We did state specifically that the town clerk shall send and contact through various parties. Kevin Canty

replies: o.k. Mary Lampert replies: I was just pointing out that it is depending on the wording. Kevin Carty replies: o.k., appreciate that. Thank you.

- Sixth citizen Rosemary Shields; the reason I'm getting on here is that I noticed the next item on the agenda is the discussion on proposals from panel members regarding adding items to future agendas. And that was actually my question. I know that two meetings ago, Jack Priest took a bunch of topics and he was going to check with the state agencies to see if there would be something that the state agencies would like to see on the agenda. I was just wondering, is that what's going to happen next? Kevin Carty replies: so, what was explained at the last meeting by Mr. Priest was that the members of the panel that are representatives of state agencies would need to run the proposed agenda items up the chain so to speak at their relevant agency before they felt comfortable voting yes or no on a given item. And that they would need to otherwise abstain. Given the enabling statute, in order to take an action, this panel must have a majority. Not just the members present but total membership that vote in the affirmative that makes the quantum of vote very high for something to succeed. So functionally those abstentions would prevent a vote from going forward. So, what was decided by the panel and by the chair, was that we would present items and give the state agency actors the opportunity to go to their agencies and run those things up the chain. Then, we would actually have votes on those items at subsequent meetings after that opportunity was afforded to them. So, I guess part two of proposed items from last time, would happen now and part one of proposed items for next time would happen now, after the public comments section. Rosemary Shields replies: o.k., thank you for the clarification. Kevin Carty replies: you're welcome.

PROPOSED FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS

- **Request for MassDEP Speaker (status of AGO review and Holtec's environmental plan)** Kevin Carty asks if anyone would like to make motion to include that as a future agenda topic. Mary Gatslick makes motion. Mary Waldron seconds the motion. Jack Priest makes comment: with the resignation of Mr. Pickering from MassDEP, they have not provided a replacement for that yet. This subject was brought to the Interagency group and has not been acted upon until they make a determination of the replacement for Mr. Pickering. To coordinate having such a speaker and their expertise and whether they make a determination of whether it's in their court to provide that information rather than the AGO's office. I'm letting you know that the state members will abstain again. I would suggest that it be brought back for a revote so that we don't have a negative vote against the subject. Kevin Carty replies: o.k. Mary Gatslick withdraws motion. Mary Waldron withdraws second. Jack Priest replies: we should have resolution by the next scheduled meeting. I think it would be appropriate to bring it back up at that time and we should have resolution for that at that time.
- **Treatment Process for water vs. what is being released from the stack.** Mary Lampert asks question: why are we voting on anything if the state people. Kevin Carty replies: they said they would abstain on the last topic but they did not indicate that they would abstain on all. Mary Lampert replies: I thought they had to talk to their people first. Kevin Carty replies: these were ones that we are revisiting so this is Phase 2 and then we will go to Phase 1 if anyone has any Phase 1 topics. James Lampert replies: can someone clarify what is meant by stack. Kevin Carty replies: the treatment process for water that is being evaporated versus

what was released during the operation at the plant. James Lampert replies: are we talking about the treatment process that was used in the past or are we talking about the treatment process that will be used in the future whether the water is discharged or evaporated or perhaps shipped. Kevin Canty replies: we will be talking about the process for water for future releases or ongoing releases. James Lampert replies: and by that you would include discharges. Kevin Canty replies: yes, that is a potential future release so yes, that would be included. Jack Priest replies: Mr. Canty, who made this motion and who are they proposing make this presentation. Kevin Canty replies: so, if an item is added to the agenda; it was contingent on us being able to find someone to speak to that. This may be able to be spoken on by Holtec potentially as to what they would do to treat the particular water and the different methods. But if it's something that would require an outside individual, we would only add it if we could get that individual here. We do not have subpoena authority or have the ability to force someone to come in and testify. Mr. McDonough makes a comment: I don't believe it holds any relevancy without a NPDES Discharge Permit approved at this time. So, I would recommend that we move it to a later meeting. Kevin Canty replies: o.k., thank you. Mary Lampert makes a comment: I would like to make a motion that we add that to an agenda item to provide clarification of the treatment for disposal of the water into the ocean and into the air. What is the treatment process as it is being entered into the environment. Kevin Canty replies: so, a motion has been made to discuss the treatment that would be applied to any water that is discharged or is being discharged. James Lampert seconds the motion. (14 in favor; 1 abstention; this motion passes). This item will be added to a future agenda.

- **Dry Cask and Spent Fuel Storage Integrity;** request for Holtec to provide experts on subject matter due to unanswered questions. Mary Lampert sent the information to Kevin Canty and documentation was forwarded to panel members in regard to the specifics of that request.
- **Voting Structure Review;** request by James Lampert potentially seeking to amend the enabling statute of the NDCAP. James Lampert makes motion. Mary Lampert seconds the motion. Pine duBois makes a comment: you should include the membership and might as well just change it once. James Lampert replies: it would be beneficial to have a quantum vote for the majority of those present and voting and clearly get rid of the eleven. Kevin Canty replies: the majority of those present and voting is how every other board and committee, at least in the Town of Plymouth, votes and there is a quorum requirement that a majority of total membership be in attendance for a meeting to occur but only those present and voting effect the outcome of a vote. Whereas the way that this statute is drafted, it requires a majority of total membership including vacant positions which is odd. David Noyes thinks it would be a mistake. Where this panel advises directly to the Governor; to just go off a straight majority of members present to be able to put something out as the position of this panel based on less than half of full membership. I don't think that's right. Kevin Canty replies: o.k. (5 in favor; 4 opposed; 6 abstentions). The motion does not pass.
- **Clapp Report;** DPH data and conclusions of independent review. Mary Lampert will be able to provide materials to discuss. David Noyes makes motion. Mary Lampert replies: where did this come from. David Noyes replies: it came from me. Kevin Canty replies: o.k. David Noyes replies: a couple of times at this meeting, we have cited the Clapp Report as if it were indicative of increased cancers associated with the operation of Pilgrim and the release of

radiation as if that were a factual basis. That was not the conclusion of the Department of Public Health and I think it's important that the Department of Public Health's review of the Clapp Report be presented seeing if we are going to treat it as if it's a factual representation. I think we should understand what the Department of Public Health has to say about it. Mary Lampert replies: first, it is not called the Clapp Report. So, I think to not sound foolish, we should have the proper title. It was called the Southeastern Massachusetts Health Study. And Dr. Clapp's not one of the authors. It was done by Dr. Knorr at the time who had the responsibility; the actual person who did it was Dr. Wood. It was published in 1990, so you call it the Southeastern Massachusetts Health Study 1990. I have the report and it is very hard to get it out of DPH. It mysteriously disappeared and I have also the journal that reported the result of the industries re-review of that report. So, I have the whole history on it. Kevin Canty replies: would you like to second the motion. Mary Lampert replies: yes, I will second with the proper title (14 in favor; 0 opposed; 1 abstention). Jack Priest makes a comment: I would just like to recognize that the study is now an over 40 year study. Kevin Canty replies: I believe that would be about 35 years; if it was printed in 1990. But thereabouts, yes. Jack Priest replies: I believe the study was actually started in 1980. Kevin Canty replies: well, we will broach the subject and merits of the report at that future agenda that we just voted to have. Jack Priest replies: very good. So, any discussion when we set that agenda as to who is going to present that study. Kevin Canty replies: we will discuss that. Mr. Noyes expressed some interest in the item. David Noyes replies: I think it's important that we understand MDPH's position on the study. They are the experts. Kevin Canty replies: o.k. Mary Lampert comments: no, they aren't, may I make a comment. Kevin Canty replies: not at this time.

- **Spent Nuclear Fuel;** request from Pine duBois. She would like a larger group and more broad discussion on this topic with a better solution on options; world view because it is a world problem. Mike Fortini makes comment that United States is behind the eight ball in regard to reprocessing facilities. He would like MA Legislature to be part of future conversations regarding why we are not building reprocessing facility plants in this country. Kevin Canty replies: the panel is going off topic and would like to go back to the future agenda list discussion.
- Mary Lampert would like to clarify that the meeting discussion topic was a request from two panel members, both herself and James Lampert. The information that was sent along was in great detail. It talked not only about vulnerability of cask but also largely about a safer method of storage particularly focusing on the method used in Switzerland. There was a diagram, and it talked about legislation, what the various options for interim storage were (2 track approach). It was very detailed, and it highlighted what they were doing at the Vermont Decommissioning Citizen Advisory Panel with a very active subgroup that was making recommendations to the committee, making reports on the status of legislation, reports on the status of site characteristics, what's necessary to get an interim or permanent storage, facility accepted, etc. So, it was a broad-brush approach to what would be a path to take for better safety and security of this huge safety issue that so far had been ignored until we had Dr. Gordon Thompson here who also not only talked about vulnerability but talked about what should be done to reduce risk. Kevin Canty replies: so, is that a motion Mrs. Lampert. Mary Lampert replies: yes. Mary Lampert makes motion. James Lampert seconds the motion. Mary Gatslick would like to clarify with Mary Lampert if this is replacing the motion that they

already have from the last meeting. Mary Lampert replies: a motion wasn't made at the last meeting. Kevin Canty replies: there was a motion at the last meeting. It did not pass. But this topic was brought up prior to the state agency actors making their statement that they would only abstain. James Lampert replies: we need to look at all aspects of what we are going to do with spent fuel storage. We need to look at interim storage. Holtec has an application pending right now for interim storage; what are its pluses and minuses. We need to look as Mr. Fortini said about reprocessing and if you read in the papers within the last week, the Administration has suggested that we go back to reprocessing. It was not just a look at the casks. We have to look at the whole subject of spent fuel storage which is the key issue facing the Commonwealth. How do we best deal with spent fuel storage; what recommendations, what facts, and what information can we give. That is the crux of the motion. It is a broad subject that is the substance of the motion.

- David Noyes makes recommendation that the panel restrict themselves to an agenda item that can be covered in one meeting. If there are multiple components to this; then let's space them out in future meetings. But having a giant agenda item that is going to consume a years worth of our meetings; isn't going to do anything. Kevin Canty replies: you need to make a motion that you think would get 11 affirmative votes in order to pass.
- Kelly O'Brien makes a comment: I understand the federal government has the responsibility of spent nuclear fuel in this country. All 110 nuclear plants that were in operation eventually had to have the ability to have dry cask storage. Under the Obama Administration, we were refused to use Yucca Mountain which was built and the ratepayers all across this country who were part of the operations of these nuclear plants, paid to have the building of Yucca Mountain. Millions of dollars. When it came time to ship across state lines, he banned it from the use of that. Reprocessing was banned by Jimmy Carter's Administration. He stopped that process. It is politics in this country. The issue of how different countries have done dry cask storage, but the key is, it falls under the federal government to come up with a place to put this and how we are going to deal with this as a country. Interim storage right now is that each site houses its own dry cask onsite. That is why the federal government is paying them through these lawsuits to cover the costs of building the dry casks onsite and also paying for the actual security force that is used to maintain it for that period of time until we finally come up with a solution. The problem is you are not going to solve it here. It is good to talk about it and educate the public on what the process is and why we are at where we are in this country. But the politics is what is going to be driven in this country. Somebody has to make a final decision on what we are going to do with this over the next whatever. 110 nuclear plants (we just built two new ones down in Georgia), they will be building more with these small modular reactors throughout the country. Palisades back online, Oyster Creek, we will have multiple things going on. So, the idea about the fuel itself; reprocessing would have been good, the other countries do it because of the fact they don't have the natural resources in the country or to be able to build the fuel in order to run the reactor itself. We have an overabundance supply here in this country to create our own uranium. Other countries don't have that ability. The reprocessing allows them to reprocess that fuel and use it over and over again. Where you are not creating more spent fuel, you are using the fuel that you have and trying to minimize the amount of fuel that is being produced in this country or in the world. But the idea is, the politics need to change. If you want to use it as a forum to try and educate the

people on this thing, that's fine. But we aren't going to solve the issue about how to change this in MA. The politics have been sitting here vacant until Harry Reid stopped the ability to put it in Yucca Mountain.

- Andrew Gottlieb makes a comment: we are debating the substance of this issue and not whether we are going to talk about it.
- Jack Priest makes a comment: we have a motion on the floor. Kevin Canty replies: we do. Mary Lampert would like to amend the motion; that it be a focal point of this group. Kevin Canty replies: that is outside the scope. So, this is about future proposals for agenda items. If you would like to propose a specific item, that is what this is for. It needs to be a discreet topic that can be covered in one or more meetings. But you need to specify that you would like it to be over multiple meetings. Mary Lampert replies: I would like it to be a focal point over multiple meetings because of the breadth and importance of the subject. However, for the upcoming meeting; it would be to delineate the importance of the issue and scope of the project going forward. Kevin Canty replies: you would like it to be about the scope of dry cask and spent fuel storage going forward. James Lampert replies: I think she has made the basic motion. It is merely a suggestion as a matter of procedure on how it should be handled over future meetings. It was not to restrict what will be done at future meetings. Kevin Canty would like Mrs. Lampert to restate the amendment to motion. Mary Lampert replies: the motion is that this panel take spent fuel storage as an agenda items going forward. The first meeting, we will delineate the scope of the problem and how it will be addressed going forward at subsequent meetings. Kevin Canty replies: so, you would like an overarching presentation on the scope of the problem of dry cask and spent fuel storage. Would that be accurate? Mary Lampert replies: of spent fuel storage period. Dry cask and its vulnerabilities will be just one element. So, I would have it broader; spent fuel storage; why it's important and how to address it to benefit our community going forward. James Lampert seconds the motion. (9 in favor; 2 opposed; 4 abstentions; the motion does not carry). Kevin Canty replies: that item will not be added to a future agenda at this time.
- **MCP Phase II Report;** Mary Gatslick makes a comment: the opportunity to question Holtec on the results that could be rolled into a general Holtec presentation. I don't know if it needs to be on the agenda. Kevin Canty replies: because it is directly related to their decommissioning process. I don't think that would be required. That can happen as part of the Holtec report.

ADJOURNMENT

- Pine duBois makes motion to adjourn. David Noyes seconds the motion (unanimous vote).