

1 **DRAFT Subject to Approval – 6.30.2015**

2 **Nuclear Decommissioning Citizen’s Advisory Panel (NDCAP)**

3 **Thursday, June 25, 2015**

4 **Brattleboro Union High School, Multi-Purpose Room, Brattleboro VT**

5 **Meeting Minutes**

6 NDCAP Members Present:

- 7 • Christopher Recchia, Commissioner of Public Service, ex officio
- 8 • Chris Campany, Executive Director of the Windham Regional Commission (WRC)
- 9 • David Mears, Commissioner of Environmental Conservation, designee for the Secretary
- 10 of Natural Resources
- 11 • Dr. William Irwin, designee for the Secretary of Human Services
- 12 • Stephen Skibniowsky, representing the Town of Vernon
- 13 • Kate O’Connor (Brattleboro), Chair, citizen appointee of Governor Shumlin
- 14 • Martin Langeveld (Vernon), Vice-Chair, citizen appointee of Governor Shumlin
- 15 • James Matteau (Westminster), citizen appointee of Senate President Pro Tempore John
- 16 Campbell
- 17 • Derrik Jordan (Putney), citizen appointee of Speaker of the House Shap Smith
- 18 • Christopher J. Wamser, Site Vice-President, Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee (VY)
- 19 • David Andrews, International Brotherhood of Electric Workers (IBEW); representing
- 20 present & former employees of Vermont Yankee
- 21 • James Tonkovich (of Wilder), citizen appointee of Senate President Pro Tempore John
- 22 Campbell
- 23 • David Deen (Westminster), VT State Representative, citizen appointee of Speaker of the
- 24 House Shap Smith
- 25 • Diane Becker, Chief of Technological Hazards, New Hampshire Emergency Management
- 26 and Homeland Security
- 27 • MA State Representative Paul W. Mark (Peru, MA), representing the Towns of
- 28 Bernardston, Colrain, Gill, Greenfield, Leyden, Northfield, and Warwick, Massachusetts

29  
30 No NDCAP members were connected to the meeting via teleconference (GoToMeeting.com)

31  
32 The following NDCAP members were absent from the meeting:

- 33 • VT State Senator Mark MacDonald, member of the Senate Committee on Natural
- 34 Resources and Energy
- 35 • Pat Moulton, Secretary of Commerce and Community Development, ex officio
- 36 • T. Michael Twomey, Vice-President External Affairs, Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee
- 37 • Michael Hebert (Vernon), VT State Representative, member of the House Committee on
- 38 Natural Resources and Energy

1 Meeting called to order at 6:05 pm

2

3 **INTRODUCTIONS**

4 Panelists introduced themselves.

5

6 **APPROVE MINUTES FROM MAY 26, 2015 MEETING**

7 Chair noted no changes were submitted since the first draft was distributed. Dave Andrews  
8 asked David Mears if the entry on page 5, regarding bill back is correct, is ANR planning to bill  
9 back for their work in the CPG process? Answer: It is possible that we may bill back some costs  
10 to Entergy. Dr. Irwin asked if that the town name listed on page 6, line 24 was correct. Answer:  
11 Yes. No changes were recommended to the minutes.

12 **Motion by Dr. Irwin to approve the minutes from May 28, 2015. Second by: Chris Company.**

13 **Motion carried 15-0.** (Aye: Christopher Recchia, Chris Company, David Mears, Dr. William  
14 Irwin, Stephen Skibniowsky, Kate O'Connor, Martin Langeveld, James Matteau, Derrik Jordan,  
15 Chris Wamser, David Andrews, James Tonkovich, Diane Becker, Paul Mark, David Deen.)

16

17 **ENTERGY UPDATE ON DECOMMISSIONING ACTIVITIES**

18 *Joe Lynch, Government Affairs Manager, Entergy Vermont Yankee, gave an update on recent*  
19 *activities. Fifty-two systems on site will be drained or "laid up" for long-term dormancy, eight*  
20 *are complete and fifteen are currently in process. Buildings continue to be transitioned to*  
21 *stable, long-term lay-up condition. Security modifications are ongoing. Last week security*  
22 *inspectors from the NRC visited the site; they were pleased by what they saw. Since the*  
23 *successful May 13, 2015 Hostile Action Based exercise concluded, the site held an additional*  
24 *training drill June 10, 2015. Entergy continues to work with ANR on the identified site waste*  
25 *storage issues. In the Certificate of Public Good (CPG) process for the second Interim Spent Fuel*  
26 *Storage Installation (ISFSI) Entergy had a status conference before the Public Service Board*  
27 *(PSB) at the end of April; site visit and public hearing on June 4, 2015; responded to the first*  
28 *discovery request on June 17, 2015; and expecting the second request for discovery this month*  
29 *with a response by the end of July. Entergy recently received approval of an exemption request*  
30 *to allow access to the Nuclear Decommissioning Trust (NDT) for applicable costs of spent fuel*  
31 *management and physical decommissioning. NRC resident staff will transition to inspection*  
32 *only as of today, June 26, 2015. NRC has scheduled a routine radiological inspection in July and*  
33 *a security inspection in August. Entergy's commitment to good communication and*  
34 *transparency continues through hosting tours, local public meetings, a monthly public access*  
35 *cable show "SAFSTOR Matters" via BCTV, and posting all information on*  
36 [www.vydecommissioning.com](http://www.vydecommissioning.com).

37 Questions and comments: Chair deferred questions and comments until after the State's  
38 decommissioning update.

39

40 **STATE OF VERMONT UPDATE ON DECOMMISSIONING ACTIVITIES**

41 *Anthony Leshinskie, Vermont State Nuclear Engineer gave an update on recent activities. The*  
42 *State has made filings opposed to the reduction of the Emergency Planning Zone (EPZ)*

1 scheduled for April 2016. The State is using available avenues to provide input to the NRC  
2 about the use of the NDT. The State is waiting for word from the NRC on the appeal of the  
3 approval of the discontinuation of the Emergency Response Data System (ERDS). The State  
4 agencies filed comments on the environmental assessment portion of the EPZ exemption  
5 request. The State and the NRC held a teleconference on the comments the State filed in  
6 January on the use of the Nuclear Decommissioning Trust (NDT). The State is now requesting  
7 participation from Green Mountain Power and Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation  
8 (VYNPC) in the future discussions. Noted that the aforementioned NRC NDT fund exemption  
9 included a waiver of the 30 day notice requirement. The State and Entergy are participating in  
10 oral arguments before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board (ASLB) scheduled for July 7, 2015  
11 regarding a petition by Vermont to intervene regarding the waiver of the 30 day notification. In  
12 the CPG process, the State has completed the first round of discovery. Second round of  
13 discovery is ongoing; State responses are due July 6, 2015. Pre-filed testimony from State  
14 agencies is due on August 19, 2015, pre-filed testimony from non-petitioners will be going on in  
15 September.

16  
17 *David Mears, Commissioner of Environmental Conservation, gave an update on ANR's activities.*  
18 He noted the Department of Environmental Conservation is looking at the stability of the soils  
19 where the second ISFSI will be located, will need to hire an expert to help with that analysis.  
20 Continuing to look at the information Entergy provided them regarding the violation resulting  
21 from the May 18, 2015 site inspection, will share the agency's response to Entergy with the  
22 Panel.

23  
24 Leshinskie noted that as part of the State's support for the NDCAP they have arranged an  
25 informational tour of the Connecticut Yankee spent fuel storage facility for six of the NDCAP  
26 panelists. The State would also provide support for a tour of Millstone, possibly for next year.  
27 The State has extended the contract of Catherine Morris of Consensus Building Institute  
28 through the end of 2016. She currently has 20 hours available to assist the NDCAP.  
29 NDCAP related information is available at  
30 <http://publicservice.vermont.gov/topics/electric/nuclear>. Members of the public can also  
31 contact the Department of Public Service via 802-828-2811 or 800-622-4496 with questions  
32 regarding Vermont Yankee.

33  
34 *Questions and Comments from the Panel:* Commissioner Recchia asked Joe Lynch to explain the  
35 context of the emergency planning exercise. Joe answered routine training exercises are done  
36 throughout the year, four teams are qualified and they rotate coverage. Some drills are for  
37 practice some, like the one in question, are graded. Scenarios vary based on a wide range of  
38 possibilities. VY practices activating all of its facilities, including the joint information center,  
39 the emergency operations facility and the plant facilities. Joe was not on the team  
40 participating, he did not know the specific scenario. Commissioner Recchia followed up by  
41 asking Tony Leshinskie if he knew. Tony only knew that it was Hostile Action Based. Tony asked  
42 if Chris Wamser knew the details. Chris Wamser did not, but he suggested that based on the  
43 plant layout - fuel resides in two places - the scenarios going forward will likely involve one of

1 those two locations. He explained that false scenarios that damage those components and  
2 systems are played out to test the organization's response. Joe Lynch added that every training  
3 scenario is used as an opportunity to continuously improve performance. He noted the most  
4 recent drill was approached as seriously as a graded exercise. The next drill is scheduled for  
5 October. Commissioner Recchia followed up by commending all involved in the hostile  
6 approach graded exercise for their performance. He made the statement that the NRC's only  
7 analysis of fuel stability and safety is based on seismic controls. They stage drills on hostile  
8 action, but do not consider hostile action's influence a threat to the safety of the fuel in the  
9 pool. Chris Wamser asked him to consider that for the purpose of training the organization and  
10 the three state's (VT, NH, MA) emergency responders it does not matter so much if the drill  
11 scenario is set in motion by an equipment failure or a hostile action because it is the outcome  
12 of the event that must be bounded by analysis. Wamser suggested the results of an equipment  
13 issue or hostile action is really the thing that we have to analyze. Recchia agreed, but added  
14 that the NRC waste confidence rule is not bounded or limited by other scenarios and that is  
15 where his disagreement is. Recchia re-emphasized that everyone involved in this recent  
16 scenario performed very well. Jim Matteau asked what Green Mountain Power (GMP) and  
17 Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation's (VYNPC) roles would be in the discussion of the  
18 use of the NDT. Recchia answered that their participation goes back to the Master Trust  
19 Agreement in place when Entergy bought with the plant in 2002. He added the State is finding  
20 inconsistency in the application of the rules for NDT and what the NRC is allowing. What is  
21 being requested by Entergy and allowed is consistent with what has been done at other plants,  
22 but the rule states the NDT is to be used for radiological decommissioning. Matteau concurred  
23 with Recchia's position and followed up by asking if GMP and VYNPC have any direct  
24 involvement with the ongoing use of the NDT. Recchia answered that they have an interest  
25 because they represent the ratepayers who contributed to the fund. David Deen asked if the  
26 Emergency Management System was activated during the graded hostile action exercise. Chris  
27 Recchia answered that the Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security was  
28 involved as well as local officials and the Emergency Alert System was activated and State  
29 protocols were followed for training purposes. Chris Wamser clarified some exercises involve  
30 participation from all the states (VT, NH, MA) and the public is notified and other drills, for  
31 training on-site, include only Entergy employees. David Deen clarified that he wanted to be sure  
32 that notification is part of the standard response to a hostile action. Chris Company commented  
33 that several select boards are meeting in mid-August to discuss what emergency management  
34 looks like without EPZ funding. He noted that in an NRC webinar on transfer of fuel to dry casks  
35 he asked if taxes can be paid from the NDT and the NRC said no. In the same NRC webinar he  
36 asked who would take over the operation of the ISFSI if the merchant plant operator went out  
37 of business and the NRC said most likely the Department of Energy (DOE). Company asked  
38 Chris Recchia if the State is reaching out to other states on these issues. Recchia indicated that  
39 the Vermont Attorney General is watching the NRC process and communicating with other  
40 states about the process.

41  
42  
43

1 **HOLTEC INTERNATIONAL PRESENTATION**

2 *Dr. Kris Singh, President & CEO Holtec International presented information on the HI-STORM*  
3 *MPC STORAGE SYSTEM FOR VERMONT YANKEE.* Vermont Yankee selected this design in 1999. It  
4 was approved by the Public Service Board in 2006 and is currently in use, with 13 loaded casks  
5 on the existing pad. Singh said the 11 foot diameter, 18 foot tall cask design is the most robust  
6 due to cylindrical, double steel walled, steel buttressed design with no exposed concrete and,  
7 most importantly, the canister is all welded. No gaskets, no seals, no paths for leaks. It is a  
8 multi-purpose, so the inner canister can be put into different over-packs and be shipped  
9 without need to handle the fuel again. This design is licensed by the NRC and many foreign  
10 regulators. These casks have been found to withstand a variety of missiles including an  
11 automobile, steel cylinder, and a bullet. Gama radiation dose from HI-STORM is in order of  
12 magnitude lower than the radiation dose from a metal cask. The cask design was independently  
13 evaluated by Sandia National Lab for an ASLB hearing 15 years ago and it was determined that  
14 the cask could withstand an F-16 crashing into the cask laden with fuel. The casks have large  
15 margins for seismic factors of safety. Casks are designed to be unaffected by being flooded by  
16 600 feet of water. Dose and risk from attack will be even less at Vermont Yankee because  
17 Entergy is using high density concrete. The loading process is extremely low risk. Not a single  
18 loaded cask of Holtec's has ever leaked anywhere. In contrast, metal casks with seals or gaskets  
19 have leaked. The maximum dose from all 58 loaded casks will be less than 5 milirem per year,  
20 well below what you encounter in daily life. Cask loading happens safely, daily.

21 *Chair notes the ongoing CPG process could mean some questions cannot be answered.*

22 Questions from the Panel (Note: All questions answered by Dr. Singh): Dr. Irwin questioned the  
23 term multi-purpose canister, will there be a need to re-pack for transport and if eventually at  
24 the end of the service life the fuel will need to be handled again. Answer: Multi-purpose design  
25 means you can take the inner canister from storage in the HI-STORM 100 and ship it in a HI-  
26 STAR 100 without handling the fuel. The system is estimated to have a service life of greater  
27 than 300 years. Holtec is still working on quantifying the exact service life, but this site has  
28 favorable conditions for the canister. Dr. Irwin followed up by asking about the transfer  
29 process and if the costs of transfer have been factored into the estimates for decommissioning  
30 Vermont Yankee. Dr. Singh could not answer in specific dollars; the internal canister can be  
31 lifted from a HI-STORM 100 and put into HI-STAR 100 in less than a day and a half with a crew  
32 of 8-12 people. Most likely the site would purchase 5 transport casks (HI-STAR) and transport  
33 them in about twelve shipments. Commissioner Recchia asked for an explanation for why dry  
34 casks are necessary because the NRC says fuel is equally safe in licensed spent fuel pools, are  
35 dry casks less vulnerable? Answer: Safety is multi-dimensional, casks are safer in certain  
36 respects, but fuel pools have also worked. David Deen asked what is an over-pack and what is it  
37 used for. Answer: It is for biological shielding and structural protection from missiles,  
38 earthquakes. Follow-up, one slide referenced the dose being 20% of the federal limit. Does the  
39 radiation level depend on the type of fuel inside the cask? Answer: Yes, the complete family of  
40 58 casks will result in less than 5 milirem/year at the site boundary. The federal limit is 25  
41 milirem, these numbers are specific to VY. Jim Matteau asked about the total thickness of the  
42 steel. Answer: The total thickness, inside and outside is two inches. Follow-up, how long have

1 these casks been in service. Answer: Since 2000, fifteen years. Matteau also asked if the testing  
2 done on the casks was done using the standard concrete or the high density concrete. Answer:  
3 Testing was done with standard concrete. Commissioner Recchia asked if there are time  
4 constraints on the two campaigns planned for 2019 and 2020 or could it be sooner? Answer:  
5 The casks can be loaded as soon as 2017. Dr. Irwin asked about the specifics of the fighter plane  
6 crash testing scenario. Answer: It was assumed that there was one target cask directly impacted  
7 by a plane, the cask tipped over, but the cover did not come off and there was no release of  
8 radiation from the canister. David Deen followed up by asking what happened to the over-pack.  
9 Answer: Over-pack is being used interchangeably with the term cask. Chair asked if Holtec will  
10 be providing fuel transfer services or just the casks. Answer: Entergy will decide, but Holtec  
11 provides casks, canisters, designs the pad, does the soil structure earthquake analysis and  
12 transfers fuel. Holtec can hand Entergy the keys to a turn-key storage facility. Followed up, have  
13 done the fuel transfer before at Entergy? Answer: Yes, at several plants. Follow-up: At VY,  
14 Answer: No. Derrick Jordan asked how much radiation is emitted from a fully loaded cask.  
15 Answer: Less than 2-3 mR/hr. Chris Campany asked for a professional opinion on if it is safe to  
16 load casks with school in session. Answer: There is no elevated risk to the community; Holtec  
17 has postulated all kinds of scenarios. Follow up: Do you believe it is safe, not just in the cask, but  
18 also during the transfer process? Answer: Fuel transfer happens at some plants outside, at  
19 Vermont Yankee transfer occurs inside the reactor building. It can be done any time of year;  
20 there is no risk in Dr. Singh's professional opinion.

21 Public Comments and Questions (Questions answered by Dr. Singh): Mike Mulligan, Hinsdale,  
22 NH - Who will be the crane operator? What proportion of the fuel is damaged; can damaged  
23 fuel be put into dry casks? Answer: The crane operator will be qualified to Entergy procedures.  
24 Unsure of exact population of damaged fuel, but damaged fuel must be placed inside a  
25 damaged fuel container in the pool before being loaded into the cask. Deb Katz, Rowe, MA -  
26 asked about the leaking cask at Surry and questioned the short track record of casks. Answer:  
27 The cask that leaked at Surry was a metal cask. No all welded cask has ever leaked and they  
28 have been in service for 40 years worldwide. Failure does not occur in stainless steel abruptly,  
29 it is gradual. Regular monitoring would pick up on any stress credible cracking that would be a  
30 precursor to a leak. There are plants where the conditions are much less favorable, so this is not  
31 the lead case. Noted the VY site temporarily holds casks that are capable of being packed up  
32 and taken away in a day and a half and transported for permanent storage. Katz followed up by  
33 asking if there is a contingency plan in the case of a leaking cask. Answer: Suspending the laws  
34 of nature and science to get a hypothetically leaking cask, Entergy will have access to Holtec  
35 who would provide a canister in which the leaking canister could be placed into and  
36 hermetically sealed. Katz commented that the NRC has said loading casks is risky. Katz followed  
37 up by asking about the statement that a cask gives off 2-3 mR/hr., meaning 58 casks would give  
38 off 189 mR/hr. Answer: That is contact dose, touching the cask. Also, that is a general number.  
39 At VY with the high density concrete you will start at .3, that is the contact dose.  
40 Peter Van der Does, Brattleboro, VT - Asked for the size of the envelope of cement in the casks.  
41 Answer: The total diameter is 11 feet. The thickness of the combined steel and concrete is  
42 about 2.5 feet. Follow-up: Isn't the industry accepted thickness to prevent radiation

1 penetration 3 feet? Answer: Depends on the magnitude of the source, there is no rule of  
2 thumb. Nancy Braus, Putney VT - How are the casks tested, how frequently, by whom? Answer:  
3 The testing of the canister can be done anytime using a helium leak test. The schedule of  
4 testing will be part of the safety plan. Follow-up: Is it entirely up to Entergy? Answer: No, we  
5 make recommendations and the NRC reviews and approves it. Right now we are working on an  
6 aging management plan for canisters everywhere to make absolutely sure there is no cause for  
7 concern. Follow-up: So we have no idea how they will be tested? Answer: Right now there is  
8 daily surveillance of the casks for any kind of abnormal external situations. There is  
9 temperature monitoring by trained plant personnel, done by procedure, every day. Follow up,  
10 Will this continue for hundreds of years? Answer: Yes, at least 300 years in the most adverse  
11 environments. Follow-up: With climate change could become an adverse environment?  
12 Answer: To adversely impact the cask you have to have three things, (1) Halite, chlorides or salt  
13 in the air. (2) High humidity and (3) Severe stress. Guy Page, Barre, VT, Vermont Energy  
14 Partnership – Does cold weather have any measurable effect on the cooling of the fuel?  
15 Answer: The casks are design to be transferred in temperatures down to minus 60 degrees  
16 Fahrenheit. If the canister is colder, the fuel is colder and the internal pressure also goes down.  
17 So the cold weather is good for the canister. Leslie Sullivan Sachs, Brattleboro- Are these casks  
18 designed to hold high burnup fuel? Answer: Yes, the canister is designed to hold up to 68,200  
19 the maximum burnup fuel and at Vermont Yankee the maximum is 50,000 to 52,000. Sullivan-  
20 Sachs referred to a test that was not completed prior to delivery of the first batch of casks at VY  
21 and asked if all the necessary NRC tests will be done prior to delivery this time. Answer: Holtec  
22 followed NRC approved procedures which stated that they could make improvements to the  
23 testing and Holtec determined that ultrasonic testing would be superior to the NRC required  
24 tests so they opted to use ultrasonic testing. One of the NRC commissioners did not agree to  
25 the new test process, so Holtec has since tested every single canister according to the NRC test  
26 process. None of the NRC tests revealed anything different than the ultrasonic tests and Holtec  
27 is in the process of sending a letter to the NRC regarding the testing process. Sullivan-Sachs  
28 followed up by asking if there is any role for the State in the oversight process? Answer: The  
29 State is welcome to come inspect Holtec. Dr. Irwin asked if the site boundary dose calculation  
30 includes the two canisters containing the greater than Class C (GTCC) reactor vessel internals?  
31 Answer: Cannot say without looking at the report. The calculations are based on the most  
32 adverse conditions for burnup and loading in order to know the worst possible dose. If Entergy  
33 asks Holtec to include the Reactor Vessel Internal levels Holtec designs special canisters that  
34 have greater radiation blockage if we are asked. Dr. Singh thanked the citizens for asking  
35 questions and agreed to come back if there are more questions.

36

### 37 **PANEL DISCUSSION OF ADVISORY OPINION PROCESS**

38 Chair reported that she has had discussions with David Victor about the SanOnofre Nuclear  
39 Generating Station (SONGS) advisory committee. They do not vote, they write advisory opinions  
40 expressing the sense of the Panel on certain issues. Chair identified several issues that the Panel  
41 needs to decide: (1) The process for determining the recommendations; (2) Possible advisory  
42 opinion topics and (3) What groups/individuals will the Panel advise? The CPG process will be  
43 ongoing so there is time to weigh in. Chris Campany asked if SONGS has staff. No, the Panel

1 does not but, some of the people on the Panel have staff that the panelist utilize. Chris Recchia  
2 feels like the NDCAP has more structural authority and flexibility, feels Panel should strive to  
3 reach consensus and not abandon the ability to make recommendations. Steve Skibniowski  
4 asked how many people are on the SONGS panel. Answer: Chris Recchia believes it is 23. Dave  
5 Andrews, beware of mission creep, perhaps it would help to have a written majority/minority  
6 position. Chris Company wonders if the Panel is currently structured to advise, the focus thus  
7 far has been gathering and the State and Entergy present information. David Deen interjected  
8 that the format could change to allow for discussions and formation of advisory opinion. Dr.  
9 Irwin suggests the committee has been reacting to the SAS and the PSDAR and getting up to  
10 speed up until now. Feels now is the time to start forming advisory opinions. Martin Langeveld  
11 suggests that the committee should consider utilizing Catherine Morris' expertise at this point.  
12 There are some issues such as use of the NDT and the second ISFSI that we could decide to  
13 schedule a discussion session rather than a hearing style meeting. Some issues might have two  
14 opposing points of view, others might have multiple. The positions could be discussed at one  
15 meeting, written up and then at a subsequent meeting voting could establish a majority  
16 position and one or more minority positions. Chair suggests picking something easy to establish  
17 the process. Jim Matteau agrees that a discussion session could be valuable for drafting  
18 possible positions in addition to these informational sessions which are also helpful and fulfill  
19 the role of being a conduit for information. Asked if there is a deadline for commenting on the  
20 CPG process. Chair answered, according to Aaron Kisicki (Staff attorney, Public Service  
21 Department) there is no rush. Recchia added the goal is to get the CPG done in the spring of  
22 next year. It would be better to get the comments in this fall. Agrees with Martin Langeveld  
23 that now is the time to make recommendations and give advice by consensus or by option of  
24 majority/minority opinions. David Deen hopes that Dr. Irwin's work leading up to this meeting  
25 can become the basis for some recommendations, said the committee should not worry about  
26 reaching full consensus in order to give advice. Wants time on the next agenda to focus on  
27 these issues. David Mears suggests inviting an independent third party expert to raise questions  
28 that the Panel might not otherwise ask and incorporating questions from the public that the  
29 Panel might want to highlight with the Public Service Board without having to reach a  
30 consensus on highly detailed, technical subjects. Chris Company would like the Panel to follow  
31 up on gaining access to an independent industry expert. David Deen suggested the Panel does  
32 not have the resources to achieve the level of technical knowledge and it does not need it if the  
33 Panel can send questions on areas of concern to the PSB, then Entergy and/or the Public  
34 Service Board to provide expert witnesses and testimony to answer. They have the tools to turn  
35 to the agency or the applicant in order to answer. Chris Wamser agreed with Deen on referring  
36 the areas of concern to the PSB is a realistic way to proceed. The Panel should look for those  
37 items that are not already being raised by others already involved in the process. Chris Recchia  
38 also agreed adding that the Panel does not necessarily need to know the technical answers in  
39 order to suggest an area of concern for the PSB to look at. Jim Matteau suggests that including  
40 items where the Panel agrees with or supports the State position is not redundant, but it is  
41 supportive. Even in areas outside the prevue of the PSB the Panel can express opinions.  
42 Matteau asked if there can be committee work on issues before the next meeting. Chair  
43 reminded the Panel that there are two more meetings scheduled this year, September 24<sup>th</sup> and

1 a Date TBD in the first two weeks of November. David Deen, Chris Company, Kate O'Connor, Jim  
2 Matteau, and Martin Langeveld volunteered to meet in July or August. Chris Company asked  
3 about the docket for the PSB hearing and the chair confirmed all documents will be sent to the  
4 panelists. Paul Mark noted that Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection is  
5 possible for the next meeting.

6 David Mears expressed reservations about only hearing from presenters who will come for free.  
7 Suggests the Panel seek resources from the State and Entergy to bring in third party presenters  
8 to inform the Panel on specific issues to raise. David Deen feels that is not necessarily the best  
9 use of the time and resources of the Panel. Chris Recchia has offered to within reason support  
10 the trips and presenters that the Panel deems worthy of bringing in. David Mears suggests that  
11 the reason there are no resources is that Vermont Yankee is a merchant plant. Other citizen  
12 advisory panels were in publicly regulated places with money available through the system to  
13 support things like this. This group cannot deal with the highly technical issues of nuclear  
14 closure without having expert information. If the only source of expert information is free then  
15 we don't have the full picture. He has no budget to provide, is willing to ask the legislature, ask  
16 federal authorities and use whatever power we have to extract funding from Entergy or others.  
17 We should be willing and open to identify. Chair suggests that in addition to the committee  
18 meeting that the Panel should try to think of who should be brought in and how, in addition to  
19 the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection which will be both enlightening  
20 and free.

#### 21 **PUBLIC COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS**

22 Susan Lantz, Northampton MA - Approves of the direction the Panel is taking. Make  
23 recommendations to the NRC that they should have regulations for closed plants. NRC has  
24 given permission to Entergy to take care of spent fuel from the NDT and that money has been  
25 collected from Vermont ratepayers, so Holtec should be working for the ratepayers not for  
26 Entergy. Wants the NRC to make Entergy replenish the fund or only use it for radiological  
27 decommissioning not fuel management or taxes.

28 Carol Levin, Guilford VT, NEC trustee - The Decommissioning Trust Fund is our money, Entergy  
29 has not put any money into it, it needs to have oversight so it is only used for radiological  
30 cleanup. The plant really needs to be decommissioned as soon as possible not in 50 to 60 years.

31 Peter Van der Does, Brattleboro - We are going in the wrong direction. The real problem is the  
32 spent fuel pool. We should try to get Entergy to remove the fuel as soon as possible. It is overly  
33 full and it really can be a dangerous situation.

34 Amy Shollenberger, Barre VT, registered lobbyist for Citizens Awareness Network. - Thanked  
35 the Panel for taking this seriously. Requested that committee discussions be made available via  
36 the website because public comment is important to the process. Chair agrees and notes that  
37 all committee meetings will be warned and open to the public.

38 Francis Crowe, Northampton, MA - Recommends bringing in Helen Caldicott and recommends  
39 reading the article in Rolling Stone about the book Command and Control.

1 Bert Picard, Brattleboro - Found the last part of the discussion tonight very positive, agrees with  
2 Commissioner Mears that the Panel should bring in third party, independent experts.

3 Clay Turnbull, Townshend, NEC - Appreciates the panelists' time. He agrees with Commissioner  
4 Mears that the Panel should consider the ultimate re-use of the site. This group does not have  
5 much say over what the casks look like, but this group could make recommendations to the  
6 Public Service Board on the highest, best use of the property and if the casks should be located  
7 elsewhere. Wants the NDCAP to weigh in ASAP on the CPG process and that NEC should be  
8 granted party status.

9 Howard Schaffer, Chesterfield NH, recommends writing a process document before trying to  
10 tackle technical issues.

11 ***WRAP UP AND ADJOURN***

12 Reminder, next meeting: Thursday, September 24, 2015, when Dave Howland from Mass DEP  
13 is expected to speak. A portion of the Panel will visit the former site of Connecticut Yankee on  
14 June 26, 2015. The chair will coordinate an Advisory Opinion Committee meeting over the  
15 summer and report back September 24th.

16

17 ***MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:00pm***

18

19 *Action Items:*

20 Next meeting is Sept 24, 2015

21 An early November meeting date will be established at the September meeting.

22 Panel will continue setting up a website

23

24

25 NOTE: Video of meeting will be available at [brattleborotv.org](http://brattleborotv.org)

26