

1 **Approved 09.21.2020**

2 **Nuclear Decommissioning Citizens Advisory Panel (NDCAP)**

3 **Monday, May 4, 2020**

4 **Skype Webcast**

5 **Meeting Minutes**

6
7 VT NDCAP Members Present (via webcast):

- 8 • **Josh Unruh**, *Citizen Appointee of Governor Phil Scott, Panel Chair*
- 9 • **Lissa Weinmann** (*Brattleboro*), *Citizen Appointee of Senate President Pro Tempore Tim*
10 *Ashe, Panel Vice-Chair*
- 11 • **June Tierney**, *Commissioner of Public Service, ex officio*
- 12 • **Madeline Arms**, *Representative for the Town of Vernon*
- 13 • **Chris Campany**, *Executive Director of the Windham Regional Commission (WRC)*
- 14 • **VT State Representative Sara Coffey** (*Guilford*), *Citizen Appointee of Speaker of the*
15 *House Mitzi Johnson*
- 16 • **Corey Daniels**, *Senior ISFSI Manager, NorthStar Vermont Yankee*
- 17 • **Emily Davis**, *Citizen Appointee of Senate President Pro Tempore Tim Ashe*
- 18 • **Dr. William (Bill) Irwin**, *Radiological & Toxicological Sciences Program Chief, Designee for*
19 *the Secretary of Human Services*
- 20 • **Bob Leach** (*Brattleboro*), *Citizen Appointee of Governor Phil Scott*
- 21 • **Brett Long**, *Deputy Commissioner of Economic Development, Designee for the Secretary*
22 *of Commerce and Community Development*
- 23 • **David Pearson**, *Vice-President and Regional Manager, NorthStar Group Services*
- 24 • **Chuck Schwer**, *Department of Environmental Conservation Waste Management Division*
25 *Director, Designee for the Secretary of Natural Resources*
- 26 • **VT State Representative Laura Sibilia**, *Member of the House Committee on Energy &*
27 *Technology*

28
29 The following NDCAP members were absent from the meeting:

- 30 • **VT State Senator Mark MacDonald**, *Member of the Senate Committee on Natural*
31 *Resources & Energy*
- 32 • **MA State Representative Paul Mark** (*Peru, MA*), *representing the Towns of Bernardston,*
33 *Colrain, Gill, Greenfield, Leyden, Northfield, and Warwick, Massachusetts, appointee of*
34 *(former) MA Governor Deval Patrick*

35
36 Three positions on the Panel are currently vacant.

37
38 With 14 Panelists present via the Skype webcast, a quorum was present (10 Panelists required).
39 Approximately 24 members of the public were connected to the webcast.

40
41 The meeting was called to order at 6:08 PM; a recording of the meeting webcast is available
42 online at <http://publicservice.vermont.gov/electric/ndcap> and at

1 [https://www.brattleborotv.org/vt-nuclear-decommissioning-citizens-advisory-panel/ndcap-meeting-](https://www.brattleborotv.org/vt-nuclear-decommissioning-citizens-advisory-panel/ndcap-meeting-5420)
2 [5420](https://www.brattleborotv.org/vt-nuclear-decommissioning-citizens-advisory-panel/ndcap-meeting-5420)

3
4 **General Instructions for Webcast Participation:**

5 State Nuclear Engineer Tony Leshinskie briefly outlined communications during the webcast.
6 Panelists connections to the meeting are unmuted to permit a free-flowing discussion.
7 Members of the public are muted; Skype’s Instant Messenger feature can be used to ask
8 questions or ask to speak. Emailing or texting Tony can also be done. All connections will be
9 unmuted at several points during the meeting for additional questions. To minimize
10 background noise, self-muting during the meeting is encouraged.

11
12 **Welcome, Opening Remarks & Overview of Meeting Agenda:**

13 The Chair, Josh Unruh, welcomed everyone for the meeting and briefly outlined tonight’s
14 agenda (available at <https://publicservice.vermont.gov/content/final-agenda-5-4-2020>).

15
16 **Amendments to the Meeting Agenda:** No additions to the meeting agenda were made. Josh
17 Unruh noted that NorthStar CEO Scott State has requested that the 8:15 PM agenda item,
18 “Status Report on VT NDCAP Legislation” be discussed earlier in the meeting, since NorthStar
19 has an announcement to make regarding this item. Josh asked whether there were any
20 objections to this item being discussed immediately before the “NorthStar Update on VY Site
21 Decommissioning Activities” discussion (the 6:25 PM agenda item). Hearing no objections, the
22 NDCAP Legislation item was moved to 6:25 PM with the NorthStar Update to immediately
23 follow.

24
25 **Introduction of Panelists:** To save time the Panel Chair dispensed with introductions. State
26 Nuclear Engineer Tony Leshinskie note that it appeared that 15 panelists were present (which
27 was later corrected to 14). In response to a question from Panelist Laura Sibilia, Tony read off
28 the list of Panelists that he could see had joined the meeting. Josh Unruh further noted that if
29 any votes were taken this evening, they would be done via roll call in alphabetical order.

30
31 **Approval of Meeting Minutes:** Tony Leshinskie noted that because hard copies of the January
32 13, 2020 draft meeting minutes were not available at the last Panel meeting, there were two
33 sets of meeting minutes that needed to be approved. He outlined several changes to the
34 minutes drafts that he had identified in reviewing the minutes last week. These potential
35 changes were previously circulated to the Panel members via email for their consideration:

36 In the January 13 minutes, on page 4, line 16 “are being held” should be added to
37 complete the sentence. Additionally, on page 4, line 28, “Dr.” should be added before
38 Bill Irwin’s name.

39 In the February 3 minutes, on page 1, line 23, “member was” should be changed to
40 “members were” to reflect that two Panelists were connected via teleconference.

41 Tony then noted an additional change for the January 13 minutes: on page 3, line 33,
42 “currently” should replace “actually.”

43 Lissa Weinmann requested that the February 3 minutes reference the written comments
44 provided by Ray Shadis. Tony noted that on page 4, beginning at line 13, it is noted that these

1 comments could be viewed on the Panel website
2 (<http://publicservice.vermont.gov/electric/ndcap>). The minutes could point to the specific
3 document link for these comments. Lissa indicated that would be acceptable.
4

5 By roll call vote, the Panel approved the January 13, 2020 and the February 3, 2020 meeting
6 minutes, with the several described changes, unanimously and without abstentions.
7

8 **Status Report on VT NDCAP Legislation**

9 Scott State, NorthStar CEO, indicated that the legislation (discussed at the January and February
10 2020 Panel Meetings) had been making “good progress” for passage in the Vermont Legislature
11 before it was “set aside” while the Legislature addressed COVID-19 pandemic response issues.
12 Accordingly, NorthStar has decided to “be a good corporate citizen” and contribute the Panel
13 funding on July 1 of this year (up to \$35,000) as though the legislation had passed.
14

15 VT Representative and Panel Member Laura Sibilgia provided a brief status summary for the bill:
16 The bill has passed the Vermont House and is under consideration by the Vermont Senate.
17 While she anticipates that the bill will pass, it probably will not pass before July 1 due to other,
18 higher priority issues. Rep. Sibilgia thanked NorthStar for coming forward with this offer. Public
19 Service Commissioner and Panel Member June Tierney echoed Rep. Sibilgia’s thanks to
20 NorthStar and indicated that the Public Service Department (PSD) will find a way to make
21 NorthStar’s offer work. (Potential legal hurdles must be considered.) If PSD is unable to accept
22 the gesture, the Department will at least remember that it was offered. VT Representative and
23 Panel Member Sara Coffey also thanked NorthStar for its gesture and expressed confidence
24 that PSD would find a way to implement it.
25

26 **NorthStar Update on VY Site Decommissioning Activities**

27 Panel Member Corey Daniels, NorthStar Senior ISFSI (spent fuel storage) Manager at Vermont
28 Yankee, presented a summary of recent site decommissioning activities. Current Reactor
29 Vessel (RV) segmentation activities were described with focus on completion of RV Steam
30 Separator segmentation and the ongoing packaging of segments for shipment offsite. Steam
31 piping and valve cutting within the Turbine Building were described. Ongoing remediation
32 efforts for the hazmat Areas of Concern (AOCs) were outlined. The demolition of the remaining
33 onsite warehouse has commenced. The next structure slated for demolition is the Advanced
34 Off-Gas Building. This latter demolition is a significant task since it has 7-foot thick concrete
35 walls.
36

37 The slides for this presentation are available at:
38 <https://publicservice.vermont.gov/electric/ndcap>
39

40 Panelist questions on NorthStar’s presentation included:
41

42 Emily Davis: It has been noted that not all remediation action plans will have a feasibility study
43 conducted for them. What benefit do feasibility studies provide? Answer from Corey Daniels:
44 Haley & Aldrich or the State Agencies can provide a better answer, but the I-rule allows for

1 small task (individual) remediations to proceed without a feasibility study for the task. Gerold
2 Noyes from Agency of Natural Resources (ANR) added that he reviewed the remediation plans
3 for the three AOCs submitted by NorthStar. They were deemed to be very straight-forward
4 given NorthStar's available heavy equipment and disposal resources. Feasibility studies are
5 reserved for more complex site clean-ups where the best remediation options may not be
6 known at the onset of the task. The proposed remediation for the three AOCs (#3, #7 and #8),
7 excavation, was deemed appropriate.

8
9 **Bill Irwin:** Asked whether NorthStar would share its schedule of major activities for 2020 with
10 ANR, DEC and Department of Health, as was done in 2019. Bill also asked about the disposition
11 of Advanced Off-Gas (AOG) Building systems, structures and components that serviced other
12 plant systems such as the effluent stack. Answer from Corey Daniels: NorthStar's schedule has
13 undergone recent adjustments due to impacts of the pandemic. The revised schedule is
14 expected to be out within the next month. Corey will work to assure that additional details are
15 made available to the Agencies and the Panel. Much of the AOG Building systems have already
16 been removed. Its ventilation systems are not required to support the rest of the plant, but
17 they will be separated out.

18 Follow-up question: Is there still water in sampling well GZ-10, which is located just east of the
19 AOG Building? Corey agreed to provide Bill with specific data from this well.

20
21 **Lissa Weinmann:** Sampling from 4 additional wells was mentioned. How was the
22 determination made to increase the number of wells? Answer from Corey Daniels: Locations
23 were based on recommendations from State's (DEC's) consultant, ATC, but also because the
24 locations made sense based on the site's hydrological gradient.

25 Follow-up question: How many wells are monitored on the property? Corey Daniels indicated
26 he did not have an exact count, but it was likely around 30 wells. Corey will follow-up with a
27 more accurate answer.

28 29 **Assessments of NorthStar 2019 Annual Project Report**

30 The Public Service Department (PSD) and Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC)
31 provided status reports on its ongoing oversight activities of the Vermont Yankee
32 Decommissioning project. These included assessments of the project's performance during the
33 2019 calendar year. The slides for these two presentation are available at:

34 <https://publicservice.vermont.gov/electric/ndcap>

35 36 **PSD Project Assessment and Update:**

37 Eric Guzman, staff attorney in the Public Service Department made this presentation. Nick
38 Capik and Mark Gymr of Four Points Group (FPG), PSD's consultants for overseeing the financial
39 and technical details of VT Yankee's Decommissioning, were also present to discuss the
40 assessment and update. Eric outline PSD's financial oversight role, which includes updates on
41 work complete versus work remaining and project expenditures versus funds remaining. PSD
42 coordinates with other State Agencies to assess project status and whether the trust fund
43 reimbursement requests are consistent with the work completed. This oversight also includes
44 site visits. Requirements for PSD's annual certification of the project were outlined. The end of

1 (2019) year balance of the Site Restoration (SRT) Fund is approximately \$62 million. The
2 currently estimated cost to complete site restoration is approximately \$23 million. NorthStar's
3 required annual financial disclosures have been received and assessed by FPG over the past
4 month. Nuclear Decommissioning Trust (NDT) and SRT disbursements over the past year were
5 summarized. The end of (2019) year balance of the NDT is approximately \$425 million. Based
6 on PSD and FPG review, no safety concerns for the project were identified. The percentage of
7 the project completed (~17.3% complete) is consistent with the expenditures to date. The
8 project is currently on track to be completed within the funds available for the project.
9

10 Panelist questions on PSD's presentation included:
11

12 Laura Sibilia: What types of red flags would PSD be looking for on the project? Answer from
13 Nick Capik: There are 3 red flags to look for: 1) a change in scope that would significantly
14 increase project cost (e.g. finding unexpected contamination), 2) a substantial change in
15 schedule, and 3) any change that would prevent NorthStar from making the financial
16 assurances included in the project agreement .

17 Follow-up question: Have any of these conditions occurred since NorthStar took over the
18 project. Answer from Nick Capik: There have been no changes in scope. There have been
19 several schedular changes (mostly related to Reactor Vessel segmentation) for which NorthStar
20 has taken corrective actions. The financial assurance conditions have improved in the past
21 year.
22

23 Bill Irwin: Does FPG publish reports that people can review? Answer from Nick Capik: Reports
24 are provided to the PSD, many of which contain proprietary or confidential information. Eric
25 Guzman added: Because of confidential information, the reports are limited to Departmental
26 review.
27

28 Lissa Weinmann: The SRT expenditures appear to have doubled recently. What type of site
29 restoration work is being done now? Answer from Nick Capik: Work falls into 3 areas: site
30 characterization, preparations of buildings for demolition, and soil removal. Characterization of
31 accessible areas has been performed, but additional characterization is done when possible.
32 Demolition preparations can include items such as asbestos remediation. The jump in
33 expenditures is related to the progress on the project.
34

35 Emily Davis: Is the nature of that work more expensive? Answer from Nick Capik: NorthStar
36 has not fully recovered the costs of the project thus far. The increase was intended to recover
37 the costs faster.
38

39 **DEC Project Update:**

40 Gerold Noyes from ANR / DEC Waste Management Division provided the update. DEC has
41 examined a Supplemental Site Investigation (SSI) received on January 31, 2020, which updates
42 the initial Site Investigation and takes additional sampling in several AOCs. Much of the
43 additional sampling was soil sampling to assess contamination resulting from fuel storage,
44 transformer coolants and onsite vehicle maintenance activities. The SSI did not find any new or

1 significant contaminant sources. Knowledge of previously identified contaminants was refined.
2 The results will be used to develop corrective action plans. Groundwater sampling conducted
3 during 2019 was described. DEC assessed whether the sampling was conducted consistently
4 with project plans. The report on this sample will be published in the near future. The
5 groundwater intercept system was briefly described. The required permitting for this plan is
6 still under review. Corrective Action Plans for AOCs #3, 7 and 8 as well as a general corrective
7 action plan have been received. Approved clean-ups for the three AOCs were described. Most
8 of the clean-up at these AOCs has been soil removals to address oil spills. Public comments on
9 the plans may be submitted via <https://enb.vermont.gov/>
10 Searching on “320 Governor Hunt” works best to locate all relevant Corrective Action Plans and
11 permits. Onsite abatement for asbestos and lead paint continues. Groundwater sample has
12 shown contaminations similar to that of a gas station. Groundwater intercept well sampling
13 will be done to assure that any water discharged to the Connecticut River is not contaminated.
14

15 Panelist questions on PSD’s presentation included:
16

17 Emily Davis: Ask which permit steps shown on the “enb” website are further along in the
18 process. Answer from Gerold Noyes: Permits and corrective action plans receive a preliminary
19 approval prior to being posted for public comments. Public comments, if received, are
20 incorporated into the final approval. “In review” means application was submitted to ANR. A
21 permit will be written once there are no questions on the application. Public comments come
22 after the draft permit is published. Approved permit is issued after public comments are
23 addressed. No public comments have been received for on-going VT Yankee applications yet.
24 Follow-up question: What is the process for public to become aware of notices on
25 <https://enb.vermont.gov/>? Answer from Gerold Noyes: The notices are published on the
26 website; adjacent property owners receive letters from ANR regarding the notices.
27 Additional technical question: Searching on “320 Governor Hunt” identifies the several
28 Corrective Actions and applications already discussed. Not all of the AOCs appear to have
29 corrective actions. How will these be addressed? Answer from Gerold Noyes: Each AOC will
30 have a Corrective Action Plan, but there is also a general corrective action plan published that
31 can apply to several of the AOCs.
32

33 **Public Questions and Answers on NorthStar and State Reports**

34 No comments or questions were received.
35

36 **Early General Public Comments**

37

38 Anne Darling: Requested a summary of COVID-19 protective measures at Vermont Yankee.
39 Answer from Corey Daniels: Face masks are required when working in areas with other people.
40 Work crew sizes have been reduced as much as possible. Remote working has been
41 implemented where possible. Additional site cleaning in common areas has been
42 implemented. Meals are being brought onto site to limit risk of exposure while buying lunch.
43

1 Additionally, Anne Darling noted that the Massachusetts towns still need a representative to
2 replace Paul Mark, who is largely unavailable for Panel Meetings. Answer: Both Public Service
3 Commissioner June Tierney and State Nuclear Engineer Tony Leshinskie indicated that they
4 understood Anne’s frustration with this issue. A replacement is being pursued through the
5 Vermont and Massachusetts Governor’s Office. The Commissioner added that her last dealings
6 with the Governor’s Office regarding the Massachusetts towns representative occurred
7 immediately prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.

8
9 Deb Katz: Asked for details on what new workers must do to assure that they do not bring
10 COVID-19 to the VT Yankee site. Answer from Corey Daniels: Workers are required to self-
11 monitor their temperature (daily), wear a face mask onsite, practice social distancing, report if
12 they have been exposed to a potential or positive COVID-19 case and abide by a rules from the
13 governor’s current pandemic mitigation executive orders.
14 Follow-up question: Has anyone onsite tested positive? Answer from Corey Daniels: None to
15 date.

16 17 **Panel Pursuit of National Decommissioning and Spent Fuel Issues**

18 Since this agenda item was requested by the Panel Vice-Chair, the intro for this issue was
19 presented by Lissa Weinmann. Lissa noted that the Panel’s duties calls for the Panel to advise
20 the Governor and the Legislature on nuclear decommissioning related issues. However, the
21 Panel has issued very few advisory opinions. It may be appropriate for the Panel to provide
22 advisory opinions on a number of national nuclear issues, particularly those related to
23 redevelopment of decommissioned sites (such as Vermont Yankee), which is particularly
24 impacted by spent fuel disposal issues. The Panel should consider weighing in on one or more
25 of the legislative proposals before Congress regarding decommissioning and spent fuel
26 management in the hopes of stimulating some national action. There may be opportunities for
27 the Panel to support NorthStar in addressing spent fuel / nuclear waste issues, such as
28 supporting the push for licensing WCS’ proposed interim storage facility. The Panel is on the
29 record as supporting interim storage through a letter that former Chair Kate O’Connor signed
30 onto several years ago. The Panel’s process for an advisory opinion is to have one or more
31 members interested in an issue draft an opinion for the entire Panel’s consideration. Lissa’s
32 main interest is to “clear” the record on an interim storage position that she was unwittingly
33 taken previously. If the Panel does want to support this position, there should be a vote on it.
34 How does the Panel want to proceed?

35
36 Rep. Sara Coffey noted that having the Congressional Delegation report on these legislative
37 proposals would be helpful. It is probably worth educating the current Panel members on some
38 of these issues, particularly now that the Panel can potentially afford to bring in subject experts
39 to speak on some of these topics.

40
41 Bob Leach noted that the current Federal budget for next year does not include money to
42 continue efforts to open the Yucca Mountain facility, even though ratepayer money has been
43 collected over the years for such a facility. Some of the collected funding has been used to
44 develop the Yucca Mountain site, but is still not ready. Without continued funding, it will not

1 move forward. Consolidated Interim Storage facility proposals do not appear to be moving
2 forward either. The Texas-Vermont radioactive waste compact site is attempting to open an
3 interim spent fuel storage facility.
4

5 Tony Leshinskie added that he represents Vermont in the National Transportation Stakeholder's
6 Forum (NTSF), which US Department of Energy uses to consult with State Governments on
7 spent fuel transportation and disposal. Bob Leach's summary of the current disposal facility
8 statuses is accurate. Tony previously presented a status report to the Panel on this topic in late
9 2017. Not much has changed. Through NTSF, Tony does have contacts with US Department of
10 Energy and Nuclear Regulatory Commissioning experts that can provide more information to
11 the Panel on these subjects.
12

13 Haley Pero from US Senator Bernie Sanders' Office indicated that she is open to providing
14 overviews of the various nuclear decommissioning-related proposals before Congress. This can
15 include budget proposals for these issues. With some advanced warning, she can provide in-
16 depth details on specific topics that the Panel is most interested in, drawing on resources from
17 the DOE, NRC and the Congressional Research Service. These summaries can be done on a
18 regular basis. (She also noted that Tom Berry from Senator Leahy's Office is also on the line.)
19

20 Bob Leach added that it may be worth the Panel's time to draft letters to Vermont's
21 Congressional Delegation supporting Yucca Mountain. Yucca Mountain is close to being ready.
22

23 Lissa Weinmann stated that this is the type of topical discussion that the Panel needs to have
24 more. The Panel should educate itself on Yucca Mountain-related issues. One option is having
25 Jim Hamilton of the National Spent Fuel Collaborative speak to the Panel
26

27 Bob Leach noted that at one point Vermont was considered as a potential spent fuel repository
28 location.
29

30 Laura Sibilia expressed concern that issue advocacy may not be within the duties of the Panel.
31

32 Lissa Weinmann moved to create a subcommittee for drafting an advisory opinion on interim
33 spent fuel storage. She also volunteered to be on this subcommittee. Sara Coffey seconded
34 the motion. The following vote was taken on whether a subcommittee should be formed to
35 draft a spent fuel storage advisory opinion:
36

Madeline Arms	NO
Chris Company	NO
Sara Coffey	Yes
Corey Daniels	NO
Emily Davis	yes
Bill Irwin	yes
Bob Leach	NO
Brett Long	Did not vote (likely disconnected from meeting)

David Pearson	NO
Chuck Schwer	Abstain
Laura Sibia	NO
June Tierney	NO
Josh Unruh	NO
Lissa Weinmann	yes

1
2 The motion was defeated 8-4, with 1 abstention. Several Panelists noted that they would be
3 open to discussing this again once live meetings are again possible to assure appropriate public
4 participation in the discussion.
5

6 **Scheduling Remaining 2020 Panel Meetings**

7 After consulting with individual schedules, the Panel agreed that its next meeting will be held
8 on Monday, September 21, 2020. Given the current COVID-19 pandemic conditions, the
9 meeting will be planned as a webcast. After concern was expressed that not meeting until
10 September may be too long of a gap between meetings, Lissa Weinmann noted that the Issues
11 Committee could meet in June to reconsider advisory opinions.
12

13 **Meeting Wrap-Up**

14 Laura Sibia requested a better webcast package be used. There were numerous audio
15 difficulties throughout this meeting. Josh indicate that he and Tony Leshinskie would work on
16 an improved platform for the next meeting.
17

18 **General Public Comments to the Panel**

19 Kevin Kamps (Beyond Nuclear) had several questions and comments. He requested clarification
20 on NorthStar receiving an NRC waiver that allows radioactive waste shipments to take more
21 than 20 days to reach their destinations. What takes so long for trains to reach destinations in
22 Texas? If the railcars are resting in train yards for long periods of time, what dose rates are
23 given off? Also, have onsite radiological surveys been extended to where leaks were taking
24 place in 2009-2010? Kevin also expressed concerned for the advocacy for Yucca Mountain and
25 the Interim Storage Facilities. Yucca Mountain is not going to happen. Beyond Nuclear has
26 filed lawsuits against both Interim Storage Facility proposals because they violate the Nuclear
27 Waste Policy Act. Hardened onsite storage is the only dependable option for the foreseeable
28 future.

29 Answers from Corey Daniels: The NRC waiver only deals with reporting requirements.
30 Previously NorthStar had to file a report with the NRC whenever a radioactive waste shipment
31 took longer than 20 days to reach its destination by rail. The reporting requirements obligate
32 the owner (NorthStar) to track shipment locations at all times. Standard rail operations
33 regularly result in shipments from Vermont taking more than 20 days to reach their (WCS)
34 Texas destination. While Corey could not provide an exact dose rate from the shipments, all
35 shipments comply with shipping requirements and radiological dose rate limits set in Federal
36 Regulations. The waiver is on the reporting requirements to the NRC, which have been
37 extended from 20 days to 45 days. The onsite radiological surveys do cover the leakage areas.
38 Groundwater sampling well GZ-10 that Dr. Irwin inquired about is one such monitoring location.

1 Through mitigation efforts and subsequent radioactive decay following the plant's shutdown,
2 all onsite sampling wells show tritium levels below the drinking water standards.

3

4 Tony Leshinskie apologized for the expletives that people likely heard during the meeting.

5 There was a point early in the meeting where it appeared that the entire Skype broadcast had
6 crashed. (The Skype interface disappeared from his laptop). He chose Skype for this meeting
7 since it was the platform that he is most familiar with. He is open to using another platform for
8 the September meeting.

9

10 **MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:48 PM.**