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CHAIR O'CONNOR: Good evening. Good evening, everybody. My name is Kate O'Connor, and I am the chair of the Vermont Nuclear Decommissioning Citizens Advisory Panel, which is the meeting you are all at tonight. And I want to officially call to order the May 25th, 2017, meeting of the Panel.

What I'm going to do for some of you who may -- this may be your first meeting, I want to explain a little bit about what the Panel is and what we do. We are a nineteen-member panel that was formed by the Legislature back in 2014 when Entergy announced that they would be closing Vermont Yankee. We have been meeting since September 2014. And in that time, I think we've had twenty-five or twenty-six meetings. So we've been meeting pretty much on a regular basis.

The Legislature gave us a series of duties, but the one that is really most relevant for tonight is that we are -- we are to serve as a conduit for public information and education, and to encourage community involvement in all matters related to the decommissioning of Vermont Yankee.

Before I go over the agenda, I want all of our Panel members to introduce themselves. We have a
diverse group. I was appointed by Governor Shumlin as
a citizen member of the Panel.

So Chris, do you want to start that on
your end?

MR. CAMPANY: Chris Campany, Windham
Regional Commission.

MR. DEEN: David Deen, citizen appointee
by the Speaker of the House.

SENATOR MACDONALD: Mark MacDonald,
Representative Vermont Senate and on this Panel.

MR. SKIBNIOWSKY: Good evening; I'm Steve
Skibniowsky, representing the Town of Vernon and
nominated by the Vernon Board of Selectmen.

MR. ANDREWS: David Andrews, representing
the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers
and representing the past and present employees of
Vermont Yankee.

MR. TONKOVICH: Jim Tonkovich, I'm an
appointee from the Senate President Pro Temp.

MR. LANGEVELD: Martin Langeveld, a
citizen member appointed by Governor Shumlin.

MR. MATTEAU: Jim Matteau, also a citizen
member appointed by the President Pro Temp.

MR. JORDAN: Derrik Jordan, citizen member
appointed by Shap Smith.
DR. IRWIN: Bill Irwin, representing the Agency of Human Services. I work for the Department of Health Radiological and Toxicological Sciences.

MR. ALLEN: And I'm Riley Allen. I'm Deputy Commissioner of the Vermont Department of Public Service. I'm here sitting in for Commissioner June Tierney, who is out of the country.

MR. MCKENNEY: Good evening. I'm Mike McKenney. I'm representing Entergy.

MR. BOYLE: Good evening. I'm Jack Boyle, also representing Entergy. I'm the Decommissioning Director at Vermont Yankee.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: We're going to have you guys -- you folks introduce yourselves in a minute.

This is an official meeting of our Panel. And tonight, we have our special guests which are representatives from Entergy and NorthStar and the NRC. And they're going to be, as you know, on the agenda for later.

The representatives from the NRC are here to take public comment on the license transfer, which is the sale from Entergy to NorthStar, and NorthStar's post-shutdown decommissioning activities report, which is called the P.S.D.A.R., which for all of you who don't know what that is, it's the decommissioning plan...
which includes the cost estimates for decommissioning
the plant.

The NRC is required to take public comment
on the license transfer, but they are not required to
hold a public meeting. But they have agreed to come
here tonight. The Panel invited them to come, as did
Vermont's congressional delegation. And I want to
thank their representatives of Senator Sanders,
Congressmen Welch, and Senator Leahy here tonight. We
have Haley Pero from Senator Sanders' office, Tom
Berry from Senator Leahy's office, and George Twigg
from Congressman Welch. And they can all wave.

So we really appreciate -- we appreciate
their help. And I also want to again thank the
Nuclear Regulatory Commission for accepting our
invitation to come here this evening.

Just so everybody knows, when we get to
the comment period all of the converse -- comments are
going to be recorded by the Nuclear Regulatory
Commission and entered into the public record. If you
don't want to comment this evening, there is a
mechanism that you can do so through the NRC website.
And the comment period is going to be through June
23rd.

And what we're going to do is put the link
on how to do it on the State of Vermont's website. And if no one minds, if you signed up, I will send you how to get that. So if you're shy and you don't want to make a comment tonight, you have another close to a month to do so.

The first half of the meeting, we're going to have Entergy and NorthStar talk to us about the license transfer and the post-shutdown decommissioning activities report. And then the NRC is going to walk us through the process that they used to decide whether they're going to accept the license transfer application.

One of the things I want to remind everybody is that this is an NDCAP meeting and we're a Panel that was created by the state, which means we follow all Open Meeting Laws and we follow Robert's Rules of Order and a charter that we all developed two and a half years ago.

So what I would ask is that everybody sort of respect how we run our meetings. They've gone smoothly in the past, so I'm hoping that they will go smoothly tonight. And I think we're going to start what we normally do at -- at our meetings, Joe Lynch, who is the Senior Government Affairs Manager, gives us an update on the decommissioning of the plant.
So for those of you who have been here before, this will be like the next chapter or whatever in the book. For some of you, this may be the first time that you hear a decommissioning report from Joe. And everything that -- the presentations that Joe gives are on -- the Entergy has a website, V Y decommissioning dot com. So if you're really intrigued and want to watch everything that's happened before -- or see everything that's happened before you can easily catch up with that.

So I guess we'll turn it over to Joe.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Kate.

Next slide, please.

As Kate has mentioned, my name is Joe Lynch. I'm a Senior Government Affairs Manager for Entergy Vermont Yankee. I'm going to provide you with a brief update on the status of decommissioning, the decommissioning trust fund, and some of the activities that we have moving towards the transaction.

Next slide, please. Next slide.

One of the key projects right now at the site is the construction of the second of two dry fuel storage pads. The construction on the second pad started back in 2016. There was a break over the winter period due to weather. We restarted
construction of the pad on March 13th. We've been moving right along with progress. Just this week, we completed the reinforcing bar placement for the second pad. So the pad is now ready to accept concrete. And that -- that pour will be scheduled, we believe, next week, weather depending.

In addition to that, we've been going through the efforts of getting ready for our 2017 dry fuel storage campaign. At this point, we're estimating that if we start over the next couple weeks, which is our target, we'll be loading approximately twenty dry casks in 2017. Then again, we'll take a break over the winter for weather reasons and we'll complete the remaining dry casks. There's a total of forty-five casks that have yet to be loaded. There are thirteen on the pad right now for our total of fifty-eight.

Our target is to have all fuel transferred either in the late third quarter of 2018 or early fourth quarter of 2018. Again, part of that is weather dependent and ensuring that our -- we meet our -- our schedule.

Next slide, please.

Some current pictures in the upper right-hand corner, that is the correct configuration of the
first pad with the thirteen casks. We recently rearranged that configuration to be ready for the acceptance of the new loaded cask, which I had mentioned we'll start very soon.

The picture in the lower left is the pouring of what is known as the leveling slab. So this is essentially the -- a pad that is put in place. We can then place the rebar on top of it. That was done recently and that sets the stage for then constructing the second pad.

Next slide, please.

On the right-hand side, you can see workers putting the rebar in place -- the reinforcing bar in place on top of that leveling slab. And then you can see, in the lower left, the rebar being rigged in place. This is very heavy steel that is placed in a -- in a very detailed configuration. It is then wired together and in advance of us pouring the concrete.

Next slide, please.

We've been talking about water management for about a year and a half now. As many of you know from previous meetings, we have water entering into the lower elevations of our turbine building. Over that period of time, we have made measures to capture
that water stored on site and then ultimately ship it.

We continue to monitor the intrusion water and address it by making repairs to any cracks or crevices where water is coming in. We continue those efforts and they've been very successful in reducing the amount of intrusion water. This time of year and in the springtime is -- is typically a time of the year that you see an increase in the groundwater elevation and, therefore, an increase in that intrusion. Because of the efforts we've been able to maintain and manage that to very low numbers. I don't have today's number, but I think we're looking at about three -- about six hundred gallons a day is -- is the number that -- that we're seeing.

The groundwater is captured, placed into frac tanks, tested and then shipped to EnergySolutions where they have a licensed disposal site in Tennessee. Right now, we're shipping about three per month at the present intrusion rate. And we've shipped five hundred and seventeen thousand gallons to date.

Next slide, please. Next slide.

In regards to the two efforts that are necessary to go forward with the transaction, one, of course, will be discussed in a very short matter of time as the NRC has been requested to take a look at
a license transfer application, as well as the revised P.S.D.A.R. We're also going through the process of seeking approval from the State of Vermont Public Service Board through the Certificate of Public Good Process.

The first round of discovery requests on us were sent out on March 17th. We provided responses on April 26th. There has been a request by Department of Public Service and others to extend -- extend that a bit because of certain documents that are -- are confidential in nature. So we had to file a motion to ensure that these confidential documents were treated in a certain way, and that those -- those entities that intervened would -- would respect them that way.

There's also a couple of documents that are very sensitive to NorthStar's business that also need special treatment. And we're going through the process right now of getting that protocol worked out.

So the second round of discovery requests on us were supposed to be May 10th, but because of the delay in this handling of documents, that will be delayed to be about three weeks after all documents have been produced.

There's also been some motions by some of the intervenors, including New England Coalition,
asking for partial summary judgment going back to some
earlier dockets on some orders that had already been
made. Those are going through the process in the
Public Service Board.

  Bottom line, very detailed, very
comprehensive process of going through this approval
in the State of Vermont. And we're hoping that this
will all take place over the next year or so with
approval at the end of first quarter 2018.

  Next slide, please. Next slide.

  An update on the Nuclear Decommissioning
Trust Fund at the end of March, last reported the
Decommissioning Trust Fund was at five hundred and
sixty-eight point nine million dollars. The most
current number at the end of April was five hundred
and seventy million dollars. That increase was due to
positive market performance, offset by the qualified
reimbursements that we have made from the trust and
some of the fund expenses that we have to pay,
especially taxes.

  So to date in 2017, we've made just under
twelve million dollars in qualified withdrawals.
We've earned about twenty-one point seven million
dollars in market gains and paid one point four
million dollars in -- in expenses.
The second trust that we've been maintaining is a Site Restoration Trust. This is wholly funded by Entergy. We have made four payments of five million dollars, or twenty million dollars. However, due to growth of the trust fund, that currently stands at twenty-three point six million dollars at the end of April. And we have one five million dollars contribution yet to be made at the end of this year.

Next slide, please.

Insofar as our communications and providing information to the public, we continue, obviously, to participate in this Panel. We continue to do speaking engagements, media interviews, local advertising, and we continue to be very strong partners with our community. On occasion, we are able to do tours at the site. They, of course, are going to be impacted by ongoing site activities. So we need to be mindful to a lot of work that's going on at the site. So we ask, if we have these type of tours, we get advance notice.

And then of course, we continue to put information out through our website V Y decommissioning dot com. And I'm happy to report that the website has been updated recently and it continues
to be updated. This is a screenshot. If you were to
go on to V Y decommissioning dot com, you will see
kind of the updated website that now has search
capabilities. And it is being updated constantly with
the latest information.

And we're also going through the process
of renaming a lot of these documents to make it easier
for individuals to find them and kind of migrate their
way through. There's been a lot of information put
out. And we're committed to making sure that we can
get that information out efficiently.

And unless there's any questions, that was
kind of the end of what I planned and prepared, Kate.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Great; thank you, Joe.

Just so everybody -- I'm not sure how many
people have the paper agenda. And we're going to
flash it up on the screen later. The public comment
portion of this meeting will start in about an hour.
And if you want to speak and haven't signed up, there
are sign-up sheets over on the table. We will have a
break after the presentations are made. So you don't
have to storm the table right now. There will be
opportunity between when this portion ends and when
the public comment period begins.

Next, I want to invite Scott State, who is
the C.E.O. of NorthStar, and Mike Twomey, who is the
Vice President for External Affairs of Entergy, to --
I guess, you're going to walk us through the license
transfer and possibly the P.S.D.A.R., but I'll let you
tell us what you're going to talked about.

MR. TWOMEY: Thank you, Kate.

This is Mike Twomey on behalf of Entergy.

This is a joint presentation between Entergy and
NorthStar. I have a limited role at the frontend of
the presentation and I'll be turning it over to Scott
in just -- just a few minutes.

I want to thank the Panel and the
chairwoman for inviting us to participate in this
meeting tonight, provide additional information about
this transaction. So with no more introductory
remarks, I'll go to the next slide.

Start briefly with what I hope is a
complementary update without duplicating anything that
Joe Lynch just covered. Right now, we have
approximately a hundred and fifty employees at the
site. That is our -- our staffing level that we
expect to maintain through approximately the third or
fourth quarter of 2018. The next major milestone is
the completion of the dry fuel storage project.

So when that work that Joe was referring
to earlier is completed, when all of the canisters have been moved on to the pad, all the spent fuel moved out of the pool, we will have a staffing reduction at that time. Along the way, we will continue to have our communications with the Panel, as well as employees and regulatory bodies.

Joe mentioned we've got a certificate of public good pending in front of the Public Service Board. In -- in general, for those of you who weren't that familiar with it, it's an application seeking approval from the Public Service Board for the transaction that we've proposed.

We have a similar, but -- but separate, filing pending in front of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. We also need approval from that federal agency for the transaction.

Joe spent some time talking about the discovery issues. I'll say that right now the procedural schedule contemplates one more public hearing opportunity, similar to the one that we had earlier in the year. I don't believe the date of that has been nailed down. I think it's currently September 5th or 6th, depending on -- on availability. That date, itself, may be adjusted, depending on where we are with the discovery process and the -- and the
testimony process.

We will have evidentiary hearings, technical hearings, I believe, is the right term in front of the Public Service Board, late in the year. Those hearings are currently scheduled for November. But it is -- is possible that the discovery issues and the testimony deadlines will impact the schedule for the technical hearing. So I would say that at this point those -- those are not set in stone.

We have requested that the board take action on the application by the end of the first quarter of 2018. We obviously have no power to compel the schedule for the board. We've simply told them that -- that's the schedule we -- we would hope they could meet. And we'll just see how the process unfolds.

We've got the license transfer application pending at the NRC. And NorthStar submitted an updated post-shutdown decommissioning activities report on April 6th. And I'm going to let Scott talk about those details. But in general, those of you who've been following this closely, Entergy filed a P.S.D.A.R. back in November of 2014.

This document, this new P.S.D.A.R. would be a substitute for the earlier filed Entergy document.
and would become the operative document for the project if the transaction is approved by both the NRC and the P.S.B. The -- the timeline at the bottom there on -- on this slide is -- is the timeline that was reflected in the post-shutdown decommissioning activities report that Entergy submitted back in 2014. Everyone knows we ceased commercial operations in December of 2014. The reactor was permanently defueled in January 2015. We contemplated fuel transfer by 2020.

So the first update that you've gotten in the last few months is that we now believe we can complete that fuel transfer by the third or fourth quarter of 2018, which is a two-year improvement on the fuel transfer schedule that we had originally anticipated.

That means that the SAFSTORE dormancy period would commence under our ownership, if we retain ownership, after the fuel is moved to the pad in 2018. And that will be of some indeterminate length. I don't want to go into too much detail tonight because we're really focused on the license transfer application. But that SAFSTORE period will be however long it needs to be under the requirements of the settlement agreement that we have at the State.
of Vermont, the funding of the Nuclear Decommissioning Trust Fund, and the decommissioning cost estimate that we have for the project under Entergy's ownership.

And so the rest of the dates are -- are, again, dates that would be in -- in effect if Entergy retains the ownership of the site.

So if we go to the next slide?

I'll just -- you know, introduce this concept again, which is that one of the primary benefits of the proposed transaction is that it substantially accelerates the safe decommissioning of the plant under ownership of a company and -- and with work, with a team that it's put together that has the capacity and the experience and the expertise to complete the decommissioning project on a much quicker timeline than under Entergy's ownership.

And so with that, I'll turn the presentation over to Scott State.

MR. STATE: Thank you, Mike.

And thank you, Kate.

I'm Scott State. I'm the Chief Executive Officer of NorthStar. Just with a show of hands, how many folks are here that haven't been to any of these meetings before where we've spoken? Not too many. That -- that's good. That means there's, I think,
good engagement among the community here. I'm not going to go over a lot of things that I've gone over before. But I do want to, initially here, cover who our team is.

NorthStar, if -- if you go around the room, you can see we've put up some large photographs this evening to show you some of the large-scale projects that -- that we've done. And I'm going to get to that in a little bit, but it's important, just in terms of the scale of work that we do, as we consider how we would do this project. And you know, what you'll find is that the size of projects that we've done in many -- many cases bound the size of Vermont Yankee. And -- and I'll talk through that a little bit more as we get into it.

In addition to ourselves on our team, we've got AREVA and we've talked about AREVA at past meetings. AREVA's a large nuclear services business. It's a French-owned company. The subsidiary that we work with is a U.S. based firm in Washington D.C. And they have a couple of specific things they're going to do for us on this project.

One is they are going to segment the reactor vessel and the reactor vessel internals. And that -- that's a significant component of the project
in that it's got a high degree of highly radioactive material. That's one of the first activities that we'll do. AREVA will also be assisting us over the many years that we will be caretaker for the spent nuclear fuel that will remain at the site until the Department of Energy comes and removes it.

A second subcontractor is Burns and McDonnell. Burns and McDonnell is a large engineering firm based in Kansas City. And they are specifically going to support us with some engineering activities and some licensing activities as we do this project.

And our third supplier is Waste Control Specialists, or W.C.S., based in Texas, an important component of this team because they take the radioactive waste or the material that comes from the decommissioning project and it goes to their site in Texas for disposal.

W.C.S. is part of -- is the disposal site for the Texas and Vermont Compact. So by statute, the material created at this project will have a right to be disposed at that site and they're are partner on this project as well.

Turning to the next slide, I'll let Mike start off. This is a transition period between Entergy and -- and NorthStar.
MR. TWOMEY: So for very briefly, we shut the facility down in 2014 and over the next several years we've been focused on getting the dry fuel storage campaign completed. That is taking the spent nuclear fuel that's currently in the spent nuclear fuel pool and moving it into the canisters that are on the dry cask storage cask pads in the yard. And the -- the effort to do that, when completed, will have removed approximately ninety-five percent or more of the radioactive material from the plant and isolated that to the ISFSI pad.

The next step after you do that is to focus on the major dismantling work. And as the owner of that facility in 2014, we were hearing loud and clear from the community, from the state, from all stakeholders, that the primary concern was that this site be decommissioned as quickly as possible, while -- while safely, but -- but not have the site languish for -- for sixty years.

And so in an effort to be responsive to those concerns, we evaluated the potential for another owner of that facility who is an expert in decommissioning, and -- and made the determination that this project could be turned over to a new owner who could do it as safely as we could, but more cost
effectively and more efficiently than we could. And then that presents the opportunity for this transaction that we're talking about this evening.

And with that, I'll turn it over to Scott to talk about what work they would do if the transaction were approved.

MR. STATE: So if -- if this transaction does get approved in 2018, we will take ownership of the site. And the first two years of our project work will be focused on segmenting the reactor vessel and the reactor vessel internals. And that will take the removal of radiological material out of the plant to about ninety-nine percent of what was the original source term, leaving about one percent residual radioactive material that we will be removing, with a very vast majority of the volume of material coming out of the site after that. And this is contamination on concrete and that sort of thing that we will be dealing with post the removal of the vessel in the internals.

So you can see the title of this chart is actually Vermont Yankee Contaminated Site Cleanup. And it's -- it's an important distinction that we make when we look at a project like this. We aren't nuclear power plant operators. And we don't really
view this specifically as a cleanup of a facility that's a nuclear power plant. We view it as decommissioning of a contaminated site.

And all around this room, you see pictures of large projects that we've done where we've decommissioned some type of contaminated site. And it may have been contaminated with radiological materials or P.C.B.s or mercury or other hazardous components or asbestos, but -- but everything that we do as a company is -- involves remediating contaminated facilities or sites. And that's exactly how we view Vermont Yankee.

So you know, our project durations here, you can see that once we get the vessel out, and the internals, those are segmented, they're packaged, and they are shipped to Texas. We've got about a six-year program planned at this point in time for the final decommissioning activities which would take the site to what would be determined a partial site release.

And it's called a partial site release because the ISFSI with the spent fuel in the -- in the canisters that are -- are there, that piece of the site can't be released until that fuel is taken away. So site-wise, you know, all but a very small number of acres can be released in -- in roughly 2026. And that
would be our target schedule at this point. And then how long we -- we have the ISFSI in place is -- is really not in our control. We certainly would like to see D.O.E. come and take that fuel away. Once that piece of the project is done, we will remove the ISFSI pad. And all of that remaining material and the site then will be -- will go for a final license determination and a full site release.

So as I mentioned, as a company, NorthStar has decommissioned thousands of facilities of various sizes with various types of contaminants. There's a number of projects back here that have radiological components, some of them significantly larger in various aspects of the work. What we've done with these -- with these photographs -- and we'll probably present these again at -- at future meetings. And you know, if folks want to talk when we're at the break with any of our people, we've got quite a few of our employees here this evening that can kind of walk you through these various projects.

But there's placards on each project that show you the volume of contaminated concrete metal and soil that was involved in each one of them. And then there's also a line on those that show you what the equivalent or the same amount -- materials are in
Vermont Yankee. And it will give you kind of an idea, I think, that we've got a lot of bounding projects on a comparative basis.

We also have a short video which we'll show in just a few minutes. And it's -- a lot of it is time lapse footage of us removing large structures, commercial industrial structures, and that type of thing. And you can see -- over, you know, less than ten minutes, you'll see many years of work that we've done on a time lapse basis.

So going forward to the next -- excuse me -- three charts, this chart -- on each of the next three charts, you'll see a green box. The green box is the volume of material that we will be removing on an annual basis at Vermont Yankee. Vermont Yankee is a six-year project with various phases. So on an annual basis, we look at how much material we would generate in each of three primary waste classes; concrete, metals, and soil.

So in terms of concrete, I don't know if you can read this in the audience or not, but the -- the primary large structures that we deal with that have concrete are going to be commercial. Power plants -- you know, nuclear power plants have a significant amount of concrete because it's -- you
know, it's the way the plants are built and it has shielding capabilities. But for the most part, the very large amounts of concrete waste that are generated in decommissioning projects come from commercial jobs.

And as you can see, the -- the largest facility here, an industrial facility, which happened to be a smelter, had two hundred thousand tons of concrete per year. And the reason this is important is in a project like this, these types of projects are logistics jobs. You're -- you're moving volumes of material and your ability to move volumes of material will determine how quickly you can get the work done.

So you know, just on a comparative basis, Vermont Yankee is about sixteen thousand tons of concrete per year. Our largest project that we've done in the last five to seven years is two hundred thousand. All of these projects, there's approximately fifteen I think here, are -- are, you know, roughly double or more the size of the amount of concrete that we will generate and remove at Vermont Yankee.

Similarly, the next slide shows metals. In a project like this, the primary metals in a nuclear plant are going to be rebar. Joe showed you
the construction of the ISFSI. The laying of rebar. If you are familiar with how this plant was built, the -- the structures of this plant have a lot of very heavy rebar in them. So we will be breaking the concrete out and separating the metal, typically, the rebar mesh, and packaging all of this for disposal at the W.C.S. site in Texas.

So from -- from this figure, you can see that as far as metals on projects, there are a lot of these projects that are power plants. And a fossil plant, interestingly enough, has a lot more structural steel in it than a nuclear plant. The structural materials in a nuclear plant, a lot of those are actually concrete. In a fossil plant, there are typically large steel members and then a lot of rebar mesh, as well.

But you know, here, you can see we've got a number of projects, some two to three times the size of Vermont Yankee, on an annual production basis of metals that we would have removed and disposed of.

And then the last slide deals directly with soils. And when we went through and looked at these kinds of projects, we actually -- we do a lot of heavy civil environmental work where we maybe build levees and dams and that sort of thing. We took all
of that out because that's really not dealing with contaminated soils. This is all projects that deal with soil that has some type of contamination.

And you know, at power plant sites, that could be things like coal ash and a number of different things, soils that maybe come out of an industrial facility that have mercury or P.H.s or P.C.B.s or something like that. At Vermont Yankee, we're looking at a site that's, you know, likely going to have more radiological contamination in the soil than these other types of components.

In one of the pictures in the back corner is a project that we did a couple of years ago at the Hanford site where we removed two hundred and fifty thousand tons of soil, radiologically contaminated soil. And by comparison, we -- we think the, you know, soil volume, as we currently are looking at it, is about twenty-eight thousand tons at Vermont Yankee. So a project roughly ten times the size of Vermont Yankee in terms of remediating radiologically contaminated soils.

MR. TWOMEY: All right. So I think we covered this, but the -- but the milestones then are -- we are -- we have requested that the NRC take action on the license transfer amendment by the end of
the year. I'll make the same disclaimer I made with respect to the Public Service Board. We have no ability to control the schedule at the NRC. So we've simply made the request. And we are hopeful that if we have submitted all the proper material and they've got the information that they need, that a decision could be reached. But that's a hope and a target, not a -- not a definitive date.

And the Public Service Board, I mentioned March 2018 was the -- was the request. And the spent fuel movement to the ISFSI, I'd say that's an element over which we have much greater control. That's -- that's operational control on our side. The dry cask campaign for 2017 should begin next week to move twenty of the remaining forty-five casks. That would leave twenty-five casks to be moved next year. If we stay on schedule, we should be done by -- by the fourth quarter.

And then if we receive approvals from the NRC and the Public Service Board, and if those approvals do not contain any conditions that are unacceptable to the parties, we would hope to close the transaction at the end of 2018.

And with that, I believe there's a short video that the -- our expert driver over there is
going to tee up and get moving.

(A video was played.)

MR. STATE: This is a project that we did a couple of years ago. And it's basically an entire city block in the middle of Los Angeles. And so you can imagine the logistics, trying to get material out, fifty thousand tons of concrete. And essentially, we -- we removed this building one floor at a time, taking the material from the top to the bottom, putting it on transport vehicles, and taking it out of the middle of the City of Los Angeles. And when we got done, that's a site much like Vermont Yankee will look like.

This project, we did about four or five years ago. This is Launch Pad 39-B, which has some historical significance. It's the launch pad that the Challenger launched from. I'm not sure if it's the last launch from that pad. This video doesn't really give you necessarily a good idea of the scale of this structure. It's -- it's incredibly large and there were lot of constraints on this. We couldn't drop material like this to the ground. The pad -- the launch pad itself had to be retained and kept in good order because they had a mobile launch structure they were going to use on the pad after we finished.
This just shows some of the specially
equipment we use that -- that we will be using here, as well. And then this is a time lapse of the
structure over a period of a number of months as we picked and peeled away all the pieces and -- and took the entire structure apart.

This is a structure in the middle of Las Vegas. Anybody that's been there would probably recognize the facility. This -- this was a twenty-seven-story building that was constructed, never opened, had structural defects, and had to be removed. It sits right on Las Vegas Boulevard, so again a very significant logistics challenge to get that much concrete out on a busy corner, another successful job about two years ago.

This is a project at an Ivy School. We do a lot of work in the northeast, removing old facilities at the -- the Ivy League schools and -- and other facilities in the Boston area. And so this is a project that we've -- I think we're still conducting today, but it's some work I believe we did last year.

What you see there is the concrete and rebar mesh that's -- that's generally mixed together. This is a project that's larger than Vermont in every respect. It's a powerplant in New York. And it's a
project that we are just finishing up some of the soils remediation at this point in time and receding. But you can see this is a project that was done in the city environment, and large boilers, so a lot of metal, a lot of concrete, a very old structure, a lot of contamination from the types of fuels used here. And, you know, at the end of the day a site that -- that went off without a hitch. And, you know, logistically probably or size-wise, the property is, you know, similar size to Vermont Yankee, as well.

Those are stacks that are somewhat similar to the Vermont Yankee stacks. Those are about three days a piece using specialty equipment that we use the stack removal.

So this is a New York Power Authority plant that we did about a year and a half ago. We finished a very large project. This plant actually has a boiler. We believe it's the largest boiler that -- that may have ever been constructed. Massive steel structure to deal with in this -- this facility, and a pretty -- pretty intense environment in terms of working, essentially, in the City of New York, taking this plant down.

We do take down a number of structures in the middle of New York City. We removed the entire
St. Vincent's Hospital. We did all the renovation work at Madison Square Garden. We did most of the removal of Yankee Stadium. None of those projects are depicted here. They're not particularly relevant to Vermont Yankee. But we're accustomed to doing very large projects in -- in complicated and difficult places.

There's some key -- you know, key things about this kind of project and about Vermont Yankee. You know, we -- we do a lot of decontamination and removal of environmental contaminants inside these structures. When you peel off the outside of the structure, then you're just removing structural materials and steel in an environment that's been decontaminated.

And this is another facility in Las Vegas that we did last summer, a large multi-block structure that we did on a very accelerated timeline. We actually did this project in about nine months. It was a Fastrac site. One of the things you don't see here is this is a site that we actually imploded. And I didn't want to have video of implosions because we're not going to use implosions at Vermont Yankee. I didn't want to give anybody the visual of the massive cloud of dust that rises when you do that type
of thing.

We do have a photograph in the back, left corner of a cooling tower at the Savannah River nuclear site that we also took down by implosion. It was a clean tower that our government had built for about one hundred million dollars and never used. So we imploded it and removed that a few years ago.

But, yeah, this is a site when you can do implosion, it's a very fast way to take down structures of this type. And you get the material to the ground, you process the concrete out and the metal out.

So of note, you know, we've stated a number of times that we're a very safety conscious and environmental regulatory compliant company and -- and every project you saw there was operated in that type of manner.

That's it.

CHAIR O'CONNOR:  Great. Thank you very much.

Now, I want to introduce, or have them introduce themselves, the representatives that have come here from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. They're going to explain the process that they go through in order to approve or not approve the license
transfer that Entergy and NorthStar are asking for.

And again, I want to thank you folks for coming tonight. And I know we'll have some questions and comments for you after your presentation. So thank you.

MS. KOCK: My name's Andrea Kock. I'm the Deputy Director of our Decommissioning Division in NRC Headquarters from Rockville, Maryland. I also wanted to thank Kate and her colleagues of the Panel for inviting us here tonight, as well as the Vermont delegation.

We do appreciate the opportunity to be here and we are pleased to be here. And I mean that sincerely because it is important for us to consider your comments with regard to our regulatory processes. It's important that we touch base with you and consider those comments as part of our process. We do very much appreciate the invitation this evening.

As Kate mentioned, the main purpose of us being here tonight is to gather your comments with regard to our review of the application we have before us for transfer of the Vermont Yankee license to NorthStar. And Kate also mentioned that we recently, just this week, issued a federal notice asking for comments on the application. So this is your
opportunity to get your comments in early.

And I also wanted to mention that we're transcribing your comments during the meeting tonight. So if you have a comment you've made the comment at the meeting, there isn't a need for you to submit an additional comment on the docket to the NRC.

What we're going to do tonight is provide you an overview, as Kate mentioned, of what we look at when we look at a transfer application, our process, and the criteria that we use. And I want to assure you that that review will be independent and thorough. As one of the cornerstones of the way the NRC operates as an independent regulator, it's very important to us as an organization and it's important to me as an individual that that's the way we operate.

And part of us being independent and thorough is getting out in the community to hear from you, but also getting out to the sites that we regulate. And in that vein, we did visit the Vermont Yankee site today to get a sense of what's going on there from a decommissioning perspective. And I think that helps us to put our own eyes on the site and gather our own thoughts so that we make sure we are being independent, as well as having a good understanding of what's going on, on the ground.
I'll just take a minute here to introduce the NRC staff that are going to present this evening. First, we're going to hear from Bruce Watson. He's our Chief of the Reactor Decommissioning Branch. He has extensive experience in decommissioning and he's going to go over for you just an overview of the decommissioning process and our process for review of the transfer application.

And then we're going to hear from Jack Parrott, here to my left. He's our project manager for the Vermont Yankee site. He's going to go into a little bit more detail for you about the process we follow and some of the considerations that we look at in the transfer application.

And then lastly, we'll hear from Mike Dusaniwskyj. He's an economist who works for the NRC. He looks at all of the decommissioning funding reviews that we do to make sure that plants have adequate decommissioning funding to decommission.

I just also wanted to mention that we have Ray Powell here. He's from our Philadelphia office in the region. He's sitting here in the front row. If you have questions about our oversight process, an important thing that Bruce will touch on is that the NRC's oversight doesn't stop when a plant goes into
decommissioning. We do extensive inspections periodically and Ray's group leads those inspections from our regional office in Philadelphia.

And just one final note and then I'll turn it over to Bruce. I did want to echo something that Kate said. Our review is currently ongoing of the application. So we haven't made any conclusions about whether NorthStar is financially or technically qualified to hold the license. We're still in the initial stages of our review. So we won't be able to give you any bottom-line conclusions about what we think about this or that.

And I don't want you to take that as us being standoffish or -- or hiding something. We're -- just we're not at that point of process. We can tell you what we look at, the criteria that we go by, but we haven't drawn any conclusions one way or the other at this point in the review.

We can let you know where we are in the process. We're happy to answer questions. We would really appreciate your comments. And because we haven't made any conclusions, some of our responses may be just thank you for your comment because we don't at this point have a conclusion. And I wanted to make that clear.
At this point, I'll turn it over to Bruce Watson. And again, thank you for inviting us.

MR. WATSON: Well, thank you again for having us come out tonight and for the invitation.

I want to give a real quick, brief overview of -- of a few of the items before we get into some of the more detail from the staff. On slide one, I just remind everybody that the NRC role in decommissioning is to ensure that the facility or site is removed from service, and that the radiological conditions will meet the license -- criteria for license termination.

And we have two conditions in which that license can be terminated, under unrestricted use or restricted use. To date, all decommissioning sites in the United States, including the ten power reactors that had been completed decommissioning and had their licenses terminated, have been released for unrestricted use, meaning the owner can use the property for whatever purpose they have intended to do in the future.

And for this particular site, I believe both Entergy and NorthStar will be -- have the criteria that they're going to release the site, terminate the license for unrestricted release.
Also, I want to point out that once the license is terminated, or in parallel with the license terminations process, the actual restoration of the site is up to the owner and the state and its stakeholders. So once the radioactive material's removed, they're free to do whatever they choose to do for the site.

Can we go to the next slide, please?

In April 2017, a revised P.S.D.A.R., post-shutdown activities -- post-shutdown decommissioning activities report, was submitted to the NRC by NorthStar. It is contingent on the sale and license transfer.

One of the key features of this P.S.D.A.R. is that NorthStar plans to complete the decommissioning by as early as 2016. We will review the -- excuse me -- 2026. Excuse me. And we will review the P.S.D.A.R. with the same rigor that we reviewed the -- the Entergy P.S.D.A.R. that was submitted in 2014. And two of the -- one of the guidance documents that you may be familiar with is Reg Guide 1.185. It's available on our public website.

And of course, we've issued the Federal Register notice and we will accept -- be accepting
comments on both the license transfer and the P.S.D.A.R. And this will end on June 23rd, 2017.

And with that, I'll turn it over to Jack Parrott to talk about the license transfer process.

MR. PARROTT: Okay. If we could go to the next slide, please.

So reactor decommissioning license transfers, they are a relatively common occurrence. The license for Vermont Yankee, which previously transferred to Entergy in 2002. NRC has regulations in place to ensure that reactor licenses are transferred to a technically and financially viable company. Transfers of licenses to facilitate the decommissioning of reactors have occurred twice before for the Zion and La Crosse plants.

Next slide, please.

Our review process, the application for license transfer was submitted in February -- on February 9th, 2017. The license transfer documents are available on our public website on the U.R.L. on the slide there. Acceptance review was documented -- our acceptance review of the -- of the license application was documented by letter dated April 6th, 2017.

Our acceptance review looked to see that
the technical and financial review topics are covered. But nevertheless, there still could be a request for additional information from our subsequent review.

The notice of consideration was published in the Federal Register yesterday. It includes an opportunity for hearing and an opportunity for public comment. The opportunity for hearing and intervention is open to any person whose interest may be affected by NRC action on this application. The opportunity remains open twenty days after the notice of consideration that was published yesterday.

The opportunity for public comment is a thirty-day period where written comments can be submitted for consideration by the staff during the review -- our review process.

As Andrea mentioned, our technical and financial review is underway. If found acceptable, a safety evaluation report, an order, and a license amendment will be issued by the NRC.

Next -- next slide, please.

The two things that we review, primary areas are the technical qualifications and financial qualifications. The technical qualification review areas focus on the management, the technical
support, and onsite organization to ensure that they are involved in, informed of, and dedicated to the safe operation of the plant, and to determine if sufficient qualified technical resources will be provided for safe operations.

All requirements -- this is an important point. All of the requirements of the current plant operator and owner at the time of transfer, should -- should the transfer be approved, will be -- will transfer to the new -- the new company, NorthStar. Implementation of those requirements is the key and will be under the continued oversight of NRC.

At this point, I'd like to turn over to Mike Dusaniwskyj to talk about the financial qualification review.

MR. DUSANIWSKYJ: Good evening. The financial qualification review in this particular license transfer is going to be focusing on decommissioning funding assurance, foreign ownership control or domination, and the price and its indemnity and nuclear insurance. In this regard, staff will seek reasonable assurance that the licensee maintains adequate funding to complete decommissioning to NRC standards and terminate the license and adequate financial protection remains available on-site and
off-site commensurate with the risk of the decommissioning plant.

Next slide.

The NRC maintains a comprehensive regulatory -- regulation-based framework to provide assurance that the new licensee for a license transfer maintains the financial means to safely decommission the facility and terminate the license. This framework includes consideration for spent fuel management and ISFSI decommissioning. ISFSI stands for independent state -- I'm sorry; I've forgotten again.

MR. PARROTT: Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation.

MR. DUSANIWSKYJ: Thank you.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Also known as the dry cask storage pad for us civilians.

MR. DUSANIWSKYJ: Yes.

Through our operations, licensees are required to certify that adequate funding for decommissioning will be available when needed. For a plant that is transitioned to decommissioning, the same requirements apply and licensees provide evidence of adequate -- adequate funding through annual reports submitted to the NRC. These reports separately
provide transparency in the license -- in the license's use of decommissioning trust funds, the estimated costs for -- to complete decommissioning and management of spent fuel, available funding to cover these costs and any material changes to the trust agreements or other allowable funding mechanisms. For a license transfer, these responsibilities are incumbent on the new licensee.

Next slide, please.

And as -- as a summary of this, the NRC regulations require licensees to maintain adequate financial assurance for decommissioning at all times. Oversight of financial assurance continues until a license is terminated. Licensees submit a financial assurance status reports annually. The report includes amounts spent on decommissioning remaining for trust fund balance and estimated cost to complete decommissioning. The report is reviewed for a reasonable assurance of the adequacy of decommissioning funding.

And with that, I'll hand it over now to Bruce.

MR. WATSON: Thank you, Mike.

I thought I'd conclude our -- our presentation with a brief discussion on our inspection
program. And I want to be clear that our inspection program continues to ensure the safe decommissioning of the site until the license is terminated. We have a dedicated inspection manual chapter for power reactor decommissioning. It's available on our website. It's I.M.C., or Inspection Manual Chapter, 2561. It contains core inspection procedures that have to be done every year and a variety of discretionary inspection procedures which are done commensurate with the work that is being performed.

Our inspection frequency and the amount of time we spend in the inspection process will be commensurate with the amount of activities on-site. So we will be coordinating closely with the licensee performing the decommissioning activities. So they'll see us a lot when there's a lot of activities going on. And they won't -- won't see us as often if there's no activities or very little activities going on.

We are required to conduct the inspection -- inspection procedures annually. And these inspection -- our inspection reports are publicly available unless they can turn -- contain information that's specific to security or safeguards.

So with that, I'd like to close our
discussion. I want to thank you for your -- for
listening. And we look forward to your comments.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Great; thank you very
much.

What we're going to do now is take a very
short period of time to have the Panel ask questions
and comments. And I'm going to tell everybody right
now not everyone is going to get to ask a question or
make a comment. And what I would ask is, because our
time is so limited, that we keep them to, you know,
one or two minutes because we want to have enough time
for anyone and everyone in the public who wants to
make a comment or ask a question to do so.

And I'm going to -- because I have the
mic, I'm going to ask the first question, which I know
is one that has come up with the public and members of
the Panel. And it's a question, I think, for the NRC,
NorthStar, and Entergy, if you all would like to
answer it.

As the NRC just outlined, one of the main
points that you're going to look at is the financial
assurance that NorthStar gives you that they -- that
they can complete the decommissioning within the
amount of money they say they are. And one of the big
questions that has come up is if the decommissioning
is not completed and the money and the nuclear
decommissioning trust fund runs out, who is
responsible for paying for the -- the shortfall?

And one of the issues, I think, that comes
up around this is, since Vermont Yankee is a merchant
plant, which means it's not getting any money from
ratepayers, there's no ratepayers to go back to -- to
get the money. So I guess our question really is who
-- and we -- we know we've heard that there won't run
out of money, but there's concern here that there will
-- there could be a shortfall of funds.

So we'd like to know who picks -- who's on
the hook for the money?

MS. KOCK: I keep forgetting to turn that
on. I can start out and then turn it over to some of
our experts. And then, I think, Kate, as you pointed
out, I think NorthStar would have a piece of this,
too. So Scott will probably want to jump in there.

But as far as the NRC is concerned --.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Hey, Andrea. I'm sorry;
can I -- everyone has to speak up a little because of
the rain.

MS. KOCK: It's raining. Okay. I'll
speak up.

As I said, I can -- I can start out and
then turn it over to some of our experts. And I think part of this can be answered by North -- NorthStar, as well.

From the NRC's perspective, the responsibility for funding is with the licensee. It's very clear and very straightforward. So for all regulatory activities, we look to the licensee they are responsible. So if the license is transferred to NorthStar, they're responsible for the funding. And if there's a shortage, they're responsible for making up that shortage.

Our regulations require that they have decommissioning financial assurance at all times. As Mike laid out, we look at the transfer application from the beginning to make sure there's adequate funds. But going forward, our regulations simply state that you have to have adequate funding at all times. And if there is a gap or shortage, they're required to make that up. And the responsibility for that would be NorthStar.

As far as how they would make that up. I think that's the piece that NorthStar could help you understand what provisions or where they would look or their contingency plan is for that. We simply set the regulation to say they have to make that funding up.
I'll just add a few more points and then turn it over to others to add on. As far as, you know, what assurances do we have for decommissioning financial assurance -- and I think we've touched on a lot of these already. As Mike mentioned, we have ongoing oversight through decommissioning. So annually, we look at how much is left in the fund, what's their estimate for how much it's going to cost to complete the decommissioning, and then we look to see if there's any gap. So it's not as if we look at it once when the application -- when the transfer occurs and then not again.

We also do a thorough review at the beginning, as we mentioned, and then we do our annual reviews. The only other thing that I would add is -- I think Bruce mentioned this well. We have had ten power reactors go into decommissioning and have their licenses terminated. In all cases, that's been done safely and funding has been made available. Either the fund was adequate from the beginning or if there were shortages during the decommissioning period, those funding shortages were made up.

And again, how -- how those can be made up, there's a variety of ways. I'll turn it over to NorthStar to answer how they would look at that. But
people could have contingency funds. They could have parent company guarantees. There's a variety of ways in which those funds could be made up. We don't dictate how it be done, just that it would be done.

MR. STATE: I guess, I'll just add a few comments about how NorthStar looks at this. So the -- you know, the front line of defense for us is we know how much money is in the trust fund today. We can see it. We can call the bank and they can tell us. And at inception of this project, the way we've established our -- our work and the way we pay ourselves, we are limited to the amount of money we take out of the trust account by performance of the work.

So in our breakdown of this project, we've got a little over nine hundred work elements. And if we execute all nine hundreds of those work elements, the site will be clean and it will be released for unrestricted use.

So when we broke it down into those work elements, we assigned a cost to each of them. We added all that cost up and that cost had to be less than or equal to the amount of money we had to work with to do the decommissioning. So our first line of defense is we simply don't take money out of the trust
fund unless we've actually executed the work that that money is tied to.

And with that, you know, assurance that we don't ever -- it's a performance-based assurance that we don't ever take more money than work actually performed, if you -- you know, if you track it all the way through and we take out exactly the amount we say we will for each of the work elements, and the work element gets done, then we'll complete this project within the amount of funding that we have. And the certainty of us executing each of these work elements for that cost is that we will provide a form of surety or guarantee for performance of each of those work elements as we do them.

So you know, that's what we view as the most important way to do a project like this. And it's, frankly, the way we do every project the company conducts, nationwide, every day. We work as a fixed price contractor, doing work like this all the time. And we worked to budgets on individual work elements.

Now, in the event that -- that somehow there's a bust, and that doesn't work out, we've also committed one-hundred-twenty-five-million-dollar performance assurance above and beyond the amount of money that's in the trust fund. And that will be a
guarantee by the company.

As we conduct this work, we actually will be taking a percentage of all the funds that we remove from the trust account and putting them into an escrow. And that's a cash first line of defense to support the -- the -- any needed cash obligations that might be above and beyond the nuclear decommissioning trust. So you know, it's kind of a two-step process. It's a process of limiting cost and then a process of making additional financial capability available above and beyond the funds that we know are present today.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

Bill?

MR. JORDAN: Yes; thank you. This is, likewise, likely to be answered by the Panel, NRC, Entergy, and NorthStar, and really dovetails to Kate's question and also to my sincere pleasure to hear that the site could be available to this community for other uses much sooner than originally planned. And I hope that that does come to pass.

An -- an obstacle to that, in my mind, is represented at the Connecticut Yankee facility, Yankee Rowe facility, and the Maine Yankee facility where there are many more acres of land, and yet, the ISFSI remains and no development has occurred on any of
those three plots of land.

So my question is does the NRC have any practical limitations with a site of about one hundred twenty to a hundred thirty acres, some of which is going to be taken up by the electric infrastructure of the switch yard and also by the ISFSI, of having another -- some other development on the remaining plot of land that was released for unrestricted use.

And two, does NorthStar feel confident that, unlike the other owners of plants around New England, they will be able to find a means by which that land can be put back to productive use?

MR. WATSON: Yeah, this is Bruce Watson. I -- I think that the plants that have been decommissioned -- as I said, that they all have been decommissioned for unrestricted use. So it's really up to the owner what they want to do. About a third of them had additional generation facilities placed on them, built on them, and -- and back into generating power because they do have the grid infrastructure there, they do have a source of cooling water, and they previously had an environmental impact statement for an operating nuclear power plant. So about one-third add generating capacity to the site.

One-third have chosen not to do anything
with the site, which would include Connecticut Yankee and a few others. At Maine Yankee, they've chosen to make part of the land a park. I think they donated part of the land to a nonprofit organization, I think dedicated to naturalization of the -- of the land. So it's an -- it's a mixed bag on what happens with the property once the license is terminated.

Granted, the dry storage facility is there. It is still under a license. We have strict requirements for that security of that facility. So yes, some of the land is taken up for that particular purpose. But from the NRC's view is that the remaining lands that are not required to be under the license are available for any -- any -- any development or unrestricted use that the owner would have for that.

So I hope I answered that part of the question.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Yes? Wait one second because we're going to let somebody --.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Counting our chickens here --?

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Well, wait one second. We got to -- we've got to get the full answer here.

MR. STATE: So you know, the owners of the
three facilities you mentioned, I've been -- I haven't been to Connecticut Yankee site. I've been to Yankee Rowe. I've been to Maine Yankee. You know, those are somewhat remote locations, somewhat remote sites. And, you know, the ownership structure there is you still have utility owners or cooperatives, in essence, multiple parties that own those sites. And I think, as a result, you know, they're people that operate or -- or there are cooperatives that were formed to operate these plants. I'm not sure that any one of those individual utilities has any specific desire to do anything with those sites.

We're commercially a very different setup. You know, we are not interested in being the long-term owner and developer of the site after it's clean. What we're interested in doing is working with the local community to find the highest and best use of the property.

We've heard suggestions of, you know, potentially looking at a micro-grid. That could be a great idea. We've suggested a solar facility might be an option there. But we're not wedded to any specific future use, but we are wedded to finding a future use. And -- and we will be, I would say, very easy to work with in terms of positioning the property for its best
potential.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Great. Thank you.

Does anyone on this side --?

SENATOR MACDONALD: I'm surprised we would be using this time to discuss what to do with a site that may or may not be cleaned up. And that is premature. I've been doing this job long enough to have been to this point, several times, with the NRC.

And on the original sale of Vermont Yankee to Entergy, we were given assurances by the NRC that the decommissioning fund was adequate, that the new operation would provide benefits to the state of Vermont, there would be additional revenues to put into the cleanup.

And what happened was, at Vermont, the owners shipped all the profits out of state and left the decommissioning fund inadequate enough so that tonight we're here discussing how to clean the place up.

The second time we arrived at this point was when the owners of the plant came in and asked to do an up-rate. And your advisory Panel that preceded this one recommended in a vote not to do the up-rate because the decommissioning fund was inadequate because the NRC assured us that there would be a
depository for nuclear waste available if we did an --
an up-rate. And your Nuclear Advisory Panel said that
that would not happen.

And the NRC gave us assurances that there
would be a place to send the waste, and despite the
recommendation that the assurances were not worth --
the assurances failed to materialize, no additional
funds were required from the owners to be put into
decommissioning to cover the additional waste. That
was the second time we were here.

The third time, Madam Chair, we arrived at
this position was when the owners asked for a license
extension. And the owners had made a commitment to
the State of Vermont to the Legislature, a handshake
and a widely understood agreement that the owners
would not ask to extend the license without the
permission of the State and the Legislature. And when
the owners didn't get permission, the owners went to
court to undo the bargain that they had offered.

And each time, the owners had slide shows
like the one we had tonight, had pictures in the back
of the room, and touted their expertise, their
professionalism, their ability to deliver on promises.

And the Chair has asked what happens if a
company like NorthStar, a relatively new company with
no deep pockets, sold the plant and fails to complete
the cleanup, who is left holding the bag. And, Madam
Chair, the reason I asked that question was when an
up-rate was being discussed and your VSNAP panel said
don't do the up-rate unless the NRC can tell us what
will happen and who will pay and who will be left
holding the bag if there is no National Nuclear
Depository.

And those that make these decisions were
persuaded to accept the assurance of the NRC and to
trust the owners that things would turn out all right.

And we are here today because of -- this
is about the fourth time that I have served where
we're given a slideshow, promises, guarantees that
these people are more clever, better accountants, and
more responsible than their predecessors. And they're
asking us to sign off on a recommendation.

But if this doesn't work, the answer is
the NRC doesn't have a rule for who will be
responsible. The rule is the people who would be
responsible are the people that have no money. Madam
Chair, I say that because when -- when, in the past,
the NRC told us that there will be a nuclear
depository available for the waste by a certain year,
and we said we don't believe you, and they said that's
our rule, there must be, you're not going to get left holding the bag. And when it became clear that there was no nuclear depository available, they, the NRC, changed its rule.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: I don't want to cut you off, but --.

SENATOR MACDONALD: You would like to talk about what we're going to do with this plant after it's been cleaned up?

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Yeah.

SENATOR MACDONALD: Instead of what is the guarantee that we're going to be -- this is going to be cleaned up and that the NRC, who writes the rules we have to obey, writes a rule for this other than that the people that have no money are responsible.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

I mean I -- I don't know if there's -- you've -- you answered the question when I asked about who's on the hook. I don't know if you want to add anything?

MS. KOCK: No, I didn't want to add anything. I just wanted to clarify one thing unrelated to the funding issue, which is that the NRC doesn't -- does not set the policy for when and where there will be a national depository. We're
responsible for reviewing any application we might get for a repository, making sure that it's safe, and issuing a license if we think it's appropriate. But we do not set the national policy on whether there will be a repository, where it will be, or when it will be. That is not something that's within our control or authority. So I just wanted to make that one clarification, but nothing else to add. Thank you.

SENATOR MACDONALD: That's --.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

SENATOR MACDONALD: That's true, Madam Chair. But they assured us, while they don't set the policy, that someone else did -- they assured us that there would be a depository there. They gave us their assurance. They don't make the policy, but they gave us the assurance. And when it failed, they made up a new set of rules to allow a hundred years for -- for getting rid of the waste.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

Chris?

MR. CAMPANY: Chris Campany, Windham Regional Commission. The Town of Vernon asked the Windham Regional -- or had initial planning grant to have the Windham Regional Commission prepare a
resilience plan for what would happen when the plant
would eventually close. And this was back in 2012.

And I just want to see if you can add any
clarity of as far as when the site might be released
with the presence of the ISFSI there? On June 12th,
2012, I had a phone conversation with Ronald Bellamy,
Chief Reactor Project Branch of NRC, Region One. And
he said that as long as the ISFSI was there after
decommissioning, that it would be unlikely the site
would be able to be released for reuse. So that was
from -- I think -- I think he's retired now and he
can't be here to explain his logic.

But I just wondered what you might want to
add or what your position would -- might be now?

MR. WATSON: I can't comment on what the
conversation was with Mr. Bellamy, back then. But any
land that is taken off the license, with the exception
of the license property, which is the dry storage
facility, it will be -- I guess, should say is planned
to be released for unrestricted use, which means it
can be used for anything that the owner or the town or
whatever choose to do, whoever controls the property
rights to that piece of land.

Yes, the ISFSI will be there until the
Department of Energy removes the fuel. At that time,
when the fuel's removed, the -- the actual facility
will be decommissioned. And then the entire piece of
property will be available for, I would believe at
that point, unrestricted use and for development for
whatever purpose the owners would have.

So, you know, I can't comment on the basis
of the conversation you had with him. But like I
said, at other facilities, the -- the remaining pieces
of land have been -- have been -- added generating
plants and -- and used for other purposes. And some
have chose not to use the property at all for -- just
letting it sit for right now so.

MR. CAMPANY: So I just -- so, Kate, can
I ask just a follow-up? So -- so, I guess what I'm --
so what's the -- like the security perimeter likely to
be around the ISFSI? I mean, how much of the site
would likely be available?

I'm asking you because -- one of the
reasons, when we went to Connecticut Yankee, one of
the reasons why they moved the spent fuel so far away
from the site was to facilitate redevelopment of that
site. And they did that at a considerable expense to
move that away. I thought that was -- and I thought
at Maine Yankee that was part of the reason, too, for
removing the spent fuel pretty far away, so they could
really -- and of course, those are much larger sites and then V.Y. So what would you anticipate like this, the perimeter might be around the ISFSI?

MR. WATSON: I really can't really answer that because I -- we don't normally look into ISFSIs too much. But I'm sure that there's a certain amount of land that's required for the security plan around it to be under the owner control to make sure that the people who are providing security and for the facility have adequate time to respond to any threats.

I can tell you that the facility at Connecticut Yankee, the dry storage facility was purposely moved up on the hill because the original location had it down in a valley. And they thought that was a -- not a wise decision for the actual security of the facility, and that the better place would be up on the hill so that it was on high land for -- for security reasons.

So I hope that answers your question to the best I can -- can do today.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Okay. We'd have one more Panel question. We'll let Jim Matteau.

MR. MATTEAU: Thank you.

It's actually, two questions, but they're both very quick and I'll throw them both out there
together. The first one for NorthStar.

Not -- not knowing the details of the commitment, I understand the -- the price per component and everything, and that's -- that's encouraging. I'm really optimistic about that. But is there anywhere in there, if you encounter something significant that you could make a clear case was reasonably not foreseeable, is there any way for you to go back and seek an increase allotment for that component, which it seems to me would, in turn, jeopardize -- could jeopardize the balance of the trust fund?

And the second question for the NRC is, if something like that were to happen or, for whatever reason, it got to the point that there wasn't enough money to complete the decom, would it be possible for the owner to apply to go back -- excuse me -- to go back into SAFSTOR? That's a one-word answer.

MR. STATE: So the -- the -- the first issue you raised is if -- if -- I think you're saying if we find an unknown source of contamination or something. If -- if we simply execute poorly, we have no recourse to anyone for anything. If, in fact, during a certain specified period of time, we find contamination that was undisclosed as part of the
transaction, we've got a level of indemnification from the seller. That doesn't go on forever. That goes on for a certain period of time.

So, you know, it behooves us early on in this process to make sure we've got the best characterization we can and determine if there's any unknown contamination that -- that was not disclosed to us.

If, in fact, we go through the process and we find unknown contamination after a certain date, it's our obligation to remove that. And we have to remove that to, you know, achieve what the objective here, which is unrestricted use of the site.

So, you know, we've done a lot of facilities like this and we've got a pretty good idea if there should be or would be certain types of contamination. These are not hard things to find. We know what the site was used for. We know, generally, you know, what kinds of things were at the site.

I can tell you that large sites that had large motor pools, a lot of times, are really bad sites because, you know, back in the day you just threw out the back door and now it's all over in the groundwater.

We know there's been certain events at the
site. We think those are pretty well documented. And we will certainly do a high level of investigation upon ownership to confirm all of that -- all of the facts that -- that we've got. But, you know, generally, we feel like there aren't any of those really big gotchas out there. But if there are, we do have a certain ability to protect ourselves, you know, day one, for those types of things.

MR. SACHS: Uh --.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Hey, Gary, we're trying to do our meeting, so let the NRC -- there will be public comment in a minute.

MR. SACHS: (Off mic) Can I --

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Yes -- yes, please do. Okay. Please go on, Bruce.

MR. WATSON: Obviously, the NRC's view of the decommissioning is that the decommissioning has to be completed in sixty years. So given the fact that this is the business model that NorthStar is taking, they're using to -- to actually take the sale of the property, it's their risk they're taking in doing their review of the site to ensure that they can meet the commitments that they're telling us in the -- in the documents in the -- in the financial information.

So for many, like previous license
transfers, we would have expected them to do their due
diligence to protect themselves, review the site
history, look at the characterization to ensure that
they -- they have a good assurance that they can clean
up the site within the funds.

Back in 2012, we strengthened our
decommissioning regulations. We actually call it the
Decommissioning Planning Rule. And it required that
the sites do additional groundwater monitoring close
to sites which could produce contamination into the
environment so it would be discovered early. I think
that enhanced the ability to prevent a lot of
underground soil contamination, which has been found
at a few of the sites that were previously
decommissioned.

So these -- these regulations enable the
owner or the operator at the time, the licensee, to
find contamination and make a determination whether
they need to clean it up now or later.

So the answer is yes, they could go into
a SAFSTOR situation, do -- for -- for whatever reason
they choose to. But as I think that's their choice.
But in this particular case, they're telling us
they're planning to the clean the site up from a
radiological standpoint by 2026.
CHAIR O'CONNOR: Okay. We have one quick follow-up. Then we have to move on.

MR. WALKE: Mr. State, I just want to follow-up quickly on the point about you're going to do your due diligence post-transfer. We've talked about phase one complete before transfer of the environments non-radiological environmental review. As the state agency is responsible for the non-radiological piece, it -- it seems to me that the -- the that I have about the risk associated with the transfer is related to why wouldn't we want to do that diligence up front and know that information from the phase two prior to transfer, so you know what the gotchas are and we have come -- more comfort into the financial resources?

MR. WATSON: I'd like to add one more piece to -- to my previous comment, in that the NRC regulations require that any incident or -- I'll call it event that would result in information that would be important -- in particular, radiological information that would be important to the decommissioning of the future of the site be recorded.

And so we do have a requirement that if they had a spill or -- or a contamination that that'd
be well-documented in the record for the site history. And so that's one area that could be looked at from a radiological standpoint.

MR. TWOMEY: At -- at one level, there have been numerous evaluations of the conditions on that site. Certainly, the prior owners before Entergy had an obligation to maintain their compliance with all the NRC --

MR. SACHS: (Off mic)

MR. TWOMEY: -- all of the requirements that they had to comply with for the NRC. When we -- when Entergy bought the facility in 2002, we did a comprehensive due diligence prior to that sale. And then --

MR. SACHS: (Off mic)

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Hey, Gary.

MR. TWOMEY: -- we also did --

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Gary.

MR. TWOMEY: -- we also did a --

MR. SACHS: Could you speak up?

MR. TWOMEY: -- site assessment study in 2014.

MR. SACHS: Is there a reason you won't speak up?

MR. TWOMEY: Is there a reason --
CHAIR O'CONNOR: Could everybody --?

MR. TWOMEY: -- you're interrupting me?

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Yeah, please don't interrupt.

MR. SACHS: I can't hear you. There's nothing to interrupt.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (Off mic)

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Well, we're going to let him finish the question, so we can move on.

MR. SACHS: (Off mic)

MR. TWOMEY: We did a comprehensive site assessment study in 2014. And then NorthStar's been doing their own due diligence as we've been working on this transaction.

And I'll let Scott speak to the level of due diligence they've done.

MR. STATE: It -- it -- I don't want you to misinterpret what I said before. It's not as if we haven't done any due diligence or -- or done any level of evaluation. I was speaking merely to, you know, post-closing and opening of structures and doing a very invasive testing that you wouldn't do prior to closing of a transaction to, you know, get absolute confirmation of what we believe to be true today.

But, you know, we've -- we are relying on
past -- past practices and past evaluations and data that's been generated from prior work on the site. And you know, we will continue to do that kind of work. We've continued to do due diligence. We are initiating certain work activities, the second half of this year and all next year, running up to the closing of the transaction.

So we're not just sitting idly, hoping there's nothing there. We are doing, you know, a substantial amount of work to verify the condition of the site at closing.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

I think what we're going to do right now is take a five-minute break. So at seven forty-five, we're going to take public comment and questions. And if you want to make a comment or ask a question, there are signup sheets right over there. So in -- we'll take five minutes.

(Off the record)

(The meeting resumed.)

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Okay. Now, what we're going to do is take comments or questions from the public. And I just want to remind everybody that the NRC is here because it's the official public comment period on the license transfer application that
Entergy and NorthStar has filed. And that, of course, is about the sale.

What I'm going to ask is when you come up, if you could state your name and what town or state and/or state you are from. It is being recorded by the NRC. And as Andrea said earlier, you don't -- if you speak tonight, you do not have to send written comments to the NRC. But if you choose not to speak tonight, there is a mechanism that you can go online on the NRC website and either email a comment in or you can do a written comment. And those comments are due by June 23rd.

I also want to remind everyone that while you may pose a question to the NRC, again I think Andrea stressed this, is that they are still in the process of reviewing the license transfer application. So they may not have an answer for you because they haven't finished the review.

I would also ask that if people can keep their comments down to two or three minutes, we'd appreciate it so we can move the meeting along. And again, I want to remind everyone that this is a meeting of the Nuclear Decommissioning Citizens Advisory Panel. And we run by Robert's Rules of Order and our charter and I just ask everyone to respect
that you are at a Panel meeting and respect all your fellow commenters or people that are here this evening.

And I'm going to call people's names in no particular order, so I don't want anyone to think you -- I'm playing favorites in any way. And what I'll do is I'll, maybe, call two names at a time so the next person knows that it's their -- their shot.

The first up is going to be Skyler Gould. And then second is Brad Ferlin. And again, if you can say your name and your town and state, so we have it in the record. Yes?

MR. GOULD: All right. Thank you very much.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: You may have to talk louder than usual because of the rain on the --.

MR. GOULD: I'm Skyler Gould of Brattleboro -- I'm Skyler Gould. I live in Brattleboro these days. Thanks very much for allowing us to come here tonight.

I have a couple of quick questions. Has the NRC approved the new Holtec dry cask design which would allow the earlier unloading of fuel beyond -- shorter than the usual five-year cooling off period?

CHAIR O'CONNOR: I think what I want to do
-- I think what I want to do is have you ask all the
questions?

MR. GOULD: Okay.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: So you could ask all your
questions and then they can answer all at the same
time.

MR. GOULD: And another is -- is there
some reason the comment period has been reduced from
the normal sixty days to thirty days? Twenty or
thirty days, I'm not sure. I think I heard thirty
this evening.

A more difficult question. On March 29th,
just this year, a judge in the Court of Chancery, of
the state of Delaware -- I have the opinion -- found
that one of the two members of the NorthStar Group
Holdings, of which Scott State is the current C.E.O.
-- current corporate members, I'm quoting here, has
adequately alleged facts that, if true, demonstrate
fraudulent representation, unquote.

This is a charge by the other member of
NorthStar Group Holdings. So basically there are two
members of NorthStar Group Holdings. One is accusing
the other of fraud. Excuse me. NorthStar
Decommissioning Holdings, the limited liability
corporation incorporated -- incorporated last November
which is seeking to purchase Vermont Yankee from Entergy is owned by NorthStar Group Services, which is owned by L.V.I. parent corporation. which is owned by NorthStar Group Holdings. which is at the heart of this fraud case, they're seeking over two hundred and thirteen million dollars in damages.

Essentially, Scott State and his -- his member of the NorthStar Group Holdings are accused of misrepresenting their corporate members' assets and liabilities to the tune of two hundred and thirteen million dollars. So my question to the NRC is do the facts of this case --?

MR. SACHS: Did you know this?

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Gary --.

MR. GOULD: Gary, please, give me a break.

Do the facts of this case concern the Commission and will the Commission fully consider this above-mentioned suit and what it may say about the integrity of the terms of the proposed sale?

And secondly, is the Commission confident that should the plaintiff in the above case prevail, which the judge in the case has concluded is enough of a possibility to allow the case to go forward, will the structural integrity of the NorthStar Enterprise -- the larger NorthStar Enterprise allow the
decommissioning of -- of Vermont Yankee to be completed according to regulatory requirements? Thank you.

MR. WATSON: Yes, I'll try and answer the questions in order. First of all, the Holtec change, I think that's still under technical review.

MR. GOULD: So is it conceivable, if that's not approved, that that will delay --?

MR. WATSON: Well, it isn't approved yet, nor is it denied. So it's still under review. Okay?

The requirement for a public period for a license transfer is thirty days in the regulations. So that's what's -- that what's published in the Federal Registry so.

MR. GOULD: Excuse me. I understand. It was never sixty days?

MR. WATSON: No; it's thirty days.

MR. GOULD: Excuse me. I see.

MR. WATSON: And in response to the -- I guess, the lawsuit you're -- yeah, we have no real comment on it. That is not part of our review. The only comment I would have as a person that is an accusation of -- of wrongdoing is not -- not an assessment of guilt until the court decides it. So it's not part of our review at all.
MR. GOULD: Thank you.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: And I do want to say one thing that we as a -- we as a Panel can request an extension on public comment period if we needed to because we've done that in the past. So that is an option.

MR. FERLIN: Yeah. Good evening. My name is Brad Ferlin. I live in Fairfax, Vermont, born in Burlington, Vermont. I serve as President of the Vermont Energy Partnership. I want to thank Kate for hosting this meeting, and NDCAP. We appreciate that. And we welcome the NRC.

We've testified before you a number of times over the years and welcome you back to Vermont.

The Vermont Energy Partnership was formed in 2005, largely through the foresight of Governor Thomas Salmon. We're comprised of a diverse group of business, labor, and community leaders. And over the years, the Vermont Energy Partnership was a strong advocate for Vermont Yankee as an economic engine, a job provider for not only Windham County, but for the State of Vermont, supplying low cost power. And we were in support of that.

One of the things we heard over the years in debate was if Vermont Yankee closed, that an
accelerated decommissioning would be desired. And lo
and behold, with NorthStar here, this -- this promise
or this desire can actually be met. So -- and to make
the site available for future economic uses. So we
view this new opportunity of having Vermont Yankee
acquired by NorthStar and have them put in place this
accelerated and safe decommissioning process as great
news for Vermont.

We've had the opportunity to meet with
NorthStar officials on a number of occasions and hear
explanations of how they plan to operate in Vermont
and decommission Vermont Yankee. We appreciate the
fact that it's going to provide, in segments, jobs and
economic stimulus for -- for the region and for the
state.

And so for the NRC we hope that NorthStar
is properly vetted by this process in a fair,
reasonable, and timely manner -- timely manner, and
that a green light is given to the sale and it signals
to all an economic boost to Windham County and that
you can do business in Vermont.

So we thank you.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Great. Thank you very
much.

And I'm so sorry if I mispronounce
people's names. Meredith Angwin and then Robert Stewart?

MS. ANGWIN: Hello; my name is Meredith Angwin and I live in -- I live in Wilder, Vermont. And I have blogged for many years at Yes Vermont Yankee in case people are wondering what side of the fence I'm on.

I would like to just make a comment about the decommissioning. And that is that while the plant was still running and Governor Shumlin -- at that point he was governor, right -- was very much against it. And he said, at one point in a press conference, that if Vermont Yankee was decommissioned, it would be a huge jobs bonus for this area. It would be fabulous and it wouldn't actually lay people off because it would take the plant a couple years to cool down and people would still be employed. He -- the polite way to describe this sort of thing is that he pulled this stuff out of the air. That's the polite way.

At any rate, I was very interested in his comments and I tried to figure out what actually happened in decommissioning. And then during the course of this, I interviewed a lot of people at three Yankees, at Energy Solutions, I read articles from EPRI. I read articles from all over the place. I
used to work in the nuclear industry, so I can figure some of these things out.

And what I found out was that a lot of the data that I would've liked to find, but was really very wrapped up in -- in the economics of the different companies doing the decommissioning and was proprietary. So the idea that this particular case, there was proprietary economic data and that's so -- so shocking to some people, it's just standard. I mean, I wish it wasn't -- sometimes it wasn't standard.

For example, I would have -- I wanted to know what percentage of the decommissioning money actually went to truck drivers and to transport, as opposed to people working on the site. This is proprietary data. I was told that by everybody and I think it's true and I think companies have a right to proprietary data. I -- my -- my point isn't that we should look more or look harder or look this or look that.

My point is that decommissioning and many other processes like this do have propriety economic data. This is not the first time. As I say, I was looking all over the country for this kind of data. And it kept coming up proprietary because that's how
it's handled.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Great. Thank you.

I have Robert Stewart and then Patty O'Donnell.

MR. STEWART: Yes, I'm Robert Stewart, although I go by Jake. And I live in Brookfield, Vermont. I'm a professional engineer and I've been concerned about radioactivity ever since the plant started operation.

And I'm particularly concerned now, among other things, but about the rubblization. If that becomes a possibility, I think that's a big mistake to leave radioactive material on-site. Even if it's diluted with other less radioactive material to dilute it, I think it all should be removed.

The -- you know, diluting it is really not a solution. And the radioactive isotopes will migrate. They will get into the Connecticut River and already are. And the -- they also will get into the aquifer. They cannot be stopped. So I think the less material that's radioactive on-site, the better. So I hope that all of that material will be, as much as possible, can be removed. Thank You.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

We'll have, after Patty, Janet Rasmussen.
MS. O'DONNELL: Good evening. Thank you so much for coming here tonight and giving us the opportunity to speak to you. As Kate said, my name is Patty O'Donnell. I have -- I come from the Town of Vernon and I have over twenty years of experience of representing the Town of Vernon in one way or another. I've served on the school board, the select board, and I've been a state representative for twelve years.

And I have to say coming from Vernon is not always an easy thing. It's not always easy to be the town with the nuclear power plant, although we have felt for years that we certainly helped the state out and are reaching out in many, many ways.

Closing Vermont Yankee has been a very, very difficult thing for my town. It's really hard for a town of twenty-one hundred people to try to figure out how do you go on. The most important people in this whole process, in this whole conversation, the ones who are going to benefit or hurt the most by the decisions that are made here, is the Town of Vernon. It's our community. We've struggled through an awful lot and it's time to allow us to go on to our future. And going on to that future is decommissioning that plant.

As a legislator, I heard, for over twenty
years, we want that plant decommissioned, we want that
plant closed. Well, they got their way; the plant is
closed. Now, we want our way. We want a viable,
fair, honest looking into the proposal. If everything
works out well, we want the plant decommissioned as
fast as we can. You will hear after, peers of mine in
Vernon will tell you about our plans for the future
and how we've been working very hard in our planning
commission to reinvent ourselves, but nothing can be
done until the plant is gone.

We have already developed or started to
develop a relationship with -- with Scott. We had a
wonderful relationship with Vermont Yankee. I know we
will continue our relationship with NorthStar. And
they're already working with us. But please, give us
a chance for a future. We certainly have given our
state enough in the last forty-two years.

MS. RASMUSSEN: Janet Rasmussen, a
resident of Vernon and a member of the Vernon Planning
Commission. I think Patty said everything far more
elegantly than I could.

FROM THE AUDIENCE: No one can hear you,
ma'am.

MS. RASMUSSEN: I'm Janet Rasmussen. I'm
a resident of Vernon and also a member of the Planning
Commission. I think Patty O'Donnell said what I would like to say a lot more elegantly than I could.

But what I really want to underscore is we live in Vernon. We work in Vernon. Our economic future is dependent on this plant being -- plant being decommissioned as quickly as possible, but also as safely as possible.

No one has a seat closer at the table than we should, because we live there. We are -- the Planning Commission has become intervenors in the process. We are -- we will read everything that we can. We have had permission from the select board to hire experts, if we can, to help us through the process.

We're encouraged about the process thus far and we hope that we are allowed to have a fair hearing. And please know no one wants this to happen more than us, economically and safely. Thank you.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

Howard Shaffer and then Madeline Arms?

And because it's raining, you do have to yell a little bit louder into the microphone.

Howard's passing. So does Maddie want to go next? And next up is going to be Lissa Weinmann.

MS. ARMS: Madeline Arms, Town of Vernon
resident and also member of the Planning Commission. Thank you very, very much for coming here, and listening to everyone, and taking all of our opinions and our hopes and our dreams into your consideration.

I certainly would like to add my support to what Patty and Janet have said. This has been a topic of much discussion in the Planning Commission and throughout the Town of Vernon. And I sincerely believe that it will not be just the Town of Vernon that benefits from this revitalization. It's going to spread to the surrounding towns and to actually the whole state of Vermont, as well. Thank you very much.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

Lissa?

MS. WEINMANN: Hi; I'm Lissa Weinmann. I'm a resident of Brattleboro and, again, I, too, appreciate you coming here tonight to hear views from our community.

I would say that in my view the Town of Brattleboro is really the host town for the reactor. Vernon is -- is the town where it is, but it's really the Town of Brattleboro that -- that absorbs a lot of the -- the emergency preparedness and other things that have to do with the plant really emanate from Brattleboro. So I would say that, in my view,
Brattleboro is the town of record here, more than Vernon.

But I have a couple of things I just want to say, quickly, which is I think that in this process really when there is a license transfer that a new P.S.D.A.R. should be completed. I think it's a new entity and really demands that a new P.S.D.A.R. be put forth and not just a revised one.

I would also say that I have a lot of issues with the cost of the decommissioning. Entergy thought it was going to be one point two billion. Our Public Service Department did an independent assessment and they thought it would be along the lines of two billion to -- to decommission the reactor. So those numbers are so wildly different, it's hard for the public to really reconcile what is real here.

I know that the overhead is going to come down and there's a lot of reasons why it's lower, but that's a lot lower. And that calls into question the credibility of the numbers in my mind.

I just want to say also that I do believe that as long as the spent fuel is in the pool and the whole process of moving the fuel to dry fuel storage means that we should have an adequate level of
emergency planning that the NRC has reduced. And I understand that decision's been made, but I take issue with that and I think it was a foolish decision.

I'd also like to -- to just on record say that I think that allowing Entergy to use the decommissioning fund in ways that it has put forth was not also something that the community supported. And I took issue with that, the NRC's decision with that as well.

I would like -- I know that you have an environmental impact study that was generically done for this site but --.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Lissa, I don't want to rush you, but I'm going to rush you.

MS. WEINMANN: Okay. All right. Well, two more points. One is that are any of the other reactor sites have a school at the front door? Because I think that the presence of school children who we know children are much more susceptible to radio -- radiation. I mean, they -- they absorb it much differently than adults do. What are the measures that are going to be taken for the very unique circumstance that this plant is in, in having a school at its doorstep? I don't think that's the case with any other plants anywhere.
And then finally, I would just say that I am against the rubblization. It flies in the face of what Entergy had agreed to do. And while it may be acceptable for the NRC and Federal standards it's not what Entergy had promised in -- in its agreement with the state.

I still have a lot of other things, but I'll put them in my written comments. And again, I appreciate your review.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: All right. Thank you.

Next up is going to be Bill Sayre and then Dan Jeffries.

MR. SAYRE: My name is Bill Sayre. I'm an economist from Bristol. My family has a lumber manufacture and as such -- is that better -- and as such, I'm also representing Associated Industries of Vermont, which is the trade association for Vermont manufacturers. I want to thank you for making the trip up to Vermont to hear what we have to say and appreciate the opportunity to speak to you all.

I may take a different view. I will take a different view than some who will speak to you tonight. I want to start by expressing my -- my association and my company's gratitude to Vermont Yankee and Entergy Corporation for all the years of
reliable, affordable, low-carbon energy that they
provided to the manufacturers of Vermont. We
appreciate it very greatly.

And we now appreciate the agreement that
they've reached with NorthStar to transition into a
decommissioning process that will be more rapid and
just as safe and just as high quality. We believe
this is good for Windham County and it's good for
Vermont. It secures the important safety and health
standards that we all want to see, keeps the economy
going, and gets the process completed in a more timely
fashion.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

After Dan Jeffries, it will be Bob
Spencer.

MR. JEFFRIES: Good evening. Thank you
NRC for making the trip up here. We were kind of
joking that down in the NRC, somebody must have asked
for volunteers to come up to Vermont. But it looks
like they got some players. Appreciate your being
here.

I got a question. This is something I
probably knew at one time, but have forgotten, and
there's a reason for asking it. The question is who
owns these spent fuel, the dry casks, after the
decommissioning is complete? One of the reasons
that's on my mind is it seems to me that it would be
appropriate for the Republican Congress to pass a law
forcing the ownership of those dry casks onto the
Department of Energy.

The Federal Government said they would
take this spent fuel way back in the '60s when they
initially allowed the industry to start building the
nuclear power plant. So I think they should take it
by law and not leave that open to argument.

Number two question is -- is NorthStar
publicly held. And if so, how's business? And the
reason I ask that question is that I'm an Entergy
retiree and when I was looking at my retirement plans,
I was looking at how secure is this Entergy retirement
check I'm going to be getting. Entergy is a large
utility, down south. Regardless of what might have
happened with any of their nuclear power plants up
here, I always felt that they were a very secure
company and that my check was highly reliable.

If NorthStar is publicly traded and can
comment on their -- you know, how things are going
business-wise, I would expect that if they needed to
bring more money to the table for the next, you know,
five years, past 2026, ten years past, if the cash
flow is there, I consider the finances secure.

May not do much for the stockholders if,
in fact, it's publicly -- publicly held, but if
they've got the cash flow, it should come to Vermont
Yankee if necessary.

And the other thing that's on my mind --
by the way, I forgot to comment, I'm a resident of
Brattleboro. So one thing I've noticed in all the
discussion is -- and I can't quite get a grip on it --
is what's so important about this one hundred acres
down here in Vernon. If you take a ride up and down
the river, there's a lot of undeveloped land up and
down the river. Why is this one hundred acres so
extremely important? It seems like this real estate's
value is extremely exaggerated in my mind. And to
that end, I'm comfortable with the four -- four-foot
reclamation. And I'm also comfortable with the
rubblization as proposed. Thank you.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

Again, it's Bob Spencer and then Peggy
Farabaugh is next.

MR. SPENCER: Good evening and thank you
to the NRC. Bob Spencer, I'm Chair of the Vernon
Planning Economic Development Commission. We've heard
from three of our members already. We also have two
other members here, Jeff Dunkley and also Martin
Langeveld, who is on the Panel.

So we are the -- the board that's charged
with looking at future use of this site. And we
recently prepared an op-ed piece that was put into the
local papers. I was just going to hit a couple
highlights of that.

That basically what we're looking at is a
Reenergize Vernon campaign. We like the idea that
some of the other decommissioned sites have hosted
other -- energy generating facilities. We are looking
at such things as microgrid battery storage,
hydroelectric because of the existing TransCanada, now
ArcLight facility, possibly solar, and the spinoff
businesses such as cloud storage and other high energy
intensive using -- uses.

We'd also like to point out the over one-
hundred-year history of Vernon in hosting energy
production, starting with the Vernon hydroelectric dam
in the early 1900s and then transitioning into the
nuclear power plant. So we feel we have a history and
a mission, sort of, to keep hosting this sort of
technology that benefits, really, three states and
hundreds of thousands of people.
The -- this next chapter that we're talking about, we're -- we're working through a number of municipal planning projects with the Windham Regional Commission to update our town plan to look at hosting and facilitating development of such facilities. We also are amending our plan to make it -- give it something that the state has a new regulation that would give us a substantial deference in supporting or opposing energy facilities.

So we're doing a lot that we feel will help facilitate redevelopment of this site. And we really are -- as an intervenor, as Janet said, we'll be commenting formally on this process and are cautiously optimistic that this deal will happen.

So thank you everyone for your -- your professional review and the due diligence from the private entities, too.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Great. Thank you.

After Peggy, it's going to be Betsy Williams and then Josh Unruh.

MS. FARABAUGH: Thank you, Kate and Panel for the opportunity to speak.

My name is Peggy Farabaugh. I'm from Vernon. I have lived there for twenty years. My husband was laid off from Entergy, so I'm coming from
a point where a lot of people are -- in Vernon are coming from. We've suffered a lot from the shutdown of the plant. But the community has come together in an amazing way to rebirth the town.

And I've heard a lot of opinions tonight about how to do that, but none of them speak to me about the difference between the environmental health and safety of a plant that's six years versus sixty years. So I'd just encourage you on behalf of the folks who I know in Vernon to make it sooner than later.

And in sixty years, all of us are going to dead. Right? And so in six years, this is something that could really help like my children and -- and the children of other people from Vernon who are in this room. So if there is no compelling safety environment, health, or financial reasons, please help us get this done in six years, instead of sixty. Thank you.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: We have Betsy and then Josh Unruh.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. My thoughts are a little bit scattered. I'll try to keep it focused. We've had a long history of interacting with various representatives from the NRC in the past.
And as somebody said earlier, I commend -- I don't know which raffle you won to come up here. They haven't always been very pleasant interactions in the past.

I think one thing that's different this time is that in the past, we were debating the continued operation of a plant and now what we're talking about is how do we safely and efficiently and cost effectively decommission it and decontaminate it.

We have a common goal. I think I've -- I think -- I guess I don't know, but I would assume that pretty much everybody in this room wants the same thing, which is we want that site to be cleaned up and cleaned up to the highest possible level it can, and for that not to become a burden financially on anyone other than the owners of this -- of the plant.

I think what we do debate is how we'll get there and how we'll get there in a way that we all can trust. Trust is a big issue here. We have lots and lots of reasons not to trust this company, and lots and lots of reasons not to trust the NRC, quite frankly.

We're talking about the most dangerous substance known to humankind that we are dealing with. I can appreciate that NorthStar has deconstructed many
sites much larger and more involved than Vermont Yankee. But most of them were not dealing with the most dangerous substances known to humankind.

We're talking about many of those substances leaving a legacy for up to a thousand generations. A thousand generations. That's our legacy. So what we do here in these next few years is really, really, really important and it cannot be taken lightly.

And I have been frustrated by decisions by the NRC in the past. For example, I do not believe that the Holtec decision, that that was the cask to use on the site, was the best decision. I don't believe that the NRC is committed to holding the -- whichever company is involved in this process -- to the very highest possible standard known to humankind today. That's what they should be held to. Not to what -- the last time I was at the NRC hearing, I was told by an NRC representative that the Holtec casks were adequate. I'm not looking for adequate.

I don't think the people of Vernon or Brattleboro or anywhere in this Tri-State region are looking for adequate. They are looking for the highest possible standard that we know of. And that's what I would like the NRC to be looking for, as well.
And I would like to feel assured that that is what the NRC is going to be holding whichever company accountable to.

It concerns me greatly, as it does many others in this room, that my understanding and I -- I'm not completely sure of this, but my understanding is that most, if not all, of the decommissionings that have happened to date have had cost overruns. Almost all of them, if not all of them. While it would be wonderful if that did not happen here, I think that we clearly have to have an absolutely assured plan of what happens should that happen.

And a company that has gone belly up, whether or not they're the owners, does not give me assurance of then who's going to bear the burden of this very dangerous legacy.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Betsy --.

MS. WILLIAMS: And I'm about to wind up, Kate.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Okay.

MS. WILLIAMS: So it also concerns me that what we're talking about here are two things that I think are in real competition with each other, which is we're trying to keep things to a certain cost which makes sense, but we're also trying to do it at the
most -- the highest possible standard of safety that we know of, which usually also translates to being a more expensive process.

The better casks are more expensive. The process for handling the materials in the most careful way is more expensive. And those two things are in direct opposition to each other. And that is the very difficult path that we are navigating. Thank you.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

Josh -- is Josh Unruh -- Josh Unruh and then Haley Pero.

And I just want to remind people if you could say your name and where you're from and keep your comments to about two minutes, that would be much appreciated.

MR. UNRUH: I can do that. I'm Josh Unruh, Select Board Chair in Vernon. I'd like to thank everybody for their time this evening.

To reiterate what has been said, there is no one with a stronger stake in the sale in the site's safe decommissioning than the Town of Vernon. I stand in support of the sale of Vermont Yankee to NorthStar. I've had the opportunity to meet with the NorthStar Executives regarding their purchase and their potential new partnership with the Town of Vernon.
Through these conversations, my personal questions and concerns have been put to rest. Among many -- among many things over the last several months we've heard, and we've also heard it tonight, is concerns about the school across the street from Vermont Yankee. The funny thing is that none of these people have children at Vernon Elementary School. I do. I have three little girls at Vernon Elementary School.

I'm no scientist. I'm no demolition expert. So I put my trust in the people that deal in this industry day in and day out that will govern the sale and demolition. That's the NRC and NorthStar. To get this land back to a usable state safely is paramount for Vernon and Southern Vermont for economic development. To not allow this sale is further cutting the Town of Vernon and Southern Vermont off at its knees. Thank you.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: After Haley, we're going to have Ann Darling and then Leo Schiff.

MS. PERO: Thank you for the opportunity to say a few words. My name is Haley Pero and I work in Senator Bernie Sanders' office. Tonight, I'm joined by my colleagues, Tom Berry in Senator Leahy's office, and George Twigg in Congressman Welch's
office.

On behalf of the delegation, we'd like to thank the NRC for making the trip to Vermont to hear directly from Vermonter. We think that's very important. And we'd also like to thank the Panel for making this meeting possible and also being a conduit for public information.

The delegation has long believed that public engagement is really critical to this process, so it's terrific to see so many members of the public here tonight.

As many of you may know, Bernie has introduced legislation a few years ago to make sure that local and state input is a meaningful and formal part of the decommissioning process, particularly on the P.S.D.A.R. Bernie will soon be reintroducing this bill and including an opportunity for the public to give input on license transfers, so then situations like we find ourselves, the public will still have a voice. Thank you.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you, Haley. And again, thanks to the Congressional delegation. They were very helpful in getting the NRC to come here this evening.

Ann?
MS. DARLING: Hi; I'm Ann Darling. I live in East Hampton, Massachusetts, which is down the river. And -- but for until a few years ago, I was a thirty-five-year resident of this area. And I consider myself -- this is my home. So I guess, you know, we're -- the Vermont Yankee site, it's in the corner of Vermont, but it's right close to Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

So the State has jurisdiction -- the State of Vermont has jurisdiction over the non-radiological aspects of decommissioning, the residents all over this area of all different states, not just Vermont, will kind of bear the brunt or the -- feel the impact of the operation, the shutdown, the decommissioning, all of that.

So my -- I'm asking the NRC what your commitment is to communicating with all of these parties and coordinating, particularly, with the State of Vermont? But all of us, as moving forward, it's kind of germane to what you were just saying. We have -- these are our lives. So we want you to talk to us. I did ask a question.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Yeah. Would you folks like to respond?

MS. KOCK: I keep forgetting the
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microphone. So sorry. I'll try and -- and, Kate, I'll try and be brief.

To answer your question about what our commitment is on being transparent and communicating, transparency is another one of the NRC's cornerstones. I don't know how else to say it more clearly. I can tell you as a -- the Deputy Director in the decommissioning division, it's extremely important to me as well. It's why we're here. It's why we have four of us sitting up here today. And so you do have our commitment. It is part of what's -- extremely important to us. Everything we do should be transparent.

And it is -- I don't know if nice is the right way to put it, but it is nice and striking to me to sit here and listen to concerns, questions, comments, no matter what side of the issue that you're on, but it's extremely important to me and I'm happy to be here.

MS. DARLING. Thank you.

I just want to say that, like my friend Betsy, many, many times we've sat with the NRC We haven't -- some of us have not felt that -- that we were more important than the industry -- the nuclear industry. And so I -- you're going to run into that
and we don't just want transparency. We want you to really listen and take our opinions into consideration. We want our -- what we say to have an impact. And that means people of Vernon and everybody else that lives here. We want to -- we want you to listen and do something about what we think. Thank you.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you, Ann.

After Leo, it's going to be Guy Page and then Bob Leach.

MR. SCHIFF: Hi there. My name's Leo Schiff. I live in Brattleboro. And I really appreciate the representatives of the NRC coming. I understand that this might be your last trip ever to Brattleboro. And because of that, I've got a question for you that is a little bit tangential to the sale of the property.

First, I want to locate myself as firmly against nuclear weapons and nuclear power, and in favor of long-term onsite stewardship of the dry casks in Vernon. What I'd like to ask you is what makes you so sure that it would be safe to transport the highest level nuclear waste and other medium or low level nuclear waste along our decaying rail lines and with the possible threats of terrorism?
CHAIR O'CONNOR: Do you have any other questions, Leo?

MR. SCHIFF: No, but I'd love to get an answer.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Okay. Great. Thank you.

MR. WATSON: Your question is pertaining to the safe transportation of radioactive materials. I can assure you that it's done almost every day in this country, whether it's in the commercial business or in the Defense Department. There's strict requirements on the condition of the rails, the roads, et cetera, on which those materials would be transported and -- and significant security requirements, especially for the transportation of spent fuel. So I can tell you it's done safely and frequently in this country all the time, may not ever -- be every day. I've personally been involved in a number of them. And the lengths that are taken for the security in the routing and the safety of the packages and the transportation are extensive. Thank you.

MR. PAGE: Guy Page, Berlin, Vermont, Vermont Energy Partnership. So welcome back to Vermont. Last time you were here I think the room is
about forty-five degrees, if I remember correctly. And just so you know, tonight the last leaves at ten with all the rain.

So anyway, as I think Mr. Twomey pointed out, the decommissioning trust fund is five hundred and seventy-two million. The expenses of the NorthStar plan, as I understand it, about four hundred and ninety-eight million. So that's about a seventy-four-million-dollar surplus. That's pretty good. Additional cost overrun, risk mitigation, you've got some guaranteed fixed payments and bonding. Team performance bonds, team contractual commitments, and one hundred and twenty-five million dollars support agreement, basically an insurance policy.

And, you know, you guys are going to be doing the deep dive on -- you know, on the -- the ability of the company to -- to -- you know, have the financial wherewithal on the technical skill and all that. But service, that seems like that's a good prudent plan.

The other thing is, you know, we've really got to look at NorthStar's past and their future. They -- they've decommissioned hundreds of power facilities. You know, we've seen all these. And as I've been Googling them, I haven't found any accounts
of, you know, oh, boy they really messed up this one. I haven't found any those. Okay? It seems that they've got a pretty good record. Extensive experience in nuclear decommissioning.

And -- and really in terms of failing, the questions were asked were what happens if you find something you didn't think you're going to find, and I thought Mr. State's answer was a good one. But really you don't become a world leader by failing to see and deal with the unforeseen. That's just a characteristic of -- of a business successes. You know how to deal with these things. So I -- my sense is that that they do.

And -- and a big question I think you really need to ask is, okay, what's the alternative. The alternative is sixty years SAFSTOR. As Peggy said, you know, we're all dead by the time this thing is done.

So I -- I know you're going to do due diligence on this. And I know the public service work is going to do due diligence. And that's all very good. That's all very necessary but I just hope the take on this is we want to get to yes. Okay? Because it's good for the community. It's even good for the environment. And I just hope it gets done. Thank
you.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you, Guy.

I just want to assure everybody if you signed up to speak, you will get to speak. So don't -- don't worry about that.

After Bob Leach, we're going to have Paul Blanch.

MR. LEACH: Good evening -- evening. My name is Bob Leach. I'm a Brattleboro resident and I strongly support the transfer of the license and the sale of Vermont Yankee to NorthStar.

I'm a Vermont Yankee retiree. For many years, I was the R.P.M., Radiation Protection Manager. I was also certified a reactor operator, a senior reactor operator. I'm a plank owner. For those who don't know the Navy terminology, it's anybody that was there when they commissioned it. I was there when it was still a hole in the ground.

I looked into NorthStar and the team that's working on this project with NorthStar, W.S.C. and Areva. Areva is an international company. They've been building power plants -- nuclear power plants around the world for as long as I can remember. They're a very respectable company. They have an outstanding reputation in the nuclear industry.
Excuse me.

W.S.C. is an operator of the radioactive waste disposal site down in Texas. Vermont Yankee -- or Vermont and Texas are the compact folks that established that particular site. W.S.C.S. operates that facility and they do it in a safe and professional manner. It will be an extremely valuable asset in the process of preparing, scheduling, and shipping the huge amount of radioactive waste which is going to be leaving Vermont Yankee.

NorthStar has a reputation for decommissioning non-nuclear power plants for years. They were used as a major subcontractor in one of the Midwest power plants. And everything I heard from that, they've been doing an outstanding job.

They did operate and successfully decontaminate a nuclear facility that was not a power plant. They did some work of Vermont Yankee, recently. It was potentially the removal of the north warehouse. Some of you are aware of that building. That was the first building at Vermont Yankee that received any radioactive waste, radioactive material, and it was used to store radioactive material right up until it was -- was decommissioned.

They brought in a professional crew,
relatively small crew. They brought in the right equipment and they completed the job on schedule and on budget. NorthStar and their partners are very capable, knowledgeable, and they've got extensive experience in this kind of job.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Bob, I'm going to have to move you along.

MR. LEACH: Okay.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: I won't gong you or anything like that but.

MR. LEACH: Okay. Sorry.

Listen, we're just saying they've got the expertise and the ability and I strongly support giving them the chance to do it.

I would like to ask one question to the NRC. I understand the State of Vermont is trying to become or looking into becoming an agreement state. I think I know the answer, but if they do become an agreement state, would they -- I know that the NRC regulates power plants, but decommissioning is slightly different. And would Vermont be obligated in any way if they become an agreement state? That's a yes or no question.

MR. WATSON: The answer is no.

MR. LEACH: Thank you.
MR. WATSON: Part 50 licenses are the responsibility of the NRC to regulate.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Okay. After Paul Blanch, we're going to have Kyle Landis-Marinello and then Clay Turnbull.

MR. BLANCH: Good evening. Thank you, Members of the Panel and Madam Chairman.

My name is Paul Blanch. I reside in West Hartford, Connecticut, about seventy miles south of the plant. I'm a -- I'm going to cut my speech, in the interest of time, a little bit short. But I have passed out copies to members of the Panel and also to Andrea of the NRC. So I'm going to cut out the major part of it, as Mark MacDonald so eloquently described my concerns.

I'm a professional engineer with more than fifty years of nuclear safety experience and regulatory experience. I've worked at Maine Yankee during the decommissioning, at Connecticut Yankee during the decommissioning, and I sat on a similar panel overseeing the decommissioning of Millstone Unit One. So I have quite a bit of experience in regulatory issues and a limited amount of experience in decommissioning.

But I was going through the regulations
and it was just briefly mentioned in one of the NRC slides, but no one seems to have amplified on it -- and I have a couple extra copies. And that's 10 C.F.R. 50.75. So I would like the Panel to review that. It has to do with financial stability of the licensee and guarantee of -- decommissioning funds.

So following up from Mark's dialogue, I'd like to make some recommendations to the Panel that Vermont must consider the requirements of some type of, quote, surety method insurance or other guaranteed method, close quote, as required by 10 C.F.R. 50.75 as a condition for transfer of the Vermont Yankee license.

Vermont's attorneys and the Panel must determine the amount of the surety bond required to assure Vermont is financially protected. Typical amounts for performance-type bonds are equal to the fix contract amount. However, this particular job is not a typical contract. Vermont's attorneys must review the license transfer and regulations of 50.75 to assure the financial protection should NorthStar fail to perform.

Vermont must oppose the license until it is satisfied and it is protected from non-performance or bankruptcy in accordance with the requirements of
A couple of statements were made by Scott about indemnification. If there is indemnification or bonding, certainly that kind of statement needs to be in writing and checked out.

And the other thing that somewhat bothered me by some of NorthStar's statements were the amount of contamination they have removed from various sites. And I don't disagree they have removed contamination, but nuclear contamination is not the same as lead, asbestos, P.C.B.s. It has its own characteristics. And they need to have that expertise, that power plant expertise on board to assure a safe decommissioning.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you, Paul.

MR. BLANCH: Thank you very much.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Kyle Landis-Marinello and then Clay Turnbull.

MR. LANDIS-MARINELLO: I'm Kyle Landis-Marinello. I'm an Assistant Attorney General for the State of Vermont. Our office is looking at this transaction, closely. This is a matter that the Attorney General was briefed on, on day one when he -- when he took office.

The Attorney General's office is participating in the proceeding at the Public Service
Board, along with the Agency of Natural Resources and the Public Service Department, and with some consultation with the Department of Health, as well. We plan to participate in the proceeding at the NRC, along with all of those agencies.

Generally, we want this site cleaned up quickly, and the transaction looks good for that reason. But this transaction needs to be fully vetted. We need to ensure, one, the site is going to be fully cleaned up, and two, that the cost of that cleanup do not fall on Vermonters.

A full vetting requires more information. For instance, there's a line item in the new decommissioning plan of two hundred twenty-three million dollars for decontamination and dismantlement. That's very different from the line-by-line breakdown that was provided in the original decommissioning cost estimate.

A second example, the spent fuel costs for this transfer assume that the Department of Energy will pick up all of the fuel by 2052. There's no guarantee that will happen. If it doesn't happen, there could be massive costs, particularly if we reach the one-hundred-year mark where dry casks would possibly need to be repackaged. And even if the pick-
up occurs by 2052, there's a chance that the Department of Energy is going to require different casks for transportation.

These type of costs need to be looked at and there needs to be an answer of where those costs would come from. So there is more information needed to fully vet this transaction.

It was encouraging to hear that the NRC still has the availability of request for additional information and we would support the NRC availing itself of that to provide more information to itself and to the public about how this transaction will do what everyone wants it to do and get the site cleaned up quickly.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you, Kyle.

We're going to have Clay Turnbull. And then after Clay, we're going to have Gary Sachs.

MR. TURNBULL: Hi. Good evening. Thanks for coming up to Vermont. So it's -- this is a warm welcome. Yeah.

I hope, in -- in not too many years, you folks at NRC are going to be able to, if -- almost brag that you were up at this meeting in Vermont because the decommissioning turned out so successful in Vermont that it's -- it's like -- it's what people
talk about and you'll be able to say yeah, we were there early in that process.

In a -- in a complex project like this, to be successful, it is essential to know what the goal is. And in this case, that -- that is like what will the site look like post-decommissioning. And I -- oh, I'm sorry. Clay Turnbull. I live in Townshend and it's been a long time since I said and I proudly live in a solar powered home for twenty-five years, off grid.

And why not see if we can do the job here of decommissioning? Can it be done? Can it be done while honoring the commitments that Entergy has already made to the State of Vermont?

We're presented with one option is let it rust. The other option is to wait sixty years. Another option is let's rush into this and get it -- let's -- we need to do this now. It's got to be done by the end of the month, you know, make your decisions right away, the rush or rust option. Or another option is you can have a greenfield. Sixty years from now, Entergy is going to honor their commitments. They're not going to rubblize. You're going to have a really beautiful site in sixty years or so; decommissioning will be done. Or you can get a
brownfield and we'll do it now.

And it's -- and it's -- we're given these -- these greenfield or brownfield or rush-or-rust options. What if we all have the goal of making that site just as clean as possible, at least as clean as Maine Yankee, so that we can all look back and not too far down the road it would be -- really wonderful to have that site decommissioned and ten years from now be saying what a great job we did. So I say how about we start with -- with that as a goal in mind.

Thank you.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thanks, Clay.

After Gary, we're going to have R.T. Brown and then Lorie Cartwright.

MR. SACH: Thanks for coming up, NRC.

Mr. State, I'm a little bit -- I haven't been to these meetings, many of them, because I was undergoing chemotherapy. And I would -- I remembered Chairman Yeskel of the NRC came and met with the activists a few years ago. I sure would like to meet Mr. State to get some answers questioned because it seems like this whole thing that's based on proprietary data.

You know, if Entergy -- I mean, I'm sorry, NorthStar, Entergy, they're so close to each other.
If NorthStar disappears 2028, let's say, what do we do? Go back to proprietary information? I don't see how that works. I'd like to understand more. Mr. Marinello -- Kyle Landis-Marinello spoke about that line item piece in the original. And I didn't see that in the current P.S.D.A.R.. But needless to say, I haven't started.

2007, the World Business Academy wrote if private investors won't buy into nuclear, why should the public? In 2007, Entergy tried to spin off its reactors into a company called SpinCo. In 2009, Entergy officials were found to have misspoken. Punishment was minimal, financial or not at all. What happened is that Entergy, after the misspeaking of 2009, promised to be honest and forthcoming. Then it shut down.

How sad that we, here in Vermont, never got the chance to believe or experience Entergy making good on their promises to be honest and forthright with us. However, they have come up at Election Day, this past year, hey, we found somebody to buy our reactor. Where the heck with NorthStar when Entergy was trying to sell the reactor for all those years? How come you didn't buy in then? What is this crap now?
I mean, so in Election Day 2016, Entergy made -- I mean, found a buyer. Here's NorthStar. Is Entergy hiding responsibility for its poor purchase decisions? Where was NorthStar when Entergy had the reactor on sale? What insurance does the NRC have that Mr. State can provide that there are no potential liens into him for perhaps millions of dollars from previous court cases or endeavors? I'd like to know that before this happens.

Areva is being bailed out by the French government. W.C.S. is already involved here, per the compact. So to have them as part as -- of this NorthStar is kind of redundant. But Burns and McDonnell's always good to get a discount.

Okay. I perceived the D.U.I. settlement agreement as an ultimatum. If it wasn't accepted verbatim, it would not have been approved. It would not have been passed into law. That's not a negotiation. That's an ultimatum.

The -- this P.S.D.A.R. means very little in a sense because the NRC doesn't approve it. It's simply that NorthStar has to do it. It's like there's a box they have to check off between here and the decision.

Is there an ISFSI pad being built right
now? It started in April as per the --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Off mic)

MR. SACH: Great. Good.

I believe this NorthStar deal is to --

well, I'll leave that for the last.

Okay. Vernon has been pro-V.Y. for forty-
two years. Can we let them have the waste? I mean,
many of the Vernon residents, I mean, no disrespect,
had said we'll take the dry casks. Let's let them
have some, not have to put it all on the concrete,
give it all to -- make you guys responsible.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Gary, I'm going to ask
you --

MR. SACH: Wait, very quickly.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Okay.

MR. SACH: I've got two things.

I need a picture from you guys, either
Entergy or NorthStar, how much of that site is going
to be visible or going to be usable for people? One-
hundred-twenty-five-acre site. Maine Yankee has a lot
of site that's not accessible because of the ISFSI.
Can we get a picture?

Would you guys like to see a picture to
see if there's actually going to be a recreational
area? Have you seen it?
A project -- a projected picture of what it would look like, have you seen it, Panel? No. Thank you. I'd like to see that prior to whatever transfer occurs. I'd like Mr. State to be more forthcoming. I know, I'm sorry, I was going through cancer, but I give you guys responsibility. I think this entire deal is to line Mr. State's pocket.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

R.T. Brown and then Lorie Cartwright. And then we're going to have Rich Holschuh next, after them.

MR. BROWN: Hi. Good evening. Thank you to the Panel, the NRC, and to NorthStar for being here tonight. I've timed myself to a minute and a half. Let's see if I can achieve this.

Closer. Good evening. My name is R.T. Brown. I work for the Brattleboro Development Credit Corporation and I'm the Windham County Economic Development Programs Project Manager. I also administer some programs related to entrepreneurship and innovation in the region.

The B.D.C.C. is one of twelve regional development corporations throughout the state and we serve the Windham region. Our sister entity, the Southeastern Vermont Economic Development Strategies,
developed the region's CEDS, or Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy. It's essentially a road map for the region -- or economic development road map.

My academic and professional background is in applied economics as it relates to local and regional development.

We entirely support the expedited process as proposed by NorthStar as an accelerated timeline by decades poses many opportunities for the community in the region. Due to the accelerated timeline and speaking from their perspective of regional economic development entity, it should be noted that this -- this place has a greater pressure on the Town of Vernon, which has very limited resources, to sufficiently and clearly plan and develop the best possible long-term reuse of the site.

There is an opportunity here to think about Vernon's infrastructure and what -- what can be done to provide the greatest possible long-term economic impact for what has been a very supportive rural host community. I think it was said very well in the last P.S.B. meeting by someone -- and my apologies, I don't -- I don't know their name.

But essentially the idea is that NorthStar has a tremendous opportunity to show their leadership
in this field that is only going to grow. We encourage the parties here to put the community first and do everything possible to not simply meet expectations, but exceed them in ways that exhibit innovation, thoughtfulness, and leadership as the next chapter of nuclear power generationers is written starting in Vernon, Vermont. Thank you.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you, R.T.

Lorie Cartwright and then after Rich, it's going to be Peter Vanderdoes.

MS. CARTWRIGHT: I apologize, I wasn't closer. It happened faster than I expected.

I am Lorie Cartwright and I am from Brattleboro, Vermont. I would also like to take this chance to thank the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for coming to Brattleboro to speak to us and to hear us.

As a taxpayer, a citizen of this great state and nation, a mother, and a fierce proponent of truly renewable energy, solar, wind, and hydro, I would like nothing more than to see this site be cleaned up as expeditiously and safely as possible, especially if it paves the way for the site to be made available for the production of such truly renewable forms of energy. It would be a boon to the local economy.
It seems that what divides some of the people that we've heard from tonight from Vernon, from some of the other people we've heard from tonight, is this notion of having the site be released on an unrestricted basis. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission representatives outlined what some of the decommissioned sites look like. But I wish that when I'm done with my comment, they would just go over that point again because I was always under the conception that there aren't any former commercial reactor sites that have been unrestricted. And that would include the entire site of the former commercial reactor.

So if -- if somebody from the NRC could articulate that for us again at the end of my comment period, I would -- I would really appreciate it.

I do, again, think that that is the deep divide. And for something this important, I think that, frankly, I don't see there being anything more important facing this world right now than the cleaning up of nuclear power plant sites and the storage of the high level, medium level, low level, any level radiated waste. It's the most critical issue for all of us.

So if we could have a better understanding about the real feasibility of seeing that site cleaned
up and redeveloped in our lifetimes, I think that that would be really helpful for everyone here to get closer to what it is that they want at the end of this.

I do have concerns about some of the ways that the proposed purchaser is going to want to go about cleaning up the site, and I won't spend a lot of time talking about it. I apologize. I'm just -- I'm really emotional about this because, like I said, I can't consider anything more important to us than this.

But rubblization is a concern; that is diluting the pollution.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Lorie, I'm going to have to ask you to wrap it up.

MS. CARTWRIGHT: Okay. Okay. And then I just -- I do want to say that it was great concern to me that one of the representatives from NorthStar suggested that they saw this sort of a clean-up the same as any other site, that the fact that it was a radioactive site really didn't make that much of a difference to them. I think that that makes all of the difference in the world.

Thank you.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you, Lorie.
There was a question, I think, to the NRC.

MR. WATSON: Yes, let me go ahead and follow up on that. The sites that had been decommissioned, all ten of them have been released for unrestricted use, meaning the owner can do what they want to on them. A few of them that which the fuel was removed completely before by the -- the fuel was removed by the Department of Energy are fully open to any redevelopment that they want to. That would include Shoreham, Pathfinder, Saxton.

About one-third have become parks or some other use, like Maine Yankee. I mentioned that one before. There are a number of plants where they had built additional fossil units. At Rancho Seco, they have two combined fossil units, combined cycle, they use gas or whatever fuel they want to use. At Humboldt Bay, they have ten combustion units which they use for stabilizing the grid in Northern California.

And at La Crosse -- both Humboldt Bay and La Crosse right now are undergoing decommissioning, but La Cross has a large coal powered plant right next to the nuclear plant. So the sites can be reused for a variety of purposes. It's really up to the owner.

MS. CARTWRIGHT: If I may, just a point of
clarification, sir, thank you. The sites where the fuel has not been removed, are those fully unrestricted sites.

MR. WATSON: Yes, except for the fuel facility -- the storage facility.

MS. CARTWRIGHT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. WATSON: Uh-huh.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: It's your turn, Rich.

MR. HOLSCHUH: (Foreign language spoken)

My name is Rich and I'm from this place, namely Brattleboro. I serve on the Vermont Commission for Native American Affairs. I work with the contemporary Native community in the State of Vermont. I'm here as spokesperson for the Elnu Abenaki Tribe, with the backing of the Nulhegan and the Koasek.

Thank you for traveling here to the Land of the People Separated, the southwestern most part of Ndakinna, the Abenaki homeland.

As indigenous people, our concern is both for the land and the people for they are the same. I would like to open with a short perspective of how we see this situation. You may not have heard this before. I don't know. But I'd like to make three brief comments, not questions just comments.

This -- tonight, this gathering is the
latest step in a story that has been unfolding for less than fifty years, blink of an eye. The spiritual beliefs of the indigenous people tell us that time is a whole, not a linear progression. We are all part of the same. There is no separation from anyone or anything else, no matter the time or the shape, only a relationship in a different way of being in the world.

Energy and matter are conserved, basic physics. Everything matters. The past is always with us and the future is now. We have a great responsibility as Native people and hopefully as human beings to honor these relationships and conduct ourselves in a matter befitting our role in creation.

But now we have some new strange things, things that have never been here before. Things that we can't see, but they're still real. Radionuclides, they're not a part of natural law. They have never been here before in these quantities. They're antithetical to life itself. They don't fit. They're not part of the story, a story that's been going on for millennia.

But yet, here they are. Somebody made a decision to step outside of relationship and now we have to live with it. The deliberations of the
moment, today, the next few weeks, years, will be with us for hundreds and thousands of years. Seems like a long time and it is.

I ask you to remember that the Abenaki and their ancestors have been in this land, the land where Vermont Yankee sits, for twelve thousand years. That's a long time. They've been flourishing sustainably within the relationship. And with thankfulness, we are still here. (language other than English) as we say in our language. And we want to honor this place, our homeland. We want the future generations to be able to give thanks in the same manner and enjoy these gifts, as well.

We ask that you make these decisions regarding the disposition of this great incongruity carefully. It affects everyone and everything. So I'd like to make three short comments.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Rich, they do have to be short.

MR. HOLSCHUH: Okay. These are with respect to the P.S.D.A.R. Vermont Yankee sits on an ancient gathering place, a place for settlement, gathering, fishing, working the land, performing ceremony, and a final resting place when it came time to walk on. The cultural significance of the site has
never been fully acknowledged.

I don't know if everybody knows this, but that's the case. NorthStar should know this. The original 1972 Atomic Energy Commission license for the plant makes it very clear, stating, quote, no formal archaeological survey was conducted at Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station prior to initial construction. And yet, for one example, historic newspaper accounts record the unearthing of multiple indigenous burials in the immediate area for the two hundred years immediately preceding the facility.

I'll leave it at that. This needs to be on the record.

The P.S.D.A.R. and the revised P.S.D.A.R. merely quote the license that came before, and it's all made up. It's a myth.

Second point. Environmental review procedures that have been put in place at Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station regarding undertakings that involve land disturbing activities, this is beyond decommissioning, undisturbed areas, require a notification procedure involving the State Historic Preservation Officer to establish the -- actions necessary to protect known or undiscovered cultural resources.
This is going to carry through in site restoration, as well. There is going to be a lot of staging areas, a lot of storage areas beyond the plant, itself. We request the tribes be included in these procedures, going forward, and the protocols that will accompany them.

And the last point, environmental justice, Executive Order 12898 from 1994 directs Federal executive agencies to consider environmental justice under the National Environmental Policy Act. It is designed to ensure low income and -- minority populations do not experience a disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects.

Now we all know where the nuclear waste sites are. They are settled -- they are set in areas with marginalized, usually indigenous people. While you're considering how this is going to take place and where these things are going to go, we want you to know that we stand with these people, we ask that you consider their lives equally and fairly as your responsibility.

Thank you.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

Peter Vanderdoes, and then Nancy Braus.
MR. VANDERDOES: I think Nancy Braus has left us.

Peter Vanderdoes from Brattleboro. First, I'd like to thank Ms. O'Connor for her very concise and intelligent question. Who will be left holding the bag? And Senator MacDonald's point that the people holding the bag will have empty pockets.

Mr. Leach, who was here earlier and spoke so eloquently of Areva, I would like to point out some of their shortcomings in cost and time overrides. The Flamanville Nuclear plant in France, which began construction in 2007, was supposed to be finished in 2012, is still under construction today.

Initially, it was estimated at three point five billion euros, but the cost has ballooned to ten point five billion euros.

Another point is the Olkiluoto Nuclear Power Plant in Finland, which Areva was working on, was due to be finished in 2009. It is also still under construction. And the initial cost has gone up from three point five billion euros to eight billion euros. The Finnish Electrical Utility, T.V.O., is taking Areva to court.

I had a whole bunch of financial information, which I was going to go through, but it
was very lengthy. So I decided just to point out to
the Nuclear Regulatory Commission 10 C.F.R. 50.38, the
ineligibility of certain applicants. Any person who
is a citizen, national, or agent of a foreign country
or any corporation or other entity which the
Commission knows to be owned, controlled, or dominated
by an alien foreign corporation or foreign government,
shall be ineligible to apply for or obtain a license.

So I know that that's sort of pushed under
the rug because Areva has done a lot of work in the
United States. But I'm wondering why shouldn't an
American Corporation be doing that work? We need the
jobs.

Thanks very much.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you, Peter.

Nancy Braus appears to have left the
building.

Is there anyone else who hasn't signed up
or I've missed you that would like to make a comment?

Yes, please come to the microphone.

MS. BURNETT: My name is Audrey Burnett.

I'm a member of the Vermont Yankee Decommissioning
Alliance. I understand that NorthStar is partnering
with the Texas-based W.C.S., to send our high-level
nuclear waste to a community in Andrews County, Texas.
Our group, along with other citizen-based groups, recently sponsored residents from Andrews County who are very opposed to receiving our high-level nuclear waste.

They are concerned that although they are told this is interim storage, there is presently no safe long-term plans for high-level nuclear waste storage. They're concerned about environmental impacts or potential terrorist attacks on this waste. I mean, this is where they live and where they're raising their children. They say that they had no nuclear power plants and yet they're hosting our waste.

I'd like everyone to consider what's being proposed and the people that will be affected by our poisonous waste for possibly generations to come.

Thank you.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you very much.

Is there anyone else who hasn't made a comment, but would like to? Yes, please come to the microphone.

MR. ZALUZNY: Hi. Steve Zaluzny, resident of Vernon, Vermont. Just quick, a little bit of history. My father was a selectperson for years in Vernon. He was there when they built the plant, along
with other select people, obviously. Spent a lot of
time and had a lot of late night meetings, one or two
o'clock in the morning, to deal with the nuclear power
plant coming to town.

So I don't want to bore you with too much
of that. But one of the promises that was made,
obviously and I don't know all the background or the
paperwork or the legal documents, but the people of
Vernon were promised that the nuclear waste would be
removed once the plant was shut down. So that
obviously has become an issue.

The -- the A.G. mentioned that, you know,
what -- what will happen after a certain year, fifty-
two, or whatever as far as cost. And I guess before
I get done maybe that's the question I'd like
answered, you know, and who pays that cost of material
on-site as it goes beyond a certain point?

And then I want to speak a little bit
about just the idea of, you know, I'm a small
contractor, obviously, but certain things are also
relevant, small or big, as far as construction
contracts. One of the things, you know, if you're
doing a bonded job, obviously a bond sounds like a
good thing and it can be. But if there's any
disputes, a bond could be contested and then you're in
a legal situation trying to deal with it.

I guess, my comments in regard to a contract are obviously up front you need to know what the costs are. Okay? That's critical especially in this case. So whoever we're going to trust, Public Service or the NRC or whoever it is, we need to know what the costs are accurately before the contract is signed and the work is done.

Once that is established, a schedule of values has to be set. That is basically what the cost of each segment of the job will be.

Once the work proceeds, it is critical that the contractor is paid accordingly to what work is done as far as its value. If a contractor would be overpaid, that's not a good situation. So that is why whoever will oversee this is able to measure the work that's done and that it's done properly. That way, if a contractor defaults, there's still enough money left to finish the work. So that is also critical.

So I think that's really important to any contract. Obviously, this has nuclear waste involved, but these requirements are -- are still relevant for any contract. And I think that's what I, as a resident of Vernon, want my government to do in this situation, that they scrutinize and make sure that the
contract is followed. And that's really going to make this work. Whether it's done over six years or sixty years that still has to happen to this -- for this to work.

So now again to my question on storage, whoever should try to answer that as far as cost and who pays the cost of storage if it were -- if we don't have a place to put nuclear waste, you know, in -- you know, in the time span we're hoping that will happen.

MR. DUSANIWSKYJ: I recognize your concern about spent fuel. And I want to remind everyone in this room that we do not make policy as to what is going to be the disposition of spent fuel. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission only maintains that they be held safely, securely, and all the other issues.

I can tell you that there's going to be some point where if there is no resolution found for spent fuel, there will be additional costs. But a lot of things will have to transpire between now and then. This is not something that's going to happen overnight.

There is sufficient funding right now, under the guidance given by the Department of Energy -- and I grant you that the Department of Energy has not had a very good track record as to what their
promises are or not. That's a fact. But there will become a point, and I'm not going to deny it, that sometime -- sometime, additional funding will have to be found.

The problem that we're going to be having is that they're not going to be necessarily popular answers. The licensee would still be held responsible for all costs because the license for the ISFSI or the dry cask storage is not terminated until such time that the fuel is removed.

So I cannot sit here and tell you what the costs are to an infinite time. There's very little way that I could do that for you. All I can say is that if it's going to happen, the licensee will be responsible for the cost.

Now, an added point to this, many of the licensees have been suing the Department of Energy to reclaim some of these costs, and they have been winning in court. There's also been, unfortunately, not necessarily a very good payment on these judgments.

I don't have answers to what's going on with the Department of Energy. All I can tell you is that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission does not make that policy. So one way or the other, as we've been
talking about throughout the evening, the licensee is responsible for the costs until the license is terminated completely.

MR. ZALUZNY: Okay. Thank you very much.

I appreciate your answer.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you. I think there was one more person who wanted to comment? Yes?

MS. OLSON: I was reluctant to come up because I --.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: You have to introduce yourself.

MS. OLSON: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm Tina Olson. And I live in Brattleboro. I came here from New York City. I've been here three years. I grew up in Massachusetts. But I belong here. This is -- these are my people. This is my land. I love the Connecticut River. And I'm a music therapist and so of all the details that is involved here I don't know much.

But what I hear is that we share a future. And I think, probably deep down, all of us love the land. So it seems to me, after listening, this comes down to a commitment to do the absolute best to save the land and ourselves and the future.

And I also understand that there really
isn't a satisfactory way to store this terrible --
curse in a way. So -- and I felt like I do need to
say something in honor of our democracy. And I
appreciate all of us here together, which I think deep
down we share the same desire and that we can come
together and hear each other so.

I don't normally do this, but I felt that
I need to speak. And I think all I can say is let us
do the best we can in a way, even if it is the most
expensive, and even if it takes a long time because we
do love the land and our people. Thank you.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you very much.

Is there anyone else in the public that
wants to make a comment or has a question? All right.
Thank you so much.

I want to thank -- we're not done the
meeting. But I want to thank the public for coming
this evening. I think it was important and it was
because of the public that we asked the NRC to come
here this evening. So I want to thank all of you for
showing up. And it's -- I think it's very instructive
for us as a Panel to hear what -- what you're thinking
and what your thoughts and concerns are because that's
part of what we -- we like to know, as well.

Just a little bit of housekeeping, if you
want to make a comment and you didn't want to do it in
this forum or you go home tonight and you think of
something that you want to say, the NRC is accepting
comments on the license transfer until June 23rd. And
again, you can go on the NRC website or what we'll be
doing is emailing you out --.

MR. PARROTT: Kate, could I -- this is
Jack Parrott over here in NRC --
Could I elaborate on that?
CHAIR O'CONNOR: Yes -- yes.
MR. PARROTT: -- public comment part?
Yesterday, we published our Federal
Register notice that it offers that opportunity. And
I just want to make sure you know that it's -- the
website to do that is W W W dot regulations dot gov.
And you use the docket number NRC dash 2017 dash zero
two five. And all that information is in the
Federal Register notice.

I don't know if it's -- if it's possible
if you could put that Federal Register notice, maybe,
on your website, it might make it easier for people to
find information.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Yes, we will. We'll put
that on this -- our Panel has a site on the State of
Vermont's website, located on the Public Service
Department site. And what we'll do is we'll make sure that that link is on it. And I'll make sure that we email out to everybody what that email address is and what the link is. So we'll push the information out as much as we can so that everybody has that information.

There was a question earlier about where people can find the slides from tonight's presentations. And there are two places. Entergy has a website, VY decommissioning dot com. And again, it's also on the State of Vermont's Public Service Department website. And the Nuclear Decommissioning Citizens Advisory Panel has our own site there. So if you're looking for that, you can find it.

The meeting will be re-broadcast on B.C.T.V., if you want to watch it on your television or you can see it any time online. So anything you wanted, you can rewatch the meeting at two in the morning if you -- if you have nothing else to do and you can't sleep.

I want to thank -- before we -- before we do a little bit more housekeeping on the Panel, I do want to thank the representatives from the NRC for coming. And I want to thank Scott State and Mike Twomey for coming. We appreciate it very much.
And I think somebody said this may be the last time we ever see the NRC. And I don't think that's true because there are other issues that are going to be coming up. And I had a conversation with them, prior to this meeting, and there may be other reasons for them to come up and fill us in on what's going on. So we -- we appreciate that offer, as well.

The next NDCAP meeting is, at this point, scheduled for June 22nd. We have confirmed that representatives from Holtec, they are the company that is doing the transferring of the fuel from the spent fuel pool, to the second dry cask storage pad. They have confirmed that they will be coming to the meeting.

We also have confirmation that representatives from Areva, which is one of the partners with NorthStar, will be coming to the meeting. There is a chance, based on everybody's schedule, we're dealing with a lot of people, that that meeting may be pushed back a week. And this is news to some people in the room here, so I apologize for springing it on you.

So I'm going to be sending an email out to the Panel and to all the people that are impacted if we change the date and see if that's a changeable date
or not. And what we do for all of you here is we post all the information, the days and times and places of our meetings, again on the State of Vermont website. And we also email it out so we get it out as much as possible.

So tentatively, put June 22nd, but it may be bumped back a week, depending on the logistics of doing that.

I don't know if anyone else on the Panel wants to say anything before we adjourn our meeting? No? Everybody is going no. So again, I want to --.

SENATOR MACDONALD: I'm sorry. Say that again, Madam Chair?

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Does anyone want to say anything before we adjourn the meeting? Oh, yes, we got to give you a microphone, Senator.

SENATOR MACDONALD: Madam Chair, public policy and decisions of this sort are best made when there are clear rules of what happens in the future. And the NRC's job or the Congress' job is to make it clear who is responsible if such -- if this goes forward.

Many of us, including myself, would like to see the money spent sooner, rather than later. But if the NRC is not telling us who's responsible if a
good faith project comes up short and the answer is we'll find out when it happens, what use is the NRC?

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Does anyone else on the Panel want to make a comment?

Yes, Steve?

MR. SKIBNIOWSKY: Steve Skibniowsky here. I'd like to just certainly thank all the panelists and NRC that are here this evening. But I would also like to remind the panelists that during the presentations, during the public comments and so forth, it would be most courteous to refrain from talking and essentially ignoring what the individuals are saying, until they're finished speaking.

And I think it's a matter of common courtesy in a public forum like this and I would like to remind all of my fellow panelists that that, at least, is the type of protocol that I'm familiar with and would certainly support in the future.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you, Steve.

Any other comments or questions from anyone on the Panel?

All right. Again, thank you all for coming.

David Andrews has made the motion to adjourn. Does anyone second that motion?
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Everybody seconds that motion.

All those in favor?

THE PANEL: Aye.

CHAIR O'CONNOR: Thank you. We're adjourning and thank you so much, everyone, for coming.

(The meeting adjourned at 9:36 p.m.)