

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Vermont Yankee Post-shutdown
Decommissioning Activities Report
Public Meeting

Docket Number: 05000271

Location: Brattleboro, Vermont

Date: Thursday, February 19, 2015

Work Order No.: NRC-1374

Pages 1-200

ORIGINAL

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 234-4433

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

+ + + + +

VERMONT YANKEE POST-SHUTDOWN DECOMMISSIONING

ACTIVITIES REPORT PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY,

FEBRUARY 19, 2015

+ + + + +

BRATTLEBORO, VERMONT

+ + + + +

The meeting convened in the Quality Inn,
1380 Putney Road, at 6:00 p.m.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PRESENT:

CHIP CAMERON, Facilitator

JOE LYNCH, Entergy

BRUCE WATSON, Chief, NMSS

DREW PERSINKO, Deputy Director, NMSS

DOUG BROADDUS, Chief, NRR

MARC FERDAS, Chief, DNMS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1		
2	ITEM	PAGE
3	Welcome/Introduction	4
4	PSDAR Introduction	10
5	PSDAR Requirements	23
6	NRC PSDAR Review/Licensing Status	27
7	NRC Inspection Programs	36
8	Entergy/PSDAR Content	43
9	Elected Officials	63
10	Public Comment Session	90
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

P R O C E E D I N G S

6:00 p.m.

1
2
3 MR. CAMERON: Good evening, everyone. I
4 want to welcome you to the public meeting tonight, and
5 my name is Chip Cameron, and --

6 MR. SACHS: Is there a reason why we don't
7 get a public hearing here?

8 MR. CAMERON: We're going to answer that
9 question, the difference between a public hearing and
10 a public meeting. We will provide that answer for
11 you, because I know that people are interested in
12 that.

13 For your information, we're taking a
14 transcript of the meeting, and that will be your
15 record of what transpired here tonight, and the NRC's
16 record.

17 Just give us a couple of minutes to figure
18 this out, because we want to make sure that all of
19 this is on the transcript, although I'm not sure it's
20 important for me to be on there. Okay, it's not
21 working.

22 You know what? I think I'm just going to
23 go ahead, because I'm not sure that it's critical for
24 me to be on the transcript.

25 Okay, and then hopefully it will be fixed

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 by then, but I just want to welcome you all. The
2 subject tonight is NRC Nuclear Regulatory Commission
3 process for the decommissioning of Vermont Yankee, and
4 specifically the NRC and our speaker from Entergy, Joe
5 Lynch, are going to talk about something called the
6 post-shutdown decommissioning activities report.

7 We're going to try to keep the -- we're
8 going to try to keep the acronyms to a minimum, but
9 one that you will hear tonight is PSDAR, okay.

10 We're going to start out with some brief
11 NRC presentations to give you an overview of the
12 decommissioning process, and we also have, as I
13 mentioned, Joe Lynch here from Entergy, who is going
14 to talk about Entergy's PSDAR that they prepared, and
15 then we're going to go out to you for questions,
16 concerns and recommendations.

17 My role as the facilitator is to try to
18 help you all have a productive meeting tonight, and I
19 wanted to spend just a couple of minutes on meeting
20 process issues, so that you know what to expect
21 tonight.

22 The objectives of the meeting, first of
23 all, the first objective is to give you clear
24 information on the NRC oversight process and on
25 Entergy's PSDAR.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Second objective is to answer your
2 questions and to listen to your concerns and your
3 recommendations.

4 In terms of format, as I mentioned -- and
5 you're probably going to -- Gary and I usually do a
6 duet, okay, throughout the meeting, and so, you're
7 probably -- you're probably going to hear Gary and --

8 MR. SACHS: Clean it up now. Don't give it
9 to our grandchildren.

10 MR. CAMERON: Gary, we're going to ask
11 Gary to try to be courteous throughout the meeting,
12 but you may have of something from that corner.

13 But anyway, format, we're going to have
14 some NRC speakers, Entergy, and then we're going to go
15 on to you, but I'm going to ask you -- ask for your
16 patience. I want to get all the information out to
17 you, before we go to you for questions.

18 So, I would just ask you to please hold
19 your questions and comments, until after all of the
20 speakers are done and --

21 MR. SACHS: That's a dumb way to do it,
22 Chip. That's a dumb way to do it. I'm not going to
23 go back and say the guy 40 minutes ago said --

24 MR. CAMERON: Well, Gary, Gary, I'm asking
25 you to do that, okay?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SACHS: I know, my bullshit-o-meter
2 works, does yours?

3 MR. CAMERON: So, the duet. At any rate
4 --

5 MR. SACHS: Chip is here to present my
6 personal --

7 MR. CAMERON: I'm going to ask you to
8 follow some ground rules tonight. The first one is to
9 wait until all of the presentations are done, before
10 we go out to you for questions.

11 Second one is, I would ask you to be brief
12 in your questions or comments. I'm not going to set
13 a time limit, but a few minutes, and I have a list of
14 all the people who signed up to speak and ask a
15 question. You can come down here to talk to the NRC
16 staff, or if you want, I'll bring you the cordless
17 microphone to you in the audience, and if you could
18 just stand up and introduce yourself to us and ask
19 your question or make your comment.

20 In terms of the ground rule about being
21 brief, I'm also asking the NRC staff and Entergy to
22 also try to be brief and concise, in answering any
23 questions, so that we give more time to all of you out
24 there, and I'm going to go to everybody once, before
25 we go back to anybody for a second round of comments

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and questions.

2 We're scheduled to go until nine o'clock
3 tonight, and if we need to, to get to our remaining
4 people, we'll go over for a little bit.

5 The NRC is also asking you to submit
6 written comments on the PSDAR, and they'll explain
7 that, but if you want to come up and give a short
8 summary of your comments for the record tonight,
9 that's fine to do that, and we have Pete Holland here,
10 who is our Court Reporter, and he's going to be taking
11 the transcript, and I would ask you, because we're
12 talking a transcript, and because we want to pay
13 attention to whomever has the floor at the moment, I
14 would ask that only one person speak at a time.

15 Finally, I would just ask for all of us to
16 extend courtesy to everybody else in the meeting room.
17 You may hear opinions that differ from yourselves,
18 your opinions, but just please respect the person who
19 is giving that, and in a minute, I'm going to
20 introduce Drew Persinko and ask him to introduce the
21 rest of the panel.

22 But first of all, before we go to that, I
23 wanted to introduce representatives of two elected
24 officials, and one is -- one is Haley Perro from
25 Senator Sander's office, and Tom Berry, who is here

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 from Senator Leahy's office, and I would also ask, is
2 there any other elected officials here, who just want
3 to stand up and introduce themselves, before we go on?

4 Okay, okay, go ahead.

5 MS. O'CONNOR: I'm Kate O'Connor and I'm
6 the Chair of the Vermont Nuclear Decommissioning
7 Citizen's Advisory Panel.

8 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Kate.
9 Any other elected officials?

10 Okay, let me get to you, sir. So, this
11 way, you'll know who is here.

12 MR. TUSINSK: My name is Peter Tusinsk.
13 I'm on the Planning Board with the town of Leyden,
14 well within the ten mile radius.

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

16 MR. WARD: John Ward, Gill Select Board,
17 Gill, Massachusetts.

18 MR. CAMERON: Gill, Massachusetts. Thank
19 you.

20 All right, well, we're going to go to our
21 Panel, and they're going to complete their
22 presentations, and then we're going to go out to you
23 for the rest of the evening, and this is Drew
24 Persinko, Deputy Director of the Division of
25 Decommissioning, and I'm going to let you go with full

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 title, NRC Office of Nuclear Material, Safety and
2 Safeguards.

3 So, Drew, I'll turn it over to you now.
4 Pete, do we have transcript -- do you have us? Okay,
5 good.

6 MR. PERSINKO: Good evening. Can you all
7 hear me?

8 Okay, I too, want to welcome everybody to
9 our meeting tonight. My name is Drew Persinko. I'm
10 the Deputy Director in the Division of
11 Decommissioning, Uranium Recovery and Waste Programs
12 within the NRC.

13 The purpose tonight, as Chip said, is to
14 discuss the Vermont Yankee post-shutdown
15 decommissioning activities report, which we're all
16 going to refer to as PSDAR, which was submitted to the
17 NRC by Entergy in December, and we're going to be
18 listening to your comments tonight.

19 The PSDAR, the purpose of the PSDAR is to
20 provide a general overview for the public and the NRC,
21 of the licensee's proposed decommissioning activities.
22 This meeting is required by NRC regulations.

23 We originally were going to have this
24 meeting in late January, but we were asked by the
25 Citizen's Advisory Panel to postpone it, which we did.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 As Chip said, we're going to have a few
2 brief presentations about the PSDAR and our
3 decommissioning program, and then Chip will facilitate
4 comments from you all.

5 The meeting is being transcribed. There
6 are feedback forms in the room here, and we plan to
7 adjourn around nine o'clock.

8 So, okay, our agenda this evening is that
9 I'm going to give a few introductory remarks. Bruce
10 Watson, to my left, will speak about the requirements
11 of the PSDAR. Doug Broaddus on my right, will speak
12 about the NRC's review of the PSDAR and the licensing
13 status of Vermont Yankee.

14 To his right is Marc Ferdas. Marc is in
15 our Region I office, and Marc will talk about
16 inspection programs at NRC and in Region I and at
17 Vermont Yankee.

18 To my left is Joe Lynch from Entergy. Joe
19 will be speaking about the contents of the Vermont
20 Yankee PSDAR, and as we said, then Chip will
21 facilitate a public comment session and then we'll
22 close the meeting at approximately nine o'clock.

23 So, let me begin with a short
24 introduction.

25 It really starts with NRC's mission. It's

1 all about the mission, and the mission is that NRC
2 licenses and regulates the nation's civilian use of
3 radioactive materials, to protect public health and
4 safety, promote the common defense of security and
5 protect the environment.

6 This was our mission during operation of
7 the facility. It remains our mission during
8 decommissioning, and the decommissioning will be
9 carried out according to our regulations.

10 One of the decommissioning regulations is
11 in Part 20. CFR stands for Code of Federal
12 Regulations. The 10 CFR Part 20, and in 10 CFR Part
13 20 is the definition of decommissioning, and the
14 definition is, "To remove facilities safely from
15 service and reduce radioactivity to a level that
16 permits either unrestricted release or restricted
17 release."

18 No nuclear power reactor, or any other
19 nuclear site in the U.S. for that matter, has pursued
20 restricted release and all have pursued what's known
21 as unrestricted release.

22 So, the release --

23 MR. SACHS: Are any of them habitable
24 today?

25 MR. PERSINKO: So, the release criteria is

1 as follows. For unrestricted --

2 MR. SACHS: Are any of those habitable
3 today, sir?

4 MR. PERSINKO: For unrestricted release --

5 MR. CAMERON: Gary, Gary, just hold your
6 questions, please.

7 MR. SACHS: It's an honest question. Are
8 any of those --

9 MR. CAMERON: It isn't --

10 MR. SACHS: -- sites habitable today, sir?

11 MR. CAMERON: We know it's an honest
12 question. We want to get this --

13 MR. SACHS: Answer it.

14 MR. CAMERON: We want to get this --

15 MR. SACHS: Please.

16 MR. CAMERON: We will answer it, okay.

17 MR. SACHS: Why wait 30 minutes to get an
18 answer to the question, of whether or not those
19 decommissioned sites are habitable by the general
20 public today.

21 MR. CAMERON: Gary?

22 MR. SACHS: Are they?

23 MR. CAMERON: Gary, I'm going to have to
24 ask you --

25 MR. SACHS: That's yes or no, sir.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: -- to just --

2 MR. SACHS: Sir.

3 MR. CAMERON: -- to just -- until -- let
4 him get -- let all these people get through their
5 presentations. So, go ahead.

6 MR. PERSINKO: For unrestricted release,
7 the requirements are that the dose be less than or
8 equal to 25 millirem to the average member of the
9 critical group, and considers all pathways for
10 receiving the dose and for a period of performance of
11 1,000 years.

12 I'm not going to through the unrestricted
13 -- through the restricted release criteria, because
14 that's not what's being pursued by Vermont Yankee.

15 For unrestricted release, I mentioned the
16 criteria being 25 millirem.

17 Well, just to put that in a little
18 perspective here, a millirem is a unit of dose on
19 human beings. Although the criteria says that it's 25
20 millirem, past history has shown by other power
21 reactors that have decommissioned, they have actually
22 decommissioned down to the order of a few millirem, on
23 the order of two, three, four, five millirems.

24 So, although our criteria says less than
25 or equal to 25 millirem, the fact is that all -- for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the other power reactors that have completed
2 decommissioning, have completed it to a much less --
3 to much lower levels.

4 For comparison, what's a millirem? I want
5 to -- just for comparison.

6 You take a ride across the country in an
7 airplane, you get about three millirems flying across
8 the country. You get a chest x-ray, you get about 10
9 millirems, and in a normal course of background, just
10 your normal course of business, in a year you get
11 about 300 to 600 millirems. So, that's just for
12 perspective, when we talk about what is a millirem.

13 Okay, this slide, it's a very important
14 slide, I believe. It shows the roles and the
15 activities of the licensee on the left, the NRC in the
16 middle and the public on the right, and so, the
17 process -- and it shows the decommissioning process in
18 a flow chart form.

19 So, on the left you see, there is initial
20 notification and fuel removal.

21 So, the initial process starts off with a
22 certification of cessation of operations by the
23 licensee, Entergy, and then a certification of fuel
24 removal from the reactor, which has been done.

25 The next is the submittal of the PSDAR.

1 You see there, it says 'decommissioning report' on the
2 left. That's the PSDAR.

3 So, it's submittal of the PSDAR and a
4 public meeting, and you can see in the middle column,
5 the NRC role, its review of the PSDAR and public
6 meeting.

7 So, where we are right now on this flow
8 chart is in the middle column where it says 'public
9 meeting'. That's where we are in the decommissioning
10 process right now.

11 I want to note that the NRC does not
12 approve the PSDAR, but we do review it to ensure that
13 our regulations are being met, and Bruce and Doug will
14 speak more about that, when they speak.

15 If you go down the left-hand side some
16 more, you'll see the next -- after 90 days, the -- we
17 wait, by regulation, we're to wait 90 days and after
18 90 days, if we don't -- if we do not comment on it or
19 after 90 days is up, the licensee can begin major
20 decommissioning, during which time the NRC will be
21 doing inspections. The NRC will be performing
22 inspections during decommissioning.

23 About two years out before the license
24 termination, another plan is submitted to the NRC.
25 It's called the License Termination Plan, and we often

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 refer to that as the LTP.

2 It's submitted to NRC and it describes the
3 remaining decommissioning activities, the plans for
4 performing radiation surveys of the site, and it
5 provides a site-specific -- an updated site-specific
6 cost estimate.

7 The NRC does review and approve the -- we
8 do review and approve the LTP, if it's acceptable.
9 Approval of the license termination plan is a
10 licensing action, and thus, there is an opportunity
11 for a hearing at that point.

12 At this point, let me just clarify a bit
13 here.

14 You know, I've been to a couple meetings
15 up here and people refer to this as a hearing.

16 At the NRC, we would call -- this is a
17 meeting. This is a public meeting, a meeting open to
18 the public.

19 When we use the term 'hearing' at the NRC,
20 we're referring to a legal adjudicatory hearing with
21 a Hearing Panel.

22 So, that's why, you know, sometimes people
23 have referred to this as a hearing, but in our
24 vernacular, this is a public meeting.

25 You can see at that stage, that's an

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 opportunity for a hearing. So, that's an opportunity
2 for the public, you can see on the right-hand column,
3 if the public wishes to, they could submit a hearing
4 request, in order to have the adjudicatory hearing.

5 Further decommissioning and further clean
6 up is done, and eventually, the final status surveys
7 are performed by the licensee.

8 The NRC verifies those surveys to make
9 sure that the clean-up levels meeting our regulations
10 have been met, and if they have, we terminate the
11 license.

12 Decommissioning regulations also include
13 provisions for protecting the environment. Our
14 environmental law is the National Environmental Policy
15 Act, otherwise known as NEPA, and there are
16 regulations that implements the law, it's 10 CFR Part
17 51.

18 At the PSDAR stage, PSDAR includes a
19 discussion -- requirements or regulations require that
20 the PSDAR include a discussion, to show that the
21 environmental impacts associated with site-specific
22 decommissioning are bounded by previous environmental
23 impact statements, or if there are significant impacts
24 during decommissioning that have not been previously
25 -- in previous EIS's, the licensee must submit a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 supplement to its environmental report.

2 MR. SACHS: Can you spell Strontium?

3 MR. PERSINKO: At the license termination

4 --

5 MR. SACHS: Is that the first --

6 MR. PERSINKO: At the license termination
7 plan, it must include the supplemental environmental
8 report, if any new information or significant
9 environmental changes are discovered, and since that
10 is a --

11 MR. SACHS: Is the Strontium new?

12 MR. PERSINKO: If that isn't -- since that
13 is an official licensing action, an environmental
14 assessment must be performed by the NRC.

15 I'm not going to say too much about this
16 slide. This slide just shows the internal
17 bookkeeping, if you will, within the NRC. The
18 decommissioning has -- different organizations within
19 the NRC have different responsibilities for
20 decommissioning.

21 At certain points in time, the project
22 management function is transferred from one of our
23 offices to another and the inspection programs are
24 transferred from one division to another. That is
25 just internal bookkeeping, if you will, from your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 perspective. What you should see is a different name
2 on the letters that are being sent out.

3 It will be a different project manager or
4 a different inspector. But that's how internally, we
5 transfer the project.

6 This slide, I wanted to show -- the
7 purpose of this slide, this bar chart is -- I wanted
8 to show that the NRC has a lot of experience in
9 performing decommissioning.

10 Since 1997, the NRC has terminated the
11 licensees of over -- the licenses over 80 facilities,
12 including power reactors, material sites and research
13 reactors.

14 I chose 1997 for the beginning of this
15 graph because that's when the current power reactor
16 decommissioning process and the release criteria came
17 into effect, by rule making. Both went into effect
18 via a change in the NRC regulations, which we call
19 rule making.

20 It went through the normal rule making
21 process, which included public comment and resolution.

22 Since 1997, the current process has been
23 used to decommission --

24 MR. SACHS: So, I just want to --

25 MR. PERSINKO: -- seven --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SACHS: You guys are NRC staff --

2 MR. PERSINKO: -- has been used --

3 MR. SACHS: Right? When you first went to
4 the commission --

5 MR. PERSINKO: Has been used --

6 MR. SACHS: -- nobody came --

7 MR. PERSINKO: -- to decommission --

8 MR. CAMERON: Gary?

9 MR. PERSINKO: -- seven power reactors,
10 and including three in New England. Those three in
11 New England are Main Yankee, which shut down in 1996,
12 Connecticut Yankee, which also shut down in 1996,
13 Yankee Rowe, which shut down in 1991, and I put this
14 last slide on here for completeness.

15 Millstone Unit 1 is in decommissioning
16 status. It's in Waterford, Connecticut. It's
17 currently in SAFSTOR, and it shut down in 1995.

18 MR. SACHS: Are there two --

19 MR. PERSINKO: That concludes my --

20 MR. SACHS: -- reactors that are open?

21 MR. PERSINKO: That concludes my
22 presentation. With that, I'm going to turn it over to
23 Bruce Watson, who will talk about the PSDAR
24 requirements.

25 MR. WATSON: Thank you, Drew, and thank

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you all, for joining us tonight and taking time out to
2 be here.

3 Our risk -- our performance based risk
4 informed regulations went into place in 1997. The two
5 key ones are Part 20 and Part 50. Part 50 deals
6 specifically with the decommissioning of power
7 reactors.

8 Another important regulation in effect is
9 the one of independent spent fuel storage, known as
10 ISFSI's.

11 Like I said, these went into effect in
12 1997. We have 18 years of implementing experience,
13 and we have completed the decommissioning on seven
14 power reactors to date, and numerous other facilities.

15 MR. SACHS: Can we play baseball there?

16 MR. WATSON: Entergy provided a draft of
17 the PSDAR in October for public review. It submitted
18 the PSDAR to us formally on December 19th, and in
19 December 23rd, the PSDAR was available in ADAMS for
20 everyone to see.

21 December 29th, Vermont Yankee permanently
22 ceased operations and on January 12th, Entergy
23 certified that VOI permanently ceased operations and
24 the reactor was completely defueled.

25 This means that the fuel cannot be put

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 back in the reactor, nor can the plant be operated
2 again. If they wanted to operate again, they'd have
3 to apply for an operating license.

4 We issued the public notice for the PSDAR
5 for this public meeting and made it available for
6 everyone to be aware of. Next slide.

7 There are three decommissioning options in
8 our guidance, DECON, which is the immediate
9 dismantling of equipment and structures. In other
10 words, the plant is promptly removed or decontaminated
11 to allow radiological release. We currently have five
12 plants in DECON.

13 . The other option is SAFSTOR. The plant is
14 placed in a safe condition -- stable condition and
15 maintained and in that state until it's decommissioned
16 to permit radiological release. We currently have 14
17 plants, including Yankee -- excuse me, Vermont Yankee
18 in that status today.

19 ENTOMB was also an option, but that is not
20 available. We have no plans to plan or we have no
21 regulations to allow ENTOMB.

22 One of the key futures of the regulations
23 is that radiological decommissioning must be completed
24 in 60 years.

25 Now, part of Vermont activities is that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they do have the settlement agreement, which takes
2 into account, information from the -- input from the
3 state and the stakeholders, and also, the NRC
4 encourages that we have -- that the licensee or the
5 state form a Citizen's Advisory Panel, which has been
6 done, and that's to continue to solicit input on the
7 decommissioning. Next slide.

8 The content of the PSDAR is outlined in
9 5082, and in reg -- and the details can be found in
10 Regulatory Guide 1.185.

11 It must include a description and schedule
12 for the planned decommissioning activities. It must
13 include a site-specific cost estimate, including the
14 cost of managing the radiated fuel.

15 It also must include a discussion that
16 provides the means for concluding that the
17 environmental impact associated with the
18 decommissioning activities will be an appropriately
19 bounded by the issued -- appropriately issued
20 environment impact statement or assessment.

21 MR. SACHS: Can you go into how that
22 interacts with Entergy's statement this week? They're
23 out of here in 60 years, sir.

24 MR. WATSON: The post-shutdown activities
25 report, part of the process is that the NRC

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 regulations that require a public meeting be held.
2 So, we're here tonight to hear your comments.

3 We will make the PSDAR available for
4 public comment, and there is the ADAMS number in our
5 publically available document system.

6 One thing I do want to note is that we do
7 not approve the PSDAR. It is a report, like I said,
8 on the description of the activities --

9 MR. SACHS: Why can't the other licensees
10 --

11 MR. WATSON: -- the cost estimates and
12 also on the environmental impacts of the
13 decommissioning.

14 I want to point out that the
15 decommissioning, with the restrictions of the time
16 tables that are outlined in the 90 day requirement and
17 other things, that decommissioning can be started
18 under the current license.

19 So, this is not a Federal action in the
20 respect that it's not a license actions in the license
21 amendment or an exemption. It's merely a report to
22 us, which we will gauge its content on and make sure
23 it meets our requirements.

24 MR. SACHS: Do you guys know how to
25 decommission Fukushima?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. WATSON: So, given that, I will turn
2 it over to Doug Broaddus.

3 MR. BROADDUS: All right, thank you,
4 Bruce. So, I'm the Branch Chief in the Office of
5 Nuclear Reactor Regulation, as Drew indicated before.

6 I have responsibility for the project
7 management oversight of the Vermont Yankee for now,
8 while it was operating, as well as now, that it's in
9 the transition from decommissioning to -- or from
10 operating to decommissioning.

11 Part of that oversight is for the review
12 of the post-shutdown decommissioning activities
13 report, and I'll be talking about that.

14 As Bruce indicated, there is specific
15 requirements associated with the post-shutdown
16 decommissioning activities report, and those
17 requirements are called out in our regulations, as
18 indicated in the slide.

19 We also have a regulatory guide that -- it
20 describes that the information that we expect to be in
21 the post-shutdown decommissioning activities report,
22 as well.

23 So, when we receive the report, we farm it
24 out to other technical reviewers that have expertise
25 in the specific areas that are required to be in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 report.

2 So, I wanted to talk a little bit about
3 the types of evaluation criteria that we have for
4 that.

5 As Bruce indicated, we don't approve the
6 report, but we do review it to ensure that it contains
7 all the required information by our regulations. So,
8 that's the key -- the first key activity.

9 We'll also look at the technical approach
10 -- the approach that the licensee has described, which
11 option they're planning to use to go forward, and to
12 determine whether or not the approach that they've
13 described is feasible, given the technology that --
14 the technologies and the approach that they are
15 planning to use.

16 The next key area is can it be completed
17 within the time frame specified, and in this case,
18 Entergy's plan indicates that they're going to
19 SAFSTOR, and therefore, that they will be conducting
20 the decommissioning activities over the 60 period.

21 So, is their plan feasible in -- and have
22 they adequately described that to determine -- for us
23 to be able to determine whether it can actually be
24 conducted during that time frame.

25 So, the -- the next area is -- I'll call

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it -- is the cost, and I'll talk about a little bit
2 more in the next slide. So, I won't get to that yet.

3 But the final thing is, you know, is it in
4 compliance with our regulations, and primarily, does
5 it -- does that PSDAR -- are there any activities that
6 would potentially endanger the public health and
7 safety? Obviously, if that were the case, we would
8 not allow them to go continue to move forward with the
9 plan from that standpoint.

10 So, it needs to be -- needs to demonstrate
11 that it's protecting the health and safety.

12 MR. SACHS: Protected action guidelines
13 are the current ones or the ones that got adjusted up
14 20 times after Fukushima?

15 MR. BROADDUS: So, as was mentioned before
16 about the -- the cost estimate.

17 So, along with the post-shutdown
18 decommissioning activities report, the licensee is
19 also required to submit a site-specific
20 decommissioning process. This is an estimate of the
21 entire cost from start to finish, for the entire 60
22 year period.

23 So, what we look at from that standpoint
24 is, are those costs -- are they -- have they -- has
25 the plan that they've laid out in the cost estimates

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that they have, does that provide reasonable assurance
2 to us that they're going to be able to complete the
3 decommissioning activities with the money that they
4 have available to them in the decommissioning trust.

5 I know that's an area of significant
6 interest to folks today -- tonight. So, really what
7 we want to look at there is to look at the techniques
8 that they're using, have they -- are the estimates --
9 are they based on realistic types of activities that
10 they would be conducting?

11 Have they identified all the areas that
12 they need to address, as part of their
13 decommissioning, and properly accounted for those
14 costs?

15 We also look at -- we understand that
16 there could be changes that occur over that period of
17 the decommissioning period. So, do they have the
18 mechanism to adjust their -- both their cost estimates
19 as they're going forward with it, and to account for
20 if they have any funding shortages or -- how would
21 they adjust the funding, to ensure that they're going
22 to be able to complete the activities, if those
23 changes occur?

24 There is also continuous oversight of
25 those -- of the costs, as well. The licensee is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 required to submit to us annually, a report of the
2 costs that they -- what they have spent, how much
3 money they have left in -- and how that comports with
4 the plans that they've submitted to us previously.

5 So, we'll look at that and make sure that
6 they're staying on track, and obviously, is there is
7 anything that -- any deviations from that, we would
8 have some questions or we would suspect that they
9 would address those changes within that.

10 In addition, if they make any significant
11 changes even throughout the year, they wouldn't --
12 they would be required to report those changes to us,
13 as well.

14 As Drew mentioned before, part of our
15 review is also from an environmental perspective, and
16 he indicated before that part of what they need to
17 look at is how does their -- how do the environmental
18 impacts comport with other prior environmental impact
19 statements that have been performed.

20 There are two key environmental impact
21 statements that would -- that would be applicable
22 here.

23 The first is the site-specific
24 environmental impact statement that was performed for
25 the plant when it was originally licensed.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, the activities would have to still be
2 within that original environmental analysis that was
3 performed at that time.

4 MR. SACHS: So, if there was Tritium on
5 site --

6 MR. BROADDUS: And that is --

7 MR. SACHS: -- is that in the --

8 MR. BROADDUS: The NRC developed a -- a
9 number of years back, a generic environmental impact
10 statement on decommissioning, specifically for
11 decommissioning of nuclear facilities.

12 MR. SACHS: And that's what you're going
13 to use here?

14 MR. BROADDUS: This is --

15 MR. SACHS: Even though there's a
16 preschool across the street?

17 MR. BROADDUS: This specific report was --
18 specifically, they addressed three different options
19 for decommissioning, that Bruce mentioned earlier, the
20 types that they could go into, and the -- and the
21 typical types of impacts that would be expected of
22 those types of activities.

23 So, the licensee would have --

24 MR. SACHS: Stakeholders want to be sure

25 --

1 MR. BROADDUS: -- to ensure that they
2 would --

3 MR. SACHS: -- with the decommissioning --

4 MR. BROADDUS: The licensee would have to
5 ensure that they have addressed those environment
6 impacts and determine whether or not they're within
7 the -- those initial or previous environmental
8 reports.

9 MR. SACHS: We'd like the NRC not to --

10 MR. BROADDUS: We will also continue to
11 assess the environment impacts throughout our
12 inspection program and see if there is any new changes
13 or any new environmental impacts that occur throughout
14 the process.

15 All right, finally, as we -- as Drew
16 mentioned earlier, we're here tonight to solicit
17 comments on the PSDAR.

18 Our review will consider those comments.
19 We'll look at those comments and we'll determine if
20 there is any -- any adjustments or any additional
21 information that is needed.

22 We would expect as well, that the licensee
23 would also be able -- you know, we would make those
24 available to the licensee, to make sure that they have
25 those and they -- they would have the opportunity to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 see those public comments, as well.

2 As we go through our review, we may ask
3 for additional information and we will -- we'll
4 complete our review, once we have all the information
5 and we're able to make the determination that the --
6 what they've submitted is in compliance with our
7 regulations and provides all the information that is
8 required.

9 So, we don't -- as we mentioned before, we
10 don't approve it, but if it's -- if we need additional
11 information to be able to complete our understanding
12 of what they're going to be doing and understanding
13 that they're -- of how they're going to proceed, we'll
14 ask for that information and expect to get that as
15 part of the responses.

16 Once we're done, we will notify the
17 licensee that we don't have any -- don't require any
18 additional information, and we'll also address, you
19 know, the -- do a summary of the public comments as
20 well, and we'll make sure that those are available to
21 the public.

22 As Bruce mentioned before, the licensee
23 can't begin major decommissioning until after 90 days,
24 after they've received -- we've received the PSDAR and
25 so, what we're -- in that 90 day period now, and we're

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 conducting our review at this point.

2 All right, so, with that, I'm going to
3 turn it over to Marc.

4 MR. FERDAS: Thanks, Doug. All right, my
5 name is Marc Ferdas. I'm from our Regional Office, as
6 Bruce said. My group has responsibility for the
7 oversight program, for sites that are in
8 decommissioning --

9 MR. SACHS: And how many have you done so
10 far?

11 MR. FERDAS: -- as well as sites that are
12 -- that have dry cask storage.

13 Before I kind of go into the details of
14 that, I'd like to just briefly mention how Vermont
15 Yankee finished its operating history from last year.

16 They finished the assessment period with
17 all green performance indicators and any findings that
18 were issued to them, as all green, meaning that they
19 were -- they continue to be in the licensee response
20 column, the NRC's action matrix.

21 If you have any questions concerning prior
22 performance, Sarah Rich is here. She's the Acting
23 Senior Resident Inspector, who will be more than happy
24 to talk to you after the meeting about that.

25 So, I just wanted to point out how the

1 station did finish out the final period of operations.

2 With that, moving forward the way the
3 oversight program works, we continue to perform
4 oversight.

5 MR. SACHS: How often?

6 MR. FERDAS: We continue to monitor --

7 MR. SACHS: How frequently?

8 MR. FERDAS: -- monitor --

9 MR. SACHS: You do?

10 MR. FERDAS: -- activities at this site.

11 MR. SACHS: You're getting rid of one
12 inspector. How many will be there, sir?

13 MR. CAMERON: Gary, Gary. I'm going to
14 have to ask you to be courteous, so that people can
15 hear what is being said up here.

16 MR. SACHS: I'm just trying to --

17 MR. CAMERON: You decide --

18 MR. SACHS: -- see what goes --

19 MR. CAMERON: You signed up, like
20 everybody else, and you're going to get your turn,
21 okay?

22 But so far, I think people are getting the
23 message. We're trying to ignore your outbursts --

24 MR. SACHS: Three times --

25 MR. CAMERON: -- and I don't want to have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you escorted out --

2 MR. SACHS: That doesn't work this state,
3 sir.

4 MR. CAMERON: -- because -- okay --

5 MR. SACHS: That's not legal.

6 MR. CAMERON: -- because I know that
7 you're passionately concerned about this and you have
8 good questions, but you're going to have to just --

9 MR. SACHS: You're disturbing --

10 MR. CAMERON: -- be courteous.

11 MR. SACHS: -- the speaker. Let him just
12 --

13 MR. CAMERON: Courtesy, okay.

14 MR. FERDAS: Okay, all right, thank you.

15 I just want to reiterate that the oversight and
16 monitoring occurs for the entire period of the
17 decommissioning process, and that includes as the
18 plant is shutdown, as it transitions to SAFSTOR, as
19 Vermont Yankee has planned, and also continues, as
20 long as there is spent fuel at the site.

21 Our focus continues to be safety and
22 security, as it was for the operating plants.

23 It's mentioned here on the slide, if you
24 are interested, you can go ahead and read about what
25 the oversight process or program entails. There is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 really two documents I would point you to.

2 One, the first one referenced there deals
3 with our decommissioning process oversight and then
4 the second one deals with our dry cask storage
5 inspection process.

6 Our oversight program really focuses on
7 three main objectives. One is spent fuel being safely
8 stored, being in the spent fuel pool or in dry cask
9 storage.

10 Decommission activities are being
11 conducted in a manner that ensures safety and security
12 to the public workers and the environment, and then
13 finally, that site operations and license termination
14 activities are performed in accordance with Federal
15 regulations and license commitments.

16 On this slide it kind of just gives you a
17 quick summary of the type of things that we look at
18 over the entire decommissioning process. We are --
19 our inspections are conducted by qualified inspectors
20 that go through rigorous training programs. It's a
21 combination of the Resident Inspector that is
22 currently at the site, our Regional Inspectors from
23 our Regional Office.

24 We also go to our headquarters technical
25 experts, if needed for certain areas, as well as, we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have contractors available to perform independent
2 surveys or other analysis that may be needed for us.

3 At the completion of every inspection that
4 we do, there is a publically available inspection
5 report. That can be found in our electronic docket
6 system, you've heard to it referred to today as ADAMS.
7 That's through our web-page. You can find all
8 inspection reports that are issued.

9 Just -- I just wanted to quickly go over
10 where -- what the oversight status is for Vermont
11 Yankee, so, everyone has a current idea of what's
12 going on there.

13 Currently, we consider Vermont Yankee in
14 the post-operations transition phase, meaning that
15 they're transitioning the plant to a long-term safe
16 storage, as their PSDAR lists.

17 Currently, there is no major
18 decommissioning activities being performed, as was
19 briefly mentioned, because they are within the 90 day
20 period, but there are no immediate plans for any major
21 decommissioning work, and that is outlined in the
22 Vermont Yankee PSDAR.

23 They are developing plans and seeking the
24 necessary approvals to construct a second dry cask
25 storage pad. This will allow them to remove all spent

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fuel that's currently in their spent fuel pool, and
2 this would be in addition to the --

3 MR. SACHS: Will this be collected --

4 MR. FERDAS: -- the casks that they
5 already have --

6 MR. SACHS: Casks we have or do not --

7 MR. FERDAS: -- onsite that have -- the
8 dry cask storage --

9 MR. SACHS: -- they were not regulated --
10 tested -- will these be done correctly, sir?

11 MR. FERDAS: And then finally, what I just
12 want to reiterate again is that, you know, the
13 oversight activities are being performed. They will
14 be performed in the immediate future, but also, the
15 long-term future, as well, and as I said, our program
16 is well-defined and it is available for the public to
17 review -- to review and to get more of the details.

18 So, Drew, I'll turn it back to you now.

19 Okay, we have one more slide. Thank you.

20 One area, this kind of is some of the main
21 reference documents, not only from what I've talked
22 about, but what the other speakers have talked about,
23 that are good documents to review. All of these are
24 available in our public webpage.

25 So, the other thing I would encourage

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 people to take a look at is the You-Tube video that
2 has been put together, that talks kind of, a lot of
3 what was talked about today, but discussed in the
4 decommissioning process.

5 MR. PERSINKO: Thanks, Marc. That
6 concludes the NRC's presentations.

7 At this point, I'll ask Mr. Joe Lynch from
8 Entergy to present the contents of the PSDAR that was
9 submitted to the NRC.

10 MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Drew. My name is
11 Joseph Lynch. I'm the Government Affairs Manger --

12 MR. SACHS: The dude with the cavalry.

13 MR. LYNCH: I'd like to --

14 MR. SACHS: Shit, that's great.

15 MR. LYNCH: -- thank --

16 MR. SACHS: What other plans have you got?

17 MR. LYNCH: -- the NRC for the opportunity
18 to --

19 MR. SACHS: Entergy's great that way.

20 MR. LYNCH: -- provide an overview of the
21 --

22 MR. SACHS: You lied to us. How about --

23 MR. LYNCH: -- PSDAR process.

24 MR. SACHS: -- you, sir? The last time,
25 they were lying to us. Here he is, telling us how

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 great he is.

2 MR. LYNCH: I'd like to start with --

3 MR. SACHS: I'd like to see --

4 MR. LYNCH: -- a brief overview of some of
5 the recent milestones that we accomplished as we
6 headed up to the point where we've issued our PSDAR.

7 As many of you know, we ceased power
8 operations on December 29th, 2014.

9 MR. SACHS: At least you guys are honest
10 about something.

11 MR. LYNCH: After 633 day run of
12 continuous safe power operations --

13 MR. SACHS: God dammit, are you guys safe.

14 MR. LYNCH: On January 12th of 2015, we
15 completed the defueling of the reactor, moving all the
16 fuel from the reactor, to the spent fuel pool.

17 MR. SACHS: How many rems did the workers
18 get?

19 MR. LYNCH: And on that same day, we
20 provided certification to the NRC, as Drew mentioned,
21 both indicating that we were ceasing operation of the
22 facility, as well that we certified that fuel had been
23 removed from the reactor.

24 As Marc recently mentioned, we entered
25 into the new oversight process that's that for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 decommissioning inspection program, exiting from the
2 reactor oversight process, and really, the most
3 important message to all of you regarding our future
4 is our commitment to our employees, to the public and
5 to safety, and when I mean safety, I mean nuclear
6 safety, environmental safety, the security of the
7 people around the site, of the robust security force
8 that we have and our commitment to doing this project
9 correctly and transparently.

10 Leading up to the shutdown, Entergy
11 Vermont Yankee announced in August of 2013, the
12 intention to shutdown the facility at the end of 2104,
13 and what's significant about that is, we formed
14 immediately, a decommissioning planning organization
15 to start the process of leading up to where we are
16 right now.

17 So, in essence, we've been working on the
18 draft of the PSDAR for about 16 months and we were in
19 a very good position to issue the PSDAR at the end of
20 2014.

21 This was consistent with the settlement
22 agreement that we had reached with the State of
23 Vermont, which would provide that information in
24 advance of its submittal.

25 Included in that settlement agreement were

1 a number of initiatives to help the economic benefit
2 of both the Windham County area, with an economic
3 development fund, a total of \$10 million was going to
4 be provided for economic benefit over a five-year
5 period.

6 We also provided \$5.2 million to the Clean
7 Energy Development Fund and we started payment to a
8 \$25 million site restoration fund, in which the first
9 \$10 million has been provided to that particular fund.

10 With all of that, we were issued a
11 certificate of public good by the Vermont Public
12 Service Department on March 28th, allowing us to
13 operate through the end of 2014.

14 The last significant milestone that we
15 accomplished prior to issuing the PSDAR for NRC review
16 was the issuance of a site assessment study.

17 We believe this is a first of a kind
18 document that was developed in part, to give
19 information to key stakeholders, state agencies and
20 the public, in advance of us submitting our PSDAR.

21 It included a draft PSDAR, about 60 days
22 before we submitted the final one, to allow people to
23 take a look at what it contained. It also gave a
24 summary of our decommissioning cost estimate, and it
25 provided two historic site assessments, one for all of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the radiological events that occurred at the site that
2 were note-worthy and would be part of decommissioning,
3 as well as the non-radiological events that occurred
4 at the site, and these are two living documents that
5 will be updated, as we go forward with
6 decommissioning.

7 The finally, we did issue our PSDAR on
8 December 19th, and we provided that on our website
9 Vydecommissioning.com, for everyone's review and to
10 ready people for this opportunity to provide comments
11 to the NRC.

12 Our transition from operating to
13 decommissioning and the SAFSTOR plan that we have also
14 involves reductions in our staffing. So, right up to
15 the end of 2014, we're about 550 staff. We've reduced
16 that staffing down to about 316 going forward. That
17 occurred on January 19th.

18 Our dedication at that point was to our
19 employees, and we're happy to report that all, but a
20 very small amount, less than six of our employees
21 found employment either within Entergy or within the
22 industry or in their area of expertise, and that was
23 a very important focus for us as a company.

24 We'll be going through another staff
25 reduction --

1 MR. SACHS: What happened to Mr. Romero?

2 MR. LYNCH: -- at the mid-point of 2016,
3 where we expect to go from our current staffing level
4 of about 315 to 320, to about 127, as we transition to
5 the point where we'll be putting fuel from wet to dry,
6 and then finally, as we transition into the full
7 SAFSTOR organization, we expect that organization to
8 be about 57 to 75 people, the majority being security,
9 overseeing the safe and continuous view of this site.

10 As far as our PSDAR is concerned, we wrote
11 that using the guidance provided by the NRC. That
12 being 10 CFR 50.82, as well as Reg Guide that the NRC
13 has issued, the same Reg Guide they'll be using to
14 review the PSDAR Reg Guide 1185 Revision 1.

15 We also reviewed a number of PSDAR's that
16 were submitted by other sites that were either in
17 previous decommissioning or in the process of
18 decommissioning, to make sure that we are getting
19 operating experience and experience from other plants
20 that were in this particular position, and we put
21 together this experienced team that included our own
22 folks from our decommissioning planning organization,
23 as well as the TLG Services, which is an industry-
24 known decommissioning estimating organization, who
25 also had expertise in writing PSDAR's.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The content follows very closely, the Reg Guide and it has a description of the planned decommissioning activities. It goes through a very detailed schedule of decommissioning. It provided the detailed decommissioning cost estimate and talks about the environmental impacts and how we comply with them.

As mentioned by the NRC, this is a living document. So, any major changes to our plans for decommissioning would inspire us to revise the PSDAR, as part of those regulations.

The decommissioning schedule that we have developed based on the SAFSTOR plan that we're going to implement at Vermont Yankee has us going from where we are right now, into a preparation period, from essentially when we shutdown at the end of the year, to the midpoint of 2016. We'll be making plans for transition into SAFSTOR.

From the middle of 2016 until the year 2020, we'll be going through the process of moving the fuel from wet storage to dry fuel storage, that will include the installation of a second dry cask fuel storage pad and the loading of 45 additional canisters, and I'll talk a little bit more about that.

Then we enter into a long-term SAFSTOR

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 period. Right now, we're assuming that to be about 32
2 years, which will have the plant laid up in a dormancy
3 state with the fuel all stored onto a dry cask fuel
4 storage.

5 It is our estimate right now, based on
6 information from Department of Energy, that they will
7 be taking fuel and completing that by around 2052, at
8 which point, we will then transition to the final part
9 of the dormancy period.

10 The one thing I will note, and I put --

11 MR. SACHS: When will this happen?

12 MR. LYNCH: -- the slide is that this is
13 based on the growth of the decommissioning trust fund,
14 at the rate the NRC allows by regulation, which is
15 about two percent per year.

16 If that decommissioning trust fund was to
17 grow at a faster rate, which it has since Entergy
18 purchased Vermont Yankee, then we would be moving all
19 these dates up and we would be starting
20 decommissioning and completing decommissioning sooner
21 than these projected dates that's in our plan right
22 now.

23 As we make our final preparations for
24 decommissioning, right now, the estimate is that we'll
25 start in about 2068 and be complete in about a year

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and a half. Then we will go into active
2 decommissioning, which would include large component
3 removals for about a year and a half, followed by
4 large system removals, building decontamination and
5 demolition from 2070 to 2073, about two and a half
6 years' worth of work, and then finally, as described,
7 we'll enter into our license termination period. We
8 will meet the NRC requirements for unrestricted site
9 use and the 25 millirem per year criteria established
10 for unrestricted use.

11 Then finally, we'll enter into a site
12 restoration period, which will take us to about 2075
13 and about 59 years from the shutdown of the facility,
14 and again, all these dates are predicated on the
15 assumption that the growth of the fund will be in
16 accordance with what we're allowed to by regulation,
17 but based on traditional and past performance, we
18 expect that we'll be able to move that up.

19 Moving onto spent fuel management, which
20 is an important element of the PSDAR.

21 The current status of our dry fuel storage
22 is that we have 13 canisters loaded and safely stored
23 on the first of what we believe to two independent
24 spent -- I'm sorry, independent spent fuel storage
25 installation pads.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We do have an application in for a second
2 pad, that was submitted to the Vermont Public Service
3 Board on June 30th, seeking approval. We expect to
4 have that approval next year, at which time, we'll
5 start construction on the second pad.

6 In total, we'll have an additional 45
7 casks for 58, storing all of the fuel, and again, as
8 I mentioned earlier, our plan is to have that complete
9 by the year 2020.

10 The next slide shows a photograph, and
11 aerial photograph of our independent spent fuel
12 storage installation and the arrows pointing to the
13 existing pad, and then the next slide shows the
14 current location of our first pad and then the
15 warehouse that's just to the right of that is the
16 location for the second pad. So, they'll be adjacent
17 to each other, to allow the loading, based on the
18 existing load pad that we have in place.

19 SPEAKER: Can you clarify, the round
20 drawing to the lower left, what might be there, a
21 parking lot, where there's a pad? Is that where spent
22 fuel is now currently stored?

23 MR. LYNCH: This is the existing pad right
24 now. This photo is from 2008, and it shows five
25 canisters loaded on the pad.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, this is one of two pads. The second
2 pad would be located where this warehouse is right
3 now, and will look very similar to the one that we
4 have installed currently.

5 SPEAKER: How many casks are there now?

6 MR. LYNCH: There is 13.

7 SPEAKER: Now?

8 MR. LYNCH: Thirteen now on that first
9 pad.

10 MR. CAMERON: We're going to have to move
11 on, and then we'll get to the questions. Go ahead,
12 Joe.

13 MR. LYNCH: Next slide, please. Submitted
14 at the same time as our PSDAR was our irradiated fuel
15 management plan. Again, this was submitted in
16 accordance with NRC regulations, and NRC will be
17 conducting their review in accordance with their
18 process.

19 This essentially discusses the changes to
20 our program for the management of irradiated or spent
21 fuel. We intend to manage the fuel in accordance with
22 the plan, to move all the fuel from wet to dry. We
23 also provide the information about how we're going to
24 fund the movement of the fuel and pay for the spent
25 fuel management going forward, and as I had mentioned

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 earlier.

2 Then again, to summarize where we stand
3 with our existing fuel, the spent fuel pool right now
4 contains 2,996 spent fuel assemblies. The 13
5 canisters I described carry -- contains 884 spent fuel
6 assemblies.

7 So, right now on site, there is a total of
8 3,880 spent fuel assemblies, and again, based on the
9 latest information from the DOE, we expect their
10 loading campaign would start in about 2026 for Vermont
11 Yankee, complete by 2052, and this program also
12 further talks about our strategies for managing the
13 fuel and the funding going forward.

14 The last thing I'll talk about is our
15 detailed Decommissioning Cost Estimate. This was
16 prepared in accordance with NRC guidance, again, by
17 TLG Services, using their cost estimating model, which
18 is used by the majority of the industry, and it also
19 was informed by plan-specific data, walk-downs that we
20 did at the sites and using our design basis to
21 determine the size of the buildings and structures
22 that are on the site.

23 The decommissioning cost estimate contains
24 specific costs for the three elements of
25 decommissioning, that being the license termination,

1 spent fuel management, site restoration, and it also
2 breaks down the costs by each period, as we work our
3 way through decommissioning.

4 Some of the key estimates -- I'm sorry,
5 some of the key assumptions used in the
6 decommissioning cost estimate is that we'll have the
7 second dry cask fuel storage pad installed in about
8 2017. We'll expect to have all of the off-loading of
9 fuel from wet to dry complete by 2020. Again, the
10 assumption is that DOE would be starting to remove
11 fuel from the site in 2026, completing in 2052.

12 MR. SACHS: Did you put your own --

13 MR. LYNCH: Our SAFSTOR period is 52
14 years, as I mentioned earlier. We'll be starting
15 active D&D or decontamination and dismantlement in
16 2068 --

17 MR. SACHS: How about 2021?

18 MR. LYNCH: -- and that will be about six
19 years, and then finally, the time assumed is 1.5 years
20 for site restoration?

21 MR. SACHS: What if you find Strontium?

22 MR. LYNCH: And again, some of the -- the
23 background information is that this is all predicated
24 on following NRC regulations in clean up standards,
25 that being the 25 millirem per year --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SACHS: And what if the money is not
2 there in 60 years?

3 MR. LYNCH: The current --

4 MR. SACHS: That's what will happen,
5 right?

6 MR. LYNCH: -- cost estimate for the
7 decommissioning of the site is \$1.24 billion. We put
8 that out --

9 MR. SACHS: Can you subtract out the --

10 MR. LYNCH: -- in our assessment study --

11 MR. SACHS: -- the two lines of what it
12 leaves --

13 MR. LYNCH: That's all we --

14 MR. SACHS: -- so we know how much we're
15 looking for?

16 MR. LYNCH: -- have in the --

17 MR. SACHS: So, you basically subtract out
18 the two lines of credit --

19 MR. CAMERON: Gary?

20 MR. SACHS: -- and I want to know --

21 MR. CAMERON: Gary?

22 MR. SACHS: I want to know.

23 MR. CAMERON: Come on.

24 MR. SACHS: I'm serious.

25 MR. CAMERON: Gary, please. I know you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 want to know, but let's let him finish so --

2 MR. SACHS: I'm wondering --

3 MR. CAMERON: -- we can go on to all of
4 the --

5 MR. SACHS: -- the \$1.24 billion minus the
6 two lines of credit --

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

8 MR. SACHS: -- of moving the spent fuel
9 leaves us -- how much are we looking for?

10 MR. CAMERON: Please finish up, Joe.

11 MR. SACHS: Now, that \$1.24 billion --

12 MR. CAMERON: Please finish up.

13 SPEAKER: We need to know that.

14 MR. SACHS: Thank you.

15 SPEAKER: We need to know that.

16 MR. SACHS: We do.

17 MR. LYNCH: The \$1.24 billion --

18 MR. CAMERON: You will.

19 MR. LYNCH: -- is made up of those three
20 elements that I mentioned earlier --

21 MR. SACHS: What about the lines of
22 credit?

23 MR. LYNCH: Our current estimates are
24 license termination of \$817 million. There is the
25 cost of site restoration at \$57 million and the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 management of the spent fuel will be \$368 million.

2 The current balance of the nuclear
3 decommission trust as of the end of 2014 was \$664.5
4 million.

5 The next slide just shows a graphic of how
6 the decommissioning costs are broken down, totaling up
7 to the \$1.2 million.

8 I will talk a little bit about the spent
9 fuel management costs. I had mentioned the total cost
10 was \$368 million. That breaks down into two elements,
11 that being the operational costs. This is the year-
12 to-year costs of overseeing the spent fuel up to the
13 year 2052, when we assume it's going to be completely
14 removed from the site.

15 MR. SACHS: You expect that?

16 MR. LYNCH: That is \$225 million and then
17 the cost to actually complete the transfer of the fuel
18 from wet to dry, completing in the year 2020, would be
19 at a cost of \$143 million.

20 In order to fund this, Entergy has
21 established two lines of credit. They total \$145
22 million and the strategy here is to use this private
23 funding, so that we don't have to take money out of
24 the nuclear decommissioning trust, thus allowing the
25 trust --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SACHS: God, you guys look good.

2 MR. LYNCH: -- to remain, and then we
3 would -- we would --

4 MR. SACHS: How nice of you --

5 MR. LYNCH: -- use the opportunity to --

6 MR. SACHS: Why are you so nice to us?

7 MR. LYNCH: -- use this with the
8 Department of Energy, to recoup those costs.

9 In conclusion, our focus as we transition
10 to dormancy and dry cask fuel storage would be
11 continued compliance with our settlement agreement
12 with the State of Vermont. We do have a number of
13 decommissioning preparation activities, including
14 system lay-ups and draining and systems, de-powering
15 certain buildings to cold and dark --

16 MR. SACHS: How about cleaning up the
17 Strontium?

18 MR. LYNCH: -- and we've upgraded our
19 security modifications.

20 We'll also have some select out-buildings
21 that will be removed to shrink the footprint on the
22 site, and get those activities done before we enter
23 into dormancy.

24 MR. SACHS: Aren't you going to put --

25 MR. LYNCH: We will have a commitment --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SACHS: -- more buildings --

2 MR. LYNCH: -- to our ongoing
3 environmental monitoring programs --

4 MR. SACHS: Aren't you guys going to buy
5 anymore --

6 MR. LYNCH: -- those will not change, even
7 though we've entered into decommissioning, and one of
8 the very key milestones that we expect to be working
9 through this year is to work closely with the State of
10 Vermont to negotiate some final site restoration
11 standards, which is one of the elements in the
12 settlement agreement that is yet to be completed, but
13 it's our intention to complete that this year.

14 Then finally, completion of this. To
15 continue to get information out to the public, we
16 expect to have open and transparent communications
17 that through our -- both our contribution to and
18 participation in the nuclear decommissioning citizen's
19 advisory panel, which has met five times since the
20 announcement, and we expect to continue to have a role
21 in that, providing updates on a regular basis. The
22 next meeting is next Thursday, February 26th.

23 We also will continue with our stakeholder
24 outreach, both through speaking engagements and
25 community involvement. I'm proud to say that last

1 weekend, we were a sponsor for the Harris Hill ski
2 jump event for the 30th year in a row, in Brattleboro,
3 which shows that we've been very serious about our
4 commitment to the community.

5 Finally, we'll be continuing tours of key
6 stakeholders and all the information, including this
7 presentation and any future information having to do
8 with decommissioning will be on our website for public
9 review.

10 MR. SACHS: Thank you. Great job, man.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you to the
12 Panel. We're going to go to -- we're going to go to
13 three officials from the State of Vermont. We're
14 going to start with Chris Recchia, then we're going to
15 go to Bill Irwin and then to Chuck Schwer. Got it?
16 Okay.

17 SPEAKER: How can we sit here for over an
18 hour and -- please.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay, we're going to try to
20 get some heat, yes. I apologize. I apologize, Deb,
21 and to all of you. It is cold, okay.

22 So, Chris, do you want to talk from here?

23 MR. RECCHIA: Yes. Hey, thanks, very
24 much, Chip.

25 Chris Recchia, Commissioner of the Public

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Service Department. Thank you all, very much for
2 coming.

3 If it's any consolation, it was colder
4 last month for the meeting. I think -- yes, we'll
5 check on the heat before we come back here.

6 Thanks for coming to Vermont. Welcome to
7 the state that has 45 percent of its electricity now
8 produced by renewable resources.

9 MR. SACHS: Nuclear is not renewable,
10 dear.

11 MR. RECCHIA: We haven't bought any power
12 from the plant for -- since 2012, when we thought it
13 should have shut down, and we're pleased to be moving
14 on.

15 That said, you know, we did reach a
16 settlement agreement with Entergy, and it's been
17 successfully implemented to date, including, you know,
18 all of the -- all of the milestones that have been
19 requested of both of us in that, and I want to thank
20 Entergy for that work, including the site assessment,
21 which was a unique document that went back to look at
22 all the potential things that are on the site, and
23 that need to be factored into decommissioning, or
24 decontamination and dismantlement.

25 But I do note that, you know, there's a

1 lot that's going to be discovered. I equate this to
2 -- for those of you who bought a house, when you
3 bought your first house, it was, you know, like really
4 exciting to see it the first time, and it all went
5 downhill from there.

6 You went and you went back for another
7 visit and you discovered, "Oh, the plumbing is not
8 quite right, the electricity is not quite right. We
9 got, you know, some septic issues," and you know, but
10 you still buy the house and you're happy about it.

11 Well, you know, we're going to
12 decontaminate a plant here that will discover other
13 things, and I think that's the focus of my main
14 comments, is the concern that the costs are going to
15 be -- are going to become clearer, as we go forward
16 and the picture is not going to get better.

17 You know, I have to mention the Strontium-
18 90, one example, even you know, in the last few
19 months, we have determined that that's present, and
20 where it came from and what the ramifications of that
21 are, we don't know yet.

22 But let me go to a couple of positive
23 things first, before I got to -- and I just want to
24 say that, you know, Chuck and Bill will follow.

25 We intend to submit written comments and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I'm not -- I'm not trying to in any way, you know,
2 categorize our comments tonight. I want to give you
3 a favor for them, and we'll go into, you know, written
4 comments, as time goes on.

5 But I do want to note that, you know, we
6 gave Entergy -- Entergy -- as part of the settlement
7 agreement, Entergy gave us the PSDAR and the
8 settlement -- and the site assessment, 60 days before
9 they filed the PSDAR with you, and we submitted
10 comments to them totaling, I think it was close to 200
11 comments or questions, and we're waiting for a
12 response from them, and we'll -- we will develop a
13 written response to you guys.

14 But you know, I want to acknowledge that
15 we are in a different mode now, right? The plant has
16 shut down. It is -- the reactor is defueled and the
17 fuel is in the spent fuel pool.

18 That said, you know, we are anxious and
19 part of the settlement agreement or Entergy's
20 commitment, I should say, it was not part of the
21 settlement agreement, is to try and move the fuel by
22 2020.

23 We appreciate that. We think that's the
24 next milestone here that we need to shoot for. I will
25 say that, you know, our concerns relate to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 emergency protection zone in the interim. It relates
2 to -- our concerns relate to the -- to the nuclear
3 decommissioning trust fund and how it's expended, and
4 that is within your purview as well, or needs to be,
5 and we're going to be focusing on that.

6 Then you know, really the long-term
7 management of the site. Our goal, or the Governor's
8 goal is to get this site restored for any purpose, as
9 soon as possible, and what that means is, we need a
10 commitment from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and
11 from Entergy, to spend costs wisely, to grow that
12 fund, as the trustee has been doing, and to make sure
13 that we can do this work as quickly as possible.

14 So, with that, I guess I will switch over
15 to my colleagues from the other agencies. I just do
16 want to say, it was one more point that I wanted to
17 make, which was particularly, on the expenditures of
18 the funds, and we'll express this more in the comments
19 to you.

20 I know your focus is on safety and concern
21 with that, but you were the -- you are the stewards of
22 the funding and the determination of when it is okay
23 and able to be fully decontaminated and dismantled,
24 and I do think you need to pay better attention to the
25 fact that we have switched environments here from our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 regulated utility structure to one where we have
2 merchant facilities that need attention.

3 As a regulator myself, please step up to
4 the regulator role and pay attention to this because
5 it's really important for Vermont. So, thank you all
6 very much.

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay, this is Bill Irwin.
8 I'll let him introduce himself, and then we're going
9 to go to Chuck and then we're going to go to Deb Katz,
10 Arnie Gundersen and Leslie Sullivan Sachs.

11 MR. IRWIN: Thank you, Chip, and thank you
12 to the NRC for making this meeting available for the
13 work that you're doing and that you're going to do, to
14 ensure the safe decommissioning of the plant.

15 I am the Radiological and Toxicological
16 Sciences Chief for the Vermont Department of Health,
17 and I'm also a member of Nuclear Decommissioning
18 Citizen's Advisory Panel.

19 I'm going to provide a brief summary of
20 our Health Department's written comments, which we
21 will be submitting to you shortly.

22 First of all, we believe that PSDAR is
23 written with inadequate detail for the Department of
24 Health to be confident that the public health and the
25 environment are protected during any of the phases of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 decommissioning.

2 The PSDAR does not adequately estimate the
3 number and types of personnel onsite to accomplish
4 work, especially wet spent fuel operations, fire
5 protection, monitoring of structure system and
6 component integrity and radiological and environmental
7 monitoring for the Health Department to be certain
8 that public health and safety will be served to the
9 degree needed.

10 The PSDAR also does not describe the depth
11 and breadth of the radiological environmental
12 monitoring program. Doing so is important because of
13 the volume of radioactive materials generated by plant
14 operations and to be maintained within the structures,
15 systems and components during each phase of
16 decommissioning.

17 Nuclear reactors that are in SAFSTOR at
18 multi-unit sites like Millstone 1 and Indian Point 1
19 are subject to a robust radiological environmental
20 monitoring program for the other operating reactors at
21 the site.

22 The PSDAR provides no indication that
23 robust radiological environmental monitoring is
24 planned or can be executed at Vermont Yankee.

25 Radiological emergency preparedness during

1 decommissioning is also inadequately described in the
2 PSDAR.

3 The basis of emergency planning seems to
4 ignore hostile action based scenarios that could
5 destroy key structures storing radioactive materials
6 or result in Zirconium fuel fire.

7 Relative to demolition to three feet below
8 grade, it's clear from records of -- that there are
9 deeper depositions of soil contamination and that
10 demolition more than three feet below grade will be
11 required in numerous places at Vermont Yankee.

12 Significant leakage of reactor condensate
13 radioactive material spills have occurred in the
14 advanced off-gas piping total from piping between the
15 AOG building and the radioactive waste building,
16 around the radioactive waste building, in the
17 condensate storage tank yard and between the reactor
18 radioactive waste in AOG buildings and Connecticut
19 River.

20 The PSDAR provides no assurance that the
21 challenges of remediating these radioactive materials
22 are factored into the planning and the funding for the
23 decommissioning of Vermont Yankee.

24 With regard to fire protection systems,
25 there is no evidence provided in the PSDAR that local

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fire department personnel are fully prepared for
2 onsite firefighting with limited support offered by
3 the staff at Vermont Yankee.

4 There is also no evidence in the PSDAR how
5 offsite responders can manage offsite contamination
6 that might result from fires that consume radioactive
7 materials stored onsite.

8 We also believe that radioactive materials
9 onsite are not adequately characterized to make
10 adequate decisions about the effectiveness of the
11 post-shutdown decommissioning activity report.

12 In particular, a number of events at
13 Vermont Yankee have left significant amounts of land,
14 as well as many structures, systems and components in
15 a radiological condition that has not been fully
16 characterized.

17 Relative to public votes, the PSDAR
18 describes the 2002 generic environmental impact
19 statement determination that the assessed range of
20 possible radiological accidents during decommissioning
21 concludes that the risk at spent fuel pools is low and
22 well within the NRC's quantitative health objectives.

23 That document, written in 2002, published
24 just months after September 11, 2001, certainly could
25 not have anticipated what we learned September 11,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 2001, and these hostile actions, according to the
2 National Academies of Science, could lead to a
3 Zirconium fire in the spent fuel pool or severely
4 damage the torus will more than 1.4 million gallons of
5 radioactive water will be stored until decontamination
6 and dismantling.

7 So, generally, we'll see additional
8 comments, more specificity in our written remarks. We
9 find it very helpful that Entergy provided a site
10 assessment study. Hopefully, you'll find that
11 valuable too, because it does give much more detail on
12 some of the historical characterization.

13 We appreciate the fact that that was
14 negotiated and we also appreciate the fact that
15 Entergy has run this plant very safely for the 41
16 years of operation, so far. We hope that it maintains
17 that throughout the decommissioning process, as short
18 as that can be. Thank you.

19 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Bill
20 and this is Chuck.

21 MR. SCHWER: Hi. Thank you, everybody,
22 and thank you, NRC. We appreciate the opportunity to
23 comment tonight.

24 My name again is Chuck Schwer. I represent
25 the Agency of Natural Resources. We have a much

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 smaller role in this than the first two speakers, but
2 also, a very important role.

3 We're focused mainly on the non-
4 radiological component of risk at Vermont Yankee.

5 So, our agency has independently reviewed
6 the PSDAR. I'm going to just share some of our
7 comments, that will also be provided in writing.

8 So, comment one. The SAFSTOR time line
9 delays, and excuse me, the SAFSTOR time line delays
10 important planning and decision making processes,
11 important site characterization and remediation for
12 non-radiological contaminates should not be delayed
13 while VY is in SAFSTOR.

14 Two, the PSDAR process inadequately
15 assesses the site-specific environmental impacts of
16 Entergy's decommissioning activities necessary to
17 facilitate proper planning.

18 The range of environmental impacts
19 addressed by the PSDAR does not include environmental
20 impacts with non-radiological contaminants and
21 generation and storage of non-radiological waste.

22 Three. The PSDAR process lacks adequate
23 review of decontamination activities. There is no
24 requirement for altering decontamination activities in
25 light of associated environmental impacts or for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 otherwise modifying the PSDAR, in light of issues
2 raised during the public comment process.

3 Lastly -- thank you, and lastly, the
4 settlement agreement between Entergy and the State of
5 Vermont requires Entergy to review and consider
6 comments provided by the state for inclusion in the
7 PSDAR.

8 There is no evidence that Entergy
9 considered or incorporated feedback from the state in
10 its comments on the October 2014 site assessment
11 study.

12 Additionally, the state specifically
13 requested additional information, to be able to assess
14 the environmental impacts of decommissioning
15 activities, as outlined in the site assessment study
16 and the PSDAR. The state has not received a response
17 to these requests to date.

18 Thank you for this opportunity. Thank
19 you.

20 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Chuck. We're
21 going to go to Deb Katz. Deb, do you want to come
22 down here, and then Arnie Gundersen, Leslie Sullivan
23 Sachs.

24 SPEAKER: Don't clap yet, because you
25 don't know what's going to happen.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 SPEAKER: Could you please tell us before
2 Deb starts, again, the names of these two gentlemen
3 and the agencies they represent?

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay, well, this is Bill
5 Irwin and Bill is Department of Health, and this is
6 Chuck Schwer, Department of Natural Resources.

7 SPEAKER: But I can't see them.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay, and you know Chris
9 Recchia. You know his -- okay, all right.

10 Okay, this is Deb Katz. Deb?

11 MS. KATZ: I'm Deb Katz. I'm the
12 Citizen's Awareness Network. We have about 3,000
13 members in the tri-state community. We were involved
14 in hearings on the decommissioning of Yankee Rowe and
15 Connecticut Yankee. We actually sued the NRC and won
16 a lawsuit against you guys, for the illegal
17 decommissioning of Yankee Rowe.

18 So, that's the context for having some
19 knowledge of issues, and I want to thank the state for
20 the clarity that they provided in their comments. I
21 really appreciated it, and I think it's really
22 important, and it actually allows me to not go into
23 the weeds, but to try to look at some financial
24 issues, in terms of Entergy being a merchant plan, and
25 how that impacts the issues of clean up.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I want to look at it in the first five
2 years, not in terms of that endless long line that
3 seems to go on forever for clean up, but in terms of
4 the movement of the fuel, which is the most dangerous
5 activity that's going to go on. In fact, one of your
6 NRC representatives I think said, "This is a very
7 risky operation."

8 In terms of that, the issue of Entergy's
9 financial vulnerability and their wanting to use money
10 from the decommissioning fund to keep the EPZ in fact,
11 in place, in fact, their request to end the EPZ at
12 this point is really troubling to people in this
13 community, because in fact, the movement of that fuel
14 is a very big deal.

15 There are two elementary schools,
16 basically a stone's throw from the reactor, and the
17 reactor is located in a village, in the middle of it.

18 This is a site-specific issue, not a
19 generic one, about why the EPZ should stay in place,
20 just as it is a site-specific issue, that during the
21 transferring of the fuel, that that school in Vernon
22 and the one across the river in Hughsdale, should not
23 have elementary students in it, when they're moving
24 the fuel, which is about 400 tons, at this point.
25 Some say got 13 casks on site.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 It is unconscionable. It is madness, to
2 think that elementary kids will be in school when they
3 move their fuel, and it is up to you as regulators, to
4 call a halt to that idea.

5 But all of this revolves around the issues
6 of Entergy's not having the financial where-with-all
7 to clean the site up, because it hasn't paid into the
8 decommissioning fund, and so, there isn't enough
9 money.

10 Now, there hasn't been enough money at any
11 nuclear site that you've had oversight over. Rowe
12 didn't. Connecticut Yankee didn't, but they had a
13 rate base to go back to, and Entergy has none, and
14 your regulations don't adequate deal with this
15 situation, in terms of keeping this corporation
16 accountable.

17 Two-million dollars a year to keep the EPZ
18 in place is not a big deal for five years. Hey, guys,
19 that's \$10 million. How come Entergy doesn't have
20 that money, and if they don't have that money, how
21 come the parent corporation that signed a letter
22 saying they would be responsible if Entergy, the
23 limited liability corporation running the reactor,
24 didn't have money, that in fact, the parent
25 corporation would?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, why isn't the parent corporation being
2 asked to come up with the money for that?

3 There is a problem in all of this. Just
4 as if those students need to be moved from the school,
5 that there is a plan that in fact, the corporation
6 pays to help relocate those students during that time,
7 and all of this revolves around the issues that the
8 NRC did not require a fully funded adequate
9 decommissioning fund, to have in place, before the
10 reactor closed, and you guys have done this at every
11 site. This isn't new to you.

12 You talk about the seven reactors that
13 you've overseen, and you've failed at every one of
14 them, to have enough money in the fund. Failed. It's
15 all on the rate payers to come up with the money again
16 and again, but we can't. Entergy has no rate base.

17 So, they're not in a good situation, but
18 I don't understand why their parent corporation isn't
19 being asked to come up with the money, rather than
20 raiding the decommissioning fund for money to keep the
21 EPZ in place, or to move the high level waste or to
22 babysit the high level waste for 50 years they're
23 talking about.

24 Why should the decommissioning fund go to
25 babysit the waste, when the nuclear industry and the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Federal Government have advocated their responsibility
2 to have a place for the high level waste?

3 It is unacceptable, that the
4 decommissioning money be used this way, and there is
5 no reason why the \$7 billion corporation that Entergy
6 is, can't come up with a measly \$6 million a year to
7 babysit the high level waste, and the \$2 million a
8 year for five years? Come on, guys, you can do a
9 better job.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,
11 Deb.

12 Okay, we're going to go to Arnie
13 Gundersen.

14 MR. GUNDERSEN: Thank you. Yes, hi. I'm
15 Arnie Gundersen from Fairewinds.

16 I'm here tonight. We have a Lintilhac
17 grant to analyze the decommissioning plan. So, I put
18 in about 200 hours on the decommissioning plan, in
19 addition to a 40 year career, which included working
20 on subcontracts with decommissioning of Shippenport,
21 and as a radiation -- member of the Radiation Safety
22 Committee at a plant that decommissioned licensee
23 facilities around the country.

24 So, I appreciate that you're giving me
25 five minutes to explain 40 years' worth of experience

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 here.

2 First up, my third year -- third grade
3 teacher is rolling over in her grave. It's SAFSTOR
4 and it rhymes with sap, not safe-store. There is no
5 'e' there.

6 Second, there is no bases in physics for
7 60 years. It's a subsidy to the nuclear industry.

8 Here in Vermont, we have to -- a windmill
9 has to have a fully funded decommissioning study --
10 fund, before it starts, and we give Entergy 60 years
11 to clean up.

12 It's really about the money. It's not
13 about trying to minimize worker exposure. The example
14 is a 60 year SAFSTOR will use about 300 rem in
15 radiation, but when Entergy needed to start Palisades
16 up in three weeks, they dished out 115 rem in three
17 weeks.

18 So, when the goal is to get a plant up and
19 running, those be damned. Please don't hide behind
20 SAFSTOR, there's no bases in physics.

21 Second, second is the emergency plan. We
22 should have an emergency plan in place as good as what
23 it was, until the fuel is removed, and you've also
24 allowed the tech specs to be changed, so the fuel pool
25 ventilation is no longer covered under the technical

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 specifications. That is an indication that you just
2 don't believe that an accident can happen.

3 Frankly, we had an accident here. I may
4 be the only one in the room that remembers, but in
5 2008, the crane brakes broke, as they were lifting the
6 canister with spent fuel in it.

7 So, accidents can happen, and in fact,
8 have happened, and I think that needs to be reflected
9 in the emergency plan.

10 I agree with Deb that we've got -- if
11 you've got to be moving those canisters, we know the
12 brakes have failed in the past, and that's an
13 indication that they might fail in the future.

14 Do it in the summer when the school is
15 out. This is not rocket science and it's not a lot of
16 money. Move the fuel when the kids aren't there.

17 All of this, by the way, will be in a much
18 longer report that Sarah Rich will be doing and also,
19 we will be putting an hour-long presentation that I
20 gave, on the web next week, with more details, and we
21 urge you to write to these guys in the next month.

22 The next thing is the AOG building. I said
23 five years ago in 2010, when I was on the Government's
24 oversight committee, that you were going to find
25 cesium and you were going to strontium under the AOG

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 building. Guess what? You did.

2 Now, you've got strontium at the well.
3 I'm telling you, I know where it's coming from. It's
4 under the AOG building.

5 We can remove the AOG building now, and
6 save money in the decommissioning fund. We're paying
7 -- we're paying by the cubic foot. Most of the horses
8 are still in the barn. Most of the horses are still
9 under the AOG building. We can move the AOG building
10 and reduce the ultimate cost of the decommissioning.

11 Now, Entergy has already told us in 60
12 years, they're going to say they're told to sue us,
13 "We're out of here," so that if that strontium is run,
14 it's going to be out liability. We have a chance to
15 nip it in the bud.

16 We can close the barn doors, decommission
17 the AOG building right now. That's it for safety.
18 The others are economic.

19 The LLC issue, this is a -- you guys think
20 -- we're establishing a precedent here. The plants
21 that you have up there are all utilities. This is an
22 LLC, and there is a big difference, as Deb already
23 said.

24 Mr. Watson from the NRC said three weeks
25 ago that Entergy is ultimately responsible, but the

1 fiscal committee, just last week, Entergy said, "We're
2 out of here in 60 years. Sue us."

3 So, to me, there is a big difference here,
4 between what the NRC thinks the regulations speak to,
5 and what Entergy thinks the regulations speak to.

6 Next is 10 CFR 50.75. It's a failure.
7 The model that you use for calculating the money that
8 should be available is simplistic and has no basis in
9 science.

10 Now, Fairewinds has developed under the
11 Lintilhac grant, as spreadsheet that does this. We
12 spent about 10 days, two people working 10 days, to
13 develop a spreadsheet. We're going to make it
14 available to the State of Vermont and to the country,
15 so that you can do a spreadsheet to track how the
16 money develops in the fund and when it's withdrawn.

17 When I do those numbers, I show we can
18 start decommissioning in 2026 and be done in 2032, if
19 the ISFSI fund, that the Independent Spent Fuel
20 Storage, is not included.

21 You're allowing Entergy to raid the cookie
22 jar by taking money out of the ISFSI fund and not
23 returning it when they get it back from the Department
24 of Energy. Something is wrong with your model. I'm
25 going to recommend to the state, that they oppose the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 exemption that Entergy will ask for, when they want to
2 raid the ISFSI fund, and Vermont, they're
3 stakeholders. We have a piece of this pie at the end
4 of the --at the end of this project, if there is any
5 left over, it's half ours and half Entergy's. That's
6 part of the agreement. So, we have a seat at the
7 table. I'm a stakeholder.

8 Finally, the expenditures that are being
9 incurred are being incurred by a company that has --
10 that has no oversight. You guys aren't giving them
11 financial oversight, and in the State of Vermont,
12 they're not a public utility. Who is overseeing the
13 cookie jar?

14 Your analysis is health and safety, and in
15 fact, TLG is a wholly owned subsidiary of Entergy.

16 So, when Entergy couldn't make money when
17 the plant is running, then you can be damn sure
18 they're going to make money on the decommissioning.

19 MR. SACHS: Beat that dead horse.

20 MR. GUNDERSEN: So, as Bill Sorrell said,
21 who is watching the cookie jar, and I think because
22 this is an LLC, you've allowed the horse to be out of
23 the barn there, and the door needs to be closed.
24 Thanks.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Arnie.

1 Leslie?

2 MS. SULLIVAN SACHS: Hello. My name is
3 Leslie Sullivan Sachs.

4 SPEAKER: The microphone closer.

5 MS. SULLIVAN SACHS: Thank you. My name
6 is Leslie Sullivan Sachs. I'm a stakeholder in
7 Vermont Yankee decommissioning. I live five miles from
8 Vermont Yankee in Brattleboro, Vermont. I'm a member
9 of the Safe and Green Campaign.

10 This has pretty much been my life for the
11 last four years, a lot shorter than many of you. But
12 I will be sending you detailed comments at a later
13 date.

14 But while you are here in front of me, and
15 I can look you in the eye, I would like to speak to
16 you from my heart, simply as a human being and a
17 resident of a Connecticut River Valley.

18 What we are doing here together is talking
19 about what could be a future humanitarian crisis and
20 what's certainly, as I was brought up, is considered
21 unethical act.

22 We are talking about leaving tons and tons
23 and tons and tons and tons and tons and tons of high-
24 level radioactive waste in a very tiny village,
25 perched on the Connecticut River in one of the most

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 beautiful places on earth.

2 When I was two years old, the engineers
3 and the scientists and the policy makers started
4 trying to figure out what to do with this waste. I'm
5 going to be 60 years old in two months. We still
6 don't know.

7 You want to take 60 years to figure out
8 what to do with this waste? I'm sorry. This is
9 unethical. This is unconscionable.

10 We're talking about my Connecticut River
11 Valley, where I gave birth to three children, where my
12 best friend has two grandchildren, one born two weeks
13 ago. Those grandchildren are the ones that are going
14 to be living to go to this license termination
15 hearing, when we finally get a real hearing.

16 I'm not going to be here. Who here is
17 going to be here? You're asking us to trust our
18 Federal Government, the NRC and Entergy to take care
19 of the land and the people and the air and water, that
20 we love.

21 This is a humanitarian crisis, this
22 nuclear waste. This SAFSTOR is a joke. We know
23 what's under that ground now. We know -- we've known
24 what's been under that ground since 2008 and decades
25 ago when there were leaks, when Entergy didn't even

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 own it. Who knows if Entergy is going to be owing it
2 10 years from now?

3 This is not just rules and regulations to
4 hide behind. This is real. This is really happening
5 to these human beings, and to these families and to
6 this water, air and land.

7 So, I'm sorry I'm shaking while I'm saying
8 this. But that's how real it is.

9 So, you've got my nice comments and
10 they'll be all about the generic environmental impact
11 statements and they'll be all about why Entergy can't
12 be trusted and how we need an independent auditors and
13 blah-blah-blah.

14 But I stand here before you, and thank you
15 for looking me in the eye, because you're talking
16 about real human beings, real land. It's not just
17 piles of paper. It's not just something I'm supposed
18 to go and search on ADAMS for, if I know the ADAMS
19 number, to read about. Thank you.

20 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Leslie. We're
21 going to go next to Jim Matteau, Peter Tusinsk and I
22 apologize for mis-pronouncing names, and Chris
23 Campany, and then we'll go to Nancy Braus, Clay
24 Turnbull and Kimberly Medeiros.

25 Do you want to come up here? And this is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Jim Matteau, okay.

2 MR. MATTEAU: Thank you. My name is Jim
3 Matteau. I'm a member of the Vermont Nuclear
4 Decommissioning Citizen's Advisory Panel.

5 I have a question and a comment too, if I
6 might.

7 The first question is on the PSDAR. I
8 understand that -- I'll try not to sneeze, excuse me.

9 I understand that it's submitted. Ninety
10 days after the submittal, Entergy can begin the
11 activities. NRC reviews it, neither approves nor
12 disapproves it, but may ask for more information if
13 something is missing and needed.

14 I'm not questioning Entergy's intent to
15 submit what's needed, and I'm not questioning the
16 NRC's intent here. But it seems possible that at the
17 end of the day, you could be a situation, whether here
18 or somewhere else, when you're simply not getting the
19 information, and if you don't disapprove it and
20 they're allowed to begin 90 days after submitting it,
21 your review notwithstanding, it seems reasonable to
22 ask are there any teeth in this at all?

23 What happens if you simply get nothing in
24 return to your questions, but the 90 days have
25 expired, so off they go? What do you do?

1 MR. CAMERON: Doug?

2 MR. BROADDUS: The situation -- I mean,
3 this is -- depends upon specifically, what the issue
4 was, but there are a number of different actions that
5 we could take.

6 If we either felt that the information
7 wasn't adequate or that it was -- wasn't in compliance
8 with our regulations or wasn't safe to conduct that,
9 and those actions could be anywhere from, like we said
10 originally, asking for information. That would be the
11 first step that we would take.

12 If there -- if we needed to escalate that
13 for some reason, we could do inspections to look at
14 what -- get some additional information that way.

15 We could go onsite and get the
16 information, if we absolutely needed to. We could
17 then escalate it even further, if needed and again, it
18 depends upon the situation to -- going to -- like
19 something -- an enforcement type of action. We could
20 have a demand for information or even issue them an
21 order, even at that point.

22 So, that -- those are the types of steps
23 that we could take, depending upon the severity of the
24 situation and what -- whether there was, like I said,
25 a health and safety issue that needed to be addressed

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 immediately. You know, that would be the higher level
2 of action that we could take.

3 MR. MATTEAU: So, if I understand it, to
4 paraphrase that, that you don't review and approve --
5 you would review it, but you don't approve the PSDAR,
6 but you might disapprove some of the proposed
7 activities within that, individual activities within
8 the PSDAR, if they don't pass?

9 MR. BROADDUS: Yes, we could do that, yes.

10 MR. MATTEAU: So, the teeth would be at
11 that level, not at the -- not at the initial review
12 level, in other words?

13 MR. SACHS: Have you ever done that?

14 MR. CAMERON: And a comment?

15 MR. MATTEAU: Yes, my comment on, and I
16 wish, and many times, in -- I've been involved in
17 meetings with -- at the state level, with the Public
18 Service Board and others for some 20 years.

19 I wish that everyone in the audience would
20 be polite and courteous, and I'm sorry that we aren't.

21 At the same time, while we're sitting here
22 tonight, Entergy's VY decommissioning Twitter account
23 is re-tweeting some very snarky comments from this
24 room, taking slams at the state officials while
25 they're up here speaking --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 SPEAKER: That's nice.

2 MR. MATTEAU: -- and I --

3 MR. SACHS: Who is doing that?

4 MR. MATTEAU: Just as I am -- please --

5 MR. SACHS: Anybody from Entergy?

6 MR. MATTEAU: Just as I'm asking people in
7 the audience to behave --

8 MR. SACHS: Me?

9 MR. MATTEAU: -- I really would like
10 Entergy to be a little better behaved on the internet.
11 Thank you.

12 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Jim. Peter?

13 MR. TUSINSK: Yes, my name is Peter
14 Tusinsk, Planning Board Town Leyden. We're not in the
15 State of Vermont. We're just over the border in
16 Massachusetts.

17 The Planning Board has been asking for
18 months now, since the plant has closed, what was the
19 main concerns of its citizens, and the EPZ is one of
20 the main concerns.

21 We're a rural community. Many of us make
22 our living farming. We have livestock, cow, cattle,
23 chickens, pigs and everything else, and we rely on the
24 expertise of those who are running Entergy's Yankee
25 plant here, to inform us of any -- what would you call

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 them? Hazards? Mistakes? Occurrences that might
2 take place, that might involve an evacuation, that
3 might involve people from our elementary school
4 leaving, and we are well within the 10 mile radius.
5 The entire town is.

6 So, the main concern was that we maintain,
7 as others have said, it's only \$10 million I guess,
8 for the five year period, that you would be offloading
9 the fuel from the spent fuel pool, to dry cask
10 storage.

11 But also one of the concerns was that on
12 the time frame. It seems like we're going to have a
13 60 year waste dump, and we're going to live within 10
14 miles of it.

15 It was stated by the young woman that
16 spoke before me, that we all love this Connecticut
17 River Valley. We don't want to see it degraded with
18 a long-range nuclear waste dump.

19 We've also listened to Mr. Gundersen, who
20 said that the total decommissioning process could take
21 a lot less than 60 years.

22 I would like to impart these ideas to the
23 NRC. It's a rare occasion to see you folks, and have
24 you take it seriously, that we live here and we don't
25 want that. We want the Government to take the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 responsibility of long-term waste storage and get the
2 damn thing out of this area, period. Thank you.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Peter, and
4 Chris, and just pronounce your last name.

5 MR. CAMPANY: Sure. It's Chris Company,
6 Executive Director Regional Commission. We're the
7 host Region for the plant.

8 I have a question and then a -- well, a
9 couple of questions.

10 First, the PSDAR makes reference to the
11 generic EIS, and or actually, I think it -- NRC and
12 Entergy have both referred to being within the bounds
13 of applicable environmental impact statement world.

14 Can you tell us exactly what EIS's, and if
15 not now, some kind of exactly --

16 SPEAKER: No, now.

17 MR. CAMPANY: -- what EIS's are applied --
18 the reason not necessarily now is, I want this to be
19 very specific.

20 Is it just a generic NUREG to EIS, or are
21 there other EIS's that we should be looking at, to see
22 what has been done?

23 MR. CAMERON: And Jeff, just introduce
24 yourself to us. This is the NRC environmental expert.

25 MR. RIKHOFF: Good evening, folks. My

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 name is Jeff Rikhoff. I'm an environmental reviewer
2 for the NRC, and I heard you question -- earlier, I
3 saw a video of the NCAP meeting.

4 The site-specific document that you should
5 be looking at is the license rule site that was
6 conducted a few years back.

7 MR. CAMPANY: Two-thousand-seven?

8 MR. RIKHOFF: Yes.

9 MR. CAMPANY: That's a supplement to the
10 generic one?

11 MR. RIKHOFF: The supplement to the
12 generic license renewal guidance.

13 MR. CAMPANY: Okay, finally discovered
14 that today.

15 MR. RIKHOFF: Okay.

16 MR. CAMPANY: Is that the only one we need
17 to look at?

18 MR. RIKHOFF: That's the only one that's
19 recently available.

20 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

21 MR. CAMPANY: And the other thing I guess
22 I would add -- I would ask the NRC to do is convene
23 the host regions and the host states to look at
24 whether or not the regulations guiding decommissioning
25 in the current modern time text are sufficient, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 whether or not they actually accomplish goals, in
2 terms of -- as far as public interest, public health,
3 safety and welfare.

4 Our concern, I think it's worth revisiting
5 those rules and regulations, especially since you're
6 going to have a number of plants likely coming offline
7 and as Chris Recchia and others have mentioned, we're
8 now in this environment of merchant plants.

9 One of the questions I have frankly is,
10 where is the funding going to come from for the state
11 agencies to provide oversight and review of the actual
12 decommissioning process, because that used to come
13 from rate payers, at least as far as I understand, the
14 way public utilities would deal with this in the past.

15 How does that work with the merchant
16 plant, and I would hope that those costs aren't going
17 to be externalized and they're not going to have to be
18 born by the decommissioning trust fund, to further
19 delay that.

20 So, there are number of issues I think
21 nationally, we need to get a handle on.

22 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Chris. Could we
23 have a quick answer to that last point, about where
24 the funds for the state oversight and review come
25 from, when you're talking about a merchant plant?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BROADDUS: I don't think I can speak
2 to that. I'd have to --

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

4 MR. BROADDUS: -- get back to you.

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay, do you have say on it,
6 Doug?

7 MR. BROADDUS: I can comment on the --

8 MR. CAMERON: Speak into the --

9 MR. BROADDUS: So, you did mention about
10 revisiting rules and such.

11 I just wanted to make you aware, the NRC
12 has just initiated -- just recently started the
13 initial phases of rule making activity of the
14 decommissioning rules.

15 Our rules right now are primarily set up
16 for operating plants. There are some regulations
17 specific to decommissioning, but the process to go
18 from an operating plant to a decommissioning facility
19 is not well described within the regulations.

20 So, we've had to do it on basically,
21 essentially through a case-by-case basis of license
22 amendments, exemptions and other types of actions.

23 So, we are embarking on our rule making
24 activity to try to address that and have the
25 regulations more effectively address that transition

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 period.

2 SPEAKER: Can I just say, could those
3 rules also -- would those rules also potentially apply
4 to Yankee and Kewaunee and Crystal River and San
5 Onofre, the ones that are --

6 MR. BROADDUS: It's a lot -- some of the
7 -- some of what has happened already, you know, is --
8 has -- would be -- you know, some of those activities
9 have already occurred for those plants, and in fact,
10 some of those activities are -- had occurred and are
11 in the process of occurring for Vermont Yankee, as
12 well, because we don't have the rules yet.

13 The rule -- a rule making process will
14 take a set number of years to complete. So, we don't
15 see that the rule would be finished by the time that
16 these plants are in the transition process. But there
17 may be parts of the rule making -- and again, we're in
18 the initial phases. So, we're still looking -- we'll
19 have to do a scoping and define the overall scope of
20 the role and everything.

21 So, that's going to happen, as we got
22 throughout this process, but there could be other
23 activities later on in the time, that could be --
24 could impact those plants.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Doug, and

1 I would just say, and thank you, Chris.

2 I would -- did you want to add something?

3 MR. WATSON: Yes, I just want to add one
4 small part of this, and part of this rule making
5 activity directed by the Commission, is that we also
6 look at the present rules in evaluating, which
7 includes the SAFSTOR's and other things.

8 So, it's going to be a while, but it takes
9 a lot of analysis sometimes, to evaluate those, but
10 it's also in the package to look at.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay, and just -- we have
12 some final information for you, perhaps. This is
13 Shawn Harwell, NRC staff.

14 MR. HARWELL: How you doing? Shawn
15 Harwell, an analyst with the financial analysis and
16 international finance branch.

17 I want to be clear when I said I'd have to
18 get back to you on that. The trust funds are
19 specifically for -- sorry about that. Better?

20 All right, sorry, about that.

21 MR. SACHS: Are you the guy that
22 transferred money to the Cayman Islands every night?

23 MR. HARWELL: So, to answer your question.
24 I'm trying to.

25 The decommissioning trust funds are for

1 decommissioning, radiological decommissioning.
2 They're not for paying taxes. They're not for non-
3 radiological decommissioning activities.

4 That being said, to completely answer your
5 question, I'd have to go back and look at past
6 instances and to see how other plants or other
7 licensees funded those, to answer your question. I
8 can't say that. I don't know. I'd have to look that
9 up.

10 But as far as the decommissioning trust
11 fund goes, and to answer your question,
12 decommissioning trust funds are for radiological
13 decommissioning.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much,
15 Shawn, and I just want to note that the NRC staff is
16 here listening and there is -- we have other NRC staff
17 in the audience.

18 But you hear some of the concerns. When
19 the formal part of the meeting is over, if the person
20 who asked the particular question, if you have any
21 information or you want to find out more about what
22 their concern is, please go and talk to them, after
23 the meeting is over.

24 But at least in terms of before we get
25 kicked out of this place, Nancy. Nancy Braus and then

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Clay Turnbull and then Kimberly Medeiros. Nancy?

2 MS. BRAUS: Hi. This also, what I'm
3 saying also pertains to the new world of merchant
4 plants being decommissioned.

5 So, it seems like we may or may not have
6 answers here, but I've been thinking a lot about how
7 the vast majority of corporations that existed 60
8 years ago are ancient history at this point, and I
9 feel like -- there are a lot of us that feel like the
10 changes that Entergy will be present 60 years from now
11 are far from 100 percent, and some people feel much,
12 much farther from 100 percent, whether it's in the LLC
13 form that runs the nuke or whether it's the larger
14 corporation of Entergy.

15 So, the assumption is that the
16 decommissioning fund is going to grow over this period
17 of time, over the 60 years, to the point of being able
18 to fully clean this site.

19 There are so many questions with that. So
20 many assumptions with that, that are potentially
21 faulty. One is the fact that they've just discovered
22 this pool, the Strontium-90 and Cesium and who knows
23 what else, under this off-gas building.

24 If this is left to spread for 60 years,
25 who knows what the extent of that clean up is going to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 be. Who knows if it's going to extend, you know, way
2 up the cost of the clean up, and should Entergy no
3 longer exist, I've talked with representatives and my
4 Senators, our Congressmen, I've talked with people at
5 the State. Nobody really has any idea.

6 What happens if Entergy does what they
7 just said they would do at the state, and if they
8 exist, walk away. If they don't exist, what happens
9 if there is not enough money in the decommissioning
10 fund?

11 Is that just -- does that mean that the
12 State of Vermont picks it up? Does that mean -- who
13 is -- you know, who is picking that up for Entergy?

14 I mean, I feel like the SAFSTOR is
15 definitely way for Entergy to get out of its financial
16 liability, should this -- the stock market not go up
17 high, should -- you know, should anyone -- any one of
18 one-million things could happen.

19 Should this underground -- the underground
20 contaminants prove to be a lot more extensive than
21 what we know now.

22 So, I just feel like it's something that
23 just should not be left to chance. Sixty years from
24 now, we do not know what the corporate environment is
25 going to be for Entergy and I feel like for a small

1 state like Vermont, which is not growing particularly
2 fast financially, it's not growing particularly fast,
3 one-billion charge onto the State of Vermont is a huge
4 amount of money we're talking about, and I don't know
5 at this point, under your regulations, who else is
6 going to get stuck with the money to decommission an
7 orphan nuke in 60 years?

8 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Nancy. Clay? Is
9 Clay here?

10 SPEAKER: I was told at the last meeting
11 that the financial portion would be --

12 MR. CAMERON: Wait. Come on, now.

13 SPEAKER: Okay, I'm sorry.

14 MR. CAMERON: Nancy?

15 SPEAKER: I didn't hear it.

16 MR. CAMERON: And just --

17 SPEAKER: I'm sorry.

18 MR. CAMERON: Just state that question
19 explicitly.

20 SPEAKER: Okay, the question is, when I
21 brought this up at the NCAP meeting, somebody said
22 that the person, which I think is you, who has
23 financial experience with the NRC, would be able to
24 address this question of what happens, should Entergy
25 no longer exist? Should Entergy in 60 years say,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 "We're walking here," and the decommissioning fund is
2 not adequate? What is the answer to this? What's the
3 answer?

4 MR. CAMERON: Shawn Harwell, again.

5 MR. HARWELL: Hi. Shawn Harwell again.

6 The best way to answer your question, I
7 would say is that we're concerned with the
8 radiological decommissioning, just as you are.

9 MR. SACHS: Is Entergy goes belly-up, what
10 are you going to do?

11 MR. HARWELL: The growth of the fund --

12 MR. SACHS: That's the question.

13 MR. HARWELL: -- as it is --

14 MR. CAMERON: Let him try to answer the
15 question, please.

16 MR. HARWELL: We have reasonable assurance
17 to think that there will be enough money.

18 Should something like that happen in 60
19 years, we would not let someone walk away --

20 MR. SACHS: They're at the top of their
21 game now.

22 MR. HARWELL: -- from their
23 responsibilities.

24 MR. SACHS: They're going no place but
25 down.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 SPEAKER: All right, stop.

2 MR. HARWELL: There are alternative legal
3 methods that could be taken, but we would not let
4 anyone walk away from that type of responsibility.
5 That, I can assure you.

6 SPEAKER: Yes, I do have a follow up,
7 which is to quote Chris Recchia, at the NCAP meeting,
8 which is, if you know, you can say I am the most
9 responsible parent in the world, but when I'm dead,
10 I'm dead. My responsibilities are -- you know, no one
11 can come after me.

12 If Entergy is gone, if it's wiped out, if
13 it's Enron, then --

14 MR. SACHS: You'll be dead.

15 SPEAKER: -- you know, what happens?

16 MR. SACHS: I'll be dead. You'll be dead,
17 Chip. You'll be dead. Everybody in this room is
18 dead.

19 SPEAKER: Stop it.

20 MR. HARWELL: Again, while it's a serious
21 question, I understand your concerns.

22 There are many hypothetical's and many
23 speculative -- a lot of speculation in that, and it
24 would be hard for to us to address that --

25 MR. SACHS: You need to.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. HARWELL: -- at this time, when we --

2 MR. SACHS: You're the man --

3 MR. HARWELL: -- when all I give you is --

4 MR. SACHS: -- to address this.

5 MR. HARWELL: -- that we would not let them
6 out -- we would not let -- I think --

7 MR. CAMERON: I think we need to --

8 MR. SACHS: Do it now.

9 MR. CAMERON: -- go on. Why don't --

10 MR. SACHS: No, we need an answer, Chip.

11 SPEAKER: Just one more question.

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

13 SPEAKER: Okay, I'm done.

14 MR. CAMERON: Nancy, okay.

15 SPEAKER: We need to know now.

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay, all right.

17 SPEAKER: No good answer.

18 MR. SACHS: You don't have an answer,
19 clean it up now.

20 SPEAKER: Yes.

21 MR. SACHS: What's with this crap? Come
22 on.

23 MR. CAMERON: Clay Turnbull. Here comes
24 Clay, and then Kimberly Medeiros. This is Clay. You
25 can use this.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 SPEAKER: I'm going to stand right here.

2 MR. CAMERON: Do you want to stand right
3 here or you want to stand over there? You can stand
4 wherever you want.

5 SPEAKER: I'd rather stand there.

6 MR. CAMERON: Good, there you are.

7 MR. TURNBULL: Great, thank you. Good
8 evening. Thanks for coming.

9 I'll start with just a little humor. This
10 is Vermont's idea of bottled water. It comes from a
11 well at my house.

12 All right, yes, I will speak up. Thank
13 you for requesting that.

14 So, I'm a member of New England Coalition
15 on Nuclear Pollution Board of Trustees. Proud to say
16 that I'm walking in footsteps for fore-fathers and
17 mothers that I'm really proud of.

18 As of 2011, NRC certified that Entergy
19 Vermont Yankee has enough money in the decommissioning
20 fund, when coupled with a parent guarantee to commence
21 decommissioning at around 650 million.

22 Entergy represented to the State of
23 Vermont that Entergy would make a good faith effort to
24 shorten the time, to beginning decommissioning as much
25 as possible. The key being when Entergy determined it

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 had accrued sufficient funds, Entergy then chose the
2 most extreme case scenario from among its TLG
3 decommissioning estimates and announced that
4 decommissioning would require \$1.24 billion.

5 This is a striking contrast to the
6 decommissioning of two, two Exelon Zion reactors in
7 Illinois, that are now under decommissioning with the
8 target cost of about \$800 million for both reactors.

9 Admittedly, the specially created
10 decommissioning company is having trouble keeping on
11 its financial track, but the contrast is still
12 remarkable.

13 The decommissioning contractor, Zion
14 Solutions said recently, in an NRC filing, that they
15 were doing the decommissioning at cost and would not
16 look to take a profit, unless there was a surplus.

17 Could this be the case -- the cause of the
18 huge disparity in decommissioning estimates? Is
19 Entergy planning on taking a profit? If so, how much
20 would that be, when comparing NRC's figures and Zion
21 figures and Entergy's?

22 Wouldn't Entergy reach the top-off point
23 in the decommissioning fund that much faster, if it
24 renounced skimming it for profit? It, being the fund.

25 The people -- and this is key, the PSDAR

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 does not show how much Entergy will be paid over cost,
2 and by the way, during the state certificate of public
3 good MOU hearings, our technical expert Ray Shaddis
4 cross-examined Michael Toomey of Entergy, every which
5 way he knew how, but could not get him to say whether
6 Entergy would or intended to make money on this
7 decommissioning. Thank you.

8 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Clay. Thank you.
9 Kimberly, do you want to --

10 MR. SACHS: What's the answer?

11 MR. CAMERON: No. Kimberly, do you want
12 to come up?

13 SPEAKER: I have no comment.

14 MR. SACHS: That's all we're here for.

15 SPEAKER: It's not just comments, it's
16 questions.

17 MR. CAMERON: Yes, questions and comments.

18 SPEAKER: Maybe the NRC representatives
19 can address Clay's comment.

20 MR. CAMERON: Clay? Where are you? Okay,
21 Clay, do you want to -- you may comment. NRC is
22 listening.

23 Can you characterize the question you
24 would like them to answer?

25 MR. SACHS: How much profit is Entergy

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 making off decommissioning?

2 MR. CAMERON: Interesting. I want to make
3 sure -- I want to make sure that they hear the exact
4 question he wants answered, okay.

5 MR. TURNBULL: This process tonight is not
6 anywhere near a venue adequate to get an answer to the
7 question of how much would Entergy be making if
8 they're going to make money on this decommissioning,
9 because I could be told anything tonight, and we're
10 all going to go home and there is nothing on the
11 record. There's nothing under oath. There is nothing
12 with --

13 SPEAKER: Ask it anyway.

14 MR. TURNBULL: -- meaningful -- there is no
15 way to test.

16 Okay, they're asking please, they want the
17 question out there, how much is Entergy planning to
18 pay themselves from the decommissioning fund?

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay, so, we got a question
20 and I appreciate what you said about this type of
21 forum is really difficult to have a complete
22 discussion of your question, so I took it as a
23 comment, for them to think about.

24 But now, we have a question, and does
25 anybody -- do you guys understand the question? Is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there anything that we can say? How about it?

2 SPEAKER: No, it's Chinese.

3 MR. SACHS: Is Entergy entitled to make a
4 profit off decommissioning, is the question. Do you
5 get it, guys? It's okay, I'll step back.

6 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead, Bruce.

7 MR. SACHS: Come on, Joe. What do you
8 think?

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay, we'll --

10 MR. SACHS: Take a guess. What do you
11 think? Give me a good guess. Yes, is the answer.

12 MR. CAMERON: Is there someone hear named
13 Gary Sachs?

14 MR. SACHS: Oh, good, my turn to speak?

15 MR. CAMERON: Not yet. Bruce?

16 MR. WATSON: Let me just say that we're an
17 independent safety regulator. We regulate the safe
18 decommissioning of the site.

19 Now, there is other costs associated with
20 decommissioning, such as site restoration that are, I
21 think part of the settlement agreement, along with
22 what to do with the money that's left over from that,
23 that we are not a party to.

24 So, we really can't make any comment on --

25 MR. SACHS: Come on, Bruce.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. WATSON: -- profitability of the -- of
2 Entergy on the decommissioning process, since the
3 funds that they're going to spend that -- that we have
4 -- you know, are looking at when we review the
5 decommissioning cost estimates, are for the safe
6 decommissioning of the site.

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

8 MR. WATSON: Don't really have an answer.

9 MR. CAMERON: All right.

10 SPEAKER: You know what that means.

11 MR. CAMERON: Kimberly?

12 SPEAKER: They're represented here. Have
13 them answer.

14 MR. CAMERON: Kimberly? This is Kimberly
15 Medeiros, and next, we're going to go to after
16 Kimberly, we're going to go to Guy Page, Carol Levin,
17 Meredith Angwi, okay, and you can correct me up here
18 for the record too. Yes, I couldn't read it, and
19 Kevin Kamps, if Kevin is here. I don't see Kevin, but
20 okay, Kimberly, go ahead.

21 MS. MEDEIROS: Thank you. So, I have been
22 working with the Citizen's Awareness Network for 20
23 years. So, I really never stay down, and I went
24 through the Yankee Rowe decommissioning with the NRC,
25 and I was there for when we sued you and we won, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 when we won, didn't really change anything. All you
2 did was change your own rule.

3 So, we pretty much stopped dealing with
4 you, but here we are again, and we have no choice in
5 the matter.

6 What I'm asking you to do is to stop
7 acting like you're Ambassadors to the nuclear
8 industry. You're kind of in bed with the -- you
9 pretty much let them do whatever they want to do, and
10 it's been that way as long as I can remember.

11 This is a precedent-setting
12 decommissioning, with Vermont Yankee being a merchant
13 reactor, and I would like you to ensure that this
14 plant is properly cleaned safely, and you need to look
15 for all the contamination. You can't trust a company
16 who is a -- who are proven liars, and I'm sorry to say
17 that that is a true statement.

18 I would like to reiterate that I agree
19 very strongly that the EPZ needs to stand until the
20 fuel is all removed, and I would like to see this
21 reactor decommissioned, because in 1974 -- I mean, I'm
22 sorry, 2074, I would be 100. So, that's kind of
23 crazy.

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,
25 Kimberly. How about Guy Page and then Carol and then

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Meredith and then --

2 MR. SACHS: Chip?

3 MR. CAMERON: -- we will go to Gary Sachs.

4 MR. SACHS: Chip?

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay, Kevin, he is here.

6 Okay, Kevin. So, we'll go to Kevin and then Gary
7 Sachs, after hear from Guy, Carol and Meredith, and
8 this is Guy Page, correct?

9 MR. PAGE: Thank you, yes.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

11 MR. PAGE: Thank you.

12 MR. SACHS: Thank you, Guy.

13 MR. PAGE: Let's see. Well, I think the
14 decommissioning put forward by Entergy for Vermont
15 Yankee is thorough, is detailed, will ensure the
16 safety of the public, provide consistent and economic
17 activity at the plant, as well as important
18 environmental benefits, and all of this is good for
19 Vermont.

20 MR. SACHS: And you want to --

21 MR. PAGE: Two components of the plan --

22 MR. SACHS: -- have them speak to you?

23 MR. PAGE: -- stand out in particular to
24 me. First, Vermont Yankee wants to go the extra mile
25 by building an additional dry cask storage pad, so

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that by 2020, all spent fuel may be situated in dry
2 cask.

3 MR. SACHS: And it's not the extra mile.
4 It is required.

5 MR. PAGE: The virtual invulnerability of
6 these dry casks to severe weather, earthquakes,
7 terrorist attacks and other threats have been well
8 documented by independent scientific experts.

9 SPEAKER: And not the ones --

10 MR. SACHS: Yes.

11 MR. PAGE: Of note, I want to say in
12 hearing last week, a place made --

13 MR. CAMERON: Look, you just can't get up
14 and be negative, perhaps rightly so. No one is
15 interrupting you. Let him speak without being
16 interrupted.

17 MR. SACHS: He's speaking, and he's paid to
18 speak.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay, doesn't matter. Go
20 ahead, Guy, please continue.

21 MR. PAGE: Thank you.

22 MR. SACHS: We haven't heard enough of
23 that.

24 MR. PAGE: At a legislative hearing last
25 week --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SACHS: You're doing great, Guy. Keep
2 it up.

3 MR. PAGE: -- Vermont Yankee was applauded
4 by state officials for its decision to move forward
5 with building and maintaining a pad, at an estimated
6 cost of \$150 million.

7 The assumption of this cost for Entergy is
8 to advance the decommissioning process instead of
9 waiting for the U.S. DOE to resolve the issue of spent
10 waste storage. Thus, minimizing the impact on the
11 decommissioning trust fund.

12 I was at a meeting on just -- just in
13 part, the letter that I'll be sending to you, but I
14 was at a meeting last week, very interesting
15 informational meeting that Mr. Gundersen was speaking
16 at, and he and the other gentleman who was running the
17 meeting noted that that decision may very well move up
18 the decommissioning time, and they thought that was a
19 very good idea.

20 Second, Vermont Yankee's decision to
21 pursue SAFSTOR decommissioning, agreed to the by the
22 2002 memorandum of understanding governing the sale of
23 the plant to Entergy, is a sound safe decision for
24 this reason, because radioactivity decays over time.

25 The longer Vermont Yankee waits to conduct

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the stated work of decommissioning, the less risk
2 there is, in that sense, of inadvertent contamination.

3 I used to be a roofer, back in the day,
4 and I learned that it's actually not very dangerous up
5 on the roof. It's not dangerous on the ground. The
6 danger is the transition. It's getting from the
7 ground to the roof, and that's like -- that's the
8 actual spade-work of the decommissioning, okay.

9 So, in that sense, waiting, there is
10 nothing wrong with waiting until that -- the decay
11 decreases, the level of radioactivity. I know there's
12 a lot of other considerations that go in there, but
13 from that --

14 MR. SACHS: Electrical.

15 MR. PAGE: -- from the area -- from the
16 perspective of radioactivity decay alone, it does make
17 sense to wait.

18 MR. SACHS: That's not true.

19 MR. PAGE: And my final comment is that I
20 really want to say, and this isn't in the letter
21 either, but I just wrote down a few notes.

22 MR. SACHS: Way to go, Guy.

23 MR. PAGE: As visitors to our beautiful
24 state, my native state, I am sure on behalf of many of
25 us here, I sincerely apologize to you for these

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 disruptions.

2 MR. SACHS: Me too.

3 MR. PAGE: Okay, I can assure you, it's
4 not how Vermonter's normally do things.

5 MR. SACHS: No, it's not.

6 MR. PAGE: Been to a lot of town meetings
7 and covered them as a reporter, and doesn't matter
8 what's being brought up, you know, a farmer could be
9 listening to a town budget, that he thinks he's knows
10 is going to lose his farm, and still, you do not get
11 up and you do not disrupt and so, I apologize for
12 that.

13 MR. SACHS: Nuclear reactor shut down.
14 Thank you, Guy.

15 MR. PAGE: So, I would --

16 MR. SACHS: Thanks, Guy.

17 MR. PAGE: So, I will give you a copy of
18 this letter and I've also given copies to the media in
19 the hopes that perhaps there might be --

20 MR. SACHS: Maybe somebody cares.

21 MR. PAGE: -- my cross will be shared with
22 any luck. Thank you.

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,
24 Guy. Carol Levin, and Carol, you can -- you can hold
25 this or you can stand. Do you want to do this? Why

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 don't you come on up here then?

2 MS. LEVIN: Sure.

3 MR. CAMERON: This is Carol.

4 MS. LEVIN: Okay, I'm Carol Levin and I
5 wish you all a good evening, ladies and gentlemen.

6 My name is Carol Levin and I am from
7 Guilford, which is in the 10 mile zone from Vermont
8 Yankee. My husband, Richard Gottlieb, died February
9 15, 2012 from a bone cancer disease, multiple myeloma
10 with a secondary, more devastating soft tissue disease
11 caused by the multiple myeloma called amyloidosis that
12 affected Richard's swallowing mechanism and his heart.

13 The damage to his heart is what proved
14 fatal, when his heart stopped that day after
15 Valentine's day.

16 We have been big supporters over the years
17 for the local movement, buying and eating and drinking
18 many products grown here in Windham County, and this
19 tri-state area.

20 When it was announced that Strontium-90
21 was found in the wells of the VY plant, I did some
22 research and found that it main affect is that is a
23 toxic that gets in the ground and the ground water,
24 and then through the grass and other plants that
25 animals and humans eat, and it gets into the bone

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 tissue of humans.

2 Although I'm not absolutely certain, but
3 I'm highly suspicious that the effects of Strontium-90
4 probably caused my husband's cancer.

5 We drank -- we drank milk, ate vegetables
6 and fruit, cheese, chicken and some meat, yogurt, ice
7 cream, all grown and produced locally, and the major
8 workforce impacted by this particular kind of cancer
9 are workers in the oil refinery business, but Richard
10 lived in Southern Vermont for nearly 40 years and was
11 in the solar energy business.

12 I urge all who are involved in the nuclear
13 plant decommissioning, to the Commission, as soon as
14 possible, and to remove and remediate all the toxic
15 materials in the ground, in the ground water and in
16 the aquifers under the property and the buildings,
17 both inside and outside the buildings, including
18 removing the buildings and getting to the underneath
19 land.

20 The two recommendations I have are one,
21 the dry cask containers now being considered a
22 temporary location, but most likely, they will become
23 permanent. They need to be treated and secured now,
24 as if it were permanent right away, so no harm could
25 come to the community, if they're disrupted.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Two, in 60 years, almost none of us are
2 going to be here, probably a dozen of the younger
3 people may still be alive, and the people that are
4 here are going to have to deal with -- not the people
5 here, but the people remaining, who come after us, are
6 going to have to deal with this closed and toxic
7 nuclear plant and its surroundings.

8 We have absolutely no project on what the
9 economy might be 60 years from now. So, please use
10 the funds that are available now, to decommission the
11 plant now. Thank you very much.

12 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Carol. Meredith,
13 do you want to use this standing, or do you want to
14 use this?

15 MS. ANGWIN: I'll just use this.

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

17 MS. ANGWIN: Hi. My name is Meredith
18 Angwin. I have worked in many aspects of energy. I
19 have some patents and control of NOx from gas turbines
20 and I have worked in nuclear.

21 I wanted to say that I hope that you will
22 go with the process that you have to assess what risks
23 are and to be very vigilant about those risks, but not
24 to assume that because somebody is frightened of
25 something, that it is a risk.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 For example, smoke. Smoke is not good for
2 anybody. There is no safe level of inhaling smoke.
3 There just isn't, and but if you go with that, you're
4 going to end up with the idea that children can't have
5 candles on their birthday cakes.

6 So, what we have to do and what we have
7 done is, we assess safe levels of this and of that.
8 There is a little bit of urea in all the water you
9 drink, but there is a level for that, and you go right
10 ahead and drink the water, because that's all the
11 water in the universe. Well, I don't know if in the
12 universe, but certainly on the surface of the earth,
13 and that is how we do things.

14 So, what I'm trying to say is, when you're
15 assessing a Strontium -- some Strontium that's been
16 detected or that there is this or there is that, do
17 not look at it as, "Oh my gosh, it's absolutely
18 unacceptable," because anything, you have to realize
19 that there have been rules that have been assessments
20 of what is a safe level, just like there is for
21 everything in the water you drink, and you must
22 vigilantly keep to those rules, but you do not have to
23 say, "Well, just think, if we spent another \$400
24 million, we could get it down to this and to that."

25 Once it's at the level that has been

1 assessed, that is the right level. Thank you very
2 much.

3 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Meredith.

4 MR. SACHS: Getting older, Meredith.

5 MR. CAMERON: We're going to go to Kevin
6 Kamps and Gary Sachs, and Claire Chang and Bob Picard.
7 Kevin? Standing?

8 MR. KAMPS: Yes.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

10 MR. KAMPS: Well, actually --

11 MR. CAMERON: Do you want to use this?

12 MR. KAMPS: -- can I use that?

13 MR. CAMERON: Yes, sure.

14 MR. KAMPS: Okay, thanks so much, Chip.

15 Hello. My name is Kevin Kamps and I serve
16 as radioactive waste specialist at Beyond Nuclear,
17 based in Takoma Park, Maryland, and I apologize for
18 just getting here. It's taken a while today. There
19 was an NRC meeting all day long on reactor pressure
20 vessels, and I kept having to pull over. I drove up
21 to testify, I couldn't drive and testify.

22 I congratulate, you know, all the folks
23 who had a hand in shutting down Vermont Yankee,
24 because on December 29th at 12:12 p.m., the reactor
25 risks went away. Well, technically when the fuel came

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 out some weeks later.

2 But the reactor risks are over at Vermont
3 Yankee, and that's really good news.

4 So, that was a part of why I was late, and
5 a public service announcement, I don't know, I just
6 got here. I got to mention about the highway shutdown
7 at Exit 3. You can't get on. So, you have to north,
8 to go north, and there is a five mile line of cars,
9 and that's what took the last hour to get here.

10 So, I have some cheat-sheets to remind
11 myself what to say. These are handouts that are
12 available out in the hallway right there, on the
13 table. I just put them out there. We've got stickers
14 by Yuko Tonohira in Brooklyn, Radiation Not In My
15 Water, that's a sheet, Radiation Not In My Fish,
16 that's a cap, Radiation Not In My Playground, that's
17 a child, and my comments follow along two major
18 themes.

19 One is decommissioning risks and the other
20 is the high-level radioactive waste.

21 So, decommissioning risks, I'm reminded
22 of, of a meeting that happened in Charlevoix,
23 Michigan, a small town in Northern Michigan, when
24 Consumers Energy, who owned the Big Rock Point plant
25 before Entergy took it over, made a sudden about-face

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on the decommissioning plans.

2 They went from SAFSTOR, perhaps 60 years
3 of SAFSTOR moth-balling so to speak, to immediate
4 dismantlement, and then they called a sudden meeting
5 and a lot of us got to drive a long ways to get there
6 in time for the meeting.

7 The things I wanted to warn about, lessons
8 from Big Rock Point, and this report that I wrote way
9 back in 2006 is out on the table. It's entitled "Say
10 Yes to Michigan, Say No to the Plutonium State Park,
11 Background on Big Rock Point Nuclear Power Plant".

12 A lot of shenanigans got played at Big
13 Rock Point. The workers weren't told much, if
14 anything, about what they were getting into, while the
15 decommissioning contractor, British Nuclear Fuels,
16 Limited, now a part of the Entergy Solutions empire,
17 was bragging on its own website that Big Rock Point
18 was the dirtiest atomic joint that they had ever
19 decommissioned, which was really saying something,
20 because British Nuclear Fuels ran the Sellafield
21 Facility in England, which is a very dirty
22 radiological mess.

23 So, workers were being told everything is
24 fine, don't worry about it, and at the same time,
25 British Nuclear Fuels had to take some pretty serious

1 precautions, like not using explosives to dismantle
2 anything because the facilities were so contaminated.

3 So, they ended up spending at that -- it's
4 a small place. It's 70 megawatts electric. They
5 spent \$366 million on the decommissioning. If you do
6 the math, that's many billions of dollars on the
7 decommissioning, and what got left behind?

8 NRC rubber-stamps an unrestricted read,
9 Greenfield Site, they called it, and it's in the
10 report. Plutonium in the soil, plutonium in the
11 groundwater. The thing they don't know is what's in
12 the sediments of Lake Michigan.

13 Big Rock Point, from 1962 to 1997, 35
14 years was discharging down a canal into Lake Michigan.
15 The NRC, the State of Michigan, the EPA, the companies
16 involved, nobody has checked the sediments in the
17 canal, in the lake, and the title for this paper came
18 from a proposal that was put out there, that this be
19 a state park, and the taxpayers could pay the company
20 \$20 million for a radioactively contaminated parcel of
21 land and bus school kids in. They were going to build
22 a museum, glorifying the atomic age.

23 A lot of us said, "No way, you're not
24 doing it," and they didn't do it. We stopped them.

25 So, there's a lot of lessons from Big Rock

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Point. You know, how deep does the clean up go? How
2 shallow is the clean up? How much contamination gets
3 left behind?

4 At Big Rock Point, it's a significant
5 amount of contamination left behind, and when they say
6 'unrestricted reuse', they mean unrestricted reuse.
7 Maternity ward, daycare center for small children,
8 growing food, it's a problem.

9 So, there is a lot of details, I won't get
10 into, but there is a lot of things to watch out for.
11 A previous speaker said the risk is on the ladder.
12 The risk is on the ground, it's on the ladder, it's on
13 the roof, and there is pitfalls at every step, and the
14 workers again, are going to be on the front line of
15 these risks.

16 So, another handout we have out there on
17 the table, 'Your Nuclear Workplace, Know Your Risks,
18 Know Your Rights', radiological protective gear,
19 you're entitled to, and contacts for more information.

20 The final handout that I have out there is
21 'Ionizing Radiation', a chart as to where the radio-
22 nuclides go and a previous speaker just now mentioned
23 Strontium-90, going to the bone. Some of these
24 shorter-lived radio-isotopes, because the reactor
25 shutdown, they will dissipate and be gone, but some of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 these risks are, of course, forever, really.

2 I mean, Iodine-129 is forever. It's 157
3 million years, 1,314 million years, it depends on if
4 you multiply that by 10 or 20, and there is a chart in
5 the report that gives those half-lives and then times
6 10, then times 20, and that's the contamination that's
7 out there.

8 You know, they check the sediments. They
9 should check the soil, the groundwater, the sediments
10 of the Connecticut River.

11 I was lucky enough, or unlucky enough to
12 go to the technical meeting, where Consumers Energy,
13 the previous owner of Big Rock Point, met with the NRC
14 at NRC Headquarters. This is around 2005, and
15 Consumers Energy said to the NRC, "Lake Michigan is
16 not our property, so, we're not responsible for the
17 contamination out there, right," and the NRC said,
18 "Yes," and that's how that decision went down.

19 So, whose property is the Connecticut
20 River? Who owns the contamination that's in the
21 sediment to the -- of the Connecticut Rivers? Who
22 owns the contamination that's in the flora and the
23 fauna and food chain? This very discussion is
24 underway in Japan.

25 Who owns the contamination that came out

1 of Fukushima Daiichi. A golf course sued Tokyo
2 Electric Power Company for contaminating the golf
3 course, saying, "Guess what, guys? We didn't create
4 this stuff. You did. So, the lawsuits are many over
5 there.

6 The last thing I wanted to talk about is
7 the high-level radioactive waste.

8 The pool is a very risky place. You lose
9 cooling water through a southern drain-down, as by the
10 drop of a heavy load, which almost happened at Vermont
11 Yankee several years ago, almost happened at Palisades
12 in Michigan, back in 2005, and the NRC was complicit
13 in the cover-up for many months.

14 So, the drop of heavy loads is a real
15 danger. You lose the water in a great big hurry, and
16 that waste can be on fire in a matter of hours, if not
17 sooner, and there is no contingency because when the
18 water is gone, the radiation shielding is gone. The
19 dose rates near the pool would be something like
20 10,000 rem an hour. You're dead in seconds, if you
21 approach it.

22 That was the whole problem at Fukushima
23 Daiichi. I happen to be in Montpelier on Saint
24 Patrick's Day 2011, because we had a Chernobyl photo
25 exhibit, long planned. It was the 25th anniversary of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Chernobyl.

2 So, that was the night that the Japanese
3 self-defense force helicopters were trying to drop
4 seawater by helicopter, onto the pool of Unit No. 4 at
5 Fukushima Daiichi, very reminiscent of what happened
6 at Chernobyl, the dropping of, you know, fire-
7 retardant materials from helicopters, and it was
8 because there was tremendous concern that Unit 4's
9 pool was empty of water, that it had drained, and now
10 the official version of things is that, no, the water
11 was always there.

12 Well, there must have been a concern, if
13 they went to such great lengths and such great risks,
14 putting those pilots at such great risks, to try to
15 drop that water in there.

16 So, if you have a sudden drain-on, if you
17 have a slower motion boil-down and you lose the water
18 that way, and again, at Fukushima Daiichi, they were
19 without electricity to turn the lights on in the
20 control room for like 10 days, let alone to run the
21 cooling water pumps on the high-level radioactive
22 waste storage pool.

23 So, a fire in the pool and the waste is
24 supposedly going to be out of there by 2020, but
25 that's five more years of pool risks at Vermont

1 Yankee, and then once the irradiated fuel moves into
2 dry cask storage, that's where the risk moves to.

3 Granted, it's a reduction of risk, but the
4 risk is not zero, far from it, because NRC regulations
5 on dry cask storage don't require safeguards against
6 terrorist attack, the some -- if attackers were to
7 show up with anti-tank missiles, they could blow the
8 dry casks away.

9 It wouldn't be that difficult to create
10 urban walls around the dry cask storage to prevent
11 line of sight attacks.

12 MR. SACHS: Right.

13 MR. KAMPS: And there was enough public
14 pressure in places like Prairie Island, Minnesota,
15 with an Indian reservation 100 yards away from the
16 nuclear power plant, that the urban walls were put in
17 place, preventing line of sight attack.

18 They have those as well, out at Palo
19 Verde in Arizona. This can be done. It's not very
20 expensive. I have an uncle in Michigan with a Bobcat
21 who would do it for \$50,000 and be very happy about
22 it. I mean, jobs, right?

23 MR. SACHS: Only in elementary school.

24 MR. KAMPS: So, the last thing in want to
25 say about the dry casks, and then I'll sit down, is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the hold tanks.

2 We have known since the year 2000, when in
3 had the honor of meeting Oscar Sarante, January of
4 2003, when I met him. Oscar Sarante worked for
5 Exelon, Commonwealth Edison in Chicago. He was their
6 lead quality assurance inspector, and he got tasked to
7 do the quality assurance inspection on the hold tack
8 dry cask fabrication facility, in the Pittsburgh area.

9 He led an audit with a dozen other
10 auditors, one each from the utilities in the country
11 using hold tacks, and in a short three-day audit, they
12 found nine major categories of quality assurance
13 violations.

14 NRC had just done a QA audit not long
15 before, found nothing wrong. Everything is fine.
16 Just one example was the welds on the hold tacks.

17 The fabrication facility called U.S. Tool
18 & Dye was cooling the welds in baths of water, putting
19 fans on them, introducing brittleness into the welds.

20 The people doing that work were not
21 qualified to be doing that work. The materials they
22 were using were not quality assured, but they don't
23 know where those materials came from, what impurities
24 were in those materials.

25 So, Oscar Sarante, and he was backed up by

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Dr. Ross Landsman of the NRC Chicago Office, dry cask
2 inspector, they have major questions about the
3 structural integrity of the hold tacks sitting still,
4 going zero miles per hour onsite storage, let alone
5 going 60 miles per hour or faster on the rails, which
6 NRC has certified them for to carry this stuff to
7 Indian reservations out west, for example.

8 So, my bottom line, all you vigilant folks
9 here who shutdown Vermont Yankee through your courage,
10 your vision, your creativity, your determination, if
11 anybody could keep on their eyes on this
12 decommissioning process, if anybody could keep their
13 eyes on the risks of high-level radioactive waste,
14 it's you guys, and believe you me, it's going to have
15 to be you guys. It ain't going to be the NRC. It
16 ain't going to be Entergy. They have other
17 motivation.

18 So, thank you very much.

19 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Kevin. Gary?

20 MR. SACHS: Do you want to ask the
21 question I asked about earlier, or do you want me to?

22 MR. CAMERON: Why don't you do it, about
23 the habitability, right?

24 MR. SACHS: No, I'm actually thinking
25 about what I heard Mr. Bruce Watson say.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Oh, okay.

2 MR. SACHS: Mr. Watson said on a webinar
3 last week, that the people who determine whether or
4 not Vermont Yankee is to be decommissioned immediately
5 or put in SAFSTOR, that is down between the owners and
6 the stakeholders. Did you say that, sir?

7 MR. WATSON: Yes, and let me clarify a
8 couple things.

9 The determination on which strategy that's
10 going to be used for decommissioning is up to the
11 owners. It's also up for them to get the input from
12 stakeholders, such as the state, the local community
13 and the other people who are interested in the
14 decommissioning.

15 With that said, we would hope that they
16 would take some of that consideration into their
17 planning and strategies for doing the decommissioning.

18 So, yes, it's a true statement. Part of
19 that, I also mentioned before is that we encourage the
20 licensee to -- or the state to --

21 MR. SACHS: Actually, I'm okay with the --

22 MR. WATSON: -- seek the Advisory
23 Committee --

24 MR. SACHS: Is it okay for you to stop
25 there?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. WATSON: No, I want to finish the
2 question.

3 MR. SACHS: But you've already spoken
4 quite a bit, and I haven't had much chance yet.

5 MR. WATSON: Well --

6 MR. SACHS: I think it's fair that --

7 MR. CAMERON: You've had more time than
8 anybody.

9 MR. WATSON: So, you know, we encourage
10 the formation of a Citizen's Advisory Panel, which the
11 state has done, to inform the public and also the
12 stakeholders, other stakeholders, on the information
13 and work with the utility and the licensee to work on
14 decommissioning issues.

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay, go ahead, second
16 question?

17 MR. SACHS: Well, I wasn't even thinking
18 of asking one, but it's another question, habitability
19 question. How many of those totally decommissioned
20 reactors that have been totally decommissioned, do
21 have daycare centers on them now and are habitable?
22 Main Yankee is not, Connecticut Yankee is not. How
23 many of them are, that you decommissioned?

24 MR. WATSON: I'll answer that. The 10
25 power reactors that have been decommissioned for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 unrestricted release, meaning the footprint of the
2 reactor itself has been -- the license has been
3 terminated, are available for the owner to decide what
4 they want to do with the property, not the NRC, and
5 they may invest some of that with the state.

6 Main Yankee donated some of the land to a
7 non-profit organization, which maintains part of the
8 site as a park. Some utilities have elected to build
9 additional generating stations on the property,
10 because they're valuable to them.

11 There is water, cooling water. There is
12 the grid infrastructure. There has also been
13 environmental impact statements done on the property
14 --

15 MR. SACHS: How about a number? A number,
16 sir?

17 MR. WATSON: Well, I'm --

18 MR. SACHS: I'm looking for a number.

19 MR. WATSON: How many have been --
20 childcare centers built on them?

21 MR. SACHS: Yes.

22 MR. WATSON: I don't know. But I do know
23 --

24 MR. SACHS: That's a good answer.

25 MR. WATSON: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SACHS: I appreciate that.

2 MR. WATSON: Because I don't know. I
3 really don't keep up with what they --

4 MR. SACHS: How many are free for people
5 --

6 MR. WATSON: -- do every day.

7 MR. SACHS: -- to walk on?

8 MR. WATSON: They're all free to be walked
9 on, but they're owned by --

10 MR. SACHS: Except for the --

11 MR. WATSON: -- private property, okay,
12 except for the one I know in Maine, which became a
13 park that is sponsored by --

14 MR. SACHS: Yes, but the reactor --

15 MR. WATSON: -- a non-profit.

16 MR. SACHS: The waste in Maine, the
17 cooling -- the casks are still in a -- you know,
18 bigger than this hotel, not occupy-able space.

19 I wanted to comment on something that Mr.
20 Kamps had said.

21 We had some casks. Actually, we have five
22 of our casks, of the 13 we currently have, which were
23 not property leak-rate tested, and that was told --
24 that came out from Holtec. How the hell did it get
25 through NRC testing, but they didn't do the leak-rate

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 testing?

2 Do you take your information from the
3 licensees, regarding dry casks also?

4 SPEAKER: Where else do they get their
5 information?

6 MR. SACHS: Just checking.

7 MR. CAMERON: Anybody?

8 MR. SACHS: Anybody want to answer it?
9 Really, like do you do any work to check the casks?

10 MR. CAMERON: Let's see if we can get an
11 answer to your question.

12 MR. FERDAS: Yes, I'll take that. We do
13 do inspections. There is, as we talked about --

14 MR. SACHS: Once every 25 years?

15 MR. FERDAS: No, no.

16 MR. SACHS: How often?

17 MR. FERDAS: As I mentioned before, we
18 have an inspection program.

19 MR. SACHS: How often?

20 MR. FERDAS: Our inspection program
21 requires us to be onsite for anyone that has dry cask
22 storage on a two year frequency.

23 MR. SACHS: So, you come in, you look at
24 a cask and you leave?

25 MR. FERDAS: No.

1 MR. SACHS: You come in, you open it a
2 cask --

3 MR. FERDAS: No.

4 MR. SACHS: -- you make sure it's sealed
5 correctly?

6 MR. FERDAS: Let me finish, please. I
7 want to give you an answer.

8 MR. CAMERON: This is not a cross-
9 examination.

10 MR. SACHS: Sure it is.

11 MR. FERDAS: Okay.

12 MR. CAMERON: No, it isn't.

13 MR. FERDAS: What we try to do --

14 MR. SACHS: I want to make sure --

15 MR. FERDAS: -- we are performance based
16 agency, what we try to do is, we align our inspection
17 --

18 MR. SACHS: Relax your shoulders, Marc.

19 MR. FERDAS: -- and actual --

20 MR. SACHS: Relax your shoulders. It's
21 okay. It's okay, Marc. I'm not here to --

22 MR. FERDAS: No, it's also okay to let me
23 finish to answer the question.

24 MR. SACHS: Well, I don't have to. I'm a
25 stakeholder.

1 MR. FERDAS: Let me just --

2 MR. SACHS: You're on my turf.

3 MR. FERDAS: -- answer your question.

4 MR. SACHS: I don't trust you.

5 MR. FERDAS: Let me just --

6 MR. CAMERON: Do you have another --

7 MR. FERDAS: I'm just curious --

8 MR. SACHS: I got a bunch of other
9 questions.

10 MR. FERDAS: What we do is, we do the
11 inspections when actual loading campaigns are ongoing.
12 For those plants that do not have loading campaigns,
13 after an extended period of time, we do come onsite to
14 review how they're maintaining their dry cask storage
15 system.

16 MR. SACHS: Okay, so, we have five that
17 have -- we not leak-rate tested. What is the effect
18 of that? What is the -- can you tell us -- can
19 someone come back to us, who live here, and tell us
20 the effect of not having had the leak-rate testing on
21 those casks that are here?

22 MR. CAMERON: Gary?

23 MR. SACHS: Are we more likely to have
24 'x'?

25 MR. FERDAS: I do not know the specifics

1 of that. I was not in charge of the group when that
2 occurred, however, there is an environmental
3 monitoring program around the ISFSI where the
4 radiation levels are measured.

5 MR. SACHS: Thank you, sir, that's good.

6 MR. CAMERON: Gary, how about two more
7 questions, and then --

8 MR. SACHS: How about I read what I
9 presented, sir? You told me to write them down. I
10 wrote them down.

11 MR. CAMERON: Yes, but --

12 MR. SACHS: For now.

13 MR. CAMERON: Gary, we have like --

14 MR. SACHS: I know you do, but this is the
15 way -- you said you'd be here past nine. This is the
16 way it's supposed to be.

17 MR. CAMERON: Gary?

18 MR. SACHS: Okay, I cite NRC information
19 notice 96-34, in reference to hydrogen explosion in
20 the process of sealing a dry cask 1996-34.

21 I cite 19840113, regarding the fuel rod
22 drop that occurred at Vermont Yankee. That was in
23 1998. I cite NRC 94-12, where the NRC proposes a fine
24 for multiple alleged violations of NRC requirements at
25 Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Plant in Vernon, Vermont.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 That's regarding multiple 1993 instances of fuel
2 mishandling at this now closed, thank you very much,
3 reactor.

4 Because of multiple -- "Because of
5 multiple examples of the alleged violations."

6 Also for the silt, etcetera that had
7 clogged the alternate cooling tower here at VY, "It
8 involved a build-up of silt and debris in the
9 alternate cooling tower basin and suction pit, which
10 left the system inoperable, possibly since 1989." You
11 guys are overseeing it. Possibly you didn't oversee
12 that in those five years.

13 MR. CAMERON: Gary?

14 MR. SACHS: I'm here. This is where I am.

15 MR. CAMERON: Wait a minute. I got a guy
16 who can answer some of your questions.

17 MR. SACHS: Great.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay, this is -- Darrell,
19 introduce yourself.

20 MR. DUNN: My name is Darrell Dunn. I'm
21 with the Office of NMSS in the --

22 MR. SACHS: Can you clarify what that is?

23 MR. DUNN: Nuclear Material Safety and
24 Safeguards in the Division of spent fuel management in
25 the Renewals and Materials Branch.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, my Branch looks at dry cask --

2 MR. SACHS: Do you think the best place in
3 the country to work -- best place in the Government to
4 work?

5 MR. CAMERON: Gary, will you just let --

6 SPEAKER: Gary?

7 SPEAKER: Leave him alone.

8 MR. SACHS: He can sweat too.

9 MR. DUNN: My Branch looks at, reviews,
10 approves or does not approve renewals of dry cask
11 storage systems.

12 So, you asked about the helium leak-rate
13 testing.

14 MR. SACHS: Yes, I did.

15 MR. DUNN: Okay, so, that should have
16 really never occurred --

17 MR. SACHS: Yes.

18 MR. DUNN: -- and all of the casks that
19 are going to be loaded with Holtec systems will be
20 leak-rate tested.

21 MR. SACHS: How do we know, if those
22 weren't? What can you tell us, to make us believe
23 you're telling me the truth?

24 MR. DUNN: The ones that you've said --

25 MR. SACHS: What can you tell me?

1 MR. DUNN: The ones that you've said were
2 not leak-rate tested were not leak-rate tested.

3 MR. SACHS: Why not? You're overseeing
4 them.

5 MR. DUNN: They just --

6 MR. SACHS: That's your job.

7 MR. DUNN: They should have been leak-rate
8 tested.

9 MR. SACHS: Are you going to swap them out
10 with good ones?

11 MR. DUNN: No.

12 MR. SACHS: Why not?

13 MR. DUNN: So, the leak-rate testing, the
14 casks were backfilled with helium. Helium is an inert
15 gas. It also provides heat transfer.

16 Those casks are low-heat load casks. So,
17 what's the effect of the low-heat -- the lack of
18 helium leak-rate testing on the low-heat low cask?
19 Very little, because there is nothing that's going to
20 happen to the fuel because it's just too cold.

21 Now, if the fuel was hot, that would be a
22 different story, okay but --

23 MR. SACHS: So, how do we know that the
24 casks -- that the most recent fuel that just got
25 transferred in, that's going to be pulled out in five

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 years, how do we know that those aren't going to be
2 put in casks that aren't -- that are helium leak-rate
3 tested?

4 MR. DUNN: They will be helium leak-rate
5 tested --

6 MR. SACHS: How do we know?

7 15 -- because it is a requirement, because
8 that got fixed.

9 MR. SACHS: They did not do it for those
10 five.

11 MR. DUNN: But that got fixed.

12 MR. CAMERON: Gary? Okay, Gary, thank
13 you. Last --

14 MR. SACHS: Can I just say this?

15 MR. FERDAS: Chip? Chip, just one other
16 thing with that.

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay, go ahead, Marc.

18 MR. FERDAS: And important aspect is that
19 there is NDE testing that was done on those casks --

20 SPEAKER: What is NDE?

21 MR. FERDAS: Sorry, non-destructive
22 examination testing that's done on all the welds, that
23 are made on that cask.

24 So, one, you have those were tested for a
25 structural integrity. The helium leak-rate test is a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 backup test to that first examination of the welds.

2 So, we do have confidence that those casks

3 --

4 MR. SACHS: Confidence? Wait, sorry.

5 MR. FERDAS: We have confidence that those
6 casks are structurally adequate.

7 MR. SACHS: We are looking for more --

8 MR. FERDAS: Okay.

9 MR. SACHS: -- than confidence. Can I
10 just --

11 MR. CAMERON: Gary?

12 MR. SACHS: -- say that --

13 MR. CAMERON: Gary, yes.

14 MR. SACHS: I'm not finished. May I
15 finish?

16 MR. CAMERON: I've got to --

17 MR. SACHS: I've got that, to there.
18 That's what I got left. I got there to there.

19 MR. CAMERON: Gary, that's -- is that --
20 those are many questions, right?

21 MR. SACHS: No, those aren't questions.
22 It's bringing things forward that have not been
23 mentioned.

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay, Gary, I'm going to
25 give you a couple minutes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SACHS: Please, fine.

2 MR. CAMERON: To do it, okay?

3 MR. SACHS: Chip, I sat and waited. I
4 done all this crap you told me to do, without --

5 MR. CAMERON: Stop saying that.

6 MR. SACHS: You told me to not make noise.
7 I didn't make fuckin' noise.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay, Gary, I'm going to
9 give you the microphone back.

10 MR. SACHS: Yes, thank you.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay, but we have a bunch of
12 people --

13 MR. SACHS: I am so tired of this crap.

14 MR. CAMERON: -- bunch of people --

15 MR. SACHS: At every meeting --

16 MR. CAMERON: -- waiting --

17 MR. SACHS: -- I can't speak.

18 MR. CAMERON: Waiting to speak --

19 MR. SACHS: People just do what you tell
20 them to do.

21 MR. CAMERON: And I just want to -- if --

22 MR. SACHS: I've got questions, man.

23 MR. CAMERON: If people who have -- if you
24 have questions, you can submit them in writing to the
25 NRC.

1 MR. SACHS: No, Chip, but this is when we
2 get to speak to them. This is what I want them to
3 sweat.

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

5 MR. SACHS: Not when they're in their
6 office and you can't see them.

7 MR. CAMERON: Gary? Gary?

8 MR. SACHS: I got it.

9 MR. CAMERON: You've got two minutes.

10 MR. SACHS: I got it.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

12 MR. SACHS: I got it.

13 MR. CAMERON: You got two minutes.

14 MR. SACHS: Great. I got it. Okay, the
15 end -- nuclear -- where am I? Oh my God.

16 SPEAKER: Gary, thank you for caring so
17 much.

18 MR. SACHS: Thank you. Okay, let's
19 continue to the spectacular cooling tower collapse of
20 2007. I don't need this.

21 The NRC oversaw the spectacular cooling
22 tower collapse and oversaw the repairs. They had to
23 come back in 2008. They had to come back in 2008
24 because they were not able to see. They were doing
25 supervision without the ability to see. You cannot do

1 supervision without vision. Supervision means over-
2 vision. Latin, vision means to see.

3 If the NRC can't see when doing repairs on
4 the plastic cooling towers, then how can they be
5 called -- say that they're doing supervision?

6 Okay, that's another cooling tower.

7 SPEAKER: Gary?

8 MR. SACHS: Yes.

9 SPEAKER: I want to ask a question.

10 MR. SACHS: The simple thing I want to
11 bring up is that Entergy right now has just been said
12 to be over-bought in the market.

13 What that means is that's the reason why
14 Entergy executives are going and selling hundreds of
15 thousands of Entergy shares. What over-bought means,
16 I didn't know before yesterday, but what over-bought
17 means is they're at the top of their game. From here,
18 Entergy stock goes nowhere but down.

19 We have a nuclear reactor leaking
20 Strontium and we have a company that says they don't
21 want to clean it up.

22 You know, when Vermont Yankee took cable
23 to Vermont in 1967 and said, "We want to run a reactor
24 for 40 years," they didn't say, "We want to run a
25 reactor for 40 years, but not clean it up for 100."

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 No, they didn't say that.

2 You guys are messing with the State of
3 Vermont. It's gross. It's really wrong, what you're
4 doing.

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay, Gary.

6 MR. SACHS: Let me finish what I --

7 MR. CAMERON: Gary?

8 MR. SACHS: Let me finish.

9 MR. CAMERON: Gary, you've been here for
10 a while.

11 MR. SACHS: I've got the microphone. You
12 don't, Chip.

13 MR. CAMERON: I'll turn the microphone
14 off.

15 MR. SACHS: I'm not surprised.

16 MR. CAMERON: I mean, I think the
17 settlement -- you said a good comment, okay. No, no,
18 no.

19 MR. SACHS: I don't care.

20 MR. CAMERON: You said a good comment.

21 MR. SACHS: Who did?

22 MR. CAMERON: He did. He said, "Thank you
23 for caring," okay.

24 MR. SACHS: Thank you too, Chip. Always
25 great to have you back here.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: You're welcome. You're
2 welcome. Claire and then Bert Picard.

3 MS. CHANG: So, I have a question. This
4 two credit lines that Entergy is establishing to pay
5 for the transfer of dry cask storage, it's \$145
6 million? Where is that credit line coming from?

7 MR. LYNCH: Entergy is borrowing money
8 from two lending institutes, and it's being backed up
9 by the company assets.

10 So, it's no different than you or I
11 borrowing money to pay for, you know, something that
12 we're going to build on our own home.

13 MS. CHANG: So, you don't own those
14 lending institutions?

15 MR. LYNCH: No, they're banks.

16 MS. CHANG: So, how much interest are you
17 paying on those loans?

18 MR. LYNCH: I have no idea.

19 MS. CHANG: Is that interest being then
20 also applied or to be reimbursed through the
21 decommissioning fund?

22 MR. LYNCH: The monies that are being
23 borrowed would be paid for by the litigation against
24 the Department of Energy, because those are costs that
25 we could recuperate for them not meeting their

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 contractual obligations to take the fuel.

2 MS. CHANG: So, let me get this straight.

3 So, there -- okay, so, that's just the --
4 that's just moving the spent fuel from the pool into
5 the dry casks.

6 MR. LYNCH: That's correct.

7 MS. CHANG: Is that what that \$145 million
8 is for?

9 MR. LYNCH: That's correct.

10 MS. CHANG: So, that's going to be for
11 this next five years?

12 MR. LYNCH: Correct.

13 MS. CHANG: But that's not -- that is this
14 part up here in the pie chart, that's the spent fuel
15 management part? Is that included in that?

16 MR. LYNCH: Yes, out of the \$368 million,
17 about \$143 million is the transfer of the fuel from
18 wet to dry.

19 MS. CHANG: So, but you have that as part
20 of the decommissioning cost of the \$1.2 billion.

21 MR. LYNCH: Billion.

22 MS. CHANG: Billion, sorry. 'B'. So, but
23 you're getting that money back from the DOE, or you
24 will sue them to get the money back?

25 MR. LYNCH: Assuming we're successful,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that's correct.

2 MS. CHANG: I don't know that any -- no
3 nuclear reactor owner who has sued the DOE has been
4 unsuccessful, up until this point. They've all gotten
5 their money back, right?

6 MR. LYNCH: I'm not aware of what other
7 licensees have done.

8 MS. CHANG: Oh, I cannot believe that, for
9 one minute, or even three seconds.

10 MR. SACHS: We get you're lying, Mr.
11 Lynch.

12 MS. CHANG: I'm sorry.

13 MR. SACHS: We think you're lying, sir.

14 MS. CHANG: Okay, so, that money --

15 MR. SACHS: Here's the new Entergy.

16 MS. CHANG: -- it's going to get back from
17 the DOE --

18 SPEAKER: From taxpayers.

19 MS. CHANG: -- right?

20 SPEAKER: Yes.

21 MS. CHANG: That's \$145 million --

22 MR. SACHS: Yes.

23 MS. CHANG: -- that you're borrowing.

24 MR. LYNCH: I'm sorry, there is two people
25 talking at the same time. So, if you can ask the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 question, I'd be more --

2 MS. CHANG: I'm sure you --

3 MR. LYNCH: -- than happy to answer it.

4 MS. CHANG: -- have been in many
5 conversations where two people have been talking at
6 the same time.

7 MR. CAMERON: Claire, can you just ask
8 your question?

9 MS. CHANG: I did ask my question. So,
10 the DOE --

11 MR. CAMERON: Just ask your question.

12 MS. CHANG: The DOE is going to give you
13 back this money, that you're including in the cost of
14 the \$1.2 billion to decommission this fund --
15 decommission this reactor, but that money that DOE is
16 giving you back, is that going into the
17 decommissioning fund then, the trust fund?

18 MR. LYNCH: The money would be paying back
19 the creditors that loaned us the money in the first
20 place, to allow us to transfer the fuel from wet to
21 dry.

22 MS. CHANG: But you're including that cost
23 into -- there is something fishy going on here, and
24 I'm not a financial person, so I can't quite put my
25 finger on it.

1 But if you're including those costs in the
2 decommissioning trust fund amount, but somehow, you're
3 not paying for it, but the DOE is paying for it, then
4 why are you including it in this cost that the trust
5 fund has to pay for?

6 SPEAKER: Yes?

7 MR. LYNCH: The overall break down of all
8 the costs are explained in decommissioning cost
9 estimate.

10 We go through why each cost is costing
11 that it is.

12 MR. SACHS: We think you're full of shit.

13 MR. LYNCH: So, that's part of the PSDAR
14 and it's part of a very detailed decommissioning cost
15 estimate. It explains all the costs, where the
16 monies are coming from and how it's being --

17 MR. SACHS: Subtract \$1.4 million from
18 \$1.24 billion.

19 SPEAKER: Can we get him a microphone?

20 MR. TOOMEY: Give me a microphone.

21 MR. CAMERON: Mike, you want to get on
22 that?

23 MR. TOOMEY: Sure. Mike Toomey from --

24 MR. SACHS: You're a scumbag, Mike Toomey.

25 The behavior you pull up --

1 MR. TOOMEY: In answer to your question --

2 MR. SACHS: -- is crap.

3 SPEAKER: I agree with you, Gary.

4 MR. TOOMEY: The answer to your question
5 is that the \$1.24 is the total cost of the project,
6 which we have identified. When this \$143 million of
7 the project is done, then you'll have less, you'll
8 have \$143 less that has to go.

9 So, the cost of the project after this
10 work has been done will be whatever \$124 billion minus
11 \$143 million --

12 MR. SACHS: Good. What is that total?

13 MR. TOOMEY: It's just like the work of
14 anything else.

15 MR. SACHS: What is that total?

16 SPEAKER: It's point-one. It's really the
17 amount that the trust fund is supposed to grow to.

18 MR. LYNCH: Well, it has to grow -- if we
19 are successful in -- we've established a line of
20 credit. We get this funding in place, which we have,
21 we do the work and we get the money back from the DOE,
22 then that's right, that \$143 million will be reduced,
23 will reduce the total cost of the project.

24 MR. SACHS: So, how much of --

25 MR. LYNCH: So, whatever that is.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SACHS: What are we looking for?

2 MR. LYNCH: Whatever \$1.24 billion minus
3 \$143 million is, which is approximately \$1. --
4 whatever -- whatever that number is, right, 1.1.

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay, can you -- thank you,
6 Mike and thank you, Claire. Can you guys talk after
7 the meeting or some time?

8 SPEAKER: We'd like to hear this in
9 public.

10 MR. SACHS: Yes.

11 MR. CAMERON: Yes, well, I think we're --
12 I think we've heard about enough as we can, right now,
13 and I got to go to Bob Picard.

14 MR. SACHS: You said you were going to be
15 here past nine, and now, you're clocking back on your
16 --

17 MR. CAMERON: No, we're going to be here
18 past nine, but we still have 10 people to go here, or
19 more, okay?

20 SPEAKER: I have a --

21 MR. CAMERON: Bob Picard?

22 MR. SACHS: Let her ask her other
23 question.

24 MR. CAMERON: Wait a minute, Claire, do
25 you have -- you have one more question? Well, go

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 ahead, as your second question.

2 MS. CHANG: Thank you very much.

3 MR. CAMERON: You're welcome.

4 MS. CHANG: I appreciate it. So, but I
5 miss your red vest.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you.

7 MS. CHANG: Now, the second question is,
8 Entergy goes belly-up next year. What are you going
9 to do?

10 MR. SACHS: Come on, NRC.

11 MR. BROADDUS: If I can -- I'll answer one
12 part of that, which is the decommissioning trust fund
13 does not go away if Entergy, the entity goes away.

14 MR. SACHS: Who takes responsibility for
15 it?

16 MR. BROADDUS: Whoever --

17 MR. SACHS: The funding.

18 MR. BROADDUS: -- becomes the licensee
19 after that.

20 MR. SACHS: What if there isn't one? What
21 if it's you?

22 MR. BROADDUS: We will keep -- we will
23 continue to hold Entergy responsible --

24 MR. SACHS: What if Entergy goes belly-up?

25 MR. BROADDUS: -- for that.

1 MR. SACHS: What if there is no Entergy?

2 MR. CAMERON: Let's let -- let's
3 concentrate on Claire.

4 MS. CHANG: Gary's line of questioning is
5 appropriate. I asked exactly --

6 MR. SACHS: This is Nancy's line of
7 questioning.

8 MS. CHANG: Entergy does an Enron and it
9 implodes. It's not that far-fetched.

10 MR. SACHS: We expect it.

11 MS. CHANG: No one would have expected --

12 MR. SACHS: They're scum.

13 MS. CHANG: -- Enron to have died, no one.
14 So, next year, I'll pick a date for you too. April
15 1st, 2016. Entergy dies. What are you to do?

16 MR. PERSINKO: Well, the first thing I was
17 going to mention is -- let me answer one thing.

18 The trust fund still exists. I mean, the
19 trust fund will still exist when Entergy -- if Entergy
20 --

21 MR. SACHS: It will still be under-funded.

22 MR. PERSINKO: -- was to be gone, but the
23 trust fund will exist and the -- it will be up to the
24 trustee of the trust fund to hire another clean up
25 contractor to clean up the -- to decommission the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reactor.

2 MR. SACHS: Up to who?

3 MR. PERSINKO: But it would be another
4 clean up contractor if Entergy --

5 MR. SACHS: Who hires them?

6 MR. PERSINKO: -- did not exist.

7 MR. SACHS: Who hires them? Who hires
8 them?

9 MR. CAMERON: Gary, come on, stop it.

10 MR. PERSINKO: I'm trying to answer the
11 question.

12 MS. CHANG: He's trying to answer it.

13 MR. PERSINKO: It would be the trustee of
14 the trust fund, I believe.

15 MS. CHANG: So, who is -- --

16 MR. PERSINKO: And the trust fund --
17 excuse me, the trust fund, I believe is Mellon Bank.
18 You know, these licensees have it with separate
19 independent banks. So, the trustee -- that is with a
20 third party. It's not with the NRC. It's not with
21 the licensee. That money is with the third party,
22 okay, and that's who they go to, to get money to do
23 the decommissioning planning and to execute the
24 decommissioning, okay.

25 MS. CHANG: And so, they don't go through

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you at all?

2 MR. PERSINKO: They advise us when -- or
3 notify us when they're going to -- they want to use
4 funds. They also report to us every year on the
5 health of that fund, and if there is any short-falls,
6 then we will address with the Entergy --

7 MS. CHANG: So, the --

8 MR. PERSINKO: -- to come up with the
9 short-fall in those funds.

10 MR. CAMERON: I'm going to have to ask you
11 to finish up, okay?

12 MS. CHANG: So, it goes back to this is a
13 merchant plant and that you don't have the rules and
14 regulations in place, and it's our fault that you
15 don't have them in place. It's your fault and you
16 knew years ago, decades ago that this was the
17 scenario.

18 MR. CAMERON: I think you made your point.

19 MS. CHANG: Right?

20 MR. CAMERON: I think you made your point,
21 Claire. Thank you.

22 MR. SACHS: Thank you, Claire.

23 MR. CAMERON: Now, this is Bert? Oh, Bob
24 Dickerman? Did we hear from Bert Picard? Okay, why
25 don't you come -- Bob, come on. Do you -- you're

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 here, and Harvey Sckaktman, Chuck Schwer, Betsy
2 Williams and Michael Granger. This is Bob Dickerman.

3 MR. DICKERMAN: I'm Bob Dickerman. I'm
4 from Northfield, Massachusetts, just over the line.

5 Something I've been seeing in the
6 newspapers down in Greenfield, is these two numbers,
7 \$650 million or so and \$1.2 billion for
8 decommissioning in the trust fund.

9 My question has been, you're saying you
10 need \$1.2 billion now. You're talking about
11 decommissioning 40 years or 50 years or 60 years into
12 the future.

13 So, my point is that at historical rates
14 of inflation of three percent, we're not going to be
15 spending \$1.2 billion in, you know, 40 or 50 or 60
16 years from now. It will be more like four times that
17 or \$5 billion in 2060 dollars or whatever they are,
18 they're won't be any 2050 dollars around to use at
19 that point, so that will be, you know, 2060 or 2070
20 dollars and it will require \$5 billion to do the same
21 amount of work that \$1.2 does today, and I wish that
22 was showing up more in the newspaper because people
23 are getting the impression that it's going to be \$1.2
24 billion, when it isn't.

25 If inflation goes higher than the

1 historical rate, maybe more like in the 70's when it
2 seven, eight, nine, ten percent, then it could be \$20
3 billion at that time.

4 So, I just want to get that out there. I
5 have another question, for you, Darrel. I guess
6 you're the expert on dry cask storage.

7 As I was sitting here, I just began to
8 wonder how does concrete deteriorate over long periods
9 of time, under that high radiation dose from those
10 spent fuel rods?

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay, Darrel, do you want to
12 provide an answer to that? Thank you.

13 MR. DICKERMAN: Do we have any empirical
14 data, test data, and I guess I have to say, I assume
15 we don't, because no plants have been decommissioned
16 for that length of time.

17 MR. DUNN: Oh, no, we do have -- we do
18 have data, and as part of storing fuel beyond the
19 initial 20 year license period for dry cask, all
20 independent spent fuel storage installations and all
21 certificate of compliance holders that provide casks
22 that can be used, like the Holtec systems that are
23 used at Vermont Yankee, they all have to come up with
24 what we call aging management programs, and they have
25 to address specifically, these issues.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, we have -- we are going to issue some
2 revised regulatory guidance. It's NUREG 1927. It's
3 going to be Revision 1 of that, and in that revision
4 to that regulatory guidance, we're also going to
5 include some example aging management programs, and
6 one of them is going to deal specifically with
7 concrete.

8 MR. DICKERMAN: How do you get a reading
9 on that? I mean, because you can't test for 60 years
10 yet. I mean, how do you tell whether your methodology
11 works?

12 MR. DUNN: There is empirical data for
13 radiation exposure of concrete, as there is for
14 radiation exposure of metals. So, we have empirical
15 data for that.

16 MR. DICKERMAN: Good. Okay, thank you.

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

18 MR. DICKERMAN: One other quick question.
19 I want to repeat again to you, Joe Lynch, you're the
20 representative here on the panel from Entergy, right?
21 Yes?

22 MR. LYNCH: That's correct.

23 MR. DICKERMAN: I want to ask you again,
24 does Entergy intend to make a profit on the
25 decommissioning process?

1 SPEAKER: Yes.

2 MR. LYNCH: The cost associated with the
3 decommissioning is an estimate to do the work, and our
4 goal is to do the work with the cost that we have.
5 There is no profit built into that estimate.

6 MR. DICKERMAN: Thanks.

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Bert? You
8 want to use that?

9 MR. PICARD: Sure.

10 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead.

11 MR. PICARD: Bert Picard, Brattleboro,
12 stakeholder.

13 The NRC, it's interesting. When the State
14 of Vermont had 27 Senators to four vote that they
15 didn't want this nuclear plant here past the 40 years,
16 didn't mean a thing to you. When the Governor didn't
17 want it, didn't mean a thing to you.

18 So, what are you? A Government of
19 occupation, right? Government of occupation. That's
20 what you are. I have no respect for any of you. We
21 all know the revolving door between the industry and
22 the regulators, right?

23 Okay, good. But anyway, I know where I
24 stand. You know, the occupied. But still, I'll say
25 something.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 First of all, you don't have a plan to get
2 rid of the nuclear fuel, right? You don't have a
3 plan. Entergy is saying, "Oh, we'll start moving it
4 in 2026 and we'll be done in 2052." You know, that's
5 a horse and pony show, right? I mean, this is all a
6 crock of you know what, right?

7 You don't have a plan. You don't know
8 what to do with this poison. You've been working on
9 it for years. You don't know what to do. This stuff
10 should have been left alone, right?

11 Okay, so, that means we basically have to
12 begin to prepare to store this stuff forever, right
13 here on the Connecticut River, in our community.

14 So, what's with these cheap casks? Why
15 not do like in Europe? Why not have the good ones,
16 you know, that you can monitor remotely, that are
17 going to last a while, because this is going to be a
18 while. This is going to be our great, great, great
19 grandchildren's problem, all right.

20 So, what's with the cheap casks? Even an
21 berm seems to be a problem. I don't know, you know,
22 I mean, does that have to be requested on bended knee?
23 "Please, shield the school." Come on. What are we
24 dealing with here? This is a joke.

25 So, first of all, we're going to have this

1 stuff forever probably, you know. The other thing is,
2 your Government is in a mess. Everybody talks about
3 how dysfunctional Congress is, right, and the economy
4 is in a mess. Wall Street is doing real good right
5 now, right? Maybe next year, not so good? Oh well,
6 get a golden parachute, right?

7 Well, Enron -- I mean, Entergy ain't going
8 to be around in 40 or 50 or 60 years. Everybody knows
9 that. Okay, so, what does that mean though?
10 Practically, decommission now with the money that's in
11 the fund now.

12 Maybe you got to write new rules for
13 merchant plants. So, write the new rules. I mean,
14 just do it. Please, this is -- we're talking about
15 just mitigating a little bit, the problem that we have
16 with this poison, right? So, that's just minimum.

17 So, the time to decommission is now. With
18 the climate change crisis that are coming and all of
19 that, things are only going to get crazier. We don't
20 do it now, it ain't happening. I don't want to know
21 what's going to be going on in 50 years. You know,
22 this thing ain't going to be cleaned up in 50 years.
23 If it's not starting to clean up now, as soon as
24 possible, like 2021 or 2026, like Mr. Gundersen said,
25 it ain't happening. That's realistic.

1 So, I say decommission now. Write new
2 rules if you have to. But that's a minimum that we
3 can demand, and from what I've heard tonight, which is
4 just a show to keep the civilians thinking that they
5 got a democracy, which we obviously don't, not as far
6 as you guys are concerned, I would want to see a
7 hearing convened by the State of Vermont that will
8 force Entergy and you guys and everybody else to come
9 and get sworn testimony, to at least get into some of
10 these questions a little bit more in depth. Thank
11 you.

12 MR. SACHS: Yes.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Bert.
14 Harvey Schaktman. Okay, Chuck Schwer?

15 SPEAKER: Betsy had to go home.

16 MR. CAMERON: Betsy has gone home?

17 SPEAKER: She's here.

18 MR. CAMERON: Betsy, okay, come on up,
19 Betsy and then Michael Granger will be next, and Chris
20 Myers, Schuyler Gould. This is Betsy.

21 MS. WILLIAMS: I'm Betsy Williams. I live
22 just up the road here, and I don't have any notes. So,
23 I'm just going to speak about a few things, few
24 reactions, no pun intended. All right, pun was
25 intended.

1 Couple of things, just reactions of things
2 that have been said. I have to say, I find it -- when
3 we're talking about one of the most dangerous
4 substances known to human kind and I would really
5 invite anyone to disagree with me on that, that's what
6 we're talking about. The most dangerous substances
7 that are known to human kind.

8 I find it more than a little insulting,
9 when it's compared to birthday cake candles.

10 We do have reason to have concern here,
11 very good reason to have concern, and when, sir, I
12 would -- I have to respectfully say to you, when you
13 tell me the casks will be adequate, that does not give
14 me great assurance.

15 I am looking for a hell of a lot more than
16 adequate. I want to know that that thing is not going
17 to crack and I want to know that when the Connecticut
18 River floods, that nothing will happen to that
19 radioactive waste that's sitting under water in a
20 flood plain.

21 I want to know when some idiot flies a
22 plane into it, that it's not going to irradiate this
23 entire region. Can you give me that assurance? I
24 don't think so.

25 When I'm told that basically we have no

1 right to say anything about our safety, because you
2 guys control our safety, we're not allowed to jay-walk
3 but by God, we better not talk about safety of nuclear
4 plants. I've had enough.

5 The level of my distrust and venom and how
6 disrespected we have been is just -- it's a very deep
7 well. We have made it so clear in this state, that we
8 want some control over what happens at this site, and
9 we have been -- had the doors shut on us over, and
10 over, and over again by you guys. "Nope, you don't
11 have control," and when we do get one tiny little
12 leverage point of control, we get sued.

13 SPEAKER: Bastards.

14 MS. WILLIAMS: By the people who told us
15 they wouldn't, "Of course, we're not going to follow
16 eminent -- we're not going to go that route. We're
17 trustworthy. We're going to be partners with
18 Vermont." Well, hey, it didn't quite go your way, did
19 it? So, we sued -- they sued us.

20 I would like to have some evidence, some
21 time that you guys give one bit of a damn about
22 anything any of us have to say, because I haven't seen
23 it yet.

24 MR. CAMERON: All right, Betsy Williams.
25 Michael Granger? Chris Myers?

1 SPEAKER: He's gone.

2 MR. CAMERON: Schuyler? This is Schuyler
3 Gould. Do you want to use this, Schuyler?

4 MR. GOULD: Thank you. Schuyler Gould of
5 the Vermont Yankee decommissioning audit.

6 In Section 3 of the PSDAR, Entergy
7 commenced to begin decommissioning when the nuclear
8 decommissioning trust funds, "Are adequate to complete
9 decommissioning and remaining spent nuclear fuel
10 management activities that the Federal Government has
11 not yet agreed or been ordered to reimburse."

12 This statement and others clearly makes
13 the assumption that Entergy has the right to use
14 decommissioning funds for spent nuclear fuel
15 management activities.

16 On May 20, 2009, Mr. Jay Faer, Entergy
17 Executive, was asked before the Vermont Public Service
18 Board, sworn testimony, "Would you also agree with me
19 that the definition of completion of decommissioning
20 excludes spent fuel management and site restoration?"
21 "Yes."

22 So, my question to Mr. Toomey, if I might
23 ask, when did Entergy's notion that -- and on what
24 basis did Entergy change its notion that fuel
25 management activities would be allowed to be charged

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to the decommissioning fund?

2 My question to the NRC is, where does it
3 in NRC regulations, say that it is appropriate and
4 legal for Entergy to use decommissioning funds for
5 spent nuclear fuel management activities?

6 MR. CAMERON: Mike, we're going to go to
7 Mike for the first question and then Doug, for the
8 second. Mike Toomey.

9 MR. TOOMEY: Thank you. The definition of
10 decommissioning under the Vermont Public Service Board
11 orders and the memorandum of understanding, and as far
12 as -- as long as Entergy has owned the plant, includes
13 spent fuel management, from the beginning, since 2002.

14 So, I don't know --

15 MR. SACHS: Why is there that loan?

16 MR. TOOMEY: I don't know what --

17 MR. SACHS: Why did you take out a loan if
18 --

19 MR. TOOMEY: Why don't you take a seat?

20 MR. SACHS: Why don't you take a seat?

21 MR. TOOMEY: Why don't you take a seat?

22 MR. SACHS: Why don't you take a seat,
23 Mike?

24 MR. TOOMEY: The issue of Mr. Faer's
25 testimony is -- I don't know the context. I don't know

1 what questions became before and after, and I need to
2 make sure --

3 SPEAKER: Just answer my question, please.

4 MR. SACHS: The answer is obvious.

5 MR. TOOMEY: I'd have to look at the
6 transcript, to see the context of the question, but
7 the overall decommissioning project absolutely
8 includes spent fuel management. That has to be done,
9 as part of the decontamination and dismantlement of
10 the plant, you have to deal with the spent fuel that's
11 onsite.

12 So, spent fuel management is part of the
13 decommissioning project, and it would be funded out of
14 the decommissioning trust fund, unless we're
15 successful getting the money from the DOE.

16 If we are successful in getting the money
17 from the DOE --

18 MR. SACHS: Which you are --

19 MR. TOOMEY: -- then there is no impact on
20 the decommissioning trust fund, other than a temporary
21 one.

22 What we have tried to do and we are
23 planning to do --

24 MR. SACHS: You're trying to pay the debt
25 with our money.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. TOOMEY: -- is on the decommissioning
2 trust fund for the next five years, for this
3 substantial front-loaded cost of the dry fuel storage
4 campaigns, we are trying to have no effect on the
5 decommissioning trust fund. By taking the lines of
6 credit out, we'll borrow the money, use it --

7 MR. SACHS: Thank you.

8 MR. TOOMEY: We're not invading the
9 principle of the trust fund for the first five years.
10 When the money comes back from the DOE, assuming we
11 get 90 cents on the dollar, which is the assumption we
12 made, that will be used to pay the lines of credit
13 off, and then it won't have an affect on the
14 decommissioning trust fund, other than the interest
15 costs, but that's function of the U.S. Government.
16 When you recover damages in a case like that against
17 the Federal Government, under the Constitution, you
18 can't recover interest. So, there will be an interest
19 cost.

20 But the principle cost will not affect the
21 decommissioning trust fund, and it was our effort to
22 allow that trust fund to grow and to get us closer to
23 the day when we can begin major dismantlement and
24 decontamination activities.

25 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. We're going to

1 go for your second question, Schuyler, to Shawn
2 Harwell from the NRC.

3 MR. HARWELL: Thank you. The second part
4 of your question was where is it in the regulations?

5 The nuclear decommissioning trust funds
6 were established for radiological decommissioning at
7 the site.

8 The licensees have an option to do co-
9 mingling. They can put other funds in the
10 decommissioning trust fund. However, those must be
11 clearly delineated and so, that the NRC can track the
12 money.

13 Now, to access that money, first and
14 foremost, we're concerned with the radiological
15 decontamination, decommissioning.

16 To access that money, the licensee has to
17 file an exemption request, at which point we will look
18 at the circumstances at hand, and decided whether
19 we'll allow that exemption for the licensee to take
20 out money for other activities.

21 We currently have a request under review,
22 and that's about as much as I can say.

23 MR. CAMERON: Sure, go ahead.

24 SPEAKER: I just wanted to ask about that.
25 I've read through the regulations and I understand why

1 there might be exemptions.

2 I mean, in some cases, they do anticipate
3 it, for instance, longer than 60 years of
4 decommissioning --

5 MR. CAMERON: Schuyler, apologies, but we
6 have to get you on the transcript.

7 MR. GOULD: Okay, sorry, thank you. Why
8 would the NRC grant an exemption? There is no
9 contingencies mentioned in the regulations which might
10 allow for an exemption? Why would you grant an
11 exemption and why should you grant an exemption?

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay, very clear. Shawn,
13 I'm bringing this back up to you, and I think Schuyler
14 was pretty clear about his two questions.

15 MR. HARWELL: Okay, to answer your
16 question.

17 When you have the decommissioning trust
18 fund, there are certain fees that go in establishing
19 funds.

20 So, if a licensee wanted to put in money
21 to keep it -- to grow, without having to pay extra
22 fees to different funds, to do the three elements, I
23 want to talk about three elements, radiological
24 decommissioning, spent fuel management, site
25 restoration.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, originally, the intent of the
2 decommissioning trust fund was for the radiological
3 decommissioning. That was our requirement, NRC
4 requirement. The licensee has the option to also put
5 in funds into the decommissioning trust fund, to pay
6 for those other elements.

7 Now, they can do it in different methods.
8 They can sub-account. They can create sub-accounts.
9 They can make sure that they track the money. It has
10 to be a line item, so that an analyst, like I, myself
11 can see where that money is going.

12 So, we take in -- the NRC takes into
13 consideration, when we see that money, we only want to
14 see the radiological decommissioning portion. That is
15 the requirement for us.

16 The others are more of a business strategy
17 to have to pay less fees to earn interest on a fund.
18 Does that answer your question?

19 MR. GOULD: No. So, the problem is that
20 --

21 MR. CAMERON: Okay, Schuyler, last one.

22 MR. GOULD: Okay, I'm still trying to get
23 an answer.

24 MR. CAMERON: I know.

25 MR. GOULD: So, you're telling me that the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 funds that are there were committed to radiological
2 decommissioning. I don't hear you saying that any of
3 those funds were put in a separate account or separate
4 accounting for spent fuel management.

5 So, why would any of those funds go into
6 spent fuel management?

7 MR. HARWELL: Sure. I think -- if I can
8 your name right, sir. Mr. Toomey?

9 MR. GOULD: No, Schuyler.

10 MR. HARWELL: Schuyler. No, I'm talking
11 to Mr. Toomey, over here.

12 From what I understand, the State of
13 Vermont and Entergy have an agreement where they see
14 decommissioning as more than radiological. It
15 includes spent fuel management as a process of
16 radiological decommissioning.

17 SPEAKER: Can we get a reference for that?
18 I never heard of it.

19 MR. CAMERON: You know, we really need to
20 go on. Could we talk? Could we talk later?

21 MR. BROADDUS: I can provide some
22 additional information, as well.

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay, why don't you go
24 ahead.

25 MR. BROADDUS: That might help clarify.

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay, go ahead.

2 MR. BROADDUS: There is another section of
3 the regulations that also requires licensees within
4 five years of their -- the end of their license term
5 or within five years of their plan to shutdown, to
6 submit to the NRC, an irradiated fuel management plan,
7 and it's their plan for how they expect in five -- in
8 that five year time period, you know, after they shut
9 down, how do they expect to pay for the cost of the
10 irradiated fuel management -- spent fuel management.

11 So, Entergy did submit an irradiated fuel
12 management plan to us, prior to -- five years prior to
13 their original period of the license term, which I
14 don't remember the exact date of that. But it's --
15 but their license -- they were in license renewal.
16 So, it would have been five years before they went
17 into that extended period.

18 So, and my recollection is, and we can get
19 you the specifics, but my recollection is that that
20 plan, they submitted at that time indicated that they
21 would come in and want to use -- they were planning to
22 use a portion of their decommissioning trust fund for
23 irradiated fuel management at that time, if there were
24 sufficient funds within the decommissioning fund to do
25 that.

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

2 MR. BROADDUS: And that's where -- there
3 is a tie within the regulations, but it doesn't
4 specifically say that -- you know, how that -- that
5 irradiated fuel management plan will be funded. It
6 just requires the licensee to tell us --

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you --

8 MR. BROADDUS: -- what they're going to --

9 MR. CAMERON: -- and again, if you could
10 get Mr. Gould that information, that would be helpful.

11 Ann Darling, Bill McKim, Francis Rod,
12 Michael Mulligan. Ann? How about Bill McKim?
13 Francis? Francis Rod? Michael Mulligan? Is this
14 Mike, in the yellow, okay. Okay, this is Michael
15 Mulligan and thank you for your patience. I know you
16 were here early.

17 MR. MULLIGAN: I'm Michael Mulligan from
18 New Hampshire. How many here are from New Hampshire?
19 That's not bad.

20 I would like to thank the police for being
21 here, and for the job they do, and I want to really
22 thank you a lot.

23 I was a reactor operator at the Vermont
24 Yankee. Got fired for raising safety issues. But the
25 job I did was basically moving water from one place to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 another. I mean, that's basically the job I did, and
2 so, maybe we need to talk about what are the places
3 where they have water.

4 One of the most dangerous -- one of the
5 most costly place that have water is in the condensate
6 storage tank. The condensate storage tank sits
7 outside the building. It's a huge tank. A lot of
8 radioactive water in there and stuff, and so, you
9 know, my major concern, the most risks would be that
10 tank.

11 The bottom of the tank, you know, had
12 leaks in the past. There is issues with having leaks
13 -- well, not now, but you know, they had leaks in the
14 past.

15 So, my question is, well, what happens in
16 five years when nobody has any heat and all that sort
17 of stuff, and you know, the tank has a chance, you
18 know, of icing over and stuff like that?

19 So, there's certain tanks in Vermont
20 Yankee. One of them would be of course, the torus.
21 The torus is a humongous tank and stuff. There is --
22 there is main condenser, which is another not so
23 contaminated water and stuff like that.

24 So, the question, you know, is what -- you
25 know, the separator up in the refueling floor, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 primary coolant pump. So, these guys got an idea that
2 they're going to not have heating. They're just going
3 to let that building be as-is, and I'm saying, what
4 are they going to do in the future, you know?

5 Minus 10 degrees or all that sort of
6 stuff, and you know, pipes can freeze with the frost,
7 frozen pipes and they get leaks and then there is all
8 sorts of corrosion type of stuff and so, you know, I
9 think the accident in the future is going to be one,
10 the torus is going to -- they're going to find a leak
11 in the torus one day, and they're going to go down in
12 the basement and the basement is going to be full of
13 water, and you think you had radiation problems -- or
14 contamination problems in the past. You ain't seen
15 nothing yet.

16 Same thing, like I said, the CST tank is
17 the most risk-full, I think tank there, and I think
18 they should get rid of the water, pipe off that tank,
19 maybe, you know, even kind of think about well, maybe
20 we ought to build a new tank. Big tank outside, maybe
21 a couple of different tanks, you know, different
22 radioactivity levels, and stuff, and you know, make it
23 so there is, you know, nice cement floor underneath
24 it, and new materials and all that sort of stuff and
25 probably, that would be the safest way.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I got a couple more comments. One is
2 Pilgrim Plant. Pilgrim Plant right now, Entergy owns
3 Pilgrim Plant. They're in deep trouble. They're in
4 a situation of basically, Vermont Yankee was three or
5 four years ago.

6 A lot equipment problems and you know, all
7 they're waiting for is one mistake, somebody kind of
8 tells a fib, and you're going to have Vermont Yankee
9 over again. So, there is -- there's a problem right
10 there.

11 One more thing is, the inspectors, the
12 inspector staff, the residents, their bosses and stuff
13 like that, you know, I'm an Irishman and you know, I
14 mourn things at times and stuff, and you know, I
15 always thought I was competitive with the NRC, we
16 didn't agree on a lot of things.

17 But what I realize now is we're not going
18 to have this staff around. We're not going to have
19 their bosses with, you know, deep education and deep
20 experience, and you know, I'm kind of sorry, I'm going
21 to miss them. Times, I didn't like them, but you
22 know, looking at it right now, they had a lot of
23 education and a lot of enlightenment to our community,
24 I think, and stuff like that, and we're going to miss
25 that education and thank you.

1 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Mike. John Ward,
2 Chris Williams and Andrew Larkin. John?

3 SPEAKER: I'm going to pass.

4 MR. CAMERON: Are you John?

5 SPEAKER: No.

6 SPEAKER: No.

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you.

8 MR. WILLIAMS: Chris Williams, I work with
9 the Vermont Citizen's Action Network, the Vermont
10 Yankee Decommissioning Alliance, and I'm a Board Chair
11 of the Nuclear Information and Resource Service.

12 But for a large chunk of my life, I was
13 consumer advocate working to protect consumers from
14 cost overruns and price gouging by regulating
15 utilities, and in that capacity, I had a lot of time
16 spent locked in rooms with utility companies and
17 Government officials, while deregulation was being
18 worked out, back in the late 90's and so forth, and
19 one of the recurring questions that myself and my
20 colleagues brought up was, this notion of the merchant
21 nuclear facilities and ultimately, the under-funding
22 or non-funding of the decommissioning funds.

23 Here we sit, some 20 years later, and what
24 I've been describing where we're at and where you're
25 at is basically the early stages of a train wreck, and

1 when I say that, I'm really saying it with all
2 sincerity.

3 I have been watching this for a long time,
4 lots of people have been watching it, and I'm sure
5 that you've been watching it, and whatever it's going
6 to take to prevent this train wreck of what, 44
7 potential units that are now merchant plants, Kewaunee
8 is the first car in the train, Vermont Yankee is the
9 second.

10 I would urge the Commission and the
11 utilities, as well as all the state jurisdictions
12 involved, to get on this soon and not -- not wait
13 until these things start careening off the track.

14 You know, in the end, when many of us who
15 are somewhat cynical, look at this, it looks like, you
16 know, ultimately there is going to have to be a
17 massive Federal bailout to get these plants cleaned
18 up.

19 But in the end, you know, we really can't
20 let these things just sit around and continue to
21 contaminate the sites and the surrounding areas, where
22 they're existing.

23 We've seen this coming for a long time.
24 I am certain that your financial analysts and other
25 people within your agency or your Commission have seen

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this, and you know, I would urge you to act sooner,
2 rather than later, to prevent the train wreck. Thank
3 you.

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, and John
5 Ward is our next speaker. Andrew Larkin, Lissa
6 Weinmann, Ned Childs and Gary Pontelandolfo. John?

7 MR. WARD: The first thing I'd like to ask
8 is if the people from Senator Leahy's office and
9 Senator Sander's office are still here? I don't see
10 them. I don't think so.

11 MR. CAMERON: I don't see them either.

12 MR. WARD: All right.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

14 MR. WARD: Because being from
15 Massachusetts, there is a lot that I cannot do. What
16 I can do is, I can go on record and say that our town
17 has asked for the continuation of the EPZ and also,
18 the continuation of the 15 minute notification, as
19 opposed to the 60 minute notification that has been
20 asked for.

21 The other thing that I wanted to ask for
22 here, and this is just myself, not as a representative
23 from a town or city or state, but this would be a very
24 good idea for all of you to keep in mind.

25 Arnie Gundersen was absolutely right, when

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 he said the AOG building should be removed and the
2 ground should be cleaned up under that, as soon as
3 possible.

4 We've known for a long time that there was
5 a Tritium plume moving from that area. The Strontium
6 has just been found in that well, because that is a
7 heavier element. It moves much slower. We could take
8 care of a lot of that contamination sooner, before
9 that plume moves, and save a lot of money.

10 I'd like to see that decommissioning fund
11 be spent as efficiently as possible, so that we can
12 get started sooner and get more done. Thank you.

13 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, John. Is Andrew
14 here? How about Lissa?

15 MS. WEINMANN: Hi. I'm getting a little
16 faded here after work, and then sitting. So, I'm not
17 sure what is going to come out because I don't have
18 prepared remarks.

19 But I will say that I think we're all in
20 this together. There is no national nuclear waste
21 policy. There is Yucca Mountain. There is not going
22 to be a Yucca Mountain. If there is a Yucca Mountain,
23 it's full already. So, there is no place to put this
24 stuff.

25 We had -- we're trying to deal with new

1 situations with old rules that do not serve us
2 anymore, and there has been Bills in Congress. They
3 go nowhere. But we know we need a new law, because
4 the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 really didn't
5 foresee all these problems. It didn't -- for instance,
6 we didn't foresee that spent fuel rods would be in
7 pools for 30, 35 years.

8 I mean, the pools were designed to hold
9 those rods for five years. We're in virgin territory
10 here.

11 You can say all day long that the spent
12 fuel pools are just as safe as the casks, but you know
13 the kind of discussion that goes on within the NRC
14 about that. You know what your outgoing Chairperson
15 said about spent fuel pools 12 years ago, that they
16 were in eminent danger because they were being
17 overcrowded, and beyond that, are not designed for
18 that purpose of long-term storage.

19 So, we know all this and we are all in it
20 together, and it's not Entergy's fault. Entergy is a
21 company. They want to make money. We all know, they
22 agreed to close the plant, but then they didn't close
23 the plant because the Federal law says they don't have
24 to, just like the Federal law says they don't have to
25 move the spent fuel right away. They could leave the

1 spent fuel there, if they so decide.

2 So, the MOU is worth nothing. I love the
3 feel-good feelings between us and Entergy and I hold
4 nothing against Entergy honestly, because we know
5 we're they're at.

6 What we need are new laws, okay, and I
7 don't understand why nobody talks about the nuclear
8 waste fund. Okay, you guys all know what it is. You
9 all know that there is about \$38 billion sitting in
10 DOE's Department of Energy nuclear waste fund. Where
11 is Department of Energy tonight? They're the ones
12 that are having responsibility for this long-term.

13 What about that \$38 billion that rate
14 payers have been paying into for the central
15 repository that will not happen?

16 Okay, everybody is talking now about
17 interim storage and that's still imperfect, I agree
18 with the speakers who said we need to treat this waste
19 storage facility, this high-level nuclear waste
20 storage facility, that we never banked on, that we're
21 completely unprepared for, we need to treat it like
22 it's going to be here forever, okay, because it very
23 well might be.

24 So, don't third-world cask us. Give us
25 what Europe and Japan had. Get the spent fuel pool

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 cleaned up pronto, because fires are a concern and you
2 all know it. That's why you agreed to do it quickly
3 and so did Dominion, okay, or else you wouldn't be
4 doing it.

5 Let's all work together to change law,
6 nobody is paying attention. We need to bring all the
7 host communities together, to sit down. You say --
8 you admitted tonight, as per McFarlane's comments in
9 the New York Times a month ago, you're in completely
10 new territory.

11 There is no provisions for merchant
12 reactors. This is all new stuff. You need to rewrite
13 the rules. It's going to take three or four years.
14 You're going to talk about it.

15 You know, we have to deal with this right
16 now, in this community. We're sitting with this
17 stuff. My kids are sitting with this stuff. We need
18 to treat it very seriously. It's a sacred
19 responsibility that our community is barring with no
20 perks, okay.

21 Blue Ribbon Commission. Oh, let's find an
22 interim storage facility and let's give them all kinds
23 of economic perks. Let's give them all kinds of
24 economic development perks. Let's give them more fire
25 fighters. Let's give them more police because we're

1 carrying this very, very important responsibility for
2 the whole rest of the nation here.

3 Okay, we are the interim storage facility
4 and we deserve a hell of a lot more than we're getting
5 right now. We're getting nothing right now.

6 You're suing DOE for the storage. What do
7 we get as a community? We deserve a whole lot more
8 and if we're smart, we're going to fight with other
9 communities nationwide, to change the law, to use the
10 nuclear waste fund for the most pressing issues first,
11 and we're going to get it done by working together,
12 not yelling at each other. Thank you very much.

13 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Lissa. Is Ned
14 Childs here? There is Ned, and Gary Pontelandolfo?
15 Gary?

16 MR. PONTELANDOLFO: Thank you.

17 SPEAKER: No, here is Ned.

18 MR. CAMERON: And last speaker would be
19 Sally Shaw and then I'm going to turn it over to Drew
20 to close up.

21 MR. CHILDS: Good evening. I'll try to
22 keep this brief.

23 It's -- there's been a lot of good
24 comments tonight, and call it a train wreck or call it
25 a -- the early end stages of a chain letter scheme, a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 ponzi scheme, it's kind of a fine mess, you know, and
2 you guys are sitting there presiding over it, and
3 maybe you didn't sell the first tickets, but it's not
4 looking very good.

5 My name is Edward Childs, the New England
6 Coalition, and we intervened, New England Coalition
7 intervened in the original operating license hearings
8 in the 1970's raising questions around the safety and
9 security of the temporary onsite storage of high-
10 level nuclear waste.

11 The at the time regulator, Atomic Energy
12 Commission, did not permit us to raise these concerns
13 in the hearing process, with the assurance that these
14 concerns were encompassed in generic studies and
15 agency determinations to be made.

16 In the NRC era, after or just before Three
17 Mile Island, the determinations matured into the waste
18 confidence rule, as you know, just for everybody else,
19 the NRC said it is confident, high-level waste can be
20 safely stored until removal to a national repository,
21 originally, that was going to be ready in 1998, then
22 it 2005, and now, as we are all discussing literally,
23 maybe never. Maybe in Finland.

24 Repack the deadly fuel where it sits,
25 every 100 years or so. That's the Commission casual

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 response. That's the best you can do, and now, you're
2 currently development an extended storage and
3 transportation regulatory program, including safety
4 and environmental analysis to support long-term
5 storage up to 300 years handling the spent fuel, and
6 the associated updates to the waste confidence rule
7 making.

8 So, Vermont, for all practical purposes,
9 is becoming a final national repository. I'm just
10 repeating things that were already said earlier, to
11 try to be less repetitive.

12 Anyway, the Entergy PSDAR said that an
13 additional site -- and additional pad, additional
14 ISFSI pad would be added in close proximity to the
15 existing pad, to expand the storage and allow for the
16 spent fuel assemblies to be stored.

17 Now, NRC authorizes storage of spent fuel
18 in two different ways, as you are aware, and if not,
19 then maybe you need to pay attention.

20 The first way is site-specific, that's 10
21 CFR Part 72 or a general license, a site-specific
22 application review safety and security, and requires
23 publication that notice for a hearing. Obviously,
24 there is some interest in a hearing in this location,
25 maybe not in Nebraska, and in this hearing, evidence

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is taken and testimony is given under oath, and
2 relevant disclosures must be made.

3 The alternative process, the general
4 license authorizes storage of spent fuel in casks
5 where a reactor has been previously licensed, and in
6 that situation, no formal hearing opportunity is
7 provided.

8 So, the New England Coalition is proposing
9 Vermont Yankee, as it's a merchant generator and for
10 various other reasons, is a special case and we would
11 like you to require of Entergy, a site-specific Part
12 72 ISFSI license application.

13 Several things make the Vermont Yankee
14 site unique. We don't know, in this case, the
15 financial aspects, whether Entergy is going to have
16 money when the time comes, to do this decommissioning,
17 some undefined term of storage and assurance
18 projections that have been given are at best,
19 fictional or non-existent, take that with a grain of
20 salt.

21 So, all right, we have, as it's been noted
22 earlier, houses and schools around, it's in a small
23 village. The five year cooling period, now we're in
24 the safe storage, might take you 50 years. You got
25 the merchant plant and they haven't look at any

1 alternatives to the environmentally sense of the site.

2 Therefore, we will appeal, in the next
3 several days, to the NRC Commissioners, I guess your
4 bosses, to require the more probing in-depth and
5 inclusive site-specific ISFSI license application
6 process.

7 We favor dry cask over wet pool storage.
8 It's not in our interest to delay and an environmental
9 impact statement was reasonably filed for license
10 renewal, and so, you should be able to do that with
11 little alterations.

12 So, justice demands a full and fair
13 hearing. Thank you.

14 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Ned. We're going
15 to Gary, and Gary, please introduce yourself to us.

16 MR. PONTELANDOLFO: Hi. I'm Gary
17 Pontelandolfo. I drove over two hours from Northwest
18 Connecticut to come up here, and I really appreciate
19 everyone who stayed so long.

20 We care. That's why we're here, and I'm
21 looking this way intentionally because I'm not sure
22 that all you fellows at the table up here do care.

23 That's interesting, because I was just
24 going to say there are so many acronyms in our world
25 today, that I get confused sometimes, and I just -- I

1 was thinking it was Not Really Cocky. In fact, I had
2 a disturbing incident, the more I think about it, the
3 more disturbing it is.

4 When I arrived here, I signed in two
5 cards, one to be here and one to speak, and there was
6 a gentleman who told me he was from the NRC that was
7 watching, and he actually spoke to me. I asked him a
8 couple of questions, and before I really came in and
9 settled down in here, I walked outside the side door,
10 had a cigarette, walked around the building and came
11 back in.

12 Five minutes later, I walked passed the
13 table and the gentleman was still there. I think it
14 was you, right? Am I recognizing you? Because you
15 didn't recognize me, and you wanted me to sign in, as
16 if I had just got here, five minutes after having a
17 conversation with me.

18 I really hate to think, though I kind of
19 do, that that's the kind of attention the NRC pays to
20 things.

21 Like I said, I'm from Connecticut. I've
22 lived in Connecticut all my life. I'm a member of the
23 People's Action for Clean Energy, otherwise known as
24 PACE, which has been around since the 70's.

25 There is a lot of people, all volunteers

1 in that organization in Connecticut, and we're paying
2 attention to what you're doing up here, because we're
3 hoping to close this up soon, and what's going on here
4 is going to set a precedent. So, we're paying
5 attention.

6 MR. CAMERON: Gary, can I get you to wrap
7 up, so we can go on?

8 MR. PONTELANDOLFO: Okay, one more thing
9 I'd like to say, and really, this is the most
10 important thing.

11 I'm sure there is people working within
12 the NRC, maybe some of you are here, who are truly
13 good people and want to do the right thing, and have
14 consciences that still operate will, and I'd just ask
15 if you would help those of us who mostly volunteer our
16 time, because we care so much about this, do what you
17 can from within the NRC, to try to hold their feet to
18 the fire. We need help, and last thing.

19 On the way up here I listened to the
20 radio. I heard the Who, "We Won't Get Fooled Again",
21 and I'm going to say, when I get home, I am going to
22 get down on my knees and pray that we don't let them
23 fool us again.

24 MR. CAMERON: All right, all right, thank
25 you, Gary. Sally?

1 MS. SHAW: My name is stakeholder, that
2 would be S-T-A-K-E-H-O-L-D-E-R aka Sally Shaw.

3 I'd like to start my comments with a quote
4 from the settlement agreement between Entergy and the
5 Vermont Public Service Department.

6 "Entergy Vermont Yankee shall make
7 appropriate filings with the NRC to obtain authority
8 to begin radiological decommissioning within 120 days
9 after it has made a reasonable determination that the
10 funds in the NDT are adequate to complete
11 decommissioning," etcetera, etcetera.

12 From the Public Service Board's final
13 order conditioning the license to continue until the
14 end of 2014, they say, "If the decommissioning trust
15 fund continues growing at its historic rate, the fund
16 could reach the \$1.16 billion in under 15 years," and
17 they also say, in that settlement agreement, they
18 repeat the thing that was said up above in the
19 settlement agreement.

20 But it says its site assessment study,
21 that their cost analysis suggests they might commence
22 decommissioning by the 2040's, which is not 15 years.
23 It's closer to 30.

24 Conversely, they say in the site
25 assessment study that they assume the Department of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Energy will start transferring spent fuel from the
2 site beginning in 2026, and complete removal of all
3 fuel by 2052.

4 At the time, decontamination and
5 dismantlement are scheduled to start, Entergy assumes
6 all spent fuel will have been removed from the site
7 and therefore, will not affect the decommissioning
8 activities.

9 Well, that means that the anticipated
10 start date for decommissioning would be 2052.

11 Elsewhere in the SAS, they say they base
12 their cost analysis on the maximum SAFSTOR period,
13 which allows them up to 60 years because that scenario
14 shows funding adequacy with the largest margin.

15 Under this last scenario, dismantling and
16 decommissioning of the plant would not begin until
17 approximately 2069, nor be completed until 2075.

18 So, much for openness and transparency.
19 I mean, in these various legal documents, they've
20 given at least half-dozen different estimates of when
21 they're actually going to start dismantling and
22 decontaminating the plant and the site.

23 I would love it if the NRC could give us
24 a date certain for start and completion date of the
25 decommissioning, but I know that is not in your job

1 description.

2 I'm wondering if in fact, you do need to
3 change the rules and whether you need a 2.802 petition
4 for rule making from one of us citizen volunteers, in
5 order to do that, because the situation is really not
6 fair to be affecting the community and the
7 stakeholders. That's my first question.

8 The second one -- may I? I'll be quick.

9 MR. CAMERON: We've got to be moving.

10 MS. SHAW: I'll be real quick. Some people
11 have gone on, and you know, I'm being as quick as I
12 can.

13 I have some standard comments to make, and
14 I would really like the opportunity, if you don't
15 mind. Thank you.

16 In 1991, a leak was discovered in the
17 drain line from the canister rack to the chemical
18 drain in the rad waste building. This leak
19 contaminated the soil under the concrete floor of the
20 lab, the volume of contaminated material was estimated
21 to be approximately 58,000 cubic feet.

22 Radio-nuclides associated with that spill
23 included cesium-134, strontium-90, iron-55. They
24 claim, this is from the SAS, that that location is the
25 only location on the Vermont Yankee site where those

1 radio-nuclides are known to have been released to the
2 environment. I don't believe that is true, because I
3 remember back during the tritium leak, when they did
4 some excavation of the trench, they found Strontium-
5 90, Cobalt-60 and iron in that trench. So, maybe they
6 took this quote in the SAS from an older study and had
7 neglected to include the fact that yes, we do know
8 that those ingredients, those radio-nuclides were
9 released during the tritium leak.

10 Anyway, it implies that what the NRC did
11 when the -- when this came to their attention was that
12 they approved the area as an onsite waste disposal
13 area under the requirements of NRC regulation 10 CFR
14 20.2002.

15 I found that really astounding, so that
16 when a nuclear plant violates their defense-in-depth,
17 when they violate their trust, and allow radio-
18 nuclides to leak in our environment, your response is
19 to say, "Oh, that's okay, we'll just change the
20 designation and call it a nuclear waste dump site."
21 That's kind of scary to me. I don't know if that's a
22 question or a statement, but it's kind of scary.

23 So, I want to know, this is a question,
24 what is going to happen to the Cobalt-60 in the
25 Connecticut River sediments, that Entergy admitted to,

1 before, as they were testifying before the Legislative
2 Committee on administrative rules in the Vermont State
3 Legislature? When will that be cleaned up? What will
4 happen to all the radioactive water Entergy plans to
5 transfer into the torus, to use as backup clean water
6 for the spent fuel pool, after that is dismantled?

7 Where is all this water going to go? Does
8 that get shipped to Texas, to be put into their
9 facility, or does it just get drained into the
10 Connecticut River? I want a specific answer.

11 MR. CAMERON: We're going to answer those
12 questions and then, thank you very much. Can we do
13 it? Answer the question?

14 MR. FERDAS: I can talk to the torus
15 question.

16 The torus will be used as part of the
17 SAFSTOR operations. When that is not needed anymore,
18 that water will be drained from the torus and taken
19 offsite to a processing facility.

20 There is no intention for that to be
21 released into the Connecticut River.

22 MR. CAMERON: And how about the
23 Connecticut River Cobalt questions, Bruce?

24 MR. WATSON: As part of their planning for
25 the decommissioning, I would expect that if the

1 historical records indicate that they had a release of
2 material to anywhere onsite, they could characterize
3 that area, to see what the levels are, to see if they
4 have to do any additional clean up work.

5 That's part of the normal process for
6 planning for decommissioning.

7 MS. SHAW: Is the river considered on the
8 site?

9 MR. WATSON: I don't know if it's in the
10 licensed part of the facility or not. I am just --
11 don't think it is, but it may be in by reference. I
12 don't know.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Sally, for
14 the questions, and I'm going to ask Drew, Senior NRC
15 official here, to close the meeting out for us. Drew?

16 MR. PERSINKO: I think folks are here to
17 -- I think we have this room until the absolute
18 latest, 10:00 probably.

19 But first of all, let me thank everybody
20 for your participation. I really mean that. There
21 was really good participation tonight. You gave us
22 numerous comments and you've given us a lot to
23 consider.

24 You know, as everybody was talking, I was
25 trying to take notes and trying to kind of group the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 comments, and you know, there were quite a few
2 comments in the emergency preparedness area, number --
3 lot of comments, I saw also in the financial areas,
4 the decommissioning trust fund area.

5 So, some questions in the environmental
6 relating to the GEIS, generic environmental impact
7 statement, questions came up, and the other area was
8 in the spent fuel area.

9 There was a number of questions, and there
10 were really two aspects of the spent fuel, as I see
11 it.

12 There was the -- there were spent fuel
13 comments made concerning movement of the fuel to the
14 ISFSI and the building of the ISFSI and things of that
15 nature, and then there were comments relating to the
16 permanent disposal of spent fuel.

17 You know, the permanent disposal of spent
18 fuel in this -- in the U.S. is really a national
19 policy issue and it's a bigger issue than just the
20 NRC.

21 So, it's not an issue that the NRC is
22 going to solve alone. It's a national policy issue.

23 So, we need to -- we will, we will look at
24 the transcripts. We'll look at your comments. We'll
25 digest them. It's going to take us a little time to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 digest them. We will group the comments and we will
2 respond as best we can to the comments we received,
3 and questions we received, and I believe the best
4 place for us to respond would be on our website.

5 But we will bin the comments in different
6 groupings and attempt to then respond to the comments
7 we received, and we will be considering these
8 comments, as we do the review of the PSDAR, as Doug
9 said initially, beginning of the meeting tonight.

10 One last -- couple last things I want to
11 say in my closing remarks are, just because the plant
12 is now shut down and is not operational, it does not
13 mean that the NRC is no longer involved.

14 The NRC will still be providing safety
15 oversight through licensing and through inspections,
16 and it really gets back to our mission at the NRC,
17 which is how I started the meeting, about protecting
18 health and safety, public health and safety.

19 I do want to assure you, there were a
20 number of comments made tonight about NRC and the way
21 we are doing safety.

22 I do want to assure you that we, at the
23 NRC, do take our safety responsibility seriously. We
24 really do. We do care, as somebody was saying. Thank
25 you very much.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay, and thank you, all.
2 I'll thank the panel, and we're adjourned. Thank you.

3 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
4 off the record at 10:20 p.m.)
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceedings
before the United States Nuclear Regulatory
Commission

Proceeding: Vermont Yankee Post-Shutdown
Decommissioning Report - Public Meeting

Docket Number: 05000271

Location: Brattleboro, Vermont

were held as herein appears, and that this is the
original transcript thereof for the file of the
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission taken
and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my
direction and that said transcript is a true and
accurate record of the proceedings.

Neal R. Gross

Official Reporter
Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701