

Memo to File: April 29, 2019

Attached is the transcript of the Annual Assessment Meeting for Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station held on March 26, 2019.



Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: 2019 Pilgrim Annual Assessment Meeting

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Plymouth, Massachusetts

Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2019

Work Order No.: NRC-0277 Pages 1-96

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

1	UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
2	+ + + +
3	2019 PILGRIM ANNUAL ASSESSMENT MEETING
4	+ + + +
5	TUESDAY
6	MARCH 26, 2019
7	+ + + + +
8	The meeting was convened in Hotel
9	1620, 180 Water Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts,
10	Donna Janda, Facilitator, presiding.
11	PRESENT:
12	ELISE BURKET, Senior Resident Inspector,
13	Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station
14	ANTHONY DIMITRIADIS, Branch Chief, Projects
15	Branch 5
16	DAVID LEW, Regional Administrator, Region I
17	BRUCE WATSON, Chief, Reactor Decommissioning
18	Branch
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	2
1	C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S
2	NRC Introduction and Opening Remarks
3	by Donna Janda 3
4	NRC Discussion of NRC Oversight
5	by David Lew and Anthony Dimitriadis 11
6	Public Q&A Session with NRC
7	NRC Closing Remarks
8	by David Lew
9	
10	
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

MS. JANDA: Good evening, everyone. We're going to go ahead and get started if everyone could take a seat. Hello and welcome to the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station annual assessment meeting.

My name is Donna Janda and tonight I'll be serving as the facilitator for this meeting. And Brett Klukan who is over in the corner to my right over there will be helping me out with this task tonight.

So here's how, before we do anything I just want to talk about exits really quick. If you could for a regular exit just use those middle doors. Is that okay, sorry, okay?

So just use those middle doors right there. The front doors and the back doors right there on the side are locked at this time.

But in the event of an emergency we have the doors on the side, the doors to the back and the doors to my left which are to the kitchen area and that can take you outside also. So in an emergency any of the doors.

But right now if you need to go out or use a restroom or you want to sign up to speak please use those middle doors right there. So here's how the

2.0

meeting is going to be structured tonight.

2.0

We're going to begin with the presentation by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission of the assessment of safety performance at the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station for 2018. The remainder of the meeting will be an opportunity for members of the public to ask the assembled NRC staff questions concerning performance issues at Pilgrim or to present comments regarding the same.

With respect to the second half of the meeting, on the registration table just outside the doors to the meeting room there's a sign up sheet for public speakers. When you register to speak you'll receive a ticket and the other half of which we collected in the container that's currently at the registration table.

The speaking order will be determined by the numbers that are pulled from the container and the intent of which is that the speaker order be at random. Just so you have some advance warning of when it's your turn to speak we'll be posting the numbers on the screen over here to my right as they are selected.

And I'd like to thank Matt and Pete over here to my left for assisting me with that. So if you

would like to speak this evening and haven't already done so please step outside through those middle doors and add your name to the list prior to the end of the NRC's presentation.

Once we resume with the second half of the

Once we resume with the second half of the meeting we're not going to add any more tickets to the container. But if you then decide you do want to speak, you know, and you register late you will have an opportunity to speak if the container has been exhausted and if time otherwise permits.

For your awareness, the meeting tonight is being recorded and a transcript will be generated after the meeting. Both the audio and the transcript will be posted to the NRC website.

So in light of that I would ask that when it is your turn to speak that you please identify yourself. And I would also ask for the sake of the audio recording that people not speak over each other.

I would ask also that we keep the area beyond the front row clear. If you have something that you would like to give to the NRC staff please hand it to me or to Brett.

Now for some basic ground rules, while recognizing that many of you have strongly held opinions concerning the matters to be discussed

2.0

1 tonight I ask that you nonetheless adhere to civil 2 decorum, that you respect each other. 3 So please do not disrupt each other. Just 4 as you wouldn't want to be interrupted during your 5 three minutes at the microphone please respect the speaking time of others. 6 7 Threatening gestures or statements will under no circumstances be tolerated and will be cause 8 9 for immediate ejection from the meeting. If you feel that you've been threatened please let me know or 10 11 please tell one of the NRC staff present at this 12 meeting. 13 So a few minor housekeeping matters. 14 restrooms are located through those middle doors and 15 they are straight across that hallway where the tables are for registration. 16 And as I mentioned already 17 where the exits are. 18 And while cameras are permitted please try not to obstruct the view of other audience members and 19 if you would be so kind to please silence your cell 2.0 21 phones at this time. 22 At this point I would like to offer

elected officials or any official representatives of any elected officials that are here tonight on their behalf the opportunity to stand and be recognized.

23

24

1	So is there anyone who just wants to
2	introduce themselves?
3	MR. MURATORE: Good evening. I'm Matthew
4	Muratore, State Rep for Plymouth.
5	MS. JANDA: Good evening.
6	MR. MURATORE: And with me is Kathleen
7	LaNatra, State Rep for the 12th Plymouth District that
8	includes Plymouth and Monica Mullen is here from Vinny
9	DeMacedo's office.
10	MS. JANDA: Thank you. Any other elected
11	officials who want to be recognized at this point?
12	Okay. So at this point I'm going to introduce the NRC
13	staff that's assembled on the dais here.
14	I will start with David Lew. Mr. Lew is
15	the Regional Administrator for NRC Region 1. Prior to
16	that he served as the Deputy Regional Administrator
17	for Region 1 and had been in that role since January
18	2011.
19	Prior to his appointment to the NRC Senior
20	Executive Service in February of 2004 he was a
21	resident inspector at Oyster Creek and Indian Point 2
22	and a senior resident inspector at Indian Point 3.
23	To Mr. Lew's left is Anthony Dimitriadis.
24	Mr. Dimitriadis is the Branch Chief of Project Branch
25	5 which is responsible for oversight of Pilgrim and

FitzPatrick Nuclear Plants.

2.0

Mr. Dimitriadis had previously served as Branch Chief of Projects Branch 1 responsible for oversight of Calvert Cliffs, Nine Mile Point and Ginna (phonetic). Previous to that he served as Branch Chief of Plant Support Branch in the Division of Reactor Safety managing inspections associated with security and emergency preparedness.

Mr. Dimitriadis has worked for the NRC Region 1 for 28 years and has previously served as an inspector and senior inspector. He graduated from Drexel University with a Bachelor of Science degree in Physics.

And to Mr. Dimitriadis's left is Elise Burket. Ms. Burket is the Senior Resident Inspector at Pilgrim. Prior to that Ms. Burket worked as a reactor inspector in the Division of Reactor Safety in Region 1.

Prior to joining the NRC in 2008, Ms. Burket served as a nuclear surface warfare officer in the U.S. Navy for seven years. She currently is a Lieutenant Commander in the Navy Reserves and serves as the officer in charge of her reserve unit.

She was recalled to active duty in 2015 for a 10 month deployment to the Middle East. And to

1 Ms. Burket's left is Mr. Bruce Watson. 2 Mr. Watson is the Chief of the Reactor Division 3 Decommissioning Branch in the of 4 Decommissioning, Uranium Recovery and Waste Programs 5 in the Office of Nuclear Materials Safety Safequards. 6 7 He has been with the NRC since March of 2004. He has extensive experience in decommissioning 8 of reactor and material sites and was the technical 9 10 lead for the license terminations at Trojan, Maine 11 Yankee, Rancho Seco and Big Rock Point. 12 Now let me turn it over to Mr. Lew, Region 13 1's regional administrator. 14 MR. LEW: Okay, thank you, Donna. First, 15 let me welcome everyone to the NRC's annual assessment 16 meeting. I recognize that the majority of you today 17 are most interested in making statements and asking 18 questions. And to be respectful of your time and your 19 interests Tony will make a presentation here that 2.0 21 should take less than ten minutes. Before I turn it 22 over we recognize that there is a great interest in 2.3 decommissioning. 24 As a result we have Bruce Watson who as 25 our Decommissioning Branch here, he will help answer

1 some of those questions. But we also have Ray Powell 2 who is one of my branch chiefs. 3 He is sitting in the second row here to 4 the left. And he will be responsible for the 5 oversight of Pilgrim once the plant shuts down. You may have met both gentlemen earlier in 6 7 January when they were in Plymouth to meet with the public on the post shutdown decommissioning activities 8 9 well present report as as to the Nuclear 10 Decommissioning Citizen's Advisory Panel. 11 And the information on those two meetings 12 are available on our website as well as YouTube. Unfortunately, we will not be able to answer specific 13 14 decommissioning question as it relates to Pilgrim's 15 license transfer as that is still under review and 16 pre-decision. 17 And as many of you know, there has been 18 contentions for which a hearing is requested and being 19 considered by the Commission. However, we will be 20 able to answer process questions as well as past 21 operating experience from decommissioned sites. 22 So with that I'm going to turn it over to 23 Tony. 24 MR. DIMITRIADIS: Okay, thank you, Dave. 25 Good evening, everyone. I will go through six slides

to discuss Pilgrim's performance in 2018. If you can 1 2 go to Slide 3. 3 Based on the inputs that I'm going to 4 present here the NRC determined that Pilgrim operated 5 safely in 2018 and showed performance improvement. It's also important to note that the site showed a 6 7 marked improvement in site safety culture. In reviewing Pilgrim's performance for 8 2018 we took into consideration all of the inspections 9 10 and noted that Pilgrim successfully met all of the 11 commitments outlined in the Confirmatory Action Letter 12 or as we say the CAL. I'll refer to that term later 13 on. 14 Also part of our assessment we reviewed a 15 number of performance indicators to evaluate how the 16 plant performed in the past year. So in 2018 Pilgrim 17 had no performance indicators that were greater than 18 green and additionally Pilgrim had no inspection 19 findings that were greater than green. 2.0 Therefore, we determined that Pilgrim 21 operated safely in 2018. We came to this conclusion 22 by following our process. 23 collected all of the inspection 24 information from the past year and in March of this

year we determined that Pilgrim's performance was

representative of Column 1 performance.

2.0

This determination was based on our, based on inspections as well as the five team CAL inspections. Next slide please.

To give some background on how we got here, in 2015 the NRC placed Pilgrim in Column 4 of the NRC's action matrix due to the identification of low to moderate or white safety findings and performance indicators.

The NRC's reactor oversight process action matrix basically has five columns that identifies the range of NRC and licensee actions where Column 1 is normal oversight where no additional oversight is required.

As performance of a plant declines in general its assessment can go into the action matrix from Column 1 to Column 5. As licensee's performance degrades the NRC may transition a plant in the action matrix from Columns 2 to 3 to 4 or to 5 where increasing additional NRC engagement is required beyond the normal inspection program.

In this case Pilgrim was placed in Column 4 back in 2015 and we began enhanced oversight which means a lot of additional inspections. Column 4 of the NRC's action matrix means that the plant while

safe to operate had reduced safety margins.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

And you can get more information about what Column 4 is all about in our Inspection Manual, Chapter 03035. Issues that contributed to this change in columns included their electrical switch yard ineffective reliability concerns and corrective actions specifically to address the multiple complicated scrams experienced at the plant in the previous years including one involving a failed safety relief valve.

This all pointed to a poor site safety culture which we define as the core values and behaviors resulting from a collective commitment by leaders and individuals to emphasize safety over competing goals to ensure protection of people and the environment.

Following Pilgrim's placement in Column 4 we performed a series of comprehensive diagnostic team inspections called the supplemental inspections as part of our review process for plants in this category.

These inspections provided an in-depth, independent review of what led to the decline of plant performance and assured continued safe operation. In 2017, we completed our supplemental inspections.

And that report was issued in May of 2017.

Later that year in August of 2017 we issued what I referred to earlier as the CAL, the Confirmatory Action Letter that outlined Entergy's commitments and the individual actions associated with each focus area which we independently evaluated through direct inspections.

In 2017 we saw progress and improvement in

In 2017 we saw progress and improvement in Pilgrim's performance. However, we had not yet determined whether this progress and improvement was sustainable in large part because there was a lot, there was remaining, there remained significant work to be done to address the underlying causes.

So despite observing improved performance we kept Pilgrim in Column 4 in 2017 or what we call the multiple repetitive degraded cornerstone column of the reactor oversight process. Next slide please.

This slide reflects what we did in 2018. In 2018 Entergy corrected all of the issues that led to moving Pilgrim into Column 4. For example, Entergy addressed and we closed all of the white findings the last of which was closed in June of last year, 2018.

We examined Entergy's actions by conducting five team inspections to evaluate such actions that Entergy implemented over the course of 14

2.0

We call these inspections the CAL follow up 1 months. 2 inspections that I referred to earlier. 3 And we completed the last of these type of 4 inspections on January 16th of this year, 5 Through these CAL inspections our NRC staff inspected and verified that all 156 action items, individual 6 7 action items were closed, complete and effective. Based on this work we determined that 8 9 has demonstrated sustained performance 10 improvement at Pilgrim in 2018, satisfactorily 11 completed the work necessary for us to close the 12 Confirmatory Action Letter and addressed the issues 13 that led us to placing Pilgrim in Column 4 including 14 the associated underlying causes. 15 As a result we have moved Pilgrim from 16 Column 4 to Column 1 of the action matrix. Next slide 17 please. 18 We committed a significant portion of our 19 inspection effort in assessing Pilgrim's safety 2.0 culture. Our inspections included focus groups, one-21 on-one interviews and direct inspections to verify 22 corrective actions. Based on these inspections we determined 23 24 that Entergy has indeed demonstrated a marked

improvement in safety culture. And this is something

1 that we think is very, very important which is why I 2 focused on it a little bit. 3 Over the course of 2018 we 4 significant improvement with respect to effective and 5 timely corrective actions. That's another piece of 6 that. 7 As part of the site's recovery plan Entergy took significant actions to train the site's 8 9 appropriate risk recognition management on 10 decision making. 11 For example, site procedures were revised 12 to ensure the risk of significant plant impacts, whether it is weather, equipment failures of changes 13 14 on the grid have been and are appropriately considered 15 during decisions related to plant operations and 16 maintenance. 17 Lastly, Pilgrim staff increased their 18 focus on effective and consistent use of human 19 performance tools through training and increased management observations of field activities which 2.0 21 helped reduce the number of human performance events. 22 Next slide, please. 23 And coming to our assessment we considered 24 the observations and insights from nearly 11,000 hours

of inspections at Pilgrim in the last year.

25

All

1 findings were of very low significance or as we say 2 green. 3 Performance indicators were all green with 4 improving trends. The frequency and significance of 5 equipment problems declined. As I mentioned in an earlier slide, our 6 7 assessment concluded that Pilgrim's actions to address the underlying causes were completed satisfactorily. 8 We arrived at this conclusion based on our independent 9 verification that all 156 actions in the CAL were 10 11 completed. 12 Based the sustained on improvement demonstrated Pilgrim was returned to normal 13 14 oversight, or as we say Column 1. Our oversight of 15 Pilgrim will continue through decommissioning. 16 slide, please. 17 We will continue our inspections with a 18 strong focus on safety and security until shutdown to 19 ensure that Pilgrim sustains its safety performance. 2.0 maintain strong oversight through We will 21 shutdown, decommissioning and fuel storage. 22 After Pilgrim shuts down and transitions 23 decommissioning level to we expect some 24 decommissioning activities to commence at the site.

Routine decommissioning inspections will be conducted

1 once the fuel is removed from the reactor vessel. 2 We will continue our inspections into the 3 decommissioning phase where we will examine areas such 4 as the licensee's safety reviews, spent fuel pool 5 safety, corrective action program, decommissioning performance and occupational radiation exposure just 6 7 to name a few. inspections 8 These are conducted by inspectors who have specialized training and have been 9 10 qualified in these core inspection procedures and are 11 managed by our Decommissioning Branch, Ray Powell 12 which is the Branch Chief within the Division of 13 Nuclear Material Safety. 14 This concludes my presentation. I just 15 want to turn it back over to Dave Lew. 16 MR. LEW: Thank you. You can just get 17 right into Q&A's at this point. Donna. 18 Okay, thank you, Dave. MS. JANDA: So 19 just a few comments before we begin with the second 2.0 half of the meeting. 21 As I noted as part of the introductory 22 remarks the speaking order will be determined by 23 numbers pulled from the container that was out in 24 front of the room, the intent of which is that the

speaker order be random.

25

So when your number is

called please queue up at the aisle microphone.

2.0

And if you need to have a microphone brought to you please just let us know, raise your hand and we will bring you the microphone. I do want to emphasize there is no prohibition against donating your ticket to others.

You are free to do so. However, both individuals must be present at the time the number is called and the donation must be announced at that time.

And if an individual has already spoken during the meeting as a result of someone donating their ticket to that person then that individual may also donate his or her ticket if called to someone else. But that individual may not use that ticket to speak again at that point.

And in an effort to give as many people as possible an opportunity to speak this evening please limit yourself to three minutes when speaking. There is a clock positioned at the edge of the stage that will count down three minutes for each speaker.

And at the three minute mark I will ask you politely to conclude. Note that the countdown clock will be paused if you ask a question in order to permit the NRC an opportunity to respond.

1	The clock will resume once you resume
2	speaking. So if possible, if you can just bundle your
3	questions together so then the NRC will have an
4	opportunity to answer all of your questions. Yes,
5	ma'am.
6	(Off microphone remark.)
7	MS. JANDA: Well there may be an
8	opportunity to ask additional questions after everyone
9	has had a chance to talk. So I think we'll
10	(Off microphone comment.)
11	MS. JANDA: I'm not sure actually at this
12	point.
13	(Off microphone comment.)
14	MS. JANDA: It's fine. That's fine. So
15	the reason why we do it in this manner is everybody
16	gets that opportunity to ask questions or make
17	comments.
18	And then if time is permitting we're going
19	to give people probably another opportunity with some
20	additional questions. But we really want to make sure
21	everybody has that opportunity to ask their first set
22	of questions.
23	Right now that is the plan, correct, yes.
24	(Off microphone comment.)
25	MS. JANDA: It's not. My understanding is

1 it's not working at this point. I apologize for that. 2 PARTICIPANT: Did you switch the people 3 that you normally hire to do this because we had it 4 for the last several meetings and I don't understand 5 why all of a sudden we don't have it. MS. JANDA: Yes, my understanding is we 6 7 did not switch. It's just there was some technical difficulty at this point with the closed captioning. 8 9 Okay, so before we begin with the public 10 speakers we will start with any elected officials or 11 their representatives who would like to speak or to 12 offer prepared statements. I do have a list here of 13 some that said they may want to speak. 14 from Senator Markey's office. 15 MS. CLARK: Thank you. A statement on behalf of Senator Edward Markey. For years Pilgrim 16 17 Nuclear Power Station has received the lowest operable 18 safety rating from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 19 Now right as Entergy prepares to shutter 2.0 the plant and sell it to new owners the NRC is saying 21 that all of the safety concerns have been addressed. 22 The surrounding community has earned its skepticism of Entergy's safety record and it is up to 2.3 the NRC to make sure the public is fully engaged and 24 25 briefed on this latest step in Pilgrim's process,

1 particularly as Entergy continues to receive 2 exemptions from the NRC on safety requirements and as 3 Entergy and Holtec work to get approval for their 4 plans to decommission the plant. 5 After the NRC's last public meeting here in January Senator Warren, Congressman Keating and I 6 7 wrote to the NRC asking them to address several 8 serious financial and environmental questions raised 9 by this community regarding the proposed sale of the 10 plant. 11 I am disappointed that the NRC felt it was 12 unable to offer a substantive response at this time. 13 This plant may be about to decommission but it will be 14 a part of this community for decades to come and this 15 community deserves to be heard. 16 I will continue to fight to ensure that 17 Pilgrim is held to the highest of safety standards 18 before, during and after the decommissioning process 19 and to ensure that this community's ongoing concerns are received and addressed. 2.0 21 I look forward to continuing to work with 22 the, engage with the NRC, Pilgrim owners and operators 23 and community stakeholders. Thank you. 24 MS. JANDA: Thank you. Hannah Benson from 25 Senator Warren's office.

1 MS. BENSON: Hello. I have a statement 2 here from Senator Warren. Senator Warren remains 3 extremely concerned about Entergy's management of 4 Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station as it moves towards 5 decommissioning later this year. disappointed in the 6 She is Nuclear 7 Regulatory Commission's recent actions that Pilgrim from a Column 4 station, the worst safety 8 9 rating a facility can have, to Column 1 without fully 10 considering the local community's safety concerns. 11 Since Pilgrim entered Column 4 in 2015 12 Senators Warren and Markey have sent six letters to 13 the NRC raising concerns about a number of ongoing 14 security issues at Pilgrim. 15 With the June 1st decommissioning 16 Pilgrim fast approaching and the license transfer from 17 Entergy to Holtec International under review the NRC 18 must take aggressive steps to hold Entergy and Holtec 19 accountable, prioritize safety and environmental 2.0 concerns and remain transparent with the community 21 about any actions regarding Pilgrim Nuclear Power 22 Station. Thank you. 23 Thank you. MS. JANDA: Michael Jackman 24 from Representative Keating's office. 25 Thank you. MR. JACKMAN: Congressman

1 Keating apologizes for not being able to be here tonight. He is in D.C. I am happy to be here to read 2 3 a statement on his behalf. 4 I have long urged the NRC to hold Entergy 5 to the highest inspectional standards so that the plant was not allowed to remain at the lowest level of 6 7 allowable operational safety as it approaches the cessation of power generation operations. 8 As the June 1st date is now just over 60 9 10 days away the decision by the NRC to move Plymouth 11 Nuclear Power Station from Column 4 to Column 1 is 12 welcome news but should not result in any reduction in 13 the NRC's careful oversight of the plant's operation. 14 believe it is also important 15 acknowledge the hard work of Pilgrim employees who 16 live and work in our community and who have a stake in 17 this plant's safe operation. 18 I will continue to work with them as well 19 as with my fellow state, federal and local officials 2.0 to hold the plant and its licensees accountable for 21 the safety of the residents of the Ninth District of Massachusetts. 22 Thank you. 23 MS. JANDA: Thank you. Matt Muratore for, 24 representing various state officials. 25 Good evening. MR. MURATORE: Thank you

1 all for coming out here again this year. My name is 2 Matt Muratore. I'm the State Representative for the 3 1st Plymouth District. 4 That includes the majority of the Town of 5 Plymouth. And with me is Representative Kathleen LaNatra from the 12th Plymouth District which includes 6 7 Plymouth, Kingston and surrounding areas. I'm here to read a statement and ask a 8 9 quick question. The statement is on behalf of the 10 South Shore Delegation, the South Coast Delegation, 11 the Cape Cod Delegation of State Representatives and 12 Senators. The Pilgrim Plant delegation of your state 13 14 reps and senators met. earlier today with 15 representatives from the NRC. At that meeting we were 16 briefed on the current status of the plant. 17 The delegation asked probing questions 18 about the change in status and about the closure 19 process including Holtec's financial stability. 2.0 delegation stands united in our efforts to 21 legislation to help ensure the prompt and 22 decommissioning of the power plant. 23 And the question we have is with the trust 24 fund in place and the Town of Plymouth just finalizing

a deal where they have two years of a pilot program

1	can the trust fund money be used, decommissioning fund
2	money be used to pay a pilot program, pay in lieu of
3	taxes?
4	PARTICIPANT: That's a good question.
5	Yes, taxes for property taxes are an indirect expense
6	that can be used, decommissioning trust fund can be
7	used for.
8	I'm not familiar with the pilot project.
9	So I really can't comment on that.
10	MR. MURATORE: What it is, is payment in
11	lieu of taxes so I think you've answered the question.
12	Thank you.
13	MS. JANDA: Thank you. At this point are
14	there any other elected officials or their
15	representatives who would like to speak or offer a
16	prepared statement?
17	MR. DORFLER: Assistant Attorney General
18	Joseph Dorfler on behalf of the Massachusetts Attorney
19	General's office. We don't have a statement at this
20	time but wanted to note our appearance. Thank you.
21	MS. JANDA: Thank you. So now we're going
22	to, we will start with our first speaker. We're going
23	to read the numbers across in the rows. And the first
24	person will be Number 15.
25	MS. DUBOIS: Thank you. I was 14, so
l	I and the second

1 Pine DuBois from the Town of Kingston and also the 2 NDCAP. 3 And my question really has to do not with 4 your recent decision to elevate Entergy's operations 5 to Column 1, that's fine. My question has to do with your oversight during the decommissioning process, 6 7 what you said would be robust. But I would like you to explain the 8 quidance that those inspectors will follow relative to 9 10 our changing environmental conditions. 11 When I was here in January I think I, we 12 had a little exchange about the way sea level is 13 rising and the impact that can have on the facility 14 not because of anybody's doing other than, you know, 15 our collective world view of things. 16 But sea level is rising. Storms are 17 increasing. Rain is falling harder. The ground water 18 will rise. The sea will rise. The so the question has to do really with 19 where is the NRC at, at not only helping the industry 2.0 21 but in your quidance for having rapid decommissioning 22 and clean up of these sites so that they can be 2.3 successful? 24 If you are delayed, if you do not adopt 25 construction measures that will enable the kinds of

1 work that you have to do, if you will instead and this 2 is the point I was trying to make in January, if you 3 will instead let everything wash everything out to sea 4 then in our minds and in our belief living here and 5 relying on that sea that's not an effective and robust clean up. 6 7 So where is the NRC quidance there? know, we just had, you know, the deluge in Nebraska, 8 you know, flooding some nuclear facilities. You know, 9 10 it happened in New Orleans. 11 Where is the quidance? It is not in the 12 SEIS and it is not in the GEIS. You have to implement 13 some. 14 So given the inspectors are there are they 15 going to run and hide or are they going to help adopt 16 some construction mechanisms that is going to make 17 sure that this decommissioning and the clean up is 18 successful? 19 MR. So there was a number 2.0 questions there. I understand your questions in terms 21 of how we deal with the change in flood heights. We 22 we have required licensees you know, 23 reevaluate the flood heights relative to the operating 24 plant.

We have confirmed through our inspector

1 that they are appropriately compensating for the flood 2 heights there. With respect to dry storage, you know, 3 we understand that pad is being moved up an additional 4 50 feet higher. 5 Generally when we look at our oversight we do look at impacts on environmental, impacts on the 6 7 particular facility and we will be inspecting It's not specifically written in a 8 accordingly. 9 specific SER. 10 But it's a part of what we review relative 11 to changes in the environment. 12 MS. DUBOIS: To clarify, I quess, I think 13 that generally speaking your quidance, as in a lot of 14 construction guidance, is very exact. And it is very 15 determinative of what tools and methods should be used 16 in any sort of construction effort. 17 I do not know where that exists here. 18 suspect that it does not exist. And what I am asking 19 and I'm not necessarily asking, Mr. Lew, for you to 2.0 tell me right now today, I am asking that you direct 21 your energies to address this major concern that is well 22 affect Pilgrim as to as the 23 facilities in the country. 24 MS. JANDA: Thank you. The next speaker 25 will be Number 7.

1 MS. LAMPERT: Yes, Mary Lampert speaking 2 for Pilgrim Watch. I'll do it as quickly as I can. 3 The question really is how did Pilgrim, 4 even though you tried to explain, go from 4 directly 5 to 1 skipping any intermediate steps which I think would have been a little bit more believable? 6 7 the decision is Ι think more of political decision not based on its performance. 8 9 seems clear to me that once again NRC commissioners, 10 not the staff are once again acquiescing to 11 industry's push for fewer inspections 12 letting industry self-assess plants the its 13 performance and cut back on what it tells the public 14 about plant's problems. 15 Commissioners The NRC industry and 16 representatives, NEI, say changes in oversight are 17 warranted to reflect the industry's overall improved 18 safety records. And how would NRC show improved industry 19 2.0 records to justify essentially a hands off policy 21 giving out green findings across the board in the 22 ropes that would show a justification for this policy? 23 And of course we know however, 24 deregulation hands off from the NRC in this case would

compromise safety. And with an industry that can have

1 huge consequences that's a very bad idea. 2 We have seen it in this administration 3 whether it's FAA, whether it's EPA, across the board 4 to deregulate. 5 Another high priority of NEI's Christmas list to the Commissioners was to eliminate press 6 7 releases about low level, so to speak, safety issues at plants meaning the kind of problems that could 8 trigger more inspections and oversight at a plant but 9 10 not constitute an emergency. 11 That's to save money for the industry. 12 The industry group also asked that NRC reduce the 13 burden radiation protection of and 14 preparedness inspections. 15 All of this was laid out by the Associated 16 Press in a March 15, 2019, report and they have a 17 hyperlink in that report to the September 19, 2018, 18 NEI letter to NRC regarding the rope and allowing 19 essentially self-assessment. 2.0 And so I think you all have done a good Brian Sullivan is far, far better as a VP than 21 22 we've seen here in a very long time. But it's the 23 Commissioners that I'm very concerned about. 24 LEW: Thank you, Mary. Just for 25 clarification, the decision to move Pilgrim from

1 Column 4 to Column 1 was not a Commission decision. 2 It was a decision made by the Commission 3 And just to be clear, you know, all of the 4 plants that have been in Column 4, you know, the way 5 we approach things is we call it the way we see it whether it was placing Pilgrim in Column 4 in 2015 or 6 7 taking them out at this point. And most plants have actually transitioned 8 9 to Column 1, in fact. And those that did not the 10 reason that they did not typically is because they 11 still have an existing greater than green input, an 12 existing white or existing yellow. In this case Pilgrim does not have an 13 14 existing input and in fact since we have put them in 15 Column 4 there was no greater than green or very low 16 safety significance, no greater than green performance 17 indicator or finding. 18 So it was appropriate for us to transition 19 from Column 4 to Column 1. Another thing I just want 2.0 to add. I know I'm talking to much. 21 The other thing I want to add is one of 22 the things that we, approach that we do is we want to 23 ensure that they address the underlying conditions of what drove the performance decline back in 2015. 24

And so you saw that.

25

Last year we saw

1	improvement, progress and improvement but we weren't
2	ready to say it was sustainable. This year we
3	continue to see progress and improvement.
4	They have addressed the underlying issues.
5	And so there's been a history through the CALs that we
6	have issued as well as other documents.
7	And our goal is really to ensure that
8	these plants do not jump in and out of Column 4. We
9	want them to address the underlying issues and for us
10	to have a level of confidence before we take them out
11	of Column 4. We call it the way we see it.
12	MR. LAMPERT: Jim Lampert, Duxbury.
13	MS. JANDA: Excuse me, Mr. Lampert, you're
14	Number 8 just to be sure?
15	MR. LAMPERT: I am.
16	MS. JANDA: Okay, thank you.
17	MR. LAMPERT: That's what it says in red.
18	I want to pick up where my wife left off a couple of
19	things.
20	First off, the reasons the industry gives
21	for wanting to back off that things are too burdensome
22	and it gives them problems with the SEC I trust the
23	NRC would agree are no reason at all to back off
24	making the types of inspections you ought to be
25	making.

1 However, there are examples of backing 2 off. And probably one of the clearest decommissioning 3 rule if you want to look at 4 burdensome. The basic justification for what looks 5 like it's probably going 6 to become the final 7 decommissioning rule is this is costing Entergy and the NRC just too much time and we're going to save 8 9 time for the public who before has spent time getting 10 into things, never had any success but now they won't 11 have to waste their time and money and effort. 12 Looking forward I'm concerned about 13 inspections. Pilgrim moved from 4 to 1. They did so 14 because they had a good vice president, and I am glad 15 change, and because you had for lot οf 16 inspections. 17 What's going on get to as we 18 decommissioning? Resident inspectors are going to 19 There aren't going to be resident any 2.0 inspectors anymore. 21 We all know what happens when you put too 22 much out to "self-regulation". And if you think of it 23 look at Max 8's and Boeing. 24 There are going to be a lot of things 25 happening over the next 45 years that are going to be

1 very important to people who live around here and I'm 2 not going to be here for the next 45 years but heaven 3 knows a lot of our, now I'm taking to groups children 4 and grandchildren will be. 5 So let me ask just three or four questions. Will the NRC be there when fuel is being 6 7 moved from the reactor into the spent fuel pool? 8 Will you be there when it goes from the 9 spent fuel pool into dry casks and eventually when 10 it's moved off site? Will you be there at the end 11 when somebody goes around and tests to see whether the 12 place is really clean? I have no idea who at Holtec or at their 13 14 partner, Lavalin has any near the competence or 15 experience that Entergy finally stepped up to at the 16 tail end here. 17 Holtec has never decommissioned anything 18 in its life. Lavalin has never decommissioned 19 anything in the United States. And let's face it, it 2.0 had problems doing what it thought it knew how to do 21 out at Santa Nofre (phonetic). 22 And its overall reputation in the world 23 for doing the job and doing it honestly is not 24 particularly great. So my final question and I quess

it's to Tony is, you talked about increased oversight.

1	I think what we need to know and we need
2	to know pretty close to right now is specifically what
3	oversight, what inspections? What are you going to do
4	to keep track of what is going on during
5	decommissioning when it's run by people who have never
6	done it before?
7	MR. LEW: Thanks, Jim. So I'm going to
8	ask our Decommissioning Branch Chief, Ray Powell to
9	answer the questions associated with decommissioning.
10	As he's getting up I just want to clarify
11	that relative to the question of will the NRC be there
12	when they move the fuel from the reactor vessel to the
13	spent fuel pool, that will still be under Tony's
14	responsibility.
15	He will still have residence on site to
16	observe the movement of the fuel from the reactor
17	vessel to the spent fuel pool. At that point once we
18	get a, I would expect the entity to provide us a
19	letter certifying that they have removed all of the
20	fuel from the reactor vessel.
21	At that point then it goes over to Ray
22	Powell who has the responsibility for the inspections.
23	MR. LAMPERT: After that the resident
24	inspectors are gone, correct?
25	MR. POWELL: Well let's talk about that.

1	MR. LAMPERT: And also a question just a
2	little layer we talked about the first transfers.
3	There are at least three more of spent fuel by the
4	time you get stuff out of here long after I'm dead.
5	MR. POWELL: Okay. Let me start at the
6	beginning. As Dave mentioned, yes, we will be
7	watching them unload the vessel into the pool. I've
8	coordinated with Tony already.
9	We'll have one of my inspectors who are
10	ASFC (phonetic) qualified even though it's not an ASFC
11	loading campaign they are very familiar with fuel
12	movements. They will supplement the resident
13	inspector.
14	So, yes, we will be there. With respect
15	to when it comes time for what I call an extended
16	offload loading campaign I can't tell you that we're
17	going to watch every cask.
18	We will pick and choose and we will be on
19	site monitoring the activities. And I know you had a
20	third question and it's escaping me.
21	MR. LAMPERT: The next move we've got it
22	into the casks. Eventually we have to get it off site
23	probably in new casks or new packaging. What's your
24	involvement in oversight of that?
25	MR. POWELL: You know, that's in the

1	future and a policy question. I don't know if you
2	have any more information on that then I would on
3	that, Bruce.
4	MR. WATSON: Yes. This is Bruce Watson.
5	In the future we would be there to monitor and inspect
6	the transfer of that fuel just like we do low level
7	waste today.
8	So those programs would have to be
9	developed along with when the DOE or if it turns out
10	to be a private consortium at this point to an interim
11	storage those types of containers and to make sure
12	they're properly packaged and shipped.
13	Right now the dry storage containers are
14	designed to be transported. And so we would expect
15	that.
16	I wanted to add one more thing. Part of
17	your question was who is going to verify that the site
18	was cleaned up. That will be the NRC.
19	If you look at what we're doing right now
20	at the Zion Plant, Lacrosse Plant and Humboldt Bay
21	which is what we've been doing since Day 1 with large
22	decommissioning projects, is we employ an independent
23	contractor.
24	Right now it's Oak Ridge Associated
25	Universities, also known as ORISE, Oak Ridge Institute

1 of Science and Education. They do perform independent 2 surveys for us. They sample the soil and everything else, 3 4 survey the areas to verify that the licensee has met 5 the requirements that's going to be in their license termination plan. They also operate a world class 6 7 laboratory for us and for the Department of Energy. 8 And so we have, we use that as 9 comparison benchmark for all radiological or 10 measurements. So I think our program in that area is 11 quite extensive. 12 There's an inspection procedure on it. 13 It's publicly available on our website too. 14 think between our NRC inspectors and our supervision 15 of our contractor we have a very good program that 16 will verify that the sites are cleaned up. 17 As you know, we've done ten of these sites 18 and we're expecting to terminate both Zion 1 and 2, Lacrosse and Humboldt Bay probably by, I'm going to 19 2.0 say mid 2020, okay. So we'll have 14 in the bank. 21 So, thank you. 22 MR. POWELL: And I think the last part of 23 your question was there an inspection presence, what 24 I can tell you is it will be commensurate with the 25 level of activity at the site.

1	And to give a more concrete example than
2	just those words, if you look at what BY (phonetic) is
3	doing they have now entered active decommissioning.
4	I basically have an inspector on site for all key
5	activities.
6	And right now it's averaging about one
7	week a month. If it needs to be more it will be. If
8	it needs to be less we'll adjust.
9	The contrary would be someone like Crystal
10	River 3. They are in safe store. They haven't done
11	anything in quite some time other than some rad waste
12	shipments.
13	So we go down there about twice a year
14	because that's commensurate with the level of activity
15	at the site. And all this is spelled out in
16	Inspection Manual, Chapter 2561.
17	Understand, but it will give you
18	references in that to the procedure Bruce referenced
19	and the information though, understand, but it is
20	readily available.
21	MS. JANDA: Okay. The next speaker is
22	Number 3.
23	MS. TURCO: Hi. Diane Turco with Cape
24	Downwinders. It's my understanding that multiple
25	repetitive degraded is kind of what Column 4 is all

1 about.

2.0

2.3

So I don't know what planet you're on because what I'm reading is something very different and it's from your reports, okay. Pilgrim's repeated shutdowns are costly.

This is from 2018. They lost \$63 million in 57 days. That equals a poor safety culture. They're not going to put money into fixes.

They aren't and it's being proven by these shutdowns because of degraded equipment. We also see ongoing problems with valves, parts being installed backwards.

Valve closure causes an automatic shutdown at Pilgrim. Pilgrim powers down a day after favorable report. A fleet-wide order to prevent willful misconduct issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to Entergy because of willful misconduct.

And that happened at Pilgrim when a worker did not do his rounds and falsified the records.

That's not the first time. It's happened may times.

So now the whole fleet has an order to put a plan together to prevent willful misconduct. And then hundreds of Pilgrim tasks were downgraded. They went from, they were reduced because of a backlog of work from adverse to non-adverse.

1 That was in 2018. You can't tell me 2 Pilgrim is now in Column 1. These are from your 3 reports. 4 Specifically, 2018 Entergy personnel 5 failed to implement work order requirements feedwater regulating valve. That caused the scram. 6 7 That's happened many times, okay. Entergy did not take effective corrective 8 9 actions to address issues in а timely manner 10 commensurate with their safety significance. Entergy 11 should still be in Column 4. 12 And why you moved them up to Column 1, I 13 mean maybe, you know, maybe you're miracle workers or 14 something. But the reality is it should have stayed 15 in 4. It's still a threat to our communities. 16 17 Last thing, January 4th was a scram, loss of off site 18 We know that happens during many storms and 19 Pilgrim scrammed. 2.0 We wanted Pilgrim to be shut down. Their 21 procedures are to shut down early but they don't 22 follow procedures and you don't enforce them because 23 they're not regulations. 24 And you actually said when you inspected 25 that you said, let's see, Entergy had a documented

1 difficulty following, the inspectors also determined, 2 "it was not reasonable to foresee or correct the cause 3 during a storm". 4 So if operators cannot foresee the loss of 5 off site power during a predicated and reported severe storm they shouldn't be operating a nuclear reactor. 6 7 And you're not doing your job. 8 we're calling on the NRC to 9 abolished just like the Atomic Energy Commission. And 10 be replaced with an authority that 11 transferred to federal and state intergovernmental 12 agency independent of the nuclear industry including 13 representation by state and local stakeholders who 14 will have full authority for public health and safety 15 for their communities. 16 Diane, I wasn't sure whether MR. LEW: 17 But I will those were statements or questions. 18 address a few things, if I may. 19 is those are issues 2.0 identified and were in the NRC report. And so just to 21 give you a little bit perspective in terms of how we 22 come to some of the conclusions and so forth, you 23 talked about the January trip, January 2018. 24 So it was about 14 months ago. And our 25 conclusion was that was an issue that was caused by

1 something miles from the plant, not owned by Entergy. 2 When we look at that particular issue and 3 we look at the switch yard I think over the years in 4 response to what we have provided oversight is, and 5 one of the bigger contributors into the, being, Pilgrim being placed in Column 4 was the 6 7 vulnerability of the switch yard. In that case it was not caused by the 8 9 switch yard. That was caused by something outside the 10 switch yard. 11 And the modifications that thev 12 implemented, the procedures, the processes, the human 13 performance in fact improved the robustness of the 14 Pilgrim switch yard. In fact, there were no scrams 15 that were caused by the Pilgrim switch yard in the 16 last three winter seasons. 17 And they went beyond that. And just to 18 give you a sense of why we think the safety culture 19 improved and the conservative decision making. 2.0 engaged Eversource, the company that owned the grid 21 and the equipment. 22 They worked with them in terms of ensuring 23 that the lightning lines that caused the trip was 24 addressed more holistically in terms

inspections and so forth. So that's just a piece of

1	what that reflects.
2	And also I will offer that we don't look
3	at how much money they lose or not. In some cases if
4	they're shutting down they are shutting down to fix
5	things.
6	And that, and from a safety point of view
7	that is in my mind not a bad thing.
8	MS. TURCO: The off site line was based on
9	Entergy's procedures to shut down if there's a
10	possibility of loss of off site power, not the switch
11	yard but loss of off site power.
12	And that storm was advertised all over the
13	news, the National Weather Service loss of power to be
14	predicted in this area and they didn't shut down.
15	MR. LEW: Yes, so, you know
16	MS. TURCO: So they didn't follow the
17	procedures. But the issue is you can't enforce them
18	following their procedures. If it was a
19	MR. LEW: No, I would disagree. They did
20	follow their procedures. And we can get into
21	MS. TURCO: Okay, no. I'll show you the
22	procedures, yes.
23	MR. LEW: more of a discussion on this.
24	MS. JANDA: Okay, thank you. The next
25	speaker will be Number 4.

1 MS. DICKINSON: Good evening. My name is 2 Elaine Dickinson and I am also with Cape Downwinders. 3 And with the closing of Pilgrim the most 4 pressing issue today is how to deal with the 5 radioactive waste in a manner that keeps with the protecting and 6 NRC's mandate of people the 7 environment. Selling Pilgrim to Holtec produces so many 8 unanswered questions. The casks, all casks are not 9 10 created equal. Thin, cheap casks are not as robust as 11 the thicker casks used in Europe. 12 Moving the waste to an area across the 13 dangerous opens more scenarios with 14 potentially devastating accidents. Putting the waste 15 in indigenous communities that do not want it is 16 racist. 17 And remember just because Holtec says they 18 will accomplish the decommissioning in a very short time wouldn't it be foolish to think that haste is 19 2.0 best when dealing with this potentially lethal 21 material. 22 In '75, 1975 the Atomic Energy Commission 23 was abolished by an Act of Congress. A new agency was 24 created, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, your

agency with the mandate of protecting public health

1 and safety.

2.0

As your website banner says, protecting people and the environment. The citizens demand you uphold your mandate or be abolished as your predecessor was and replaced with an agency that will.

By transferring Pilgrim's license to Holtec, a company that has never decommissioned a reactor before and which is joining with SNC-Lavalin, a Canadian company under investigation for corruption and bribery, seriously I ask you how can you uphold your mandate by transferring the license to such a company?

If there was no suitable company to do this dangerous work why not allow Entergy to do the decommissioning and take care of the waste that they have produced? The community is watching.

MR. LEW: So I take that as a statement?

MS. DICKINSON: That's a question. Is that a consideration? We've been to these decommissioning Commission meetings and it sounds like it's a done deal that Holtec is going to get it.

MR. LEW: Well again, I guess, you know, I think as I stated in the beginning we are not, it was under review. It's pre-decisional. Also there was contentions associated with that issue.

1 So we won't be answering those questions 2 that are directly related to the license transfer. MS. DICKINSON: Well I'm just giving you 3 4 things to think about then. Thank you. 5 MS. JANDA: Thank you. Next speaker will be Number 19. 6 7 MR. GARRITY: Good evening. My name is John Garrity and I was the recovery manager at Pilgrim 8 9 as we came through this series of inspections. 10 And if you remember last time we were here 11 I got asked the question why was it going to take so 12 long for Pilgrim to return to Column 1. And I 13 explained that it was going to be a systematic very 14 detailed process of inspections that we would follow. 15 That we were scheduled to come back to 16 Column 1 right about this time frame. 17 explained that we as Pilgrim Station were taking 18 ownership of our problems which meant we had to work 19 very diligently on our culture which is our core 2.0 values. 21 One of our core values which is just 22 unmistakable is safety. So the NRC made sure that not 23 only did we solve our technical issues which were 24 relatively easy to show compared to our cultural

issues, and then they made sure that we took the time

1 to understand and correct the underlying root causes 2 of these issues. That took a lot of time. And I personally 3 4 was involved with all five inspections. And I can 5 tell you those inspections were not performed by politicians. 6 7 They were performed by engineers. And if you deal with engineers they deal with facts. 8 dealt with the facts. We dealt with the causes. 9 And then at the very last inspection was 10 11 our safety culture inspection. And that one took the 12 longest because it's the hardest. 13 It's very hard to prove to people that you 14 care about safety, that you understand you own the 15 issues and that you, us were responsible for creating 16 them, correcting them and making sure they didn't come 17 back. 18 So I feel proud of the people that worked 19 on that project. I'm very confident that we corrected the issues. 2.0 But I'm more confident that we learned how 21 22 we got there so that we will not go there again. 2.3 thank you very much. 24 MS. JANDA: Thank you. The next speaker 25 will be Number 17.

MS. CORRIGAN: Hi, Joanne Corrigan (phonetic). I live here in Plymouth. I can actually ride my bike down to the power plant. I have a couple concerns.

And apparently there are those of us who are skeptical that Pilgrim went magically from Column 4 to Column 1. And I have a problem with trying to believe that since their corrective action plans that they've had over the years they've failed this, this didn't work, they didn't know how to fix it.

And they didn't give them six months, a year, whatever to fix it. You guys gave them get to it when you feel like it which is why a lot of stuff never got done.

I was in the, I was an (inaudible) tech for 45 years. We had hospital inspections. If JCAHO finds out something was wrong, that we were doing something in any part of the hospital we had a corrective action plan with a set time frame which these guys never got which is why a lot of stuff didn't get done.

They have a laundry list of failures over there starting with the operators failing your own proficiency test, the equipment malfunctions numerous, the repairs not done or done incorrectly and the

2.0

1 falsification of their medical physicals. That was a 2 good one. 3 So the violation of their inspections and 4 so many failures over so many years only resulted in 5 a pass or a slap on the wrist by the NRC. really expect us to believe that Pilgrim went from 4 6 7 to 1 in a short time as if by magic? Which leads me to believe that apparently 8 9 Entergy hired Dumbledore and the Wizard of Oz and 10 that's how it got done. But there's one problem over, 11 after the other over there not to mention the nitwit 12 decision to put the casks next to the ocean. 13 What on earth were they thinking? 14 didn't have to have big studies done. Just come down 15 in any Nor'easter stand at the step end of Priscilla 16 That wave comes up those 12 steps into the 17 street across the parking lot into the street. 18 And they put those casks so close to the 19 with an area where we have Nor'easters, 2.0 hurricanes, full moon high tides constantly and not to mention the sea level is rising. 21 22 So and then now they're going to put them 23 along Rocky Hill Road so the terrorists can see the 24 targets they need to hit with their RPGs. 25 history of Pilgrim So the past

1 indicative of the lack of interest and concern to keep 2 us safe. Thank you. And thank you. I understand 3 MR. LEW: 4 your skepticism. I would maybe offer this for you to 5 consider and something that we look at. It's beyond just having all the actions 6 7 that were done under the Confirmatory Action Letter as well as the effectiveness review. But when I take a 8 9 step back and I take a look in the last two years 10 there were two scrams at Pilgrim. 11 One was outside their control, equipment 12 that was miles from the plant and not owned by the 13 But those two scrams, and one was 14 equipment failure. 15 But that's not abnormal in terms of what 16 you see in other plants consistent with Column 1. But the more salient piece of it is when the plants did 17 18 scram and you look at the response the equipment 19 worked the way it should have. 2.0 Processes and procedures were followed. 21 Performance of the operators were good. And that's an 22 important data point, you know, in terms of how the 23 plant responds to the scram. 24 And I just share that with you to sort of 25 contrast that to 2015 when they had the scram and they

1 had a safety-related valve that did not work as it 2 should have. That there were risks, important 3 equipment that did not respond the way they did. 4 The command and control was not as strong 5 as it should be. So that's certainly an indication in terms of how they addressed those issues and looking 6 7 at how the plant responded. So, you know, certainly I just share that 8 as a data point for you to consider. 9 10 Well Pilgrim did not do MS. CORRIGAN: 11 what it had to do when it was generating and making 12 money and making electricity. So I can't imagine when it goes offline how all of a sudden it's going to have 13 14 this big concern to keep us safe. 15 In March, we knew about those storms. Ιt 16 was, March was one storm after the other last year. 17 The third of March we had a huge nor 'easter storm. 18 I went all the way to 495, nobody had 19 I came down here to get to 495 and I couldn't 2.0 even get down Rocky Hill Road there were so many trees 21 down. 22 I got to the light here. All the power 23 The only reason I got out of here was was out. 24 through that little side road you have going to 3A and 25 that's only because I have a little standard and I

1 went off road into the mud and snow to get out of 2 there. And Entergy claimed they didn't lose off 3 4 site power. They didn't lose any power at all. Well They must have their own power source 5 that's funny. because none of the street lights were working and 6 7 there was no power from here to 495. They don't take into consideration where 8 9 this plant is, the kind of weather we get here. 10 don't know how if no one is inspecting them the whole 11 time that they have to wait, what four years for the 12 thing to cool down to take the rest of the rods out, 13 right? 14 MR. LEW: Right. And I just want to be 15 respectful of other's time. I don't want the conversation to go a little long, you know, being 16 17 respectful. 18 And I'm looking at Donna to tell me to 19 yank me off the mic. But just to share with you last year, 2018 was a significant winter season. 2.0 21 tough. 22 In each of those cases we had inspectors 23 on site ensuring that the licensee followed their procedures, appropriately addressed those issues. 24 25 Yes, there was the January trip.

1	There was also a delay in the start up
2	that was for another trip. But we were there. And I
3	just want to assure you that we were there and we
4	observed and inspected throughout.
5	MS. JANDA: Okay, thank you. Next speaker
6	is Number 1.
7	MR. GOLLINGHAM: John Gollingham
8	(phonetic). I'm really glad I got Number 1. I've
9	read some NRC testing that acknowledges the potential
10	for chloride stress corrosion cracking in the type of
11	steel used in Holtec's dry cask storage system.
12	And because the casks are so close to the
13	ocean do you include testing, did you include testing
14	in your safety assessment of the casks?
15	MR. WATSON: Let me just speak to the fact
16	that chloride stress corrosion is a known entity for
17	attacking stainless steels.
18	The stainless steels are, the design of
19	the casks and the thickness of the walls all take that
20	into consideration along with long term monitoring of
21	the containers.
22	MR. GOLLINGHAM: So how do you, what
23	monitoring is used?
24	MR. WATSON: Right now the industry and
25	

1	surveillance requirements for looking at the casks.
2	Not long ago one cask was removed from
3	Maine Yankee and tested and it had been there for, I
4	think a dozen years. And so no signs of any corrosion
5	or other activity.
6	MR. GOLLINGHAM: And what emergency plan
7	is intact in case a cracked cask, right? I can't
8	even, the plan of an event of a cracked cask, is there
9	an emergency plan in place? What happens then?
10	MR. WATSON: Yes, the casks are inspected
11	or at least the facility is inspected at least
12	annually. There are plans in place for and the fact
13	that if they were to detect a leak that actions could
14	be taken.
15	MR. GOLLINGHAM: What actions?
16	MR. WATSON: One would be to make sure
17	that the monitoring of the cask continues and see what
18	kind of provisions could be made to have the cask
19	removed and encapsulated or placed in another cask to
20	ensure its integrity.
21	MR. GOLLINGHAM: It doesn't sound like
22	anything is in place. And can a cracked cask be
23	moved?
24	MR. WATSON: Well I guess you have to
25	define crack. We expect a crack would be very minor.

1	However, you know, to have a crack is extremely
2	unlikely.
3	There would have to be some kind of cause
4	for that. That's why we would inspect them and
5	periodically to make sure that there is no corrosion
6	or attacks on the particular metal for the long term
7	storage of these casks.
8	MR. GOLLINGHAM: From my obsessive
9	research the chloride stress cracking is like spider
10	cracks. It's not like a nice little crack that you
11	can weld or anything like that.
12	Holtec's president said if you could find
13	a crack it couldn't be fixed. So that's why I'm
14	curious, I'm not hearing, you know, you have a plan in
15	place because you can't fix the crack. It's not a
16	fixable crack.
17	MR. WATSON: And this is why I mentioned
18	taking and putting the cask in another cask to ensure
19	the integrity of the material.
20	MR. GOLLINGHAM: Are those casks going to
21	be on site? Are you going to have Holtec have those
22	extra casks on site?
23	MR. WATSON: There's no requirement for
24	that right now.
25	MR. GOLLINGHAM: It sounds like it would

1	be important.
2	MR. WATSON: Well let me finish. Holtec
3	is not the only manufacturer. New home facilities
4	actually have a transfer cask which could be used to
5	load an old cask into.
6	I was just out at Rancho Seco. They still
7	have the old transfer cask there which is available
8	for how they transferred it from the plant to the dry
9	fuel storage.
10	MR. GOLLINGHAM: So there was a container
11	at the Koeberg Plant in South Africa which was thicker
12	steel than what is used in Holtec steel. And that had
13	a through the wall crack within 17 years.
14	Can you talk to that? Do you know any
15	more information on that?
16	MR. WATSON: I really don't know any
17	information about that.
18	MR. GOLLINGHAM: It's in one of your
19	documents.
20	MR. WATSON: Yes, I do decommissioning.
21	I don't do spent fuel management. I'm trying to at
22	least answer some of your questions.
23	That one I don't know the particular
24	technical details on. But I would point out that
25	there's been comments made that thicker casks are

1 safer.

2.0

I don't know that's necessarily true. If you say this cask was thicker, so --

MR. GOLLINGHAM: Well that was my next question. Why are thick wall casks used in other countries and not in America? Why aren't we doing that?

MR. WATSON: The primary reason that we have thinner walled casks than those made in Europe is our casks are designed to be transferred. So they are intended to be able to place in a transfer cask so they could be shipped to a permanent repository.

MR. GOLLINGHAM: Well that's a concern of mine as well because if they sit by the ocean with the chlorine and now they're next to the road with more chlorine coming up with road salt if that steel becomes more vulnerable and you're not catching that cask and then you're shipping it across the country that's, right, it's not that funny. I mean I'm concerned about that.

MR. WATSON: Well fundamentally to do any type of radioactive material shipment you're going to ensure the integrity of the container before you put it in a transportation mechanism to be moved. That's part of our inspection procedures.

1	MR. GOLLINGHAM: Promise?
2	MR. WATSON: It's part of our inspection
3	procedures even for low level waste today.
4	MR. GOLLINGHAM: All right. My last
5	question is how quickly would the public be informed
6	if a cask cracked?
7	Are we going to be, are you going to keep
8	that to yourselves or will the public be informed that
9	a crack, that you have had an event?
10	MR. WATSON: There are emergency plan
11	procedures in place for dry fuel storage facilities.
12	I would assume those procedures would be followed.
13	Again, it's not my area. But I know they
14	have plans in place for notification of not only the
15	public but the NRC of safety issues.
16	MR. GOLLINGHAM: All right, thank you.
17	MS. JANDA: Thank you. Next speaker,
18	Number 6.
19	MS. CARPENTER: I'm Susan Carpenter with
20	the Cape Downwinders. And I'm concerned about the
21	finances of all of this, about the decommissioning.
22	And one of the things that concerns me is
23	several other companies have requested waivers to use
24	decommissioning funds for other purposes. And I'm
25	wondering has the NRC ever refused to grant a waiver

1 to the industry? 2 I guess to rephrase your PARTICIPANT: 3 question is have we ever denied an exemption. 4 specifically your question is for the separation or, 5 of spent fuel management funds and decommissioning funds. 6 7 think there was one. But I can't remember exactly. It may have been either withdrawn 8 9 by the licensee. There was something that had to do 10 with Vermont Yankee not too long ago. 11 But most exemptions are, the fact that 12 most utilities or licensees at the time the original 13 rules required one fund. And the rules were changed, 14 I think, back a little while ago that you had to have 15 separate funds. 16 But since they have a single fund under 17 one trustee by an independent bank where the money is 18 kept there is actually an accounting by the trustee 19 that separates the two. So that's the equivalent 2.0 almost of having separate trust funds. 21 So we've granted that exemption where they 22 can show to us that we have two accounting and which 23 money goes where and what it's for. 24 MS. CARPENTER: So it's not a common

occurrence then? I mean it's been used for taxes Mary

1	just said and a waiver was granted.
2	PARTICIPANT: I can tell you that the
3	payment of taxes from the decommissioning fund are
4	only allowed once the plant is in decommissioning.
5	When they're operating they can't use those funds for
6	any other purpose.
7	So they stay with the trustee in the bank.
8	They are not allowed to release the money for anything
9	but decommissioning funded activities.
10	MS. CARPENTER: And that's coming up quite
11	quickly. Thank you.
12	MS. JANDA: Thank you. The next speaker
13	is Number 16. My apologies for missing that. Okay,
14	we're going to move on to Number 2 please.
15	(Off microphone comment.)
16	MS. JANDA: Okay, thank you. Number 11.
17	MR. ROTHSTEIN: Richard Rothstein, Town of
18	Plymouth and Member of the Massachusetts NDCAP. Let
19	me first state that I'm not opposed to nuclear
20	decommissioning trust funds being used for on site
21	spent nuclear fuel management as may be necessary or
22	appropriate.
23	That said, are there any current
24	applicable NRC regulations or policies for existing
25	nuclear power plants which are still operating or have

been permanently shut down and undergoing decommissioning per their submitted **PSDARs** mandate any monies recovered via lawsuits against the U.S. Department of Energy for on site spent nuclear fuel management be used by the licensee to fully reimburse the decommissioning trust fund if such monies were or will be used via exemptions granted by the NRC for such said purposes?

The basis for my question is NRC's October 17, 2018, approval of Northstar's financial exemption request made for Vermont Yankee.

In that approval the NRC determined that Northstar's revised PSDAR demonstrated reasonable assurance existed that funds within the nuclear decommissioning trust when combined with other funds including a "anticipated future United States Department of Energy reimbursements" would be in excess of the amount needed to cover the estimated costs of radiological decommissioning and irradiated fuel management.

MR. WATSON: In the Vermont case part of their justification for maintaining adequate funding to do the decommissioning was that they were going to take credit for any monies that come from DOE go back into the trust fund to either complete the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1 decommissioning or manage the spent fuel. 2 So that was a commitment they made and we 3 agreed that was okay. Does that answer your question? 4 MR. ROTHSTEIN: Partially. I wasn't 5 questioning the decision of the NRC. My question is more related to regulatory 6 7 policy in terms of even if the funding is deemed by NRC to be sufficient in that case or in the case for 8 9 Pilgrim for any future exemptions that may be granted 10 by the NRC is there a current or even a proposed 11 regulatory requirement that such monies recovered from 12 DOE be placed back into the DTF in the event that the 13 licensee has needed to use any portion of the DTF for 14 spent fuel management? 15 Well, I quess I'll have to MR. WATSON: 16 answer your question this way. First of all, you're 17 not supposed to be using decommissioning funds for 18 spent fuel management without our prior approval such 19 as in Vermont because they agreed to put the money back into the fund. 2.0 21 But there is no requirement to take the 22 money that you get back from DOE back into the spent 23 fuel fund in order to manage the spent fuel into the 24 future. 25 However, there is a requirement that you

1 maintain sufficient funds to make sure the fuel remains safely into the future and that it's properly 2 3 managed and kept under good security. 4 MR. ROTHSTEIN: I'm satisfied with that, 5 Bruce. What concerns me is why is there not an NRC regulation that spells that out even from a simple 6 7 bean counting exercise to make sure those monies which were used for spent fuel management costs would go 8 back in terms of recoverable funds from DOE? 9 10 I know you can't answer that totally. But 11 it's more of a recommendation. 12 MR. WATSON: Yes, I understand that. The 13 decommissioning fund is trust supposed be 14 independent and sufficient to reasonably, to give us 15 reasonable assurance that they can complete 16 decommissioning fund. 17 And that's why we have a separation 18 between the two funds designated for the two different 19 issues. 2.0 MR. ROTHSTEIN: And please note I'm not 21 questioning about NRC's ability to watch everything as 22 carefully as you intend to do and do there, but having 23 that regulation in place is just another belt and 24 suspenders there. Thank you. 25 Thank you. MR. WATSON:

1 MS. JANDA: Next speaker is Number 13. 2 MR. AGNEW: No real concern. The industry's captive 3 regulatory agency has raised 4 Pilgrim from Column 4 to Column 1. I take that as a 5 bad joke but also as a sign that things with our local Mark 1 BWR have been worse. 6 7 days And I'm counting the 67 until Pilgrim's final shutdown and the unknown number of 8 days until the final defueling of the reactor and 9 10 removal of all (inaudible) material from the pool. 11 As the Patriot Ledger wrote, "what the 12 public and the regulators need to watch now is how well decommissioning is done." No cutting corners, no 13 14 substandard materials, no shoddy work. 15 Given that Entergy seeks to hand off 16 Pilgrim to SNC-Lavalin, a scandal plaqued outfit 17 facing fraud and corruption charges in relation to 18 millions of dollars of bribes given to Libyan 19 officials, it's not a great start. 2.0 Abuse of the populous by the nuclear 21 industry will continue. How much abuse? At least as 22 much as the public will tolerate. 23 After 47 years of Pilgrim polluting the 24 environment with radionuclides Entergy Holtec wants 25 the Commonwealth and its citizens to have no say

1 regarding decommissioning claiming the would be 2 interveners rely on speculation. 3 As if the corporations don't speculate 4 with their own projections. It's ludicrous that the NRC has allowed Entergy to put nary a penny into 5 Pilgrim's decommissioning trust fund in the 19 years 6 7 they've been the licensed operator. 8 Entergy says that the fund has enough The Commonwealth needn't worry it's pretty 9 10 And they want to tap into the DTF to little head. 11 deal with the waste fuel, the pad, casks, transfer of 12 the high level waste. I quess they failed to speculate that 13 14 these things would be needed. And by the way, Entergy 15 expects the rate payers to pay Plymouth \$13 million 16 for hosting their liability. 17 I wish we could trust the NRC to disallow 18 these obvious attempts at theft. But as former NRC Commissioner Victor Gilinsky said, the Agency is a 19 wholly owned subsidiary of the nuclear power industry. 2.0 I don't know if I mentioned, I'm David 21 22 Agnew from Harwich. 23 MS. JANDA: Thank you. Next speaker, 24 Number 9. 25 MS. CHIN: Hi, yes. I'm Rebecca Chin.

I'm the co-chair of the Nuclear Advisory Committee for 1 2 the Town of Duxbury. I have a comment. I've been listening to 3 4 what will happen with the NRC during decommissioning. 5 My concern is that you will actually have eyes on the ground and you will be protecting the 6 7 public health and safety of the environment here which 8 we care about. My question is that when you do your final 9 10 sampling and you send it to your labs to determine the 11 clean up standard, are you going to have split samples 12 so the Massachusetts Department of Public Health can 13 also confirm those numbers? 14 MR. WATSON: Yes, this is Bruce Watson. 15 The state is welcome to take as I'll answer that. 16 many samples and do their own independent analysis as 17 they choose. 18 We will be doing normally sampling on our 19 own, independent sampling of the licensee. 2.0 will also split samples with the licensee to verify 21 the performance of their laboratory because 22 laboratory is world class. It's always in the top one percent of the 23 24 laboratories performing in the country. So, yes, 25 there will be split sampling with the licensee to

verify their lab work and also we'll be taking our own 1 2 independent samples at the completion of the clean up 3 to make sure that it meets our standards for meeting 4 our unrestricted release criteria. 5 MS. CHIN: But you won't do split samples 6 of your samples with the Massachusetts Department of 7 Public Health? You're going to make them take their 8 own samples? 9 MR. WATSON: It's up to them if they want 10 to do that. But my point is that they're welcome to 11 take their samples if they choose to. It's up to, 12 whatever they would like to do we are willing to talk 13 about that. 14 It just costs money to do that and it's up 15 to them whether they want to expend the funds or not 16 because we have a very good program, I'll say an 17 excellent program for verification of the final status 18 of the sites. 19 MS. JANDA: Thank you. The next speaker 2.0 is Number 20. 21 MS. CALDWELL: So I'm almost 74 and I've 22 been fighting all the problems with nuclear power 23 plants it seems like more than half my lifetime. 24 when I was in graduate school it was the honor system

and we were supposed to try and do our best and be the

best.

2.0

And when we couldn't be the best then we would go back and try to be the best. And when we made a mistake we would try harder and harder and harder until somebody would tell us this is not good enough and then we would go back and try to be better.

And when I look at the Nuclear Regulatory
Commission I am just so sad because I know you all
want to be your best. I know you want to go home at
night proud of what you've done.

And all that I hear at the Citizen's Advisory meeting or with you is failures when we couldn't live up to my expectations of what the best is. So this is my question.

How can we have nuclear power in the United States when we can't plan how to decommission a plant safely so that it can go 50 years into the future, 100 years into the future? We're just arguing about a few seven years of decommissioning and then the money runs out.

When are we going to tell the people of the United States that we don't know how we're going to decommission a plant? The people of the United States are not going to allow nuclear waste from one state to travel to another state.

1 They'll be more massive riots about 2 nuclear waste passing through any state than we've 3 seen to date. So if they're not going to allow them 4 to travel to any site that's forced to take it, it 5 means that Pilgrim and Yankee and all the plants across the country have to be safe for storage. 6 7 But you said, this gentleman over here 8 that we're worried about money. So we're worried 9 about money. 10 We don't have enough money to really put 11 in thicker steel or thicker casks or watch cracks or 12 we don't even have enough money to go through what 13 Entergy has done to find out where the spills and 14 mistakes are. 15 How do I know that, because at the 16 Citizen's Advisory meeting when we asked where are the 17 spills and we keep saying where are the spills, where 18 are the spills and they say it's a lot of paperwork to 19 go through and find the spills. 2.0 So I guess this is rambling and I can see 21 your faces. I quess I'm just really depressed about 22 the bad state of the nuclear power industry. And I don't see how we can hire Holtec. 23 I don't see how we can hire Holtec who doesn't have 24

the money to deal with a mistake or deal with a spill

1	or deal with anything except the chaos we're in.
2	I'm sorry it wasn't written up. I'm just
3	depressed about the future of the industry and
4	Plymouth.
5	PARTICIPANT: I apologize if we had facial
6	expressions. It was in an attempt to try and better
7	understand. And I think what you're saying here is
8	just a statement, rhetorical.
9	Was there anything specific you wanted us
10	to try and answer?
11	MS. CALDWELL: No.
12	MS. JANDA: Ma'am. Could you give your
13	name for the record? I'm sorry.
14	MS. CALDWELL: Irene Caldwell.
15	MS. JANDA: Thank you. Next speaker is
16	Number 21.
17	MR. BURKE: My name is Kevin Burke. And
18	I've been coming to these meetings off and on for over
19	20 years. I've not been a true dedicated activist
20	with regard to the nuclear industry.
21	And I thank you people who I follow in the
22	newspaper for what you've done to keep this on track.
23	And tonight I can tell you that I don't feel much
24	confidence in terms of what's going to happen in the
25	future.

1 I see the ocean levels rising. I see not 2 attention being paid to these casks I just don't 3 ultimately where they're going to go. 4 understand how we ended up in the mess that we're in. 5 I read the newspaper about a woman who left the Cape in a banged up car and drove right up to 6 7 the reactor. This was in the Globe. Where is the 8 security? 9 I just, it's beyond me. I met a man down 10 on the canal. He was an engineer over at the nuclear 11 reactor and he had retired. And he had a cap on. 12 And it said Kellogg, Brown and Root. 13 said to him isn't that the same firm that 14 involved in Iraq? He said, yes. I said do you work 15 for them, where do you work? 16 And he said I work over at the Pilgrim 17 Plant. And I said give me an insight into how things 18 are going over there. This was about five years ago. 19 He said well I'll tell you a little story. 2.0 We use pumps to pump water. And we've got pumps 21 coming in and the pumps didn't have the proper packing 22 in them. So I told my supervisor do not use those 23 24 pumps because we have to get the packing that goes in 25 there that keeps them watertight. So he had gone away

1 on vacation and lo and behold he got a panicked 2 telephone call they had taken, one of the pumps had broken down and they used this pump, supposedly new 3 4 pump and put it in its place. And they had a room full of radioactive 5 Now you don't hear about any of this stuff. 6 7 You hear about the anecdotal stuff and it really makes 8 you wonder what the hell is going on. 9 So once again, I thank my concerned citizens for their dedication and I hope it just keeps 10 11 us out of trouble. But just remember the thermal 12 expansion of the ocean is out there and you can't stop 13 that. 14 MS. JANDA: Thank you. Next speaker will 15 be Number 14. Number 18. 16 MR. PERRY: My name is Doug Perry. 17 resident of Plymouth and an employee of the plant. 18 And Ι just wanted to express 19 appreciation to my coworkers and friends at the plant for the hard work and dedication that it's taken over 2.0 21 the last three or four years, I quess, to work through 22 the recovery and also for the folks who preceded them 23 and us and the 47 years of safe, reliable plant 24 operation and, you know, I quess the contribution that

Pilgrim has made to carbon-free energy here in New

1	England over the last well 47 years. Thanks.
2	MS. JANDA: Thank you. Next speaker,
3	Number 18.
4	MR. PERRY: I was 18.
5	MS. JANDA: You were 18, sorry, Number 12.
6	MR. DOVE: Hi, good evening, folks. My
7	name is Dan Dove, a citizen here in Plymouth part time
8	while I work at the power plant. I've been there
9	approximately five years.
10	And I wanted to respond to some of the
11	questions regarding the sampling. In my position I do
12	what's called (inaudible) shipping. So I'm
13	responsible for sending off the samples that you
14	people are talking about.
15	And in regards to Massachusetts Department
16	of Health and Public Safety I send them samples
17	regularly. They are split samples. Chemistry takes
18	the samples.
19	We send part to a lab that is a lab we
20	choose and we also send them to Massachusetts
21	Department of Health. So to say that you don't know
22	what we're going to do, we already do it.
23	We're going to continue to do it in
24	decommissioning. In regards to Oak Ridge National
25	Labs and the ORISE facility I've been there. I've
Į	

1 seen how they work. 2 It's a great facility. In regards to 3 moving from Column 4 to Column 1 if you think three 4 years is a short period of time, I don't think so. 5 It didn't take them that long when they said hey, we've got a bunch of problems here at 6 7 Pilgrim. Did they move us from 1, 2 to 3 to 4? 8 didn't happen that way. So to go the opposite direction in three 9 10 years I don't think is a big deal. Let's talk about 11 Things I know factually, I've worked for Plum costs. 12 Brook which was part of NASA at a decommissioning 13 there. 14 And you want to talk about costs I'll tell 15 you what costs cost. They did a study in 1976 and the 16 good people said it's going to cost a million dollars 17 to decommission that. 18 Way too much money, can't do it. 19 forward, waited until 1998. It cost \$250 million just 2.0 20 short years later. We have a billion dollars in 21 our trust fund. 22 Eight years may seem aggressive. You say Holtec has never done it before. Someone has to be 23 24 first. You can't have one company do all

decommissionings otherwise people are just going to

1 stack up. 2 So long story short, as an employee of the Entergy Company I'm proud to work there. 3 I think we 4 do a great job. I think our NRC oversight keeps us in 5 check. And you know what, we've created lots of 6 7 tools. They're in this little book right here, 8 Achieving and Sustaining Excellence. Human performance tools you can work with, you can live by. 9 10 Thank you so much. That's all I have. 11 MS. JANDA: Thank you. Next speaker will 12 be Number 10. 13 MS. GASLIC: Good evening. My name is 14 Mary Gaslic (phonetic). I'm a resident of Plymouth. 15 I've been here for 34 years. And for the sake of 16 transparency I am also an employee of the Pilgrim 17 Nuclear Power Station. 18 And I've worked there for 24 years. All 19 right, this is the last public meeting we're going to have as an operating nuclear power plant. You know, 2.0 21 it kind of saddens me. It would have been nice to continue to 22 23 provide clean, carbon-free energy until 2032. that's not the case here. I was not surprised when 24

the plant, I'm not surprised that the plant is back in

Column 1.

2.0

The return to Column 1 was not because of fairy dust, by no matter but rather the hard work and the dedication of the employees and the individuals there. And I have seen it, I've been a part of it.

And so anybody to say anything else is a slap in the face to those guys that work there. The NRC annual assessment letter indicated that Pilgrim had demonstrated sustained improvement.

The plant had addressed all of the reactor oversight program items that had initially moved it to Column 4 and had completed all of the recovery plan items that were in the Confirmatory Action Letter.

I'll tell you what the best part of reading that letter was. You know what it was, it was reading those words Pilgrim will transition out of Column 4 and into Column 1.

As the plants sets down the road to decommissioning it still will be with NRC oversight.

It's not like the wild west where anything goes.

The plant will be decommissioned under guidelines just as strict whether it's under safe store DCON (phonetic) the same vigor will be applied so that the process will be done safely and environmentally sound.

1	And as a resident of Plymouth I'm not
2	afraid of having dry cask storage in the town. I am
3	however disappointed that the government has not lived
4	up to the contract that they, the contract and
5	supplied the nuclear industry with a final repository.
6	This has been an ongoing battle since the
7	1980s. I implore you, the NRC, to grant the DOE's
8	license application for the (inaudible) Project.
9	And I as a citizen promise you that I will
10	tell my lawmakers to get off their duffs and approve
11	it. Thank you.
12	MS. JANDA: Thank you. Next speaker will
13	be Number 5.
14	(Off microphone comments.)
	(Off microphone comments.) PARTICIPANT: All right, question.
14	_
14 15	PARTICIPANT: All right, question.
14 15 16	PARTICIPANT: All right, question. Entergy has said that if there's a problem with the
14 15 16 17	PARTICIPANT: All right, question. Entergy has said that if there's a problem with the casks that they would be putting an overpack over the
14 15 16 17	PARTICIPANT: All right, question. Entergy has said that if there's a problem with the casks that they would be putting an overpack over the cask as their way to resolve that. Are you aware of
14 15 16 17 18	PARTICIPANT: All right, question. Entergy has said that if there's a problem with the casks that they would be putting an overpack over the cask as their way to resolve that. Are you aware of that situation?
14 15 16 17 18 19	PARTICIPANT: All right, question. Entergy has said that if there's a problem with the casks that they would be putting an overpack over the cask as their way to resolve that. Are you aware of that situation? PARTICIPANT: We're aware that the
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	PARTICIPANT: All right, question. Entergy has said that if there's a problem with the casks that they would be putting an overpack over the cask as their way to resolve that. Are you aware of that situation? PARTICIPANT: We're aware that the manufacturers are, that is their plan for any
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	PARTICIPANT: All right, question. Entergy has said that if there's a problem with the casks that they would be putting an overpack over the cask as their way to resolve that. Are you aware of that situation? PARTICIPANT: We're aware that the manufacturers are, that is their plan for any potential degradation of the casks in the future.

1	approved that?
2	PARTICIPANT: They have not submitted them
3	for our approval yet.
4	PARTICIPANT: Okay, all right. Well
5	Entergy is saying that's what they're going to do with
6	the casks, the 17 on the pad now.
7	But I just want to go back to Mr. Lew.
8	You mentioned when we talked before that, you know,
9	that Entergy has taken care, during that January storm
LO	scram that Entergy has taken care of the switch yard
11	and everything.
L2	But my question was regarding off site
L3	loss of power. And you brought it back to the switch
L4	yard and that everything is fine there.
15	I want to read from your website, okay
L6	that they have to take action based on criteria by the
L7	National Weather Service forecast. This is from your
L8	website.
L9	For the most severe cases the intent of
20	the directed action is to reduce the risk of core
21	damage due to a loss of off site power by reducing the
22	plant's heat load before the loss of off site power
23	occurs.
24	Second paragraph, when weather conditions
25	indicate that the probability of loss of off site

power is high the procedures change is now direct shutting the plant down and immediately placing the shutdown cooling system in service to cool down to less than 200 degrees.

That is your, on your website regarding loss of off site power and that didn't happen during that storm. And are you also aware during the March 4th storm that the governor declared no, a travel ban and the local emergency directors said they could not implement their emergency plans?

And they sent that to the Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency which pushed it up to the NRC. So here we have a situation where our local emergency directors are saying they cannot protect the public, they cannot implement their emergency plans and the NRC sat on it for 40 hours until the MEMA reported back to them that it was all clear.

MR. LEW: So let me try and address and certainly 14 months ago I want to make sure, I want to caveat that I probably need to go back and take a look at it.

My recollection though relative to the January event was the only loss, when you talk about loss of off site power we ought to be clear in terms of are you losing all loss of off site power in that

2.0

1	particular case.
2	My recollection and may look for some help
3	here was only one line
4	PARTICIPANT: That's true.
5	MR. LEW: of off site power was lost.
6	PARTICIPANT: Right, that's true, yes.
7	MR. LEW: And actually Brandon was
8	actually, were you on site for
9	PARTICIPANT: And shortly after that the
10	second line went down, yes.
11	MR. LEW: Not in January, okay. So just
12	a clarification that it was one line of off site
13	power. The licensee then took corrective actions to
14	shut the plant down. Relative to the
15	PARTICIPANT: Loss of off site power, yes.
16	MR. LEW: MEMA that was back in March
17	of 2018
18	PARTICIPANT: March, yes.
19	MR. LEW: you are talking about. And
20	so when we receive the information and I believe Doug
21	Tift (phonetic) who is also here received that
22	information that evening about the question about
23	evacuation I will offer that MEMA and FEMA worked
24	through the night so not 40 hours, but worked through
25	the night and made a determination relative to the

ability to evacuate.

2.0

So that call goes to MEMA and FEMA. From the NRC's perspective, you know, certainly it's the role of MEMA and FEMA to make that determination. But from our perspective we establish a defense in depth approach.

And emergency preparedness is just one of those defense in depth. And from our perspective the short period of time that MEMA and FEMA took to make that decision and make that call was reasonable and it would be inappropriate based on that to order the plant to shut down.

And relative to defense in depth during that storm Entergy did in fact strengthen their safety defenses in terms of actions for severe weather, multiple actions that they have. And we were on site verifying that they completed those actions and ensuring that the plan continued to operate safely.

PARTICIPANT: Yes, and I was here, the inspectors were on site during the storm June '02 when it crashed, yes.

But so we see repetitive degraded nuclear reactor still operating, the valves are repetitively degrading. There is mismanagement. There is ongoing issues that should still keep it in Column 4.

1 They're not resolved. But that's why we 2 call for the abolishment of the Nuclear Regulatory 3 Commission to be replaced by an interstate 4 governmental agency. 5 MR. LEW: So if I can just ask Donna at this point just for transparency and how we want to 6 7 move forward. Do you want to discuss how we want to 8 move forward since we've gone through the first round 9 of questions and we're continuing? 10 MS. JANDA: Yes. So before we go to any 11 other questions and then I can answer that. Dave, we 12 were going to offer up some more time because we still 13 have time before the end of the meeting. 14 It's scheduled into 8:45. So if there are 15 other people. But before we get to that, one sec. 16 understand there is a selectman who would like to make 17 a statement. If that's the case please come forward. 18 MR. MAHONEY: Good evening, everyone. 19 John Mahoney from the Plymouth Board of Selectpersons. 2.0 My colleague Shelagh Joyce and third colleague is in the room, Chairman of the Board of Selectmen back 21 22 there is Kenneth Tavares. 23 So in a meeting we were a little tardy. 24 We got here late because we had a 5 o'clock meeting 25 that ran a little late. But we appreciate everybody

coming out.

2.0

Every time I see Bruce he knows this is one of his favorite stops throughout the course of the year and he tells me that all the time. But we appreciate the passion that is being shown by the individuals in the room.

You can tell and I certainly appreciate your patience with respect to answering their questions. But you can tell this is a significant thing not only to the community but to an entire region.

I would say it's one of the top issues in the state but certainly in the region south of Quincy and out to "P" (phonetic) Town it's, this is right up there. So we're looking forward to working with you in a partnership.

We want a safe and prompt decommissioning process. And one of the prior speakers referenced, I think evidenced based or everything was based on engineers.

Yes, we want it to be non-political and, you know, just a disciplined process moving forward so that, you know, ten years down the road, God willing, you know, this thing is behind us and we can move on. Thank you.

1	MS. JOYCE: And if I could just emphasize
2	as well transparency and communication are a priority
3	as well. So we appreciate your time and your effort
4	and look forward to the rest of the meeting. Thank
5	you.
6	MS. JANDA: Thank you. Did we get your
7	name, I'm sorry.
8	MS. JOYCE: My name is Shelagh Joyce, one
9	of the Plymouth Selectmen.
10	MS. JANDA: Thank you.
11	MS. LAMPERT: Mary Lampert, Pilgrim Watch.
12	Question to Bruce. I didn't quite get the details of
13	your response to Rebecca Chin on the NRC's plan for
14	environmental monitoring.
15	So help me out here. Do I understand that
16	the NRC itself, and this would be a couple years
17	before termination I guess, takes actual samples and
18	sends it to the laboratory?
19	Do you also take some of the split samples
20	from Entergy and send those for verification also to
21	the laboratory then the results of your samples, the
22	results of the split samples are they made public in
23	a timely manner or do you put the results up on your
24	website?
25	Next question is what Mass Department of

1 Public Health, how they would interface? Would they just send some of their samples and that would be 2 3 ridiculous that they test in their own lab in Jamaica 4 Plain or instead do they get a split from NRC's sample 5 and a split from the split of, that sounds ridiculous, but of Entergy's sample to be able to see the results? 6 7 And would MDPH have to pay the cost of this or is there a procedure other than legislation in 8 9 the State of Massachusetts to assess the licensee for 10 the environmental monitoring? Last question, could 11 you direct to whatever regulation NUREG me 12 discusses this? 13 MR. WATSON: Well I think I counted 15 14 questions. But I lost count after 12. All kidding 15 aside, the one thing I want you to realize is that the 16 NRC environmental monitoring program which is 17 effect today continues all the way almost to the end. 18 And by that I mean at the end there is 19 hopefully nothing to measure, okay. So we will do our independent sampling all through the process. 2.0 We will have our samples analyzed just 21 22 like we would do today if the residents or the HP 23 inspectors that inspect the plant will take samples 24 and they'll be analyzed by our independent laboratory

just like it is today.

1 One of the things I wanted to, we don't 2 necessarily publish results on the website. But they 3 are referenced in inspection reports or discussed in 4 inspection reports. So those are publicly available. 5 As as the splitting samples with Massachusetts Department of Public Health, I think 6 7 it's MPH, I was glad you brought this back because Rebecca Chin, yes, I had some more thoughts after you 8 9 sat down. 10 And at Maine Yankee they had the state 11 inspectors doing sampling and surveys. And we always 12 results with Т don't compared them. recall 13 specifically splitting samples with them. 14 But we always compared results. The State 15 of Connecticut also with Connecticut Yankee because I 16 was involved, very much involved in Maine Yankee. 17 So we worked with the, they had, typically 18 had two inspectors there frequently. I'm trying to 19 think of the quy's name. Pat Dosties (phonetic) was 2.0 the name, as a matter of fact. He was an employee of 21 the state. 22 And one of his jobs was to follow up on 23 the, just like we did on inspections and doing surveys 24 and sampling. So, yes, there's an opportunity to do

that.

1	It depends on what the State of
2	Massachusetts, MPH decides they want to do. They can
3	discuss that with us. You know, we, I'm sure they
4	have their own lab which you mentioned which I'm sure
5	is a quality lab.
6	I'm sure they do the kind of, what we call
7	the inter-comparison laboratory tests with blind
8	testing to make sure they have a good quality control
9	on their laboratory just like our lab does.
10	But as far as funding that's up to the
11	state how they fund their own programs. There's
12	nothing that I know that the NRC provides to them.
13	It's really their choice on what level of
14	involvement they want to have in the decommissioning.
15	So I think I answered most of your questions.
16	PARTICIPANT: And is there a NUREG?
17	MR. WATSON: There is an inspection
18	procedure. We do talk about sampling I think in NUREG
19	1757, Volume 2. That's a thick volume.
20	It's a lot of technical stuff. I'll admit
21	that. And we're in the process of actually revising
22	that. It's going to be even thicker for the stuff
23	we've learned over the last ten years.
24	So, you know, it will definitely help you
25	with your sleeping, at least it does me. Just

kidding, anyway, there is some guidance on that.

I can't think of anything specifically.

It covers a cadre of technical issues that also

It covers a cadre of technical issues that also includes a verification and when we do sampling throughout the decommissioning process to validate the licensee's historical site assessment, the characterization actually going out and doing what we call in process surveys where we do them side by side with the licensee to see how good their program is with our inspectors and our experts.

And also do the split sampling to verify their lab works, they are getting quality results. We have had issues with contracted laboratories that some of the licensees have used, not specifically the utilities but other labs that, in material sites.

And also of course I just talked about the independent verification at the end to make sure that they've met our criteria for the actually terminated license.

(Off microphone comment.)

MR. WATSON: That would be when they complete that. The licensee will generally start that at the beginning of the decommissioning. And that is generally based on what's called the 10 CFR, yes, G file.

2.0

1 Yes, and that's the regulation that was 2 in place back in the 1990s. And it was established to capture data related to spills and 3 4 other radiological events or mishaps so that the, it's 5 basically established a record that's important to decommissioning. 6 7 I know there is a file there at Pilgrim. I've already talked with the residents about taking a 8 9 good look at that and having our inspectors look at 10 that. 11 So there is a large, fairly large file on 12 that from issues that they've had through the years. 13 mind plant So keep in when the qoes 14 decommissioning many of the things that we do today 15 the plant is in operation continue when into 16 decommissioning. 17 includes the And that environmental 18 monitoring program. Excuse me, it is the same, okay. 19 That program continues. And so that in association with the rules 2.0 21 that place, call put into what the 22 decommissioning planning rules in 2012 with 23 additional groundwater monitoring up close to the

plant give us a good assessment on the radiological

situation at the site as well as the licensee and for

24

1 planning decommissioning. 2 So like I said, that rule was intended to 3 detect leaks up close to the plant so that you detect 4 it early so that the plant would know there is a leak 5 to go fix it and most utilities have done that. So really 6 to prevent large areas getting 7 contaminated. Is there anybody else who 8 MS. JANDA: 9 would like an opportunity to speak who hasn't had a 10 Sir. chance? 11 MR. COUGHLIN: Joe Coughlin, resident of 12 Also a member of the NDCAP. Plymouth. I want to thank Bruce for attending our NDCAP meeting the day 13 14 after you all were here last January. 15 One of the issues that came up at that meeting was, and comes up at a lot of meetings, the 16 17 adequacy of the DTF. A question was raised in that 18 regard that if the licensee who says with their 19 filings with you that the, they can do the full 2.0 decommissioning job compliance in with your 21 requirements based on the amount of funds in the DTF. 22 But if during that decommissioning process 23 the funds in the DTF prove to be inadequate the

question was raised in regard to that using this term.

Could the corporate veil be pieced?

24

Meaning that if there are other companie
involved even though they're not the direct license
could in essence they be gone after to acquire th
additional funds that may be necessary to complete th
decommissioning process so such a burden would no
fall on the host community, such as Plymouth and/o
the Commonwealth.
Bruce, I think you said at that time tha
the NRC's attorneys were looking into that issue. I
it possible to give us an update on where they may b
in researching that?
MR. WATSON: Yes. Excuse me
unfortunately, you know, we have this, we're i
hearing space with the contentions that have bee
filed.
So I kind of have to be careful here wha
I say just to be
MR. COUGHLIN: Sure.
MR. WATSON: honest with you. Righ
now I'll tell you what the process is. And that i
the regulations require at the end of March, Marc
31st that the licensees report to us the status o
those decommissioning funds for the previous year.
And so we take a look at those, wha
they're reporting to us. It can be verified throug

the independent trustee what those funds really are, true that they're there.

And so each year we will be doing an evaluation to ensure that the amount of funding is reasonable to complete the decommissioning. If we feel it's not we will address that to the licensee to come up with a plan on how they're going to recover that money in order to ensure that there are adequate funds or a reasonable amount of assurance that the funds are going to be there to complete the decommissioning.

So that review goes on annually. And also so that's fundamentally what we do to verify that there is adequate funding throughout the decommissioning.

MR. COUGHLIN: So would it be safe to assume that going through that process if in one of those annual updates the issue arose that there appeared not to be adequate funding to complete the decommissioning process and you then went back to the licensee to rectify that, that the NRC probably wouldn't care where the funds came from as long as the funds were made available to complete the process?

MR. WATSON: I would have to say that's probably a true statement. I don't know that we've

2.0

1	had that happen to my knowledge because I haven't been
2	following the financial parts very closely.
3	I know that we have one self-funded plant
4	for an (inaudible) 1 that is kind of funded from the
5	utility. It never had a decommissioning fund. It
6	only operated for a couple years.
7	And that the utility has actually been
8	directly funding that. And so they stopped
9	decommissioning right now to allow the fund to grow
10	back.
11	But they're about 90 percent complete on
12	the decommissioning. And, you know, they did a
13	significant amount of work to get there. And so now
14	they're letting the funds grow.
15	MR. COUGHLIN: Thank you.
16	MS. JANDA: All right, thank you. Are
17	there any other individuals who would like to speak or
18	have any questions that haven't had a chance yet?
19	Okay, so I believe this will end the
20	public meeting and I'm going to ask Dave if he has any
21	final
22	MR. LEW: Just a very, a big thank you to
23	everybody. I do appreciate the respect that you've
24	shown each other and the questions.
25	And certainly, you know, if you do have
	I

1	any other questions, you know, as always we remain
2	available to answer those questions either one on one
3	or afterwards. Thank you.
4	MS. JANDA: Thank you very much for
5	attending tonight.
6	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
7	off the record at 8:17 p.m.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	