

	<u>S P E A K E R S</u>	
		<u>Page</u>
1		
2		
3	Brad Ferland	5
4	Deborah Katz	7
5	Asher Crispe	11
6	Michael Granger	13
7	Ben Kinsley	14
8	Christopher Williams	15
9	Tim Smith	17
10	Leslie Sullivan Sachs	19
11	Bob Spencer	21
12	Zach Hozid	25
13	Josh Unruh	27
14	Guy Page	28
15	John Field	32
16	Betsy Williams	35
17	Peter Van der Does	39
18	Gary Sachs	42
19	Leo Schiff	49
20	Lorie Cartwright	51
21	Ned Childs	54
22	Lissa Weinmann	57
23	Clay Turnbull	61
24		
25		

1 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Good evening. This is
2 a Public Hearing in Case Number 8880 on the Joint
3 Petition of NorthStar Decommissioning Holdings, LLC,
4 NorthStar Nuclear Decommissioning Company, LLC,
5 NorthStar Group Services, Inc., Parent Corporation,
6 NorthStar Group Holdings, LLC, Entergy Nuclear Vermont
7 Investment Company, LLC, and Entergy Nuclear
8 Operations, Inc., and any other necessary affiliated
9 entities to transfer ownership of Entergy Nuclear
10 Vermont Yankee, LLC, and for certain ancillary
11 approvals, pursuant to 30 V.S.A. Sections 107, 231, and
12 232.

13 I'm Margaret Cheney, a member of the Vermont
14 Public Service Board, and with me tonight is my fellow
15 Board member, Sarah Hofmann. Our Chairman Jim Volz was
16 not able to be with us tonight. The purpose of this
17 hearing is to provide an opportunity to hear input from
18 the public regarding this joint petition. In this
19 case, the Board will be determining, among other
20 things, whether to approve a proposed indirect transfer
21 of ownership of the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Plant by the
22 Entergy Group to NorthStar Decommissioning Holdings as
23 well as propose site restoration standards.

24 This is the first of two public hearings that the
25 Board has scheduled in Vernon with respect to this

1 case. A second public hearing is currently scheduled
2 for early September after all the parties have had the
3 opportunity to conduct discovery and file testimony in
4 this case. These public hearings are not the only
5 opportunity or only forum for input. We also welcome
6 letters and emails as well as comments submitted
7 through the Board's new electronic filing system, which
8 we call ePSB. There is a handout available at both
9 ends of the table that provides specific information
10 about how to submit comments about this case by email,
11 mail, and through ePSB.

12 Tonight's public hearing will be transcribed by a
13 court reporter, and this transcript, along with all
14 other comments received by the Board, become part of
15 the case's public file so that Board members, staff,
16 and the participants in the case can consider the
17 comments. Public comments are very important to us in
18 raising new issues or perspectives that the Board
19 should consider, and these comments are sometimes the
20 basis for questions that we raise with parties during
21 the evidentiary hearings that will take place this
22 fall.

23 Additional information about this case is publicly
24 available on our website through ePSB. The website
25 address for ePSB is listed on the handout at both ends

1 of the table as well as instructions for obtaining
2 access to such information.

3 As you know, the joint petitioners and the Vermont
4 Department of Public Service and other parties to this
5 case have representatives here tonight. You may have
6 heard from some of them during the information session
7 earlier this evening. However, the purpose of this
8 section of the evening, this public hearing, is for us
9 to hear from the public. It is not a back-and-forth.
10 It is for us to hear from you and not from the parties
11 or their representatives.

12 So we will now open the floor for public comment.
13 If you wish to speak and have not already done so,
14 please put your name on the sign-up sheet. I have one
15 here. There was also another one going around the
16 room. And we will call on you in turn. When it is
17 your turn to speak, please state your name clearly for
18 the court reporter and, if necessary, please spell it
19 for her. Thank you. The first person I have is Brad
20 Ferland.

21 MR. FERLAND: Good evening. My name is Brad
22 Ferland, and I serve as president of the Vermont Energy
23 Partnership. I appreciate the opportunity to testify
24 in favor and support of the sale of Vermont Yankee to
25 NorthStar.

1 The Vermont Energy Partnership was formed in
2 January of 2005 largely through the foresight of
3 Governor Thomas P. Salmon. We are comprised of a
4 diverse group of business, labor, and community
5 leaders. Along with advocating for safe, reliable,
6 affordable, and clean energy, we also advocate for a
7 strong economy and the development of good-paying jobs
8 in Vermont.

9 The correlation between low-cost clean energy and
10 a strong economy has been at the core of our values and
11 mission. Over the years the Vermont Energy Partnership
12 was a strong advocate for the continued operation of
13 Vermont Yankee. The 600 jobs, the low-cost and clean
14 baseload power supplying a third of Vermont's demand
15 was a tremendous asset to the Vermont economy and more
16 than significant economic engine for Vernon and Windham
17 County.

18 We felt it was very unfortunate for Vermont to
19 lose VY and for southern Vermont to lose this
20 tremendous business asset. Our impression of Vermont
21 politics at that time was not flattering or healthy for
22 Vermont's economy or reputation as a place to do
23 business. One of the calls to action we heard if
24 Vermont Yankee was to shut down was that it should be
25 decommissioned in some accelerated fashion, making the

1 site available for future uses.

2 What Vermont Yankee has as a standard
3 decommissioning practice of SAFSTOR process could take
4 40 to 60 years. So we view this new opportunity of
5 having Vermont Yankee acquired by NorthStar and having
6 them put in place an accelerated and safe
7 decommissioning process as great news for Vermont.

8 We have had the opportunity to meet with NorthStar
9 officials and hear explanations of how they plan to
10 operate in Vermont and decommission Vermont Yankee.
11 The work flow and process as experts at decommissioning
12 -- as experts at decommissioning is exciting both in
13 terms of a timeline but also for the economic boost it
14 will bring to Windham County. We hope the microphone
15 works.

16 (Microphone malfunction.)

17 We hope upon hope that, as NorthStar is properly
18 vetted by this process in a fair, reasonable, and
19 timely manner, that a green light is given to this sale
20 and it signals to all, You can do business in Vermont.

21 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: All right. The next
22 person on the list is Deborah Katz.

23 (Brief pause to repair microphone.)

24 MS. KATZ: So I want to thank you for -- I
25 hope it's working now. Okay. So I want to thank you

1 for coming down to hear us. I'm Deborah Katz. I'm the
2 Executive Director of the Citizens Awareness Network.
3 We have over 2,000 members in the tri-state community
4 concerned with the decommissioning of this reactor.
5 CAN actually has been involved as an intervenor in the
6 cleanup of Yankee Rowe and Connecticut Yankee and won a
7 lawsuit against the NRC in terms of the illegal
8 decommissioning of Rowe, and so we've had some
9 experience dealing with decommissioning.

10 This, what is being proposed, is a radical change
11 in decommissioning. What has happened before is either
12 a utility has cleaned up a site or, in the case of the
13 Zion reactors, the license has been transferred, but it
14 has been returned to the licensee, in that case,
15 Exelon. This will be the first commercial reactor
16 where the license is transferred and remains
17 transferred, and, although NorthStar sounds --

18 (Microphone malfunction.)

19 Hi. Although NorthStar sounds really good and I
20 would like to believe this because it sounds so good,
21 but things that sound so good don't always work out so
22 well. So this is a corporation that's talking about
23 cleaning up a large-scale nuclear reactor, and that's
24 not a small potato. I mean, they've done research
25 reactors, but those are 6, 10, 12 megawatts, not over

1 600 megawatts.

2 And they talk about using AREVA to do the
3 internals work. Well, AREVA right now is under
4 investigation for forgery and, in fact, manufacturing
5 substandard parts. It is owned by France, and now
6 France is investigating them. So there are real
7 questions about AREVA's work. They are potentially
8 going bankrupt.

9 And so you're having a corporation coming in that
10 is on a fixed cost structure, and there is always a
11 question when there's a fixed cost that safety will be
12 compromised. So they'll come in at the budget that
13 they have to meet, but it doesn't mean that the cleanup
14 will be as good. Those are one of the concerns in
15 this.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Debbie, it's not owned by
17 France. It's owned by EDF which is only 85 percent
18 owned by France.

19 MS. KATZ: Thank you. Men, they always have
20 to correct women, don't they? Women are talking, and
21 men just can't keep their mouths shut. So what has
22 been said by nuclear corporations before this is that
23 this is an iterative process that, as you begin
24 decommissioning, even though they have a wonderful list
25 of a thousand different things that have to get done,

1 when you start cleaning up the reactor, what was found
2 at Yankee Rowe and Connecticut Yankee were levels of
3 groundwater contamination millions of curies that were
4 unexpected.

5 So that the issue of their laying out a scheme of
6 how to do it is really good, but it doesn't take into
7 account the fact that they may find contamination that
8 is completely unexpected that will take them way over
9 budget. Yankee Rowe cost \$39 million to build. It
10 cost over \$700 million to clean up, and that does not
11 include putting the high-level waste on a pad.

12 I also want to talk about the issue of how
13 NorthStar is raising the idea of suing the DOE,
14 basically, to pay for the guardianship of the waste and
15 claiming it as an asset. This is a lawsuit. It has
16 not even started, and there was, in fact, a lawsuit, I
17 think, at Surrey in 2000 to attempt to get the DOE to
18 pay for guardianship of the waste, and it was rejected
19 by the court. So there is no guarantee that, in fact,
20 NorthStar will win this lawsuit, and then they will
21 have to come up with \$5 million a year.

22 In Rowe, in Connecticut Yankee, at Maine Yankee
23 the ratepayers, we are paying \$5 million a year to
24 babysit the waste, but there is no, there's no utility.
25 This is not -- there's no rate base to go back to. The

1 question becomes, With a corporation that has so little
2 financial backup to begin with, where will it get the
3 money to do that job?

4 And I just want to stress this notion that, in
5 fact, NorthStar may reach its budget. It may hold to
6 its budget, but what you may wind up with is a dirty
7 cleanup. What you may wind up with, in fact, is having
8 a brownfield at Vermont Yankee where it doesn't have to
9 meet the 15-millirem standard of Vermont or the
10 25-millirem standard of the NRC but the 100-millirem
11 standard for a brownfield under the NRC. In fact,
12 Yankee Rowe and Connecticut Yankee have still not been
13 released for unrestricted use, and they have had all
14 the ratepayer funds they needed to get those sites
15 cleaned up. Thank you.

16 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Thank you. The next
17 speaker is Asher Crispe.

18 MR. CRISPE: Hello. Asher Crispe from Danby,
19 Vermont. I happen to be a technology futurist, so it's
20 very interesting to hear about some of the concerns
21 that are coming up about this particular cleanup
22 proposal.

23 BOARD MEMBER HOFMANN: Can you tip your
24 microphone higher?

25 MR. CRISPE: Yes. Is that better? Okay.

1 Can people hear me? All right. So it's very
2 interesting to hear the concerns that people bring up
3 with the cleanup. I'd like to, first of all, say
4 unequivocally that I'm very much in favor of this deal,
5 that the faster that we can accelerate the cleanup, the
6 faster that we can repurpose this space, which I think
7 is very valuable. Having grown up in Brattleboro in
8 particular, I see the long-term economic benefit and
9 the short-term economic benefit from having this
10 accomplished right away.

11 In terms of the concerns over margins and costs, I
12 think that those considerations looking at the past are
13 often justified. However, what people often neglect to
14 understand is that technology today is growing at an
15 exponential pace and that more is different and, also,
16 we can do more with less as we move forward, and, from
17 where I stand, I think that there are technologies that
18 are just on the threshold of commercialization that
19 will actually enable cleanup of facilities like this in
20 the near future within the time horizon that NorthStar
21 is talking to be accomplished in an even more
22 economical way. So, if anything, the margins are
23 probably going to grow, not shrink, even if unexpected
24 things show up because of technological innovation.

25 So I urge people to look a little bit broader when

1 it comes to their concerns, and the next, the next ten
2 years are going to be nothing like the last ten years.
3 Things are moving much, much faster in every area of
4 technology including materials science, including
5 things related to the decommissioning of nuclear power
6 plants, and I think that this will probably come in
7 under budget rather than over budget as a result of
8 these innovations. So I strongly recommend that this
9 deal be able to go forward. Thank you very much.

10 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Thank you. The next
11 speaker is Michael Granger.

12 MR. GRANGER: Thank you. I'm probably going
13 to hit on a common theme here, and I think, you know,
14 for skeptics you realize quickly whenever you do
15 anything that Murphy works overtime on any kind of
16 project and cost overrun, time overrun is pretty
17 standard. So you look at their, the NorthStar's 952
18 items, and what some of the literature that the license
19 transfer application seems to imply is that they will
20 be getting a performance bond. Then, then there's
21 other times where they're saying -- in one application
22 it's said that it's likely that they will get a
23 performance bond for the majority of the work.

24 That doesn't seem to be defined as to whether or
25 not that includes a radioactive or just physical

1 performance, and, if you look into performance bonds,
2 they're, they're nonexistent or extremely rare for
3 nuclear power plants. They're common for wind.
4 They're common for solar. They're common for natural
5 gas, and, in fact, they're mostly insisted upon when a
6 plant is constructed, but, as far as I know, there is
7 no performance bond especially for radionuclides
8 included. I would argue that it's likely that they are
9 excluded in a performance bond.

10 So now you get down to the statement that
11 NorthStar made tonight, and that is they're willing to
12 put up \$125 million -- and their literature also says
13 that -- that, in the unlikely event that they can't get
14 an acceptable performance bond for the majority of the
15 work, they'll put up \$125,000. Quick math on that is
16 15 percent on the hundred, on the \$811 million that
17 they're estimating. Most projects I advise people on,
18 I tell them 1.25 to 1.3, even when you've really licked
19 your pencil. So I would argue that the Board or their,
20 their professionals should maybe look into whether or
21 not the 125 is acceptable and/or whether or not
22 performance bonds are even available. Thank you.

23 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Thank you. Next we
24 have Ben Kinsley, I believe.

25 MR. KINSLEY: Hi. My name is Ben Kinsley.

1 I'm Executive Director of Campaign for Vermont
2 Prosperity. We're a statewide policy development and
3 advocacy group that's dedicated to creating prosperity
4 for all Vermonters. I, like many of you, am primarily
5 here to learn more about what this merger means and
6 what this potential opportunity for Southern Vermont
7 might be.

8 We realize that there is little public trust in
9 some of the parties involved, but we believe that there
10 are potential real benefits for Southern Vermont from
11 an accelerated decommissioning. This plan deserves
12 thorough vetting and consideration for both public
13 safety and economic impact. Thank you.

14 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Thank you. And I think
15 I'll start also saying the next name so that the next
16 speaker can be ready. Up immediately next is
17 Christopher Williams, and after him will be Tim Smith.

18 MR. WILLIAMS: Good evening. You got this?
19 Working?

20 BOARD MEMBER HOFMANN: Working.

21 MR. WILLIAMS: My name is Christopher
22 Williams. I live in Hancock, Vermont, and I've been
23 following Yankee and the various policies regarding
24 Yankee that have floated through the legislature and
25 before the Board for quite some time, and I have to say

1 I, I would really like to see this plant cleaned up
2 sooner rather than later. I really want to see the
3 cleanup done in a, in a superb way, in a Vermont way.
4 I want to see it better than any cleanup has been done
5 to date in this country.

6 That said, I have to, I have to let you know that,
7 as I hear the proposal from NorthStar and the responses
8 from Entergy, I think back to 2007 and the proposal
9 that was named by Entergy as Spinco -- they later said
10 that that was just like a placeholder name for the
11 proposal -- to basically put this plant, when it was
12 operating, into a separate company that was completely
13 cut off from its parent corporation and very much
14 undercapitalized proposal.

15 As I hear the, the proposal from NorthStar and
16 Entergy regarding the plant and its license and the
17 plan not to give the license back to Entergy at the
18 time that decommissioning is complete, or not complete,
19 what I hear is a, or what I think of is a transfer of
20 liability, a way to get out from under liability, and
21 that concerns me greatly.

22 And I am not going to belabor it, and I'll be
23 speaking more after all of the evidence and your
24 hearings have taken place, but, when you look at the
25 history of nuclear decommissioning in this country,

1 regardless of the march of technology or the incredible
2 spreadsheet that can be put together, the history is
3 cost overruns, serious cost overruns, and on top of
4 those cost overruns, the other feature that really
5 sticks out is sites that are seriously more impaired
6 with pollutants, radioactive and otherwise. Those are
7 the plants that have serious cost overruns.

8 And, unlike Maine Yankee, unlike Zion in Illinois,
9 to name two, we have a seriously impaired site here,
10 and we've known that since at least 2009, or 2010 was
11 when the truth came out. So I appreciate the job that
12 you have to do, and we'll be watching, and do it
13 diligently, please. Thanks.

14 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Thank you. Next is Tim
15 Smith, and following Tim Smith will be Leslie Sullivan
16 Sachs.

17 MR. SMITH: Thank you. My name is Tim Smith.
18 I'm with the Franklin County Industrial Development
19 Corporation. I've been in this position for 17 years.
20 Obviously, our mission is capital to create an
21 environment for job retention, job creation, and
22 capital investment, and I'm one of 12 RDC's from around
23 the state, and I'm speaking specifically for Franklin
24 County Industrial Development.

25 I hesitated coming tonight because I didn't feel

1 that this may be more of a regional discussion than a
2 statewide discussion, but, the more I thought about it,
3 this is a conversation that's been going on for as long
4 as I can remember and probably many in the audience,
5 and I think it's time that we probably put this to bed
6 so that my children don't have to worry about this
7 conversation. It's been a contentious conversation for
8 years. It's been contentious in the State House, it's
9 been contentious in this region, and I think it's time,
10 if we have the opportunity, which there is a proposal
11 on the table, that we should move forward.

12 Obviously, we encourage proper vetting of
13 NorthStar. We think there's obviously an economic
14 impact. You know, if you look at the State's budget,
15 of which we've been running a deficit for a number of
16 years, our general budget, for the most part, is, 65
17 percent of it is created by income tax, sales tax, room
18 and meals tax, and corporate income tax. We have an
19 opportunity in the short run to impact that State
20 budget with, with these, this closure and the jobs that
21 will be created in the short run, and, hopefully, we'll
22 be able to create jobs in the long run as well.

23 You know, it's, it's an issue that I know it's a
24 hot issue, but it's one that we have the potential to
25 put behind us. When we were talking about this in the

1 State House five years ago, the closure time was 2045,
2 2060, but now we have time to shorten that and move
3 forward and move beyond this, and that's what I would
4 encourage you to do is to take a serious look at this
5 proposal, vet it properly as you would anything, and I
6 encourage you to, if it, if it fits, let's move forward
7 and put this behind us. Thank you.

8 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Leslie Sullivan Sachs,
9 and following Leslie will be Bob Spencer.

10 MS. SULLIVAN SACHS: Hi. My name is Leslie
11 Sullivan Sachs. I live in Brattleboro, Vermont, and
12 I'm with the Safe and Green Campaign. I want to thank
13 you for coming down here from Montpelier, and I really
14 want to thank you for scheduling two hearings so that
15 you can get a gist of what our concerns are early on
16 and then after there's more evidence and hear from us
17 again to see how our concerns may have changed.

18 I'm an agnostic. I do very strongly believe that
19 it is the responsibility of our generation to clean up
20 this site. We're the generation, whether we were for
21 nuclear energy or against nuclear energy, we're the
22 generation that created the waste and that created the
23 contamination. At the same time, I'm worried about
24 Vermont being a guinea pig. So I look forward to your
25 fully vetting all aspects of this sale proposal.

1 I've been to many NDCAP meetings when the PSDAR
2 was going on and when the settlement agreement was
3 going on, and I've been to every meeting since the sale
4 was announced, and I would just give you a little piece
5 of advice which is, Please don't forget, when the
6 companies are using generic language, that what they
7 are actually doing is talking about high-level nuclear
8 waste and other contaminants, cesium and strontium-90
9 and PCB's and asbestos and other toxins.

10 It gets very easy to get lulled. I mean, I heard
11 a whole, like, 20 minutes on moving the spent fuel from
12 the pool into the dry casks which not once would you
13 have known that they weren't just moving cans of
14 tomatoes around. So it's very easy to get lulled into
15 and forget what we're actually talking about here.

16 I also, you know, like, earlier this evening the
17 fellow from NorthStar, when asked a direct question
18 about how many nuclear power plants they had
19 decommissioned, you know, he kind of, like, slid right
20 by, Well, NorthStar and AREVA, when, you know,
21 NorthStar has only decommissioned for university lab
22 ones and AREVA is the one pulling the heavy weight. So
23 you have -- I'm sure you know this, but you have to be
24 really cautious and keep asking the hard questions. We
25 don't know about -- I don't, anyways, and I haven't

1 heard from the NDCAP meetings, What about the structure
2 of this, you know, this dream team, you know, this team
3 of four partners, and has NorthStar ever coordinated a
4 team of four partners of this magnitude before?

5 I guess, the last piece of advice or what I would
6 really love to see from the PSB is that we take this
7 opportunity for NorthStar to prove itself to the
8 industry as being the new wave of decommissioning, as
9 being a leader in decommissioning by having the
10 strongest standards, really Vermont green standards,
11 that we could possibly have and then have them follow
12 through and do that over, you know, really strong,
13 transparent processes that include oversight by the
14 State and by the NRC.

15 Have them work with all the intervenors also as
16 partners in the PSB process rather than to see them as
17 adversaries and put together the strongest plan that
18 you can for Vermont and then do it, and then NorthStar
19 will come out smelling like a rose and have a great
20 business. So I would, I would encourage you to, you
21 know, just keep in mind that that could be a goal as
22 opposed to something that, every step of the way, we
23 try to get, you know, the, the standards lower and
24 lower and lower. Thank you very much.

25 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Thank you. Next we

1 have Bob Spencer followed by Zach Hozid, I believe the
2 name is.

3 MR. SPENCER: Hi. I'm Bob Spencer. I'm
4 Chairman of the Vernon Planning and Economic
5 Development Commission, and we really appreciate you
6 coming to Vernon so we don't have to drive all the way
7 to Brattleboro. Anyway, well, it's also a great
8 opportunity for our residents to have an up-close
9 opportunity to get to know our biggest regulatory
10 partner. So thank you.

11 I want to just point out that Vernon has an over
12 hundred-year history as an energy producing community
13 starting with the hydroelectric facility here on the
14 river reaching across to New Hampshire and then, of
15 course, 40 years of Vermont Yankee, and we actually
16 have a lot of support in this town for more energy
17 production, and we would like to see the site
18 eventually redeveloped for energy production.

19 And we've had a number of meetings with major
20 energy players and planners throughout Vermont that we,
21 we have a vision of repurposing this site into a
22 microgrid, alternative energy generation sources,
23 whether it be a combination of hydroelectric, battery
24 storage, solar, anaerobic digestion -- not wind. It's
25 too low -- and perhaps some other new technologies that

1 were mentioned as possibilities tonight. It's almost
2 an ideal site with the VELCO grid interconnect, the
3 substation, and the access to the river power.

4 So, in light of that, we have recently received a
5 grant from the State of Vermont to update our town
6 plan, and the primary purpose of that will be to
7 facilitate the redevelopment of this site consistent
8 with town policies and goals, and we're working with
9 Windham Regional Commission on that grant. We've
10 retained their services.

11 We also have been selected as a model energy
12 planning town, one of three in Windham County, and,
13 again, working with Windham Regional to look at giving
14 preferential -- I forget the term that they're using
15 for this, if you have an energy plan. Anyway, it's a
16 nice bureaucratic term, but, if you have -- it's like a
17 preferential. If you have a solid plan, then either
18 against or for different energy projects, you get extra
19 points in the Public Service Board. So we, we are --
20 you should know that term. Something like deferential
21 treatment. Or we just started -- Chris, what is it?

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Substantial deference.

23 MR. SPENCER: Substantial deference. Thank
24 you. I was close.

25 BOARD MEMBER HOFMANN: We knew what you

1 meant, so --

2 MR. SPENCER: Yes. So we appreciate people
3 from outside of town having concerns, but believe me,
4 there's no greater concern of what happens right here
5 right across the street than right here tonight.

6 I also want to just sort of toot the horn of the
7 Vernon Planning and Economic Development Commission.
8 We have seven members. It was restructured two years
9 ago to go from five to seven to give us more expertise
10 and breadth. We have on the board an energy
11 development financing specialist. We have a corporate
12 executive. We have a dairy farmer. We have a
13 newspaper publisher and editor. We have a marketing
14 specialist. I'm an environmental planner and a
15 specialist in waste management myself, and we come to
16 this with the intention of helping the Town get the
17 very best possible deal out of this.

18 We are thrilled initially with the NorthStar
19 proposal. It's almost too good to be true, as we've
20 heard, that ten, thirteen years from now the site could
21 be released for redevelopment, the development of
22 multimillion-dollar businesses utilizing the site,
23 generating jobs, generating revenue for taxes. So we
24 have a huge stake here, and we have filed as an
25 intervenor. We have intervenor status. We will be

1 commenting as appropriate to the various dockets. We
2 don't have anything to comment on yet. It's all just a
3 proposal, but, so far, we're very excited about this
4 prospect. It's almost -- we hadn't anticipated that.

5 So our goal is to see that the town plan is
6 consistent with the future development of that site,
7 that we have status and deferential -- I forget --

8 BOARD MEMBER HOFMANN: Substantial deference.

9 MR. SPENCER: -- substantial deference when
10 whatever is proposed. So we thank you very much, and
11 we appreciate everyone coming here and the interest
12 people express in this project. It's very important
13 for the whole state and the region. Thank you.

14 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Thank you. Next we
15 have Zach Hozid, and followed by him is Josh -- it
16 looks like "unruly", but I probably have that wrong.

17 MR. HOZID: My name is Zach Hozid. I live in
18 Tunbridge, Vermont, and I'm a third-year law student at
19 Vermont Law School, and I'm doing some research on this
20 project. I have two points to make. The first is
21 related to the feasibility of the project, and the
22 second relates to financial and legal liability.

23 So it's to the first point of the feasibility. I
24 did a little bit of research on the process they're
25 going to, NorthStar is going to use to decommission the

1 site, and I haven't found that process done anywhere
2 else, and I also did some research into scientific
3 articles and couldn't find anything on that as well
4 there. So I think, before this process is approved,
5 there should be, should make sure that, if it's either
6 been done before and it worked or, if it hasn't been
7 done, that it is totally feasible and it is possible
8 and that it can work, and I think the burden should be
9 on NorthStar to show that it can work and could work.

10 I think, also, to make sure that this process
11 continues to work throughout, it should be open and
12 transparent, as NorthStar said earlier today that it
13 will be, and to make sure that it is open and
14 transparent, I think there should be continuous
15 monitoring and reporting on the part of NorthStar and
16 making those reports open to the public and to have a
17 penalty assessed if they do not comply with that, and
18 this could be similar to any sort of standard permit
19 for pollution where they have to monitor and report
20 themselves, and, if they don't, then there's a penalty
21 assessed, and it could perhaps be some sort of citizen
22 suit, part of that where a citizen could sue them if
23 they don't follow through on their obligations.

24 The second point of financial and legal
25 accountability, they need to make sure that this

1 project is affordable, and they've testified earlier,
2 said earlier today that they've made thorough,
3 thoroughly make sure that they can do everything
4 they're considering like they're going to do, and I
5 think they need to have thorough plans that are just as
6 thorough, not more thorough, for in case things don't
7 work out, to have a Plan B, C, D, E, F that are just as
8 thorough as their primary plan of doing things.

9 And perhaps on the financial responsibility one
10 suggestion could be to have them put sort of their own
11 trust fund or their own account in case the
12 decommissioning fund does run out for some reason that
13 they have money already set aside that can come in and
14 take that place if need be. That way, there's always
15 some money that is available in case things go wrong.

16 And then, finally, there should be some sort of
17 way to keep Entergy on the hook at least to some extent
18 in case things go wrong. Thank you.

19 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Thank you. Next we
20 have Josh, and following Josh we have Guy Page.

21 MR. UNRUH: I'm Josh Unruh. I'm the
22 Selectboard Chair here in the Town of Vernon.

23 BOARD MEMBER HOFMANN: Can you spell your
24 last name, please?

25 MR. UNRUH: It's U-N-R-U-H. So, to reiterate

1 what Bob Spencer just said, there's nobody that has a
2 stronger stake in this sale than the Town of Vernon. I
3 stand tonight to support the sale of Vermont Yankee to
4 NorthStar. I've had the opportunity to meet with
5 NorthStar executives regarding this purchase and their
6 potential new partnership with the Town of Vernon.
7 Through these discussions, my personal questions and
8 concerns have been put to rest.

9 I'm no scientist and certainly no internet
10 scientist. So I put my trust in the people that deal
11 in this industry day in and day out and that will
12 govern the sale and demolition. To get this land back
13 to a usable state is paramount for Vernon and Windham
14 County for economic development. To not allow this
15 sale is further cutting the Town the Vernon off at its
16 knees. Thank you.

17 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Next is Guy Page, and
18 following Guy Page is John Field.

19 MR. PAGE: Good evening, and thank you for
20 coming down. You know, I, I'm finding myself agreeing
21 with an awful lot of what I'm hearing. You know, Chris
22 Williams, you're absolutely right, diligence.

23 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Guy.

24 MR. PAGE: Yeah. Jim Smith, you know, this
25 is a statewide issue, and Bob and, and the other folks

1 from Vernon, this is also very much a Vernon thing, and
2 Vernon's energy vision is really exciting. I think,
3 you know, decommissioning is really, is an integral
4 part of energy generation.

5 I used to be a roofer, and what I would tell my
6 roofing crews is, The job isn't done when all the
7 shingles are on the roof. The job is done when all the
8 nails are picked up off the ground and all the stray
9 pieces of shingle are safely taken away. That's when
10 the job is done. So, you know, it's, I really think
11 the idea of a thorough, well-considered plan for
12 decommissioning is --

13 I know you guys are -- I know -- I'm sorry. Not
14 you guys -- the Public Service Board has the expertise
15 and the process to do that, so I believe that that's
16 going to happen, and I hope, with all that, that you
17 will be able to get to yes, because yes is good for the
18 environment and for the economy of Vermont and not just
19 Windham County, really. It is for all of Vermont.
20 Windham County is not an island. It's, we're all
21 connected.

22 The, the economic aspect, according to the Brattle
23 Group study, the economic impact for Vermont is, of
24 just the decommissioning work, \$781 million is the sort
25 of middle-ground estimate for that. Well, from a

1 positive economic impact, that's a good thing. The
2 environmental is even more clear. The low-level
3 radioactive material will be gone, you know, what,
4 maybe 10, 15 years? That's, you know, compared to 60
5 years, that's great and also the possibilities of
6 possibly more prompt removal of the high-level waste is
7 really exciting.

8 We've got Waste Control Systems as part of the
9 team here. Waste Control Systems is the applicant
10 right now before the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for
11 a, a repository in Andrews County, Texas, and the
12 current Secretary of Energy is the former governor of
13 Texas, Rick Perry. So and also, of course, Vermont and
14 Texas are part of this waste control compact. So the
15 stars are aligning, I think, much more than they were a
16 couple years ago for, for the high-level waste also to
17 be, to be taken out of Vermont. If there's anything we
18 do all agree on, boy, we all want that.

19 So I -- yes, be careful, be thorough, but don't
20 shy away from vision, because vision is, vision is part
21 of Vernon's history. It was a hundred years ago that
22 seven businessmen in Brattleboro said, We need a
23 generating dam on the Connecticut in Vernon, and we're
24 going to use a modern design, a concrete design sunk
25 into bedrock, when everything else was rocks with,

1 like, crib dams. That was the accepted design. They
2 said, No, we're going to take it to the next level, and
3 a new, modern, at the time, design, turbine design as
4 well, and a hundred years, more than a hundred years
5 later that dam is actually still licensed to operate,
6 and it's just been, just been purchased. So a success
7 story there.

8 50 years ago Vernon took the chance to host VY,
9 and, you know, incredible jobs, economic benefit,
10 emissions-free, equivalent with hydro, solar, and wind
11 per kilowatt, an absolute fact, okay? Thank you. And
12 so in that sense, you know, this has been a real win,
13 and now there's, there's the next level which is the
14 microgrid and, again, an idea that people aren't all
15 that familiar with but our utilities are on board with,
16 and Vernon has a chance three times in really a hundred
17 years to be trendsetters in energy generation, and I, I
18 just think that that's a great thing to shoot for.

19 But first we need to have the other cutting-edge
20 new idea which is this prompt decommissioning which,
21 you know, we're all asking questions like, Well, how
22 can you do it so quickly? And how are you going to get
23 that done? Good questions, but don't shy away from the
24 vision. Don't kick the can down the road, because
25 these problems, whatever problems there are now,

1 they're also going to be here 50 years from now, if
2 anything, perhaps worse, but we will have lost the
3 opportunity of the economic benefit that this is going
4 to bring.

5 So I'd just encourage you to, you know, be
6 thorough, do the vetting, do the job, but don't shy
7 away from the vision too. Thank you.

8 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Thank you. Next we
9 have John Field, and followed by John Field is Betsy
10 Williams.

11 MR. FIELD: Hi. My name is John Field. I'm
12 from Putney, and I want to thank you again also for
13 coming down and taking such an interest in this. I'm,
14 it's kind of hard for an ordinary citizen, an ordinary
15 Vermonter who is not steeped in nuclear engineering
16 background, financial, complex financial instruments
17 background, much less mitigation of environmental
18 problems to speak with any kind of credibility or
19 authority. We are not paid.

20 The large industries have consultants to prepare
21 documents and go to school and hire Ph.D.'s. So it's
22 with some disadvantage I feel that people, ordinary
23 people who are not technically trained, testify, but
24 remembering the "P" in the PSB that you represent the
25 public, I would ask you to consider the following

1 things:

2 Number one, I read recently an article by a
3 gentleman by the name of -- and I'm going to forward
4 this on to you for your consideration -- Fred Gatte.
5 He's a Brit, G-A-T-T-E. He's an underwriter of the
6 nuclear, of the British Nuclear Underwriters
7 Association, and he warns about the terrible lessons
8 from AREVA.

9 There's a long article. This is an underwriting
10 insurance professional in Britain from the British
11 nuclear industry who warns about the real chain of
12 disasters that happened in France upon AREVA's
13 mismanagement, and what, my understanding is what's
14 happened in France is that, due to the bankrupt, what
15 was going to be the bankruptcy of AREVA, AREVA being
16 one of the partners in this proposed dream team, the
17 French citizenry, the French citizens, the taxpayers,
18 are bailing out AREVA's mess.

19 I think many Vermonters are worried that the same
20 thing could occur here, and it is kind of a paradox and
21 a scary one that this deal is being embedded in with
22 the same company that showed such poor performance in
23 France. That's the first thing that I would hope that
24 you guys would take into consideration. I think it's
25 kind of a too-big-to-fail kind of thing. Who would

1 have thought that Lehman Brothers would have failed and
2 all these other banks that went down in 2008? But they
3 did, and we are still bailing them out.

4 The second thing I would ask you to consider is,
5 to me as a layperson, it seems like there's an
6 essential conflict of interest between a private
7 corporation, in this case, NorthStar, and their need to
8 build a profitable operation and extract profit from
9 their operations and the public's need for assurance of
10 clear, of a clear, cleaned up radiological and
11 nonradiological site.

12 If I'm the company that's, that's, you know, as
13 Chris said, is going to relieve myself by the relief of
14 liability, I'm going to -- my incentive is to do the
15 job as inexpensively as I can so that I can reap the
16 most profit. I mean, it doesn't take a Ph.D. to
17 recognize that. So I'm worried about the essential
18 conflict of interest that's embedded in this deal.

19 The last thing I'd like to say is I understand
20 that, that the need to try to finish the mess and the
21 sadness, the loss of jobs, the loss of income, the loss
22 of houses, and all the other losses that the people of
23 Vermont, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire have
24 sustained. There is an honest need to try to, as one
25 of the speakers said, put it behind you, but, to me,

1 grabbing the grail of promises that have been produced
2 by the NorthStar spokesman is a really dangerous
3 proposition.

4 I think that I would urge you folks to please take
5 your time, perhaps stretch out the process so that we
6 don't, in our effort to get this place cleaned up, grab
7 onto something that could potentially leave Vermont
8 taxpayers in an awful, awful lot of liability
9 ourselves. Thanks.

10 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Thank you. Betsy
11 Williams and, following Betsy Williams, Peter Van der
12 Does.

13 MS. WILLIAMS: My name is Betsy Williams. I
14 live in Westminster West, Vermont, and I agree with a
15 lot of what some previous speakers have said. One
16 thing I wanted to start with is I do think that there's
17 actually a huge area of agreement that I'm hearing from
18 everybody I've heard in this room so far is that I
19 don't think anyone in this room would disagree that we
20 all want to ultimately have a clean and safe site over
21 where Vermont Yankee is right now. All of us would
22 like nothing better. I would like nothing better than
23 to not have, essentially, a nuclear waste dump just
24 down the river from where I live.

25 And, and I'm not particularly enthusiastic about

1 the idea of it remaining under the control of Entergy
2 and taking 60 years to get there. At the same time,
3 I'm very, very concerned, and I share -- many of these
4 things have already been said, and it was talked about
5 at some length in the information session before we
6 started this part of the hearing. The representative
7 from NorthStar has outlined, I'm sure, very, very
8 detailed, specific plans of how they would do this
9 decommissioning within a certain budget, and, if they
10 could do that, that would be really swell, but there is
11 no guarantee.

12 And I believe that the Public Service Board needs
13 to -- and I know that there are efforts afoot already
14 in this, and I applaud those -- to have assurance that
15 the State of Vermont will not be held liable for any of
16 the costs associated with this decommissioning no
17 matter what, no matter if the costs go over, no matter
18 if the company that --

19 You know, they kept saying, Well, they'll be the
20 owner. Well, okay, but what happens if this limited
21 liability corporation that owns it goes belly up? Then
22 what? Then who? And I'm not hearing anybody answer
23 that question, and it keeps being asked, and nobody is
24 answering that question of what happens then. Because
25 it seems to me, and I would love to be corrected, that

1 it would then fall to the people who live here to have
2 to do something. That's one concern.

3 Another concern I have, a couple of speakers ago,
4 a gentleman was talking about the high-level waste
5 being taken to Texas. While in my own self-interest
6 that sounds lovely, it does not sound very lovely for a
7 couple of very important reasons. One is that the way
8 it would be transported to Texas is on our railway
9 systems as I understand it. Doesn't strike me as a
10 very viable option to transport some of the most
11 dangerous substances known to humankind on rail systems
12 through some of the most heavily, densely populated
13 regions of our country and then putting it in Texas,
14 whether they want it or not, doesn't seem like a very
15 good plan to me.

16 Another concern that I'm hoping that the Public
17 Service Board will do is that, in whatever parameters
18 are set for should this transfer happen, that the
19 highest possible standards known to us now -- there's
20 been a lot of talk about how technology has improved
21 and we can do everything faster and cheaper and we know
22 how to do it better. That's great. Let's make sure
23 that we vet out to find the highest possible standard
24 for the removal of waste that exists and hold this
25 company to that standard.

1 Because I would agree with what John was just
2 saying. You know, the company is trying to do this
3 within a budget, and there are a couple of ways you do
4 that. You either do it -- you find shortcuts that are
5 less expensive, or you don't do it to the standard that
6 you need to. If, if it's not going to fit, if the
7 standard you hoped was not going to fit within the
8 budget, those are kind of your two options. So, so I
9 would hope that the Public Service Board will make sure
10 to hold them to the highest possible standard
11 available.

12 And I also want to share the concern raised by
13 Chris Williams -- I do have a Chris Williams who is a
14 brother, but that's not him -- that there is great
15 concern I have for a decommissioning process happening
16 right across the street from an elementary school and
17 that any residual dust or fumes or whatever that I'm
18 presuming would happen with any, even if you're doing
19 it well, that would happen that there could be risk to
20 the children right across the street, and I have grave
21 concerns about that as well.

22 So I just would hope that, in the process of
23 getting to what we all want, which is a fully clean
24 site where alternative energies can start being sourced
25 there, that would be a fabulous thing. We all want

1 that, and it's, really, the, the question is not about
2 that. The question is about, How do we get there, and
3 whether or not we can get there in a way that will hold
4 the correct people responsible for the cost of it and
5 will get us there in a way that is responsible as
6 citizens, not only of Vermont and Massachusetts and New
7 Hampshire who are all impacted by this, but also as
8 citizens of this planet and what we're leaving for the
9 generations to come. Thank you very much for coming
10 down and allowing us the opportunity to speak.

11 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Thank you. Peter Van
12 der Does, and then we have one more speaker on the list
13 after him, and that's Gary Sachs, and, if anyone else
14 wants to speak who is not signed up, we have another,
15 we have a clipboard. So please add your name if you're
16 still interested.

17 MR. VAN DER DOES: Peter Van der Does from
18 Brattleboro. First, I want to thank the Public Service
19 Department for their hard work representing all of the
20 stakeholders here and very belatedly congratulate Ms.
21 Hudson on her promotion, very belatedly. Make no
22 mistake, I think most people here would really like to
23 see this go through. There are some caveats that I'd
24 like to cover. There are technical problems which can
25 occur, and there are also cost overrides.

1 NorthStar, in its previous life as LVI Services,
2 is virtually spotless with many, many years of taking
3 down industrial structures. However, in its recent
4 reincarnation as NorthStar, it has chosen partners that
5 bear a closer look. It would have been easier and much
6 less expensive Googling court cases and doing queries
7 in Google News for reports on technical competency or
8 financial soundness rather than using Coopers & Lybrand
9 or whoever to do the due diligence.

10 I'm just going to talk a little bit about AREVA
11 that I have been against since they were Framatome.
12 AREVA has a \$7 billion hole which the French
13 government, through their 80 percent owned Electricite
14 de France, has tried to patch it up with a 2-billion
15 Euro buyout of part of its organization just to get it
16 through another year. They also have a lawsuit with
17 TVO, the Finnish nuclear authority, because they're
18 nine years behind construction schedule and it's
19 costing the Finnish 10.2 billion Euros or three times
20 the original cost estimate, not to mention a colossal
21 technical screwup during a major ISFSI design build
22 project when AREVA forgot to include the all-important
23 drying process in the transition from spent fuel into
24 dry casks. Three years after they began construction
25 on this project, they were excluded from it by

1 Energoatom, the Ukranian nuclear authority.

2 Burns & McDonnell, another NorthStar partner, was
3 sued by a regional airport in Branson, Missouri,
4 because the \$70 million runway foundation that they
5 were the consultant engineers on collapsed two years
6 after the facility opened.

7 As consulting engineers for the retrofit of a
8 municipal incinerator, Burns & McDonnell stated in 1999
9 that the initial cost was going to be between \$45 and
10 \$47 million. By 2007 the project was still unfinished,
11 and the cost had ballooned to \$90.3 million. They were
12 also consultants to a tannery which used hexavalent
13 chromium as a fertilizer. 18 farm families were
14 afflicted with brain damage and various other ailments
15 and were awarded \$10 million in a legal suit. I don't
16 think that brought back their health.

17 Make no mistake, we all want this decommissioning
18 to go through, and these partners might be the best in
19 the business or at least the best known, but what we
20 want are sound legal instruments which will guarantee
21 payment of all decommissioning costs and solid legal
22 commitments guaranteeing the site restoration with the
23 same radiation release standards as Maine Yankee, in
24 other words, 10 millirem. Thank you.

25 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Thank you. Gary Sachs,

1 and following Gary will be Leo Schiff.

2 MR. SACHS: Carol and I are here as the
3 survivors of cancer. We're trying to figure out where
4 cancer comes from. Maybe you guys have some input into
5 that. We both survived lymphoma in the past year.
6 Lots of gratitude.

7 Dilution is not the solution to pollution. It
8 certainly is not the solution to pollution when it
9 comes to radiation. Have I heard NorthStar or Entergy
10 NorthStar speak of rubblization? I believe Ms. Hofmann
11 was available in the PSB hearing rooms when it was
12 clearly stated during the aughts that rubblization
13 would not be used here at Vermont Yankee because
14 rubblization is basically the epitome of dilution is
15 the solution to pollution.

16 We don't want that, okay? We really can't have
17 that. This is radiation. No. Well, the genie is
18 outside the bottle. Burlington, Vermont, is on a year
19 radiation this week from veterans today. So gamma
20 radiation is here. You guys live up there. We don't.
21 You live in Norwich, I know.

22 So rubblization is NorthStar's way around the
23 decontamination issue. Perhaps this is why, when I
24 read the NorthStar application, I did not see
25 decontamination written. I saw decommissioning written

1 but not decontamination, to which I want to draw to
2 your attention as the PSB. They are decontaminating a
3 severely contaminated radioactive site that is known to
4 leak, that has low-level waste that they've tossed into
5 the back 40 that we heard about in the PSB hearings.
6 That's going to cost more for them to decommission, but
7 they are planning on decommissioning at their
8 \$513 million cutoff or whatever it is. I can't bring
9 it that close. Oh, boy.

10 Remember when this thing got announced? It was
11 November 8th. What kind of stupid corporation
12 announces this sale this big on Election Day? Do you
13 really want to make sure we don't look at it? Yeah,
14 maybe nobody will notice. That drove me nuts. To me,
15 I think, if it was real or genuine or authentic, it
16 wouldn't have been announced that day. It would have
17 been announced on a day when people were available to
18 see it or hear it.

19 Okay. Who is NorthStar? Sure, okay, great. Who
20 is NorthStar Group Services, LLC? If we go to sue
21 somebody, State of Vermont goes to sue somebody, let's
22 say, 20, 15 years from now because let's say the
23 \$125 million is not enough, it's left to the
24 ratepayers, and, sure, I was there when we sold the
25 reactor to Entergy, and I know that we sold it to

1 Entergy because Vermont doesn't know how to
2 decommission a reactor. That's why we don't, we don't
3 know how to decommission.

4 Entergy did. They took care of Maine Yankee after
5 it was sold, after it closed, but Entergy doesn't want
6 to be in the decommissioning business. They want to
7 hook up with, I guess it's NorthStar Decommissioning
8 Group, LLC, which is made up of Burns & McDonnell,
9 AREVA, and -- it will come to me in a minute. Burns &
10 McDonnell, AREVA, and Waste Control Specialists.

11 AREVA, to the best of my awareness, AREVA is owned
12 by a Japanese company, okay? Japan is under a state
13 secret law such that we may not be able to get -- so
14 you were wrong, but maybe I'm wrong. So AREVA was
15 formerly Siemens and was recently noted by the NRC when
16 they tried to buy Calvert Cliffs. I don't know what
17 AREVA's business is in the United States anymore, okay?
18 They can't be the primary owner of a reactor. We
19 learned that in 2014 or '15 when they tried to buy
20 Calvert Cliffs and the NRC said no. I don't know if
21 AREVA is in other companies in the country or if this
22 is NorthStar's approach to bring AREVA into this
23 country. I don't know. I don't know what AREVA is
24 doing.

25 Needless to say, as other people have mentioned to

1 you, AREVA, the branch of electricity to France, has
2 more than enough issues of its own right now.
3 Currently, well, let's just talk about the Creusot
4 Forge. That's good enough. The Creusot Forge is owned
5 by AREVA, but yet they made nuclear parts that were not
6 actually up to snuff, so there are a number of reactors
7 in this country with parts by AREVA's Creusot Forge.
8 I'd like to see them shut down, but that's not why
9 we're here.

10 You're here to talk about this sale. Well, a
11 couple of weeks ago General Electric announced that
12 they're going to Europe to decommission reactors.
13 General Electric is who built this reactor. I wonder
14 if Entergy went to GE and said, You guys want to
15 decommission your reactor? I tend to doubt it. I
16 think NorthStar might have been cheaper.

17 So I also have a question as far as, if there's a
18 lawsuit down the road from Vermont, not that Entergy
19 ever sued Vermont, really, not that Entergy ever sued
20 Vermont. How many times did Entergy sue Vermont? Who
21 can count, okay? But, because they're closing, that's
22 all history now, and we love them as a good company
23 now. I'm sorry. I don't. They've lied to us numerous
24 times. I believe this whole NorthStar deal is a
25 made-up Entergy Spinco, but let's -- that's just my

1 thought.

2 Waste Control Specialists, yes, they're trying to
3 do the high-level nuclear waste above the Ogallala
4 Aquifer in Andrews County, Texas. I'd rather have my
5 waste stay in Vernon. I've been to Maine, and I've
6 seen the Maine Yankee site. No. They have dry casks.
7 It is not accessible to the public. It's about 200 --
8 I don't know if it's 100 yards or 200 yards, but you
9 can't get anywhere near the dry casks. We have a much
10 smaller site than Maine Yankee. I don't think it will
11 be open to the public while the waste is still there,
12 and I don't see the stranded waste as going anywhere
13 quickly.

14 I don't know how much radiation is on the site,
15 but I've heard that NorthStar says it wants to take
16 98 percent of it away. If we don't know the 100
17 percent number, how are we going to know the 98 percent
18 number, and how are we going to know how much they're
19 leaving behind? You know, because, if they go through
20 with their rubblization --

21 Oh, I also have something to say about the Entergy
22 tactic that came through with the revenue sharing
23 agreement, which I don't know if it's a part of this
24 deal or not. If the Public Service Board doesn't agree
25 to this deal as it's put out by NorthStar-Entergy, does

1 that close the deal? I don't know, because that's how
2 it was for the revenue sharing agreement, and I don't
3 consider that to be a negotiation. I considered that a
4 -- I consider that to be a you have your arm behind
5 your back and you're forced into it. I don't have the
6 right term in my head.

7 I get nervous at microphones. I've been doing it
8 for a long time. I don't like doing it. I'm a -- I
9 have a life. I don't want to have to know this stuff,
10 or I don't want to make believe to know it. I want to
11 know who you're going to sue. 15, 10 years down the
12 road, who do you sue?

13 If, let's say AREVA cuts a part wrong or Waste
14 Control Specialists cuts a part wrong and it can't be
15 transported and it costs more and it goes out beyond
16 the money factor. Who does the State of Vermont sue,
17 NorthStar? Mr. State? That doesn't really make sense
18 if it's an AREVA issue or a Waste Control Specialists
19 issue, point. So that's why I don't like the one
20 person, one point person concept of Mr. State. It's a
21 -- it didn't read right. Between that and not seeing
22 decontamination in the application, it didn't work for
23 me at all.

24 There are no guarantees this process works. As
25 the man who researched it from Vermont Law School

1 Stated, he looked. It hasn't been done before. Wow,
2 we got 942 things to do, but who knows if it's going to
3 work? Not to mention, if they get into the third thing
4 and find it takes them to the seventeenth, then they
5 get to rewrite the whole numbers.

6 So Waste Control Specialists, they're owned by
7 another company. they are a subdivision of Energy
8 Solutions, and Burns -- I don't know why we don't have
9 Energy Solutions here. Instead, we have Waste Control
10 Specialists. Where is their parent corp? What do they
11 say about this?

12 And then, Burns & McDonnell, I don't know how to
13 draw this connection, so, when in doubt, I can leave it
14 out, but I'm pretty sure there's a connection between
15 Burns & McDonnell and Mallinckrodt, which Mallinckrodt
16 is a pharmaceutical company that was known to have
17 created a number of radioactive isotopes that were left
18 in various places around St. Louis. SLAPS is an
19 acronym to follow, SLAPS St. Louis, blah, blah, blah.
20 There are, there's the burning waste in Bridgeton in
21 the landfill, in the West Lake Landfill. That could
22 have something to do with Burns & McDonnell and their
23 fine engineering, but I don't know that.

24 One thing I saw in the application was that it was
25 important for Mr. State to have the land. That's what

1 I've heard people talk about here is the land. It's
2 become clear to me that there is a right of first
3 refusal, that the State of Vermont has the right of
4 first refusal and that is, hello, that's an issue
5 before you guys. I don't understand why NorthStar has
6 to own VY. When I read it in the application, it read
7 like gobbledegook. Because of their business plan,
8 it's important that they own the reactor to then do
9 their proper decommissioning the right way. It didn't
10 make -- it didn't read logically.

11 It's like, every other reactor that's
12 decommissioned, they maintain ownership, and the
13 company comes in like Entergy did at Maine and
14 decommissions it, and then they return the site to
15 Maine Yankee or Yankee Atomic, whomever it was. AREVA
16 is sounding more and more like Westinghouse. Thank
17 you.

18 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Thank you. Leo Schiff
19 next and then Lorie Cartwright.

20 MR. SCHIFF: Thank you for coming down here
21 tonight. My name is Leo Schiff from Brattleboro. I'm
22 part of the Safe and Green Campaign. I wasn't planning
23 on speaking tonight. This is a pretty complicated
24 issue, and I really wanted to listen more than talk,
25 but Guy Page inspired me to talk, because Guy expressed

1 the belief that we all want the high-level nuclear
2 waste to leave Vermont, to leave Vernon, and I have to
3 say I'm not so sure that's a good idea. That waste
4 belongs to us. We, the people, the energy users in
5 Vermont, are the ones who, on some level, benefited
6 from its creation, and it's our job to be the stewards
7 of that waste, and as the Public Service Board, I think
8 that you have in your interest the long-term health,
9 safety, economic well-being of Vermont, and I think
10 that responsible stewardship of this waste is part of
11 that charge.

12 So this waste will be highly toxic longer than the
13 State of Vermont has existed. It will be highly toxic
14 longer than the entire Judeo-Christian history, and
15 what I'd like to see, really -- and I know this is kind
16 of a pipe dream -- I'd like to see most of the waste
17 stay in Vernon, the high-level waste, where we can pass
18 along the story from generation to generation of how
19 toxic it is and how we need to care for it, but in
20 order to ensure that that story continue well, I'd like
21 to see a portion of the waste on the State House lawn
22 in Montpelier where our lawmakers, our legal
23 representatives, our law, our publicly elected
24 representatives also keep it in mind for responsible
25 stewardship.

1 And, since Burlington is the largest city and the
2 economic engine of the State of Vermont, I'd be happy
3 to see a few dry casks right at the top of the Church
4 Street Marketplace so that that part of Vermont also
5 gets to think about this product, this high-level
6 waste, and care for it for as long as it continues to
7 be a danger for the people around it.

8 So I hope that, in your deliberations about this
9 sale, that you keep in mind the safe and responsible
10 care of this really important waste product and not
11 look for a quick and cheap solution of foisting our
12 responsibility off on other people. Thank you.

13 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Thank you. Leo --
14 sorry. Lorie Cartwright next followed by Ned Childs,
15 and, at this point, Ned Childs is the last speaker
16 tonight, unless somebody -- oh, we take that back. We
17 will have some more after that.

18 MS. CARTWRIGHT: Hi. I'm Lorie Cartwright
19 from Brattleboro. I am on the Board of New England
20 Coalition. We're an intervenor in this matter.
21 However, I am here speaking tonight on my own behalf.
22 I do also want to thank you for coming to Windham
23 County and not having us all drive up to Montpelier.
24 And, like so many here tonight, I would like nothing
25 more than to see a faster decontamination of the Vernon

1 Vermont Yankee site. However, I do have cause for
2 alarm due to some of the items that have been in the
3 news regarding some of the entities that are hoping to
4 take over the responsibility of this matter.

5 And I know that, sometimes, when things seem too
6 good to be true, they are. So I would just implore the
7 Board to please do its homework, do its due diligence,
8 and, yes, I'm sure the majority, if not all, Vermonters
9 would like to see this site cleaned up faster but not
10 at the cost, the great cost, of safety.

11 I know I'm not supposed to talk about radiological
12 safety, but there are other safety concerns. There are
13 many contaminants, known and unknown, not of the
14 radiological type on the site, and to do it cheaper and
15 faster isn't always necessarily the safest, and, for
16 many generations of Vermonters to follow, we have a
17 great responsibility, an enormous responsibility, and,
18 yes, Vernon is the site, but this is a matter -- the
19 contamination doesn't stay within the boundaries and
20 the borders of this town. It travels across the state.
21 It travels across the nation. It travels across the
22 earth.

23 And so I do implore you to do your due diligence
24 and not just take a quick, easy deal that might look
25 good at first blush, and I'm not implying that I would

1 think you would do that. I know you all take your
2 positions very seriously, and we appreciate the hard
3 work that you're doing for the public.

4 I have been confused for a long time when I read
5 about the hopes of the Town and others to repurpose the
6 site. Yes, we do want to see that site repurposed, but
7 I'm not personally aware of any other nuclear reactor
8 site that has been decommissioned that has been
9 released to be repurposed. Perhaps portions of these
10 sites have been, but, as long as the high-level waste
11 remains on site, the site will not be able to be
12 released for redevelopment, and I apologize if I'm not
13 using the correct jargon, but I hope it's clear what I
14 mean.

15 Yes, if we could continue to produce energy there,
16 and, ideally, clean, green energy, not nuclear energy
17 -- it's not clean, and it's not green. I don't care
18 who says it. It's not backed up by science. Yes,
19 let's produce clean, green energy there, but, until the
20 waste is removed, I just, I don't know where people are
21 getting these notions, and there's a lot of people,
22 very smart people, spending probably a lot of hours
23 talking and planning, but it's just, it's a pipe dream,
24 and I don't want to rain on anyone's parade, but it's
25 just not happening, and, like Mr. Schiff, I do feel

1 like we have a responsibility to continue to host it.

2 I don't think that the racial justice movement
3 would be too pleased to learn that we're considering
4 shipping our high-level radioactive waste to a less
5 than -- I don't want to say this and sound rude, but
6 it's not a very economically viable part of the
7 country. I mean, sure, they might think they want it,
8 but they don't.

9 And shipping it on rail has been mentioned. I
10 shudder to think of the possibilities of accidents.
11 And we talk about the millirems of the radiation that
12 we want to have this company agree to leave us. I
13 don't want to know about millirems. I want to know how
14 many tens or hundreds of thousands of cancer deaths
15 those numbers represent. The difference between a
16 hundred for a brownfield for millirems, 25, 15, it's
17 all very complicated, I'm sure, but at the end of the
18 day, how many cancer deaths does each millirem
19 represent? Thank you.

20 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Thank you. Ned Childs
21 and then Lissa Weinmann.

22 MR. CHILDS: Testing. Good evening, Sarah.
23 I haven't met you yet. And welcome to everybody here
24 tonight. We've had a chance to meet and be with each
25 other over the years, so this is just a little bit of a

1 historical slant. It's a, it's a part of the debate
2 that is somehow left out. So, with apologies to the
3 good residents of Vernon, I'm from Dummerston, Ned
4 Childs. I'm also found at the New England Coalition
5 from time to time and speak as a private citizen.

6 So, two score and five years ago, our fathers
7 brought forth here upon this field a fantastic and
8 grievous land use crime, in case you wonder where I
9 stood. So we are met here on this field of a heinous
10 and willful crime against the future of all life on
11 this rocky and watery planet.

12 In the name of almighty greed, with plans hatched
13 back in the 50's and 60's for untold profits to be had
14 from large-scale uranium utilization, our forefathers
15 from General Electric and the Atomic Energy Commission
16 caused to be built here a gigantic factory designed for
17 the production of poisonous biotoxins. As a byproduct
18 of this reaction, quantities of electricity are made
19 available for sale, electricity which we can all agree
20 is largely wasted.

21 So here we are at the end of this promise-plagued
22 road with \$500 million more or less still in the bank
23 to clean up this thoroughly polluted and irradiated
24 once bucolic site right across from Vernon's elementary
25 school and their town offices. Behold the bitter irony

1 as we debate ways to reduce the residual gamma shine
2 from the site, from the spent fuel assemblies and their
3 slowly failing concrete and steel canisters while
4 poisonous tritium leeches into the local groundwaters
5 and where also cesium, strontium, and plutonium abound
6 at the site.

7 Efforts to control these toxic legacies gobbling
8 up our precious moneys by the five and ten million
9 dollars per year ad infinitum, and for what? So that
10 big utilities could attempt to maintain their control
11 of the sale of retail electricity for a few decades
12 more while these same utilities caused distributed
13 solar and wind to die on the vine and Public Service
14 Boards of years past and joint congressional committees
15 gone by, university research grant recipients from
16 Harvard and Yale to MIT over the years have all been
17 complicit in this unnecessary crime which was designed
18 to monetize uranium ore for private profits while the
19 unwitting and underserved public always, the hapless
20 public, always picks up the unrelenting costs with
21 their taxes and with their health, the costs of this
22 horrendous, poisonous, and, most importantly,
23 unnecessary uranium folly. Thank you for listening.

24 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Thank you. I have one
25 more name, and it's Lissa Weinmann.

1 MS. WEINMANN: I'll just hold it. Thanks.
2 So I'm Lissa Weinmann, and I live in Brattleboro,
3 Vermont. I also have a business in downtown
4 Brattleboro and have raised my family here in the
5 evacuation zone of the reactor and was pleased to see
6 it closed, but, since then, I've been doing a lot of
7 study about the issue of nuclear waste and the policy
8 around it. I've attended meetings with the DOE in
9 Washington, some of their consent-based siting
10 gatherings, and I've been taking a very close look at
11 the issue, and it's interesting.

12 When you hear people say, Let's put this issue to
13 bed, well, there is no putting this issue to bed
14 because there is no central repository. Yucca Mountain
15 will not be redeployed. The waste isolation pilot
16 project in Carlsbad which was sort of a defense waste
17 repository and was being thought of as the sort of
18 model had an explosion a couple years ago, is now
19 closed, and has no date where it's going to be
20 reopened. So, you know, the conventional wisdom about
21 this idea that one day we'll have a central repository
22 where all the waste will go has really, as someone
23 called it, has really been a pipe dream.

24 So I really appreciate the fact that Vernon wants
25 the waste to go, but, guys, just take a look at the DOE

1 reports and the gatherings. The waste is going
2 nowhere. The PACT and the Texas site, I do not have
3 high hopes for that, and even if you talk to the DOE
4 officials -- and you should talk to them as part of
5 these gatherings -- they don't think anything's going
6 anywhere for at least 40 years.

7 So what I would like to propose is, similar to the
8 sort of outlandish, some of you might think, concept
9 that we all want the waste to leave, well, maybe
10 there's another way to go about it. You know, maybe
11 the thing that Vermont should be looking at is
12 eliminate the middleman. I mean, NorthStar is coming
13 in here to do a job. Why? Why? It does sound a
14 little too good to be true, right? I mean, what's in
15 it for NorthStar? Why are they picking up something
16 that Entergy doesn't see money in? How come NorthStar
17 sees money in the process?

18 Well, the reason they want the land and they want
19 the standing is because they know that they're going to
20 be suing the federal government in perpetuity to care
21 for that waste, and I'm wondering, you know, Well, if
22 the waste has to be cared for potentially on the banks
23 of the Connecticut River in perpetuity, maybe Vernon
24 and the State of Vermont should be looking at taking
25 that role on somehow and suing the federal government

1 and managing the waste and getting the money and being
2 responsible. Because, at the end of the day if
3 something goes wrong, then we are going to be
4 responsible. There is going to be no one to sue.

5 There's a crisis with nuclear waste storage in the
6 United States. The policies around it will have to
7 change. There's no more room in the spent storage
8 pools. We need to have interim waste facilities, but
9 the conventional wisdom is moving more toward
10 prolonged, hardened on-site storage, and, if that is
11 the case, then we're going to be looking at at least
12 another 50 years of having this stuff here.

13 Maybe we should think about what's in it for us.
14 Maybe we should be suing the federal government and
15 doing that job for ourselves. I don't know how we
16 would do it, but maybe that's worthy of examination.
17 Eliminate the middleman here, which is NorthStar and
18 these, you know, somewhat questionable partners that
19 they've put together.

20 So I just put that out there, because I think that
21 there's a lot that Vermont can do to, to take care of
22 this waste that could be profitable for us in the long
23 run. There is the nuclear, the waste, the Nuclear
24 Waste Fund has something like \$30 billion in it that is
25 earmarked specifically for the use of creating a

1 centralized storage facility that we now know and the
2 federal government is acknowledging is not going to
3 happen. So what's going to happen to that \$30 billion
4 in the Nuclear Waste Fund? Well, maybe some of that
5 can go to us and we can build a state-of-the-art
6 facility here and turn it back into our own economy.

7 So I just, you know, I put it out there. I look
8 at this issue, will be looking at it a lot more in the
9 days ahead, but just be careful about what looks too
10 good to be true, because it certainly, most of the
11 time, isn't. Thank you.

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is that \$30 billion in a
13 lock box?

14 MS. WEINMANN: Well, it is there, but that's
15 a more complicated issue, but it is there, and the
16 industry knows it's there. People don't like to talk
17 about the Nuclear Waste Fund, because the industry
18 wants it sort of kept quiet, but it is there, and it
19 was legislated, and they paid a tax into it for many,
20 many years, so they know it's there.

21 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Thank you very much. I
22 believe we have no more people signed up to speak. So
23 I just want to thank everyone again for coming out on
24 this very rainy, nasty night, and your comments, again
25 --

1 BOARD MEMBER HOFMANN: Mr. Turnbull, I think.

2 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Oh, we do have another
3 speaker? Okay, thank you.

4 MR. TURNBULL: I did have a very brief
5 comment.

6 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: Could you state your
7 name, please?

8 MR. TURNBULL: My name is Clay Turnbull. I'm
9 a resident of Townshend, Vermont. I am a trustee, and
10 I work at New England Coalition, but tonight I had a
11 brief comment just from myself as an individual, and
12 that is I would hope that we can all get around the
13 concept of seeing this site cleaned up to a standard
14 that's at least 100 percent as clean as was achieved in
15 Maine and that Massachusetts is working toward. Right
16 now it's proposed at 150 percent, and I'd like to see
17 it at 100 percent. Let's get Vermont as clean as Maine
18 Yankee has been cleaned up and Massachusetts has
19 committed to and is working toward. We should be at
20 least as clean as they achieved in Maine, and already
21 it's not proposed to be that clean, and I believe it
22 should be. Thank you.

23 BOARD MEMBER CHENEY: All right. Thank you.
24 I just want to remind you that comments can continue to
25 be submitted, and the instructions on how to do that

1 are at either end of the table. We will also be having
2 another public hearing in Vernon in early September,
3 and evidentiary hearings will be held in the late fall.
4 Thank you again very much.

5
6
7 (Whereupon at 8:48 p.m. the hearing was adjourned.)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

