

**Compilation of Recent CEP Communications  
09/02/2016 to 10/25/2016**

**From:** Tom Palmisano  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 07, 2016 5:19 AM  
**To:** Manuel Camargo  
**Cc:** Liese Mosher ; Maureen Brown  
**Subject:** Good article for the CEP

Manuel,

Here is a good article for the CEP. Please review and provide it to them.

Tom

*Attachment:*

*1 - Nuclear: 'Dead Plant Society' lobby group booms as reactors close by E&E Reporter Hannah Northey*

~~~~~

**From:** Tom Palmisano  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 14, 2016 11:56 AM  
**To:** Manuel Camargo  
**Cc:** Tom Palmisano  
**Subject:** Good article on nuclear waste disposal

Manuel,

Attached is a good article summarizing the situation with nuclear waste disposal for both low level waste and high level waste. Please provide this to the CEP members and the co-participants.

Tom

*Attachment:*

*2 – The Towns that say “Yes in my Backyard!” to Nuclear Waste, Priceonomics by Ben Christopher*

~~~~~

**From:** David G. Victor  
**Sent:** Monday, September 19, 2016 5:39 PM  
**To:** Patricia Borchmann ; Donna Gilmore ; Dave Roberts; Dianne Jacob; George Courser  
**Cc:** Dan Stetson ; Manuel Camargo  
**Subject:** (External):Re: Request from San Diego public stakeholders to replace County SD Supervisor Bill Horn, as "designated" SD rep on Community Engagement Panel (CEP)

Dear Patricia (if I may)

**Compilation of Recent CEP Communications**  
**09/02/2016 to 10/25/2016**

Thank you for your email. I copy Dan Stetson and Manuel who will put this into the official record. Manuel may also comment on the process used to select CEP members.

All best wishes

David

**From:** Patricia Borchmann

**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2016 at 4:43 PM

**To:** "David G. Victor" , Donna Gilmore , Dave Roberts , Dianne Jacob , Patricia Borchmann , George Courser

**Subject:** Request from San Diego public stakeholders to replace County SD Supervisor Bill Horn, as "designated" SD rep on Community Engagement Panel (CEP)

As you recall, I spoke with you briefly during the break at Community Engagement Panel (CEP) Meeting in Oceanside last Thursday evening (09 15 16).

Since you are also a resident in San Diego county, you've also noticed the consistent pattern where the 'designated' CEP rep for SD County (Bill Horn) does not attend most CEP meetings during past 18 months. I understand that on some occasions, Supervisor Horn may send an 'aide' to CEP Meetings, to 'observe and report' on the meetings to him. Since that intermittent substitution, or attendance by an aide in Bill Horn's District 1 is inconsistent, irregular, and not publicly visible, I feel strongly that Horn's substitute attendance by an aide from District 1 is not a functional equivalent. Horn's consistent absence at CEP Meetings fails to fully represent the ongoing concerns and credible technical issues that many stakeholders in San Diego county have about Southern California Edison (SCE's) Decommissioning Plan prepared for San Onofre. As you are well aware, stakeholders in San Diego county have many technical concerns about adequacy of the HOLTEC Umax spent fuel storage cask selected by SCE, emergency response plans for San Diego County, and Edison's exemptions which reduced scope, scale, and funding for Emergency Response, service life and durability of proposed dry cask storage exposure in marine moisture conditions on coastline, seismic risks, tsunami risks, human error or series of cascading events.

During Meetings with County of San Diego Board of Supervisors, where County OES staff represented County during SCE modification to Emergency Response Plans last year, it was noted that two other Supervisors from other Districts in SD County were well prepared, more well informed, and both applied interest and expertise to important issues before the Board of Supervisors, than Bill Horn did himself. Specifically, Supervisor Dave Roberts (District 3), and Dianne Jacobs (District 1) have displayed their expertise and technical skills to responsibly address complicated utility issues, to protect County of San Diego emergency response capabilities, and protect public health and safety of constituents in San Diego they were elected to represent. .

During the past 18 months, based on Supervisor Bill Horn's apparent lack of personal interest to invest time necessary to preview so many technical reports, prepared by Edison staff, consultants retained by Edison, industry reports, and concerns expressed by independent experts outside the nuclear industry, and stakeholders in San Diego are frankly tired of being either unrepresented, or underrepresented, or both.

**Compilation of Recent CEP Communications  
09/02/2016 to 10/25/2016**

If possible, I am among many stakeholders in San Diego who request the CEP Panel designate another San Diego Supervisor, plus an alternate to replace Bill Horn, so San Diego stakeholders will have an ongoing active and consistent voice on all CEP panel issues, and an informed representative with expertise to fully apply and use that authority to fully represent stakeholders in San Diego. It is only unfortunate that this CEP Panel has already operated at least 18 months already, with a representative from San Diego who chose not to attend personally, or designate an alternate Supervisor. Many critical issues and serious Decommissioning challenges still remain to be resolved, so CEP Panel will have no shortage of complicated technical areas to learn about, and fully understand perspectives from experts both inside, and outside the nuclear industry or contractors.

The projected schedule presented by SCE at the CEP Panel Meeting last Thursday indicates there will be ongoing work by SCE, consultant, and industry to implement the Decommissioning Plan at San Onofre, and complete the multiple stages of additional work to be performed that will need CEP coordination and oversight. Stakeholders in San Diego both deserve, and demand fair representation at all future CEP Panel Meetings, so we would appreciate any and all assistance possible, to accomplish replacement of Bill Horn, as CEP designated rep for SD Diego County, and seek capable representation by Dave Roberts and Dianne Jacob instead.

If you have questions, my phone is . Many thanks for thoughtful consideration

~~~~~

**From:** Ted Quinn  
**Date:** Monday, September 19, 2016 at 11:54 AM  
**To:** "David G. Victor" , Manuel Camargo , Maureen Brown , Tom Palmisano , 'Daniel Stetson'  
**Subject:** FW: DOE does not need Congress to move ahead on private nuclear waste storage

[Making sure you see this.](#)

Best regards,

Ted Quinn  
ANS Past President  
The OSU NEP Advisory Board Chair  
IEC SC45A WGA9 Convenor  
President, Technology Resources  
<http://www.technology-resources.com/>

**From:** Gene Cramer  
**Sent:** Monday, September 19, 2016 10:29 AM  
**To:** mbrexchange  
**Subject:** DOE does not need Congress to move ahead on private nuclear waste storage

Thursday, September 15, 2016 2:10 PM ET **Extra**

**Compilation of Recent CEP Communications**  
**09/02/2016 to 10/25/2016**

Moniz: DOE does not need Congress to move ahead on private nuclear waste storage

By Andrew Coffman Smith

The U.S. Department of Energy sees an opportunity in privately owned interim storage facilities to overcome the political impasse over nuclear waste, Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz told a Senate appropriations subcommittee.

Sources

Industry Document:

Statement of Dr. Ernest J. Moniz 9/14/2016

Moniz told the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development on Sept. 14 that the DOE is encouraged by the "novel approach" of private initiatives to build interim storage facilities for nuclear waste. In reference to a recent license application filed at the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission by Valhi Inc. subsidiary Waste Control Specialists and others to build an interim storage facility for 40,000 metric tons of nuclear waste in West Texas, Moniz said the filing suggests a "certain level of consent" in line with the Obama administration's consent-based policy. The DOE proposal requires the support of communities, states, and the federal government to store or dispose of nuclear spent fuel.

The energy secretary also acknowledged that somewhat unclear language in a statute already authorizes the DOE the ability to store nuclear waste at a private storage facility. For a government-operated facility, he said the DOE would need authorization by Congress. However, Moniz said, "acknowledging that authority from the Congress is very important" for the confidence of potential developers.

**When pressed on whether the DOE can go ahead with plans of storing nuclear waste at privately owned facilities, Moniz said the department is already gathering information and will issue a request for information in coming weeks to seek public input.** "There's a lot that we can do to move forward," he said; in particular on the issues of spent fuel transportation and contracting. The secretary is also hopeful that a consent-based siting plan will be issued later in 2016.

Moniz's comments received a positive reception from subcommittee Chairman Lamar Alexander, R.-Tenn., and the panel's ranking Democrat, Sen. Dianne Feinstein of California, who together introduced in 2015 legislation to establish a pilot storage facility for spent fuel from decommissioned nuclear power plants. Despite the bipartisan efforts on interim storage, Alexander and Feinstein continue to disagree over the only commercial used nuclear fuel and high-level waste repository authorized by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, at Yucca Mountain in Nevada. **The permanent deep geological repository at Yucca Mountain was defunded in 2011 and continues to have its funding blocked by Senate Minority Leader Harry Reid, D.-Nev., who is retiring in January 2017.**

**Feinstein said she cannot continue supporting nuclear energy if there is no strategy for interim storage and long-term disposal of its waste.** "Spent nuclear fuels continue to pile up: 77,000 metric tons to date scattered all across our country in spent fuel pools and dry casks at reactor sites," she said. "For me it is a deterrent to new nuclear power. If we can't properly store the waste, we shouldn't build the reactors."

"The lesson in Yucca is that any solution to the nuclear waste issue needs to be voluntary and must have the consent of not only the local governments but also of the state," said Feinstein.

During what were otherwise pro-nuclear remarks, which warned of the environmental and economic consequences if operating licenses of nuclear plants are not extended from 60 years to 80 years,

**Compilation of Recent CEP Communications**  
**09/02/2016 to 10/25/2016**

Alexander took a swipe at the nuclear energy industry on the issue of storage. The Tennessee Republican said it was **"a boneheaded move by the nuclear industry" to "jerk the rug out from under" the subcommittee by only endorsing Yucca Mountain instead of supporting several paths at once aimed at solving nuclear waste, including short-term repositories and private storage.**

**{{ But Congress was the party whose Nuclear Waste Policy Act revision killed the original plan to R&D five different geologies, then have one burial east and one west of the Mississippi ...**

**[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuclear\\_Waste\\_Policy\\_Act](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuclear_Waste_Policy_Act)**

The **Nuclear Waste Policy Act** of 1982 is a United States federal law which established a comprehensive national program for the safe, permanent disposal of highly radioactive wastes.

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act required the Secretary of Energy to issue guidelines for selection of sites for construction of two permanent, underground nuclear waste repositories. DOE was to study five potential sites, and then recommend three to the President by January 1, 1985. Five additional sites were to be studied and three of them recommended to the president by July 1, 1989 as possible locations for a second repository. A full environmental impact statement was required for any site recommended to the President.

Locations considered to be leading contenders for a permanent repository were basalt formations at the government's Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington; volcanic tuff formations at its Nevada nuclear test site, and several salt formations in Utah, Texas, Louisiana and Mississippi. Salt and granite formations in other states from Maine to Georgia had also been surveyed, but not evaluated in great detail<sup>1</sup>

The President was required to review site recommendations and submit to Congress by March 31, 1987 his recommendation of one site for the first repository, and by March 31, 1990, his recommendation for a second repository. The amount of high-level waste or spent fuel that could be placed in the first repository was limited to the equivalent of 70,000 metric tons of heavy metal until a second repository was built. The Act required the national government to take ownership of all nuclear waste or spent fuel at the reactor site, transport it to the repository, and thereafter be responsible for its containment. **enc}}**

"We should push ahead with something [to store nuclear waste for the near- and long-term]," Alexander said. "Those people who believe that if we stopped one, we should've stopped all, are as misinformed, I think, as those who believe that climate change is urgent but we don't need nuclear power to help solve the problem."

~~~~~

**From:** Manuel Camargo  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 20, 2016 5:01 PM  
**To:** 'David G. Victor' ; Ted Quinn ; Maureen Brown ; Tom Palmisano ; 'Daniel Stetson'

**Compilation of Recent CEP Communications**  
**09/02/2016 to 10/25/2016**

**Cc:** Liese Mosher

**Subject:** RE: (External):Re: Updated list of research questions for Congress's funding----- Explanation of the Cutoff on DOE Research Funding

David and Ted,

The blog post by Scott Burnell (public affairs at NRC) strikes me as appropriately concise and plain-spoken, and it includes links to the phase 1 and phase 2 reports for those who want more information. In talking to the SONGS team here, that blog post was most helpful in explaining the NRC's rationale for the cancellation when that decision was made. I have re-pasted that blog post below.

Manuel

**Examining the Reasons for Ending the Cancer Risk Study**

Posted by Moderator on October 6, 2015

Scott Burnell

Public Affairs Officer

One way NRC regulations protect communities around U.S. nuclear power plants is by requiring the plants to regularly sample air, water, and vegetation around their sites. [Results](#) of this sampling are sent to the NRC (and in some cases state agencies) to show only very tiny amounts of radioactive material are released during normal operations.

Even with this scrutiny — and a 1990 study showing no difference in cancer mortality rates between those living near U.S. reactors and those living elsewhere — questions persist about cancer risk from nearby reactors. The NRC had worked with the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) since 2010 on a study into the potential cancer risk of living near a U.S. nuclear power plant. But we ended this work earlier this month after a hard look at the low likelihood of getting usable results in a reasonable time frame.

Why are we comfortable that this decision, also driven by our budget situation, is in line with our mission to protect public health and safety?

First and foremost, the staff considered existing conditions around U.S. reactors, as shown by the ongoing environmental sampling and analysis we mentioned earlier. That evidence supports the conclusion that the average U.S. citizen's annual radiation dose from natural sources, such as radon and cosmic rays, is about a hundred times greater than the largest potential dose from a normally operating reactor.

This information shows how complicated it would be to single out an operating reactor's potential contribution to cancer risk. Researchers looking for small effects need a very large study population to be confident in their results. The NAS discussed this issue in its [report](#) on Phase 1 of the cancer risk study. The NAS said that the effort "may not have adequate statistical power to detect the presumed small increases in cancer risks arising from... monitored and reported releases."

**Compilation of Recent CEP Communications  
09/02/2016 to 10/25/2016**

The NRC staff examined the NAS Phase 2 [report](#) plans to validate the methods recommended in Phase 1. The Academy was very clear that the pilot study at seven U.S. sites was unlikely to answer the basic risk question. The NAS proposal said: “any data collected during the pilot study will have limited use for estimating cancer risks in populations near each of the nuclear facilities or for the seven nuclear facilities combined because of the imprecision inherent in estimates from small samples.”

The pilot study would also examine potential differences between individual states’ cancer registries. Large differences in registry quality or accessibility would hurt the study’s chances of generating useful results.

The NAS concluded they would need more than three years and \$8 million to complete the pilot study. If the pilot succeeded, expanding the research to all U.S. operating reactors would require additional years and tens of millions of dollars. The NRC decided that in our current budget environment the time and money would not be well spent for the possible lack of useful results.

The NRC agrees with the NAS that the study’s overall approach is scientifically sound. Interested individuals or groups can examine the NAS Phase 1 and 2 reports for a more detailed discussion of the methods and resources needed to conduct the proposed study. The NRC staff will examine international and national studies on cancer risk to see if we should conduct any future work in this area.

~~~~~

**From:** Patricia Borchmann  
**Sent:** Friday, September 23, 2016 1:56 PM  
**To:** David G. Victor  
**Cc:** Rick Morgal ; Dave Roberts; Dianne Jacob; Dan Stetson ; Manuel Camargo  
**Subject:** (External):Re: Request from San Diego public stakeholders to replace County SD Supervisor Bill Horn, as 'designated' SD rep on Community Engagement Panel.

David Victor -

Thank you.

On Fri, Sep 23, 2016 at 1:54 PM, David G. Victor wrote:

Thank you—I will be sure this email is part of the record and the materials that we circulate periodically to the CEP. David Victor

**From:** Patricia Borchmann  
**Date:** Friday, September 23, 2016 at 1:51 PM  
**To:** "David G. Victor"  
**Cc:** Rick Morgal , Patricia Borchmann , Dave Roberts , Dianne Jacob

**Subject:** Fwd: Request from San Diego public stakeholders to replace County SD Supervisor Bill Horn, as 'designated' SD rep on Community Engagement Panel.

**Compilation of Recent CEP Communications**  
**09/02/2016 to 10/25/2016**

David Victor - CEP Panel Chair

I am forwarding the email comments (dated today) prepared by San Diego resident Richard Mogul (from Ramona) to supplement my earlier email (09 19 16), which requested replacement of San Diego Supervisor Bill Horn as the designated representative on the CEP Panel. Since Richard Mogul has both technical expertise, and close familiarity with ongoing public safety issues at San Onofre, I hope you will agree his comments have extreme value from a technical perspective. His comments also reinforce the fact that the argument in my email is shared by other interested San Diego stakeholders.

If possible, please make it available to other CEP Panel members at your earliest convenience. If you have questions, my phone is

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Richard Mogul

Date: Fri, Sep 23, 2016 at 10:04 AM

Subject: Re: Request from San Diego public stakeholders to replace County SD Supervisor Bill Horn, as 'designated' SD rep on Community Engagement Panel.

To: Patricia Borchmann

Hello Patricia,

Supervisor Horn is a terrible Community Engagement Panel representative for San Diego I base my opinion on the incident below.

During a San Diego County Board of Supervisor Meeting in early 2015 before the decision by the California Coastal Commission to allow the waste to be stored on-site, there was a request for public comments from the San Diego County BOS on the issue of storing the waste on site.

I attended and spoke at the BOS meeting as did Ray Lutz. I spoke about my concern based upon the 5/8" stainless steel canisters that Southern California Edison is planning on placing the waste into for an undetermined period of time.

I spoke clearly and directly regarding the likelihood that the canisters could be on-site for decades and that we already have 50 on-site that are up to 12 years old (at the time). I told the supervisors that according to an EPRI inspection, conditions at Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant ISFSI were sufficient to allow Chloride Induced Stress Corrosion Cracking to initiate after just a few years of being exposed to the salt air found at both Diablo Canyon and SONGS.

I provided handouts to all the supervisors indicating that it might be possible that we already have cracked stainless steel canisters and will likely have them before the Federal Government is ready to take the waste to a permanent repository. I then told them of the need to re-canister the waste if the NRC is not confident that the canisters are robust enough for transport, which would require a nuclear waste reprocessing plant at San Onofre before the waste could be removed off site.

Somewhere in this speech I overheard Supervisor Horn stating that people couldn't even read the documents well enough to understand what was being said. Puzzled I continued on with my 2 minute

**Compilation of Recent CEP Communications  
09/02/2016 to 10/25/2016**

talk on a subject that is so complex that an hour might be sufficient to describe all that is wrong with the SONGS ISFSI and the Holtec Canisters.

Clearly Supervisor Horn is not open to the idea that SCE the NRC and Holtec are not acting in the best interests of the public or the County of San Diego. Sadly it takes decades to prove how poorly the NRC, the US government and local governments are handling this issue.

Please do what you can to get someone on the CEP that can make a difference as supervisor Horn is not a good representative of the public on this issue.

Rick Morgal

**From:** "Patricia Borchmann"  
**To:** "Michael Aguirre" , "Maria Severson" , "Charles Langley"  
**Cc:** "Rick Morgal" , "Martha Sullivan" , "Deanna Polk" , "Ray Lutz" , "George Courser"  
**Sent:** Friday, September 23, 2016 9:17:35 AM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Request from San Diego public stakeholders to replace County SD Supervisor Bill Horn, as 'designated' SD rep on Community Engagement Panel.

Mike Aguirre, Maria Severson, Charles Langley, Rick Morgal, Martha Sullivan, Deanna Polk, Ray Lutz, George Courser

In case you were not aware, I'm forwarding my email request from September 19, 2016 to David Victor : "Request from San Diego Stakeholders to replace 'designated' SD rep on Community Engagement Panel (CEP), Bill Horn.

I hope that my email was not premature, and hope that it expressed the shared sentiment among San Diego stakeholders. Comments?

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** **Patricia Borchmann**  
**Date:** Mon, Sep 19, 2016 at 3:39 PM  
**Subject:** Request from San Diego public stakeholders to replace County SD Supervisor Bill Horn, as 'designated' SD rep on Community Engagement Panel.  
**To:** David Victor  
**Cc:** Donna Gilmore , George Courser , Patricia Borchmann , Dave Roberts , Dianne Jacob

As you recall, I spoke with you briefly during the break at the Community Engagement Panel (CEP) Meeting in Oceanside last Thursday evening (09 15 16).

~~~~~

**From:** David G. Victor  
**Sent:** Monday, October 17, 2016 8:24 AM  
**To:** Ted Quinn ; Manuel Camargo ; Maureen Brown ; Tom Palmisano ; 'Daniel Stetson'  
**Subject:** (External):Re: Officials have authored a guide for other communities facing nuclear decommissioning

**Compilation of Recent CEP Communications  
09/02/2016 to 10/25/2016**

Thanks. We should share this article and the actual report with the CEP in our next circular. Frankly, I think the report has some wisdoms that are mainly relevant for the VT situation and not directly applicable to us. And the report, in my view, has not adequately flagged the tradeoffs involved in designing a panel that is fully independent from the plant operators. But those are my two cents. D

**From:** Ted Quinn

**Date:** Monday, October 17, 2016 at 8:04 AM

**To:** David Victor , Manuel Camargo , Maureen Brown , Tom Palmisano , 'Daniel Stetson'

**Subject:** FW: Officials have authored a guide for other communities facing nuclear decommissioning

[Making sure you see this.](#)

Best regards,

Ted Quinn

ANS Past President

The OSU NEP Advisory Board Chair

IEC SC45A WGA9 Convenor

President, Technology Resources

<http://www.technology-resources.com/>

**From:** Gene Cramer

**Sent:** Sunday, October 16, 2016 9:31 PM

**To:** mbrexchange

**Subject:** Officials have authored a guide for other communities facing nuclear decommissioning

## Brattleboro Reformer

By Mike Faher

Posted: 10/16/2016 08:59:15 PM EDT | Updated: 23 min. ago

U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for...

**BRATTLEBORO** >> Early in a new report on Vermont Yankee's shutdown, **Windham Region officials acknowledge that the closure's full impacts "have yet to be realized and may not necessarily be easy to quantify."**

Nevertheless, they believe they've got a story to tell.

That's the purpose of the report, framed as "lessons learned" both before and after the Vernon nuclear plant's December 2014 closure. **The document – the result of a tri-state effort – serves as an advisory, a tutorial and a warning for other communities that may face a loss of jobs, tax revenue and residents due to a nuclear plant shutdown.**

The document's perceived importance was emphasized by its release on Friday at a downtown Brattleboro gathering attended by U.S. Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vt.; U.S. Rep. Peter Welch, D-Vt.; and Matt Erskine, a top official at the U.S. Economic Development Administration.

**Compilation of Recent CEP Communications**  
**09/02/2016 to 10/25/2016**

"Other towns, regions and communities across the nation will learn from your experience to help set their course forward," Erskine said.

In the wake of Vermont Yankee's closure, **officials in Windham County have wrestled with challenges including complex federal nuclear regulations; abrupt economic impacts; continued conflict between the state and the plant's owner; and limited financial and technical resources to deal with it all.**

The plant's demise also has had an impact on neighboring Franklin County, Massachusetts, and Cheshire County, New Hampshire. The three counties hosted the majority of Vermont Yankee employees, who numbered about 550 just prior to shutdown.

Now, the tri-state counties have teamed up to produce a report titled "**When People and Money Leave (and the Plant Stays) – Lessons Learned from the Closure of the Vermont Yankee Power Station: A Tri-Region Experience.**" The full document is available for download at <http://brattleborodevelopment.com>.

In Windham County, Brattleboro Development Credit Corp. and Windham Regional Commission contributed to the report. Also involved were the Franklin Regional Council of Governments in Greenfield, Massachusetts, and the Southwest Region Planning Commission, based in Keene, New Hampshire.

That cooperative effort across state lines was lauded repeatedly at Friday's event. "What I've seen that's inspiring to me is the all-in approach that folks in the region are taking," Welch said.

Some of the new report's key points "are applicable to any locale that will or could lose a major employer," said Adam Grinold, executive director of Brattleboro Development Credit Corp.

But the report – which was produced with funding from the Economic Development Administration and BDCC – mostly focuses specifically on nuclear decommissioning issues.

Experts have said the Vermont Yankee situation is representative of a new wave of nuclear closures. They typically involve "**merchant" plants, which are not utility owned** and sell power into the wholesale market. And they've been marked by a shift toward the lengthy SAFSTOR decommissioning schedule, under which plant cleanup can take 60 years.

Chris Company, Windham Regional's executive director, said he recently has fielded decommissioning inquiries from New Jersey, California and Massachusetts, where Entergy has announced plans to close the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station in 2019.

"I'm getting more questions from other places," Company said. With the issuance of the new report, he added, "now I can point them to something and say, 'take a look at this.'"

Key points from the report include:

- Many of the "lessons learned" preach comprehensive planning – as much of it as possible, and as early as possible.

## Compilation of Recent CEP Communications 09/02/2016 to 10/25/2016

For example, though Vermont Yankee was always controversial, Windham Regional Commission stayed involved in plant proceedings over the years from a "neutral position so it could promote conversation among all sides," officials wrote.

Also, the report notes that the Windham Region's Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy was developed "with the assumption that VY would, at some point, close."

Though such conversations may be difficult to have when a nuclear plant has not yet been scheduled for closure, they are vitally important, officials say.

- Thorough planning and study should lead, the report says, to an in-depth understanding of a nuclear plant's role in a community.

**The report notes the high salaries associated with a nuclear plant: The average Vermont Yankee staffer earned about \$105,000 annually, "which is two and a half times greater than the average pay in the region," officials wrote.**

They also offer sobering advice about efforts to retain former nuclear workers. Many will be recruited to work and live elsewhere, the report says, and replacing a region's lost wages "will likely require more jobs at a lower wage level."

The report also notes that "there is a need to look beyond employment and income to also understand the role of employees, spouses and children in the community and civic life." **One Vermont Yankee example is the big drop in charitable contributions in the Windham Region since the plant shut down.**

- Such studies, however, come at a cost. The report warns that "there is no dedicated funding stream to assist communities with the economic impact mitigation of nuclear plant closures. You'll need to piece together other federal, state and local resources."

In some cases, a local organization simply has to bear the burden. Windham Regional officials write that they've spent "more than \$125,000 in staff time on critical decommissioning-related work and regional plan policy advocacy between 2009 and 2016 with no dedicated funding source."

"That's other work we're not able to spend time on," Company said.

In addition to those main themes, the report offers other bits of information and advice including the importance of citizens' advisory panels; the probability that a nuclear site will remain off-limits for redevelopment for many years; and the sharp drop in workforce associated with the slower SAFSTOR method of decommissioning.

Additionally, officials exhort nuclear host communities to "please get involved" in federal decommissioning rule-making. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is in the midst of that process, and Vermont's congressional delegation has been among those weighing in, pushing for more state and local involvement.

At Friday's gathering, Welch reiterated that "we have got to make certain that the (decommissioning) procedures that are enacted absolutely, fundamentally include the local community."

**Compilation of Recent CEP Communications  
09/02/2016 to 10/25/2016**

*Mike Faher reports for the Reformer, VTDigger, and The Commons.*

*Attachment:*

*3 - When People and Money Leave (and the Plant Stays)-Lessons Learned from the Closure of the Vermont Yankee Power Station: A Tri-Region Experience, October 2016*

~~~~~

**From:** Tom Palmisano  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 20, 2016 10:35 AM  
**To:** Manuel Camargo  
**Subject:** CEP reading

Manuel,

See the attached AP story about Germany's plans for nuclear waste disposal. Probably worth sending this to the CEP.

Tom

*Attachment:*

*4 - Germany readies \$26 billion fund for nuclear waste disposal*

~~~~~

**From:** David G. Victor  
**Sent:** Monday, October 24, 2016 1:42 PM  
**To:** Manuel Camargo  
**Cc:** Ted Quinn ; Glenn Pascall ; Tim Brown ; Dan Stetson ; Tom Palmisano  
**Subject:** (External):for the next cep circular...

Manuel

At the next circular email can you pls include a pdf of this article about a speech that Ernie M gave today at CSIS on the US nuclear complex:  
<https://morningconsult.com/2016/10/24/moniz-congress-authorize-interim-nuclear-fuel-storage/>

thanks  
david

*Attachment:*

*5 – Moniz: Congress Should Authorize Interim Nuclear Fuel Storage*

~~~~~

**Compilation of Recent CEP Communications  
09/02/2016 to 10/25/2016**

**From:** David G. Victor  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 25, 2016 6:47 AM  
**To:** Manuel Camargo  
**Cc:** Tom Palmisano ; Ted Quinn ; Dan Stetson ; Tim Brown  
**Subject:** (External):FW: september 2016 shutdown sites report

Manuel

And pls include this email from Steve M and the link to the new shutdown sites report as well.

Thanks

David

**From:** "Maheras, Steven J"  
**Date:** Monday, October 24, 2016 at 6:55 PM  
**To:** "David G. Victor" , "Quinn, Ted", "O'Connor, Kate", "Campany, Chris", "Leshinskie, Tony", "Mann, Matt", "Langeveld, Martin", "Jammal, Sam"  
**Subject:** september 2016 shutdown sites report

All—

The September 2016 shutdown sites report has been posted on the DOE-NE website at <http://energy.gov/ne/downloads/preliminary-evaluation-removing-used-nuclear-fuel-shutdown-sites>. The shutdown sites report presents a preliminary evaluation of removing used nuclear fuel from 13 shutdown sites. The shutdown sites evaluated were Maine Yankee, Yankee Rowe, Connecticut Yankee, Humboldt Bay, Big Rock Point, Rancho Seco, Trojan, La Crosse, Zion, Crystal River, Kewaunee, San Onofre, and Vermont Yankee. Changes from September 2015 shutdown sites report include incorporating spent nuclear fuel data from the GC-859 database; updating of Google Earth imagery; incorporating revisions to transportation certificates of compliance; adding information obtained from site visits to the Pacific Sun Railroad and Camp Pendleton, California; adding rail assessments for Kewaunee, Crystal River, and San Onofre to Appendix B of the report; and adding information obtained from the site visit to Vermont Yankee.

Regards,  
Steve Maheras

*Attachment:*  
*6 – Preliminary Evaluation of Removing Used Nuclear Fuel form Shutdown Sites, September 2016*

~~~~~