

STATE OF VERMONT
PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD

Joint Petition of NorthStar Decommissioning)
Holdings, LLC, NorthStar Nuclear)
Decommissioning Company, LLC, NorthStar)
Group Services, Inc., LVI Parent Corp.,) PSB Docket No. []
NorthStar Group Holdings, LLC, Entergy)
Nuclear Vermont Investment Company, LLC,)
and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., and any)
other necessary affiliated entities to transfer)
ownership of Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee,)
LLC and for certain ancillary approvals,)
pursuant to 30 V.S.A. §§ 107, 231, and 232)

SUMMARY OF INITIAL PREFILED TESTIMONY OF HARRY DODSON

Mr. Dodson's testimony addresses whether earlier decommissioning of the VY Station, as proposed by NorthStar, will unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region or have an undue adverse impact on aesthetics.

Mr. Dodson sponsors the following exhibits:

JP-HLD-1	Resume of Harry Dodson
JP-HLD-2	Excerpts from Windham Regional Commission 2014 Windham Regional Plan
JP-HLD-3	2013 Vernon Town Plan
JP-HLD-4	Excerpts from 2014 Master Plan for the Town of Hinsdale, New Hampshire
JP-HLD-5	Prefiled Testimony of Harry Dodson in Docket 8300
JP-HLD-6	Supplemental Prefiled Testimony of Harry Dodson in Docket 8300

STATE OF VERMONT
PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD

Joint Petition of NorthStar Decommissioning)
Holdings, LLC, NorthStar Nuclear)
Decommissioning Company, LLC, NorthStar)
Group Services, Inc., LVI Parent Corp., NorthStar) PSB Docket No. []
Group Holdings, LLC, Entergy Nuclear Vermont)
Investment Company, LLC, and Entergy Nuclear)
Operations, Inc., and any other necessary)
affiliated entities to transfer ownership of Entergy)
Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC and for certain)
ancillary approvals, pursuant to 30 V.S.A. §§ 107,)
231, and 232)

PREFILED TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS OF HARRY DODSON

1 **Q1. Please state your name, occupation and business address.**

2 A1. My name is Harry L. Dodson. I am a principal at Dodson and Flinker, Inc., landscape
3 architects and planners, the business address for which is P.O. Box 160, 463 Main Street,
4 Ashfield, Massachusetts 01330.

5 **Q2. Please describe your educational background and professional experience.**

6 A2. I received a master's degree in landscape architecture from the Harvard Graduate School
7 of Design in 1980. I was chief landscape architect at the Massachusetts Department of
8 Environmental Management from 1980 to 1986 where I co-authored the Massachusetts
9 Landscape Inventory, the first comprehensive, statewide scenic landscape inventory in
10 the United States. In 1986 I founded Dodson Associates, Ltd. (now, Dodson and Flinker,
11 Inc.), where I have completed over 20 visual evaluation and assessment projects
12 including: the development of New York State's coastal scenic assessment methodology
13 for the New York Department of State; the Hudson River Scenic Landscape Assessment;
14 the East Hampton, NY Scenic Landscapes Preservation Plan; Scenic Byways Assessment
15 Programs for Vermont, Nevada and British Columbia; and the visual assessment of a

1 major development proposal in the Adirondacks for the Adirondack Council in 2011. I
2 have testified on numerous occasions on aesthetic and land-use impacts before Vermont
3 Act 250 district commissions, the former Vermont Environmental Board, the Adirondack
4 Park Agency Board and the Vermont Public Service Board. Exhibit JP-HLD-1 is a copy
5 of my resume.

6 **Q3. Have you previously testified before the Board on behalf of Entergy VY?**

7 A3. Yes. I provided testimony for Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC, and Entergy
8 Nuclear Operations, Inc. (to which I refer collectively in my testimony as “Entergy VY”),
9 in: Docket 6812 regarding the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station (or “VY Station”)
10 Uprate Plume Visual Analysis. I also provided testimony in Dockets 7440/7862,
11 including the aesthetic impacts associated with continued operation of the VY Station as
12 well as the impact of such operation on the orderly development of the region; and I
13 testified in Docket 8300 relative to the construction of the VY Station’s second
14 Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (“ISFSI”) pad and new emergency diesel
15 generator’s impacts.

16 **Q4. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

17 A4. I have been retained by the petitioners to testify as to whether earlier decommissioning of
18 the VY Station, which I understand NorthStar plans to do if the transaction that is the
19 subject of this docket is approved, will unduly interfere with the orderly development of
20 the region or have an undue adverse impact on aesthetics.

21

1 **Q5. Please describe your understanding of the proposed changes in approach to**
2 **decommissioning the VY Station that NorthStar plans.**

3 A5. NorthStar proposes to acquire the entity that owns the VY Station and to decommission
4 and restore the site by 2030 by removing all above-ground structures on site, other than
5 the ISFSI and associated security facilities, the Plant Support Building, the VELCO
6 switchyard and other, uncontaminated structures that can be part of site redevelopment
7 without affecting the site's release for unrestricted use under NRC regulations. NorthStar
8 is considering, as well, reuse of the site, shortly after 2030, potentially for energy
9 generation or light industrial development, once decommissioning and site restoration
10 have been completed for the portions of the site unrelated to the ISFSI and switchyard.
11 From an aesthetic point of view, earlier decommissioning by NorthStar—as compared to
12 Entergy VY's planned decommissioning following an extended SAFSTOR dormancy
13 period—will not change the impacts I addressed in Docket 8300 (and also in Dockets
14 7440 and 7862), and indeed my conclusion was and remains that the impacts will be
15 beneficial. I understand that the equipment that will be involved in NorthStar's
16 decommissioning approach may be different from Entergy's, and structures may be
17 removed in a different sequence but the same ones will ultimately be dismantled. The
18 principal difference—of particular relevance to consideration of the orderly development
19 of the region—is that the plant (other than the ISFSI facility, switchyard, and other
20 structures that will be reused when the site is redeveloped) will be dismantled much
21 earlier than if the VY Station is placed in SAFSTOR.

1 **Q6. Please describe the examination you undertook as to the impacts of earlier**
2 **dismantlement of the plant.**

3 A6. I interviewed Entergy employees George Thomas, Senior Project Manager, and Paul
4 Paradis, Decommissioning Director, concerning the proposed change in approach to
5 decommissioning. I also reviewed my previous testimony and exhibits before the Board
6 concerning impacts to aesthetics and orderly development of the region. Further, I
7 reviewed the Windham Regional Commission's 2014 Windham Regional Plan, sections
8 of which relevant to my testimony I sponsor as Exhibit JP-HLD-2, Vernon's 2013
9 Vernon Town Plan, Exhibit JP-HLD-3, and the 2014 Master Plan for the Town of
10 Hinsdale, New Hampshire, sections of which relevant to my testimony I sponsor as
11 Exhibit JP-HLD-4.

12 **Q7. Will the proposed transaction interfere with the orderly development of the region?**

13 A7. No. Removing most of the structures and thereby freeing up non-ISFSI and switchyard
14 portions of the site for redevelopment will enhance the region's orderly development by
15 making the vast majority of the site available for reuse sooner than originally envisioned,
16 an important objective of the Vernon Town Plan as I will explain. It will also provide a
17 boost for the region's workforce and economy as noted in Dr. Berkman's prefiled
18 testimony. Removing these structures will also enhance the aesthetic character of the
19 site, as I will describe later in my testimony, and be consistent with the Town of Vernon's
20 land-conservation measures as well.

21

1 **Q8. Will the proposed transaction unduly interfere with the orderly development of the**
2 **region based on the policies and findings of the 2013 Vernon Town Plan?**

3 A8. No, it will not.

4 First, earlier dismantlement of the plant is consistent with Vernon’s stated interest in
5 working with the plant owner to secure re-use of the power plant’s site (Economy Policy
6 4), because, after acquiring ENVY, NorthStar will accelerate the time when a large
7 portion of the site will be available for redevelopment.

8 Second, earlier dismantlement of the plant is consistent with the Post-VY Resiliency Plan
9 (Finding 3)—which states that Vernon should assume that the site will not be available
10 for redevelopment and in any event not expect redevelopment for a period of at least 10
11 years—because the proposed transaction will allow implementation of an approach to
12 decommissioning by NorthStar that will dismantle plant structures and make the vast
13 majority of the site available for alternate use essentially within the time frame for
14 redevelopment suggested by Vernon’s plan. Earlier dismantlement is also consistent with
15 the plan’s recognition that the timing of decommissioning could affect the rate at which
16 those presently employed by the plant will either lose their jobs or elect to leave (page
17 14), because by undertaking plant dismantlement earlier, NorthStar will have an
18 opportunity to directly and indirectly employ approximately 40 persons expected to be
19 employed at the VY Station at the time of the transaction’s closing.

20

1 I recognize that a new/updated town plan, which presents an opportunity explicitly to
2 address Vernon's goals for redevelopment, is being considered by Vernon but has not yet
3 been adopted.

4 **Q9. Is the proposed transaction and plan for earlier decommissioning consistent**
5 **specifically with land-conservation measures contained in the Vernon Town Plan?**

6 A9. Yes. The Plan has an overall objective (Page 7, Objectives 2, 5-7) to protect the rural
7 character of the Town through careful management and guidance of new development.
8 Redevelopment of the site following dismantlement would be consistent with this
9 objective because the land made available for development will be relatively small, only
10 portions of it will be visible, and it will be located within the VY Station site, an existing,
11 developed facility.

12 In fact, the plan's Existing Land Use map identifies the site as "I-Industrial," which the
13 plan states (page 40) are sites capable of and intended for accommodating existing and
14 expanded industrial uses and development, that generally have few development
15 constraints, and that have ready access to transportation by truck or rail. Moreover, the
16 Future Land Use map attached to the Town Plan, which is "the vision of what Vernon
17 land use should look like in the future" (page 42), designates the VY Station site as
18 Industrial.

19 If the site is redeveloped for a generation facility, earlier dismantlement of the plant
20 would also be consistent with the plan's policy (Policy 5, page 21) to site generation
21 facilities to minimize impacts on the environment and on historic, recreational and scenic
22 facilities and sites. The VY Station was previously developed for generation and has on-

1 site access to transmission facilities, so locating new generation there would minimize
2 potential impacts on the environment and on historic, recreational and scenic sites located
3 elsewhere in Vernon.

4 Finally, future redevelopment of the site is also consistent with the following policies and
5 principles of the 2013 Vernon Town Plan: preservation of agricultural soils (page 21),
6 management of forest lands (24), preservation of water resources (page 25), preservation
7 of wildlife habitat (page 26) and redevelopment recommended for industrial lands (page
8 38).

9 **Q10. What about the town plan for neighboring Hinsdale, New Hampshire?**

10 A10. Earlier dismantlement and decommissioning and future redevelopment of the site, as I
11 previously discussed, are consistent with the following policies and principles of the 2014
12 Hinsdale Master Plan relating to the Connecticut River: designated rivers (pages 58-59)
13 and wildlife habitat (pages 60-64). The site after decommissioning and site restoration,
14 which NorthStar will accomplish sooner than Entergy VY, will be minimally visible
15 except from certain portions of the Connecticut River and the Hinsdale shoreline and
16 bluffs. As a result, as with Vernon, earlier decommissioning will not impact adversely
17 the rural character of Hinsdale.

18 **Q11. Will the proposed transaction unduly interfere with the orderly development of the**
19 **region based upon the policies and findings of the 2014 Windham Regional Plan?**

20 A11. No, it will not.

21

1 Earlier dismantlement of the plant is consistent with Land Use Policy 1 to direct new
2 growth into appropriate development types, including commercial/industrial areas,
3 because the transaction will make the VY Station site available for redevelopment at a
4 location already developed as an industrial site.

5 Redevelopment of the site presents an opportunity, as well, to ensure development is
6 consistent with WRC's policies on land use and the natural environment (Plan at pages
7 12-14, 31-34).

8 Last, I understand that earlier dismantlement will be consistent with WRC's Utilities
9 Facilities & Technology Policies (Policy 20) to ensure safe and effective storage,
10 transportation, and disposal of low-level radioactive waste. I understand further that the
11 proposed site restoration standards that are to be considered and approved by the Board in
12 this proceeding and have been proposed by NorthStar to be, overall, generally as
13 stringent as those applied at alternative sites (Policy 21).

14 **Q12. Turn now to aesthetics. Will earlier dismantlement of the plant have an undue**
15 **adverse effect on aesthetics based on your previous analysis and the three photo-**
16 **simulation scenarios that you referenced earlier in your testimony and that you**
17 **developed for Docket 8300?**

18 A12. Exhibits JP-HLD-5 and 6 contain my prefiled testimony and supplemental prefiled
19 testimony and exhibits from that docket in which, among other matters, I addressed three
20 scenarios for decommissioning, concluding that each would not have an undue adverse
21 effect on aesthetics under the *Quechee* test:

- 1 • Scenario 1 – Plant not dismantled. Most existing plant structures remain in place
2 for up to 60 years.
- 3 • Scenario 2 – Plant dismantled but some structures remain for potential reuse of
4 the site for a power-generation facility including the 115-kV and 345-kV
5 switchyards, the intake and discharge structures, the 115 kV and 345 kV
6 switchyards, the existing Plant Support Building and Vernon Substation.
- 7 • Scenario 3 – Plant dismantled and only the ISFSI, the Plant Support Building, the
8 200-kW diesel generator, related security features, the intake structure and the
9 Vernon Substation remain.

10 Nothing in the proposed transaction and NorthStar’s planned, earlier decommissioning
11 changes anything related to Scenario 3, but the transaction accelerates the time when
12 Scenario 2 will occur. I understand further that the wall adjacent to the generator will be
13 four feet higher than simulated in these several scenarios and certain discharge structures
14 removed but do not consider these changes to be materially different in appearance than
15 the three simulations I analyzed in Docket 8300.

16 **Q13. Why did you determine in Docket 8300 that under the *Quechee* Test all three**
17 **scenarios would not have an undue adverse effect on aesthetics?**

18 A13. The proposed transaction will result in an aesthetic impact that looks like either Scenarios
19 2 or 3, which is the same aesthetic impact to which I testified with respect to Entergy
20 VY’s planned approach to decommissioning in Docket 8300. Accordingly, my opinion
21 has not changed: based on my prior *Quechee* analysis, set forth at pages 5-15 and 5-6 of
22 Exhibits JP-HLD-5 and 6, respectively, the proposed transaction and resulting earlier
23 decommissioning will not have an undue adverse effect on aesthetics.

24

1 **Q14. Please comment on the potential to redevelop a portion of the VY Station site from**
2 **the perspective of the effect on the site's aesthetics.**

3 A14. Statutes exist (Section 248 and Act 250) to ensure that no undue adverse aesthetic effects
4 occur, applying the *Quechee* test. I understand that potential reuse options might include
5 electric generation or light industrial uses. For example, a solar farm could be proposed
6 for a portion of the site. A Section 248/Act 250 review would evaluate the proposed
7 project and either approve, approve with conditions or deny such redevelopment to
8 ensure that no undue adverse aesthetic impacts result.

9 **Q15. Does this conclude your testimony at this time?**

10 A15. Yes.

11 17148619.1