

January 4, 2005

MEMORANDUM TO: Luis A. Reyes  
Executive Director for Operations

FROM: Brian W. Sheron, Associate Director */RA/*  
for Project Licensing and Technical Analysis  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: NOVEMBER 2004 REPORT ON THE STATUS OF PUBLIC PETITIONS  
UNDER TITLE 10 OF THE *CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS*,  
SECTION 2.206

The attached reports give the status of petitions submitted under Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Section 2.206. As of November 30, 2004, there were two open petitions that were accepted for review under the 2.206 process in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR).

Attachment 1 provides a detailed status of the open petitions.

Attachment 2 provides the status of incoming letters that the staff is reviewing to determine if they meet the criteria for review under the 2.206 process.

Attachment 3 shows the age statistics for the open 2.206 petitions as of November 30, 2004.

Attachment 4 shows the age trend of closed petitions for the last 3 years.

This report, Director's Decisions, and other 2.206-related documents are placed in the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS). In making these readily accessible to the public, the staff has identified another vehicle to address our performance goal of ensuring openness in our regulatory process.

Attachments: As stated

CONTACT: Donna Skay, NRR/DLPM  
415-1322

January 4, 2005

MEMORANDUM TO: Luis A. Reyes  
Executive Director for Operations

FROM: Brian W. Sheron, Associate Director /RA/  
for Project Licensing and Technical Analysis  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: NOVEMBER 2004 REPORT ON THE STATUS OF PUBLIC PETITIONS  
UNDER TITLE 10 OF THE *CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS*,  
SECTION 2.206

The attached reports give the status of petitions submitted under Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Section 2.206. As of November 30, 2004, there were two open petitions that were accepted for review under the 2.206 process in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR).

Attachment 1 provides a detailed status of the open petitions.

Attachment 2 provides the status of incoming letters that the staff is reviewing to determine if they meet the criteria for review under the 2.206 process.

Attachment 3 shows the age statistics for the open 2.206 petitions as of November 30, 2004.

Attachment 4 shows the age trend of closed petitions for the last 3 years.

This report, Director's Decisions, and other 2.206-related documents are placed in the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS). In making these readily accessible to the public, the staff has identified another vehicle to address our performance goal of ensuring openness in our regulatory process.

Attachments: As stated

CONTACT: Donna Skay, NRR  
415-1322

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

ADAMS Accession Number: ML043360398

OFFICE	PM:PDI-1	LA:PDI-1	D:PDII	DD:DLPM	ADPT:NRR	
NAME	DSkay	SLittle	HBerkow	JLyons	BSheron	
DATE	12/15/04	12/15/04	12/16/04	12/16/04	12/17/04	

DISTRIBUTION FOR NOVEMBER 2004 REPORT ON THE STATUS OF PUBLIC PETITIONS  
UNDER TITLE 10 OF THE *CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS*, SECTION 2.206

Dated: January 4, 2005

PUBLIC

PDI-1 Reading File

EMerschhoff, DEDR/ EDO

MVirgilio, DEDMRS/ EDO

PNorry, DEDM/ EDO

WKane, DEDH/ EDO

WDean, AO/ EDO

TBergman, OEDO

PAnderson, OEDO (Email after this document has been put into ADAMS)

EJulian

RLauffer

CHolden

JDyer, NRR

RBorchardt, NRR

BSheron, NRR

CMohrwinkel, NRR

KCyr, OGC

LChandler, OGC

SLewis, OGC

JCordes, Jr., OCAA

FCongel, OE

PLohaus, STP

JStrosnider, NMSS

PGoldberg, NMSS

CAbrams, NMSS

BBoger, NRR

GCaputo, OI

LMarsh, NRR

HBerkow, NRR

DSkay, NRR

OCA

OPA

OCM/DOC

Regional Administrators

SLittle

**Status of Open Petitions**

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Petitioner/EDO No.</u>	<u>Page</u>
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station	New England Coalition G20040284.....	1
All BWRs with Mark I and II containments	Nuclear Security Coalition G20040549.....	3

## Report on Status of Public Petitions Under 10 CFR 2.206

---

Facility:	<u>Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station</u>
Petitioner:	Raymond Shadis, New England Coalition
Date of Petition:	April 22 and September 10, 2004
Director's Decision to be Issued by:	NRR
EDO Number:	G20040284
Proposed DD Issuance:	December 27, 2004
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	September 22, 2004
Petition Manager:	Alan Wang
Case Attorney:	Stephen Lewis

### Issues/Actions requested:

That the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the Commission) order a halt to all fuel movement at Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station (Vermont Yankee) until such time as Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (Entergy or the licensee) has rendered an accurate and NRC-verified account of the location, disposition, and condition of all irradiated fuel, including fuel currently loaded in the reactor core.

### Background:

On April 21, 2004, Vermont Yankee formally notified the NRC that two short spent fuel rod segments were not in the spent fuel pool (SFP) in the location specified in documents. The segments are described as about 7 inches long and 17 inches long, respectively. Both are approximately the diameter of a pencil. These segments had been placed in a special container at the bottom of the SFP in 1980. The licensee initiated an investigation to attempt to locate the missing segments. On May 19, 2004, Entergy reported to the NRC that the visual inspection of the SFP was essentially complete. A camera search of the SFP did not detect the unaccounted for spent fuel rod segments.

The NRC staff contacted the petitioner on April 28, 2004, to discuss the 2.206 process. Following this call, the NRC sent a letter to the petitioner notifying him that all fuel movements had been completed for the current refueling outage prior to the NRC's receipt of his petition. The staff concluded that the petitioner had not identified a safety concern that would prevent the plant from restarting.

The Petition Review Board (PRB) held a teleconference with the petitioner on May 5, 2004. During this teleconference, the petitioner clarified his request to exclude fuel movements associated with locating the missing fuel pin segments from the scope of his request. Following the teleconference, the PRB met in a closed session and determined that the petition satisfied the criteria for review under the 2.206 process. An acknowledgment letter was issued to the petitioner on May 28, 2004.

The NRC determined that its Director's Decision would be based partly on the actions taken by the licensee to locate the missing fuel. The NRC staff called the licensee on May 11, 2004, and discussed with them a request to document the actions they are taking and the results of these actions. The requests discussed in this phone call are described in a letter to Entergy dated May 21, 2004. By letter dated June 8, 2004, Entergy submitted its response to the NRC's request.

On July 13, 2004, Entergy notified the NRC that the fuel rod segments had been located in the SFP. The pieces had been stored in a unique aluminum cylinder which was previously thought to be part of an existing in-pool structure.

The petitioner supplemented his petition on September 10, 2004. The supplement requested further verification of the current inventory of special nuclear material on site. The PRB held a second teleconference with the petitioner on September 22, 2004. Based on the new information in the supplement and additional requests for action, the NRC staff extended the expected completion date of its review to December 27, 2004.

On October 5, 2004, the NRC issued a letter to the licensee requesting specific information to assist in its review of the petition.

On October 25, 2004, the NRC issued a second acknowledgment letter to the petitioner in response to the supplement dated September 10, 2004, and subsequent teleconference.

**Current Status:**

On November 19, 2004, Entergy submitted a letter that provided information on its investigation in response to the NRC's request dated October 5, 2004. The staff reviewed the information in this letter and is completing a proposed Director's Decision. The NRC expects to issue a proposed Decision for comment by December 27, 2004.

Facility: All Boiling-Water Reactors (BWRs) with Mark I and II containments  
Petitioner: Nuclear Security Coalition  
Date of Petition: August 10, 2004  
Director's Decision to be Issued by: NRR  
EDO Number: G20040549  
Proposed DD Issuance: 2/15/05  
Final DD Issuance: TBD  
Last Contact with Petitioner: 10/19/04  
Petition Manager: Peter Tam  
Case Attorney: Stephen Lewis

Issues/Actions requested:

That the NRC:

- (1) Issue a demand for information to the licensees for all Mark I and II BWRs and conduct a 6-month study of options for addressing structural vulnerabilities;
- (2) Present the findings of the study at a national conference attended by all interested stakeholders, providing for transcribed comments and questions;
- (3) Develop a comprehensive plan that accounts for stakeholder concerns and addresses structural vulnerabilities of all Mark I and II BWRs within a 12-month period;
- (4) Issue Orders to the licensees for all Mark I and II BWRs compelling incorporation of a comprehensive set of protective measures, including structural protections; and
- (5) Make future operation of each Mark I and II BWR contingent on addressing its structural vulnerability with participation and oversight by a panel of local stakeholders.

Background:

The petitioners requested a teleconference to address the PRB. Due to difficulties in coordinating the availability of the petitioners, the teleconference was not scheduled until September 23, 2004. The teleconference was subsequently changed to a public meeting to accommodate petitioners who requested to be present.

Following the meeting on September 23, 2004, the PRB met in a closed session and determined that the petition satisfied the criteria for review under the 2.206 process. An acknowledgment letter was issued to the petitioners on October 19, 2004.

Current Status:

The staff determined that the response to the specific requests in the petition will be dependent on the NRC's response to a National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report on fuel pool vulnerabilities. The PRB decided to stop the clock on this petition, as of October 19, 2004, until the NAS report is issued. The petitioner was notified of this action on November 22, 2004.

## Status of Potential Petitions Under Consideration

---

---

Facility: FitzPatrick  
Petitioner: Citizens Awareness Network  
Date of Petition: October 27, 2004 **as supplemented on  
November 16, 2004**  
EDO Number: G20040743  
PRB meeting: December 7, 2004

### Issues/Actions requested:

That the NRC modify or suspend the operating license for FitzPatrick until the following actions are completed:

1. Conduct physical tests of the ventilation and heat-up rates of the pump rooms under simulated fire scenarios, with verification of the test results by an independent third party, followed by an open public meeting;
2. Seal floor/ceiling penetrations between the basement level pump rooms and the first floor;
3. Provide alternate cooling and ventilation for Emergency Service Water (ESW) and Fire Safety related pump rooms; and
4. Verify the adequacy of completed actions by NRC inspection team.

### Background:

The petition states that the former and current licensees have failed to fulfill commitments to resolve inadequate fire protection and ventilation affecting the ESW and Fire Safety Related Pump rooms.

### Current Status:

**A Petition Review Board meeting with the petitioners has been scheduled for December 7, 2004.**



Facility: Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station  
Petitioner: Paul Blanch and Arnold Gundersen  
Date of letter: July 29, 2004 (G20040511)  
Responsible Office: NRR  
PRB meeting: July 29, 2004, and August 26, 2004

Issues/Actions requested:

That the NRC issue a Demand for Information requiring Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. to provide the NRC with information that describes how Vermont Yankee complies with the General Design Criteria.

Background:

By letter dated August 20, 2004, the NRC staff notified the petitioners that this request would not be treated under 2.206 because it involves a licensing action which is currently open for members of the public to request a hearing. Per the NRC's procedures, a request will not be treated under 2.206 if it can be resolved through the hearing process. Subsequent to being notified of this decision, the petitioners requested an opportunity to address the Petition Review Board. This teleconference was held on August 26, 2004.

In addition, on August 30, 2004, the New England Coalition filed a request for hearing on the Vermont Yankee power uprate. Among the contentions submitted was a contention that the licensee failed to maintain adequate documentation to determine design basis conformance.

Current Status:

By Order dated November 22, 2004, the ASLB concluded that the contention submitted by NEC related to design basis conformance was not admissible to the hearing. Therefore, the Petition Review Board will reconvene to evaluate this request.

ASSIGNED ACTION OFFICE	FACILITY	Incoming petition	PRB meeting <sup>1</sup>	Acknowledgment letter / days from incoming <sup>2</sup>	Proposed DD issuance Date/ age <sup>3</sup>	Date for final DD/ age <sup>4</sup>	Comments if not meeting the Agency's Completion Goals
NRR	All BWRs with Mark I and II containments	8/10/04	9/23/04	10/19/04 70	02/15/05	TBD	Due to scheduling difficulties, a meeting with the petitioner and licensee was delayed to 9/23/04.  The clock was stopped on this petition as of 10/19 until the NRC receives the report from NAS.
NRR	Vermont Yankee	4/22/04	5/11/04	5/28/04 36	<del>9/27/04</del> 12/27/04	TBD	The clock was reset due to receipt of supplement on 9/10/04

- 1) Goal is to hold a PRB meeting, which the petitioner is invited to participate in, within 2 weeks of receipt of petition (there is often a delay of up two weeks from the date that the letter is issued until it is received by the reviewing organization).
- 2) Goal is to issue acknowledgment letter within 5 weeks of the date of incoming petition.
- 3) Goal is to issue proposed DD within 120 days of the acknowledgment letter.
- 4) Goal is to issue final DD within 45 days of the end of the comment period.

# Average Days to Issuance of Proposed Directors Decisions

