



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

July 17, 2000

Ms. Pamela Blockey-O'Brien
7631 Dallas Highway
Douglasville, Georgia 30134

SUBJECT: TRANSCRIPT OF CONFERENCE CALL TO DISCUSS THE 10 CFR 2.206
PETITION REGARDING EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2
(TAC NOS. MA9145 AND MA9146)

Dear Ms. Blockey-O'Brien:

On June 15, 2000, a conference call was held between you, Mr. Don Crowe of Southern Nuclear Operating Company (the licensee for Hatch) and representatives of the NRC staff. The purpose of the call was to provide you an opportunity to explain to members of the Petition Review Board the actions requested in your May 29, 2000, petition, their bases, and answer any questions raised by the NRC staff. The call was transcribed, and a copy of the transcript is enclosed and will be forwarded to the public document room. If you have any questions, please contact me at 1-800-368-5642.

Sincerely,

Leonard N. Olshan, Project Manager, Section 1
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant

cc:

Mr. Ernest L. Blake, Jr.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts
and Trowbridge
2300 N Street, NW.
Washington, DC 20037

Mr. D. M. Crowe
Manager, Licensing
Southern Nuclear Operating
Company, Inc.
P. O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201-1295

Resident Inspector
Plant Hatch
11030 Hatch Parkway N.
Baxley, Georgia 31531

Mr. Charles H. Badger
Office of Planning and Budget
Room 610
270 Washington Street, SW.
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Harold Reheis, Director
Department of Natural Resources
205 Butler Street, SE., Suite 1252
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Steven M. Jackson
Senior Engineer - Power Supply
Municipal Electric Authority
of Georgia
1470 Riveredge Parkway, NW
Atlanta, Georgia 30328-4684

Charles A. Patrizia, Esquire
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker
10th Floor
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20004-9500

Chairman
Appling County Commissioners
County Courthouse
Baxley, Georgia 31513

Mr. J. D. Woodard
Executive Vice President
Southern Nuclear Operating
Company, Inc.
P. O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201-1295

Mr. P. W. Wells
General Manager, Edwin I. Hatch
Nuclear Plant
Southern Nuclear Operating
Company, Inc.
U.S. Highway 1 North
P. O. Box 2010
Baxley, Georgia 31515

Mr. L. M. Bergen
Resident Manager
Oglethorpe Power Corporation
Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant
P. O. Box 2010
Baxley, Georgia 31515

July 17, 2000

Ms. Pamela Blockey-O'Brien
7631 Dallas Highway
Douglasville, Georgia 30134

SUBJECT: TRANSCRIPT OF CONFERENCE CALL TO DISCUSS THE 10 CFR 2.206
PETITION REGARDING EDWIN I. HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2
(TAC NOS. MA9145 AND MA9146)

Dear Ms. Blockey-O'Brien:

On June 15, 2000, a conference call was held between you, Mr. Don Crowe of Southern Nuclear Operating Company (the licensee for Hatch) and representatives of the NRC staff. The purpose of the call was to provide you an opportunity to explain to members of the Petition Review Board the actions requested in your May 29, 2000, petition, their bases, and answer any questions raised by the NRC staff. The call was transcribed, and a copy of the transcript is enclosed and will be forwarded to the public document room. If you have any questions, please contact me at 1-800-368-5642.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Leonard N. Olshan, Project Manager, Section 1
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

Distribution:

PUBLIC RidsAcrcsAcnwMailCenter
PDII-1 Reading (paper copy) RidsRegion2MailCenter
RidsNrrDlpmLpdii1
Edunnington (paper copy)
RidsNrrPMLOlshan
RidsOgcRp
DOCUMENT NAME: G:\PDII-1\HATCH\blockeytrn.wpd

| | | | |
|--------|------------|-------------|--------------|
| OFFICE | PDII-1/PM | PDII-1/LA | PDII-1/(A)SC |
| NAME | LOlshan:mw | CHawes (MH) | LRaghavara |
| DATE | 7/13/00 | 7/11/00 | 7/13/00 |

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

**OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title: HATCH PETITION

Case No.:

Work Order No.: NRC-1368

LOCATION: Unknown

DATE: Thursday, June 15, 2000

PAGES: 1 - 27

**ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1014
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 842-0034**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

HATCH PETITION

Thursday, June 15, 2000

The above-entitled meeting commenced, pursuant to
notice.

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SPEAKER: I couldn't -- I kind of meant stuff on trying to call in at first.

SPEAKER: You did it right.

SPEAKER: Okay. Okay. All right. Well, should we get this show on the road?

MS. BLACK: Yes. My name is Susanne Black, and I'm the Chairman of the Petition Review Board, and I would like to just describe the purpose of the 10 CFR 2.206 process.

It provides an opportunity for members of the public to file a request for enforcement action and requires that the petition be submitted in writing and provide sufficient grounds for taking the proposed action.

And today you will be given an opportunity to provide clarifying information. We can ask you questions that we need to, to make a determination if your letter meets the criteria to be considered under 2.206.

And the licensee will be -- is also on this call and they have an opportunity to also ask clarifying questions of you, if that's acceptable.

MS. BLOCKEY-O'BRIEN (SPEAKER): Yes. Yes.

MS. BLACK: And I'd like to go around the room first and introduce all of us, and have people here and in the region and the licensee identify themselves.

1 My name is Susanne Black, B-l-a-c-k.

2 SPEAKER: Okay.

3 MS. BLACK: And I'm the Chairman of the Petition
4 Review Board.

5 MR. OLSHAN: I'm Lenny Olshan, O-l-s-h-a-n, and
6 I'm the Project Manager and the Chairman of the -- Petition
7 Manager, that's what they call me. And by the way, if
8 everybody would spell their names for the purposes of the
9 transcript, I'd appreciate it.

10 MR. SUBBARATNAM: My name is Ram Subbaratnam,
11 spelled S-u-b-b-a-r-a-t-n-a-m. I'm the coordinator of the
12 2.206 for the agency.

13 SPEAKER: Hang on one sec. Could you repeat the
14 last name, please?

15 MR. SUBBARATNAM: The last name is
16 S-u-b-b-a-r-a-t-n-a-m. Subbaratnam.

17 SPEAKER: A-r-a-t?

18 MR. SUBBARATNAM: N, as in Nancy, A, M as in
19 Mother. Subbaratnam.

20 SPEAKER: Thank you. Yes?

21 MR. SUBBARATNAM: S-u-b-b-a-

22 SPEAKER: A-r-a-t-n-a-m.

23 MR. SUBBARATNAM: Correct.

24 SPEAKER: Subbaratnam.

25 MR. SUBBARATNAM: Yeah, correct.

1 SPEAKER: Okay.

2 MR. SUBBARATNAM: And I am the agency coordinator
3 for 2.206 petitions.

4 SPEAKER: I see.

5 MR. GOLDBERG: I'm Jack Goldberg, G-o-l-d-b-e-r-g,
6 from the NRC's Office of General Counsel.

7 SPEAKER: I can't hear you very well. You didn't
8 come through very clearly.

9 MR. OLSHAN: Okay. We're moving closer. And,
10 please, if have any trouble hearing any of us, let us know,
11 because we can't tell from here.

12 SPEAKER: Yes. Yes.

13 MR. OLSHAN: So don't hesitate to interrupt us and
14 tell us that.

15 SPEAKER: Okay. Maybe you can put one of the mics
16 or whatever.

17 MR. OLSHAN: Okay.

18 MR. GOLDBERG: This is Jack Goldberg,
19 G-o-l-d-b-e-r-g, from the General Counsel's Office at the
20 NRC.

21 SPEAKER: Yes.

22 MR. KLEMENTOWICZ: My name is Steve Klementowicz,
23 spelled K-l-e-m-e-n-t-o-w-i-c-z, and I'm a health physicist.

24 SPEAKER: K-l-e-m-e-n-t-o-w-i-z-z, no T?

25 MR. KLEMENTOWICZ: I-c-z.

1 SPEAKER: I-c-z. Okay. I thought I was -- yeah,
2 okay.

3 MR. RAGHAVAN: This is Raghavan, R-a-g-h-a-v, as
4 in Victor, a-n, as in Navy.

5 SPEAKER: Yes.

6 MR. RAGHAVAN: First name is Ragl, R-a-g-l.

7 MR. OLSHAN: Licensee, would you introduce
8 yourself, please?

9 MR. CROWE: This is Don Crowe. I'm the licensing
10 manager on Plant Hatch, and it's spelled C-r-o-w-e.

11 SPEAKER: Okay.

12 SPEAKER: And Region --

13 SPEAKER: And do you -- are you, sir, with the
14 Southern Company or with Georgia Power or which?

15 MR. CROWE: I'm with Southern Nuclear Operating
16 Company.

17 SPEAKER: Okay. You're with SONOCO. Okay.

18 MR. CAHILL: This is Steve Cahill, in Region II,
19 C-a-h-i-l-l. I'm the Division of Reactor Projects Branch
20 Chief of the Southern Company plant. That's it for here.

21 MS. BLACK: We do have three -- I think, believe
22 it's three questions from headquarters here about your
23 petition, and Lenny Olshan will ask those.

24 MS. OLSHAN: Ms. Blockey-O'Brien, on the second
25 page of your petition, I guess it's the second paragraph,

1 you say "Southern has basically refused to discuss all of
2 the so-called class one issues."

3 Can you tell me what you're referring to when you
4 say class one issues?

5 SPEAKER: Wait. Can you hang on a second.

6 MR. OLSHAN: Sure. I'm sorry.

7 SPEAKER: We're -- I've got to find where we're
8 at.

9 MR. OLSHAN: And later on you talk about class one
10 issues.

11 SPEAKER: Yeah. First, I need to ask you which
12 sections you are considering as the petition.

13 MR. OLSHAN: We're considering the whole -- all --
14 we're not? I'm sorry.

15 MR. GOLDBERG: This is Jack Goldberg, from General
16 Counsel's Office.

17 SPEAKER: Yes.

18 MR. GOLDBERG: Although we want to understand the
19 whole document and make sure everything is understood in the
20 proper context, we read your petition as the last paragraph
21 of this, along with the references to the statements of --

22 SPEAKER: Judge [inaudible.]

23 MR. GOLDBERG: Yes. Is that correct?

24 SPEAKER: Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. I was just
25 making -- trying to make sure that we were all on the same

1 page.

2 MR. OLSHAN: Okay. So you're saying the rest of
3 this is not even supporting information?

4 MR. GOLDBERG: Only the last paragraph that she's
5 submitting as a 2.206 petition.

6 SPEAKER: Okay. I'm submitting the last paragraph

7 --

8 SPEAKER: But to the extent that we want to put
9 that in context with everything else, it's appropriate to
10 ask you the question.

11 MR. OLSHAN: Okay. Okay.

12 SPEAKER: In other words, the last paragraph is being -- beg
13 your pardon -- is being submitted as a 2.206, with the --
14 also the reference to Judge Gensche, but, also, obviously,
15 it is in the context with everything that has been submitted
16 under the license renewal process.

17 Are you following what I'm trying to say here?

18 MR. OLSHAN: Well, I took it to mean, and maybe
19 Jack can correct me, I took the rest of this document to be
20 supporting information to the conclusion that the plant
21 should be shut down. Is that not a correct way to look at
22 that?

23 SPEAKER: Who are you asking?

24 MR. OLSHAN: I'm asking both our lawyer and you.
25 Is that how -- what did you intend to the rest of this

1 document to be?

2 SPEAKER: Well, there are -- there's the first
3 document and there are three supporting submissions against
4 the plant that were submitted to the NRC in license renewal.

5 MR. OLSHAN: Okay. Now, wait. I'm looking at
6 your letter of May 29th and you're saying --

7 SPEAKER: Yes. And a lot of information that I
8 will refer to, if need be, is in some of those documents,
9 but the basic petition is the last paragraph of this May
10 29th, 2000 letter, plus the comments by Judge Gensche.

11 MR. GOLDBERG: Yeah, that's -- that's -- Jack
12 Goldberg, again. That's exactly how I read your May 29th
13 submission as a 2.206 petition.

14 SPEAKER: Yes. Okay. Okay. So we're on the same
15 page.

16 MR. GOLDBERG: It still -- we would appreciate
17 your answering the question.

18 SPEAKER: Yes, if you could get back to it.

19 MR. GOLDBERG: About the class one issues.

20 SPEAKER: Could you repeat that question?

21 MR. OLSHAN: Now, back to your May 29th letter.

22 SPEAKER: Yes, yes.

23 MR. OLSHAN: You have the cover letter and then
24 from -- the rest of it -- on the second page of the second
25 document.

1 SPEAKER: Yes.

2 MR. OLSHAN: It looks like the second paragraph
3 starts off as "Southern has basically refused to discuss all
4 the so-called class one issues."

5 SPEAKER: Okay. Wait. Let me find it.

6 MR. OLSHAN: "This is really an outrage," and so
7 on and so forth.

8 SPEAKER: We're on the May 29th letter.

9 MR. OLSHAN: On the May 29th, the first thing I
10 have is just the one page, half a page, signed by you. Then
11 the enclosure is the seven page -- what you call seven pages
12 of supplemental testimony.

13 SPEAKER: Okay. Wait a minute.

14 MR. OLSHAN: Okay.

15 SPEAKER: We are not on the same page here,
16 because -- oh, I see what happened, the reason we're not on
17 the same page.

18 Okay. You're talking about page two.

19 MR. OLSHAN: Yeah. I'm talking about page two of
20 what you call the supplemental information of --

21 SPEAKER: Of May --

22 MR. OLSHAN: Seven pages.

23 SPEAKER: On page two of May 29th.

24 MR. OLSHAN: Right.

25 SPEAKER: Okay.

1 MR. OLSHAN: The top, where it says "iodine."

2 SPEAKER: Okay. Got you. Yes. Okay.

3 MR. OLSHAN: Okay. Now, the second -- the first

4 --

5 SPEAKER: Okay. "Has refused to" --

6 MR. OLSHAN: -- full paragraph.

7 SPEAKER: I've found you, yes.

8 MR. OLSHAN: Okay. "Southern has basically
9 refused to discuss all the so-called class one issues."

10 SPEAKER: Yes. That is in the first portion of
11 their -- you know, it's a massive submission, 1,200 pages,
12 and basically that's more or less what they did. In my
13 opinion, they basically decided they were just not going to
14 go into them in great detail and they tossed everything out,
15 more or less, and of the SAMAs, the -- and those were very,
16 very, very important.

17 MR. OLSHAN: Okay. What --

18 SPEAKER: Well, you have to get the thing out and
19 read it, and then you will see what I'm talking about.

20 MR. GOLDBERG: Would we be -- this is Jack
21 Goldberg.

22 SPEAKER: Yes.

23 MR. GOLDBERG: Again. Because your 2.206 petition
24 is the, as we discussed before, the last paragraph and the
25 references --

1 SPEAKER: Yes.

2 MR. GOLDBERG: -- the same [inaudible] statements.

3 SPEAKER: Yes.

4 MR. GOLDBERG: Would we be correct in concluding
5 that that particular statement and what you mean by class
6 one issues is not relevant to your 2.206 petition?

7 SPEAKER: The -- what Southern has done, the
8 toss-out of the SAMAs you mean, or refused to discuss all
9 the so-called class one issues?

10 MR. GOLDBERG: Yes, refused to discuss the class
11 one issues. That's, as I understand it, a complaint you
12 have about the renewal proceeding.

13 SPEAKER: Yeah. That's the renewal.

14 MR. OLSHAN: Okay. I'm sorry. So you're
15 referring to the license renewal proceeding then.

16 SPEAKER: Yes. That refers to the license renewal
17 proceeding.

18 MR. OLSHAN: I'm sorry. Okay. That clarifies
19 that. Thank you.

20 SPEAKER: Okay.

21 MR. OLSHAN: Okay.

22 SPEAKER: That refers to the license renewal
23 proceeding.

24 MR. OLSHAN: Let me go on a little further here
25 then and --

1 SPEAKER: Yeah. You need to stick to the last
2 paragraph and what Judge Gensche said.

3 MR. OLSHAN: Previous to the last paragraph, on
4 the same page, where you start out, at the bottom, it says
5 Samuel W. Gensche.

6 SPEAKER: Yes.

7 MR. OLSHAN: Two paragraphs above that.

8 SPEAKER: Yes.

9 MR. OLSHAN: You say you remember one of Hatch's
10 recent events, the loss of coolant accident, which, of
11 course, leads to his statement about a melt-down.

12 What event are you referring to that was a loss of
13 coolant accident?

14 SPEAKER: They just had a recent loss of coolant
15 accident. It was documented, as it says, in the recent AIT
16 report.

17 MR. OLSHAN: Okay. That's the one you're
18 referring to, then. The one that was -- the January 26, the
19 recent AIT is what you're referring to as the loss of
20 coolant accident.

21 SPEAKER: Yeah. Well, that's what it was. It was
22 a loss of coolant accident and that's -- that's what they
23 had.

24 MR. OLSHAN: Okay. Okay. I just wanted to make
25 sure that was what you were talking about.

1 SPEAKER: Yeah. No. What Judge Gensche said
2 speaks for itself.

3 MR. OLSHAN: Right. Okay. And the last question
4 I have is on the last page, item seven.

5 SPEAKER: Yep.

6 MR. OLSHAN: You say, "Because NRC's own staff
7 wanted to ban pressure suppression" --

8 SPEAKER: Yes.

9 MR. OLSHAN: -- "containments" --

10 SPEAKER: Yes.

11 MR. OLSHAN: -- "like at Hatch."

12 SPEAKER: Yes.

13 MR. OLSHAN: What are you referring to there?

14 SPEAKER: Well, this is a massive historical
15 situation. The -- many, many, many years ago, I think that
16 you can all go and look it up, if you're not aware of it,
17 what happened was there were massive concerns raised by the
18 NRC's top staff, safety people, as well as -- not just
19 safety -- I'm trying to think of the title of the gentleman,
20 what his actual title was at the time.

21 Well, it will come to me in a minute, I'm sure.
22 What they did is they raised the fact that they were so
23 dangerous, that they shouldn't license any of them. It was
24 Steven Hanauer. He was the Chief Federal Nuclear Safety
25 Advisor from 1965 to 1982.

1 MR. OLSHAN: Okay.

2 SPEAKER: Okay.

3 MS. BLACK: This is Suzy Black. What I think
4 Lenny's question was is do you mean by that, by pressure
5 suppression containment, the MARK I BWR containment?

6 SPEAKER: Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.

7 MR. OLSHAN: So you're referring to the
8 containment that Hatch has.

9 SPEAKER: Yes.

10 MR. OLSHAN: Okay. The suppression pool
11 basically.

12 SPEAKER: Yes. The pressure suppression system
13 and there were also other concerns regarding other BWRs of a
14 similar type.

15 MR. OLSHAN: Okay.

16 SPEAKER: And what happened was Hanauer and some
17 of the other top staff raised this issue that it was very,
18 very, very serious. Okay. Gus Lainas, L-a-i-n-a-s, an
19 Atomic Energy Commission safety analyst, he also looked into
20 this and it was very serious.

21 And they made the recommendation that these be
22 banned. Hanauer had concluded that they be banned and
23 submitted technical reports and all sorts of stuff.

24 And Atomic Energy Commission officials even said,
25 according to what I have in front of me, that Steve's idea

1 to ban pressure suppression containment schemes is an
2 attractive one, in some ways.

3 Right. They didn't challenge any of the technical
4 analysis or anything.

5 But the senior AEC official was -- didn't want to
6 go this way because it was that it could be the end of
7 nuclear power. You know, they were freaking out, basically.
8 That was the bottom line. [Inaudible] whole thing.

9 MS. BLACK: Do you have a reference for what you
10 are reading from?

11 SPEAKER: Yes, because I was going to read you an
12 additional section here, and that might help you, as well.
13 What Hendry -- it was Dr. Joseph Hendry, who was the senior
14 Atomic Energy Commission official. Right.

15 However, the acceptance of pressure suppression
16 containment concepts by all elements of the nuclear field,
17 including Regulatory and the ACRS, is firmly embedded in the
18 conventional wisdom. Reversal of this hallowed policy,
19 particularly at this time, and what he meant by that was the
20 ECCS hearings then in progress, which were proving a major
21 embarrassment to the Atomic Energy Commission, could well be
22 the end of nuclear power.

23 It would throw into question the continued
24 operation of licensed plants, would make unlicenseable the
25 GE and Westinghouse ice condenser plants now in review, and

1 would generally create more turmoil than I can stand to
2 think about.

3 Hendry proposed no corrective actions to deal with
4 the safety problem Hanauer had raised. He got no reply to
5 his memo and the matter was resolved by being ignored.

6 You can find the details, you can find --

7 MS. BLACK: And can you provide the reference to
8 that for us?

9 SPEAKER: Yes. You can read 192, 193, 194, 195.
10 I mean, you can kind of keep going, okay? 196.

11 MS. BLACK: What do those numbers relate to?

12 SPEAKER: Okay. This is the text I was just
13 reading you. This is in the book that Judge Gensche wrote
14 the foreword to.

15 MS. BLACK: Oh, okay. I see.

16 SPEAKER: Okay.

17 MS. BLACK: I see it referenced in here.

18 SPEAKER: Yes. That's the reference to him.
19 Melt-down [inaudible] of the Atomic Energy Commission.

20 MS. BLACK: Well, that was all the questions we
21 had here. I'd like to see if the licensee has any
22 clarifying questions that they think they need to address
23 any safety issues.

24 SPEAKER: Yes.

25 MR. CROWE: Susan, this is Don Crowe. The second

1 question that you all raised concerning the LOCA.

2 SPEAKER: Yes.

3 MR. CROWE: I can understand the response, but I
4 do want to make it clear that it's my understanding this is
5 not what we consider the, quote, "traditional LOCA," that we
6 analyze.

7 There was a January event, but it was not a
8 L-O-C-A.

9 SPEAKER: And you believe that that is not to your
10 understanding.

11 MR. CROWE: It's a fact.

12 MR. CAHILL: This is Steve Cahill, in Region II.
13 That's our understanding, also. We did not use that
14 terminology in the AIT report.

15 SPEAKER: The Union of Concerned Scientists
16 maintains it's a LOCA and they issued supporting --

17 MS. BLACK: We understand there is a difference of
18 opinion on that.

19 SPEAKER: And -- and there was definitely -- was
20 there or was there not a loss of coolant?

21 MR. CROWE: Not as we define a loss of coolant
22 accident, as a breach in the reactor coolant piping, no.

23 SPEAKER: What I'm trying to say here is, was
24 there a loss of coolant to the reactor? Not what you
25 define, as you've just said, but there was a loss of

1 coolant, was there not?

2 MR.CROWE: What do you mean by a loss of coolant?
3 The reactor was cooled and -- and we're not going to get
4 into splitting hairs over the definition.

5 MR. OLSHAN: In fact, I was going to recommend we
6 -- at least we know the event she is referring to and we'll
7 address it in the response, but I don't know --

8 SPEAKER: It was -- it was a loss of coolant.

9 MR. OLSHAN: I just wanted to make sure we're
10 talking about the same event. We are talking about the
11 January 26th --

12 SPEAKER: Yes.

13 MR. OLSHAN: -- event that led to the AIT.

14 SPEAKER: Yes.

15 MR. OLSHAN: And whether it's a loss of coolant or
16 not, we don't have to resolve at this point. We'll address
17 it in the response we send you.

18 SPEAKER: Yes. Well --

19 MS. BLACK: Now, I'd like to make sure you
20 understand or make you understand --

21 SPEAKER: Yes, ma'am.

22 MS. BLACK: -- that the transcript of this tape
23 will be used as a supplement and the Petition Review Board
24 will consider that, along with your written petition, when
25 we meet to determine whether you meet the criteria, whether

1 this meets the criteria for consideration under 2.206.

2 And if it does not meet that criteria, that
3 doesn't mean that we won't address your issues. We will
4 still respond to your concerns through a letter, as opposed
5 to a Director's decision.

6 We will be having the Petition Review Board
7 meeting shortly and you will be advised within probably two
8 to three weeks of our determination of the -- of how we will
9 handle this correspondence.

10 SPEAKER: May I add something?

11 MS. BLACK: Yes.

12 SPEAKER: GE issued its own -- there's a whole
13 thing called the Reed report. You need to acquire it. That
14 GE issued.

15 MS. BLACK: A Reed report, you said?

16 SPEAKER: Yes. The Reed report. It was an
17 internal report. It was never meant to really become
18 public.

19 MR. SUBBARATNAM: Do you have the issue date of
20 that report, ma'am?

21 SPEAKER: You could -- you all should have the
22 Reed report, because they also -- what -- what it concerned
23 was that they didn't make a quality product, in other words.
24 You know, when you got the people who make it saying they
25 didn't make a quality product, more or less, then, on top of

1 it all, I've referred to NUREG 1079. Okay.

2 And, of course, these are all different scenarios.
3 There can be many other scenarios that can lead to a
4 catastrophe. We all know that.

5 But NUREG 1079 was very specific, as well, in one
6 type of scenario and what could happen and then the
7 interaction with the cement used and so on and so on and so
8 on, and whether which -- whether it had limestone, whether
9 it didn't.

10 I mean, there was a whole lot of stuff. But the
11 key issues with it were that the core can begin to uncover
12 in that particular type of accident that NUREG 1079 cites,
13 at 33 minutes.

14 Now, the thing is, you can see from the AIT report
15 and everything else the flurries that happened of everybody
16 running around like chickens without a head, just back in
17 January.

18 And the thing is, if you look at the site-specific
19 documents that each licensee has, in this case, Hatch,
20 there's a fat stack of documents that state how they go
21 about determining what to do.

22 In other words, you have -- basically, they're
23 meant to flip through this thing and figure out, well, is
24 this happening, is that happening, or, well, let's see,
25 let's go to page ten; oh, well, no, maybe it's on page four.

1 It's a step-by-step, press this, do that, press
2 this, do that.

3 Now, when all hell is breaking loose, I submit
4 that it is extremely difficult, and, not only that, unfair
5 to the workers, to expect them to try and figure out, you
6 know, how to read the manual on what button to press.

7 I mean, this stuff is really, really serious. If,
8 for example, you had a situation where the core would
9 uncover at 33 minutes, and they don't have to do
10 notification of the state, say, until 45 minutes, I believe
11 it is.

12 MS. BLACK: Notification of our emergency center?

13 SPEAKER: Yeah.

14 MS. BLACK: I think --

15 SPEAKER: And you have people who, with all due
16 respect, a licensed operator is only required to have a high
17 school education, plus some training, and a non-licensed
18 operator is only required to have training provided by the
19 licensee, and the senior operator is required to have a
20 degree in engineering, but, as I understand it, not
21 necessarily nuclear engineering.

22 That, in itself, I find extremely worrying. I
23 want to emphasize that I believe that the Commission should
24 go down to the area and should drive around in a 50-mile
25 radius, because that would be the evacuation pathway for

1 airbornes, and see how rural the area is, see the back
2 roads, see the dirt roads, see the little houses set off --
3 maybe you wouldn't [inaudible.]

4 See the size of the [inaudible] emergency
5 headquarters. It is in half of what appears to be a disused
6 gas station. They have got converted -- a converted school
7 bus, a couple of other things that they've painted up.

8 These people are meant to be the first responders.
9 There is no way, with the best in the world, that they could
10 get everybody out. They just could not do it.

11 The other issue is with the DDVS, direct -- you
12 know, the bypass system. That was not [inaudible.] That's
13 a generic issue. It was a generic idea. Let's pull the
14 plug and gas the surrounding population to try and save
15 time, basically, try and relieve pressure.

16 But Howard Denton, who is also senior staff at the
17 Atomic -- you know, the AEC, NRC, he himself said, and that
18 was printed, he said that this containment type, MARK I's,
19 had a 90 percent probability of being virtually certain to
20 fail.

21 MS. BLACK: Okay.

22 SPEAKER: Okay. And --

23 MS. BLACK: We will certainly consider all the
24 sources when we look at the interpretation, and I --
25 understand I do -- that we do have a copy of the Reed

1 report.

2 SPEAKER: You do. You should have a copy, yes. I
3 think you probably would.

4 MS. BLACK: Yes.

5 SPEAKER: And, you know, at the time it came out,
6 somebody even wrote in from South Georgia, very, very
7 worried about Hatch. This is years ago. Very worried, and
8 cited the Reed report as the reason why he was worried.

9 MS. BLACK: Okay. Well --

10 SPEAKER: As well, you know. When I say the
11 difficulties of evacuation, I want to raise that, depending
12 on weather systems and so on, last year, everybody thought
13 there was going to be a hurricane, they tried to evacuate
14 everybody out of Florida, as well as the Georgia coast,
15 because everything in Florida has to come through Georgia.

16 It was an absolute nightmare. There were people
17 stuck in traffic for 12 hours. They couldn't move. For
18 hundreds of miles. And that was just a hurricane that was
19 sort of on its way, if you see what I'm saying.

20 MS. BLACK: I understand.

21 SPEAKER: I mean, the -- it is the children --

22 MS. BLACK: Let me explain the rest of the process
23 of the 2.206 review to you, or do you have any questions on
24 the way we will handle this information?

25 SPEAKER: Well, no. What I do want to add,

1 though, is -- and I should have probably included it, but
2 actually you already have it. I mean, I will send it up, if
3 you like.

4 Dr. John Goffman's letter, I had attached it to --
5 let me see -- I had attached it to the back of my May 10
6 statement to the NRC down in Baxley. I will gladly send you
7 an additional copy of it.

8 MS. BLACK: I think that would probably be wise,
9 because I have -- nobody in the room here seems to have a
10 copy of it.

11 SPEAKER: Okay. All right. Because I would like
12 that also added as supporting documentation in terms of when
13 I say that there is no way that the children won't be
14 damaged.

15 MS. BLACK: Okay. And could you mail that to Mr.
16 Olshan, at the same address that you mailed your petition?

17 SPEAKER: Yes. Okay. In other words, U.S. NRC,
18 Washington, D.C., that address?

19 MR. OLSHAN: Yes.

20 MS. BLACK: Yes. And put it to me, O-l-s-h-a-n.

21 SPEAKER: Okay. Yes. Dr. Goffman was the top
22 staff senior scientist of the Atomic Energy Commission. He
23 was their man. He was renowned worldwide. He was the man
24 who isolated the first milligram, or rather is, he's still
25 alive, the first milligram of plutonium for the Manhattan

1 Project.

2 He is the man who holds the patent on two methods
3 of isolation of plutonium. He was the founder and first
4 biomedical director of Lawrence Livermore Labs. He is both
5 a medical doctor as well as holds degrees in nuclear
6 chemistry and so on and so forth. And he is Professor
7 Emeritus of Molecular and Cellular Biology at the University
8 of California at Berkeley.

9 And he has pointed out over and over again the
10 dangers of what we are dealing with, especially when it
11 comes to low dose, and he is not the only one.

12 MS. BLACK: Okay. Well, we'll certainly take into
13 consideration his statement, if you send it to us.

14 SPEAKER: Yes. Yes. I will do that. I should
15 probably have tossed that in, too.

16 MS. BLACK: Okay.

17 SPEAKER: But the effects to children, that is the
18 paramount thing. These are the next generation.

19 MS. BLACK: Okay.

20 SPEAKER: And that, above all, that, above all,
21 must be held up. It affects children in utero. We know, I
22 have added some comments that were in my June 4th
23 attachment. You might want to just read it.

24 MS. BLACK: Okay.

25 SPEAKER: On the true effects of Chernobyl. You

1 can read it.

2 MR. OLSHAN: Did you say June 4th?

3 SPEAKER: Pardon me?

4 MR. OLSHAN: You said June 4th?

5 SPEAKER: Yes. In my June 4th submission, I
6 mentioned some of the real effects of Chernobyl.

7 MS. BLACK: And was this in the license renewal?

8 SPEAKER: Yes, it's in the license renewal.

9 MR. OLSHAN: Oh, this is something else. I'm
10 sorry. Okay.

11 SPEAKER: Yes, it's something else.

12 MR. OLSHAN: I'm sorry. Okay.

13 MS. BLACK: Well, we can get that from our license
14 renewal people.

15 MR. OLSHAN: Right.

16 SPEAKER: Yes. I think you might want to read it.

17 MS. BLACK: Okay. Well, if anybody else has any
18 other questions around the room? No. All right. Well, you
19 should be hearing from us in two to three weeks and we'd
20 appreciate it if you would send the report off as soon as
21 possible so we can consider it in our deliberations.

22 SPEAKER: Yes. I'll get it in the mail today.

23 MS. BLACK: Okay. Well, thank you very much.

24 SPEAKER: All right. Well, thank you.

25 MS. BLACK: Goodbye.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SPEAKER: Bye-bye.

SPEAKER: Goodbye.

[END TAPE 1, SIDE A.]

[SIDE B NOT RECORDED.]

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the matter of:

Name of Proceeding: HATCH PETITION

Docket Number:

Place of Proceeding: Unknown

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission transcribed by me from recorded tapes provided by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and that the transcript is a true and accurate record of the foregoing proceedings to the best of my belief and ability.



Natalie Perino

Transcriber

Ann Riley & Associates, Ltd.