# Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title:

Petition Review Board Meeting

RE: Vermont Yankee

Docket Number:

50-271

Location:

(telephone meeting)

Date:

Wednesday, May 12, 2004

Work Order No.:

NRC-1476

Pages 1-35

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC. Court Reporters and Transcribers 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 234-4433

1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS
5	PETITION REVIEW BOARD MEETING
6	x
7	IN THE MATTER OF:
8	PETITION REVIEW BOARD MEETING : Docket No. 50-271
9	RE: VERMONT YANKEE :
10	x
11	Telephonic Meeting
12	Wednesday, May 12, 2004
13	PRESENT (IN ORDER OF IDENTIFICATION)
14	Alan B. Wang, Petition Manager
15	Eric J. Leeds, Petition Review Board Chairman
16	Herbert N. Berkow, NRR
17	Donna Skane, 2.206 Coordinator
18	John F. Stang, Jr., NRR Project Manager
19	Stephen H. Lewis, Office of General Counsel (OGC)
20	Cornelius F. Holden, Jr., NRR
21	Richard B. Ennis, NRR Project Manager
22	for Vermont Yankee
23	Raymond Shadis, representing New England Coalition
24	Arnold Gunderson, consulting expert for NEC
25	Paul Blanch, consulting expert for NEC

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	PRESENT (IN ORDER OF IDENTIFICATION - cont.)
2	Charlene Faison, Entergy, White Plains, New York
3	Rhonda Deplukas, Entergy at Vermont Yankee
4	Rob Williams, Vermont Yankee
5	Jim BeVincentis, Manager of Licensing, Vermont Yankee
6	Peter Alexander, New England Coalition
7	Susan Small, Rutland Herald
8	Laurie P. Butler, Brattleboro Reformer
9	Jeff Scott, freelance TV and press reporter
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

### 1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2 (time not provided.) 3 MR. WANG: We'd like to get started. I'm 4 Alan Wang, I'm the Petition Manager. What I'd like to 5 do is I'd just like to have the participants introduce 6 themselves, and then if there's anybody from the 7 public, I'd also like to have them introduce 8 themselves. But, as we noted, the public is allowed 9 to listen but not participate. So we'll go around the 10 table here first. MR. LEEDS: My name's Eric Leeds. I'm the 11 12 Petition Review Board Chairman. 13 MR. BERKOW: Herb Berkow, NRR. MS. SKANE: Donna Skane, I'm Agency 2.206 14 Coordinator. 15 16 MR. STANG: John Stang, NRR Project 17 Manager. MR. LEWIS: Stephen Lewis, Office of 18 General Counsel. 19 MR. HOLDEN: Cornelius Holden, NRR. 20 21 MR. ENNIS: Rick Ennis, NRR Project 22 Manager for Vermont Yankee. MR. WANG: Ray, do you want to introduce 23 who the Petitioners are?

MR. SHADIS: Sure. This is Raymond Shadis

24

1	representing the New England Coalition, and we have
2	with us today our consulting experts, Arnold Gunderson
3	and Paul Blanch.
4	MR. WANG: Is there anybody from the
5	Licensee on this line?
6	MS. FAISON: Yes. This is Charlene Faison
7	from Entergy, White Plains, New York.
8	MR. WANG: Could you speak a little
9	louder, we didn't quite hear you?
10	MS. FAISON: Charlene Faison, Entergy from
11	White Plains, New York.
12	MS. DEPLUKAS: Rhonda Deplukas, Entergy at
13	Vermont Yankee.
14	MR. WILLIAMS: And Rob Williams, Vermont
15	Yankee.
16	MR. DAVIS: Jim BeVincentis, Manager of
17	Licensing from Vermont Yankee.
18	MR. WANG: Do we have anybody from the
19	public?
20	MR. ALEXANDER: Peter Alexander from the
21	New England Coalition.
22	MS. SMALL: This is Susan Small here from
23	the Rutland Herald.
24	MS. BAGWELL: Lauri P. Butler, Reformer.
25	MR. SCOTT: Jeff Scott, freelance TV and

press reporter.

MR. WANG: Eric Leeds is the PRB Chairman. He's going to read a short statement. When you speak, would you please state your name, so -- we're going to have this transcribed, so we do need to have whoever speaks so we can get the right name.

MR. LEEDS: Thank you, Alan. Let me get this started. Again, my name's Eric Leeds. I'm Deputy Director, Division of Licensing Project Manager here at the NRC. I'm also the Petition Review Board Chairman for this petition.

The subject of this teleconference is a 2206 petition submitted by the New England Coalition, dated April 23, 2004. The Petitioners have requested that the NRC halt all fuel movement at Vermont Yankee until such time as Entergy, the Licensee, has rendered an accurate and NRC-verified account and location disposition and condition of all irradiated fuel, including fuel currently loaded in the reactor core.

The purpose of this teleconference is to allow the Petitioners to address the Petition Review Board. This is an opportunity for the Petitioners to provide additional explanations or support for this petition. This is also an opportunity for the staff and Licensee to ask any clarifying questions. The

purpose of this teleconference is not to debate the merits of the petition. Let me repeat that so that everyone is clear. The purpose of this teleconference is not to debate the merits of the petition. It's simply to ask any clarifying questions and allow the Petitioner to provide any additional explanations.

Also, let me emphasize that unlike other NRC public meetings, members of the public are permitted to listen only. Only the Petitioners, the NRC staff and the Licensee are permitted to participate in the discussion.

Following this phone call, the Petition Review Board will meet today to determine whether the NRC accepts the petition under the 2206 process or whether it will be dealt with under another mechanism. The Petition Review Board's meeting today will not determine whether we agree or disagree with the contents of the petition.

The teleconference is being transcribed, as Alan stated earlier, so it will help if anyone making a statement first state their name clearly. The transcript will become a supplement to the petition and will be made publicly available. We are requesting that the Petitioners keep their remarks to approximately 30 minutes.

1 If the Petition Review Board decides that 2 the petition will be considered under the 2006 3 process, then the NRC will issue an acknowledgement 4 letter to the Petitioner. The Petition Manager will 5 Petitioners keep the and Licensee periodically 6 informed of the progress of the staff's review. 7 With that, I'm going to turn it over to 8 the Petitioners and allow them some time if they would 9 like to provide any additional explanations or support 10 for the petition. 11 MR. SHADIS: Yes. This is Raymond Shadis 12 speaking. First, I owe NRC an apology. We made what we thought was an off-the-record statement to the 13 14 press here with respect to how slow the NRC was in 15 responding to our petition, and in fact the petition 16 was submitted on the 23rd and we had a response by the 17 27th. 18 MR. WANG: Ray, do you have noise coming 19 across the line? 20 MR. SHADIS: Does that help? 21 MR. WANG: Or is someone moving? 22 MR. SHADIS: Does that help? 23 MR. WANG: Yes, that's better. 24 MR. SHADIS: Okay. Yes. Let me just 25 start over. We had made a statement regarding -- are

we still getting that noise?

MR. WANG: Yes. We're still getting noise here.

PARTICIPANT: I think people who are not talking need to put their phones mute, and I think that will help some of the disturbance.

MR. LEEDS: Why don't we start again, if you would, Mr. Shadis.

MR. SHADIS: Thank you. There's a statement of ours that was reported in the Vermont media and I know which we had thought off the record, but even so, it was a misstatement. We had castigated NRC for being slow to respond to this petition, and in fact it was only a matter of four or five days from the time the petition was filed until we heard back from NRC.

As you know, we asked for expedited action from NRC with respect to limiting or halting the movement of fuel, and by inference in our petition that meant not restarting, because we also had asked for an inspection of the fuel in the reactor. We have since gotten a call from Region 1 and Region 1 wanted to ascertain if we had specific information to particular fuel assemblies or we had some allegation with respect to particular fuel loaded in the reactor,

which we did not.

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

Our concern was that Vermont Yankee had a record of fuel damage that it was apparent that they had lost control of their fuel inventory, and our concern was that they could as well as not be loading damaged fuel. And NRC then determined that that was not adequate to require halting the start-up. So I just wanted to clarify that we understand that portion of NRC's decisionmaking, and we're prepared to now discuss the remainder of our 2206 petition.

I would like to reaffirm the request that fuel movement be halted. We understand that fuel movement in terms of off-loading the reactor and reactor reload is completed; however, we would like it understood that the request to halt fuel movement includes now any plans to rearrange, rerack any of the fuel in the spent fuel pool. And if this investigation is not complete before this fuel cycle is over, certainly it would preclude any fuel movement at that time. So, in essence, we want to confirm that we are asking NRC to halt all fuel movement except for that necessary to examine fuel or to look for broken fuel or fuel segments. And I wonder if I'm clear on that or if you have questions on that?

MR. LEEDS: That was interesting, your

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 last, "except for that necessary to examine the fuel 2 or to look for the fuel segments." 3 MR. SHADIS: That's correct. 4 LEEDS: All right. MR. That's very 5 helpful. That was one of the questions that we had. 6 If the Licensee is looking, if they need to locate 7 these missing pin segments, they may find it necessary 8 to rearrange fuel in the fuel pool in order to search 9 different portions of the fuel pool. But you find 10 that movement would be acceptable. MR. SHADIS: Yes. And we understand that 11 12 NRC now has an inspection team onsite. We're 13 presuming that this inventory will be conducted with hands-on NRC oversight. 14 MR. LEEDS: We do have an inspection team 15 16 onsite, yes, and we are monitoring the Licensee's actions. 17 of 18 MR. SHADIS: Okay. One our 19 stipulations was that the inventory, and here we're 20 talking about a complete, exhaustive inventory, that 21 it be certified by NRC. And I'd like to clarify that, 22 if I may. 23 As interested members of the public, we 24 are not assured by the general run of NRC statements, 25 and, further, if anticipating any further action with

respect to this issue, we are, in essence, acting NRC to be itself accountable. I have an issue with respect to how NRC has represented the fuel inventory to date, and if you'll bear with me just a minute.

We had an NRC public meeting at Vernon, Vermont on March 31. At that meeting, the issue of the lost fuel pins at Millstone was raised, and the reassurance we got from the NRC at that meeting was that that kind of thing did not exist or would not exist at Vermont Yankee. And I'd like to read to you now our own transcript of a portion of that meeting and response then to whether or not an issue similar to Millstone could exist at Vermont Yankee.

We have an NRC representative, and I believe it was Bill Ruland speaking first who says, Pelton, I know you have looked at accountability of the spent fuel pool. Would you care to address the question here in Vermont?" And Dave Pelton, as you know, is Senior Resident Inspector. "I will. Accountability, as you mentioned, at Millstone did have an issue with a fuel pin that was lost. There was an intense NRC inspection on that. A lot of early on shipments were made from spent fuel pools, and there is an NRC inspector's report that talks about probable causes on that. Other aspects were

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

related to the NRC did an inspection following that to 1 2 do a material accountability at all" --MR. WANG: Mr. Shadis? 3 4 MR. SHADIS: Yes? 5 MR. WANG: I'm sorry to interrupt. 6 getting -- someone else is having a conversation on 7 this line, and I really urge the people who are not 8 speaking to please put their phones on mute, because 9 it is interrupting our ability to understand what 10 you're saying. 11 MR. SHADIS: Thank you. 12 If I'm sorry, Mr. Shadis. MR. WANG: you'd continue. 13 14 MR. SHADIS: The last sentence, "Other 15 aspects were related to, " and then a blank. did an inspection following that to do a material 16 accountability at all pools across the nation." 17 18 Pelton continues, "To address that specific part of 19 your question, if you'll bear with me for a second, 20 myself and the other resident inspector we did a 21 fairly detailed review of the spent fuel pool at Vermont Yankee here where I look at it almost every 22 23 day anyway, and we looked through historically,

through the record from day one since they've put

anything into that pit, and we validated that there's

24

a record on all the material they said was in there 1 still is in there, and we challenged them on a number 2 3 of points to validate some areas that we didn't understand how they followed their process. We 4 challenged them on that, they took some action, and 5 6 indeed we did validate it." Pelton 7 And then with a break Mr. 8 continues, "We validate that we fully understand all 9 of the inventory and that everything they say in there is right where it belongs." 10 Now, I don't mean to pick on Mr. Pelton at 11 12 all. Apparently, he made this statement before he had actually completed verifying the pool because it was 13 then in a very short period of time when he did ask 14 for a visual inspection of the container with the two 15 16 missing fuel segments. 17 My point is --I'm 18 MR. LEEDS: Excuse me, Mr. Shadis. 19 sorry, but we're getting a lot of interference again. 20 Can you hear that? 21 MR. SHADIS: Yes, I can. It sounds like 22 a conversation about some domestic matter. 23 MR. WANG: John, can we be quiet for a 24 second and can you pick up the noise and drop that 25 line?

1 JOHN: There's nobody giving us any static 2 I did hear it, but I couldn't catch who it right now. 3 was. 4 MR. WANG: Okay. MR. LEEDS: Sorry, Mr. Shadis. We'll try 5 6 to get that cleared up. 7 MR. SHADIS: All right. And I will be 8 glad to provide the Petition Review Board with a copy 9 of this transcript so that you can read what it is 10 that we're saying. 11 But, basically, we have Mr. Pelton's 12 public assurance that the spent fuel pool at Vermont 13 Yankee has been -- there's been stringent oversight 14 and everything has been examined and accounted for. 15 And then within very short order we have these two 16 missing fuel segments. I don't mean to fault him but 17 the statement, if anything, it was premature, it was 18 done before that examination was completed. 19 And this is not what we want from NRC with 20 respect to this petition. We do want a formal, on-21 the-record, certified accounting of the spent fuel, 22 and I believe that given -- let me just check my notes 23 here -- I believe that given the reporting provisions 24 and the accounting provisions, for example, in 10 CFR

70.51 and 70.54, the Licensee is required to do a

1	periodic complete inventory. It has not been done,
2	and we're now asking that our request for an inventory
3	be expanded into a formal order from NRC requiring
4	that the Licensee complete a full inventory with some
5	quality assurance attached to it.
6	MR. LEEDS: All right. Mr. Shadis, can I
7	repeat back what my understanding is of what
8	MR. SHADIS: Certainly.
9	MR. LEEDS: you're asking for so that
10	you can correct me if I don't have it right? This
11	petition, NEC is requesting a formal, on-the-record,
12	certified accounting by the Nuclear Regulatory
13	Commission of the spent fuel inventory at Vermont
14	Yankee.
15	MR. SHADIS: We would anticipate that the
16	Licensee would actually be performing the inventory,
17	but we are asking for NRC's oversight to the extent
18	that NRC is able at the end of this inventory to
19	provide certification that it is complete.
20	MR. LEEDS: Okay. Can you explain or give
21	me any kind of clarification on what you mean by
22	certification? Is this oath and affirmation?
23	MR. SHADIS: Well, oath and affirmation I
24	don't believe is necessary. If NRC will compose a
25	formal letter accepting the Licensee's fulfillment of

an order that requires a complete inventory, that 1 2 would do the trick, I believe. MR. LEEDS: Okay. I understand you asking 3 that the NRC issue a formal order to the Licensee to 4 5 complete a fuel inventory with appropriate QA review and then following that NRC issue a formal letter to 6 7 the Licensee accepting the completion of that fuel 8 inventory. 9 MR. SHADIS: That's right. And, you know, 10 fuel inventory, and we want to be clear on our terms 11 here, 10 CFR 70.51 uses the term, "special nuclear 12 material." We presume that that means the spent fuel and other contents of the Licensee's nuclear 13 14 inventory. So, for example, I guess what we are 15 really asking for here is an inventory of all that is 16 contained in the spent fuel pool. MR. LEEDS: All that is contained in the 17 18 spent fuel pool? 19 MR. SHADIS: Yes. I don't want to be 20 hemming myself in here, because I guess what we're 21 really interested in here is the special nuclear 22 material wherever it may be within the Plant. 23 MR. LEEDS: Well, yes. Let me ask you to 24 clarify that. I understand that you want to know 25 everything that's contained in the spent fuel pool,

	$\mathbf{n}$
1	which is special nuclear material.
2	MR. SHADIS: Right.
3	MR. LEEDS: Now, you just
4	MR. SHADIS: I turned that around on you,
5	and I'm sorry for the vacillation.
6	MR. LEEDS: That's all right. Can you
7	clarify exactly are we reserving the review to the
8	spent fuel pool, are we looking at perhaps things
9	outside of the spent fuel pool?
10	MR. SHADIS: Well, right now, for example,
11	we don't know the location of the missing fuel
12	segments, and we don't know if they have been broken
13	up, and because the Licensee has, in effect, lost
14	control of their inventory, we don't know where there
15	may be fragments or pellets. And if this includes all
16	areas where this material is handled, be it in the
17	spent fuel pool, in the transfer canal, in the
18	immediate area of the reactor, then certainly our
19	sense is that those areas should be included.
20	MR. LEEDS: Okay. I have one of the staff
21	wants to expound on some clarifying questions.
22	MR. SHADIS: Certainly.
23	MR. BERKOW: This is Herb Berkow. Would
24	you exclude anything in new fuel storage in the
25	reactor core, start-up sources that might be

1	available? In other words, are you interested
2	primarily in spent fuel?
3	MR. SHADIS: I have to answer that yes
4	with the kinds of exclusions that you've put in, new
5	fuel, neutron sources, all the rest of that, presuming
6	that spent nuclear fuel greater than Class C waste,
7	the other kinds of things that you would expect to
8	find in the spent fuel pool, would not have been in
9	those other areas.
10	MR. BERKOW: So it's primarily spent fuel
11	then.
12	MR. SHADIS: That's correct.
13	MR. BERKOW: Okay.
14	MR. LEEDS: This is Eric Leeds again, Mr.
15	Shadis. If you would allow me, I'd like to ask if
16	there's anyone else from the staff that has any
17	clarifying questions for Mr. Shadis?
18	MR. HOWE: I have one.
19	MR. LEEDS: Identify yourself.
20	MR. HOWE: Mr. Shadis, this is Alan Howe.
21	You said something about greater than Class C waste.
22	I'm uncertain as to what you're referring to with
23	regard to that in terms of any inventory.
24	MR. SHADIS: Well, because we don't have
25	an inventory of the pool, it's a little bit difficult

for me to say. But what we do know is that -- because we don't have an inventory of the pool, it is difficult for me to say, but if there are portions of the control elements or fuel bundle components or other bits and pieces that have been highly irradiated and have now been characterized as Class C, our presumption is that they are stored in the spent fuel pool along with the fuel.

That one of the means of confirming what it is you have stored in the fuel pool is a radiological survey, that it is reasonable that there could be confusion with respect to these materials and the missing materials and that one way of nailing down what you actually have there is to do a complete inventory of all the materials that you have stored in proximity of the spent fuel. So I mentioned Class C because of the presumption that radiation levels might be similar to that of aged fuel. And we may be technically not on real solid ground there, but that's our perception of it.

MR. HOWE: Okay. Let me just clarify what I thought I heard. This is Alan Howe again. You're referring to a process for how to identify the result issue which is an understanding of the inventory of spent fuel.

MR. SHADIS: Yes, or as it's termed in 1 2 70.51, special nuclear material. 3 MR. HOWE: Okay. 4 MR. SHADIS: I mean that's NRC's 5 terminology. Special nuclear material is a 6 MR. HOWE: 7 broader class than spent nuclear fuel. 8 MR. SHADIS: I understand. 9 MR. HOWE: That's why we're working hard 10 to try to clarify what the result will be. 11 MR. SHADIS: Well, could you help me, 12 please, understand now, is NRC's review of Vermont 13 Yankee's apparent failure to do a physical inventory 14 of all special nuclear material, is that now limited 15 to review on spent fuel or is NRC now seeking to see 16 if the Licensee was in compliance with 10 CFR 70.51(d) or not? Does that question make any sense to you? 17 18 MR. LEEDS: This is Eric Leeds again. 19 Yes, I think the question makes sense. I don't know 20 that I can answer that without the region on the line, 21 because they're the ones conducting the special 22 inspection. However, not that your question isn't a 23 good question and isn't warranted, I do want to make 24 sure that we stick with the 2006 petition, make sure

that we understand what New England Coalition is

1 asking for so we can proceed. 2 MR. SHADIS: Okay. 3 MR. LEEDS: I don't know the answer, Mr. We certainly could get back to you on that 4 Shadis. 5 But getting back to what Alan Howe was question. 6 asking about, I am a little confused with regard to --7 you're primarily interested in spent fuel but I also 8 heard you talk about a complete inventory of all 9 materials that are being stored in the spent fuel pool, which would include things like greater than 10 11 Class C waste --12 MR. SHADIS: Right. MR. LEEDS: -- and sources that are used 13 14 at the site and that sort of thing. 15 MR. SHADIS: Right. 16 MR. LEEDS: Is that what is of interest to the New England Coalition? 17 18 MR. SHADIS: Yes, it is. And part of this 19 is the rationale that was applied at an investigation 20 at Millstone and now seems to be something that's 21 emanating from statements made by the Licensee that 22 there is a possibility that the missing fuel segments 23 may have been shipped. And here we're not talking 24 greater than Class C but here we're talking low level 25 waste shipments, that they may have been packed under

water and shipped with low level waste to a low level waste repository. And it is apparent to us that unless you are inventorying all of the materials that you're required to inventory, that kind of confusion, that kind of mistake can happen, and our concern is that, number one, of course, is that it not happen in the future, but also, by way of confirming a full inventory, that all these other materials also be looked at.

MR. LEEDS: All right, Mr. Shadis. And my understanding of the New England Coalition's request is a complete inventory of all materials stored in the spent fuel pool, including spent fuel greater than Class C waste and whatever other types of materials the Licensee is currently storing in the spent fuel pool.

MR. SHADIS: Right. And I have to tell you that we're coming from two perspectives here. One is our understanding physically of what might or might not be in the spent fuel pool and our sense of common sense about what a full inventory might be. But the other perspective that we're coming at here is the legal requirement for inventory and reporting that the Licensee has. And, certainly, any order that would emanate from NRC with respect to a complete inventory

1 would reference the legal requirements under 70.51 and 2 so on. 3 MR. LEEDS: Understand. You're saying the basis for the NRC's order would be the regulatory 4 5 requirements in 10 CFR Part 70. 6 MR. SHADIS: That's correct. 7 Thank you. Any other MR. LEEDS: Okay. 8 clarifying questions from the NRC staff? I don't see 9 any. Can I extend to the Licensee are there any 10 clarifying questions you'd like to ask the New England 11 Coalition? 12 MS. FAISON: None at this time. 13 MR. LEEDS: Thank you very much. All 14 Mr. Shadis, is there anything else that you'd 15 like to tell us before we -- I know I have a couple of 16 questions that I'd like to ask you, and the staff may 17 have some, but is there any other clarification or 18 explanation that you'd like to share with us? 19 MR. SHADIS: I don't -- well, they're 20 really housekeeping things. 21 MR. LEEDS: That's fine. 22 MR. SHADIS: If we can take care of them 23 One is would you like for me to send you a copy 24 of our transcript? I presume that NRC's transcript of 25 that March 31 meeting ought to be prepared anytime

soon.

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

MR. LEEDS: Yes. This is Eric Leeds again. Yes. I'm being told by the staff that, yes, we have it, and -- is it publicly available yet, Rick?

MR. ENNIS: Not yet. This is Rick Ennis.

It's going to be made publicly available as part of

the meeting summary which is in concurrence.

MR. SHADIS: Okay. That will help. so I quess you all can refer to that for the statement from Mr. Pelton that I referred to. The other thing is in our preliminary call last week, we asked if there was documentation on the 1979-1980 incident, and Mr. Alan Wang looked for that and was unable to find any publicly available documents on that. thing that has our attention is that the morning report, the NRC morning report for April 23 stated that two fuel pins were broken into several pieces, and I know that the folks that write up the morning report aren't -- they're not being held to some kind of standard of testimony or anything in terms of the exact accuracy of their words, but there's no way for us to confirm any of that information or review it. The idea that we are only missing two small segments when the morning report says several pieces and two fuel pins leads us to question where the other

portions of those fuel pins are and if their location has been verified. And, certainly, that would be something that we would want to see incorporated in a full inventory.

I guess the other part of that is that

I guess the other part of that is that when an inventory is done, a full inventory is done and certified by NRC, we would hope that it would be made publicly available and not be something like this original report, which we so far haven't been able to get a hold of.

In that same vein, we mentioned the fuel damage and here we have a former employee who saw a photo representation of a split open fuel pin at the 1992 incident. NRC's told us they're well aware of that 1992 incident, but there, too, we've been unable to obtain the documents, the relevant documents, and we did ask the Petition Review Board if they could help us in that regard and provide those documents. I'd like to reiterate that request for that information.

MR. LEEDS: All right, Ms. Shadis. This is Eric Leeds again. Let me repeat back to you what I heard to make sure that I understand.

MR. SHADIS: Sure.

MR. LEEDS: One of the concerns had to do

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

with the NRC morning report for April 23, the pins 1 were broken into several pieces. 2 I saw in your petition that you're requesting the location of the 3 longer pieces, the remaining. 4 5 MR. SHADIS: Right. saw that And I in the MR. LEEDS: 6 7 Verify the location of the remaining petition. 8 lengths, some ten feet of fuel pin or its condition. So you want -- you're asking the Review Board to also 9 look into that and make sure that's part of the 10 11 inventory. MR. SHADIS: Yes, sir. We wrote that 12 petition before we saw the morning report. So we were 13 14 essentially speaking about the remainder, presuming that these two unaccounted for fuel fragments came 15 from one pin. But in the morning report we see now 16 that the incident involved two pins, and we see the 17 18 language that they were broken into several pieces. 19 So, in essence, we're asking for information on the location, verified location and the condition of the 20 21 remainder of that --Of those two pins. 22 MR. LEEDS: MR. SHADIS: Yes. 23 MR. LEEDS: Okay. Good. Thank you. 24 You 25 also asked to make sure that the report of the NRC's

1	oversight of the Licensee's activities be publicly
2	available and I guess also the NRC certification of
3	the Licensee's inventory also be publicly available;
4	is that correct?
5	MR. SHADIS: Yes. On the first part, if
6	there is any way to do it, it is the Licensee's report
7	to the NRC with respect to the inventory that should
8	be publicly available.
9	MR. LEEDS: The Licensee's report to the
10	NRC.
11	MR. SHADIS: Yes.
12	MR. LEEDS: Okay.
13	MR. SHADIS: As well as the NRC's
14	certification or letter which certifies that NRC is
15	satisfied with the conduct of the inventory.
16	MR. LEEDS: Okay. I think I understand
17	your request.
18	MR. SHADIS: Okay.
19	MR. LEEDS: The Licensee's report as well
20	as the NRC's report. Also you discussed a little bit
21	about a former employee saw that there was a split
22	open fuel pin?
23	MR. SHADIS: Yes.
24	MR. LEEDS: And you were unable to obtain
25	the relevant documents from that.
11	

1 MR. SHADIS: Yes. This is approximately 2 1992. 3 MR. LEEDS: Nineteen ninety-two, You also reference that in the 4 understand that. 5 petition, and you're asking the Petition Review Board 6 if we could help provide those documents. 7 MR. SHADIS: Yes. 8 MR. LEEDS: All right. Okay. And those 9 were -- you called those housekeeping. 10 (Laughter.) 11 MR. SHADIS: Well, it doesn't go to the 12 heart of our concern, but these are part of the -- I 13 presume that you're going to be looking at these 14 documents as part of your petition review, and we're 15 at a extreme disadvantage because we don't have access to them. 16 17 MR. LEEDS: I understand your request, 18 sir. I have one housekeeping item for you, and then 19 I want to move into whatever questions that we have, 20 the clarifications for the petition that New England Coalition submitted. 21 22 My housekeeping issue for you has to do with your statements earlier regarding the senior 23 resident's statements at the public meeting and that 24 25 he may have spoke prematurely.

MR. SHADIS: Right.

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

MR. LEEDS: We take any inferences about the staff and potential wrongdoing very seriously. We'll handle it appropriately with regard to the NRC's processes, and so that I want to make sure that you understand that we heard your concern loud and clear and that we will examine your concern. And also I just want to recount for the record that it was because of the senior resident's questioning that the Licensee even identified that these two fuel segments were missing.

MR. SHADIS: Yes. And that's why I said that I did not want this to be taken as a negative comment with respect to the inspector. We're fully aware that Mr. Pelton required them to go ahead and visually confirm the contents of that container, and we fully appreciate that. We have to hypothesize here supposing that had never happened. What we had was an assurance from NRC that every aspect of the Licensee's inventory-keeping had been confirmed, and I'm just presuming that Mr. Pelton made that statement but still had things to do on his agenda with respect to confirming the fuel pool content. So in that sense, we're faulting NRC for a comment that would be premature, and had it not gone any further, the public

1 would have gone away with a false assurance. 2 MR. LEEDS: I understand. Thank you, Mr. 3 Shadis. Thank you. Now, questions for you, if you would, sir, 4 5 I'm looking at Page 2 of your petition, the third full 6 paragraph. 7 MR. SHADIS: Okay. 8 It begins, "Therefore, if and MR. LEEDS: 9 when the Licensee now finds fuel pin segments in some 10 unplanned storage location." MR. SHADIS: Yes. 11 12 MR. LEEDS: All right. Now, I think we just talked a little bit about this, and I was asking 13 14 for what your particular concern was. I think that 15 you answered this in our previous discussion, but if 16 you could go into -- if you could just briefly clarify 17 your concern that you have written here in this 18 paragraph. 19 MR. SHADIS: Yes. I'm sorry that it 20 wasn't written in a way that would be real clear. 21 What we're saying is because the missing segments are 22 an indicator that the inventory of these special 23 nuclear materials is not complete, it's not accurate, 24 to fail to do a complete inventory at this point and

rely only on a search of the pool for these missing

1	segments could, in our point of view, be misleading.
2	If you find a fuel fragment and it is roughly from
3	that time frame if you scale out the decay and if you
4	determine that this is from the '79-'80 time frame, it
5	still doesn't say that it is what you have been
6	looking for, because you don't have a complete
7	inventory of what's in there. It could just as well
8	come from another segment or a portion of whatever was
9	broken back then.
10	MR. LEEDS: Okay. That was very helpful.
11	Thank you.
12	MR. SHADIS: Okay.
13	MR. LEEDS: That clarified that for me.
14	MR. SHADIS: It was just our way of
15	pushing the idea that
16	MR. LEEDS: The complete inventory is
17	necessary.
18	MR. SHADIS: Absolutely.
19	MR. LEEDS: Right. Right. Understand.
20	Okay. My last question for you has to do with the
21	oh, let me see, one, two, three, four, five the
22	fifth paragraph down on that same page, there's a
23	statement, "Additionally, NRC tolerance of such poor
24	licensee practices, as exhibited by the loss of the
25	fuel pin segments," can you clarify what you mean by,

"NRC tolerance of such poor licensee practices?" 1 2 MR. SHADIS: Now, that's a good question. 3 That's a good guestion. It may very well be that these missing fuel segments have been missing for a 4 5 long time, and where the Licensee is required to do a 6 periodic inventory and reporting of their special 7 nuclear materials inventory, something has failed in 8 that system. I think maybe the word, "tolerances," 9 was a poor choice, but something in NRC's system or 10 application of their system has allowed this condition 11 to exist, it has allowed the Licensee to go perhaps 20 12 years without doing a visual confirmation of what 13 might be in that open canister. And if that's the 14 standard of oversight, then it does not bode well for 15 other areas where oversight is necessary. Does that 16 make any sense? 17 MR. LEEDS: Yes, it certainly does. I 18 think that was very helpful. Thank you, Mr. Shadis. 19 MR. SHADIS: Okay. Let me at this time open it 20 MR. LEEDS: 21 Are there any questions to the New England up. 22 Coalition regarding their petition from the NRC staff? 23 I see a lot of shaking heads, no. All right. 24 you. Let me open it up to the Licensee then.

the Licensee have any questions of the New England

1	Coalition with regard specifically to their petition.
2	MS. FAISON: None at this time.
3	MR. LEEDS: Okay. Thank you. Are there
4	any Mr. Shadis, are there any other speakers? You
5	introduced Mr. Blanch and Mr. Gunderson. Are there
6	any other speakers for the New England Coalition that
7	you'd like to address the Petition Review Board?
8	MR. SHADIS: Well, Mr. Gunderson, because
9	of a work schedule, had to leave us a little bit
10	earlier on. Mr. Blanch, are you there? Okay. We've
11	lost Mr. Blanch also. So I guess not.
12	MR. LEEDS: I guess not. All right. I
13	think that this concludes the call. Appreciate the
14	time, the clarification, the explanation for the
15	petition. As I said earlier, the Petition Review
16	Board will meet later today. We'll consider this for
17	acceptance into the 2206 petition process, and we will
18	certainly let you know how the Board's review turns
19	out, Mr. Shadis.
20	MR. SHADIS: Thank you. May I make one
21	final point of clarification here?
22	MR. LEEDS: Yes, sir.
23	MR. SHADIS: I referenced 10 CFR 70.51,
24	but, as you all know, there are reporting requirements
25	under Part 61 and there may be under other NRC
- 1	

1	regulations additional requirements that have to do
2	with inventorying, maintaining control and reporting
3	on the fuel, and I hope that you will, in considering
4	this and a possible order, not narrowly restrict it to
5	the cited regulation.
6	MR. LEEDS: I understand you're asking the
7	NRC to consider your request broadly
8	MR. SHADIS: Yes.
9	MR. LEEDS: not strictly restricted to
10	the two parts of the Part 70 that you had previously
11	referenced.
12	MR. SHADIS: That's correct.
13	MR. LEEDS: Okay.
14	MR. SHADIS: That's correct. I mean 70.54
15	I'm looking at here, 74.13. There is a number of
16	places where this kind of responsibility is cited in
17	regulation.
18	MR. LEEDS: Okay, sir.
19	MR. SHADIS: Yes.
20	MR. LEEDS: Very good. All right. Well,
21	again, I appreciate your time.
22	MR. SHADIS: Thank you. We thoroughly
23	appreciate your time and your accommodation on this.
24	MR. LEEDS: Yes, sir.
25	MR. SHADIS: Yes.
i	<b>\</b>

1	MR. LEEDS: Okay. Thank you. I will
2	conclude the call, and you all have a good day.
3	MR. SHADIS: Thank you. Bye now.
4	MR. LEEDS: Thank you. Bye.
5	(Whereupon, the Petition Review Board
6	Meeting was concluded.)
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

#### CERTIFICATE

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

Name of Proceeding: Petition Review Board

Meeting

Re: Vermont Yankee

Docket Number:

50-271

Location:

telephone meeting

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission taken by me and, thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under the direction of the court reporting company, and that the transcript is a true and accurate record of the foregoing proceedings as recorded on tape(s) provided by the NRC.

Mia Thar

Official Transcriber

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.