RAS 12357

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

Before Administrative Judges:

Alex S. Karlin, Chairman
Dr. Anthony J. Baratta
Lester S. Rubenstein

In the Matter of ENTERGY NUCLEAR VERMONT YANKEE L.L.C. and ENTERGY NUCLEAR OPERATIONS, INC. (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station)	Docket No. 50-271-OLA ASLBP No. 04-832-02-OLA October 12, 2006

ORDER
(Transmitting Redacted Version of Transcript from Proprietary Session)

On September 14, 2006, the Board held a closed session of the evidentiary hearing for the purpose of questioning witnesses about information in documents claimed to be proprietary by Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee L.L.C. and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (collectively, Entergy).[1] On September 27, 2006, we ordered Entergy to submit proposed redactions to the transcript of the proprietary session that would protect the proprietary information, and on October 4, 2006, Entergy did so. The Board adopts Entergy's proposal. A redacted version of

[1] No party challenged Entergy's claim that the documents were proprietary.

the transcript for the closed session is enclosed as an attachment to this order and shall be incorporated into the record.

It is so ORDERED.

FOR THE ATOMIC SAFETY
AND LICENSING BOARD[2]

Alex S. Karlin
ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

Rockville, Maryland
October 12, 2006

[2] Copies of this order were sent this date by Internet e-mail transmission to representatives for (1) licensees Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee L.L.C., and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.; (2) intervenor New England Coalition of Brattleboro, Vermont; and (3) the NRC Staff.

Entergy's Proposed Redactions (Redacted Materials Blacked Out)

Official Transcript of Proceedings{PRIVATE }

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Hearing ITMO Entergy Nuclear PROPRIETARY SESSION

Docket Number: 50-271-OLA; ASLBP No.: 04-832-02-OLA

Location: Newfane, Vermont

Date: Thursday, September 14, 2006

Work Order No.: NRC-1247 Pages 1579-16

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers

1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 234-4433

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD PANEL

+ + + + +

HEARING

In the Matter of: :

ENTERGY NUCLEAR VERMONT :

YANKEE L.L.C. and : Docket No. 50-271-OLA

NUCLEAR OPERATIONS INC., : ASLBP No. 04-832-02-OLA

(Vermont Yankee Nuclear :

Power Station) :

Thursday, September 14, 2006

The above-entitled hearing was convened, pursuant to notice, at 2:00 p.m. at the Windham County Superior Court, 2nd floor Courtroom, 7 Court Street, Newfane, Vermont.

BEFORE:

ALEX S. KARLIN, Chair

ANTHONY J. BARATTA Administrative Judge

LESTER S. RUBENSTEIN Administrative Judge

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of the Licensee:

MATIAS E. TRAVIESO-DIAZ, ESQ.

SCOTT VANCE, ESQ.

of: Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman

2300 N Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20037

(202) 663-8142

On Behalf of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

SHERWIN E. TURK, ESQ.

STEVEN C. HAMRICK, ESQ.

of: Office of the General Counsel

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Mail Stop O-15D21

Washington, DC 20555

(301) 415-1533

ALSO PRESENT:

MARCIA CARPENTIER, ESQ., ASLBP Staff

I-N-D-E-X

EXAMINATION

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

1:56 p.m.

CHAIR KARLIN: We are now in the confidential proprietary session of the hearing on the uprate for Entergy's application for the uprate. We'd like to call to the stand the Entergy witnesses again, please, Mr. Casillas and Mr. Nichols.

(Pause.)

CHAIR KARLIN: Let me once again remind you that you're under oath and please remember that as we ask you these questions. Okay. Judge Baratta?

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Okay. In reading the constant pressure power uprate document I was a little bit confused about a couple of statements that appeared in there.

And really what I was confused about was that the -- it appeared -- and it may be my misreading of it, so bear with me -- that it talked about doing [redacted]

And it also talked about doing [redacted] Could you maybe describe that a little bit and help clarify my understanding?

WITNESS CASILLA: [redacted]

[redacted]

And so, every time the plant is refueled a limited set of FSAR cases are directly calculated using the projected fuel characteristics of the next fuel cycle. And so, that is done all the time.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: And that's normally what's done regardless of whether it's an uprate or --

WITNESS CASILLA: That is correct.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Yes.

WITNESS CASILLA: And certainly if there is a change of some -- there is actually quite often changes made to the plant that do not involve any kind of a licensing action.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Right.

WITNESS CASILLA: Positions, characteristics, positions of valves, characteristics, and so on. And so, all of that is updated as well as set points.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: What I'm referring to is page five where it reads, for the record, it reads that the [redacted]

[redacted]

WITNESS CASILLA: Correct.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: See that there?

CHAIR KARLIN: What document?

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: I'm sorry, that is the CPPU update.

WITNESS CASILLA: Correct.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: And that is -- sorry, the exhibit number escapes.

WITNESS NICHOLS: Entergy Exhibit 30.

WITNESS CASILLA: Yes, Entergy Exhibit 30.

CHAIR KARLIN: All right, great.

WITNESS CASILLA: [redacted]

And they're going to be factored into the

specific calculation of the cycle when it comes up in the future. And, as you can tell, you know, the EPU process takes quite a long time.

[redacted]

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Okay.

WITNESS CASILLA: However, other parts that would -- go ahead.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Well, I wanted to, other parts wouldn't --

WITNESS CASILLA: Correct.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: -- for example, be included. Could you be specific as to --

WITNESS CASILLA: What is done?

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: [redacted]

WITNESS CASILLA: Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Was there anything in connection -- specifically, was there

anything in connection with an MSIV or a --

WITNESS CASILLA: Yes. The MSIV overpressure -- excuse me.

CHAIR KARLIN: Pardon me.

(Audience interruption.)

WITNESS CASILLA: [redacted]

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Okay, and what about the turbine trip?

WITNESS CASILLA: The turbine trip and the load rejections are -- [redacted]

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: All right. [redacted]

WITNESS CASILLA: [redacted]

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Now, and they

have been done now?

WITNESS CASILLA: Oh yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: [redacted]

WITNESS CASILLA: [redacted]

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: I gather the specific difference that we would see at Vermont Yankee is the degree of bypass. Well, of course, that doesn't come into play there.

WITNESS CASILLA: Exactly.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: I'm sorry, forget that question.

WITNESS CASILLA: [redacted]

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: [redacted]

[redacted]

WITNESS CASILLA: [redacted]

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Without bypasses.

WITNESS CASILLA: Correct.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Right. Okay. Let me see if I have anything more on that. Just bear with me for a second

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: Can I ask an intervening question?

WITNESS CASILLA: Sure, please.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: This is nothing related. It seems to me you operate on the power of flow curve and you have rod positions. And the thrust of the question is the hydraulic stability issue.

Under EPU conditions are you going to operate differently? Do you have a different regime on startup to follow the curve? Or is it essentially the same?

WITNESS CASILLA: Well, the region of low stability margin happens to incrase slightly for EPU. But the practice of starting up and avoiding the regions is the same.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: The

methodology is the same and the rationale?

WITNESS CASILLA: Correct. Yes, the rationale is the same. And they will avoid it in startups.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: I was wondering if it really shifted the curve. And not really.

WITNESS CASILLA: It shifts it very small amount because the fuel design, in order to have the core operate at the 120, as you would imagine, is a little more reactive.

And so, it will tend to indirectly affect the stability margins.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: So you do this with a larger burnable poison load?

WITNESS CASILLA: A lot more, right.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: A lot more than this?

WITNESS CASILLA: Yes, because --

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: Are you using lithium?

WITNESS CASILLA: Excuse me?

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: Are you using lithium oxide? What do you use?

WITNESS CASILLA: No just gadolinium.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: Oh, gadolinium.

WITNESS CASILLA: Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: Okay.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Yes, I guess what we just talked about is there, just for the record so we know where it is, on page six of the CPU document, the Exhibit that we already cited.

There's a statement that appears towards the top of that page, about the middle of the second paragraph, [redacted]

WITNESS CASILLA: Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: That would be the --

WITNESS CASILLA: [redacted]

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Okay. The CPPU approach, referring to page eight, is achieved by just increasing the overall core, thermal power and flow. Is that through the core?

WITNESS CASILLA: Which? Where is it?

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: I lost my space, sorry.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: I think the question speaks for itself.

WITNESS CASILLA: What is the question?

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: According to this document, the increase is achieved. First you don't increase the pressure.

WITNESS CASILLA: Correct.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: What you do though is you increase the core power.

WITNESS CASILLA: Correct.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Obviously. And you also increase the core flow. Is that correct?

WITNESS CASILLA: Well, increase it in an -- not in an absolute sense, but in an average sense, if you will. If I may draw a picture, I can.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: You can just draw it. You increase the heat generation rate

WITNESS CASILLA: This is showing what I can graph here, what we call the operating plant. Power, that's a function of flow. And I can put here the 100 percent and 100 percent value, which is where the plant currently operates.

And I can put here 120, 100 percent where the plant will operate after the uprate. And we have, if you will, a normal what we call minimum flow characteristic and then an increase in flow.

And I'll just draw here. The plant will follow this path to reach the 100 percent power, being able to oeprate at low flow and at high flow and having this boundary here of operatin, which we call a rod line.

So when they operate now up here, they are limited to this boundary also. This boundary has approximately constant Boyd fraction. And so the characteristics are very, very similar.

Ass you increase flow you increase power. And so the balance is -- so this is -- so you do increase

flow along with power. But you're not allowed to operate in this region.

So you have lost, if you will, some flexibility of operation.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Is that how your minimum power to flow ratio if you went below the rod line?

WITNESS CASILLA: [redacted]

CHAIR KARLIN: May I ask a clarifying question?

WITNESS CASILLA: Yes.

CHAIR KARLIN: You referred to that as the rod line.

WITNESS CASILLA: Correct.

CHAIR KARLIN: Okay, how is that spelled? R-O-D line?

WITNESS NICHOLS: Control line.

CHAIR KARLIN: Control line, okay.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: Your control rods are fixed in a BWR.

CHAIR KARLIN: I just wanted the Court

Reporter to be able to get that down.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: Oh, okay. Sorry.

MR. TRAVIESO-DIAZ: Mr. Chairman, I hate to do this to my own witness. But, could you ask Mr. Casillas to summarize in words if he can what he described to you graphically so it will be on the record?

CHAIR KARLIN: Yes, I think that would be a good idea. Could you? The Court Reporter, that's not going to be in the evidence. So, could you describe in words something that will appear in a narrative.

WITNESS CASILLA: Yes. What I have made is an illustration of what is called the power to flow operating map for a boiling water reactor. And it illustrates how when the reactor increases power on a constant rod line it maintains its characteristics constant.

That is, it does not increase in Boyd while it increases in power.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: What I was referring to was the statement, by the way, that appears along page nine that briefly describes the CPU approach. Again, that's that same reference where it says the CPPU approach to power uprate by increasing

core power density to core thermal power increase.

I want to get the details of that in light of what you said about the core flow yesterday. I think you may have answered that.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: And not necessarily germane to the EPU, but I'll ask it anyway. You alluded to the fact that you're trying to negotiate a way from your creepings up the power flow curve to crossing the BWR stability columns. Are you saying you now, for my identification, you now know what the problem is a little better and how to avoid it?

WITNESS CASILLA: The problem?

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: Yes.

WITNESS CASILLA: What problem?

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: The EPR stability.

WITNESS CASILLA: Well --

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: You know, that's why you're creeping up the power flow curve. Do you want to answer it?

WITNESS CASILLA: No, the -- certainly the loss of core flow range is an important flexibility that boiling water reactors need to operate efficiently.

And so, we're in the process of restoring that range. But restoring that range involves a lot of technical challenges.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: And you had --

WITNESS CASILLA: And one of them is stability.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: -- little piece of insight that -- we can move on.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Going to page 12, there was a statement that I was curious as to what is meant by that. Just prior to section 1.6 conclusions there's a statement that appears at the very end of that paragraph.

And I don't know what this refers to. It says this is a difference in approach from previous power uprate submittals. Could you explain what that's referring to?

[redacted]

(Pause.)

WITNESS CASILLA: This part of the NRC's

conclusion. [redacted]

[redacted]

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Okay. I just didn't quite understand what this was referring to.

WITNESS CASILLA: Right.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: I think you already answered that one. And that one too. I think that's probably all I had on Entergy Exhibit 30P. Do you have any?

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: Just an understanding EPU. Is your MAPLHGR the same?

WITNESS CASILLA: Yes.

CHAIR KARLIN: What?

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: Mass of average heat in linear heat generation range. It's a term of --

CHAIR KARLIN: Well, what's the acronym?

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: M-A-P-L-H-G-R.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: Okay, that's the same. But your average linear heat generation over the axial portion of a fuel rod is increased a little bit.

WITNESS CASILLA: Yes, the MAPLHGR value, sorry, the limit is derived from a loss of coolant accident analysis. [redacted] So the limits remained the same. So the peak value that the NE-1 node in the core is allowed to operate. It remains unchanged while the average increases.

And so, EPU requires a lot more control on peaking designing the core with flatter peaking.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: So your heat flux over the full length of a rod is increased a little bit?

WITNESS CASILLA: If it's a peak rod.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: Not the peak.

WITNESS CASILLA: Yes, on the average it is.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: Yes. I'm just trying to get a feel for how you achieved the power density increase. I didn't read the sales brochure.

WITNESS CASILLA: Okay.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RUBENSTEIN: Thank you.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Okay. If we could turn to, I believe it's exhibit 32P, qualification of one dimensional core transient model ODYN for boiling water reactor, supplement one, volume four.

WITNESS NICHOLS: Volume four?

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Yes, volume four.

WITNESS NICHOLS: Exhibit 32?

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Thirty-two, yes.

CHAIR KARLIN: Thirty-two P?

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Yes. I think you said yesterday in this volume there was a comparison of ODYN calculations to MSIV closure.

WITNESS CASILLA: No.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Sorry.

WITNESS CASILLA: No, this was to flow, MSIV closure being a pressure transient. It was the basis

for approval for pressure transient, given by the qualification to the three Peach Bottom tests.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Right.

WITNESS CASILLA: This volume extends the, was provided in support of qualifying ODYN to non pressurization transients such as flow related transients and others level inventory. And so this provides that qualification.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: All right, I see. Okay.

WITNESS CASILLA: There is an internal GE report which we provided that includes a comparison to an MSIV closure. And that's the one that we --

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Okay, is that an exhibit?

WITNESS CASILLA: Yes, that's an exhibit.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Okay. I must have misunderstood you as to what exhibit it was.

WITNESS CASILLA: It's Exhibit 34.

WITNESS NICHOLS: Thirty-four P.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Thirty-four?

WITNESS CASILLA: Yes. Is that the entitled qualification of the ODYN -- I assume MO means mod five.

WITNESS CASILLA: Actually, the M and the V

that proceed 05 are internal nomenclatures that indicate M is for motor recirculation, variable motor speed recirculation in BWRs.

And V is for valve flow control recirculation plants. So this is for ODYN version `05.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Okay.

CHAIR KARLIN: Try to speak up if you could, please.

WITNESS CASILLA: Okay.

CHAIR KARLIN: I just wanted to confirm that it was the same document I was looking at. Could you briefly point me to the comparisons and maybe just very briefly summarize them that would be pertinent to the discussion?

WITNESS CASILLA: Yes. I will take your attention to table 1-1 in page 1-2.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Okay, table 1-1. That's a summary of the qualification cases.

WITNESS CASILLA: Yes. So this is a series of cases by which we are qualifying internally this new model. And the very first on is a Hatch MSIV closure case.

And in there we say the key parameters, the objectives for this, using this test, is the dome

pressure and the water level. And so, the comparison to that --

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: And that's because of an MSIV closure, those are the two critical --

WITNESS CASILLA: Correct, yes. The power doesn't go anywhere. So you will see that in pages 2-2 and 2-3.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Okay, on page 2-2, this is a plot of the dome pressure versus time. And the test data is the solid line, is that correct?

WITNESS CASILLA: The test data is the solid line, correct.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Okay. And then there's two ODYN results.

WITNESS CASILLA: Yes, one is `05 and the other one is `06.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Okay. So I assume in the -- is it -- could you describe the difference between those two?

WITNESS CASILLA: Models?

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: As far as the importance of this transient.

WITNESS CASILLA: Yes, this version was being derrived to improve the water level predictions.

And the key to the water level prediction had to do with the annulus modeling.

So we wanted to add more nodes there and be able to capture the level more discrete set of nodes. And, as an improvement of that, also it has improved the back end of the pressure rise as we briefly discussed earlier.

And so, in fact, you can see that the pressure of the new code, of the `05 code is an improvement over the `06.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: The other way around, isn't it? It looks like it's over `05.

WITNESS CASILLA: Right.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: I know the numbers look the sae.

WITNESS CASILLA: I know.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Okay. In figure 2-2, could you describe what --

WITNESS CASILLA: Yes, figure 2-2 is the water level comparison.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Now, what -- well, is this in the core region? Is it collapsed? Is it a mixture?

WITNESS CASILLA: No, this is the two phase, what we believe is the two phase mixture.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Okay, two phase mixture level.

WITNESS CASILLA: Two phase mixture in the annulus, right.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Oh, in the annulus, okay.

WITNESS CASILLA: Correct, measured, the measured level. And so, we have the measured in the predited. And that's the comparison.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Did you attempt to make any -- did you make any attempts to model the level instrumentation? Because there is a disparity between even the later version of the code and the earlier version, between the later version of the code and the test data that is not insignificant.

WITNESS CASILLA: [redacted]

So this is the instrument as we believe it existed in the plant.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Okay. So you did try to model the instrumentation then?

WITNESS CASILLA: Correct, it's all in

there.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Okay.

WITNESS CASILLA: The level has always presented challenges.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: I understand. I won't go any further with that. Okay. So, based on that, your conclusion for -- what you were doing was a developmental assessment, I guess is what we'll call it.

WITNESS CASILLA: Correct.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: For this particular as opposed to --

WITNESS CASILLA: Version.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: -- licensing arena type of assessment, is that correct?

WITNESS CASILLA: Yes, and of course, in the case of the MSIV design event, the pressure is the more pertient parameter for application.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Because, even though the tracking level was not as good as one would like, you're still, I assume, at these levels well above the top of active --

WITNESS CASILLA: Oh yes, significantly, right.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: And, Mr.

Nichols, do you know, are these the same Hatch transients that were discussed in the LERs, or maybe -- either one of you. I'm not sure.

WITNESS NICHOLS: I don't believe so.

WITNESS CASILLA: No, this MSIV closure is the cycle one Hatch test. It was not an unplanned event. It was a --

WITNESS NICHOLS: This was not an EPU event. It was from 1983.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Okay. All right. I think that's it.

CHAIR KARLIN: All right, that's it then. Okay. Thank you. You all may step down.

(Pause.)

CHAIR KARLIN: All right, we are completing this session, the proprietary session. It's less than an hour. So I think that worked pretty well. And we appreciate the witnesses' patience on this.

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE BARATTA: Do you want to give them ten minutes to see if they have any questions that they would ask? We said we would.

CHAIR KARLIN: Well, I guess we did. We did say that if there were any follow-up questions that you would like to suggest that we ask arising from the questions we just asked.

MR. TRAVIESO-DIAZ: I don't believe so.

MR. TURK: No, Your Honor.

CHAIR KARLIN: All right. Thank you. I'm sorry. I did want to give you that opportunity. You can take a break if you wanted to think about it. But, I think if we can proceed, that's great.

What we'll do now is break and re-convene at ten of. That's about an hour. Ten of three we will reconvene. That's 20 minutes. That's a goodly amount of time.

And we'll finish up, hopefully for the day at that time. So, okay. Thank you. We will adjourn at this time.

(Whereupon, at 2:34 p.m. the above-entitled matter was concluded.)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
ENTERGY NUCLEAR VERMONT YANKEE L.L.C.	)	Docket No. 50-271-OLA
and ENTERGY NUCLEAR OPERATIONS, INC.	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
(Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station)	)	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing LB ORDER (TRANSMITTING REDACTED VERSION OF TRANSCRIPT FROM PROPRIETARY SESSION) have been served upon the following persons by deposit in the U.S. mail, first class, or through NRC internal distribution.

Office of Commission Appellate
Adjudication
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Administrative Judge
Alex S. Karlin, Chair
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel
Mail Stop - T-3 F23
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Administrative Judge
Anthony J. Baratta
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel
Mail Stop - T-3 F23
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Administrative Judge
Lester S. Rubenstein
4270 E Country Villa Drive
Tucson, AZ 85718

Sherwin E. Turk, Esq.
Steven C. Hamrick, Esq.
Office of the General Counsel
Mail Stop - O-15 D21
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Raymond Shadis
New England Coalition
P.O. Box 98
Edgecomb, ME 04556

Docket No. 50-271-OLA
LB ORDER (TRANSMITTING REDACTED VERSION OF
TRANSCRIPT FROM PROPRIETARY SESSION)

John M. Fulton, Esq.
Assistant General Counsel
Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
440 Hamilton Avenue
White Plains, NY 10601

Anthony Z. Roisman, Esq.
National Legal Scholars Law Firm
84 East Thetford Rd.
Lyme, NH 03768

Jonathan M. Rund, Esq.
Law Clerk
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel
Mail Stop - T-3 F23
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Sarah Hofmann, Esq.
Special Counsel
Department of Public Service
112 State Street - Drawer 20
Montpelier, VT 05620-2601

Jay E. Silberg, Esq.
Matias F. Travieso-Diaz, Esq.
Scott A. Vance, Esq.
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP
2300 N Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037-1128

Terence A. Burke, Esq.
Associate General Counsel
Entergy Services, Inc.
1340 Echelon Parkway
Jackson, MS 39213

Evangeline S. Ngbea
Office of the Secretary of the Commission

Dated at Rockville, Maryland,
this 12th day of October 2006