

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
NRR PETITION REVIEW BOARD

Title: Mr. Sherwood Martinelli 10CFR2.206 Petition
On Indian Point Nuclear Plant

Docket Number: 50-247, 50-286

Location: Telephone Conference

Date: Thursday, August 14, 2008

Work Order No.: NRC-2386 Pages 1-30

Edited by John Boska, Petition Manager, Office of Nuclear Reactor
Regulation (NRR)

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

Enclosure 1

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
NRR PETITION REVIEW BOARD (PRB)

CONFERENCE CALL:

INDIAN POINT 2.206 PETITION
THURSDAY, AUGUST 14, 2008

The conference call was held at 1:00 p.m.,
MARK MAXIN, PRB Chairman, presiding.

NRC HEADQUARTERS STAFF:

MARK MAXIN, Acting Deputy Director of Policy and
Rulemaking, NRR

JOHN BOSKA, NRR Petition Manager

RICHARD CONATSER, NRR

STEVE GARRY, NRR

KIMBERLY GREEN, NRR

MICHELLE HONCHARIK, NRR PRB Coordinator

JENNY LONGO, Office of General Counsel

NRC REGION I:

SAM McCARVER

JOHN WHITE

PETITIONER:

SHERWOOD MARTINELLI

LICENSEE: INDIAN POINT (ENTERGY):

MIKE BURNEY

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

(1:01 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: My name is Mark Maxin, M-a-x-i-n. I am the PRB Chair. Good morning.

MR. MARTINELLI: Could you please tell me what P-R-B means?

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: The Petition Review Board Chair. Good morning and welcome to the NRC.

MR. MARTINELLI: It is afternoon.

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: Sorry. And welcome to the NRC meeting regarding the 2.206 petition submitted by the Indian Point nuclear power plant in Buchanan, New York.

MR. MARTINELLI: They didn't submit it. I submitted the petition.

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: Before we get into the heart of the discussion, I would like to provide some general information about the NRC's 2.206 petition process.

MR. MARTINELLI: Well, could you correct your clarification? The petition was submitted by Sherwood Martinelli. It was not submitted by Indian Point.

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: That's fine. Let the record reflect that, sir.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

Under Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, section 2.206, any person may petition the NRC to take an enforcement-related action, such as modifying, suspending, or revoking a license. The NRC's staff guidance for the disposition of 2.206 petition requests is in management directive 8.11, which is publicly available for review.

The purpose of today's meeting is to provide the petitioner an opportunity to comment on the Petition Review Board's initial recommendations and to provide any relevant additional explanation and --

MR. MARTINELLI: Point of information. I have still not received your initial recommendation.

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: Okay. Let the record --

MR. BOSKA: No, that is not true. He received an e-mail with the initial recommendations --

MR. MARTINELLI: Excuse me.

MR. BOSKA: -- on April 17th --

MR. MARTINELLI: Excuse me. The fact that you sent it does not mean that I received it.

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: Okay. Well, we have an

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

e-mail that was sent on April 17th --

MR. MARTINELLI: And why wasn't there a hard copy mailed certified mail?

MR. BOSKA: And he responded to the e-mail that he received it.

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: I'll tell you, we have on the record the fact that you received the e-mail.

But what we'll do here, sir, is if you could wait for me to go through some basic points? And then at that point, we will give you the floor. And you will be free to respond accordingly on all those issues. And it will only be a few minutes.

Again, this meeting is not a hearing, nor is it a meeting for the participants to examine the merits of the issues presented in the petition request. No decisions regarding the merits of the petition will be made at this meeting.

Following this meeting, the Petition Review Board will conduct its internal deliberations to determine if there is a need to modify its initial recommendations. The outcome of this internal meeting will be documented in a letter to the petitioner.

MR. MARTINELLI: Also, so that you know, because I saw some discrepancies in the transcript

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

of the last one of these meetings I participated in,
I am recording this conversation.

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: Okay. I would like to summarize the scope of the petition under consideration and the NRC activities to date. On March 30, 2008, Mr. Sherwood Martinelli submitted to the NRC a petition under 2.206 regarding problems at the Indian Point nuclear plant.

In this petition request, Mr. Martinelli's request to the NRC was: one, "request for action that will suspend the license for IP2 and IP3 reactors located in Buchanan, New York, owned by Entergy, until they are fully in compliance with all 10 CFR rules and regulations as well as other local, state, and federal laws and regulations and have eliminated the environmental risks that have contributed to and/or caused my wife's breast cancer."

Allow me to discuss the NRC's activities to date. On April 16th, 2008, the NRR Petition Review Board discussed the petition using the acceptance criteria in management directive 8.11. Based on the information submitted in the petition, the PRB made an initial determination to combine this petition with the petitioner's previous two

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

petitions on Indian Point groundwater and sirens.

The PRB also recommended to reject the request for the NRC to halt the license renewal process for Indian Point as this is not a request for enforcement-related action and does not meet the criteria for acceptance in the 2.206 process.

On April 17th, 2008, the Petition Manager, John Boska, informed the petitioner, Mr. Martinelli, of the PRB's initial recommendations and made available the opportunity for the petitioner to address the PRB.

Mr. Martinelli requested to address the Petition Review Board but also requested a delay until after August 1, 2008. The PRB granted the request for a delay.

Mr. Martinelli, if I did not capture the essence of the petition and the issues correctly, you will be given every opportunity to clarify them during your remarks.

Again, the purpose of the meeting today is to provide you, the petitioner, with an opportunity to comment on the Petition Review Board's initial recommendation and to provide additional information and explanation in support of the petition.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

The purpose of this meeting is not to provide an opportunity for the meeting participants to question or examine the Petition Review Board regarding the merits of the petition request. This meeting is not a hearing. No decision regarding the merits of the petition request will be made during this meeting.

Subsequent to this meeting, the Petition Review Board will conduct an internal meeting to make a final recommendation on whether to accept or reject the petition for review. The result of that meeting will be documented in an acknowledgement letter to the petitioner.

The Petition Review Board typically consists of a chairman, usually a manager at the Senior Executive Level at the NRC. It has a petition manager, which for a plant-specific petition is usually the licensing project manager. Other members of the Board are determined by the NRC staff based on the content of the information in the petition request.

At this time I would like to introduce the Board and turn the meeting over to you, sir, as the petitioner. I am Mark Maxin, the Petition Review Board Chairman. John Boska is the Petition

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Manager for the petition under discussion today. Michelle Honcharik is the office's 2.206 Coordinator.

In addition, we have Sam McCarver and John White from the NRC's Regional Office on the Petition Review Board. We also have Steve Garry from the Division of Inspection and Regional Support and Kim Green from License Renewal. We also obtain the advice from our Office of General Counsel, represented by Jenny Longo.

As described in our process, the NRC staff may ask clarifying questions in order to better understand the petitioner's representation and presentation and to reach a reasoned decision whether to accept or reject the petitioner's request for review under the 2.206 process.

I will note that Entergy, the licensee for the Indian Point nuclear power plant, has also been invited to this meeting and will be afforded an opportunity to ask clarifying questions of the petitioner for --

MR. MARTINELLI: I will refuse to answer any questions by Entergy. They're scum.

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: For clarification, the licensee is not part of the decision-making process

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

for the --

MR. MARTINELLI: And, again, for clarification, I will not answer any of their questions.

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: We invite the licensee so that they are aware of --

MR. MARTINELLI: And fine. They're welcome to listen. I will not answer their questions.

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: If I can continue, sir?

MR. MARTINELLI: I am just making sure you understand my point.

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: I think we understand that.

MR. MARTINELLI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: And we are not condoning it.

MR. MARTINELLI: You don't have to condone it. It's my free right, will, and privilege as a United States citizen to answer the questions from people I so choose. I even have the right to remain silent in a court of law if I so choose.

I will not be answering any of Entergy's questions. If someone from the Board chooses to ask a similar question, that's fine.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: Thank you, sir.

We invite the licensee so that they are aware of an ongoing request for action against their facility and, although you reject this concept, provide an opportunity to ask questions so that they may understand the details pertaining to their facility.

Okay. Are there any general questions regarding the 2.206 process before I turn it over to you, sir?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: As a reminder for the phone participants, please identify yourself if you make any remarks as this will help us in the preparation of the meeting transcript that will be made publicly available.

Thank you. The floor is all yours, sir.

MR. MARTINELLI: Okay. The NRC has a familiarity with me. This isn't my first 2.206, nor will it be my last. Entergy is an unsafe nuclear reactor operator. I believe that they are in violation of certain SEC rules and regulations as well as violations of numerous NRC rules and regulations.

And I further believe that their various

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

and assorted misdeeds have contributed to and caused not only my wife's breast cancer but two of my eight cats' breast -- or not breast cancer but cancers, one of them leading to the cat having to be put down, the other one leading to having a significant tumor removed from the cat's spine.

I filed this petition because I am well-aware of the fact that the licensee is in violation of various and assorted NRC 10 CFR rules and regulations, but instead of the NRC actually taking any enforcement action against the licensee, they instead choose to take and give them a rubber-stamped "Well, they're trying to address it, and that's good enough for us..." and letting them continue to operate.

As an example of this, I would start with the non-working sirens, plural. The first siren system, the original siren system, does not work properly. It does not function in the way that it is supposed to.

There are numerous reports within the NRC on an ongoing basis of sirens, for instance, going off when they are not supposed to go off and sometimes not going off when they are supposed to go off.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

The new siren system, perhaps the best way that I can say it, is to use the words of the Indian Point safety evaluation ISE, where it states specifically "The siren update project was undertaken to address requirements of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. That legislation includes a special provision applicable only to Indian Point because of the population density in its emergency planning zone to have full backup power for its siren system."

For starters, I take exception to the way that sentence was diagrammed because the fact of the matter is, is the wording in 2005's Energy Policy Act specifically states that any nuclear reactor that meets that criteria must install a siren system that has a full backup system.

It is absolutely and positively possible at any time in the future for any other nuclear reactor to have to install the same type of emergency system with a backup based on population growth in their area at any given time. So that rule was not targeted towards Indian Point, as this sentence makes it seem.

The report goes on further to say, "Along with meeting the mandated requirement," which

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

they have not done. Again, the sentence is poorly crafted. "Along with attempting to meet the mandated requirement" is what it should say. "Entergy chose to incorporate other attractive features as well and to install an entirely new state-of-the-art system."

Well, for starters, one of the reasons why they have not been able to meet the deadlines, several of them -- I believe four, in fact, and they are not going to meet the fifth one -- and I have that on good source.

They are not being able to meet it because a) they've put two new sirens in in an area that only partially falls within the ten-mile area but not fully.

And, as a result of adding those new siren systems, they're back at square one. And they're going to have to start all over in tying all of the sirens into each other, which is needlessly putting us, the public, at senseless risk.

It says, "This initial decision to provide a state-of-the-art class system that exceeds regulatory requirements, while well-intentioned, has substantial bearing on the ultimate project difficulties." It should be "project failures," not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

"difficulties."

Furthermore, if you would bother to look, you would find out that this system does not meet the regulatory requirements; has not been approved; and, in fact, Entergy has abandoned a similar system at another one of its plants as a result of the failure of the company they bought it from to provide what they are supposed to as a part of the contract.

It goes on to state, "As of the panel's review, the new system still had not been completely installed and tested and it was unclear whether the current committed completion date would be met."

It is not going to be met. I know it. The public knows it. This is a clear violation of both federal law, of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, and various assorted rules of the NRC.

And, yet, you people refuse to take any enforcement action of merit. So far the only enforcement merit that you have taken was a slap-of-the-wrist \$130,000 fine.

And that becomes very important when you read on because it goes on further to say, "Examining the siren project in detail, the ISE panel identified a series of errors, including the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

use of unfamiliar technology, inadequate project management," emphasis added, "and contractor support, and a lack of clarity around both the NRC's and FEMA's approval requirements."

In short, they have bungled the whole entire thing. And, yet, we as the host community are told "Don't worry about it. You're safe. They have the old system, and it's working properly." No. The old system does not work properly.

And the fact of the matter is, is my wife has breast cancer. The fact of the matter is, is my wife had to go in for a lumpectomy. The fact of the matter is, is my wife had to go in for radiation treatments. The fact of the matter is, we're still dealing with it. The fact of the matter is, is my wife is now at high risk.

And if there is any kind of a problem at Indian Point that could affect public health and safety, it is my duty to be able to be well-informed and be able to get my wife out of the area to mitigate her health risk.

And, yet, you people choose to ignore that. You choose to ignore that because you say it's a safe facility. No, it's not. My petition specifically asks that the NRC suspend the license

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

until such time as the licensee is in full compliance with all local, state, and federal laws, rules, and regulations.

The fact of the matter is, is if you just look at the discharge canal, they don't even have a proper easement in place, nor did they ever build the fish return canal that was a part of it. They applied for all of the permits that were supposed to be put in. They never put it in.

You take -- and in the ISE, the ISE sits there. And I can read it to you specifically. The ISE sits there and admits that there is underground leakage from the spent fuel pools, both 1 and 2. They neglect to mention that there is also leakage from spent fuel pool 3.

They take and they mention that the leakage for spent fuel pool 1 is going to be taken care of when they transfer the fuel over to spent fuel pool number 2 and then from there load it into dry cask storage.

Well, for starters, spent fuel pool 2 has leaks, leaks that in the ISE's own report they admit Entergy has not been able to locate, emphasis added, not been able to locate.

They further admit that those leaks

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

include strontium-90 and tritium. That becomes rather interesting because in the NRC's own document cache and Entergy's hired professionals admit in one of their water reports that the thumbprint for two of the samples that were taken from the leakage area did not match, emphasis added, did not match, the tritium footprint that you would expect to find if the leak was coming from the spent fuel pool.

In short, there are other tritium leaks on the facility. And if those tritium leaks are not coming from the spent fuel pools, they have to be coming from the hot side of the plant, which means you have a tritium leak in the primary system of that plant somewhere.

And the leak that they found on the fuel transfer canal piping was not an adequate enough leak at the time to match that tritium sample that was taken and collected.

So, therefore, it also was not coming from the spent fuel transfer canal. It's coming from someplace else on the hot leg of the reactor. That is a serious and significant violation.

Further, they do not have the proper DPES, I believe it's called, permits with the State of New York. They lost their appeal. And, yet,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

nothing has been done to address that. Right now Entergy is illegally dumping their cooled water into the Hudson River without their proper state permits in place to do so.

And the NRC requires that they have any and all necessary local, state, and federal licenses and permits in place to continue operation. They do not have those, and they cannot get one right now from the state. They cannot get one from the state until they come into compliance.

They can't come into compliance, one, because they have a 300,000-gallon plume of irradiated water sitting under reactor number 3 that is actually potentially putting the reactor's base in danger in the wintertime due to freezing and thawing and the heaving of the ground under it.

Then we go on. Let's go back to the leaks. The fact of the matter is, is the NRC is sitting there saying that the leaks have not yet reached the Hudson River, nor have they reached the -- any wells off of the facility, even though they admit that radioactively contaminated water, containing both strontium-90, tritium, and cesium-137 have been located at various assorted testing wells on site. That is not completely true.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I talked to a geologist who has studied the maps of the area. It is possible based on the foundation and makeup of the rock under that facility and the various assorted cracks and fissures that exist there for that water to migrate as far as eight miles. There's been no testing whatsoever except in the immediate area of the facilities.

So when they claim that the water is not getting off the facility, they don't know that for a fact. And a perfect example of that is the radioactive goat that's over in Connecticut around another nuclear power plant that is also leaking and a contaminated well on a farm over there.

So we're sitting here. And it's like you people at every step of the way tell us we're safe. Okay? You tell us not to worry. You tell me that you're going to deny my petitions.

You tell me that they should be able to continue operating, even though they don't have a viable and legally licensable and approvable siren system.

And one of the reasons why you stay for that is you tell us the plant is safe from a terrorist attack. The fact of the matter is it is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

not. For starters, your DBT is fundamentally flawed.

It's fundamentally flawed because, for starters, people from NEI and reactor owners themselves got the NRC to take their original recommended list of weaponry and downgrade it and water it down so that, rather than making the licensees meet the requirements of a healthy and vital and vibrant DBT, they watered the DBT down to the point where the licensees could pretty well meet it as is.

Some examples of that, an easily gathered weapon is a 50-caliber rifle, a high-powered rifle. The fact of the matter is that weapon was taken off of the DBT list of weapons that they needed to guard against, same thing with rocket-propelled grenades, RPGs, same thing with shoulder-launched rockets and mortars, taken off of the list. These are standard issue weapons used by terrorists.

The fact of the matter is one sniper with a 50-caliber machine gun can instantly take out Indian Point's guard towers. The reason why, because Indian Point and almost every other nuclear facility in the United States of America does not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

have bulletproof glass and sides on their guard towers. They, instead, have bullet-resistant glass.

The fact of the matter is I have done some research. I have talked to some military personnel. It is actually possible to disable Indian Point without ever going onto the facility with the simple use of a 50-caliber machine gun.

With a shoulder-launched rocket or a shoulder-launched grenade, an RPG, there are six different spots over by the military base around the traffic circle where a sniper under cover could easily take out the helicopters that the military base would try to lift off to send reinforcements to the facility.

Furthermore, one person who is an expert in explosives, without being seen, could very easily take out the bridge just before you get to the traffic circle, thus making it impossible to get military reinforcements over there by land as well.

Then let's go on to the fact that they don't know what they are doing. A perfect for instance of this is I took and was doing an internet search. And the county commissioners admitted they made a mistake, that the information was inadvertently put up and shouldn't have been, but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the fact of the matter is that when you go to evacuate us, you're going to have buses at strategic points. And the citizens are supposed to gather there and then be bused safely out of the area.

With all due respect, Entergy shows a total lack of logistical understanding when one of the key places to bring people, including our students to, is the very artery and the very traffic crossroads that you're going to need to be bringing emergency equipment into the facility, which means you're going to have a bunch of people racing there to be bused out of the area. You're going to have mass chaos. And then you've got emergency equipment that's going to be trying to go against the flow of traffic to get emergency equipment over to the facility.

And I bring this up because in the ISE, one of the reasons why they say that Indian Point is safe is because they're totally relying upon outside help to come to their aid.

Going back to the DBT, the fact of the matter is the original explosive vehicle that was supposed to be included in the DBT was a 28-foot rental truck, similar to the ones that have been used, for instance, to blow up the federal building

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

out in Oklahoma.

But because the nuclear industry realized that a lot of their plants would not withstand a vehicle that large filled with explosives, they, instead, reduced the size of the vehicle to an SUV.

So, again, what they did was they manipulated the DBT and reduced the safety standards to the members of the public so that they could take and pass the DBT. That's not taking care of public safety.

These are all violations. In other words, these are all little points that all go to the point that when you people sit there and tell us "Don't worry about the siren system. The facility is safe," no, the facility is not safe.

You're trying to sell us a pig in a poke. You're putting us in a situation where you're asking us to trust. You're asking us as the general public to trust you. And, yet, at every step of the way, at every step of the regulatory process, you are reducing the safety standards. You are reducing the safety margins. It is why the siren system is not working should be reason enough to shut down the facility.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Then you sit here. And before they relicense, the Indian Point is supposed to do a reactor pressure test to make sure that the reactor is sound and that the crazing on the inside of the reactor isn't at a point where they need to worry about it.

Entergy cheated on the test. They literally took, and the one thing that you were going to be looking for to ascertain the level of leakage because they needed a score of three or above to pass, what they did was they deliberately took and washed all of that out 24 hours before the test so that when they took the test, they would be able to pass because there wasn't enough -- I believe it's like -- I would have to check but, in other words, it might be boric acid.

I've got all of the stuff at home, and I am not at home right now. They cheated on that reactor pressure test so that they could pass. And then they bragged about it.

And the reason why they bragged about it is because I have the EPRI document where they actually told your other reactor licensee owners how to do the same thing, which means that if you go and you do that test and you do it the way it is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

supposed to be done, they can't pass.

And if they can't pass, NRC's own regulations sit there and call for emergency action at the facility. Well, how is that supposed to make us feel? They're lying at every step of the way.

They claimed in their license renewal application that there are no refurbishment issues, even though they have two new reactor vessel heads on order for installation in 2011 and 2012.

Lying to the NRC in documents that equate to sworn testimony, that is one of the most egregious sins according to your own rules and regulations that a licensee can be guilty of. And it's cause for immediate suspension of their license until you get to the bottom of it.

And, yet, you people sit here, not just with Indian Point, every one of your reactors. You take up 2.206 petitions. And, instead of like taking what we bring you and looking for the truth, you, instead, put us in a position where unless we have absolute concrete proof in our hands, we were not even allowed to see three-quarters of the documents, you dismiss our cases. The fact of the matter is the leaks at Indian Point are far worse than you are being told.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

An example of that -- I have made this allegation before, and it's why there's more tritiated water underneath of the facility than they're letting on to. A few years ago, welders put a huge gash in one of the spent fuel pools. Water leaked for over a year until they figured out how to fix it.

When I brought this concern up before, I was told, "Where's your proof?" Well, now I have proof. There's a gentleman that used to work for the underwater welding company. His name is Sam Vale, S-a-m V-a-l-e. He was there the day the accident happened. He saw it with his own eyes. He will give you the name of the president of the company that did the work. He will give you the name of the person who made the gash in the spent fuel pool.

They lied and covered that up. The NRC either a) wasn't informed or b) if they were informed were a part of the cover-up, which would be even more disturbing.

It's for these kinds of reasons, these kinds of assorted and various breakings of the rules and regulations you have in place that we're asking -- that I'm asking that their license be suspended

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

until they're fully in compliance.

They're sitting there right now. They, the NRC, has told the licensee, "You don't have to do A, B, C, and D because we're going to let you do it at some future date and time."

Well, here's the flaw with that. For starters, you have already got licensees who have received the license renewal approval who are now finding out they can't meet the promises. And, in fact, I have the EPRI document wherein EPRI suggests one of the ways to getting out from underneath these promises that were made to get the license renewal application to go through, is to ask that these promises to the public for safety be waived.

Further, that document goes on and admits brazenly that one of the reasons why the licensees aren't being able to meet these promises that were made to get their license renewals or to continue operating, as in Entergy's case right now, is because the industry hasn't even formed a group that is going to study the issue and try and come up with a solution.

So you're standing there putting all lives at risk, all lives in danger, promising us solutions that you haven't even started looking for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

yet. And every one of those things that you are looking for solutions for is a violation of 10 CFR rules and regulations. And instead of admitting that, you people issue these generic letters of exemption, saying we will deal with it later.

Well, no. If you're going to ask us to play host to a bastard child nuclear reactor for 20 more years, the rules and regulations require the licensee to be in full compliance before the new license is issued. And that is why I am asking for a suspension of their license today until they become in full compliance with the NRC's rules and regulations, which they're not. And I can show you over 400 NRC documents that acknowledge this and prove this, including generic letters of exemption that have been issued.

The Indian Point reactors are not in compliance. And they're needlessly risking my health, and they're needlessly risking the health of my wife. And they have already caused my wife to have breast cancer.

So if you look and you do the health study statistics within a five-mile area of Indian Point, you are going to see greatly elevated levels of breast cancer in the women of our community.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

And as somebody whose wife has now had breast cancer as a victim of Indian Point operating, I don't buy into the whole ALARA crap. Maybe to you my wife having breast cancer is fine and dandy and you don't have a problem with that and she's just the cost of doing business. For me I take it personal.

And I will give you a promise today. I will do whatever it takes. I will file petition after petition after petition after petition after petition to force you people to stop coddling the industry and do your jobs as regulators.

Now, have you got any questions?

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: Sir, just for the record, I would just like to say we're very, very, very sorry that your wife has breast cancer.

I would like to move on and say, as noted earlier, no NRC decisions regarding the merits of petitioner requests will be made during this meeting. Subsequent to this meeting, the PRB will conduct an internal meeting to make a final recommendation on whether to accept or reject the petition for review. The results of that meeting will be documented in an acknowledgement letter to the petitioner.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

At this time does the staff here at headquarters have any questions for the petitioner?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: None here. What about in the region?

MR. McCARVER: This is Sam McCarver in Region I. I have no questions.

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: I would like to ask first if the licensee has any questions.

MR. BURNEY: Licensee has no questions.

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: Mr. Martinelli, do you have any final questions or comments?

MR. MARTINELLI: No. I know your rubber-stamping program, and I know exactly what you are going to do. You're going to go back and find various and assorted reasons to wave your magic wand and ignore the truth.

CHAIRMAN MAXIN: I want to thank the petitioner for taking time to provide the NRC with clarifying information on the petition you have submitted.

With that, I will conclude the meeting. And we are going to secure the telephone connection. Thank you, sir.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter was concluded at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1:40 p.m.)



NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701