

Enclosure 1
ML101470093
Monthly 10 CFR 2.206,
“Requests for Action
Under this Subpart”
Status Report

June 18, 2010

PETITIONS CLOSED DURING THIS PERIOD

FACILITY	PETITIONER/EDO No.	Page
Indian Point, Unit 3	Sherwood Martinelli G20090723	2
Palisades Nuclear Plant	Michael Mulligan G20100053	3
Florida Power and Light Company	Thomas Saporito G20100185	4

CURRENT STATUS OF OPEN PETITIONS

Florida Power and Light Company	Thomas Saporito G20090107	5
Idaho State University (Research Test Reactor)	Kevan Crawford G20090374	6
Indian Point Units 2 and 3; Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, River Bend Nuclear Power Plant	Sherwood Martinelli G20090487	7
Prairie Island Nuclear Facility	David Lee Sebastian G20090510	8
Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 3	Thomas Saporito G20090690	9
U.S. Army Installation Command	Isaac Harp G20100136	10
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station	Representative Paul W. Hodes G20100235	11

CURRENT STATUS OF OPEN PETITIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station	Michael Mulligan G20100027	12
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station	Ray Shadis G20100074	13
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station	Thomas Saporito G20100098	14
Davis-Besse Nuclear Plant	David Lochbaum, Union of Concerned Scientists G20100192	15
Davis-Besse Nuclear Plant	Tom Gurdziel G20100238	16
Callaway Nuclear Power Plant	Lawrence Criscione G20100257	17
Callaway Nuclear Power Plant	Lawrence S. Criscione G20100264	18
Millstone Power Plant, Unit 3	David Collins G20100272	19

FACILITY: Indian Point (IP), Unit 3
REACTORTYPE: Pressurized Water Reactor
PETITIONER: Sherwood Martinelli



CLOSED PETITION
EDO # G20090723

DATE OF PETITION: DECEMBER 29, 2009
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: MAY 13, 2010
PETITION MANAGER: JOHN BOSKA
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons specified within the petition request, the petitioner requests that the NRC seek enforcement action, as described in the petition, against Entergy, the licensee for Indian Point, Unit 3 (IP3), on the basis that he believes there is a critical leak in the IP3 reactor core shell. In addition, the petitioner request immediate shutdown of IP3.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS	
		PETITION AGE: ~6 MONTHS	
The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	12/29/09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On March 10, 2010, the PRB met to make the initial recommendation. The PRB initial recommendation was that this request meets the criteria for review; however, it is being rejected in accordance with the criteria for rejection, on the basis that the issues raised have already been reviewed, evaluated, and resolved by the NRC. 	03/10/10
On January 6, 2010, the PRB met to discuss the request for immediate action. The PRB did not identify any immediate safety concerns to warrant an immediate shutdown of IP3. Thus the PRB denied the petitioner's request for immediate action. In an email dated January 7, 2010, the petitioner was informed of the PRB's decision.	01/06/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On March 15, 2010, the PRB requested an extension to permit time to support additional interactions with the petitioner and to support internal PRB meetings necessary to reach a final recommendation. The OEDO approved an extension until May 27, 2010. 	03/15/10
Please note that although the petitioner's request was for an immediate shutdown of IP3, the PRB believes that the petitioner made an error in referencing IP3 since the concerns he raised are only relevant to IP2. Given that, the PRB did not identify any immediate safety concerns to warrant an immediate shutdown of IP2. The petition manager plans to clarify this point with the petitioner to ensure that his references to IP3 within the petition were in fact a typographical error. To date, the petitioner has not provided any clarification.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On March 22, 2010, the petition manager spoke with the petitioner. The petitioner requested an opportunity to address the PRB by telephone on April 7th or April 14th of 2010. The OEDO approved an extension request until May 27, 2010, to allow additional time for the petitioner to address the PRB by telephone. The petitioner has been scheduled to address the PRB by telephone on April 14, 2010. 	03/22/10
On January 26, 2010, the PRB requested an extension to permit time to support additional interactions with the petitioner and to support internal PRB meetings necessary to reach a final recommendation. The OEDO approved an extension until March 31, 2010.	01/26/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 8, 2010, the telephone call with the petitioner planned for April 14, 2010, was cancelled by the PRB, due to the fact that the petitioner was unresponsive to multiple requests to confirm his availability, after proposing the date for the telephone call. The PRB plans to issue a close-out letter to convey the PRB's final recommendation that the petition meets the criteria for rejection. 	04/08/10
Additional requests for the NRC to consider, from the petitioner, are described in the petition. These additional requests were considered by the PRB on February 18, 2010, when the PRB met internally for the purpose of making the initial recommendation. However, an initial recommendation was deferred until a future date because the PRB needed to obtain additional support from NRC staff before proceeding with the initial recommendation.	02/18/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 13, 2010, the PRB issued a closure letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML101100080) to convey the final recommendation, which was to reject the petition for review as the NRC has already reviewed, evaluated, and resolved the issues raised by the petitioner. All NRC actions on this petition are closed. 	05/13/10

FACILITY: Palisades Nuclear Plant
REACTOR TYPE: Pressurized Water Reactor
PETITIONER: Michael Mulligan



CLOSED PETITION
EDO # G20100053

DATE OF PETITION: JANUARY 28, 2010
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: MAY 6, 2010
PETITION MANAGER: MAHESH (MAC) CHAWLA
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons discussed in the petition, Mr. Mulligan identified his concern regarding the 20 year Palisades nuclear relicensing, which was completed on January 18, 2007. He is challenging the NRC activities during relicensing of the plant without addressing the swollen fuel racks problem identification and correction. He also accuses NRC of wrongdoing and states that NRC participated in a cover-up through delaying of inspection activities to obfuscate the connection of relicensing and the swelling of the fuel racks.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	01/28/10
On February 1, 2010, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by email to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB. On February 1, 2010, the petitioner accepted this opportunity to address the PRB.	02/01/10
On February 18, 2010, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone.	02/18/10
On March 9, 2010, the PRB met to make the initial recommendation. The PRB initial recommendation was that the petition met the criteria for review under 10 CFR 2.206; however, the PRB is rejecting the petition using the criteria in MD 8.11.	03/09/10
On March 17, 2010, the petitioner was informed of the PRB's initial recommendation by e-mail, and offered a second opportunity to address the PRB.	03/17/10

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~4 MONTHS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On March 23, 2010, the petitioner requested a call to clarify his understanding of the PRB's initial recommendation. In addition, he requested a second opportunity to provide additional information to the PRB by telephone. 	03/23/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On March 31, 2010, the petitioner had an informal call with the petition manager and technical leads to discuss the initial recommendation. 	03/31/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 6, 2010, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to provide additional information in support of the petition, before the PRB makes the final recommendation. 	04/06/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 12, 2010, the OEDO approved an extension until May 7, 2010, to issue the acknowledgement letter. 	04/12/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 6, 2010, the PRB issued a closure letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML101170761) to convey the PRB's final recommendation that the petition met the criteria for rejection. All NRC actions on this petition are closed. 	05/06/10

FACILITY: Turkey Point (TP), Units 3 and 4
REACTOR TYPE: Pressurized Water Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



CLOSED PETITION
EDO # G20100185

DATE OF PETITION: MARCH 31, 2010
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: MAY 3, 2010
PETITION MANAGER: JASON PAIGE
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

As described in detail in the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC take enforcement action against Florida Power and Light Company (FPL), the licensee for TP, Units 3 and 4, by issuing a confirmatory order modifying the licensee's operating licenses for TP, Units 3 and 4. The petitioner also requests that the NRC require the licensee to bring both units to a cold shutdown mode until the NRC and the licensee can conduct an investigation of the void described in NRC Event Number 45791.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~2 MONTHS

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.

03/31/10

- The NRC staff was evaluating the petition to determine if it meets the criteria for review in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206.
- On May 3, 2010, the NRC staff issued a closure letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML101170581). The NRC staff determined that the petition did not meet the criteria for review. All NRC actions on this petition are closed.

04/01/10

05/03/10

FACILITY: Turkey Point (TP), Units 3 and 4
REACTOR TYPE: Pressurized Water Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20090107

DATE OF PETITION: JANUARY 11, 2009
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: APRIL 28, 2010
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: JULY 12, 2010
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: APRIL 28, 2010
PETITION MANAGER: JASON PAIGE
CASE ATTORNEY: MOLLY BARKMAN



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

The petitioner requests that the NRC take enforcement action against Florida Power and Light Company (FPL), the licensee for TP, Units 3 and 4, by issuing a Notice of Violation and Civil Penalty in the amount of \$1 million and a Confirmatory Order modifying FPL's operating licenses DPR-31 and DPR-41 for TP Units 3 and 4, as described in the January 11, 2009, 10 CFR 2.206 petition request.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS & NEXT STEPS PETITION AGE: ~16 MONTHS	
The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	01/11/09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On July 10, 2009, the PRB held a telephone call with the petitioner. On August 10, 2009, the OEDO approved an extension request until November 20, 2009, to support the PRB's need for additional coordination with RII, prior to making a final recommendation. On November 19, 2009, the PRB issued an acknowledgement letter to the petitioner, accepting the petition in part for review under 10 CFR 2.206. (ADAMS Accession No. ML091880900) On December 11, 2009, the PRB issued a revised <i>Federal Register</i> Notice to correct an omission. On January 5, 2010, Mr. Saporito submitted a 2.206 petition (G20100009) regarding the TP ECP. In the January 5, 2010, letter, Mr. Saporito referenced similar issues as stated in his January 11, 2009 petition, G20090107. G20090107 has already been accepted for review, in part. On January 20, 2010, the OEDO approved the PRB's request to handle G20100009 as a supplement to G20090107. The letter from Mr. Saporito, associated with G20100009 will be addressed in the Proposed Director's Decision associated with G20090107. The OEDO has terminated G20100009. On March 11, 2010, the OEDO approved the PRB's request for an extension until April 30, 2010, to provide additional time for OGC to conduct its legal review of the Proposed Director's Decision. On April 28, 2010, the Proposed Director's Decision was issued (ADAMS Accession No. ML100630413). Thirty days were provided from the date of issuance of the Proposed Director's Decision for the petitioner and the licensee to provide any comments. 	07/10/09
Note: To review the complete status of this petition up until May 1, 2009, please refer to the December 2009 monthly status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML100070075).	(no date)		08/10/09
On May 1, 2009, the PRB requested an extension from the OEDO to support the additional interactions required for the PRB to make its initial and final recommendation. On May 4, 2009, the OEDO approved the extension request with a new due date of June 30, 2009.	05/01/09		11/19/09
On May 7, 2009, the petitioner addressed the PRB by phone. The PRB reviewed the additional information to determine if the petition met the criteria for acceptance under 10 CFR 2.206.	05/07/09		12/11/09
On June 25, 2009, the OEDO approved an extension until July 17, 2009 for the PRB to issue its final recommendation.	06/25/09		01/05/10
On June 30, 2009, the PRB made an initial recommendation to accept the petition for review, in part, under 10 CFR 2.206. The NRC notified the petitioner of the initial recommendation on July 1, 2009, and the petitioner requested a second opportunity to provide additional information to the PRB.	06/30/09		01/20/10
			03/11/10
			04/28/10

FACILITY: Idaho State University
REACTOR TYPE: Research Test Reactor
PETITIONER: Kevan Crawford



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20090374

DATE OF PETITION: JUNE 26, 2009, AS SUPPLEMENTED BY
 EMAILS DATED AUGUST 28, 2009
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: MARCH 19, 2010
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: JULY 30, 2010
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: APRIL 21, 2010
PETITION MANAGER: GREG SCHOENEBECK
CASE ATTORNEY: KIMBERLY SEXTON



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

The petitioner is concerned that Idaho State University is not operating the research and test reactor in accordance with NRC regulations and requests that the NRC immediately suspend the reactor operating license for Idaho State University.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	06/26/09
On July 16, 2009, the petitioner requested an opportunity to address the PRB before it meets internally to make an initial recommendation to accept or reject the petition for review under 10 CFR 2.206.	07/16/09
On July 23, 2009, the OEDO approved an extension request until September, 30, 2009, to support the PRB's ability to coordinate the call with the petitioner in accordance with Management Directive 8.11.	07/23/09
On August 6, 2009, the petitioner was scheduled to address the PRB by telephone. Due to a schedule conflict with the petitioner, the PRB rescheduled the telephone call for September 1, 2009.	08/06/09
On August 28, 2009, the petitioner provided a written statement of the comments he intended to make during the September 1, 2009 telephone call.	08/28/09
On September 1, 2009, the petitioner addressed the PRB.	09/01/09
On September 15, 2009, the PRB met internally and made an initial recommendation to accept the petition, in part, for review under 2.206.	09/15/09
On September 24, 2009, the OEDO approved an extension request until November 18, 2009, to support the PRB's ability to coordinate additional calls with the petitioner.	09/24/09
On September 29, 2009, members of the PRB contacted the petitioner by telephone to inform him of the PRB's initial recommendation and to offer the petitioner a second opportunity to address the PRB.	09/29/09

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~11 MONTHS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On October 1, 2009, the petitioner declined an opportunity to address the PRB again. The PRB plans to make a final recommendation to support issuance of the acknowledgement letter by November 18, 2009. 	10/01/09
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On November 19, 2009, the PRB issued an acknowledgement letter to the petitioner, accepting the petition in part for review under 10 CFR 2.206. (ADAMS Accession No. ML092800432) 	11/19/09
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On December 30, 2009, the petitioner contacted the petition manager by email to provide feedback on the <i>Federal Register</i> notice. The PRB is treating the additional feedback provided in this email as supplemental information. 	12/30/09
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On March 19, 2010, the Proposed Director's Decision was issued (ADAMS Accession No. ML100600868). Twenty days were provided from the date of issuance of the Proposed Director's Decision for the petitioner and the licensee to provide any comments. 	03/19/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 14, 2010, the petitioner contacted the PRB Chairman to discuss the Proposed Director's Decision. The petitioner indicated that additional time would be needed to provide comments on the Proposed Director's Decision. 	04/14/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 21, 2010, the petition manager contacted the petitioner to discuss a path forward to providing comments to the Proposed Director's Decision. 	04/21/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 29, 2010, the OEDO approved an extension to request additional time to obtain written comments from the petitioner, prior to issuance of the Final Director's Decision. The Final Director's Decision due date is now July 30, 2010. 	04/29/10

FACILITY: Indian Point (IP), Units 2 & 3; Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station;
REACTOR TYPE: River Bend Nuclear Power Plant
PETITIONER: Pressurized Water Reactor; Boiling Water Reactor
 Sherwood Martinelli



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20090487

DATE OF PETITION: AUGUST 22, 2009
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: AUGUST 20, 2010
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: DECEMBER 22, 2009
PETITION MANAGER: DOUG PICKETT
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

The petitioner requests that the NRC suspend the operations of Entergy owned plants, (specifically for Indian Point Units 2 (IP2) and 3 (IP3), Vermont Yankee Nuclear Station, and River Bend Nuclear Power Plant) until Entergy brings the decommissioning funds for all of its licensed nuclear reactors to the adequate minimum levels required by the NRC regulations.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS PETITION AGE: ~10 MONTHS	
The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	08/22/09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On December 17, 2009, the PRB issued an acknowledgement letter to the petitioner, accepting the petition in part for review for Vermont Yankee Nuclear Station and River Bend Nuclear Power Plant, under 10 CFR 2.206 (ADAMS Accession No. ML093440334). On December 22, 2009, the petitioner provided supplemental information in support of his petition by email. On December 28, 2009, Mr. Martinelli submitted an email to the NRC, which was tracked under G20090722 (now a closed petition). In G20090722, Mr. Martinelli referenced his petition of August 22, 2009 (G20090487) and voiced objections to the PRB denying his petition with respect to Indian Point. The PRB met internally on January 14, 2010, and concluded that in accordance with MD 8.11, Mr. Martinelli's email dated December 28, 2009 (G20090722), would be better handled as a supplement to G20090487. Therefore, the information provided in G20090722 will be reviewed as a supplement to G20090487. The OEDO has terminated G20090722. On March 2, 2010, the OEDO approved an extension request until May 28, 2010, to support the NRC's staff's resolution of decommissioning funding issues. On May 14, 2010, the OEDO approved an extension request until August 20, 2010, to support the NRC staff's resolution of decommissioning funding issues. 	12/17/09
On September 3, 2009, the petition manager offered the petitioner to address the PRB prior to its initial meeting to make an initial recommendation. The petitioner requested an opportunity to address the PRB; however, due to scheduling conflicts, the petitioner requested that the telephone call be held in mid-October.	09/03/09		12/22/09
On September 25, 2009, the petition manager spoke to the petitioner, after several attempts were made by phone and email, to confirm if the petitioner could support a call on October 20, 2009. The petitioner stated that he could not commit to this date. The call tentatively planned for October 20, 2009, was cancelled on October 19, 2009, since the petitioner was unavailable.	09/25/09		12/28/09
On October 27, 2009, the petition manager spoke to the petitioner. The petitioner was still unable to confirm his availability for a future telephone call to address the PRB. The petition manager is still following up with the petitioner to establish a future date for a telephone call.	10/27/09		01/14/10
On November 10, 2009, the petition manager informed the petitioner that the PRB planned to proceed with an internal meeting to make an initial recommendation to accept or reject the petition for review under 10 CFR 2.206. Once the initial recommendation has been made, the petition manager will inform the petitioner and provide him with a second opportunity to address the PRB. An internal PRB meeting is scheduled for December 8, 2009.	11/10/09		03/02/10 05/14/10

FACILITY: Prairie Island Nuclear Power Plant
REACTOR TYPE: Pressurized Water Reactor
PETITIONER: David Lee Sebastian



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20090510

DATE OF PETITION: SEPTEMBER 4, 2009
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: MAY 7, 2010
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: JULY 21, 2010
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: MAY 7, 2010
PETITION MANAGER: TERRY BELTZ
CASE ATTORNEY: MAURI LEMONCELLI



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

The petitioner requests that the NRC issue an Order for compliance and to exhaust any and all administrative remedy on behalf of the petitioner to request that the Personnel Security Manager and Program Manager (for Northern States Power Company) and the Prairie Island Nuclear Power Plant, cease and desist from the current arbitrary practices using the Access Authorization Program/Fitness for Duty Program, for purposes other than their created intent.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS PETITION AGE: ~9 MONTHS	
The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	09/04/09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On Monday, October 26, 2009, the PRB met internally to make an initial recommendation to accept or reject the petition under 10 CFR 2.206. The PRB Chair recommended that additional coordination with the NRC's Office of General Counsel and the Allegations Coordinator occur prior to finalizing the initial recommendation. 	10/26/09
The NRC staff determined that the letter contained no allegations. On September 22, 2009, the letter was referred from allegations to the 10 CFR 2.206 process since it contained a request that the NRC take enforcement action against Prairie Island.	09/22/09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On December 2, 2009, the PRB made an initial recommendation to accept the petition for review under 10 CFR 2.206. 	12/02/09
On Thursday, September 24, 2009, the petition manager left messages by phone and email with the petitioner to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process.	09/24/09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On December 9, 2009, the OEDO approved an extension until January 15, 2010, for the PRB to issue an acknowledgement letter. 	12/09/09
On September 28, 2009, the petition manager arranged a time to call the petitioner to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process further. The petitioner was unavailable.	09/28/09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On December 16, 2009, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB initial recommendation by telephone, to accept the petition for review. The petitioner did not request to address the PRB to provide additional information. 	12/16/09
On September 30, 2009, the petition manager followed up with the petitioner by email to arrange a time for the initial call.	09/30/09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On January 15, 2010, the PRB issued an acknowledgement letter to document the PRB's final recommendation to accept the petition for review (ADAMS Accession No. ML093410050). 	01/15/10
On October 13, 2009, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to clarify the information that was provided in the petition request.	10/13/09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The petition manager coordinated with the Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response to develop the Proposed Director's Decision. 	03/31/10
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 7, 2010, a Proposed Director's Decision was issued (ADAMS Accession No. ML101170134). The petitioner and licensee were provided with 30 days to comment on the Proposed Director's Decision. 	05/07/10

FACILITY: Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 3
REACTOR TYPE: Pressurized Water Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20090690

DATE OF PETITION: DECEMBER 5, 2009
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: JULY 1, 2010
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: MARCH 4, 2010
PETITION MANAGER: FARIDEH SABA
CASE ATTORNEY: MICHAEL CLARK



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For reasons specified within the petition request, the petitioner requests that the NRC take enforcement action against Progress Energy Company, the licensee for Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 3, in the interest of protecting the public health and safety regarding the structural failure of the Crystal River, Unit 3, containment building.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS PETITION AGE: ~6 MONTHS	
The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	12/05/09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On January 21 and February 1, 2010, the PRB met internally and made an initial recommendation to accept the petition for review, in part. 	01/21/10 & 02/1/10
On December 9, 2009, the petition manager contacted the petitioner (by telephone and email) to discuss the 2.206 process. The petitioner informed the petition manager by email that he requested an opportunity to address the PRB by telephone before the PRB meets to make the initial recommendation to accept or reject the petition for review under 10 CFR 2.206. A call is scheduled with the petitioner on January 7, 2010.	12/09/09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On February 3, 2010, the petitioner was informed of the PRB's initial recommendation and offered a second opportunity to address the PRB. 	02/03/10
On December 11, 2009, the OEDO approved an extension request until March 8, 2010, to support the PRB with scheduling of the initial telephone phone call with the petitioner, the PRB internal meetings, a possible second presentation by the petitioner to the PRB by phone, and issuance of the acknowledgement letter.	12/11/09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On February 12, 2010, the petitioner declined the opportunity to address the PRB. The PRB plans to document the final PRB recommendation to accept the petition for review, in part, in an acknowledgement letter to the petitioner by March 8, 2010. 	02/12/10
On January 7, 2010, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to provide additional information in support of the petition.	01/07/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On March 4, 2010, the PRB issued an acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML100471416) to the petitioner. The acknowledgement letter conveyed the final recommendation to accept the petition for review, in part. A Proposed Director's Decision is scheduled for issuance by July 1, 2010. 	03/04/10

FACILITY: U.S. Army Installation Command
REACTOR TYPE: N/A
PETITIONER: Isaac Harp



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20100136

DATE OF PETITION: MARCH 4, 2010
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: FSME
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: AUGUST 24, 2010
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: APRIL 26, 2010
PETITION MANAGER: KENNETH KALMAN
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A

NO IMAGE AVAILABLE

ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner filed a Notice of Appeal in the matter of the Atomic Energy Safety and Licensing Board Memorandum and Order (Denying Requests for Hearing) (LBP-10-04), US Army Installation Command, Docket No. 40-9083, served February 24, 2010. In the Notice of Appeal, the petitioner requested that the NRC take enforcement action by initiating an investigation into a potential violation of License SUB-459 and if it is determined that a violation has occurred to apply the full penalty permissible by law. In addition, the petitioner requests that any monetary fines should go toward environmental remediation of depleted uranium contamination at Schofield and Pohakuloa, if the law provides for such action.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for a Notice of Appeal, which was referred to the 10 CFR 2.206 process for review.

03/04/10

On March 25, 2010, the petition manager contacted the petitioner to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and offered the petitioner an opportunity to provide additional information to the PRB. The petitioner accepted this opportunity to address the PRB by telephone.

03/25/10

On April 14, 2010, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to provide additional information in support of the petition.

04/14/10

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~3 MONTHS

- On April 14, 2010, the PRB met internally to make the initial recommendation. The PRB's initial recommendation was that the petition met the criteria for review, as provided by 10 CFR 2.206.
- On April 22, 2010, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's initial recommendation. The petitioner was offered a second opportunity to address the PRB and declined. Since no new information was provided, the initial recommendation by the PRB became the final recommendation.
- On April 26, 2010, the PRB issued an acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML101100139) to convey the PRB's final recommendation to accept the petition for review under 10 CFR 2.206.

04/14/10

04/22/10

04/26/10

FACILITY: Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station
REACTOR TYPE: Boiling Water Reactor
PETITIONER: Representative Paul W. Hodes



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20100235

DATE OF PETITION: APRIL 19, 2010
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: SEPTEMBER 17, 2010
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: MAY 20, 2010
PETITION MANAGER: JOHN BOSKA
CASE ATTORNEY: MOLLY BARKMAN



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner requested that the NRC prevent Entergy, the licensee for Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, from resuming power production after its scheduled refueling outage until several efforts (as described in the petition) have been completed to the NRC Commission's satisfaction.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~2 MONTHS

The petitioner submitted a letter to the Honorable Gregory B. Jaczko to request that the NRC not allow Vermont Yankee to restart after its scheduled refueling outage until all environmental remediation work and relevant reports on leaking tritium at the plant have been completed. Since the letter requested an enforcement action against Entergy, the letter was referred by the Office of the Secretary to the 10 CFR 2.206 process.

04/19/10

On April 29, 2010, the Office of Congressional Affairs confirmed that the petitioner was in agreement with the NRC's approach to process the letter in accordance with the 10 CFR 2.206 process. In a subsequent discussion with the petition manager, the petitioner declined an opportunity to address the PRB before it met internally to make the initial recommendation.

04/29/10

- On May 3, 2010, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition. The PRB's initial recommendation was that the petition met the criteria for review and should be accepted for review under the 10 CFR 2.206 process.
- On May 4, 2010, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the initial recommendation and offered a second opportunity to address the PRB. The petitioner declined. Thus the initial recommendation will become final and will be documented in a letter to the petitioner by May 27, 2010.
- On May 20, 2010, the EDO issued an acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML101310049) to convey the PRB's final recommendation to accept the petition for review under 10 CFR 2.206.

05/03/10

05/04/10

05/20/10

FACILITY: Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station
REACTOR TYPE: Boiling Water Reactor
PETITIONER: Michael Mulligan



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20100027**

DATE OF PETITION: JANUARY 12, 2010
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: FEBRUARY 23, 2010
PETITION MANAGER: JAMES KIM
CASE ATTORNEY: MOLLY BARKMAN



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

The petitioner believes that the radioactive leak at Vermont Yankee poses risks to human health and environment and he requests that Vermont Yankee be immediately shutdown and all leaking paths be isolated. The petitioner also requests that Vermont Yankee discloses its preliminary "root cause analysis" and that the NRC releases its preliminary investigative report on this before plant start-up.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	01/12/10
On January 15, 2010, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by email to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB. On January 20, 2010, the petitioner accepted this opportunity to address the PRB.	01/15/10
On January 25, 2010, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone.	01/25/10
On February 1 and 4, 2010, the PRB met internally to consider the additional information received and to make an initial recommendation. The PRB's initial recommendation is that the petition meets the criteria for rejection because the issue raised has already been the subject of NRC staff review, and a resolution has been achieved.	02/01/10 & 02/04/10

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~4 MONTHS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On February 12, 2010, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's initial recommendation. The petitioner requested a second opportunity to address the PRB. 	02/12/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On February 23, 2010, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to provide additional information in support of his petition. The PRB is currently evaluating the additional information provided by the petitioner, before it meets internally to make a final recommendation. 	02/23/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On February 26, 2010, the PRB obtained approval from the NRR Office Director to consolidate this petition with similar Vermont Yankee 2.206 petitions from Mr. Shadis (G20100074) and Mr. Saporito (G20100098) in accordance with MD 8.11, "Criteria for Consolidating Petitions." The petition manager has notified each Vermont Yankee petitioner of the PRB's decision to consolidate all of the similar VY 2.206 petitions. 	02/26/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PRB is still evaluating the additional information provided by the petitioner, before it reaches a final recommendation. 	03/30/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 12, 2010, the OEDO approved an extension until July 15, 2010, to issue the acknowledgement letter. 	04/12/10

FACILITY: Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station
REACTOR TYPE: Boiling Water Reactor
PETITIONER: Raymond Shadis, New England Coalition (NEC)



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20100074**

DATE OF PETITION: FEBRUARY 8, 2010
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: MAY 5, 2010
PETITION MANAGER: JAMES KIM
CASE ATTORNEY: MOLLY BARKMAN



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons discussed within the petition request, the petitioner requested that the NRC immediately require that Vermont Yankee be placed in cold shutdown and depressurize all systems in order to slow or stop the leak. The NEC also requests that VY be held in cold shutdown until all leaks of radio-contaminants have repaired, all buried pipes replaced, and until the affected area (of the leaks) is radiologically characterized together with a determination of its potential additional cost of remediation in decommissioning.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	02/08/10
On February 17, 2010, the PRB met to discuss the request for immediate action. The PRB did not identify any immediate health or safety concerns to warrant an immediate shutdown of Vermont Yankee. Thus the PRB denied the petitioner's request for immediate action.	02/17/10
On February 19, 2010, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's decision regarding the request for immediate action. The petitioner was also offered an opportunity to address the PRB prior to its internal meeting to make the initial recommendation. The petitioner accepted this opportunity and requested to address the PRB by telephone on March 3, 2010.	02/19/10
On February 26, 2010, the PRB obtained approval from the NRR Office Director to consolidate this petition with similar Vermont Yankee 2.206 petitions from Mr. Mulligan (G20100027) and Mr. Saporito (G20100098) in accordance with MD 811, "Criteria for Consolidating Petitions." The petition manager has notified each Vermont Yankee petitioner of the PRB's decision to consolidate all of the similar VY 2.206 petitions.	02/26/10

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~3 MONTHS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On March 3, 2010, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to provide additional information in support of the petition, prior to the PRB's internal discussion to make the initial recommendation. 	03/03/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On March 25, 2010, the PRB met internally to make the initial recommendation. The PRB determined that further internal discussions are still needed to consider all aspects of the consolidated Vermont Yankee 2.206 petitions. Therefore, a subsequent internal PRB meeting will be held in April 2010 to make the initial recommendation. 	03/25/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 22, 2010, the PRB met internally to make the initial recommendation. The PRB determined that the petition met the criteria for acceptance, in part. 	04/22/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 27, 2010, the petitioner was informed of the PRB initial recommendation and requested a second opportunity to address the PRB. 	04/27/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 5, 2010, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone. 	05/05/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 10, 2010, the PRB met internally to discuss the additional information provided during the call and to make a final recommendation. The PRB initial recommendation, to accept the petition for review, in part, will be documented in an acknowledgement letter as the PRB's final recommendation. 	05/10/10

FACILITY: Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station
REACTOR TYPE: Boiling Water Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20100098**

DATE OF PETITION: FEBRUARY 20, 2010
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: MAY 5, 2010
PETITION MANAGER: JAMES KIM
CASE ATTORNEY: MOLLY BARKMAN



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner requested that the NRC immediately bring the Vermont Yankee to a "cold-shut-down" mode of operation until such time as (1) the "root-cause" of the radioactive tritium leak can be determined; and (2) the tritium leak repaired and verified by an independent NRC contractor or state contractor; and (3) Licensee executives that gave false and misleading information to state officials are removed from positions of authority in the oversight and operation of Vermont Yankee.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	02/20/10
On February 25, 2010, the PRB met to discuss the request for immediate action. The PRB did not identify any immediate health or safety concerns to warrant an immediate shutdown of Vermont Yankee. Thus the PRB denied the petitioner's request for immediate action.	02/25/10
On February 26, 2010, the PRB obtained approval from the NRR Office Director to consolidate this petition with similar Vermont Yankee 2.206 petitions from Mr. Mulligan (G20100027) and Mr. Shadis (G20100074) in accordance with MD 811, "Criteria for Consolidating Petitions." The petition manager has notified each Vermont Yankee petitioner of the PRB's decision to consolidate all of the similar VY 2.206 petitions.	02/26/10
On March 1, 2010, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's decision regarding the request for immediate action. The petitioner was also offered an opportunity to address the PRB prior to its internal meeting to make the initial recommendation. The petitioner accepted this opportunity and requested to address the PRB by telephone on March 8, 2010.	03/01/10

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~3 MONTHS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On March 8, 2010, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to provide additional information in support of the petition, prior to the PRB's internal discussion to make the initial recommendation. 	03/08/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On March 25, 2010, the PRB met internally to make the initial recommendation. The PRB determined that further internal discussions are still needed to consider all aspects of the consolidated Vermont Yankee 2.206 petitions. Therefore, a subsequent internal PRB meeting will be held in April 2010 to make the initial recommendation. 	03/25/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 22, 2010, the PRB met internally to make the initial recommendation. The PRB determined that the petition met the criteria for acceptance, in part. 	04/22/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 27, 2010, the petitioner was informed of the PRB initial recommendation and requested a second opportunity to address the PRB by telephone. 	04/27/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 5, 2010, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone. 	05/05/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 10, 2010, the PRB met internally to discuss the additional information provided during the call and to make a final recommendation. The PRB initial recommendation, to accept the petition for review, in part, will be documented in an acknowledgement letter as the PRB's final recommendation. 	05/10/10

FACILITY: Davis-Besse Nuclear Plant
REACTOR TYPE: Pressurized Water Reactor
PETITIONER: David Lochbaum, Union of Concerned Scientists



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20100192**

DATE OF PETITION: APRIL 5, 2010
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: APRIL 21, 2010
PETITION MANAGER: MICHAEL MAHONEY
CASE ATTORNEY: MAURI LEMONCELLI



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

As described in detail in the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC take enforcement action against the licensee for Davis-Besse nuclear plant to prevent the reactor from restarting until such time the NRC determines that applicable adequate protection standards have been met and reasonable assurance exists that these standards will continue to be met after operation is resumed. The specific technical issue of concern pertains to the UCS conclusion that Davis-Besse has operated repeatedly for longer than six hours after the onset of pressure boundary leakage, and that the Davis-Besse technical specifications do not allow any pressure boundary leakage.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS	
		PETITION AGE: ~2 MONTHS	
The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	04/05/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">On April 14, 2010, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition and to make the initial recommendation. The PRB was unable to make an initial recommendation regarding if the petition met the criteria for review and recommended additional coordination with Region III.On April 21, 2010, the petition manager informed the petitioner that additional time was needed to coordinate with Region prior to making the initial recommendation. The petitioner confirmed by email that he had no questions or concerns at this time.On April 28, 2010, the OEDO approved an extension request until July 16, 2010, to support additional coordination with Region III. The PRB is scheduled to meet internally on June 14, 2010, to make the initial recommendation.	4/14/10
On April 7, 2010, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by email to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB. The petition manager spoke on the telephone with the petitioner on April 8, 2010 to discuss the process. The petitioner confirmed his understanding of the 10 CFR 2.206 process and declined an opportunity to address the PRB before it met internally to make the initial recommendation.	04/07/10		4/21/10
			04/28/10

FACILITY: Davis-Besse Nuclear Plant
REACTOR TYPE: Pressurized Water Reactor
PETITIONER: Tom Gurdziel



**OPEN PETITION
 UNDER
 CONSIDERATION
 EDO # G20100238**

DATE OF PETITION: APRIL 15, 2010
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: MAY 24, 2010
PETITION MANAGER: MICHAEL MAHONEY
CASE ATTORNEY: LAURA GOLDIN



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

As described in detail in the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC take enforcement action against First Energy, the licensee for Davis-Besse nuclear plant, to prevent the reactor from restarting until the NRC conducts further evaluations in accordance with the list of questions and comments provided in the petition.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS PETITION AGE: ~2 MONTHS	
The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	04/15/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 29, 2010, the petition manager spoke on the telephone with the petitioner to discuss the process. The petitioner confirmed his understanding of the 10 CFR 2.206 process and declined an opportunity to address the PRB before it met internally to make the initial recommendation. 	04/29/10
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 11, 2010, the PRB met to discuss the petition and to make the initial recommendation. The PRB's initial recommendation was that the petition did not meet the criteria for review since it failed to provide sufficient facts to warrant further inquiry. 	05/11/10
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 24, 2010, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by phone to discuss the initial recommendation and to offer the petitioner a second opportunity to address the PRB. The petitioner declined to address the PRB, thus the initial PRB recommendation will become the final recommendation. The petition manager is preparing the closure letter to convey the final PRB recommendation to the petitioner in writing. 	05/24/10

FACILITY: Callaway Nuclear Power Plant
REACTOR TYPE: Pressurized Water Reactor
PETITIONER: Lawrence S. Criscione



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20100257**

DATE OF PETITION: APRIL 27, 2010
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: N/A
PETITION MANAGER: MOHAN THADANI
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

As described in detail in the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC issue an Information Notice to licensees in commercial nuclear industry which informs the licensees of the abnormalities of the October 21, 2003, reactor shutdown at Callaway Plant. The petition further describes information that should be included in the Information Notice.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~2 MONTHS

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.

04/27/10

The NRC staff is evaluating the petition to determine if it meets the criteria for review in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206.

05/31/10

FACILITY: Callaway Nuclear Power Plant
REACTOR TYPE: Pressurized Water Reactor
PETITIONER: Lawrence S. Criscione



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20100264**

DATE OF PETITION: APRIL 30, 2010
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: N/A
PETITION MANAGER: MOHAN THADANI
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

As described in detail in the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC add a requirement to modify the technical specifications of all Westinghouse pressurized water reactors.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~2 MONTHS

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.

04/30/10

The NRC staff is evaluating the petition to determine if it meets the criteria for review in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206.

05/31/10

FACILITY: Millstone Power Station, Unit 3
REACTOR TYPE: Pressurized Water Reactor
PETITIONER: David Collins



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION**
EDO # G20100272

DATE OF PETITION: MAY 3, 2010
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: N/A
PETITION MANAGER: CARLEEN SANDERS
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

As described in detail in the petition, the petitioner requested that the NRC prevent the restart of Millstone Power Station, Unit 3.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS PETITION AGE: ~1 MONTH	
The NRC was provided an article written by Mr. David Collins on April 21, 2010. Mr. David Collins provided a revised copy of his article at an NRC public meeting held on April 22, 2010. The NRC staff in Region I, together with the staff from the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, identified a 10 CFR 2.206 request in the article. Mr. Collins further revised his articles on April 29 and May 6, 2010, and provided copies of these revisions to Region I staff	04/21/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 7, 2010, the petition manager informed the petitioner, Mr. Collins of the PRB's decision on the request for immediate action and offered the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB before it met internally to make the initial recommendation. The petitioner requested an opportunity to address the PRB by phone on Thursday, May 20, 2010. On May 20, 2010, the petitioner informed the petition manager that he did not want to address the PRB and requested that his 10 CFR 2.206 petition be withdrawn from NRC review. The petition manager is in the process of preparing a letter to close-out the NRC staff's actions on this 10 CFR 2.206 petition. 	05/07/10
On May 3, 2010, the petition manager conducted a call with Mr. Collins. The purpose of the call was to explain the 10 CFR 2.206 process and to determine if he was in agreement with the NRC staff's recommendation to review his concerns under the 10 CFR 2.206 process. Mr. Collins agreed and requested that his concern be handled as a 10 CFR 2.206 petition.	05/03/10		05/20/10
On May 3, 2010, the PRB met internally to discuss the request for immediate action contained within the article. The PRB denied the request to prevent Millstone from restarting on the basis that no immediate safety concerns were identified for the plant or the public, which would warrant that the NRC take immediate action to prevent the restart of Millstone Power Station, Unit No. 3, as identified in the article.	05/03/10		
On May 5, 2010, the OEDO assigned the article provided to the NRC by Mr. Collins as a 10 CFR 2.206 petition.	05/05/10		

Enclosure 2
ML101470093
Age Statistics for Open
10 CFR 2.206 Petitions

June 18, 2010

AGE STATISTICS FOR AGENCY 10 CFR 2.206 OPEN PETITIONS

Assigned Action Office	Facility/ Petitioner	Incoming Petition	PRB Meeting¹	Acknowledgment Letter/Days from Incoming Petition²	Proposed Director's Decision/Age in Days³	Final Director's Decision/Age in Days⁴	Comments If Not Meeting the Agency's Completion Goals
NRR	Turkey Point, Units 3 and 4 / Thomas Saporito G20090107	1/11/09	3/05/09 64 days	11/19/09 311 days	04/28/10 160 days		Additional time was requested by NRR to allow additional time for the Agency's General Counsel to conduct its review and form an opinion on the issues raised in the petition and addressed in the Proposed Director's Decision.
NRR	Idaho State University, Research & Test Reactor / Kevan Crawford G20090374	6/26/09	9/15/09 81 days	11/19/09 146 days	03/19/10 120 days		
NRR	Indian Point, Units 2 and 3; Vermont Yankee Nuclear Station G20090487	8/22/09	12/08/09 109 days	12/17/09 117 days			The PRB meeting was delayed to support a request from the petitioner to address the PRB by phone, before it met internally to make an initial recommendation. The delay in holding the PRB meeting also impacted our ability to issue an acknowledgement letter in accordance with the NRC's timeliness goals.

¹ Goal is to hold a Petition Review Board meeting, which the petitioner is invited to participate in, within 2 weeks of receipt of petition.

² Goal is to issue acknowledgment letter within 35 days of the date of incoming petition.

³ Goal is to issue proposed Director's Decision within 120 days of the acknowledgment letter.

⁴ Goal is to issue final Director's Decision within 45 days of the end of the comment period.

NRR	Prairie Island G20090510	09/04/09	10/13/10 39 days	01/15/10 133 days	05/07/10 112 days		.
NRR	Crystal River G20090690	12/05/09	01/07/10 33 days	03/04/10 86 days			The PRB meeting was delayed to support a request from the petitioner to address the PRB by phone, before it met internally to make an initial recommendation. With the holidays, 1/7/10 was the earliest opportunity that the petitioner and the PRB could accommodate.
FSME	U.S. Army Installation Command G20100136	03/04/10	04/14/10 41 days	04/26/10 53 days			This letter was originally submitted to the NRC as a petition for a Notice of Appeal, which was subsequently referred to the 10 CFR 2.206 process for review. The additional time required to ensure that this letter was in the correct process, in addition to time needed to coordinate a call with the petitioner, contributed to the delay with holding a call with the PRB within two weeks of receipt of the petition and with issuing the acknowledgement letter in accordance with the NRC's timeliness goals.
NRR	Representative Paul Hodes G20101235	04/19/10	05/03/10 14 days	05/20/10 31 days			