

Enclosure 1
ML102080216
Monthly 10 CFR 2.206,
“Requests for Action
Under this Subpart”
Status Report

PETITIONS CLOSED DURING THIS PERIOD

FACILITY	PETITIONER/EDO No.	Page
Florida Power and Light Company	Thomas Saporito G20090107	2
Idaho State University (Research Test Reactor)	Kevan Crawford G20090374	3
Prairie Island Nuclear Facility	David Lee Sebastian G20090510	4

CURRENT STATUS OF OPEN PETITIONS

Indian Point Units 2 and 3; Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, River Bend Nuclear Power Plant	Sherwood Martinelli G20090487	5
Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 3	Thomas Saporito G20090690	6
U.S. Army Installation Command	Isaac Harp G20100136	7
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station	Representative Paul W. Hodes G20100235	8
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station	Michael Mulligan G20100027	9
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station	Ray Shadis G20100074	10
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station	Thomas Saporito G20100098	11
Davis-Besse Nuclear Plant	David Lochbaum, Union of Concerned Scientists G20100192	12

CURRENT STATUS OF OPEN PETITIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station	Mark Edward Leyse and Raymond Shadis, New England Coalition G20100368	13
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station	Michael Mulligan G20100388	14
Pilgrim Nuclear Station	Mary Lampert G20100454	15

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



CLOSED 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 9, 2010
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JULY 9, 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

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	01/11/09
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)
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
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
On June 25, 2009, the OEDO approved an extension until July 17, 2009 for the PRB to issue its final recommendation.	06/25/09
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
On July 10, 2009, the PRB held a telephone call with the petitioner.	07/10/09
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.	08/10/09

CURRENT STATUS & NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~18 MONTHS

<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. ML091880900) 	11/19/09
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On December 11, 2009, the PRB issued a revised <i>Federal Register</i> Notice to correct an omission. 	12/11/09
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On January 5, 2010, Mr. Saporito submitted a revised 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. 	01/05/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	01/20/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	03/11/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	04/28/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 28, 2010, the petitioner provided written comments on the Proposed Director's Decision. No comments were provided by the licensee. 	05/28/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On July 9, 2010, the Final Director's Decision was issued (ADAMS Accession No. ML101790047). The petitioner's comments were addressed by the NRC in the Final Director's Decision. All NRC actions on this petition are closed. 	07/09/10

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

CLOSED 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
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

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~13 MONTHS

<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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No written comments were submitted to the NRC by the petitioner. The NRC plans to issue the Final Director's Decision by July 30, 2010. 	06/30/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On July 30, 2010, the Final Director's Decision was issued (ADAMS Accession No. ML101160492). All NRC actions on this petition are closed. 	07/30/10

FACILITY: Prairie Island Nuclear Power Plant
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: David Lee Sebastian



CLOSED 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 20, 2010
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JULY 20, 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
---	--------------------------------------

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES	CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS
The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	09/04/09
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
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
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
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
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
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
On December 2, 2009, the PRB made an initial recommendation to accept the petition for review under 10 CFR 2.206.	12/02/09
PETITION AGE: ~11 MONTHS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-start;"> • On December 9, 2009, the OEDO approved an extension until January 15, 2010, for the PRB to issue an acknowledgement letter. 12/09/09 <li style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-start;"> • 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 <li style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-start;"> • 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 <li style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-start;"> • The petition manager coordinated with the Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response to develop the Proposed Director's Decision. 03/31/10 <li style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-start;"> • 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 <li style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-start;"> • On June 4, 2010, the petitioner provided written comments on the Proposed Director's Decision to the NRC. The licensee did not provide any comments. 06/04/10 <li style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-start;"> • On July 20, 2010, the Final Director's Decision was issued (ADAMS Accession No. ML101650032). The petitioner's comments were addressed by the NRC in the Final Director's Decision. All NRC actions on this petition are closed. 07/20/10 	

FACILITY: Indian Point (IP), Units 2 & 3; Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station;
 River Bend Nuclear Power Plant
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: 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: JULY 2, 2010
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

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	08/22/09
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
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
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
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

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~11 MONTHS

<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). 	12/17/09
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On December 22, 2009, the petitioner provided supplemental information in support of his petition by email. 	12/22/09
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	12/28/09
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	01/14/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	03/02/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	05/14/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On July 26, 2010, the OEDO approved an extension request until January 21, 2011, to support the NRC staff's resolution of decommissioning funding issues. 	07/26/10

FACILITY: Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 3
LICENSEE TYPE: 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: DECEMBER 4, 2010
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 24, 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: ~8 MONTHS

<p>The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.</p>	<p>12/05/09</p>	<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. 	<p>01/21/10 & 02/11/10</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>12/09/09</p>	<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. 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. 	<p>02/03/10 02/12/10</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>12/11/09</p>	<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. 	<p>03/04/10</p>
<p>On January 7, 2010, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to provide additional information in support of the petition.</p>	<p>01/07/10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 24, 2010, the OEDO approved an extension request until December 4, 2010, to permit additional time for the staff to issue the Proposed Director's Decision. An extension was needed because of the complexity of the activities that need to be completed by the licensee and for the NRC to review and evaluate these actions. The petition manager informed the petitioner of this change on June 24, 2010. 	<p>06/24/10</p>

FACILITY: U.S. Army Installation Command
LICENSEE TYPE: Materials
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: JANUARY 28, 2011
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 29, 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

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~5 MONTHS

<p>The petitioner filed a petition for a Notice of Appeal, which was referred to the 10 CFR 2.206 process for review.</p>	<p>03/04/10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>04/22/10</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>03/25/10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>04/26/10</p>
<p>On April 14, 2010, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to provide additional information in support of the petition.</p>	<p>04/14/10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 28, 2010, the petition manager updated the petitioner on the status of the petition review via telephone and followed up the phone conversation with a summary email of the conversation dated June 28, 2010, per the petitioner's request. The petitioner confirmed receipt of the summary email on June 29, 2010. 	<p>06/28/10</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>04/14/10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On July 30, 2010, the OEDO approved an extension request until January 28, 2011, to support the NRC's ability to obtain additional information from the U.S. Army. 	<p>07/30/10</p>

FACILITY: Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station
LICENSEE TYPE: 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: JUNE 18, 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: ~4 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. 05/03/10
- 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. 05/04/10
- On May 14, 2010, the petitioner submitted a supplement to the petition (ADAMS Accession No. ML101370031). 05/14/10
- 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. 05/20/10
- On June 16, 2010, the petitioner submitted a letter to NRC Chairman Jaczko after learning of recent reports of leaking radioactive water at Vermont Yankee. 06/16/10
- On June 18, 2010, the NRC's Office of Congressional Affairs confirmed that Representative Paul Hodes wanted the June 16, 2010, letter treated as additional information in support of his April 19, 2010, petition request. 06/18/10

FACILITY: Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Michael Mulligan



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20100027

DATE OF PETITION: JANUARY 12, 2010
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: OCTOBER 25, 2010
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 25, 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 disclose its preliminary "root cause analysis" and that the NRC releases its preliminary investigative report on this before plant start-up.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS		
		PETITION AGE: ~5 MONTHS		
The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	01/12/10	<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. The PRB is still evaluating the additional information provided by the petitioner, before it reaches a final recommendation. On April 12, 2010, the OEDO approved an extension until July 15, 2010, to issue the acknowledgement letter. On June 25, 2010, the NRC issued an acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML101450004), accepting the petition for review, in part. 	02/26/10	
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			03/30/10
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			04/12/10
On February 23, 2010, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to provide additional information in support of his petition. The PRB is evaluating the additional information provided by the petitioner, before it meets internally to make a final recommendation.	02/23/10			06/25/10

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



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20100074

DATE OF PETITION: FEBRUARY 8, 2010
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: OCTOBER 25, 2010
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 25, 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		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS	
		PETITION AGE: ~5 MONTHS	
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	<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. 	3/25/10
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	<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
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	<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
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 May 5, 2010, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone. On May 10, 2010, the PRB met internally to discuss the additional information provided during the call and to make a final recommendation. 	05/05/10 05/10/10
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 25, 2010, the NRC issued an acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML101450004), accepting the petition for review, in part. 	06/25/10

FACILITY: Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20100098

DATE OF PETITION: FEBRUARY 20, 2010
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: OCTOBER 25, 2010
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 25, 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	CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS PETITION AGE: ~5 MONTHS
--------------------------------------	--

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES	CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS PETITION AGE: ~5 MONTHS										
<table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width:80%;">The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.</td> <td style="width:20%; text-align: center;">02/20/10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>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.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">02/25/10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>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.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">02/26/10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>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.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">03/01/10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>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.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">03/08/10</td> </tr> </table>	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	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"> <li style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-start; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <div style="width: 80%;"> <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. </div> <div style="width: 15%; text-align: center; vertical-align: top;">03/25/10</div> <li style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-start; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <div style="width: 80%;"> <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. </div> <div style="width: 15%; text-align: center; vertical-align: top;">04/22/10</div> <li style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-start; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <div style="width: 80%;"> <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. </div> <div style="width: 15%; text-align: center; vertical-align: top;">04/27/10</div> <li style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-start; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <div style="width: 80%;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On May 5, 2010, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone. </div> <div style="width: 15%; text-align: center; vertical-align: top;">05/05/10</div> <li style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-start; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <div style="width: 80%;"> <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. </div> <div style="width: 15%; text-align: center; vertical-align: top;">05/10/10</div> <li style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-start;"> <div style="width: 80%;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On June 25, 2010, the NRC issued an acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML101450004), accepting the petition for review, in part. </div> <div style="width: 15%; text-align: center; vertical-align: top;">06/25/10</div>
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										
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										

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



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20100192

DATE OF PETITION: APRIL 5, 2010
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: NOVEMBER 10, 2010
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JULY 13, 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: ~3 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 28, 2010, the OEDO approved an extension request until July 16, 2010, to support additional coordination with Region III. The PRB met internally on June 14, 2010, to make the initial recommendation. The PRB determined that the petition met the criteria for review. The petition manager informed the petitioner by email on June 22, 2010. On July 13, 2010, the NRC issued an acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML101890876) to the petitioner. A proposed Director's Decision is scheduled for issuance by November 10, 2010. 	04/28/10
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		06/14/10
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.	04/14/10		07/13/10
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.	04/21/10		

FACILITY: Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Mark Edward Leyse & Raymond Shadis, New England Coalition



OPEN PETITION UNDER CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20100368

DATE OF PETITION: JUNE 7, 2010
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JULY 26, 2010
PETITION MANAGER: JOHN BOSKA
CASE ATTORNEY: BRETT KLUKAN



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner requested that the NRC require that Entergy, the licensee for Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station (VYNPS), lower the licensing basis peak cladding temperature of VYNPS in order to provide a necessary margin of safety – to help prevent a partial or complete meltdown – in the event of a loss-of-coolant accident.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~2 MONTHS

<p>The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.</p>	<p>06/07/10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 29, 2010, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition and made an initial recommendation that the petition did not meet the criteria for review, as there was another proceeding (rulemaking) that the petitioners could be a party. The petitioners were informed of this initial recommendation and requested a second call with the PRB to provide additional information. On July 26, 2010, the petitioners addressed the PRB by phone to provide additional information in support of their petition. The PRB will consider the information provided during the call prior to making a final recommendation. 	<p>06/29/10</p>
<p>On June 16, 2010, the petitioners requested an opportunity to address the PRB before it met internally to make the initial recommendation.</p>	<p>06/16/10</p>		<p>07/26/10</p>
<p>On June 23, 2010, the petitioners addressed the PRB by telephone.</p>	<p>06/23/10</p>		

FACILITY: Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Michael Mulligan



**OPEN PETITION
 UNDER
 CONSIDERATION
 EDO # G20100388**

DATE OF PETITION: JUNE 14, 2010
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 29, 2010
PETITION MANAGER: DOUG PICKETT
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner requested that the NRC immediately shutdown Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station (VYNPS). The petitioner's basis for requesting this action is that the material condition of the Vernon Dam power station and its switchyard makes the blackout and normal emergency power supply at VYNPS unreliable and dangerous.

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.	06/14/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 29, 2010, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone. On July 13, 2010, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition and made an initial recommendation that the petition met the criteria for rejection because the issues raised have already been reviewed, evaluated, and resolved by the NRC staff. The petitioner was informed of this initial recommendation. The PRB is awaiting feedback regarding if the petitioner requests a second opportunity to address the PRB, before a final recommendation is made. 	06/29/10
On June 18, 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 petitioner requested an opportunity to address the PRB by telephone.	06/18/10		07/13/10
On June 21, 2010, the PRB met to discuss the petitioner's request for immediate action only. The PRB denied the petitioner's request for an immediate shutdown because there is no immediate safety issue that would warrant an immediate plant shutdown. The petition manager informed Mr. Mulligan of the PRB's decision regarding his request for immediate action.	06/21/10		

FACILITY: Pilgrim Nuclear Station LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor PETITIONER: Mary Lampert	 U.S. NRC <small>UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION</small>	OPEN PETITION UNDER CONSIDERATION EDO # G20100454
--	--	--

DATE OF PETITION:	JULY 19, 2010
DIRECTOR'S DECISION (DD) TO BE ISSUED BY:	NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE:	N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE:	N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER:	JULY 31, 2010
PETITION MANAGER:	RICHARD GUZMAN
CASE ATTORNEY:	MAURI LEMONCELLI



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner requested that the NRC issue a Demand For Information Order that Entergy, the licensee for Pilgrim Nuclear Station (PNS), demonstrate that all inaccessible cables at Pilgrim NPS are capable of performing their required function, be it safety or non-safety related.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS & KEY MILESTONES		<u>CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS</u>	
		PETITION AGE: ~2 WEEKS	
The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	07/19/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The petition manager confirmed that the petitioner can support a call on August 9, 2010. The petitioner will address the PRB by telephone to provide additional information in support of her petition request. 	07/31/10
On July 27, 2010, the petition manager contacted the petitioner to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB. The petitioner requested an opportunity to address the PRB by telephone before it meets internally to make the initial recommendation.	07/27/10		

Enclosure 2
ML102080216
Age Statistics for Open
10 CFR 2.206 Petitions

AGE STATISTICS FOR AGENCY 10 CFR 2.206 OPEN PETITIONS

Assigned Action Office	Facility/ Petitioner	Incoming Petition	PRB Meeting ¹	Acknowledgment Letter/Days from Incoming Petition ²	Proposed Director's Decision/Age in Days ³	Final Director's Decision/Age in Days ⁴	Changes to the Completion Goal status (since the last report)
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	07/09/10 40 days	
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	07/30/10 112 days	The goal to issue the Final Director's Decision (DD) was not met. The Proposed DD was issued on March 19, 2010. After the comment period ended for the Proposed DD, the petitioner provided verbal comments during a conference call with the PRB Chairman. During the call with the PRB Chairman, the petitioner expressed the desire to provide written comments on the PDD. An extension was approved by the EDO until July 30, 2010, for the staff to garner and address the petitioner's comments in full, to resolve the petition in a comprehensive, effective and efficient manner. Although the EDO approved the extension, the petitioner did not

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.

							submit additional comments, as requested during the call with the PRB Chairman.
NRR	Indian Point, Units 2 and 3; Vermont Yankee Nuclear Station Sherwood Martinelli G20090487	8/22/09	12/08/09 109 days	12/17/09 117 days			The goal to issue the acknowledgement letter was not met. 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 impacted our ability to issue an acknowledgement letter in accordance with the NRC's timeliness goals.
NRR	Prairie Island David Lee Sebastian G20090510	09/04/09	10/13/10 39 days	01/15/10 133 days	05/07/10 112 days	07/20/10 43 days	
NRR	Crystal River Thomas Saporito G20090690	12/05/09	01/07/10 33 days	03/04/10 86 days			The goal to issue the acknowledgement letter was not met. 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 impacted our ability to issue an acknowledgement letter in accordance with the NRC's timeliness goals.

FSME	U.S. Army Installation Command Isaac Harp G20100136	03/04/10	04/14/10 41 days	04/26/10 53 days			The goal to issue the acknowledgement letter was not met. 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	Vermont Yankee Representative Paul Hodes G20101235	04/19/10	05/03/10 14 days	05/20/10 31 days			
NRR	Vermont Yankee Michael Mulligan G20100027	01/12/10	01/25/10 12 days	06/25/10 164 days			The goal to issue the acknowledgement letter was not met. On February 26, 2010, the PRB obtained approval from the NRR Office Director to consolidate this petition with similar VY petitions from Mr. Shadis and Mr. Saporito. The goal to issue the acknowledgement letter within 35 days of the incoming petition was exceeded as a result of the PRB's interactions with all three petitioners. However the delay facilitated the PRB's ability

							to review all similar VY petitions in a consolidated manner.
NRR	Vermont Yankee Raymond Shadis, NEC G20100074	02/08/10	02/17/10 9 days	06/25/10 137 days			The goal to issue the acknowledgement letter was not met. On February 26, 2010, the PRB obtained approval from the NRR Office Director to consolidate this petition with similar VY petitions from Mr. Mulligan and Mr. Saporito. The goal to issue the acknowledgement letter within 35 days of the incoming petition was exceeded as a result of the PRB's interactions with all three petitioners. However the delay facilitated the PRB's ability to review all similar VY petitions in a consolidated manner.
NRR	Vermont Yankee Thomas Saporito G20100098	02/20/10	02/25/10 5 days	06/25/10 125 days			The goal to issue the acknowledgement letter was not met. On February 26, 2010, the PRB obtained approval from the NRR Office Director to consolidate this petition with similar VY petitions from Mr. Shadis and Mr. Mulligan. The goal to issue the acknowledgement letter within 35 days of the incoming petition was exceeded as a result of the PRB's interactions with all three petitioners. However the delay facilitated the PRB's ability to review all similar VY

							petitions in a consolidated manner.
NRR	Davis-Besse David Lochbaum G20100192	04/05/10	04/14/10 9 days	07/13/10 99 days			The goal to issue the acknowledgement letter was not met. Additional coordination between the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation and Region III was necessary to support inspections and a public meeting at the plant, to support the PRB's ability to make the initial and final recommendations. This delayed issuance of the acknowledgement letter to the petitioner.

