Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: 2.206 Petition Review Board

RE Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: (telephone conference)

Date: Thursday, August 26, 2010

Work Order No.: NRC-403 Pages 1-25

Transcript edited by Douglas Pickett, NRC

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

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION + + + + + 10 CFR 2.206 PETITION REVIEW BOARD (PRB) CONFERENCE CALL RE VERMONT YANKEE NUCLEAR POWER STATION + + + + + 9 THURSDAY AUGUST 26, 2010 10 11 The conference call was held, Ted Quay, 12 13 Chairperson of the Petition Review Board, presiding. 14 15 PETITIONER: MICHAEL MULLIGAN PETITION REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS: 16 TED QUAY, Deputy Director, Division of Policy and 17 Rulemaking, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation 18 DOUGLAS V. PICKETT, Petition Manager 19 20 DOUGLAS DODSON, Region I, Division of Reactor Projects TANYA MENSAH, Petition Coordinator, NRR 21 22 KENN MILLER, NRR, Electrical Engineering Branch 23 DUC NGUYEN, NRR, Aging Management of Structures Electrical and Systems Branch 24 25

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1	PETITION REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS: (cont.)
2	NANCY SALGADO, NRR, Chief, Plant Licensing Branch I-1
3	OTHER NRC PERSONNEL PRESENT:
4	JAMES KIM, Project Manager, Division of Operating
5	Reactor Licensing
6	ALICIA CALERO, General Engineer, Division of Policy
7	and Rulemaking
8	HEATHER JONES, NRC Region I, Vermont Yankee
9	Resident Inspector
L O	
11	ALSO PRESENT:
12	JIM DeVINCENTIS, Licensing Manager, Entergy
13	
L 4	
15	
16	
L 7	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23 24	
4	

	3
1	T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S
2	Welcome and Introductions 4
3	Doug Picket, Petition Manager
4	PRB Chairman's Introduction 8
5	Ted Quay, Chairman
6	Petitioner's Presentation
7	Michael Mulligan, Petitioner
8	PRB Chairman's Closing Remarks
9	Ted Quay, Chairman
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

NEAL R. GROSS

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

10:04 a.m.

BOARD MEMBER PICKETT: Thanks, everybody, for attending this meeting.

My name is Doug Pickett.

We are here today to allow the Petitioner, Mr. Michael Mulligan, his second opportunity to address the Petition Review Board, who we'll refer to as the PRB regarding his 2.206 petition, dated June 15, 2010, on the adequacy of the Vernon Hydroelectric Station Tie-In to the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station located in Vernon, Vermont.

I am the Petition Manager for the petition.

The PRB Chairman is Ted Quay.

As part of the PRB's review of this petition, Mr. Mulligan has requested this opportunity to address the PRB.

This meeting is scheduled to conclude by approximately 11:00 a.m. The meeting is being recorded by the NRC Operations Center and will be transcribed by a court reporter. The transcript will become a supplement to the petition. The transcript will also be made publicly available.

I'd like to open this meeting with

NEAL R. GROSS

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

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

introductions. As we go around the room, please be
sure to clearly state your name, your position, and
the office that you work for within the NRC for the
record.
I'll start off. I'm Doug Pickett. I'm
from NRC. I'm the Petition Manager for the petition.
BOARD MEMBER SALGADO: Nancy Salgado. I'm
the Branch Chief from Division of Operator and Reactor
Licensing.
BOARD MEMBER KIM: James Kim, Project
Manager from the Division of Operating and Reactor
Licensing, NRR.
COURT REPORTER: Folks, I'm sorry, but
this is the Court Reporter. The folks on the staff
who I think are on a speakerphone are not making it
onto the record.
BOARD MEMBER PICKETT: This is Doug
Pickett.
I can send you an email with everybody's
name on it so we have if you want to go over it
again.
BOARD MEMBER MILLER: On the line is Kenn
Miller, NRR, Electrical Engineering Branch.
CHAIRMAN QUAY: Okay. You got Ted Quay,
the PRB Chairman in Headquarters, NRR.

BOARD MEMBER PICKETT: And from Region I. BOARD MEMBER DODSON: Doug Dodson, Region 1, Project Engineer. The Residence BOARD MEMBER PICKETT: Office. BOARD MEMBER JONES: Heather Jones. BOARD MEMBER PICKETT: And the licensee? MR. DeVINCENTIS: Jim DeVincentis. 9 BOARD MEMBER PICKETT: And Mr. Mulligan. PETITIONER MULLIGAN: Yes. This is Mike 10 11 Mulligan. I'm the petitioner. BOARD MEMBER PICKETT: And is there anyone 12 13 who has not introduced themselves on the phone. Okay. Then we'll move on. 14 We've completed our introductions 15 we've got the representative from the licensee on the 16 And Mr. Mulligan has introduced himself. And 17 phone. 18 no one else. I'd like to emphasize that we need to 19 20 speak clearly and loudly to make sure that the Court 21 Reporter can accurately transcribe this meeting. Ιf 22 you do have something that you would like to say, 23 please state your name for the record. 24 For those dialing into the meeting, please

NEAL R. GROSS

mute your

remember

to

25

phones to minimize

background noise or distractions. If you do not have a mute button, this can be done by pressing the key star 6. To unmute, you press star 6 again.

At this time I'll turn it over to the PRB Chairman, Ted Quay.

CHAIRMAN QUAY: Welcome to this meeting regarding the 2.206 petition submitted by Mr. Mulligan.

I'd like to first share some background information on our process.

Section 2.206 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations describes the petition process; the primary mechanism for the public to request enforcement action by the NRC in a public process. This process permits anyone to petition the NRC to take enforcement-type action related to NRC licensees or licensed activities. Depending on the results of its evaluation, the NRC could modify, suspend or revoke an NRC-issued license or take any other appropriate enforcement action to resolve a problem.

The NRC's staff's guidance for the disposition of 2.206 petition requests in its Management Directive 8.11 which is publicly available.

The purpose of today's meeting is to give the petitioner his second opportunity to provide any

NEAL R. GROSS

additional explanation or support of the petition before the Petition Review Board makes its final recommendation on whether or not to accept this petition for review.

This meeting is not a hearing, nor is it an opportunity for the petition to question or examine the PRB on the merits or the issues presented in the petition request.

No decisions regarding the merits of this petition will be made at this meeting.

Following the meeting, the Petition Review Board will conduct its internal deliberations. The outcome of this internal meeting will be discussed with the petitioner.

The Petition Review Board typically consists of a Chairman, usually a manager at the senior executive service level at the NRC. It has a Petition Manager and a PRB Coordinator. Other members of the Board are determined by the NRC staff based on the content of the information in the petition request.

At this time, I would like to introduce the Board.

I am Ted Quay, the Petition Review Board Chairman.

NEAL R. GROSS

Doug Pickett is the Petition Manager for the petition under discussion today. Mensah is the office's Tanya PRB Coordinator. Our technical staff includes: Duc Nguyen from the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulations' Aging Management of Structures, 8 Electrical, and Systems Branch; 9 Kenn Miller from the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation's Electrical Engineering Branch; 10 Nancy Salgado from the Office of Nuclear 11 Reactor Regulation's Plant Licensing Branch 1-1, and; 12 Doug Dodson from NRC's Region I, Division 13 of Reactor Projects. 14 15 As described in our process, the NRC staff may ask clarifying questions in order to better 16 17 understand the petitioner's presentation and to reach 18 a reasoned decision whether to accept or reject the 19 petitioner's requests for review under the 2.206 20 process. 21 I would like to summarize the scope of the 22 petition under consideration and the NRC activities to 23 date. On June 15, 2010, Mr. Mulligan submitted 24 to the NRC a petition, under 10 CFR 2.206 regarding 25

NEAL R. GROSS

the Vernon Hydroelectric Station's power supply to the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station.

In this petition request, Mr. Mulligan requested the following:

- (1) The immediate shutdown of the Vermont Yankee facility;
- (2) An independent investigation, outside of NRC and Entergy, to determine whether fraud and/or falsification of issues were involved in the license renewal efforts for Vermont Yankee;
- (3) An investigation on what the petition describes as a subtle shift from reliance on diesel generators to the Vernon Hydroelectric Station by the Vermont Yankee licensee without the appropriate quality of a nuclear grade electrical power supply, and;
- (4) An inspection by the NRC or other responsible organization of the Vernon Hydroelectric Station dam and switchyard.

On June 21, 2010, the PRB met and considered the petitioner's request for the NRC to immediately order the shutdown of the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station. The PRB did not identify any immediate safety concerns. Therefore, the PRB denied the request for immediate shutdown. Mr. Mulligan was

NEAL R. GROSS

informed of the PRB's decision on June 25th.

On June 29th, a teleconference was held with you, the Petitioner, and the PRB in which you provided further explanation and support for your petition. A transcript of that phone call has been provided to you and is publicly available in ADAMS.

On July 13th, the PRB met internally to discuss your petition concerning the adequacy of the Vernon Tie to the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station and make its initial recommendation in accordance with Management Directive 8.11. The initial recommendation of the PRB is that the issues raised in your petition have already been reviewed, evaluated and resolved by the NRC. Therefore, your petition meets the criteria for rejection.

In summary, the PRB concluded that the NRC staff has extensively reviewed the power supply provided by the Vernon Hydroelectric Station and the reliance placed on this power supply by the Vermont Yankee facility. During the Station Blackout review of Vermont Yankee, the staff concluded that the Vernon Hydroelectric Station power station supply provides an acceptable alternate AC power source. In addition, the Vernon Hydroelectric Station switchyard was reviewed, inspected and found acceptable in the

NEAL R. GROSS

Safety Evaluation dated March 30. staff's 2007. 1 supporting license renewal for Vermont Yankee. 2 3 By email dated July 23, 2010, you were informed of the PRB's initial recommendation and provided a detailed discussion that included the basis 5 for our findings. 6 On July 30, 2010, you requested a second opportunity to address the PRB for the purpose of 8 9 providing additional supporting information for your 10 petition. Following today's discussion, the PRB will 11 meet internally to discuss the additional information 12 provided today and make its final recommendation in 13 accordance with Management Directive 8.11 14 As a reminder for the phone participants, 15 please identify yourself if you make any remarks as 16 this will help in the preparation of the meeting 17 transcript that will be made publicly available. 18 19 Thank you. And at this point, Mr. Mulligan, I'd like 20 to turn it over to you. And you have approximately 35 21 22 minutes, as Mr. Pickett previously informed you. PETITIONER MULLIGAN: Thank you, sir. 23 I'd just like to say, I'm self aware of 24

NEAL R. GROSS

how fortunate I am to be a citizen of the United

States. Because, you know, essentially the Constitution gives us the ideals for this type of thing. And I just -- you know, I feel very fortunate to be a citizen of the United States and be able to talk to you guys, really, when it gets down to it.

Basically I attest that all of what was talked about as far as the petition, you didn't -- the NRC didn't talk -- the NRC and Entergy didn't talk about rusting conditions of the electric towers. They didn't do a detailed inspection. I don't know what codes.

I mean, this whole is -- there -- there's a lack of information. You know, you go into this thing and you kind of want the information, you want to get your ducks in order and everything. But when you really get down it, very little information is provided for a petitioner to-- to be able to fight back you guys according to your rules and stuff.

And so, the SER and I suspect Entergy, really hasn't -- I haven't found any place in here that they talked about the rusting towers. This is what happened with the rusting towers, this is the condition of the rusting towers and explained it thoroughly in engineering terms. All you guys are engineers, you know what I'm talking about.

NEAL R. GROSS

And then made an open evaluation of -this isn't necessarily about is inoperable. This is - the question is essentially is licensing -relicensing adequate, is it thorough? What's missing
in this thing, and stuff like that.

And what was missing is an evaluation of what the rust -- rusting towers mean. And if you guys were competent, you would have covered that. You would have known how to protect yourselves and Entergy. You would have covered it thoroughly, exposed everything and then I wouldn't have had a leg to stand on, and stuff like that.

I can't find anything in the written trail here of anybody discussing the rusty towers, or -- and that, of course, questions, you know.

Is that switchyard going to be taken care of appropriately for the next 20 years of relicensing?

So essentially, maybe this isn't necessarily all about whether the running dam is adequate for Vermont Yankee. This is a kind of language thing, you know. Help in communication type of thing.

Is the Agency and Entergy capable of communicating, identifying problems and solving them, and stuff like that? It's a disease with the

NEAL R. GROSS

bureaucracy more that concerns me. The symptoms are the switchyard. The disease is, essentially, twisted language that's being used here. And, you know, and you don't have any idea of the quality behind a lot of these terms, and stuff like that. You don't have any -- I can't see it in the documents. It's an issue with the way you document everything, or don't document everything, or the rules documenting -- and documenting stuff. And so I don't have -- as an outsider, I don't have the information. really don't have the information, very much information. Just bits and piece of stuff like that.

And so, I mean that's essentially where the big problem is: Language, the ability of everybody to talk and communicate, and the essence to know that there's a quality behind this stuff instead of all this -- you know, an institutional failure like we've seen in the Gulf of Mexico, and all this sort of stuff, it's about language. It's about the garbage dumb of language and communication.

Essentially, it's like throwing your divan in -- you know, you have an old piece of furniture, a divan. You throw it in the garbage -- the garbage dump. Then you go back later on and you're trying -- you know, you go back, you look for that divan. And

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

all you find is pieces of the arms and the legs, and they're all disconnected and fragmentary, and you can't make heads or tails. You can't make heads or tails really what the components are, and stuff.

And so this is what I'm talking about with language and stuff.

I wish -- see, I'm on a different phone. I'd like to reference the petition that talked about NSAC, N-S-A-C 108. NSAC. That's derived from the Electric Power Research Institute, and stuff. And basically the petition referenced that as a standard for diesel generators, and stuff.

And, you know, I wish I had -- I wish -- I wanted -- I don't have my computer and I wanted to quote what the Petition Board said about the 95 percent or higher reliability of the diesel generators. But I don't have that. I'm not -- I don't have access to my computer anymore.

But basically, the petition said that it was referenced -- the 95 percent was referenced by EPRI and NSAC-108.

You know, you start going through NSAC-108 or NSAC-108, you start going through it the only quote it says about 95 percentibility, and it's a quote here "Generally industry and the NRC like independent EDG

NEAL R. GROSS

reliabilities to be 95 percent or higher."

So, you know, the way the petition quoted it to me was the 95 percent standard comes from EPRI. And then, you know, you gave me the reference number - the reference number. And I looked it up. And Doug gave me a copy, and stuff. But then it really -- it doesn't really identify is a standard.

You know, it's just this circular kind of logic business. So, like I said, I mean the only thing that referenced 95 percent was what I just quoted, and stuff. And it really doesn't identify.

This is EPRI -- this -- this should be EPRI standard that emergency diesel generator reliability should be greater than 95 percent reliable, and stuff like that.

You guys are all engineers and you know, I'm going to talk about the grid out -- outside Vermont Yankee. I mean, you know basically -- I mean, I was there when we lost a grid, and stuff. So -- and -- and all we had were diesel generators. So, you know, it happens. And basically, you know, the grid normally stays energized 100 percent -- 100 percent reliability. You could essentially say that, and stuff like that. But that -- that's not enough.

We know that in the past that we've had

NEAL R. GROSS

troubles with the grid. So we don't depend -- we don't know that that is a high enough quality for us for electricity for a nuclear power plant. So that's why we have the diesel generators and to power up all your electricity and stuff like that.

higher So a quality of you want electricity -- of electricity. And so how you test it? You test it through the plant's two-way system. You just test -- you know, you test it once a month, or whatever you guys do now. And it runs for an hour, or sometimes you do it for -- I mean, that's how there's an assurance of high quality power to an electric station is -- I mean, that's the gold It's not -- it's not that the grid is -standard. the grid is energized, although that is nice -- that is really nice to have. Everyone knows that, that we don't want -- we want to use a diesel generator; we want to use the grid. But we know that the grid is -is not adequate, and stuff like that. So then we flip to the -- we use the diesel generators in case of -in an emergency and stuff.

And so, I mean -- so, the wording that you gave me with the petition basically says -- the way -- the way the wording is, you frame it's -- it's 95 percent reliability because the grid is -- because

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that line is energized more than 95 percent of the time, and stuff like that. And, you know, it isn't the same. It is -- you know, you kind of say, well the way you word it, it's not clear. The way you word it is, it's equivalent to a diesel generator, but it's really not even close to being as reliable as a diesel generator.

And, you know, this garbage dump -- this garbage dump of words and language really bothers me, and stuff. And this kind of circular stuff, and you're referencing an EPRI document and then you start looking into -- you know, more looking in the dump trying to figure out what's going on, and stuff. And getting bits and pieces of information, and stuff like that. And the EPRI document doesn't even really reference the quality of diesel generators. It doesn't -- it's not a reference. It doesn't specifically state this is a reference.

We -- EPRI would like you to have -- in that document, that document that was referenced to me, we would like to have all plants have greater than 95 percent reliability of the diesel generators, you know.

You know, I mean, but then you're kind of saying that's what -- you're kind of -- you're kind of

NEAL R. GROSS

inferring that's what the reliability of the Vernon Tie is, and stuff like that. And we don't -- you know, it's not the same thing as -- it's not the same standard as what we use for diesel generators. It's -- it's kind of deceptive.

And -- and -- you know, you got an -- it's like I've talked before. You've got an incidence on one side and then on the other side you've got five or six codes or rules and you throw them up in the air. None of them really fit. And then what falls back down to the earth, you pick up five or six of these pieces of the codes and stuff, and -- and you come out authoritative -- authoritatively talking that the code says that we're allowed to use -- we're allowed to use the Tie, it's equivalent.

I know that if I was to run around with my photograph and said "Okay, that Vermont Yankee is --we're --we're in dire emergency and we want to use --and want to use the Vernon Tie, we want to use the Vernon Dam and its offshoots. We want to use that for emergency power." And if I showed them that picture, you know 95 percent of the people in my community would say "Oh, no. That's not right. You can't use." You know, they would -- they would tell you that's not adequate. They would tell you that's an abomination,

NEAL R. GROSS

depending upon that grid, the visual effects.

I think that's -- you know, you got this goggledygook of technical stuff and it doesn't make sense.

And I think the impression of people looking at the grid and saying what you -- I mean, looking at the Tie or looking at the dam -- excuse me. I think, you know that -- that impression that you want in a dire emergency and you're going to depend upon that switchyard to power up Vermont Yankee and prevent a core melt, I think if you showed them, if you said that "Do you want to depend on this -- the switchyard," I think 95 percent of the people would say the NRC's nuts.

Having overly complex and numerous sets of codes and rules is worse than having no codes and rules at all, you know. That's what I think. I think you can pick up these bits and fragments and pieces of these codes, and nobody understands them. And I don't even think the Agency half the time really understands them the way they talk and stuff.

And you open -- start opening up the curtains, you know you start walking past the Vernon Switchyard and you say "How about this rust here?"

"Oh, they had a relicensing." I wonder what -- I

NEAL R. GROSS

wonder how -- I wonder how that's situated in the relicensing documents and stuff. And then you go in there, and nothing's even mentioned about it. And then you start -- then you go through a petition process and they -- they -- they -- they reference this NSAC-108 business and you start looking into that. And, you know, fragments of information, that's all. It's no clear-cut -- no clear-cut -- at least what I can see, reference to a reliability rate, and stuff.

And, you know the reliability rate of diesel generators across the board, you know it's been noted through all the years that everybody plays games with figuring out, you know, identifying whether it's a real failure or not a failure. I mean games -- everybody games that, the diesel generator reliabilities things, you know, to make it -- want to make it look better, and stuff.

You know, I -- so that's -- so that's -- I wish I had -- you know, Mr. Pickett, I wanted to read that email I sent you into the record today, but I don't have my computer next to me. And, you know, I don't know if you could read it into the record for me, because I don't have it because of my phone --

BOARD MEMBER PICKETT: Doug Pickett here.

NEAL R. GROSS

+	we have the email you sent to us and the
2	write-up in it. And we will include that as a
3	supplement to your petition, and we'll put it in
4	ADAMS.
5	PETITIONER MULLIGAN: Okay. I'm just
6	trying to think of anything I want to say anything
7	else I want to say. I think I pretty well much
8	covered it.
9	Oh. And I made I made a spelling
10	mistake. The lessons from Forsmark in my letter to
11	you initially about the petition. And that's F-O-R-S-
12	M-A-R-K. That's the lessons from Forsmark electrical
13	event. That's an NRC document. And I just wanted to
14	correct the spelling in that.
15	Would that letter is that letter going
16	to be entered into ADAMS?
17	BOARD MEMBER PICKETT: Are you talking
18	about your email from this morning?
19	PETITIONER MULLIGAN: The email I sent
20	you, I don't know, a week ago, two weeks ago, or
21	whatever, in response to the
22	BOARD MEMBER PICKETT: Oh, yes. That's in
23	ADAMS. And we're making it publicly available. That
24	was at your request.
25	PETITIONER MULLIGAN: Yes, I think I

think that I -- I'm done. CHAIRMAN QUAY: Okay. At this time, does the staff here at Headquarters have any questions for Mr. Mulligan? Okay. Seeing none, does the license have any questions? MR. DeVINCENTIS: Entergy has no questions 8 or comments. 9 CHAIRMAN QUAY: Okay. Does the Region 10 have any questions? 11 BOARD MEMBER DODSON: The Region has no 12 questions or comments. CHAIRMAN QUAY: Okay. I believe there 13 were no members of the public identified. 14 15 So, Mr. Mulligan, I want to thank you for taking time to provide the NRC staff with clarifying 16 17 information on the petition you've submitted. Before we close, does the Court Reporter 18 need any additional information for the meeting 19 transcript? We did agree to provide you with the 20 names of the individuals here. Is there anything else 21 that's needed? 22 COURT REPORTER: No. And Mr. Pickett can 23 24 either email me or he can call me. Does he want my 25 number right now.

BOARD MEMBER PICKETT: That would be helpful. COURT REPORTER: It's 202-234-4433 ask for 3 John. I'm the only one in the office, the only one 5 named John. BOARD MEMBER PICKETT: Okay. Thank you. PETITIONER MULLIGAN: And I'm want -- and 8 I want to thank you for this opportunity to speak 9 again. CHAIRMAN QUAY: You're welcome. 10 And I guess with that, I guess this 11 12 meeting's concluded. And thank you again, Mr. 13 Mulligan. (Whereupon, at 10:32 a.m. the meeting was 14 15 concluded.) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25