# **Official Transcript of Proceedings**

# **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title: 10 CFR 2.206 Petition Review Board

RE Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit

Docket Number: 50-247, 50-286

Location: (telephone conference)

Date: Tuesday, November 2, 2010

Work Order No.: NRC-540 Pages 1-19

Edited by John Boska, NRC Petition Manager

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
2	+ + + +
3	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
4	+ + + +
5	10 CFR 2.206 PETITION REVIEW BOARD (PRB)
6	CONFERENCE CALL
7	RE:
8	INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NOS. 2 AND 3
9	+ + + +
10	TUESDAY,
11	NOVEMBER 2, 2010
12	+ + + +
13	The teleconference was held at 9:00 a.m.,
14	TED QUAY, Petition Review Board Chair, presiding.
15	PETITIONER: PAUL BLANCH
16	PETITION REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:
17	TED QUAY, Chair, Deputy Director, Division of Policy
18	and Rulemaking, NRR
19	JOHN BOSKA, Petition Manager, Division of Operating
20	Reactor Licensing, NRR
21	TANYA MENSAH, PRB Coordinator, Division of Policy and
22	Rulemaking, NRR
23	RAO TAMMARA, Office of New Reactors
24	JIM TRAPP, Division of Reactor Safety, Region I
25	BRICE BICKETT, Division of Reactor Projects, Region I
26	NEAL R. GROSS

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

(9:01 a.m.)

MR. BOSKA: We are ready to get started, then. I would like to thank everyone for attending this meeting. My name is John Boska. And I am the NRC's Petition Manager for this petition.

We're here today to allow the petitioner, Mr. Paul Blanch, to address the Petition Review Board regarding his 2.206 petition dated October 25th, 2010, pipelines at Indian Point Nuclear the gas Generating Unit numbers 2 and 3, which are located just north of New York City on the Hudson River and Entergy operated by Nuclear Operations, Incorporated, who may also be referred to as the licensee or Entergy.

the Petition Manager for the The Petition Review Board Chairman is Ted petition. As part of the Petition Review Board's review this petition, Mr. Blanch requested opportunity to address the Petition Review Board. we may also refer to the Petition Review Board as the PRB.

This meeting is scheduled to conclude by 10:00 a.m. The meeting is being recorded by the NRC Operations Center and will be transcribed by a court

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

reporter. The transcript will become a supplement to the petition, and the transcript will also be made publicly available. And is the court reporter on the line? THE REPORTER: Yes, sir. This is the court reporter. I am on the line. 6 MR. BOSKA: Thank you very much. I would like to open this meeting with 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 12 record. I am John Boska. I am a project manager 14 in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, which is also referred to as NRR. 15 I'm Nancy Salgado. MS. SALGADO: 16 work in the Division of Operating Reactor Licensing. 17 And I am a Branch Chief for Plant Licensing Branch 18 1-1.19 Good morning. I'm Chris Hott. MR. HOTT: I work in the Office of Enforcement. I'm a senior enforcement specialist. CHAIRPERSON QUAY: Ted Quay, Deputy 24 Director, Division of Policy and Rulemaking, NRR. MS. SAFFORD: Carrie Safford in the Office

2

8

9

10

11

13

20

21

22

23

1	of General Counsel.
2	MR. BOYLE: Patrick Boyle, project
3	manager, Office of NRR.
4	MS. MENSAH: Tanya Mensah, NRR, Division
5	of Policy and Rulemaking.
6	THE REPORTER: This is the court reporter.
7	Could the last two speakers please repeat their
8	names?
9	MR. BOYLE: Patrick Boyle, project
10	manager, NRR.
11	MS. MENSAH: Tanya Mensah, NRR, Division
12	of Policy and Rulemaking.
13	MR. TAMMARA: Rao Tammara. I'm the
14	technical reviewer for external hazards in NRO.
15	MR. BOSKA: All right. We have completed
16	introductions here at NRC headquarters. At this time,
17	are there any NRC participants from NRC headquarters
18	calling in on the phone?
19	(No response.)
20	MR. BOSKA: All right. Will the NRC
21	participants from the Region I office please introduce
22	themselves?
23	MR. BICKETT: This is Brice Bickett, NRC
24	Region I, senior project engineer.
25	MR. TRAPP: Jim Trapp, Branch Chief,
1	1

1	Region I.
2	MR. TIFFT: Doug Tifft, state liaison
3	officer, NRC Region I.
4	MR. CONTE: Richard Conte, Chief,
5	Engineering Branch Number 1, Division of Reactor
6	Safety.
7	MR. McCARVER: Sam McCarver, project
8	engineer, DRP Branch 1.
9	MR. GRAY: Mel Gray, Branch Chief,
10	Division of Reactor Projects, Branch 2 in Region 1.
11	MR. BICKETT: That's all from Region I,
12	John.
13	MR. BOSKA: All right. Thank you.
14	Are there any representatives from Entergy
15	on the phone?
16	MR. WALPOLE: John, there are. I'm Bob
17	Walpole. I'm the licensing manager for Entergy at
18	Indian Point. There are four more of us. Go ahead,
19	John.
20	MR. CURRY: John Curry, project manager,
21	Indian Point.
22	MR. ZULLA: Sal Zulla, consultant working
23	on license renewal.
24	MR. SKONIECZNY: John Skonieczny, senior
25	engineer, Civil Engineering Department.

MR. DRAKE: Richard Drake, civil 2 structural supervisor, design engineering. 3 MR. BOSKA: Are there any Entergy folks that have dialed in also? 4 MR. DACIMO: Yes, Fred Dacimo, President of Operations, License Renewal. 6 MR. BOSKA: All right. MR. WALPOLE: And I believe that's it for 8 9 us. 10 MR. BOSKA: All right. Thank you. 11 Mr. Blanch, would you please introduce yourself for the record? 12 MR. BLANCH: Yes. My name is Paul Blanch. 13 14 I reside in West Hartford, Connecticut. I am an independent energy consultant speaking solely on 15 behalf of myself. And I have filed a 2.206 petition 16 about my concerns about the potential gas line 17 explosion and its impact on Indian Point units 1, 2, 18 and 3.19 And I have been essentially taken --20 21 actually shocked this morning, John, by absolutely new 22 information that you have sent me this morning related to my petition. 23 24 MR. BOSKA: Mr. Blanch, could I interrupt 25 for one minute?

MR. BLANCH: Yes. MR. BOSKA: I would like to finish the introductions before we get down to the order of 3 business. We will let you know when to start your discussions. MR. BLANCH: Great. MR. BOSKA: All right. Thank you. Are there any other people on the phone, 8 9 such as members of the public, who would like to introduce themselves for the record? 10 11 MR. LOCHBAUM: Dave Lochbaum, Union of Concerned Scientists. 12 John Boska, this is Paul Eddy 13 MR. EDDY: 14 and Alyse Peterson from New York State. 15 Thank you very much. MR. BOSKA: Anybody else? 16 (No response.) 17 18 MR. BOSKA: All right. I would like to emphasize that we each need to speak clearly and 19 loudly to make sure that the court reporter can 20 21 accurately transcribe this meeting. If you do have 22 something that you would like to say, please first state your name for the record. 23 24 For those dialing into the meeting, please 25 remember to mute your phones to minimize any

background noise or distractions. If you do not have a mute button, this can be done by pressing the keys \*6. And then to unmute your phone, press the \*6 keys again.

Please do not place this call on hold. Many phone systems play music when a call is on hold, which is distracting for the other callers. Thank you.

At this time I will turn it over to our Petition Review Board Chairman, Ted Quay.

CHAIRPERSON QUAY: Good morning. I'm Ted Quay, the Petition Review Board Chairman. Welcome to this meeting regarding the 2.206 petition submitted by Mr. Blanch.

I would like to share some background 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

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

problem.

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

The purpose of today's meeting is to give the petitioner an opportunity to provide any additional explanation or support for the petition before the Petition Review Board makes an initial recommendation on whether or not to accept this petition for review.

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

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

Following this 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 Senior Executive Service level at the NRC. Petition Manager and а Petition Review Board Coordinator. Other members of the Board are

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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. John Boska is the Petition manager for the petition under discussion today. Tanya Mensah is the office's Petition Review Board Coordinator.

Our technical staff include Rao Tammara from NRC's Office of New Reactors, Brice Bickett from NRC's Region I Division of Reactor Projects, Jim Trapp from NRC's Region I Division of Reactor Safety. We also have legal advice from Carrie Safford from the NRC's Office of General Counsel and advice from Chris Hott from the NRC's office of Enforcement.

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

I would like to summarize the scope of the petition under consideration and the NRC activities to date. On October 25th, 2010, Mr. Blanch submitted to the NRC a petition, ML number 103020293, under 10 CFR 2.206 regarding the potential hazard to the Indian

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Point Nuclear Generating Units 1 and 2 [sic.] from the gas pipelines that cross the site.

The petitioner requests that the NRC order the licensee to demonstrate that the licensee has the capability to protect the public in the event of a rupture, explosion, or fire on the gas pipelines. The petitioner also requests that the NRC review all applicable information, including demanding necessary information from the licensee, to ensure compliance with all regulatory requirements.

Allow me to discuss the NRC activities to date. On October 25th, the NRC received this petition. This petition was assigned to the NRC's Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation for evaluation. On October 26th, the Petition Manager contacted the petitioner to offer the opportunity to address the Petition Review Board, to which the petitioner agreed. That led to this teleconference.

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

At this point, Mr. Blanch, I will turn it over to you to allow you to provide any information

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

you believe the PRB should consider as part of your petition. You may now proceed.

MR. BLANCH: Thank you, Mr. Quay.

My name is Paul Blanch again, reside in West Hartford, Connecticut, speaking solely on behalf of myself.

I am very concerned about safety as it applies to the gas lines crossing Indian Point.

A few minutes ago, I received a communication by email from Mr. Boska. And in this email, my petition has been significantly modified, supposedly based upon sensitive and security-related information.

All the information that is provided in my petition is publicly available. Right now it is publicly available in the public document rooms. I have -- at the last minute --- I filed this petition eight days ago, and a few minutes before our meeting, I receive a modification to my petition. And I have not had a chance to digest these modifications, redactions petition, which Ι consider to my inappropriate because it is all public information.

And I am formally requesting time to evaluate the changes the NRC has removed from my formal petition. I am not sure that all of the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

participants in this call have seen the modification to my petition. And I am formally requesting that we postpone this meeting until a later date, either later this week, until I can have a chance to digest the change to my petition made by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission just a few minutes before our formal conversation, which we are participating in right now.

Ι say, Ι am not sure all participants or all listeners to this meeting are privy to the modifications that have been made by the NRC. And would like to formally request postponement of this because of the few minutes' notice I have been given on a modification to my participation.

And I would like to -- I have shared that with Mr. Lochbaum. And I would like to formally request his input here on his thoughts on what the NRC has done to essentially attempt to remove and classify what is non-sensitive publicly available information from my petition.

Dave, if you would like to say your thoughts on this?

MR. LOCHBAUM: Yes. This is Dave Lochbaum with the Union of Concerned Scientists.

Less than five years ago, the issue of the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

information such as the Indian Point individual plant examination of external events was raised. NBC News did a story on the fact that that information is readily available in local public document rooms across the United States.

At that time, the NRC said, "It doesn't matter. The information is old, obsolete, and cannot provide useful information to those who may wish us harm. So, therefore, it is okay that that information is readily publicly available."

Now, when Mr. Blanch cites some of that readily available information, the NRC flips its story and, all of a sudden, conjures up this notion that this information is somehow now relevant to national security and must be withheld.

It would be interesting to know when the NRC made that determination. Was it in the middle of the night before so they couldn't notify Mr. Blanch until 90 minutes before today's call or did the NRC know about this sometime last week and decided to sandbag the poor fellow and withhold that information from him until he had no chance whatsoever to digest it and act upon it in a meaningful way?

It is somewhat shameful on the staff to pull this kind of antic. And I hope the Inspector

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

General is listening in this call. If not, they will be made aware of it immediately after the call because the Inspector General looked into that information, was told by the senior manager of the NRC that that information has no relevance to the national security, and it's okay that it be out there across the world.

In addition, the State of New York requested that information in 2009 under the Freedom of Information Act. The NRC provided that response to the State of New York and made those records publicly available in 2009.

That information is available today. This morning I checked in the NRC's publicly available ADAMS. So I don't understand what game the NRC staff is playing by magically waving the national security flag and trying to withhold information from Mr. Blanch's petition.

You know, I also notice that, if I got it correctly, that, as Mr. Quay identified all of the participants on this call, there is nobody from the NRC Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response, the people who basically make the calls on information security. So I don't know if you consulted them or you did it on your own, you came up with this dodge, but, you know, it's shameful, like I said.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON QUAY: This is Ted Quay. We are willing to grant the extension that Mr. Blanch asked for, but I also want to emphasize that while information is being redacted out of the petition, that is the publicly available petition; we will consider the petition in its entirety because we have the information. So it in no way impacts our review of the petition.

MR. BLANCH: Well, it seems -- this is Paul Blanch again. It seems totally inconsistent that the NRC will gut my petition, redact my position, put it in the PDR, take out information that is publicly available in every public document room. And it is just totally inconsistent. And I consider this -- I haven't even got a word to describe it, but it is totally, totally inconsistent.

And I would like to coordinate with Mr. Boska a rescheduling and a postponement of this formal discussion with the PRB.

And I would like to have a transcript of this particular meeting and everything that everyone said, including myself and Mr. Lochbaum, in a timely fashion.

CHAIRPERSON QUAY: We certainly will do

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

	17
1	that.
2	MR. BLANCH: Thank you.
3	CHAIRPERSON QUAY: Okay. I guess we're
4	back. I guess we're going to conclude this phone
5	call. Does anybody else have any comments?
6	(No response.)
7	CHAIRPERSON QUAY: Hearing none, I want to
8	thank you for the phone call.
9	UNKNOWN: Excuse me, John. There were two
10	people who signed onto this call after it started.
11	Could they be identified?
12	MR. BOSKA: This is John Boska from the
13	NRC. This is a public forum. It's no different than
14	a public meeting that the NRC holds. We do not force
15	members of the public to identify themselves.
16	With that, we intend to conclude the phone
17	call. Are there any final comments?
18	(No response.)
19	MR. BOSKA: All right. We are signing
20	off, then. Goodbye.
21	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter was
22	concluded at 9:21 a.m.)