Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: 10 CFR 2.206 Petition Review Board

Byron Unit 2

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: (telephone conference)

Date: Wednesday, January 12, 2011

Work Order No.: NRC-661 Pages 1-16

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	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	10 CFR 2.206 PETITION REVIEW BOARD (PRB)
5	CONFERENCE CALL
6	RE
7	BYRON UNIT 2
8	+ + + +
9	WEDNESDAY
10	JANUARY 12, 2011
11	+ + + +
12	
13	The conference call was held, Ted Quay,
14	Chairman of the Petition Review Board, presiding.
15	
16	PETITIONER: BARRY QUIGLEY
17	
18	PETITION REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:
19	TED QUAY, Chairman, NRR/DPR
20	CHARLES NORTON, Petition Manager, NRR/DORL
21	STACEY ROSENBERG, On behalf of Tanya Mensah,
22	2.206 Coordinator
23	
24	
25	
26	NEAL R. GROSS

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2:30 p.m. MR. NORTON: Is Barry Quigley on line? MR. QUIGLEY: Yes, I am. MR. NORTON: Okay. I'd like to thank everybody for attending this meeting. 6 My name is Chuck Norton and I am a 8 Project Manager in the NRR Division of Operating Reactor Licensing. 10 We are here today to allow the Petitioner, Barry Quigley, to address the Petition 11

Review Board regarding the 2.206 Petition concerning Byron Unit 2, dated January 2nd of this year.

Mr. Quigley included David Lochbaum on the Petition distribution.

On January 6th of this year Mr. Lochbaum responded to Mr. Quigley's email and included Mr. Bill Borchardt, the EDO, on his email response.

From my discussion with Mr. Quigley on Friday January 7th of this year, the NRC's Petition Review Board will treat Mr. Lochbaum's response as a supplement to the Petition.

I am the Petition Manager. The Petition Review Board Chairman is Ted Quay.

As part of the Petition Review Board's,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

or PRB, review of this Petition, Barry Quigley has requested this opportunity to address the PRB. 2 This meeting is scheduled from 2:30 to 3 3:30 Eastern Time. The meeting is being recorded by the NRC's Operations Center and will be transcribed by a court reporter. The transcript will become a supplement to the Petition. This transcript will also 8 be made publicly available. 9 I'd like to open this meeting with 10 introductions. As we go around the room, please be 11 sure to clearly state your name, your position and the office that you work for within the NRC for the 12 13 record. 14 I'll start off. I'm Chuck Norton, Project Manager NRR in the Division of Operating 15 16 Reactor Licensing. 17 CHAIR QUAY: I'm Ted Quay, the Petition Review Chairman. I work in NRR in the Division of 18 19 Policy and Rulemaking. 20 MS. ROSENBERG: I'm Stacey Rosenberg. 21 I'm a Branch Chief in the Division of Policy and 22 Rulemaking. MR. FELIU: I'm Luis Feliu, Mechanical 23 24 Engineer in NRR, Division of Component Integrity

MR. BILLERBECK: I'm John Billerbeck, a

1	Mechanical Engineer in Division of Component
2	Integrity, Component Performance and Testing Branch
3	MR. McMURTRAY: I'm Tony McMurtray. I am
4	the Chief of the Component Performance and Testing
5	Branch in the Division of Component Integrity in the
6	Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.
7	MR. DiFRANCESCO: I am Nick DiFrancesco,
8	Project Manager on Braidwood and Byron. Division of
9	Operating Reactor Licensing.
10	MR. NORTON: We have completed the
11	introductions at NRC Headquarters. At this time, are
12	there any NRC participants from Headquarters on the
13	phone?
14	MS. JAMES: Yes. Lois James. I'm the NRR
15	Office Allegations Coordinator.
16	MR. NORTON: Are there any NRC
17	participants from the regional office on the phone?
18	MR. ORTH: Yes, there are. This is Steve
19	Orth. I'm the Regional Enforcement Officer out here
20	in NRC Region III.
21	MR. DUNCAN: And my name is Eric Duncan.
22	I'm the Branch Chief for the Divisional Reactor
23	Project here in Region III. I have oversight at both
24	Byron and Braidwood.
25	MR. HILLIARD: And I'm Jim Hilliard. I

1	am the Region III Allegation Coordinator.
2	MR. BARTLETT: Bruce Bartlett. Inspector
3	for Byron Station Region III. And John Robbins,
4	Resident Inspector, Byron Station Region III.
5	MR. NORTON: Are there any Exelon
6	representatives on the phone?
7	MR. ENRIGHT: Yes. At Byron Station we
8	have Dan Enright, the Site Vice President, Brad Adams
9	the Plant Manager, Ben Youman, Site Operations
10	Director, Elmer Hernandez, the Engineering Director,
11	Dave Gudger, the Regulatory Assurance Manager, Scot
12	Greenlee, Corporate Engineering Director, Patrick
13	Simpson, Corporate Licensing Manager and Darin
14	Benyak, Corporate Licensing Director.
15	MR. NORTON: Mr. Quigley, would you
16	please introduce yourself for the record?
17	MR. QUIGLEY: My name is Barry Quigley,
18	I'm the Petitioner. I work at the Byron Plant in the
19	Design Engineering Department.
20	MR. NORTON: Are there any other, such as
21	members of the public, on the phone.
22	MR. FERRARO: This is Don Ferraro, F-E-R-
23	R-A-R-O. I'm another Exelon representative calling
24	from Kennett Square, PA.
25	MR. NORTON: Is there anyone else

attending the meeting on the phone.

I'd like to emphasize that we each need to speak clearly and loudly to make sure that the court reporter can accurately transcript this meeting. If you do have something that you would like to say, please state your name first for the record.

For those dialing into the meeting, please 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 star 6. To unmute, press the star 6 keys again. Thank you.

AT this time I'll turn the meeting over to the Petition Review Chairman, Ted Quay.

CHAIR QUAY: Good afternoon. I am Ted Quay.

Welcome to this meeting regarding the 2.206 Petition submitted by Mr. Quigley.

I'd like to first 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 this evaluation, NRC could modify, suspend or revoke an NRC issued license or take any other appropriate enforcement action to resolve a problem.

The NRC staff guidance for the 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's initial consideration and recommendation.

This meeting is not a hearing, nor is it an opportunity for the Petitioner to question or examine the Petition Review Board on the merits or the 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.

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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 Petition Review Board 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.

Chuck Norton is the Petition Manager for the Petition under discussion today.

Tanya Mensah is the NRC's Office of
Petition Review Board Coordinator. Due to her
absence today, we have Stacey Rosenberg, her Branch
Chief filling in.

Our technical staff includes:

John Billerbeck from the Division of Component Integrity, Component Performance and Testing Branch.

Luis Feliu from the Division of Component Integrity, Component Performance and Testing Branch.

As described in our process, the NRC may ask clarifying questions in order to better understand the Petitioner's presentation and to reach

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

a reasoned decision whether to accept or reject the Petitioner's request for a review under the 2.206 process.

I would like to summarize the scope of the Petition under consideration and the NRC activities today.

On January 2, 2011, as supplemented by

David Lochbaum on January 6, 2011, Mr. Quigley

submitted to the NRC a Petition under 2.206 regarding

untimely Corrective Action and failure to follow

procedures at Exelon's Nuclear Byron Unit 2. In this

Petition request, Mr. Quigley identified the

following areas of concern:

- (1) Seat leakage past the Unit 2
 pressurizer safety valve, and the number on that
 valve is 2RY8010A, establishes conditions that could
 delay the time before the safety valve would be
 effective in reducing reactor coolant system
 pressure;
- (2) Leaking steam could cause internal temperature changes and result in valve lift pressures outside the allowable band;
- (3) The possible presence of two-phase leakage may alter the valve lift pressure since the flow characteristics in the huddling chamber would

NEAL R. GROSS

2

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

not be as designed;

- (4) The continuous operation of the pressurizer backup heaters on Unit 2 increases the pressurizer vapor space hydrogen concentration. The presence of increased noncondensible gases reduces heat transfer and could be preventing reformation of the loop seal;
- (5) There's an unwritten management expectation that issue reports will not be written until written assurances can be provided to

 Operations that the components are operable such that new issues have not been entered into the Corrective Action process;
- (6) The informal Exelon Differing
 Professional Opinion Program lacks the necessity
 necessary horsepower to shutdown a 1200 megawatt
 electric unit;
- (7) A constantly alarming tail pipe temperature alarm could mask safety valve degradation and delude the operators into thinking an open safety valve is closed following actuation with a failure to reclose, as happened at TMI;
- (8) As of January 2, 2011, the operability section of Issue Report IR-1144179 has not been completed contrary to the 24 hour procedural

requirement.

Mr. Quigley requests that the NRC issue the appropriate level of violation for failure to comply with 10 CFR Appendix B Criterion XVI as it applies to pressurizer safety valve 2RY8010A leakage, issue the appropriate level of violation for failure to document operability for Issue Report 1144179. As the basis for this request Mr. Quigley stated that high temperatures downstream of the Byron Unit 2 pressurizer safety valve 2RY8010A were noted in June of 2010. High tail pipe temperature alarm occurred and cleared over the summer, but the tail piece high temperature alarm has been in soldid without clearing since late October.

On October 24, 2010 Mr. Quigley wrote

Issue Report 113085 titled "Concerns with 2RY8010A

Operability". Mr. Quigley performed the operability

evaluation for the valve on October 29, 2010 and

selected November 29, 2010 as the Corrective Action

date, and provided reasons for selecting that date.

The Corrective Action date was subsequently changed

to February 7, 2011 without Mr. Quigley's input.

On November 23, 2010 Mr. Quigley wrote Issue Report 1144179 to disagree with 2RY8010A OP evaluation CA extension. In this Issue Report, Mr.

Quigley stated that he would withdraw his signature from the original operability evaluation effective midnight on November 29, 2010. Contrary to a procedural requirement to perform an operability evaluation within 24 hours on January 2, 2011 when this Petition was filed Issue Report 1144179 had not been reviewed for operability.

On January 6, 2011, Mr. Quigley requested the opportunity to address the Petition Review Board prior to its initial meeting. The purpose of today's meeting is to provide an opportunity for Mr. Quigley to discuss his Petition before the Petition Review Board.

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.

And at this time, I'd like to turn it over to you, Mr. Quigley.

MR. QUIGLEY: Thank you.

This is Barry Quigley.

One point in your summary you made mention about the informal DPO not having the horsepower. I have no issue with the DPO. That was

NEAL R. GROSS

provided as additional information, and it was not intended to be part of the Petition.

CHAIR QUAY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. QUIGLEY: Okay. You summarized it very well. The pressurizer safety valve has been leaking over the summer. I was concerned with it over the summer. I spent some amount of my own time looking into it, trending the date [data], talking to the other engineers about it. And then my concern started to grow, and I tried to find out when the safety valve would be replaced. And I was not able to get a clear answer of when the valve would be replaced.

I started doing quite a bit more research and, which led to my writing on October 24th last year of the IR-1130085. Prior to that, I fulfilled the unwritten management expectation when I wrote the IR, and provided what I thought would be reasonable arguments for operability. However, those took me about two weeks to develop before I wrote the Issue Report.

I asked that the IR led to a formal operability evaluation, which I anticipated would come to me, and this would allow me to have input into the replacing date that I couldn't get any

NEAL R. GROSS

information about.

I selected the date of November 29th for the reasons outlined in the Petition, and I would like to point out that that rationale is based on an NRC RIS for operability.

I selected a due date of 11/29, as I said. When I attempted to process the operability evaluation with that date I met with resistance on the part of management. It was all very professional, but it was resistance, nonetheless. I eventually stated that as the OP valve preparer, I would not sign the operability evaluation with a due date past November 29th. The date was agreed to, and I signed the operability evaluation.

Our process requires that this be a

Corrective Action in our CAP process. I was mistaken
in my belief in how a Corrective Action due date

could be changed, and it turns out that it doesn't

take a whole lot to change a Corrective Action due

date. And then when I found out that the date had

been changed to early February, I wrote the second

Issue Report.

Well, that is my additional clarifying information. And if anybody has any questions, I'd be happy to respond.

CHAIR QUAY: Thank you, Mr. Quigley. At this time does the staff here at 2 3 Headquarters have any questions for Mr. Quigley? Seeing none, does any NRC member on the phone, do NRC 5 staff and Headquarters? Lois, do you have any questions? 6 MS. JAMES: No, I don't. Thank you. 8 CHAIR QUAY: Okay. Does the Region III 9 staff have any questions? 10 MR. ORTH: No, we don't. Thank you. CHAIR QUAY: Okay. Before I conclude 11 12 this meeting, members of the public may provide 13 comments regarding the Petition and ask questions 14 about the 2.206 process. However, as stated at the 15 opening, the purpose of this meeting is not to provide an opportunity for the Petitioner or the 16 17 public to question or examine the Petition Review Board regarding the merits of the Petition request. 18 19 At this time, I didn't hear anybody else 20 join the call, but I will ask one more time if there 21 are any members of the public on. 22 Mr. Quigley, thank you for taking Okay. the time to provide the NRC staff with clarifying 23 24 information on the Petition you've submitted.

NEAL R. GROSS

Before we close, does the court reporter

1	need any additional information for the meeting
2	transcript?
3	CHAIR QUAY: Okay. One little
4	administration thing for everybody on the phone call.
5	Mr. Carlson, who is a Branch Chief in Reactor
6	Projects joined us. Okay.
7	Does Exelon have any questions for the
8	Petitioner?
9	MR. ENRIGHT: No, we do not.
10	CHAIR QUAY: Okay. Thank you.
11	And with that, I'm going to conclude the
12	meeting. And thank you for all involved.
13	(Whereupon, at 2:59 p.m. the Petition
14	Review Board Conference Call was adjourned.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	