# **Official Transcript of Proceedings**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title: 10 CFR 2.206 Petition RE

Palisades Nuclear Power Plant

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: (telephone conference)

Date: Monday, March 7, 2011

Work Order No.: NRC-774 Pages 1-28

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

	<u> </u>
1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	+ + + +
3	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
4	+ + + +
5	NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
6	+ + + +
7	PETITION REVIEW BOARD
8	DISCUSSION WITH PETITIONER
9	
10	In the Matter of: :
11	10 CFR 2.206 PETITION :
12	OF MICHAEL MULLIGAN :
13	WITH RESPECT TO :
14	PALISADES NUCLEAR PLANT :
15	
16	Monday, March 7, 2011
17	
18	The above-entitled conference convened via
19	teleconference, pursuant to notice, at 1:00 p.m.
20	Eastern Daylight Time.
21	BEFORE:
22	THEODORE QUAY, Petition Review Board Chairman
23	MAHESH CHAWLA, Petition Manager for 2.206 petition
24	TANYA MENSAH, Petition Coordinator
25	ANDREA RUSSELL, NRR/Division of Policy and Rulemaking
26	NEAL R. GROSS

1	NRC STAFF PRESENT:
2	MERRILEE BANIC, NRR/Generic Communications
3	Branch
4	JOHN CASSIDY, Region III
5	GREG CASTO, NRR/DSS/Balance-of-Plant Branch
6	JOHN ELLEGOOD, Senior Resident Inspector,
7	Palisades Nuclear Plant Region III
8	STEVEN GARRY, NRR/Health Physics and Human
9	Performance Branch
10	JACK GIESSNER, Region III/Division of Reactor
11	Projects/Branch IV
12	VIJAY GOEL, NRR/EEEB
13	MATTHEW HAMM, NRR/Technical Specifications
14	Branch
15	LOIS JAMES, NRR/EQVB
16	ROBERT LERCH, Region III/Division of Reactor
17	Projects/Branch IV
18	ROBERT PETTIS, NRR/DE/EQVB
19	KEVIN ROCHE, NRR/DIRS/IPAB
20	ANTHONY ULSES, NRR/DSS/Reactor Systems Branch
21	JAY WALLACE, NRR/DCI/Piping and NDE Branch
22	
23	ALSO PRESENT:
24	BARBARA DOTSON, Entergy Nuclear/Palisades
25	JIM KUEMIN, Entergy Nuclear/Palisades
26	NEAL R. GROSS  COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

(1:00 p.m.)

MR. CHAWLA: Good afternoon. I would like to thank everybody for attending this meeting. My name is Mac Chawla. And I am the Palisades Nuclear Plant Project Manager.

We are here today to allow the petitioner,
Mike Mulligan, to address the Petition Review Board
regarding the 2.206 petition dated February 22, 2011.

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

As far as the Petition Review Board's, or PRB's, review of this petition, Mike Mulligan has requested this opportunity to address the PRB. This meeting is scheduled from 1:00 to 2:00 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time.

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 would like to open this meeting with introductions. As you 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

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	record.
2	I will start off. Again, my name is Mac
3	Chawla. And I am the Petition Manager. We go around
4	here.
5	MR. GOEL: My name is Vijay Goel,
6	electrical engineer from the Office of Nuclear Reactor
7	Regulation, Electrical Engineering Branch.
8	MR. WALLACE: Jay Wallace, materials
9	engineer, NRR, Division of Component Integrity.
10	MS. RUSSELL: Andrea Russell, 2.206
11	Coordinator.
12	MS. JAMES: Lois James, Office Allegation
13	Coordinator, NRR.
14	CHAIRMAN QUAY: Ted Quay, Petition Review
15	Board Chairman, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.
16	MR. PETTIS: Bob Pettis, senior reactor
17	engineer, Division of Engineering, NRR.
18	MR. CASTO: Greg Casto, Balance-of-Plant
19	Branch Chief, Division of Safety Systems, NRR.
20	MR. ULSES: And this is Anthony Ulses, the
21	Branch Chief of the Reactor Systems Branch in the
22	Division of Safety Systems, NRR.
23	MS. BANIC: Lee Banic, Generic
24	Communications Branch, NRR.
25	MR. HAMM: Matthew Hamm, reactor systems

1	engineer, NRR Technical Specifications Branch.
2	MR. CHAWLA: Okay. We have completed
3	introductions at the NRC headquarters. At this time
4	are there NRC participants from headquarters on the
5	phone? Please introduce yourselves.
6	MS. MENSAH: Tanya Mensah, NRR.
7	MR. CHAWLA: Steven Garry, I believe you
8	are on. Steve Garry? Steve Garry, are you on the
9	phone?
10	MR. GARRY: Yes, Steve Garry is on the
11	phone, senior health physicist, NRR.
12	MR. CHAWLA: Okay. Anybody else from
13	headquarters on the phone?
14	(No response.)
15	MR. CHAWLA: I believe that is all we
16	have. Are there any NRC participants from the
17	regional office on the phone? Please introduce
18	yourself.
19	MR. LERCH: All right. My name is Robert
20	Lerch. I'm the project engineer for Branch IV in
21	Region III.
22	MR. GIESSNER: Jack Giessner, Branch
23	Chief, Region III, responsible for inspections at
24	Palisades.
25	MR. CASSIDY: John Cassidy, senior health

1	physicist in the Division of Reactor Safety, Region
2	III.
3	MR. LERCH: That's it for the region.
4	MR. ELLEGOOD: This is John Ellegood,
5	senior resident inspector for the NRC at Palisades.
6	MR. CHAWLA: Are there any representatives
7	for the licensee on the phone?
8	MR. KUEMIN: Jim Kuemin from Palisades
9	Licensing Department.
10	MS. DOTSON: And also Barb Dotson,
11	Palisades Licensing.
12	MR. CHAWLA: Okay. I believe that's it
13	for the licensee. Mr. Mulligan, would you please
14	introduce yourself for the record?
15	MR. MULLIGAN: I'm Mike Mulligan. And I
16	had a 2.206 back a little while ago on the fuel pool.
17	And I am a whistle-blower. I have been involved with
18	a lot of whistle-blowing activities. And I was
19	worked as I was in submarines. And then I worked
20	at a nuclear power plant as a reactor operator. And
21	thank you.
22	MR. CHAWLA: It is not required for
23	members of the public to introduce themselves for this
24	call. However, if there are any members of the public
25	on the phone that wish to do so at this time please

state your name for the record.

2

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(No response.)

MR. CHAWLA: Hearing none, I believe there is no members of the public here.

I would like to emphasize that we each need to speak clearly and loudly to make sure that the Court Reporter can accurately transcribe this meeting. If you do have something that you would like to say, please first state your name 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 \*6. To unmute, press the \*6 key again. Thank you.

At this time I will turn it over to the PRB Chairman, Mr. Ted Quay.

CHAIRMAN QUAY: Good afternoon. Welcome to this meeting regarding the 2.206 petition submitted by Mr. Mulligan. I would like to first share some background on our process.

Section 2.206 of Title X 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

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

the NRC to take enforcement-type action related to NRC licensees or licensed activities. Depending upon the results of its 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 on the disposition of 2.206 petition requests is a 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 the 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 at the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

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 I am Ted Quay, the Petition Review Board Chairman. Mac Chawla is the Petition Manager for the petition under discussion today. Andrea Russell is the 2.206 Coordinator. Our technical staff includes Greg Casto, Branch Chief from the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation's Balance-of-Plant Branch; Tony Ulses, Branch Chief from the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation's Reactor Systems Branch; Lois James, Senior Office Allegation Coordinator from NRR's Quality and Vendor Branch; Bob Pettis, senior reactor engineer from NRR's Quality and Vendor Branch; Vijay Goel, electrical engineer from NRR's Electrical Engineering Branch; Jay Wallace, material engineer from NRR's Piping and NDE Branch; Matt Hamm, reactor systems engineer from NRR's Technical Specification Branch; Steven Garry, senior health physicist from NRR's Health Physics and Human Performance Branch; Jack Giessner, Branch Chief, Branch IV from Region III, Division of Reactor Projects; Bob Lerch, project

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

engineer, Branch IV from Region III's Division of Reactor Projects; and John Ellegood, senior resident inspector, Palisades Nuclear Plant from Region III.

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 the petitioner's request 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 February 22nd, 2011, Mr. Mulligan submitted to the NRC a petition under the 2.206 process regarding Palisades Nuclear Plant located in Van Buren County, Michigan.

In his petition request, Mr. Mulligan identified the following areas of concern. Mr. Mulligan stated that the reactor oversight program is ineffective and Entergy has a documented history of a culture of falsification and thumbing their noses at recurring violations.

In his petition, Mr. Mulligan requested the following actions: one, immediate shutdown of Palisades and other Entergy nuclear power plants; two, replacement of top Palisades management staff; three,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

replacement of Entergy corporate nuclear staff; four, assignment of two additional NRC inspectors at Palisades; five, formation of a local public oversight panel around every plant; six, formation of an emergency NRC senior official oversight panel; seven, formation of a national NRC oversight public panel; eight, analysis of Entergy's reoccurring problems; and, nine, evaluation of NRC Region III resources.

As the basis for this request, Mr.

Mulligan cited various plant events/issues, which

could be divided into the following categories: one,

equipment failures; two, documentation or design basis

concerns; three, radiation protection; four, records

falsification; and, five, reactor oversight process.

Allow me to discuss the NRC activities to date. On February 24th, 2011, Mr. Mulligan requested an opportunity to address the Petition Review Board by phone.

On March 2nd, 2011, Mr. Mulligan made an additional request to speak to an NRC official regarding the general state of conditions at Palisades prior to addressing the PRB.

On March 3rd, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the request for immediate action only. The PRB denied the request for immediate action because

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

there were no immediate safety concerns to the plant or to health and safety of the public.

On March 4th, 2011, the Petition Review Board's decision was conveyed to Mr. Mulligan. Mr. Mulligan was also informed that the request to speak to an NRC official was outside the 2.206 process and he would have the opportunity during the phone call with the PRB to address his concerns and provide additional information.

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 point I will turn it over to you, Mr. Mulligan.

MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you. Thank you for this opportunity this afternoon. I hope I am talking loud enough that people can hear me.

CHAIRMAN QUAY: We can hear you fine.

MR. MULLIGAN: The first, this is -- well, this is the second H. B. Robinson plant this year or within the last year or so and stuff, Wolf Creek. And I'm reading this from the Professional Reactor Operator Society. And it's about Wolf Creek recent

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

inspection findings. "Based on the recent results of the inspections, the NRC" -- this is -- PROS just came out with this today. Based on the recent results of the inspections, the NRC identified 11 violations. A number of findings" -- well, we won't go into that, but there's a lot of stuff there.

The NRC -- and here is a comment by Bob Meyer, who is the head honcho of PROS, "The industry needs to get a grip on poor procedures, procedure backlogs or an event could occur that will halt any nuclear construction in this country."

He goes on to list all of the findings of that Wolf Creek event or inspection thing. And he goes on to say, "The procedure exists. The procedure issues exist at every plant out there. The NRC and INPO executives have been informed of the fleet not controlling backlogs and procedures. The numbers of issues point towards an event, a significant event if you did not get procedures backlogs under control."

You know, H. B. Robinson basically was an event that, you know, really, there were so many things involved in there, training, equipment problems, simulator fidelity. You know, it's just mind-boggling.

But I listen to you guys, you NRC guys,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

identify yourselves. All I can think about, your college education, I mean, all the years you -- you know, collectively it's tremendous and all the experience that you have around these plants and stuff like that. You know, I know you guys are really smart and educated and stuff like that. And it's astonishing.

And the H. B. Robinson event was, you know, a couple of little more problems than you might have had at the TMI event. Basically this Wolf Creek kind of they went to a shutdown. They got into all sorts of troubles, simulator fidelity problems, procedure problems, problems with the license operators and stuff like that.

I mean, hey, there's something going on here. A lot of people recognize it. And that is what I have been trying to do, is to get everybody's attention and stop fiddling around and fix the problems and stuff like that.

I mean, I have talked a lot on this 2.206 about Vermont Yankee. It's all basically the same thing. And, you know, there's -- typically with all of us, you know, our country sets limit. If you go past the law, there's usually a punishment. There's some sort of activity that is done to us that forces

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

us to engage the problem. You know, there's a punishment. And then, finally, we get it. Either we pay a terrible price or we recognize that we have been wrong and there is something about what we think of ourselves as wrong. And we realize we have to change ourselves. You know?

The way you guys handle it is you get into problems or you get into a set of issues. And then the next thing you do is you think that in order to fix it, you've got to write another rule or you've got to ramp up complexity, you've got to put it into the RCA or to corrective actions, you've got to sit there, write more rules and procedures.

You are paper-whipping, I think. You paper whip. You are paper-whipping people with more rules and laws that are generally not enforced. And there's -- you know, there's just not enough.

Something is not put in front of you where you sit there and you say, "Wow." You know, something is going on, and I've got to change my ways.

And that is what I am trying to get at with Palisades and Vermont Yankee also and stuff.

When are we really going to come to our senses? You know, this thing isn't an endeavor to make profits.

It's not only that. There's so much riding on this.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Twenty percent of our electricity is produced by nuclear power. If we was to lose confidence in the nuclear industry, it's bad enough in this environment where nobody trusts government. You know, it's mind-boggling the consequences if we lost numerous plans because, you know, we lost confidence and people telling us the truth.

We got, you know, potentially the new nukes coming on and stuff like that. And, you know, I tell you right now if the NRC is -- this mealy-mouthed stuff keeps going on and especially reactor construction and if they don't nip it in the bud and if they're not tough, we've going into the 1970s all over again. It's going to be the same thing. You're going to go hide behind your closed doors and debate the procedures until it is sickening. They're going to build the plants out.

Then you're going to say, "Oh. Well, we"

-- then there's going to be a public response. And

then the next thing you know, you know, everybody is

doing the same thing they did in the '70s, you know,

adding on components after the fact and just barely

getting the plants online if they're lucky and stuff.

So there's a lot of things on the line here. And we've seen -- you know, typically a lot of

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

these institutional problems, you know, we see them.

Before the accident, we consider them walking on

water. We consider them -- it's a falsification

because if we knew what it really was before the

accident what was going on, we would stop it. We

would step in there with authority and power. And we

would get their attention. And they would change

their ways.

So like the Gulf of Mexico, you know, beforehand, BP was -- well, we knew in the background a lot of other activities BP was doing. You know, nothing surprised us. But with the Gulf, we thought they were walking on water. They were doing everything right. Most of the public bought that and stuff like that.

And the pattern always is after the accident, after the billions of dollars after we pick up the body parts, we discover retroactively that it was a garbage pit and stuff. And this happened at all of our institutional accidents from NASA to Katrina, our economic troubles with Washington and stuff like that.

We don't recognize the situation beforehand and turn the direction of the industry.

It's a falsification. We don't identify what is going

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

on, clearly document it, clearly explain what is going on to the public, and give us the opportunity to interact with our environment and stuff like that.

And then after the accident, you know, then the Blue Ribbon Commission and all that sort of stuff comes out. And you find out that it was a train wreck before the accident. I mean, it was clear and obvious to everybody a train wreck was coming or, you know, the information kind of tells you they have to know that a train wreck was on the way.

Why didn't they stop it? Why aren't they thinking about our country and what is best for all of us? How come? This can't make sense all these kinds of accidents happening and we just let it happen.

It's not like they come out of nowhere. We discover after this terrible accident that the system was -- it was a garbage dump.

Repetitive things happen over and over again. And the thing that made them finally -- the things finally gave out, you know, gave out before, many times, and had problems. And people just ignored it. But that's the message that I am trying to get across.

Again, you know, procedures and rules and federal regulations and congressional intent and stuff

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

like that, I mean, you can look at these things in two different ways. You can say, "I'm going to use my authority. And I'm going to use the rules and regulation, the tools that the United States needs to be in the United Sates, the country. And I'm going to use them for a good intent or I'm going to use them for self-interest intent." You know what I'm saying?

I mean, just because you're following the rules doesn't say it's right. Just because you're following the procedure doesn't say it's right.

We're astonishing, smart people, all of us, and stuff. You know, I've studied a lot about the brain and the stuff that goes on inside our brains and the different levels in our brain that work altogether. They've got specific areas. Then they're all connected holistically and they operate the same kind of -- it's amazing how smart we are and even the stupid ones, the most stupid ones, of us.

I'm not making fun of disability or anything like that, but we're astonishing, our ability to do things and set the course right and figure out who we finally are and then do the right thing.

You know, I've seen this so many different times. I see the worst. And I also see the astonishing ability that us humans have to be smart,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

to figure out the small events that are erupting and to interact with it and make our lives better. What is going on now is -- I don't know what we're doing. We're following the rules.

What is that new movie that just came out,
The Adjustment Bureau or whatever it is, and stuff
like that, where a man and a woman meet each other and
they start liking each other and then The Adjustment
Bureau doesn't want them to stay together, get to know
each other because it will change the course of
history.

Well, you know -- and then you find out they're just following the rules, right? These guys, these Adjustment Bureau people, saints if you want to call them that, are just following the rules. And nobody knows why they are following the rules. And, you know, they're happy following the rules but why? To what end and stuff? And, you know, we follow the rules to make our lives better. And we have to start thinking about that, the rules, regulations, procedures, and stuff.

We're better than what this shows, what the stuff with Palisades shows and Vermont Yankee and Entergy and H. B. Robinson. I mean, I don't know.

With everybody's education and stuff, we're better

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

than what is going on here in the nuclear industry.

And we've got so much consequences up in front of us if we don't screw our heads on right.

We're either losing our fleet now or having an energy problem. And when it gets deep enough that we have to -- a false sense in the nuclear industry more that we're not going to be prepared. We're not going to have the credibility to do what is in our national interest.

You know, people call me anti-nuke and stuff like that, but, you know, I am an anti-nuke. Sometimes I'm the best and the most pro-nuclear person in the United States because I am just trying to do what is right and bring attention to what is going on here.

And to figure out -- you know, Entergy has to kind of figure out what is going on with all of these plants. They have to be forthright about it and explain to us what is going on so we all have a role and a fix on what is going on and stuff.

You know, we live in the United States.

We are an open democracy. We are supposed to not be hidden behind barriers. What makes our country great, one thing is our Constitution. And that allows us to see what is going on in the government. And I think

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

that is a way of life.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You know, we are not supposed to be hidden by corporate secrecy and individual secrecy. What makes our nation great is everybody can see what is going on. I know we are kind of a little bit bound, but I'm telling you that is what is beautiful about the United States is transparency, being able to see everything, being involved in our nation and every component of it, our energy and stuff.

And a lot of this stuff seems to be more and more from us, and we can't see what is going on.

And we can't help you guys if we can't see what is going on. We can't help you guys straighten out.

And I think that is part of the role of being in the United States, that, you know, you have private enterprise and we get to see what is going on. And we kind of make a decision on the direction of our nation and stuff. And, you know, I worry about that we can't see what is going on anymore.

And, you know, I have done this 2.206 business so many times. You know what my big problem is. I don't have access to the real facts. Sometimes I hear it from employees. Most of the times I read the inspection report and stuff like that.

But I know I am only getting five percent

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

of the world as far as I worked in the industry. I know more than most, you know, what the 95 percent of the stuff that is going on that is not reported and stuff like that. I know that. And I'm sure the NRC knows that they are only getting a view of five percent of the utilities world. I know that it is just too complicated.

And I want everybody to be aware we don't have a perfect vision of what is going on in the Palisades plant. And that worries me because I think if we knew what was going on, number one, Entergy would behave better.

Number two, if we knew what was going on, we would make them straighten out not because we hate them or we're punishing them or they're on them but because we all want to be -- we all want to belong to a country and we all want to be doing better and doing well. I mean, that is my vision of the United States.

So, you know, I never -- you know, the VT-2 bothers me particularly with this, the VT-2. Your last inspection report, you had a VT-2 inspection. They didn't do the inspection according to ASME. That is the visual inspection on the reactor vessel or the control rod drive mechanisms. And then the next inspection report, they're having procedure

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

problems on the VT-2.

You know, like I said, most plants take pictures of all of this. And so, you know, you have got a visual representation of what is going on.

I didn't read it. Like I told you, I've seen at other plants they take pictures. And I'm surprised that with Palisades, they're not taking pictures of the inspection of the core, stuff like that.

You know, there's a feeling I have that if you -- like me. I live my personal life. I'm pretty transparent. You know, I explain what's going on.

I'll tell you the stupid things I'm doing and stuff.

You know, I think that's a better way to live.

And then people give me feedback and stuff like that or they do. And some of it I fling over my shoulder. Other stuff I listen to it. I think that's the best way to be is to be open and honest and interact with everybody, listen to everybody's point of view, plus and minus, and take a ton of that.

You know, hiding, even if hiding is according to the rules, I don't think that's good for us. I think that allows us to do things that we wouldn't normally do if people could see us. If we had the idea that, "Oh, the whole community is going

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

to be watching me doing this VT-2 inspection, I'll damn well get it straight. I damn well will get it straight and look at the procedures and know my stuff before I get out there and make an idiot of myself."

I just think this sense of secrecy for a host of reasons and stuff like that, you know, some of it is good, but I think it's gone so far overboard nobody can see what is going on. And I think that is the problem, a lot of the problem.

My wish is that everybody would come to their senses, especially the NRC. We think that they are criticized because of -- they're an independent agency. In other words, they ain't worried about the President. They are worried about a couple of congressmen flailing around in the media and a couple of House members holding up their budgets and intimidating NRC commissioners. We think that the framework makes the NRC more beholding to these pipsqueak senators and House of Representatives people than if they were if they were under the Executive Branch.

So, you know, I think that the framework of an independent agency -- you know, that was all made during another era. And it was a dirty era. And I think we would be better honestly if the agency was

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	under the Executive Branch.
2	So I'm hoping everybody comes to their
3	senses, Entergy and the NRC, and, you know, hope for
4	that day that everybody would come to their senses and
5	we would have something out there that we would all be
6	proud of. We would all say, you know, "We did it" or
7	"We came back from so far. And we were so deep in the
8	hole. And we came back such a long distance. And
9	we're so strong now."
10	So, anyways, I thank you very much for
11	giving me this opportunity. I hope you listen to me.
12	Thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN QUAY: Okay. At this time does
14	anyone here at headquarters have any questions for Mr.
15	Mulligan?
16	(No response.)
17	CHAIRMAN QUAY: Does any of the
18	headquarters staff on the phone have any questions for
19	Mr. Mulligan?
20	MR. GARRY: No, Steve Garry does not.
21	CHAIRMAN QUAY: Okay. What about the
22	region? Does the region have any questions for Mr.
23	Mulligan?
24	MR. GIESSNER: Jack Giessner. No
25	questions from the region at this time.

27 CHAIRMAN QUAY: Okay. Before I conclude the meeting, members of the public may provide comments regarding the petition and ask questions about the 2.206 process. However, as stated at the opening, the purpose of this meeting is not to provide an opportunity for the petitioner or the public to question or examine the Petition Review Board regarding the merits of the petition request. Is there any member of the public that wishes to make a comment? (No response.) CHAIRMAN QUAY: I don't think any were identified, but I heard some beeps. I don't know if

someone got on.

Okay. Mr. Mulligan, thank you for taking time to provide the NRC staff with clarifying information on the petition you have submitted.

Before we close, does the Court Reporter need any additional information for the meeting transcript?

THE REPORTER: Hi. This is the Court I just want to provide Mr. Chawla with my Reporter. e-mail address so he can send me a list of the participants.

> MR. CHAWLA: Okay. Please. I will go

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	ahead and write it down.
2	THE REPORTER: Okay. My e-mail address is
3	kjgamin@gmail.com.
4	MR. CHAWLA: Okay. Let me just repeat
5	it Kjgamin@gmail.com?
6	THE REPORTER: That's right.
7	MR. CHAWLA: Okay. I will provide you the
8	list of the people, participants here.
9	THE REPORTER: Thank you.
10	MR. CHAWLA: Okay. Thanks.
11	CHAIRMAN QUAY: With that, then, this
12	meeting is concluded. And we will be terminating the
13	phone connection.
14	MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you very much.
15	CHAIRMAN QUAY: Thank you.
16	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter was
17	concluded at 1:37 p.m.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	