Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title:

10 CFR 2.206 Petition Review Board

RE Vermont Yankee

Docket Number:

(n/a)

Location:

(telephone conference)

Date:

Wednesday, June 15, 2011

Work Order No.:

NRC-955

Pages 1-27



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 | VERMONT YANKEE |
| 8 | + + + + |
| 9 | WEDNESDAY |
| 10 | JUNE 15, 2011 |
| 11 | + + + + |
| 12 | |
| 13 | The conference call was held, Michael Cheok, |
| 14 | Chairperson of the Petition Review Board, presiding. |
| 15 | |
| 16 | PETITIONER: MICHAEL MULLIGAN |
| 17 | |
| 18 | PETITION REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS |
| 19 | MICHAEL CHEOK, Deputy Director, Division of Risk |
| 20 | Assessment, NRR, Chairman |
| 21 | JAMES KIM, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, |
| 22 | NRR, Petition Manager |
| 23 | MERRILEE BANIC, Division of Policy and Rulemaking, |
| 24 | NRR, PRB Coordinator |
| 25 | |

| 1 | NRC HEADQUARTERS STAFF |
|----|----------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | MUHAMMED RAZZAQUE, Division of Safety Systems, NRR |
| 3 | NANCY SALGADO, Branch Chief, Division of Operating |
| 4 | Reactor Licensing, NRR |
| 5 | |
| 6 | ALSO PRESENT |
| 7 | JIM DEVINCENTIS, Entergy Nuclear Operations |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

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

| 2 | 9:59 a.m. |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------|
| 3 | MR. KIM: Good morning. I'd like to thank |
| 4 | everybody for attending this meeting. My name is |
| 5 | James Kim and I'm the Vermont Yankee Project Manager. |
| 6 | We are here today to allow the Petitioner, |
| 7 | Mr. Michael Mulligan, to address the Petition Review |
| 8 | Board regarding 2.206 petition dated March 17, 2011. |
| 9 | I'm the Petition Manager for the petition. |
| 10 | The Petition Review Board Chairman is Michael Cheok. |
| 11 | As part of the Petition Review Board's |
| 12 | review of this petition, Mr. Michael Mulligan has |
| 13 | requested this opportunity to address the PRB. This |
| 14 | meeting is scheduled from 10 to 11 a.m. The meeting |
| 15 | is being recorded by the NRC Operations Center and |
| 16 | will be transcribed by a court reporter. |
| 17 | The transcript will become a supplement to |
| 18 | the petition. The transcript will also be made |
| 19 | publicly available. |
| 20 | I'd like to open this meeting with |
| 21 | introductions. As we go around the room, please be |
| 22 | sure to clearly state your name, your position, and |
| 23 | the office that you work for within the NRC for the |
| 24 | record. |

25

I'm

| | a Project Manager in the Division of Operating Reactor |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | Licensing in NRR. |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN CHEOK: I'm Mike Cheok, the |
| 4 | Division Director in the Division of Risk Analysis in |
| 5 | NRR. |
| 6 | MS. BANIC: Merrilee Banic, Division |
| 7 | Coordinator, NRR. |
| 8 | MR. KIM: At this time, are there any NRC |
| 9 | participants from the headquarters on the phone? |
| 10 | MR. RAZZAQUE: Muhammed Razzaque from |
| 11 | Reactor Systems Branch, NRR. |
| 12 | MR. KIM: Are there any NRC participants |
| 13 | from the regional office on the phone? |
| 14 | (No response.) |
| 15 | MR. KIM: Are there any representatives |
| 16 | for the licensee on the phone? |
| 17 | MR. DEVINCENTIS: Yes, this is Jim |
| 18 | Devincentis, Entergy Nuclear Operations. |
| 19 | MR. KIM: Mr. Mulligan, will you please |
| 20 | introduce yourself for the record? |
| 21 | PETITIONER MULLIGAN: I'm Mike Mulligan. |
| 22 | I live in Hinsdale, New Hampshire and I'm a |
| 23 | whistleblower. |
| 24 | MR. KIM: Thank you. |
| 25 | MS. SALGADO: Nancy Salgado, Branch Chief |
| | |

in DORL. 1 2 MR. KIM: Are there any other such members 3 of the public on the phone? 4 (No response.) 5 It is not required for members of the 6 public introduce themselves for this call. 7 However, if there are any members of the public on the 8 phone that wish to do so at this time, please state 9 your name for the record? 10 Hearing none, I'd like to emphasize that 11 we each need to speak clearly and loudly to make sure 12 that the court reporter can accurately transcribe this 13 meeting. If you do have something that you would like 14 to say please first state your name for the record. 15 For those dialing into the meeting, please 16 remember to mute your phone to minimize any background 17 noise or distractions. If you do not have a mute button this can be done by pressing the keys *6. 18 19 unmute, press the *6 keys again. Thank you. At this time, I'll turn it over to the PRB 20 Chairman, Michael Cheok. 21 22 CHAIRMAN CHEOK: Good morning again. 23 Welcome to this meeting regarding this 2.206 petition

Ι

would

like

to

24

25

submitted by Mr. Mulligan.

First,

some

share

| 1 | background on our process. Section 2.206 of Title 10 |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | of the Code of Federal Regulations describes the |
| 3 | petition process, the primary mechanism for the public |
| 4 | to request enforcement action for the NRC in a public |
| 5 | process. This process permits anyone to petition NRB |
| 6 | to take enforcement-type action related to NRC |
| 7 | licensees or licensed activities. Depending on the |
| 8 | results of its evaluation, NRC could modify, suspend, |
| 9 | or revoke an NRC-issued license or take any other |
| 10 | appropriate enforcement action to resolve a problem. |
| 11 | The NRC staff's guidance for the disposition of 2.206 |
| 12 | petition requests is in Management Directive 8.11, |
| 13 | which is publicly available. |
| 14 | The purpose of today's meeting is to give |
| 15 | the Petitioner an opportunity to provide any |
| 16 | additional explanation or support for the petition |
| 17 | after the Petition Review Board's initial |
| | |

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

consideration and recommendation.

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

Following this meeting, the Petition

NEAL R. GROSS

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| 1 | Review Board will conduct its internal deliberations. |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | The outcome of this internal meeting will be discussed |
| 3 | with the Petitioners. |
| 4 | The Petition Review Board typically |
| 5 | consists of a Chairman, usually a manager at the |
| 6 | Senior Executive Service level at the NRC. It has a |
| 7 | Petition Manager and a PRB Coordinator. Other members |
| 8 | of the Board are determined by the NRC staff based on |
| 9 | the content of the information in the petition |
| 10 | request. |
| 11 | At this time, I would like to introduce |
| 12 | the Board. |
| 13 | I am Michael Cheok, the Petition Review |
| 14 | Board Chairman. |
| 15 | James Kim is the Petition Manager for the |
| 16 | petition under discussion today. |
| 17 | Merilee Banic is the Office PRB |
| 18 | Coordinator. |
| 19 | Our technical staff includes Muhammed |
| 20 | Razzaque from Office of Reactor Systems Branch and |
| 21 | Thomas Setzer from the NRC's Region I, Division of |
| 22 | Reactor Projects. |
| 23 | As described in our process, the NRC staff |
| 24 | may ask clarifying questions in order to better |
| 25 | 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.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Next, I would like to summarize the scope of the petition under consideration and the NRC's activities to date. On March 17, 2011, Mr. Mulligan submitted to the NRC a petition under 2.206 concerning the use of Buna-N material instead of the originally used silicon for the traded seals of the main steam safety relief valves.

In this petition request, Mr. Mulligan (1) requested Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Plant and all Entergy Nuclear Plants to be immediately shut down; (2) requested to replace the O-ring Buna-N material with silicon; (3) requested an investigation on onesafety-related replacement parts program before startup and throughout Entergy and to consider Entergy's QAQC investigation; (4) requested an outside NRC investigation of this NRC behavior for tolerating this atrocious regulatory behavior; (5) requested top Vermont Yankee staff to be fired and replaced before startup; (6) requested Entergy's corporate nuclear senior staff be fired and replaced before the restart of the plants; (7) requested the formation of a local public oversight panel around every plant; (8)

requested an emergency NRC senior official oversight panel with the aims of reforming the ROP for the reactor oversight process; (9) requested a national NRC oversight panel of outsiders to oversee and to report to the Agency's activities. That there should be a mixture of professional/academic people and capable lay people. (10) Stated that there is some heavy-duty and exceedingly numerous findings of problems with Entergy plants during the inspection reporting cycle and to do an analysis of why this is occurring.

Next, allow me to discuss the NRC's activities to date. On March 29, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the request for immediate action of emergency shutdown of Vermont Yankee. The PRB denied the request for immediate action because there was no immediate safety concerns to the plant or to the health and safety of the public.

On March 30, 2011, you were informed of the PRB's decision on immediate action. Next on April 26, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition. The PRB's initial recommendation is that the petition meets the criteria for rejection because the issues raised have already been the subject of NRC's fact review and resolution has been achieved.

Entergy performed a replacement of the 1 2 traded seals prior to restart from a refueling outage 3 in April 2011. Further analysis was performed by Entergy and the condition was reported in accordance 4 5 with 10 CFR 50.73. The review of the LER was documented in 6 7 our first quarter inspection report and a less-thanminor, non-cited violation on this was issued and was 8 identified in our biennial PI&R which the Problem 9 Identification and Resolution Report. 10 11 On June 6, 2011, you were informed of the PRB's initial recommendation and you requested another 12 13 opportunity to address the PRB to provide any comments on the PRB's initial recommendation which is the 14 15 purpose of today's call. 16 As a reminder to all phone participants, please identify yourself if you make any remarks and 17 this will help us in the preparation of the meeting 18 transcript and will be made publicly available. Thank 19 20 you. 21 Mr. Mulligan, I'll turn it over to you to 22 allow you to provide any information you believe the PRB should consider at this part of the petition. 23 24 PETITIONER MULLIGAN: Mr. Cheok, boy,

you'd be an interesting person to talk to outside of

this thing because you must be a neat guy on risk perspective. I certainly don't have a handle on that anyways.

The recent allegation I made with the Browns Ferry red finding and this is a quote from the NRC in return to me: "In regards to your issue with potential falsification οf documents, NRC characterized the subject License Event Report as inaccurate." Generally, I think what I'm going to say right here is expressions like a model is really outside the individuals, but it expresses an NRC model of cultural traits and attributes and I think you see it up in the Commissioners' Office. I think you see it at Vermont Yankee and with these issues and stuff. And -- so this -- I'm all confused now.

(Pause.)

So this is with Chairman Jaczko with the OIG investigation, appears to have violated federal laws requiring the NRC chair to keep fellow Commissioners fully and currently informed about important matters before the Commission. This was what I've picked out by the media, was unprofessional and wrong as he repeatedly misled fellow Commissioners about his efforts to stop work on a disputed dump for high-level radioactive waste and Agency watchdogs.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Chairman Jaczko manipulated the panels for other Commissioners by selectively withholding information on a critical safety review of Yucca Mountain. OIG Bell, it's not an upfront way to do business, to keep fellow Commissioners fully and currently informed about important matters before the Commission.

Commissioner Jaczko has an obligation under law to fully inform the Commissioners. Barton told Bell, "You in your own report indicates that you did not fully inform." The Commissioners said had they known they would have taken preemptive actions to prevent what he did. He violated the law indicating that Jaczko intimidated his staff who he disregarded and withheld information from NRC members in an effort to stop Yucca Mountain. Often lost his temper with NRC Commissioners and staff members, selectively administered Commissioners' overseas travel.

You know, I see employees up in the control room, you know, and I see all this playing out, you know. These guys, you might have an employee up there worried about penny-pinching, corporate penny-pinching and you might have issues that change the outcome of the plant or even the Agency and he's sitting up there saying look at how the Commissioners

are -- the head Commissioner, all the rest of them are playing these word games and these rule games. You know, this certainty, uncertainty gaming, essentially either engineering or restricting information or rules, selective application of rules.

You see that and you see the poor son of a bitch up in the control room with his heart hanging out and he wants to say something and he sits there and he says, you know, if I say something that pisses everybody off in the industry, because everybody is so loose with integrity and truth-telling, how do I stand a chance to survive if I say what everybody doesn't want me to say? How do I survive in this atmosphere?

You know, I really think a lot of employees feel that way when they see this stuff going on. And I think it's a big problem.

Here's a time line on this, on the safety release Buna -- the thread seal was manufactured in 2002, you know. I wonder what the shelf life is, the service life is on that guy? Anyways, and applied to VY in 2008, it was installed in 2008.

The LER, the event date was September 25, 2010. They submitted the LER on December 22, 2010. The updated LER was submitted on January 2011. I mean, you know, here we are in June and stuff, and you

still have that equipment in the plant. I mean from 2008, the big deal was -- remember talking about Browns Ferry and LERs and accuracy and stuff like that? This is all crazy talk what's going on here as far as being able to express yourself in LERs, the declarations and documents and stuff like that, you know?

Why couldn't -- the way I would see it is the mythical perfect disclosure or LER would be Vermont Yankee nudges the NRC and says you know, we got a problem with these relief valve actuators. The company that we use doesn't have the right quality material. They're talking us into using a lesser quality set of components or actuator and stuff like that. What do you think? And then the NRC would, you know, would write up something about it and you know, but this should happen before. This should happen before 2008 and stuff. And it had been up-front on the Internet and then people could look over that and scrutinize what you're doing and stuff like that and give a sense of, you know, a sense of honesty and fairness with the operation of Vermont Yankee.

Worse comes to worse, you know, they went into that outage and they didn't have the right stuff, and the vendor talked them into using a bad component

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and stuff like that. You would assume -- I mean the perfect thing was in the very next -- you would assume the LER would have talked about everything that went on with that, you know, as far as it was the wrong quality material. The vendor kind of bum-doped them and stuff like that and they would have fully explained that rather quickly. If worse came to worse, the very next inspection report, you think the NRC would have had inspectors, you know, look over that and document what went on there. And documented that it was a lesser quality Type 2 actuator than the original design of the Type 1 and stuff and you know, then it would have been scrutinizable for the public. People could have gotten a feeling, you know, well, you know, this is kind of shady stuff, but at least they're honest about it.

Here, we sit out here, you know, almost three years later and there's still bad components in that plant. I mean this is all crazy stuff. I'm certain that everybody has followed the procedures and stuff like that. Do you hear what Jaczko says? You know, they don't have to follow the procedures. He didn't follow the procedures. He gets a choice whether to follow the NRC procedures. He admitted that. What does that say for everybody else in the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

do that kind of stuff, and not have an understanding how important procedures are, or if you have to do something different you acknowledge it. You document it and you show it to everybody. This is what I'm doing, you know? I have to do it this way now because of this reason and everybody gets an understanding. This underhandedness stuff has got to stop. It's craziness, not expressing, not disclosing things, right off the bat, without the games, without the funny talk, without your procedures that allow you to lie and deceive and be deceptive and stuff like this. It's got to stop. The consequences are too huge to keep going like this.

industry? If the Chairman can say that kind of -- and

So the inspection report, right off the bat, express everything the best you can, the mythical perfect inspection report, everything is upfront and stuff like that. That's the only way these big bureaucracies work is if you get it in a document the first time.

You know, it's interesting, the NRC just June 14th, they just submitted the cultural policy statement, the new cultural policy statement and positive safety cultural traits. I think it's the second one. Problem identification and resolution,

issues potentially impacting safety are promptly identified, fully evaluated and promptly addressed and corrected commensurate with their significance. Boy, I'd like to talk to you, Mr. Chairman, about that. Significance.

(Pause.)

I'm sorry. Here we go. So we're getting down to their latest inspection report that kind of -there's a lot of new stuff in there, you know, in
2011. They did June 2, an NRC problem identification
and resolution. I mean two of the four pneumatic
actuators leaked. Did you replace? I don't know.
You know, you had two that leaked and two that you had
slots. I don't know what you mean by slots, you know.
You talked about convection cooling and stuff.

make a case that it was outside. The slot business kind of reminds me of a fin. And my fear is that that a vent inside the mechanism, the actuator, there's a lot of -- I mean it's a new thing. The old actuator didn't have a slot and the assumption is that there would be contact with the environment, the air in the drywell and stuff like that. So you know, potentially steam environment, potentially a moisture type of thing. You know, come up with some sort of mechanism

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

designed ambient temperature, Type 2 is 150 degrees. Vermont Yankee says the ambient temperature is 185 to 90. You know, this -- they're accurate, but are they truthful? Do they express the truthfulness of what's going -- what should be going on in there? The Type 1 ambient temperature is designed for 210 to 250 degrees. That 250 degrees reminds me of something about the vessel level detection instrumentation. Maybe it was the -- I mean I remember it being that environment, the instrumentation being qualified for 260 degrees inside there, potentially. Maybe that was the -- something to do with the water level.

to -- for corrosion and damage common-mode failure of

the reliefs, or all the ones that have a slot in it.

But it's interesting that the Type 2, the

Who knows what the other two have?

But anyways, 250 degrees kind of seems right in a bad accident. That's what I'm saying, you know? This is -- the right designed ambient temperature is -- I mean Vermont Yankee says the ambient temperature in the CR is 185 to 190, but you know, the real deal is what's that environment in the worst accident you can think of? And that is in the area of 250 degrees. You know -- I don't know if the insulation is still around the other two non-leaking

actuators and stuff. You know?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The vendor says initially -- the vendor says initially, the Type 1 was rated to 390 degrees. The Type 2 was rated for 210 to 250. You know, for what it's worth, sometimes writing -- given your wrong data, you can show me falsifying, what was important parameter or a limitation. Is it worse to falsify intentionally, give you inaccurate information one time or is it worse because you're so confused and conflicted and you give inaccurate information or you use inaccurate information 100 times by you know, essentially not falsification because everybody is confused and so what's worse? One time? does it cold-bloodedly one time or the organization is so -- is such in chaos that they give inaccurate information 100 times.

What is worse? Overly dependent on the vendor recommendation? That's what the LER says.

So you know, I mean the only way you operate these things is if you paint a picture, an accurate picture of what's going on around you. And you do it by documents and you do it by people talking to you and stuff and in essence you keep banging on the hammer of trying to over and over again, this is my rendition of what I think I see and I'm going to

attach a written document and stuff like that. Oh, I might see something new and then I update my documents and stuff like that. You sit there and that's what this is all about. You sit there and you keep banging on the -- trying to figure out, trying to paint a picture of what's going on at the plant? And you're trying to paint a picture that everybody else can see and stuff and then you hope people have good hearts, you know? If people can see the picture and respond to what is there, the reality and stuff like that and correct it and make better the world and stuff like that.

That's the object of everything here, it

That's the object of everything here, it is. It's to paint a picture and hope people got good hearts. If everybody is not painting a good picture, an accurate picture as possible, we're screwed. The nation is screwed if you guys follow your procedures and selectively disclose information and what the outcome of everything is insanity, I just don't -- I just don't know what to think about things, actually.

(Pause.)

You know, here's a -- I don't mean to pick on you, Mr. Setzer, but you wrote me a letter yesterday and stuff like that. I think this -- a lot of his stuff, he is expressing phrases -- typical

phrases that the NRC says. I like Mr. Setzer and I think he has a good heart and stuff like that, but -but I have to respond to what he wrote to stuff. As stated in my previous -- here's a quote he wrote to me on June 14th. "As stated in my" -- this is kind of typical NRC talk. "As stated in my previous email, NRC resident inspectors reviewed the LER associated with the issue and documented their inspections and NRC report da, da, da. "The inspection determined that all NRC LER and reportability requirements for these issues were fully met." What does that mean? Like I said, how come everything, all

these temperatures and stuff and the Type 1 and Type 2 and stuff like that, how come that wasn't in the You know? first LER? How come they followed procedures and the rules and the OIG talks about Part 21 being all confused and stuff like that? How can everybody be comfortable with that?

The reportability -- how can anybody be comfortable with that, the "reportability requirements for this issue have been met." You know from that first LER, everything is accurately characterized. I The reportability requirement mean this is crazy. gives you permission to selectively disclose events at the plant. How can that be sane?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

I'm not picking on Mr. Setzer, I'm picking on the NRC talk and stuff. "In addition to the inspector review, the PI&R inspected the unit and material. The team found that during previous refueling" -- you know? How comes that wasn't like the 2008 refueling outage and stuff? You know? Instead of previous -- this kind of opaque talk type of stuff.

However, in the SRV actuator issue at VY was some time upgraded to a newer component -- a newer component due to lost availability of technical support. You know, they didn't replace -- the essence was, it wasn't a newer component. It was a reducedquality component. I mean that's the essence of what happened here. And I just -- you know, the touristy rendition of it, the happy-land I call it that, the Frame it in the best possible, not in the NRC talk. Frame it according to NRC most accurate way. procedures, requirements, or ALARA, frame it according to what the laws allow you to say, not what is accurate, what is there. That's what drives me crazy is as these procedures give you permission to be inaccurate and to create the happy land rendition, the happy land picture, you know, the pretty picture that is really falsification.

I have an issue with the culture of the NRC with what they do there, with the procedures and regulations and laws give you permission to do. you know in your heart you're supposed to declare everything. You're supposed give your best rendition That's the only thing that keeps reality. everybody safe.

I would like somebody to talk to me abut the definition -- I can't even talk now -- "included there is a reasonable basis" -- that's almost like ALARA, what is the definition of "reasonable basis" and stuff?

Again, you know, I don't know what the slots are, what that really means. I assume that the inside internals are in direct contact with the drywell atmosphere and I don't know if they're qualified to be in there and the assumption is that they are supposed to be similar to the environmental qualifications of a vessel level instrumentation, the type of drywell.

You know, I don't know if you get into a - you know, this Buna material, if you can get into
how that Type 1, Type 2 -- you know, you know, there's
a lot of guesses here. I mean has that been -- I mean
that's the standard of safety. Has that Type 2

material been tested to the environment of the drywell?

I mean nobody is making any -- everybody is guessing. You guys give permission to guess and stuff like that. I want to have the facts. I want to go by the facts. I want to go by what testing tells me. And the only way you can do that is you test that in a similar environment, you know, as the vessel level instrumentation in the drywell or any other instrumentation in the drywell, what are the -- is it 250 degrees or something like that? And then you put it in that environment and you -- and you put it in that environment for a length of time and you know what the results are going to be.

You have evidence. If it's science based, you have evidence and because they don't have the right quality, some vendor out there is lying and he doesn't have the right quality material for you and stuff like that, we can off science. We can off engineering basis and stuff like that. We can make a lot of suppositions about stuff. I don't think that does anybody any good.

Just a few more minutes and I'll be done.

(Pause.)

All right, thank you very much for this

NEAL R. GROSS

| 1 | opportunity to talk with you and the NRC has been kind |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | with spending some time talking with me or |
| 3 | communicating and I just want to acknowledge that the |
| 4 | NRC has been pretty decent as far as this is |
| 5 | concerned. |
| 6 | Thank you very much. |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN CHEOK: Thank you. Let me go |
| 8 | around the room and on the phone to see if anyone else |
| 9 | in headquarters have any questions for Mr. Mulligan. |
| LO | I see some head shakes here, so Muhammed, |
| L1 | do you have any questions? |
| L2 | MR. RAZZAQUE: No. |
| L3 | CHAIRMAN CHEOK: Does the licensee have |
| L4 | any questions? |
| L5 | MR. DEVINCENTIS: No questions. |
| L6 | CHAIRMAN CHEOK: No questions. Do any |
| L7 | members of the public who joined us during the phone |
| L8 | call and if you have any questions at this point? I |
| 19 | hear none. |
| 20 | Mr. Mulligan, again, thank you for taking |
| 21 | your time to talk to us and for providing us with the |
| 22 | clarification and additional information in the |
| 23 | petition you have submitted. |
| 24 | We have looked at things like what has |
| 25 | been tested previously and we will take your comments |
| | |

| 1 | into our deliberations. |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | Before we close, does the court reporter |
| 3 | need any additional information for the meeting |
| 4 | transcript? |
| 5 | COURT REPORTER: Yes. Do you want to |
| 6 | cover this on the record or off? |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN CHEOK: On the record, please. |
| 8 | COURT REPORTER: One moment, please. I |
| 9 | need names and spellings of the Petition Review Board |
| 10 | members and also a listing of people who are on the |
| 11 | call, correct name spellings and things like that. |
| 12 | MR. KIM: This is James Kim. I will |
| 13 | provide the information, either give you a call or |
| 14 | send an email. |
| 15 | COURT REPORTER: Okay, that will be fine. |
| 16 | And then Mr. Mulligan, you mentioned a letter from a |
| 17 | Mr. Seltzer or Setzer? |
| 18 | PETITIONER MULLIGAN: Setzer. |
| 19 | COURT REPORTER: Can you just give me the |
| 20 | selling of that name, please? |
| 21 | CHAIRMAN CHEOK: S-E-T-Z-E-R, and he's a |
| 22 | member of the Review Board and that's part of the |
| 23 | information we will give you. |
| 24 | COURT REPORTER: Okay, great. Thanks. |
| 25 | That's all the questions that I have. Thank you very |
| | II |

much. CHAIRMAN CHEOK: Okay, if there's no other questions we thank you again and with that the meeting is concluded and we will be terminating the phone connections. (Whereupon, at 10:41 a.m., the conference call was concluded.)

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the matter of:

Vermont Yankee

Name of Proceeding: 10 CFR 2.206 Petition by:

Michael Mulligan

Docket Number:

(n/a)

Location:

(teleconference)

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission taken by me and, thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under the direction of the court reporting company, and that the transcript is a true and accurate record of the foregoing proceedings.

Charles Morrison

Official Reporter

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.