

Enclosure 1
ADAMS Accession
No. ML111860039
Monthly 10 CFR 2.206,
“Requests for Action
Under this Subpart,”
Status Report

PETITIONS CLOSED DURING THIS PERIOD

FACILITY	PETITIONER/EDO No.	Page
Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2	Eric Epstein G20100619	2
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station (Related to Japan Earthquake)	Michael Mulligan G20110191	3
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station	Michael Mulligan G20110220	4
Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1	Thomas Gurdziel G20110310	5

CURRENT STATUS OF OPEN PETITIONS

Indian Point Nuclear Generating Units 2 and 3; Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station; River Bend Station	Sherwood Martinelli G20090487	6
Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 3	Thomas Saporito G20090690	7
U.S. Army Installation Command	Isaac Harp G20100136	8
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station	Thomas Saporito G20110043	9
U.S. Nuclear Power Reactors (Related to Japan Earthquake)	Thomas Saporito G20110171	10
Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 1, 2, and 3	Eric Schneiderman, Office of the Attorney General, State of New York; G20110221	11

CURRENT STATUS OF OPEN PETITIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION

Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station	Mary Lampert G20100454	12
Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 2 and 3	Deborah Brancato, Esq., Riverkeeper G20110218	13
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station	Michael Mulligan G20110192	14
General Electric Boiling-Water Reactor Mark I Units (Related to Japan Earthquake)	Paul Gunter, Reactor Oversight Project & Kevin Kamps, Nuclear Waste Specialist G20110262	15
NextEra Energy, Florida Power & Light Company, St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 and 2	Thomas Saporito G20110365	16
Progress Energy, William D. Johnson, H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant	Thomas Saporito G20110367	17
Exelon Generating, Exelon Nuclear, Limerick Nuclear Generating Station, and John Rowe	Thomas Saporito G20110398	18
Tennessee Valley Authority, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, and Tom Kilgore	Thomas Saporito G20110449	19
Entergy Nuclear Generation, Entergy Nuclear, Inc., Entergy Nuclear Northeast, Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Entergy Nuclear Palisades, LLC., Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC., Entergy Operations, Inc., and J. Wayne Leonard	Thomas Saporito G20110477	20
Omaha Public Power District, Fort Calhoun Station, Unit 1	Thomas Saporito G20110492	21

FACILITY: Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2
LICENSEE TYPE: Materials
PETITIONER: Eric Epstein



CLOSED PETITION
EDO # G20100619

DATE OF PETITION: SEPTEMBER 30, 2010
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: FSME
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: APRIL 6, 2011
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: JUNE 2, 2011
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 2, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: JOHN BUCKLEY
CASE ATTORNEY: PATTY JEHL

NO IMAGE AVAILABLE

ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner seeks enforcement action in the form of a demand for information requiring FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company to provide the NRC with site-specific information and financial guarantees that demonstrate and verify that the licensee has adequate funding in place to decommission and decontaminate Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2, and that any proposed mergers will not place additional financial pressures on FirstEnergy's ability to satisfy its decommissioning obligations in 2036.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS	
		PETITION AGE: ~9 MONTHS	
The petitioner filed a petition for enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	09/30/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">On April 6, 2011, the petition manager called the petitioner to inform him that the NRC was transmitting the proposed director's decision for review and comment. On April 6, 2011, the NRC sent a copy of the proposed director's decision and transmittal letter to the petitioner and licensee via e-mail, with a hard copy sent by mail.On April 29, 2011, the petitioner provided written comments on the proposed director's decision.On June 2, 2011, the NRC issued the final director's decision (ADAMS Accession No. ML111370330). All NRC actions on this petition are closed.	04/06/11
To review the status of this petition before January 31, 2011, please refer to prior monthly status reports.	10/18/2010		
On February 14, 2011, OEDO approved an extension request, until May 13, 2011, to provide FSME with additional time to issue the proposed director's decision.	02/14/11		04/29/11
On March 9, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the schedule change via telephone.	03/09/11		06/02/11

FACILITY: Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Michael Mulligan



CLOSED PETITION
EDO # G20110191

DATE OF PETITION: MARCH 17, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 2, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: JAMES KIM
CASE ATTORNEY: M. CLARK & K. SEXTON



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner is concerned that the side of the reactor building at Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station has large concrete cracks and that the plant never met the design-basis earthquake due to this construction defect. The petition also includes additional requests for the NRC.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	03/17/11
On March 23, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB. On March 23, 2011, the petitioner accepted this opportunity to address the PRB.	03/23/11
On April 4, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the request for immediate action only. The PRB denied the request for an immediate shutdown because there is no immediate safety concern for public health and safety. The NRC informed the petitioner of the PRB's decision to deny the request for immediate action on April 4, 2011.	04/04/11
On April 6, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by teleconference to provide additional information in support of the petition.	04/06/11
On April 19, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition and supplemental information provided. The PRB's initial recommendation is that the petition does not meet the criteria for review because the petitioner failed to provide sufficient facts to warrant further inquiry. Specifically, the petition contains general assertions that safety concerns exist; however, the petitioner failed to provide the PRB with sufficient facts to support his requests. The PRB attempted to obtain additional clarification and supporting facts during a telephone call with Mr. Mulligan on April 6, 2011. The petitioner confirmed during that call that he did not have any facts to support his petition request.	04/19/11

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~3 MONTHS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 29, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's initial recommendation. The petitioner requested a second teleconference with the PRB. 	04/29/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 4, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by teleconference to provide additional information in support of the petition. 	05/04/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 12 and May 16, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the supplemental information provided by the petitioner. 	05/12/11 & 05/16/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 2, 2011, the PRB issued a closure letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML111450209) to convey the PRB's final recommendation that the petition did not meet the criteria for review. All NRC actions on this petition are closed. 	06/02/11

FACILITY: Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Michael Mulligan



CLOSED PETITION
EDO # G20110220

DATE OF PETITION: MARCH 25, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 7, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: JAMES KIM
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC immediately shut down Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station because the "Reactor Oversight Program is ineffective and Entergy has a documented history of a culture of falsification and thumbing their noses at reoccurring violations." The petitioner also requests an investigation by an organization outside the NRC of the NRC's behavior in tolerating Entergy's "atrocious regulatory behavior."

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS PETITION AGE: ~3 MONTHS	
The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	03/25/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 12, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone before the PRB met internally to discuss the petition and to make an initial recommendation. 	04/12/11
On March 31, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB. On March 31, 2011, the petitioner accepted this opportunity to address the PRB.	03/31/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 25, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition. The PRB's initial recommendation was that the petition did not meet the criteria for review because the petitioner failed to provide sufficient facts to warrant further inquiry. Specifically, the petition contains general assertions that safety concerns exist; however, the petitioner failed to provide the PRB with sufficient facts to support the requests. 	04/25/11
On April 5, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the request for immediate action only. The PRB denied the request for an immediate shutdown because there is no immediate safety concern for public health and safety. The NRC informed the petitioner of the PRB's decision to deny the request for immediate action on April 5, 2011.	04/05/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 29, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's initial recommendation. The petitioner requested another opportunity to address the PRB to provide any comments on the PRB's initial recommendation and additional information in support of the petition. On May 16, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to discuss the PRB's initial recommendation. On June 7, 2011, the PRB issued a closure letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML111520183) to convey the PRB's final recommendation that the petition did not meet the criteria for review because the petitioner failed to provide sufficient facts to warrant further inquiry. All NRC actions on this petition are closed. 	04/29/11 05/16/11 06/07/11

FACILITY: Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Gurdziel



CLOSED PETITION
EDO # G20110310

DATE OF PETITION: APRIL 22, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 29, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: RICK ENNIS
CASE ATTORNEY: MARCIA SIMON



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For reasons specified within the petition request, the petitioner requests that the NRC fine PSEG Nuclear, LLC, the licensee for Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1, for failing to have an effective corrective action program that fixes problems promptly. Specifically, the petitioner requested that the licensee be fined \$250,000 for each significant down-power due to grassing events.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS PETITION AGE: ~2 MONTHS	
The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	04/22/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 2, 2011, the petitioner requested a change from a single fine of \$500,000 (as initially requested in the petition dated April 22, 2011) to \$250,000 per each significant down-power due to grassing. 	05/02/11
On April 28, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and to offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB before it meets internally to make the initial recommendation to accept or reject the petition for review. The petitioner declined an opportunity to address the PRB before it makes its initial recommendation.	04/28/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 26, and June 7, 2011, the PRB met to discuss the petition. After reviewing the concerns, the PRB's initial recommendation was that the petition not be accepted for review in the 10 CFR 2.206 process because the petitioner did not set forth facts sufficient to constitute a basis for the requested action. On June 13, 2011, the petitioner manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's initial recommendation and offered the petitioner a second opportunity to address the PRB. The petitioner declined the second opportunity to address the PRB. Since no additional information was provided by the petitioner, the initial recommendation became the final recommendation. On June 29, 2011, the PRB issued a closure letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML111640303) to convey the PRB's final recommendation that the petition did not meet the criteria for review. All NRC actions on this petition are closed. 	05/26/11 & 06/07/11 06/13/11 06/29/11

FACILITY: Indian Point Nuclear Generating Units 2 & 3; Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station;
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Sherwood Martinelli



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20090487

DATE OF PETITION: AUGUST 22, 2009
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: OCTOBER 31, 2011
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: MAY 23, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: DOUG PICKETT
CASE ATTORNEY: PATRICIA JEHL



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

The petitioner requests that the NRC suspend the operations of Entergy-owned plants (specifically Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 2 and 3, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, and River Bend Station) until Entergy brings the decommissioning funds for all of its licensed nuclear reactors to the adequate minimum levels required by NRC regulations.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	08/22/09
For a complete summary of NRC actions before December 17, 2009, please refer to the August 2010 monthly status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML102510120).	12/17/09
On December 17, 2009, the PRB issued an acknowledgement letter to the petitioner, accepting the petition in part for review for Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station and River Bend Station, under 10 CFR 2.206 (ADAMS Accession No. ML093440334).	12/17/09
On December 22, 2009, the petitioner provided supplemental information in support of his petition by e-mail.	12/22/09
On December 28, 2009, Mr. Martinelli submitted an e-mail to the NRC, which was tracked under G20090722 (now a closed petition). In G20090722, Mr. Martinelli referenced his petition of August 22, 2009 (G20090487), and voiced objections to the PRB denying his petition with respect to Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 2 and 3.	12/28/09

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~22 MONTHS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PRB met internally on January 14, 2010, and concluded that, in accordance with MD 8.11, Mr. Martinelli's e-mail dated December 28, 2009 (G20090722), would be better handled as a supplement to G20090487. Therefore, the information provided in G20090722 will be reviewed as a supplement to G20090487. The Office of the Executive Director for Operations (OEDO) terminated G20090722. 	01/14/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On March 2, 2010, OEDO approved an extension request until May 28, 2010, to support the NRC's staff's resolution of decommissioning funding issues. 	03/02/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 14, 2010, OEDO approved an extension request until August 20, 2010, to support the NRC staff's resolution of decommissioning funding issues. 	05/14/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On July 26, 2010, OEDO approved an extension request until January 21, 2011, to support the NRC staff's resolution of decommissioning funding issues. 	07/26/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On September 2, 2010, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the schedule change. 	09/02/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On December 21, 2010, OEDO approved an extension request until June 24, 2011, to support the NRC staff's resolution of decommissioning funding issues. The petition manager informed the petitioner of this schedule change on December 28, 2010. 	12/21/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 17, 2011, OEDO approved an extension request until October 31, 2011, to support the NRC staff's resolution of decommissioning funding issues at River Bend Station. The petition manager informed the petitioner of this schedule change on May 23, 2011. 	05/17/11

FACILITY: Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 3
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20090690

DATE OF PETITION: DECEMBER 5, 2009
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: DECEMBER 2, 2012
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: MAY 27, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: FARIDEH SABA
CASE ATTORNEY: MICHAEL CLARK



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For reasons specified within the petition request, the petitioner requests that the NRC take enforcement action against Progress Energy Company, the licensee for Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 3, in the interest of protecting public health and safety regarding the structural failure of the Crystal River, Unit 3, containment building.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS PETITION AGE: ~19 MONTHS	
The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	12/05/09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On November 23, 2010, OEDO approved an extension request until June 3, 2011, to permit additional time for the staff to issue the proposed director's decision. The petition manager informed the petitioner of this change on November 23, 2010. On May 27, 2011, OEDO approved an extension request until December 2, 2012, to permit additional time for the staff to issue the proposed director's decision. The petition manager informed the petitioner of this change on May 27, 2011. 	11/23/10
For a complete summary of NRC actions before March 1, 2010, please refer to the April 2011 monthly status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML111220348).	03/01/10		05/27/11
On March 4, 2010, the PRB issued an acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML100471416) to the petitioner. The acknowledgement letter conveyed the final recommendation to accept the petition for review, in part.	03/04/10		
On June 24, 2010, OEDO approved an extension request until December 4, 2010, to permit additional time for the staff to issue the proposed director's decision. An extension was needed because of the complexity of the activities that the licensee needs to complete and for the NRC to review and evaluate these actions. The petition manager informed the petitioner of this change on June 24, 2010.	06/24/10		
In an e-mail dated October 17, 2010, the petitioner requested another opportunity to present additional information to the PRB as a direct result of information shared during an NRC public meeting held with the licensee on June 30, 2010. In accordance with MD 8.11, the petition manager informed the petitioner that additional information should be submitted in writing to the OEDO for PRB consideration. If the PRB determines that a call is warranted with the petitioner to clarify any additional information provided, a conference call will be coordinated. To date, the petitioner has not provided any new information to the EDO for PRB consideration.	10/17/10		

FACILITY: U.S. Army Installation Command
LICENSEE TYPE: Materials
PETITIONER: Isaac Harp



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20100136

DATE OF PETITION:	MARCH 4, 2010	
DD TO BE ISSUED BY:	FSME	
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE:	JUNE 30, 2011	
FINAL DD ISSUANCE:	N/A	NO IMAGE AVAILABLE
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER:	JUNE 29, 2011	
PETITION MANAGER:	KENNETH KALMAN	
CASE ATTORNEYS:	BRETT KLUKAN & KIMBERLY SEXTON	

ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner filed a notice of appeal in the matter of the Atomic Energy Safety and Licensing Board Memorandum and Order (Denying Requests for Hearing) LBP-10-04, U.S. Army Installation Command, Docket No. 40-9083, served February 24, 2010. In the notice of appeal, the petitioner requested that the NRC take enforcement action by initiating an investigation into a potential violation of License SUB-459 and, if it is determined that a violation has occurred, to apply the full penalty permissible by law. In addition, the petitioner requests that any monetary fines should go toward environmental remediation of depleted uranium contamination at Schofield and Pohakuloa, if the law provides for such action.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS PETITION AGE: ~16 MONTHS	
The petitioner filed a petition for a notice of appeal, which was referred to the 10 CFR 2.206 process for review.	03/04/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By letter dated April 5, 2011, the staff requested the Army's response to unresolved questions/issues related to the 10 CFR 2.206 enforcement action. On April 28, 2011, the petition manager notified the petitioner that a pre-decisional enforcement conference was scheduled for May 10, 2011, to discuss apparent violations of NRC requirements involving possession of source material (depleted uranium from Davy Crockett spotting rounds) without a license. On May 10, 2011, the NRC staff held a pre-decisional enforcement conference with the Army. By email dated June 29, 2011, the petition manager notified the petitioner that the NRC is in the process of finalizing its enforcement decision and is considering all available information in the decision making process. The petition manager also provided additional information regarding the Army's license. 	04/05/11
To review the status of this petition before January 1, 2011, please refer to prior 10 CFR 2.206 monthly status reports.	01/01/11		04/28/11
On January 27, 2011, the NRC staff held an enforcement panel to disposition some recently identified potential issues as a prerequisite to a possible preliminary enforcement conference with the U.S. Army.	01/27/11		
OEDO approved an extension request to support the FSME's issuance of the proposed director's decision by June 30, 2011.	01/31/11		05/10/11
			06/29/11
On February 2, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner to address the petitioner's January 22, 2011, e-mail concerning the Army's intent to modernize the Pohakuloa Training Area and to provide an update on the status of the 10 CFR 2.206 petition.	02/02/11		

FACILITY: Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20110043

DATE OF PETITION: JANUARY 14, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: JULY 25, 2011
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: MARCH 28, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: JAMES KIM
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner is concerned with the safety of the plant and requested that “the NRC take escalated enforcement action against the licensee, to include, but not to be limited to, (1) issuing a confirmatory order requiring the licensee to immediately bring the reactor in question to a cold shutdown mode of operation; (2) issuing a civil penalty against the licensee, (3) cause the removal of licensee employees responsible for this matter from NRC licensed activities for a period of no less than 5 years; and (4) cause an immediate NRC investigation and inspection of the licensee’s Vermont Yankee facility to ensure that all nuclear safety-related systems are properly operational in accordance with the licensee’s technical specifications and NRC license.”

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS	
		PETITION AGE: ~6 MONTHS	
The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	01/14/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On February 2, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition and made an initial recommendation that the petition meets the criteria for review. On February 8, 2011, the NRC informed the petitioner of the PRB’s initial recommendation to accept his petition for review. The petitioner requested a second opportunity to address the PRB by teleconference. On February 14, 2011, the petitioner provided additional information to the PRB in support of his request for an immediate shutdown. The additional information provided did not change the PRB’s decision to deny the request for immediate action. By letter dated March 28, 2011, the PRB issued an acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML110601262) to document the PRB’s final recommendation that the petition met the criteria for review. The NRC will issue a proposed director’s decision within 120 days of issuance of the acknowledgement letter. 	02/02/11
On January 19, 2011, the petitioner requested a teleconference with the PRB to provide additional relevant information in support of his petition before the PRB met internally to make the initial recommendation.	01/19/11		02/08/11
On January 24, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the request for immediate action only. The PRB determined that there was no immediate safety concern to the public health and safety and no technical basis to warrant an immediate shutdown of Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station. The petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB’s decision to deny the request for immediate action.	01/24/11		02/14/11
On January 26, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by teleconference to provide additional information in support of his petition request.	01/26/11		03/28/11

FACILITY: U.S. Nuclear Power Reactors
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20110171

DATE OF PETITION:	MARCH 12, 2011	
DD TO BE ISSUED BY:	NRR	
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE:	OCTOBER 25, 2011	
FINAL DD ISSUANCE:	N/A	NO IMAGE AVAILABLE
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER:	JUNE 28, 2011	
PETITION MANAGER:	PETER TAM	
CASE ATTORNEYS:	MICHAEL CLARK & KIMBERLY SEXTON	

ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner seeks immediate enforcement action for the NRC to issue an order requesting the immediate shutdown of all nuclear power reactors in the United States that are known to be located on or near an earthquake fault line.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~3 MONTHS

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	03/12/11	
On March 21, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB. On March 21, 2011, the petitioner accepted this opportunity to address the PRB.	03/21/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 14, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone. During the call, the petitioner provided supplemental information in support of the petition request. Directly following the teleconference, the petitioner e-mailed supplemental information to the petition manager for PRB consideration.
On April 4, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the request for immediate action only. The PRB denied the request for an immediate shutdown because there is no immediate safety concern for public health and safety. The petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's decision to deny the request for immediate action on April 4, 2011.	04/04/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 28, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition, including supplemental information provided, and made an initial recommendation to accept the petition, in part. On May 12, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's initial recommendation. The petitioner requested a second teleconference to address the PRB. On May 25, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone. The PRB reviewed the additional information provided by the petitioner during the teleconference and made a final recommendation to accept the petition for review, in part. On June 28, 2011, the PRB issued an acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML11137A213) to the petitioner, to convey the PRB's final recommendation to accept the petition for review, in part.

FACILITY: Indian Point Nuclear Generating Units 1, 2, & 3
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Eric Schneiderman, Office of the Attorney General
 State of New York



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20110221

DATE OF PETITION: MARCH 28, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: OCTOBER 27, 2011
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 28, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: DOUGLAS PICKETT
CASE ATTORNEY(S): BRETT KLUKAN & BOB RADER



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For reasons specified within the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC to immediately issue an Order that takes the following actions with respect to Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 1, 2, and 3:

1. Identify the violations of 10 CFR 50.48, Appendix R, Sections III.F and III.G, that exist as of the date of the petition (i.e., March 28, 2011) at Indian Point Units, 1, 2, and 3.
2. Compel Entergy and its affiliates to comply on or before September 20, 2011, with the requirements contained in 10 CFR 50.48, Appendix R, Sections III.F and III.G, for all the fire zones in Indian Point, Units, 2 and 3 and any Indian Point, Unit 1 fire zone or system, structure, or component relied on by Indian Point, Unit 2 or 3.
3. Convene an evidentiary hearing before the Commission to adjudicate the violations by Entergy and its affiliates of 10 CFR 50.48, Appendix R, Sections III.F and III.G, at Indian Point, Units 1, 2, and 3.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	03/28/11
On March 31, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB. The petitioner accepted this opportunity to address the PRB in person.	03/31/11
On April 5, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the request for immediate action only. The PRB denied the request for immediate action because (1) the licensee's actions are within the NRC-defined process, (2) enforcement discretion is applicable, (3) there are no identifiable safety concerns, and (4) there is no basis to take immediate action.	04/05/11

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~3 MONTHS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 8, 2011, the petitioner confirmed that he would like to address the PRB in an NRC public meeting at NRC Headquarters in Rockville, MD. 	04/08/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 12, 2011, the NRC informed the petitioner of the PRB's decision to deny the request for immediate action. 	04/12/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 9, 2011 (ADAMS Accession No. ML111090949), the petitioner addressed the PRB during a public meeting at NRC Headquarters to provide additional information and support for the petition request 	05/09/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 19, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition. The PRB's initial recommendation is that petition meets the criteria for review. 	05/19/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 27, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's initial recommendation. The petitioner did not request a second opportunity to address the PRB. Thus the initial recommendation is the PRB's final recommendation. 	05/27/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 30, 2011, an acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML111520393) was issued accepting the petition for review. 	06/30/11

FACILITY: Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Mary Lampert



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20100454**

DATE OF PETITION: JULY 19, 2010
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: MAY 31, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: RICHARD GUZMAN
CASE ATTORNEY: MAURI LEMONCELLI



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition (G20100454), the petitioner requested that the NRC issue a demand for information order that Entergy, the licensee for Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, demonstrate that all inaccessible cables at Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station are capable of performing their required function, be it safety or nonsafety related.

As supplemented on August 13, 2010 (G20100527), the petitioner requested that the NRC issue an order that requires Entergy, the licensee for Pilgrim, to immediately perform an updated hydrogeologic analysis. On November 15, 2010 (G20100689), the petitioner requested that the Commission review the PRB's decision with respect to G20100527.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS PETITION AGE: ~12 MONTHS	
Please refer to prior 10 CFR 2.206 monthly status reports (on the NRC public Web site) to review the status of this petition before November 2010.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The petitioner submitted a late-filed request for hearing of a contention related to Entergy's management of inaccessible cables under the Pilgrim license renewal review proceeding on December 13, 2010. Per MD 8.11 (Part III, Section C.1.a(iii)), a 10 CFR 2.206 petition request will not be treated under the 10 CFR 2.206 process if there is an ongoing licensing hearing/proceeding through which the petitioner's concerns could be addressed. The PRB reconvened on January 4, 2011, and determined that the petitioner's concerns related to inaccessible cables would be held in abeyance until an outcome of the contention is made under the Pilgrim license renewal hearing process. On January 25, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's determination and confirmed that the aforementioned PRB determination would be documented in a letter. By letter dated February 23, 2011 (ADAMS Accession No. ML103400692), the NRC issued a letter to the petitioner, which stated that the portion of her petition related to the hydrogeologic analysis met the criteria for rejection, and that the portion related to inaccessible cables was being held in abeyance until an outcome of the contention is made under the Pilgrim license renewal hearing process. By letter dated May 31, 2011 (ADAMS Accession No. ML11160334), the NRC issued a letter to address Ms. Lampert's concerns regarding the PRB's decision to hold her petition in abeyance. 	01/04/11
On November 4, 2010, the PRB met internally to discuss the supplemental information (G201000527) received before making the final recommendation. The PRB determined that the information submitted under G20100454 met the criteria for review. The supplemental information provided under G20100527 met the criteria for rejection because the NRC reviewed, evaluated, and resolved the issues raised about the hydrogeologic analysis.	11/04/10		
On November 5, 2010, OEDO approved an extension request until December 30, 2010.	11/05/10		
On November 10, 2010, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's final recommendation and of the schedule change.	11/10/10		01/25/11
By letter dated November 15, 2010 (G20100689), the petitioner requested that the Commission review the PRB's decision to reject the portion of the petition relevant to the hydrogeologic analysis for review under 10 CFR 2.206. The NRC acknowledgement letter to the petitioner will address G20100454, G20100527, and G20100689.	11/15/10		02/23/11
On December 22, 2010, OEDO approved an extension request until February 26, 2011, to support the staff's ability to document the PRB's final recommendation.	12/22/10		
On December 28, 2010, the petition manager informed the petitioner of this schedule change to issue the acknowledgement letter.	12/28/10		05/31/11

FACILITY: Indian Point Nuclear Generating Units 2 & 3
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Deborah Brancato, Esq., Riverkeeper, Inc.



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20110218**

DATE OF PETITION: MARCH 28, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 8, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: JOHN BOSKA
CASE ATTORNEY: BRETT KLUKAN



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For reasons specified within the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC lower the licensing-basis peak cladding temperatures of Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 2 and 3, in order to provide necessary safety margins in the event of loss-of-coolant accidents.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	03/28/11
On March 31, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by phone to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB. On April 1, 2011, the petitioner requested an opportunity to address the PRB by telephone.	03/31/11

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~3 MONTHS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 18, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to discuss the petition and provide additional information to the PRB. 	04/18/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 25, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition. 	04/25/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 7, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's initial recommendation that the petition did not meet the criteria for review on the basis that there is another NRC proceeding available in which the petitioner is or could be party and through which the petitioner's concerns could be addressed. The petition applies to all power reactors, not just IP2 and IP3, and should be addressed through rulemaking. The NRC is reviewing identical concerns submitted by Mr. Leyse under Rulemaking petitions (PRM 50-93 and 50-95). 	06/07/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 8, 2011, the petitioner requested a second opportunity to address the PRB by telephone to provide additional information. The teleconference has been scheduled for July 11, 2011. 	06/08/11

FACILITY: Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Michael Mulligan



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20110192**

DATE OF PETITION: MARCH 17, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 15, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: JAMES KIM
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC immediately shut down Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station and all Entergy nuclear power plants and that "they replace their relief valve o ring Buna-N material with silicone." The petitioner bases his petition on Licensee Event Report 05000271/2010-002-01, "Inoperability of Main Steam Safety Relief Valves due to Degraded Thread Seals," which cites the use of Buna-N material instead of the originally used silicone.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS PETITION AGE: ~3 MONTHS	
The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	03/17/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none">On April 13, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to discuss the petition before the PRB met internally to make an initial recommendation.On April 26, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition.On June 6, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's initial recommendation that the petition meets the criteria for rejection because the issues raised have already been the subject of NRC staff review, and resolution has been achieved.On June 15, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to discuss the PRB's initial recommendation. The PRB is evaluating the additional information provided by the petitioner.	04/13/11
On March 23, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB. On March 23, 2011, the petitioner accepted this opportunity to address the PRB.	03/23/11		04/26/11
On March 29, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the request for immediate action only. The PRB denied the request for an immediate shutdown because there is no immediate safety concern about public health and safety. The NRC informed the petitioner of the PRB's decision to deny the request for immediate action on March 30, 2011.	03/29/11		06/06/11
			06/15/11

FACILITY: All General Electric Boiling-Water Reactor Mark I Units
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONERS: Paul Gunter, Reactor Oversight Project
 Kevin Kamps, Nuclear Waste Specialist
COPETITIONERS: Noted Below Under "Current Status and Next Steps"



**OPEN PETITIONS
 UNDER
 CONSIDERATION
 EDO # G20110262**

DATE OF PETITION: APRIL 13, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A **NO IMAGE AVAILABLE**
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 8, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: SIVA LINGAM
CASE ATTORNEY: MICHAEL CLARK & KIMBERLY SEXTON

ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For reasons specified within the petition request, the petitioner requests that the NRC immediately suspend the operating licenses of General Electric (GE) boiling-water reactor (BWR) Mark I units to ensure that public health and safety is not unduly jeopardized. As stated by the petitioner, this petition focuses on "the unreliability of the GE BWR Mark I containment system to mitigate a severe accident and the lack of emergency power systems to cool high density storage pools and radioactive reactor fuel assemblies."

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~3 MONTHS

The petitioners filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	04/13/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In a letter dated May 14, 2011 (G20110355), Pilgrim Watch requested to be added as a copetitioner. 	05/14/11
<p>On April 19, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioners to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and to offer them an opportunity to address the PRB before it meets internally to make the initial recommendation to accept or reject the petition for review. The petitioners requested an opportunity to address the PRB in a public meeting before it makes its initial recommendation.</p> <p>In addition, on April 19, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the request for immediate action only. The PRB denied the request for immediate action because there was no immediate safety concern for the plant or for public health and safety. The petitioners expressed a general safety concern about the GE BWR Mark I units but did not provide any facts or information that would lead the NRC to immediately shut down these plants.</p>	04/19/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In a letter dated May 18, 2011 (G20110366), the New England Coalition requested to be added as a copetitioner. In a letter dated May 27, 2011 (G20110395), the GE Stockholders' Alliance requested to be added as a copetitioner. In a letter dated May 31, 2011 (G20110396), Marvin Lewis requested to be added as a copetitioner. In a letter dated May 31, 2011 (G20110400), David Kraft requested to be added as a copetitioner. 	05/18/11 05/27/11 05/31/11 05/31/11
On April 21, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioners of the PRB's decision to deny the request for immediate action.	04/21/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A public meeting was held on June 8, 2011, so that the petitioners could address the PRB in person. The NRC issued a public meeting notice, which contained the agenda (ADAMS Accession No. ML11126A096). Over 3,000 co-petitioner requests were received by the NRC following the June 8, 2011, public meeting with Beyond Nuclear representatives. Due to the large volume received, those requests cannot be individually listed in this status report. On July 12, 2011, the PRB is planning to meet internally to discuss the petition, as supplemented, and make the initial recommendation. 	06/08/11 07/12/11

FACILITY: St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 and 2
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20110365**

DATE OF PETITION: APRIL 3, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 9, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: TRACY ORF
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For reasons specified within the petition request, the petitioner requests that the NRC take escalated enforcement action against NextTera Energy, Florida Power & Light Company, and St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 and 2 and either suspend or revoke the NRC license granted to the licensee for operation of St. Lucie, Units 1 and 2. The petitioner also requests that the NRC issue a notice of violation with a proposed civil penalty against those collectively and singularly named above. The petitioner's basis for the requested action is that on April 19, 2010, the "licensee admitted to the NRC that when St. Lucie, Unit 1 was licensed, the facility was not required to incorporate a single failure design capability for a non-safety system." The petitioner contends that the licensee's admission and the NRC's inspection (Inspection Report EA-09-321, dated November 3, 2010) supports a finding that the licensee is operating outside the NRC's regulations. Finally, the petitioner requests that the NRC immediately Order the licensee to bring the St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 and 2, to a cold shutdown mode of operation.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	04/03/11
On May 12, 2011, the petitioner submitted a letter to the NRC stating that the NRC had taken no action under MD 8.11 on the petition dated April 3, 2011. Because the NRC staff was not in receipt of the April 3, 2011, petition, the staff plans to proceed in accordance with MD 8.11 to evaluate the petition.	05/12/11

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~2 MONTHS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 25, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and to offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB, prior to the PRB's initial recommendation. The petitioner accepted this opportunity to address the PRB. 	05/25/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 2, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the request for immediate action only. The PRB denied the request for immediate action because there was no immediate safety concern to the plant, or to the health and safety of the public. 	06/02/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 9, 2011, the petitioner confirmed his availability to address the PRB by telephone on July 7, 2011. 	06/09/11

FACILITY: H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20110367**

DATE OF PETITION: APRIL 17, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 14, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: TRACY ORF
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For reasons specified within the petition request, the petitioner requests that the NRC take escalated enforcement action against Progress Energy, William D. Johnson, and H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant and either suspend or revoke the NRC license granted to the licensee for operation of H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant. The petitioner also requests that the NRC issue a notice of violation with a proposed civil penalty against those collectively and singularly named above. The petitioner's basis for the requested action is that on March 28, 2010, the NRC sent a special inspection team to investigate the circumstances of a significant event that occurred at H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant and caused a condition that increased the chance of reactor core damage. The petitioner claims that Progress Energy informed the NRC in writing that certain diagnostics and testing had been performed at H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, when, in fact, those activities had not occurred.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.

04/17/11

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~2 MONTHS

- On May 12, 2011, the petitioner submitted a letter to the NRC stating that the NRC had taken no action under MD 8.11 on the petition dated April 17, 2011. Because the NRC staff was not in receipt of the April 17, 2011, petition, the staff plans to proceed in accordance with MD 8.11 to evaluate the petition. 05/12/11
- On May 25, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and to offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB, prior to the PRB's initial recommendation. The petitioner accepted this opportunity to address the PRB. 05/25/11
- On June 14, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to discuss the petition request. The PRB plans to review the information provided in the petition, as supplemented, when making the initial recommendation. 06/14/11

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	06/01/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 20, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition. On June 23, 2011, OEDO approved an extension request to support the staff's ability to reach a final recommendation. An extension was granted until September 2, 2011. On June 27, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's initial recommendation that per MD 8.11, the facts that constitute the basis for taking the particular action must be specified and the petitioner must provide some element of support beyond the bare assertion. The petitioner did not provide any element of support beyond the basic assertions, to warrant further inquiry. Thus, the PRB's initial recommendation is that the petition does not meet the criteria for review. The petitioner requested a second opportunity to address the PRB by telephone. On June 30, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to discuss the PRB's initial recommendation. The PRB will meet internally again to discuss the petition, as supplemented during the June 30th teleconference. 	06/20/11
On June 2, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB. The petitioner accepted this opportunity to address the PRB.	06/02/11		06/23/11
On June 13, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to discuss the petition before the PRB met internally to make an initial recommendation.	06/13/11		06/27/11
			06/30/11

FACILITY: Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20110449**

DATE OF PETITION: JUNE 4, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: N/A
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 22, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: CHRISTOPHER GRATTON
CASE ATTORNEY: CARRIE SAFFORD



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC take enforcement action against Tennessee Valley Authority, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, and Tom Kilgore. The basis for the petition is that on May 9, 2011, the NRC issued a final significance determination of a red finding, Notice of Violation, and assessment followup letter (EA-11-018). The petitioner states that the NRC considered all available information provided by the licensee and concluded that the red finding was correctly characterized; however, the petitioner is requesting a 2.206 petition because the licensee recently filed an appeal asking the NRC to re-evaluate the red finding.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.

06/04/11

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~1 MONTH

- On June 21, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner that the petition did not meet the criteria for review under 10 CFR 2.206. The petitioner was also informed that a letter documenting the staff's decision would be submitted to him in the near future.

06/21/11

FACILITY: Palisades Nuclear Plant & Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20110477**

DATE OF PETITION: JUNE 20, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: N/A
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: N/A
PETITION MANAGER: LYNNEA WILKINS
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC take enforcement action against Entergy Nuclear Generation, Entergy Nuclear, Inc., Entergy Nuclear Northeast, Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Entergy Nuclear Palisades, LLC., Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC., Entergy Operations, Inc., and J. Wayne Leonard. The basis for the petition stems from an NRC public meeting discussion, held with licensees on June 20, 2011. The discussion was related to a change in the structure for which quality control (QC) and quality assurance (QA) licensed activities are conducted at nuclear power plants. The petitioner states that the licensee failed to comply with the NRC regulations and standards when making material changes to their QC/QA programs and the licensees failed to submit a license amendment request, failed to update the Final Safety Analysis Report, and failed to update the Technical Specifications for each material change made to the QC/QA program.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.

06/20/11

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~1 WEEK

- The petition manager plans to initiate contact with the petitioner to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process.

06/30/11

FACILITY: Fort Calhoun Station, Unit 1
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20110492**

DATE OF PETITION: JUNE 26, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: N/A
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: N/A
PETITION MANAGER: LYNNEA WILKINS
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC take escalated enforcement action against the Omaha Public Power District and Ft. Calhoun Station, Unit 1. The basis for the petition is that on June 26, 2011, a 2,000-foot berm at Fort Calhoun Station, Unit 1, collapsed from the forces of flood waters. The petitioner states that the licensee's installed flood-protection measures and systems and barriers at Fort Calhoun Station, Unit 1, are insufficient to adequately protect the reactor from a full meltdown scenario and that the licensee's station blackout procedures are not sufficient to meet the challenging extended loss of off-site power due to flood-waters and other natural disasters or terrorist attacks.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.

06/26/11

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~1 WEEK

- The petition manager plans to initiate contact with the petitioner to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process.

06/30/11

Enclosure 2
ADAMS Accession
No. ML111860039
Age Statistics for Open
10 CFR 2.206 Petitions

AGE STATISTICS FOR AGENCY 10 CFR 2.206 OPEN PETITIONS

Assigned Action Office	Facility/ Petitioner	Incoming Petition	PRB Meeting/Days from Incoming Petition ¹	Acknowledgment Letter/Days from Incoming Petition ²	Proposed Director's Decision/Age in Days ³	Final Director's Decision/Age in Days ⁴	Comments on the Completion Goal Status
NRR	Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 2 and 3; Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station Sherwood Martinelli G20090487	8/22/09	12/08/09 109 days	12/17/09 118 days			The goal to issue the acknowledgement letter was not met. The PRB meeting was delayed to support a request from the petitioner to address the PRB by phone before it met internally to make an initial recommendation. The delay in holding the PRB meeting impacted our ability to issue an acknowledgement letter in accordance with the NRC's timeliness goals.
NRR	Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant Thomas Saporito G20090690	12/05/09	01/07/10 33 days	03/04/10 86 days			The goal to issue the acknowledgement letter was not met. The PRB meeting was delayed to support a request from the petitioner to address the PRB by phone before it met internally to make an initial recommendation. The delay in holding the PRB meeting impacted our ability to issue an acknowledgement letter in accordance with the NRC's timeliness goals.

¹ Goal is to hold a Petition Review Board meeting, in which the petitioner is invited to participate, within 2 weeks of receipt of the petition.

² Goal is to issue an acknowledgment letter within 35 days of the date of the incoming petition.

³ Goal is to issue a proposed director's decision within 120 days of the acknowledgment letter.

⁴ Goal is to issue a final director's decision within 45 days of the end of the comment period.

FSME	U.S. Army Installation Command Isaac Harp G20100136	03/04/10	04/14/10 41 days	04/26/10 53 days			The goal to issue the acknowledgement letter was not met. This letter was originally submitted to the NRC as a petition for a notice of appeal, which was subsequently referred to the 10 CFR 2.206 process for review. The additional time required to ensure that this letter was in the correct process, in addition to time needed to coordinate a call with the petitioner, contributed to the delay in holding a call with the PRB within 2 weeks of receipt of the petition and in issuing the acknowledgement letter in accordance with the NRC's timeliness goals.
FSME	Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2 G20100619	09/30/10	10/19/10 19 days	11/09/10 40 days	04/06/11 148 days	06/02/11 43 days	The goal to issue the final director's decision was met. The comment period ended on April 20, 2011.
NRR	Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station Thomas Saporito G20110043	01/14/11	01/26/11 12 days	03/28/11 73 days			The goal to issue the acknowledgement letter was not met. The PRB meeting was delayed to support a request from the petitioner to address the PRB by phone before it met internally to make an initial recommendation. In addition, the petitioner requested a second call following the PRB's initial recommendation. The delay in holding the PRB meeting impacted our ability to issue an acknowledgement letter in accordance with the NRC's timeliness goals.

NRR	All U.S. Nuclear Reactors Thomas Saporito G20110171	03/12/11	04/14/11 33 days	06/28/11 108 days		<p>The goal to hold a PRB meeting, in which the petitioner is invited to participate, within 2 weeks of receipt of the petition, was not met. Due to the complexity of the petition, and the ongoing staff workload associated with support of the earthquake in Japan, the earliest availability for the PRB members to meet (to coincide with the petitioner's availability) was April 14, 2011.</p> <p>The goal to issue an acknowledgment letter within 35 days of the date of the incoming petition was not met. The delay in holding the PRB meeting impacted our ability to issue an acknowledgement letter in accordance with the NRC's timeliness goals. NRR obtained an extension, which was approved by the OEDO, to support the PRB's ability to hold an additional conference call with the petitioner, and to coordinate the internal PRB discussions which involved a significant amount of staff throughout the entire agency.</p>
NRR	Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 1, 2, and 3 Eric Schneiderman, Office of the Attorney	03/28/11	05/09/11 42 days	06/30/11 94 days		<p>The goal to hold a PRB meeting, in which the petitioner is invited to participate, within 2 weeks of receipt of the petition, was not met. The petitioner requested this first opportunity and the</p>

	General, State of New York; G20110221						<p>earliest availability which coincided with the petitioner's availability was May 9, 2011.</p> <p>The goal to issue an acknowledgment letter within 35 days of the date of the incoming petition was not met. The delay in holding the PRB meeting impacted our ability to issue an acknowledgement letter in accordance with the NRC's timeliness goals. NRR obtained an extension, which was approved by the OEDO, to support the PRB's ability to hold a public meeting with the petitioner, and to coordinate the internal PRB discussions .</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--