

Official Transcript of Proceedings

“Corrected Transcript: Corrections denoted within brackets []”

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: 2.206 Petition by Thomas Saporito

Docket Number: n/a

Location: by teleconference

Date: September 29, 2011

Work Order No.: NRC-1170

Pages 1-37

“Corrected Transcript: Corrections denoted within brackets []”

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

10 CFR 2.206 PETITION REVIEW BOARD (PRB)

CONFERENCE CALL

RE:

NORTH ANNA POWER STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

SEPTEMBER 29, 2011

+ + + + +

The conference call was held, Patrick Hiland, Chairperson of the Petition Review Board, presiding.

PETITIONER: THOMAS SAPORITO

PETITION REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:

PATRICK HILAND, Petition Review Board Chairman

JON THOMPSON, Petition Manager

TANYA MENSAH, 2.206 Coordinator

GUJENDRA BEDI, NRR/DCI/CPTB

KAMAL MANOLY, NRR/DE

GERALD McCOY, R-II/DRP/RPB5

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

DAVID RAHN, NRR/DE/EICB

SHIH-LIANG WU, NRR/DSS/SNPB

NRC HEADQUARTERS STAFF

MAURI LEMONCELLI, OGC

RICHARD STATTEL, NRR

LICENSEE STAFF PRESENT:

MARGARET EARLE

PATRICK [PAGE] KEMP

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

P R O C E E D I N G S

1:03 p.m.

MR. THOMPSON: On the record.

This is John [Jon] Thompson, the Petition Manager. I'd like to call the meeting to begin. First of all, I would like to thank everybody for attending this meeting. As I said, my name is John [Jon] Thompson and I'm the Petition Manager for this Petition.

We're here today to allow the Petitioner, Mr. Thomas Saporito, to address the Petition Review Board regarding the 2.206 Petition dated September 8, 2011. That is a public document for those who would like to look it up. The Petition Review Board Chairman is Patrick Hiland.

As part of the Petition Review Board's review of this Petition, Thomas Saporito has requested this opportunity to address the Petition Review Board. This meeting is scheduled from 1:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.

The meeting is being recorded by the NRC Operations Center and will be transcribed by a court reporter. The transcript will become a supplement to the Petition. The transcript will also be made

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 publicly available.

2 I'd like to open this meeting with
3 introductions. As we go around the room please be
4 sure to clearly state your name, your position and
5 the office that you work for within the NRC for the
6 record. And I'll start off.

7 My name is John [Jon] Thompson. I'm the
8 Petition Manager. I work in the Division of
9 Operating Reactor Licensing.

10 MR. STATTEL: My name is Richard
11 Stattel. I'm a technical reviewer in the INC [I&C]
12 Branch of NRR.

13 MS. MENSAH: My name is Tanya Mensah.
14 I'm the 2.206 coordinator in the Office of Nuclear
15 Reactor Regulation, Division of Policy and
16 Rulemaking.

17 CHAIRMAN HILAND: My name is Pat Hiland.
18 I work in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
19 in the Division of Engineering.

20 MS. LEMONCELLI: Mauri Lemoncelli. I'm
21 with the Office of the General Counsel.

22 MR. WU: Shih-Liang Wu. Nuclear
23 Performance and Code Review Branch, NRR.

24 MR. MANOLY: Kamal Manoly, Division of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Engineering.

2 MR. BEDI: Gujendra Bedi, NRR,
3 Department of Component Performance and Testing
4 Branch.

5 MR. RAHN: My name is David Rahn. I'm
6 an INC [I&C] Technical Reviewer in the Office of NRR
7 in the Instrumental and Controls Branch.

8 MR. THOMPSON: We have completed
9 introductions at the NRC Headquarters. At this
10 time, are there any NRC participants from
11 Headquarters that are on the phone?

12 (No verbal response.)

13 Hearing none, are there any NRC
14 participants from Region II on the phone?

15 MR. MCCOY: Yes, this is Gerald McCoy.
16 I'm in the Division of Reactor Projects, Region II.
17 And I'm the only one here at this phone.

18 MR. THOMPSON: All right. Are there any
19 representatives for the Licensee on the phone?

20 MR. KEMP: Yes. This is Page Kemp,
21 Project Manager, at North Anna Power Station.

22 MS. EARLE: And this is Margaret Earle,
23 Licensing Engineer at Innsbrook Technical Center for
24 Dominion.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Saporito, would you
2 like to please introduce yourself for the record?

3 MR. SAPORITO: Yes. My name is Thomas
4 Saporito. I'm the Senior Consultant with SaproDani
5 Associates based in Jupiter, Florida. And I'm the
6 Petitioner in this.

7 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you. It is now
8 requested for members of the public to introduce
9 themselves for this call. I don't think there
10 should be any. However, if there are any members of
11 the public on the phone that wish to do so at this
12 time please state your name for the record.

13 (No verbal response.)

14 Hearing none, I'd like to emphasize that
15 we each need to speak clearly and loudly to make
16 sure that the court reporter can accurately
17 transcribe this meeting. If you do have something
18 that you would like to say, please first state your
19 name for the record and then make your remarks.

20 For those dialing into the meeting,
21 please remember to mute your phones to minimize any
22 background noise or distractions. If you do not
23 have a mute button on your telephone, this can be
24 done by pressing the keys * and then 6. And to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 unmute you can press *6 again and you'll come back
2 on and be able to speak where people can hear you.
3 So thank you for observing that.

4 At this time, I'll turn it over to the
5 Petition Review Board Chairman Patrick Hiland.

6 CHAIRMAN HILAND: Good afternoon. My
7 name is Patrick Hiland. And welcome to this meeting
8 regarding the 2.206 Petition submitted by Mr.
9 Saporito.

10 First, I'd like to share some background
11 on our process. Section 2.206 of Title X [10] of
12 the Code of Federal Regulations describes the
13 Petition process. The primary mechanism for the
14 public to request enforcement action by the NRC in a
15 public process. This process permits anyone to
16 Petition NRC to take enforcement[-]type action
17 related to NRC licensees or licensed activities.

18 Depending on the results of its
19 evaluation, NRC could modify, suspend or revoke NRC
20 [-]issued license or take any other appropriate
21 enforcement action. The NRC staff's guidance, the
22 disposition of 2.206 Petition request, is in
23 Management Directive 8.11 which is publicly
24 available.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 The purpose of today's meeting is to
2 give the Petition an opportunity to provide any
3 additional explanation or support for the Petition
4 before the Petition Review Board's initial
5 consideration and recommendation. This meeting is
6 not a hearing nor is it an opportunity for the
7 Petitioner to question or examine [the] Petition
8 Review Board on the merits or the issues presented
9 in the Petition request. No decisions regarding the
10 merits of this Petition will be made at this
11 meeting.

12 Following this meeting, the Petition
13 Review Board will conduct its internal
14 deliberations. The outcome of this internal meeting
15 will be discussed with the Petitioner.

16 The Petition Review Board typically
17 consists of a chairman, usually a manager at the
18 senior executive service level at the NRC. As
19 explained, Patrick Hiland, that's me. I'm the
20 Chairman of this Petition Review Board. And [and]
21 I am at the senior executive level.

22 It has a Petition manager and a Petition
23 Review Board coordinator. Other members of the
24 Board are determined by the NRC staff based on the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 content of the information in the Petition request.

2 And very briefly, I'll go over the Petition Review
3 Board members.

4 John [Jon] Thompson is Petition manager
5 for the Petition under discussion. Tanya Mensah is
6 the Office's Petition Review Board Coordinator. Our
7 technical staff who are on the phone today include
8 Gerald McCoy from Region II, Gurjendra Bedi from the
9 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation Component and
10 Performance and Testing Branch, Kamal Manoly from
11 the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation Division of
12 Engineering, Shih-Liang Wu from the Office of
13 Nuclear Reactor Regulation Nuclear Performance and
14 Code Review Branch, David Rahn from the Office of
15 Nuclear Reactor Regulation Instrumental and Controls
16 Branch. We also have advice from our Office of
17 General Counsel represented by Mauri Lemoncelli.

18 As described in our process, the NRC
19 staff may ask clarifying questions in order to
20 better understanding [understand] the Petitioner's
21 presentation and to reach a reasoned decision
22 whether to accept or reject the Petitioner's request
23 for review under the 2.206 process. The Petition is
24 a public document available in the NRC's electronic

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 library.

2 I would like to briefly summarize the
3 scope of the Petition under consideration and the
4 NRC's activities to date. On September 8, 2011, Mr.
5 Saporito submitted to the NRC a Petition under 2.206
6 regarding the North Anna Power Station Units 1 and
7 2. In this Petition request, Mr. Saporito
8 identified concerns with the safe operation of North
9 Anna Power Station after the earthquake of August
10 23, 2011.

11 Mr. Saporito requests that the NRC:

12 (1) take escalated enforcement action
13 against the North Anna Power Station to suspend or
14 revoke the licenses for that facility;

15 (2) issue a notice of violation with a
16 proposed fine of \$1 million;

17 (3) issue an order to keep the North
18 Anna Power Station in cold shutdown until the
19 completion of four sets of activities described in
20 the Petition which are meant to ensure the safety of
21 the North Anna Power Station.

22 As the basis for this request, Mr.
23 Saporito states that the North Anna Power Station
24 experienced ground acceleration on August 23, 2011

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 in excess of the design basis earthquake and that
2 licensee inspection and testing activities at the
3 site are incomplete.

4 But the Petitioner states that the Licensee
5 cannot meet the requirements of the updated facility
6 safety analysis report as a result of this event
7 because the plant sustained damage outside the
8 Licensee's safety design. The Petitioner also
9 expressed concerns with the scope of testing and
10 inspection activities for the reactor core and fuel
11 assemblies.

12 Allow me now I want to discuss the NRC
13 activities to date. On September 14, 2011, the
14 Petition Manager contacted Mr. Saporito to discuss
15 the 10 CFR 2.206 process and to offer him an
16 opportunity to address the Petition Review Board by
17 phone or in person. Mr. Saporito requested to
18 address the Petition Review Board by phone prior to
19 its internal meeting to make the initial
20 recommendation to accept or reject the Petition for
21 review.

22 On September 20, 2011, the Petition
23 Review Board met internally to discuss the request
24 for immediate action. The Petition Review Board

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 denied Mr. Saporito's request for immediate action
2 on the basis that there was no immediate safety
3 concern to the plant or to the health and safety of
4 the public.

5 The Petition Review Board also
6 determined that the requirement to demonstrate that
7 no functional damage has occurred to those features
8 necessary for continued operation without undue risk
9 to the health and safety already exists in 10 CFR
10 2.100 [100,] Appendix A. Mr. Saporito was informed
11 on September 21, 2011 of the Petition Review Board's
12 decision to deny his request for immediate action.

13 As a reminder for the phone
14 participants, please identify yourself if you make
15 an [any] remarks as this will help us in the
16 preparation of the meeting transcript that will be
17 made publicly available.

18 Mr. Saporito, I'll turn it over to you
19 to allow you to provide any information you believe
20 the Petition Review Board should consider as part of
21 this Petition.

22 MR. SAPORITO: All right. Thank you,
23 Mr. Chairman.

24 For the record, my name is Thomas

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Saporito. I'm a Senior Consultant with SaproDani
2 Associates. And we're located in Jupiter, Florida.

3 Before I get into the part of this
4 matter, I want to put a correction in the record.
5 The Petition which we filed on September 8, 2011 at
6 pages four and six speaks to the North Anna Nuclear
7 Power Plant Unit 1 and Unit 2. Those unit numbers
8 were inadvertently interchanged. So where it says
9 Unit 2, it should really be Unit 1. And where it
10 says Unit 1, it should really be Unit 2 at page four
11 and page five of the Petition. All right.

12 CHAIRMAN HILAND [Jon Thompson]: Mr.
13 Saporito, I'm sorry. Just for clarification, that's
14 pages four and five or four and six where those
15 number units are inverted.

16 MR. SAPORITO: I'm sorry. Yes, you're
17 correct. It's four and five. I'm sorry, sir. It's
18 four and five where those two corrections are.

19 CHAIRMAN HILAND [Jon Thompson]: Okay.
20 We'll address that.

21 MR. SAPORITO: And another housekeeping
22 issue is on September 8, 2011 I authored a letter on
23 behalf of SaproDani and Associates to Oscar
24 Demiranda, D-E-M-I-R-A-N-D-A. He works for the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission. He's a
2 Senior Allegations Coordinator out of Region II
3 Headquarters based in Atlanta, Georgia. And these
4 allegations set forth in this two-page letter are
5 relevant to this proceeding and they are
6 specifically addressing nuclear safety concerns with
7 respect to the August 23, 2011 earthquake event at
8 the North Anna Nuclear Power Plant. And through
9 this reference I'm going to incorporate that two-
10 page document which is a September 8, 2011 letter
11 from Saprodani Associates to Oscar Demiranda of the
12 NRC into this public record.

13 And while I'm on the subject in
14 accordance with NRC Management Directive 8.11 all my
15 comments today that are made to the NRC's Petition
16 Review Board are to be accepted into the record and
17 are required to be considered by each member of the
18 Petition Review Board sitting here today just the
19 same as if I had placed these comments and
20 information and references into the record and when
21 I initially initiated the 2.206 Petition on
22 September 8, 2011.

23 All right. First, I want to identify
24 into the record a news article issued by Los Angeles

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Times, LATimes.com on September 8, 2011. And it's
2 entitled "NRC: Earthquake Shook Nuclear Past Design
3 Limits." And I'm just going to read a couple of
4 relevant portions of this into the record.

5 It says, "A nuclear power plant in
6 Central Virginia may have experiences twice as much
7 shaking as it was designed to withstand during last
8 month's rare east coast earthquake according to
9 Federal Nuclear Regulators, although no major damage
10 has been found." So that document references an NRC
11 opinion that the earthquake event had a magnitude
12 which was twice the rate of design based license of
13 the North Anna Nuclear Units 1 and 2.

14 The next document I want to put into the
15 record is issued by the Washington Post on September
16 8th entitled "Virginia Nuclear Plant Experienced
17 Strong Shaking in August 23 Earthquake." And what I
18 want to put into the record is specifically it says
19 "The event that occurred at North Anna had high
20 acceleration spikes but did not have sufficient
21 duration of energy to cause any damage." And that
22 was made by a senior vice president for Dominion, a
23 fellow by the name of Grecheck, G-R-E-C-H-E-C-K.

24 And the next article is an article dated

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 September 9, 2011 by Reuters, R-E-U-T-E-R-S,
2 Robertson's (phonetic) Agency. And the part I'm
3 going to put in here is a quote. It says, "It looks
4 like the fuel rods were going into the core prior to
5 the transformer opening." And that comment was made
6 by Dominion executive. And that was also reflected
7 in a post [-] earthquake meeting held by the NRC and a
8 Dominion executive representing the North Anna Power
9 Station.

10 And finally I want to put into the
11 record a USA Today news article dated September 18,
12 2011 entitled "Weeks After Quake Town Near Nuclear
13 Plant Remains Rattled." And specifically I want to
14 reference -- It says here, "North Anna" which
15 they're talking about the North Anna Nuclear Plant
16 Units 1 and 2. It says, "North Anna 90 miles
17 southwest of the White House is emerging as a test
18 case for the nuclear industry as it faces increased
19 scrutiny."

20 Okay. Ninety miles from the White House
21 is what this articles says. And if you recall just
22 a few minutes ago I put in the record quoted
23 comments made by the senior executive vice president
24 for Dominion, the Licensee, that the earthquake that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 wasn't of a significant duration.

2 Well, the day before yesterday and
3 yesterday I viewed news articles by national press,
4 various national press agencies, over the internet
5 which showed a video which was taken by security
6 cameras located inside the Washington Monument
7 during the earthquake event. And I would like the
8 Petition Review Board members to review that video.

9 It's available on the internet.

10 And the video specifically shows a
11 significant shaking the Washington Monument at the
12 particular level that security camera was located
13 at. And there's a clock, a timer, timing the
14 duration of the event. And it lasted almost three
15 minutes. So it was a significant earthquake.

16 This Washington Monument is 90 miles
17 from the North Anna Nuclear Facility. So Dominion's
18 opinion through that executive vice president is
19 wholly false. And it calls into question the
20 reliability of the seismic instrumentation which the
21 Licensee used to gather data as to the acceleration
22 of this earthquake event and as to the duration of
23 this earthquake. The NRC should look into that
24 issue.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Also in this September 18, 2011 news
2 article issued by USA Today it says and NRC is
3 quoted here, Eric Leeds, a [the] Director of Nuclear
4 Regulatory Commission [the Office of Nuclear Reactor
5 Regulation]. It says, "We don't have a lot of
6 experience in this area." He was quoted as saying
7 that. "We don't have a lot of experience in this
8 area." And I believe that was also captured on the
9 NRC's video tape in a subsequent meeting subsequent
10 to the earthquake with the Licensee.

11 It also says in this article that "The
12 earthquake moved 25 casks," that's nuclear fuel
13 storage casks that weigh 115 tons each and holds
14 spent nuclear fuel up to -- it moved the casks up to
15 4.5 inches.

16 And finally it says, "An NRC document
17 estimated a quake strong enough to exceed North
18 Anna's design would occur once in 5,000 years."
19 Okay. "Once in 5,000 years." And based on that
20 this fellow Donal, D-O-N-A-L, Day, D-A-Y, a nuclear
21 physicist who is employed at the University of
22 Virginia was quoted as saying, "It just shows
23 they're wrong." And he's talking about the NRC.
24 The NRC is dead wrong with respect to how frequent

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 an earthquake can occur.

2 Not only is the NRC wrong and all its
3 evaluations wrong and incorrect with respect to how
4 frequent an earthquake can occur, this particular
5 earthquake occurred where there was no known
6 earthquake fault line. And there wasn't supposed to
7 be an earthquake occurring here. No one expected an
8 earthquake to occur here.

9 And it certainly calls into question all
10 the NRC's seismic evaluation to date, all the NRC's
11 reliance on those seismic evaluations to date, all
12 the NRC's nuclear safety regulations under 10 CFR
13 Part 50 to date with respect to all licenses issued
14 to some 104 nuclear power plants in the United
15 States.

16 As I mentioned earlier, I personally
17 attended via an internet link a video conference
18 that was held with the Licensee shortly after the
19 August 23rd earthquake event. And during that
20 conference or during my monitoring of that meeting
21 between the NRC and the Licensee, the NRC stated
22 that a restart of North Anna 1 and 2 nuclear
23 reactors required NRC approval because of the
24 Appendix A regulation cited earlier by someone here

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 today in this meeting by the NRC.

2 The Licensee stated at that time of the
3 earthquake on August 23rd Units 1 and 2 were 100
4 percent power and that there was a -- Eleven seconds
5 into the event as I understand -- these are my
6 personal notes -- there was a negative flux signal
7 trip of the nuclear reactor. They tripped because
8 of a negative flux indication. And then
9 subsequently there was an alert declared. And on
10 the 24th Units 1 and 2 were brought into cold
11 shutdown mode of operation.

12 Then on August 26th, the Licensee
13 recovered scratch plates which are a piece of
14 equipment used to record the acceleration of the
15 earthquake and that the Licensee states that it was
16 outside of the design basis. It was in excess of 5
17 Hertz.

18 And they had no positive -- At that
19 time, they had no positive root cause for the
20 negative flux rate trip of the nuclear reactor to
21 provide to the NRC. And there was no control room
22 indication with this particular seismic event.

23 They talked about the 25 casks that
24 shifted as much as four and a half inches. And the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Licensee stated to the NRC that there are two seals
2 inside of these spent fuel casks. And they
3 validated that the seals were intact. They affirmed
4 to the NRC during that meeting that the casks seals
5 remained intact because there were no alarms.

6 Well, that's not validation because
7 there were no alarms in the control room to give the
8 operators a heads-up about the seismic event.
9 What's to say these alarms even were operable in
10 these spent fuel casks? The NRC needs to go in
11 there and look at the surveillance testing. When
12 was the last time those alarms were tested and
13 validated prior to this earthquake event before the
14 Licensee can be allowed to rely on an alarm
15 indication to validate a seal for nuclear fuel? You
16 know, that's a pretty incredible statement by the
17 Licensee.

18 And they talked a little bit about some
19 roof panels being moved on a roof. And then the
20 Licensee -- Oh yeah. There was an anchor bolt up on
21 the roof that was apparently displaced by the
22 earthquake event. And it was on page 24 of their
23 handout I believe if I recall correctly according to
24 my notes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Anyway, this anchor bolt you could see
2 it in this slide handout. It was physically ripped
3 out of the concrete slab. And there were other --
4 There was at least one other picture provided by the
5 Licensee, one other slide, which shows another
6 anchor bolt on a tank I believe where the piece of
7 concrete had been dislodged from the movement of the
8 earthquake.

9 So this calls into question whether any
10 and how many other supports within the plant and
11 specifically this nuclear safety related equipment,
12 support brackets, snubbers, piping support and other
13 hardware where the bolts are actually sheared. The
14 Licensee doesn't know about it because they just did
15 a visual inspection.

16 I request that the NRC order the
17 Licensee to do torque testing of all those -- of any
18 retaining bolts throughout the plant on all
19 equipment which is safety related for both nuclear
20 reactors. You can't just look at a bolt and say
21 it's fine because it could be very well sheared
22 beneath the surface where you can't see it. So
23 that's another issue of importance for the NRC to
24 look at.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 They talk about a tape that was made of
2 the seismic event. It's a tape that was sent
3 offsite because it had to be converted digitally.
4 It's an analog recording and they needed to have it
5 converted to a digital signal that could be
6 evaluated to ascertain the magnitude of the
7 earthquake or the acceleration, the movement.

8 My concern here is what was the sampling
9 rate by the contractor from -- You know, you have to
10 sample an analog signal. The more you sample that
11 analog signal, the higher the sampling rate, the
12 more accurate the conversion is going to be. So if
13 it was not a sufficient sampling rate, then the
14 result supplied from the contractor to the Licensee
15 to the NRC is erroneous.

16 So there has to be some standard applied
17 to these types of conversions. And I don't know
18 what that standard is. But I would hope that the
19 NRC would look into that.

20 And again there was discussion about the
21 failure of the control room panel to alert the
22 operators of the earthquake event. There were some
23 other technical discussion with respect to CoMetrics
24 [] who was the contractor apparently who read

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this tape and converted it from an analog to
2 digital.

3 Then there was a discussion about this
4 negative flux that had affected both units. So
5 again you could have a common mode significant
6 problem to both reactors tripped offline for the
7 same reason. So this is something the NRC needs to
8 look at. Was it a common mode failure? If so, why?
9 What actually caused the negative flux rate trip?
10 I'll get into that a little bit more later on.

11 We talked about the design based
12 earthquake. And then the Licensee stated that Unit
13 2 was in a refueling outage. And that Unit 1, it
14 was their intent to bring it back online. In the
15 latter part of September, I think it was September
16 22nd, the executive vice president intended to bring
17 the Unit 1 back online.

18 And his opinion was, the Licensee's
19 opinion was, that Unit 1 reactor internal did not
20 have to be inspected because the inspection of Unit
21 2 during the refueling outage would bound any damage
22 that would have been suspected on Unit 1. And
23 that's an outrageous opinion and that doesn't hold
24 any water. And that's in violation of NRC's safety

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 regulations under 10 CFR Part 50. And I'll get into
2 that a little bit more here later on.

3 Now let me just grab this. With respect
4 to the enforcement petition, the specific request
5 set forth in this petition, page three, beginning of
6 page three, the escalated enforcement action is
7 asked to be taken against the Licensee. And one of
8 the reasons is the arrogance of the Licensee of
9 wanting to restart these nuclear reactors as early
10 as September 22nd. They wanted to restart Unit 1 as
11 early as September 22nd of this year even before the
12 NRC's augmented inspection team had concluded its
13 inspection activities and without investigating and
14 testing and inspecting the internals of the nuclear
15 reactor at Unit 1. So clearly the Licensee's
16 attitude and arrogance is based on their economic
17 needs and concerns to generate revenue through
18 operation of Unit 1 rather than to protect public
19 health and safety by ensuring that there is no
20 damage to the internals of Unit 1 and to other
21 systems and components of Unit 1.

22 And the NRC needs to take into
23 consideration what the Licensee's attitude and
24 behavior is with respect to protecting public health

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 and safety by their action and their comments when
2 they speak to the NRC and affirm to them their basis
3 for wanting to restart the nuclear reactor without
4 required safety inspections under their license
5 which requires them to make these safety
6 inspections. They're willing to forego NRC safety
7 regulations under 10 CFR Part 50. The NRC should
8 just go ahead and revoke that license until the NRC
9 has reasonable assurance that those executive
10 managers have been replaced with others who think
11 otherwise and would rather comply with the NRC
12 safety regulations under 10 CFR Part 50 rather than
13 jeopardize public health and safety in a rush to
14 restart a nuclear reactor.

15 The civil penalty of \$1 million goes
16 towards again the Licensee's attitude and arrogance
17 as to jeopardizing public health and safety for the
18 reasons I just stated and the NRC request for
19 confirmatory order requiring the Licensee to keep
20 the units into a cold shutdown. Again, I defer to
21 the Chairman, not the NRC chairman, the NRC -- Well,
22 the Petition Review Board Chairman, that's the word
23 I was looking for.

24 In early comments today, we referred to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Appendix A I believe under the 10 CFR 50 which
2 requires NRC authorization before the Licensee can
3 restart these reactors. That would suffice to cover
4 that requirement.

5 However, within the petition, it is
6 requested that the Licensee completes an independent
7 seismic and geological evaluation of the North Anna
8 Nuclear Plant Site to ascertain the degree and
9 magnitude inclusive of acceleration consideration of
10 future earthquake events which could result in
11 destructive forces outside the safety design basis
12 of the facility as experienced by the Licensee's
13 facility during the August 23, 2011 earthquake
14 event. And that independent evaluation should look
15 at a worst case based earthquake scenario.

16 Since this was a 5.8 magnitude with a
17 significant acceleration above 5 Hertz and twice of
18 what the plant was licensed for by the NRC, it
19 stands to reason that the NRC cannot allow either
20 one of these nuclear reactors to restart until a
21 proper seismic evaluation has been done so that the
22 NRC can evaluate whether these reactors can ever
23 restart and without a significant retrofit. I mean
24 they may be able to be retrofitted with more

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 supports and heavier brackets and other replacement
2 of safety related equipment. I don't know.

3 But they certainly cannot be restarted
4 in their present condition because neither nuclear
5 reactor is licensed to operate sitting in a nuclear
6 reactor site where an earthquake of 5.8 magnitude
7 occurred and where that earthquake is twice of what
8 the NRC license allow those nuclear plants to
9 operate.

10 Third in the petition, it says the NRC -
11 - one other requirement is that the NRC approves a
12 submittal by the Licensee which upgrades the
13 Licensee's current final safety analysis report
14 and/or updated final safety analysis report to
15 incorporate the plant retrofit for Units 1 and 2
16 described in the first two items that I addressed
17 here. So their current FSAR and updated FSAR are
18 inadequate and erroneous at this point. Because
19 what you have is you have two nuclear reactors which
20 are in an unanalyzed condition at this point.

21 So those documents, the FSAR and the
22 updated FSAR, are no longer relevant to the licenses
23 issued by the NRC. And the Licensee cannot rely on
24 them to provide reasonable assurance to the NRC that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 those nuclear reactors can be operated in a safe and
2 reliable manner to protect public health and safety.

3 Fourth, the Licensee needs to complete
4 an investigation of both Units 1 and 2 to North Anna
5 facility to determine the extent of any damage to
6 the physical plant and safety related systems and
7 components including but not limited to:

8 (1) the nuclear reactor core fuel
9 assemblies, components, structures, supports, CRDMs
10 which is control rod drive mechanisms, etc.;

11 (2) installation of three field seismic
12 instrumentation because none exists at the
13 Licensee's facilities to date;

14 (3) torque test all safety related
15 equipment, support installation and retention bolts
16 to assure that the bolts have not sheared with the
17 recent earthquake event;

18 (4) inspect all snubbers throughout the
19 entire facility to ensure that the license remains
20 intact and enable to perform the design function;

21 (5) inspection and validate all nuclear
22 steam supply piping and related piping systems
23 including the nuclear reactor hot and cold leg
24 piping on both units to validate its integrity and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to evaluate the seismic capability of the piping to
2 withstand an earthquake event greater than the
3 plant's current design basis and to meet any
4 enhanced plant design basis described in Items 1, 2
5 and 3 above that I recently spoke of;

6 (6) determine that digital sample rate
7 used and relied upon by metrics [] and
8 converting the analog tape captured the earthquake
9 event to assure that a sufficient sample rate was
10 used during the conversion process;

11 (7) hire and/or train personnel to
12 ensure that any future acceleration determination
13 can be quickly completed in-house by the Licensee
14 rather than spend critical time to have such
15 determinations made offsite; and

16 (8) ensure through an independent
17 evaluation that the measured earthquake event
18 acceleration was not skewed by the location of the
19 scratch plate in the auxiliary building of Unit 1
20 due to a shift in the soil from the earthquake
21 event.

22 Now the Licensee is required under its
23 updated final safety analysis report and its final
24 safety analysis report at Section 3.7.4.6 and by NRC

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 safety regulations under 10 CFR Part 50 to ensure
2 that all safety related equipment and systems are
3 fully operational and can function within the
4 plant's safety design basis. The Licensee cannot
5 meet this requirement to date because the Licensee
6 refuses to inspect the Unit 1 nuclear reactor
7 internals. That's significant.

8 There is no leeway or exception that can
9 be made by the NRC to allow the Licensee to restart
10 Unit 1 without opening that vessel and doing the
11 required inspection. If the NRC allows the Licensee
12 to restart Unit 1 without complying with current
13 regulations that I've just delineated, then perhaps
14 this matter needs to go to Federal Court to
15 challenge the NRC's oversight of this Licensee.

16 As I spoke earlier, both units,
17 inspection of both units in their entity [entirety]
18 is required. The Licensee admitted there was a
19 negative flux rate trip which caused both reactors
20 to trip offline. And at the recent conference
21 meeting held with the NRC which I talked about
22 earlier that I attended through the internet video,
23 they had no root cause for it at that time. They
24 hinted that there were four possible reasons, but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 they didn't know why.

2 So the reactor internals must be
3 physically inspected for damage. A negative flux
4 rate trip most likely was caused by the movement of
5 nuclear fuel during the earthquake event. As the
6 NRC Petition Review Board members fully well know
7 the nuclear fuel rod assembly [assemblies] are
8 strategically positioned within the core could cause
9 a nuclear reaction, nuclear fission. And during an
10 earthquake event which apparently lasted for almost
11 three minutes or more, that nuclear fuel certainly
12 moved. The retaining brackets certainly moved. And
13 the fuel rod assemblies entirely [entirety] surely
14 moved. Instrumentation inside that nuclear reactor
15 vessel certainly moved.

16 All those internals on both units have
17 to be inspected. CRDMs have to be inspected. They
18 are very precise pieces of equipment that are
19 electronically engaged to support the poison rod,
20 control rod, within the nuclear reactor core to
21 control the power levels of the reactor and to
22 automatically open during the reactor trip, to scram
23 the reactor, to prevent a nuclear accident.

24 But you have fuel rods that need to be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 inspected. You have fuel rod assemblies that need
2 to be inspected. You have nuclear fuel reactor
3 supports that need to be inspected. Control rod
4 drive mechanisms that need to be inspected.
5 Instrumentation like the loose parts monitors in
6 there that need to be inspected. The reactor
7 coolant system piping needs to be inspected in its
8 entirety including snubbers, brackets and supports.

9 Units 1 and 2 are currently in an
10 unanalyzed condition. The earthquake was outside of
11 the design basis of the licenses issued to the
12 Licensee by the NRC by a factor of two. They were
13 twice the magnitude outside, twice the acceleration
14 outside, of the design basis. And because the NRC
15 issued the Licensee a license for Unit 1 and Unit 2
16 under 10 CFR Part 50, the NRC did so with the
17 assurances proffered by the Licensee at the time of
18 issuance that those plants were physically located
19 and would be operated under 10 CFR Part 50 within a
20 certain expectation of seismic activity.

21 Well, we know now that on August 23,
22 2011 an earthquake event shook the North Anna
23 nuclear reactors at twice the design basis, twice
24 outside the design basis that the NRC issued those

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 licenses for. Therefore, the plants, Units 1 and 2,
2 are in an unanalyzed condition. So the NRC -- Even
3 if the Licensee would be willing at this point to
4 inspect the internals of Unit 1 as they did Unit 2 -
5 - and I'm hoping they did. I have no certification
6 they did to date, but they made that affirmation to
7 the NRC during the meeting -- but even if they
8 would, the Licensee would, inspect Unit 1's
9 internals, that would not be sufficient for the NRC
10 to authorize the Licensee to restart either of the
11 nuclear units, either of the nuclear reactors, under
12 their current licenses because they could not meet
13 the Appendix A, Appendix 100 or Appendix A,
14 requirements under 10 CFR Part 50 to provide
15 reasonable assurance to the NRC that those nuclear
16 safety equipment will operate as designed because
17 we're operating in an unanalyzed condition.

18 The Licensee actually has to go back and
19 redesign the plant to meet an earthquake greater
20 than a 5.8 magnitude or greater than the peak of the
21 acceleration detected by those scratch plates
22 because it occurred and put the plant outside of its
23 design basis, outside of its license requirements.

24 Finally, the Licensee during the context

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 of that meeting which I subsequently watched the
2 video at least two times, nowhere during that
3 meeting, did I learn from the Licensee's comments to
4 the NRC that they made any effort at all to inspect
5 the offsite power structures and facilities
6 providing power to North Anna nuclear reactors 1 and
7 2. And that's critical.

8 And the NRC must require that because
9 you could have a station blackout event caused by
10 damage which the Licensee is currently unaware of.
11 You could have damage to the physical transmission
12 lines, the installators which separate the
13 transmission lines from the support structures. You
14 could have damage at any number of substations
15 which could cause the nuclear reactors to trip
16 through an unbalancing of the power over those
17 transmission lines. And the list goes on and on.

18 So the Licensee has to inspect the
19 entirety of its high voltage distribution lines, its
20 offsite power, before any consideration can be made
21 to restart these nuclear reactors.

22 Now I'm going to sum up here and close
23 so that the NRC has an opportunity and anyone else
24 who may be attending this meeting, public or media,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 to ask questions. But in summation what we have
2 here is two nuclear power plants, North Anna Units 1
3 and 2, who were subjected to a significant seismic
4 event on August 23, 2011 of a duration of almost
5 three minutes when you compare the video footage of
6 the security tape from the Washington National
7 Monument which is available to the NRC. It's a
8 public document, a public video. And where that
9 seismic event was twice outside the design basis of
10 the license issued by the NRC for the operation of
11 North Anna Units 1 and 2 under 10 CFR Part 50.

12 Therefore, Units 1 and 2 are now in an
13 unanalyzed condition. And they can never be
14 restarted under the current licenses because the
15 current licenses are null and void as a result of
16 this earthquake event. And at that, I have
17 concluded. I will stay on the line to answer any
18 questions.

19 CHAIRMAN HILAND: Thank you, Mr.
20 Saporito. At this time, does the staff here in
21 Headquarters have any questions for Mr. Saporito?

22 (No verbal response.)

23 There are no questions in Headquarters.
24 Region II, do you have any questions for Mr.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 Saporito?

2 MR. McCOY: No questions here. Region
3 II.

4 CHAIRMAN HILAND: I understood that a
5 representative or more from the Licensee is on the
6 phone. Do you have any questions for Mr. Saporito?

7 MS. EARLE: No, I don't.

8 CHAIRMAN HILAND: I didn't hear any
9 members of the public announce themselves. But at
10 this time if there are any members of the public on
11 this phone conversation, do you have any questions
12 for Mr. Saporito?

13 (No verbal response.)

14 Hearing none --

15 MS. LEMONCELLI: Mr. Saporito, this is
16 Mauri Lemoncelli from the Office of the General
17 Counsel. As long as there is no other objection,
18 would you mind if I took just a minute or two to
19 confirm with some members of the NRC staff before we
20 adjourn?

21 MR. SAPORITO: Take all the time you
22 want.

23 MS. LEMONCELLI: Just a moment, sir.
24 Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (Pause.)

2 CHAIRMAN HILAND: Ms. [Mr.] Saporito,
3 are you still on the phone? This is Pat Hiland.

4 MR. SAPORITO: Yes, sir. I'm here.

5 CHAIRMAN HILAND: The question that
6 we're mulling over early in your presentation you
7 mentioned and some concerns you had distributed or
8 you had sent to the Region II Allegation Office.
9 And as you may be aware the petition and all its
10 contents are public documents.

11 And so what I will do is I will approach
12 our team coordinator for Allegations in the Office
13 of NRR and I will ask her to coordinate with Region
14 II and this is a formality. They will have to
15 contact you and get permission from you to make that
16 document you sent them a public document.

17 And I assume you are aware of how we
18 handle incoming correspondence at alleged
19 activities. We handle it in confidence and I just
20 want to make sure [,] as well as the people in the
21 room[,], you understood that.

22 MR. SAPORITO: Let me suggest something.
23 Why don't you just go ahead and send me an email
24 and request that document. And I'll email it to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you.

2 CHAIRMAN HILAND: Certainly you can
3 enter that into the public record via this way
4 separately. And what we'll do is we'll accept your
5 email and we will enter it into the record as you've
6 requested.

7 MR. SAPORITO: Okay. I will wait for
8 your email and I'll send it right out to you.

9 CHAIRMAN HILAND: Okay. As stated at
10 the opening, the purpose of this meeting is not to
11 provide an opportunity for the Petitioner or the
12 public to question or examine the Petition Review
13 Board regarding the merits of the petition request.

14 Mr. Saporito, thank you for taking time
15 to provide the NRC staff with clarifying information
16 on the petition you've submitted.

17 Before we close, does the court reporter
18 need any additional information for the meeting
19 transcript?

20 COURT REPORTER: Yes, I need the
21 Dominion representatives to spell their last names
22 and that's it.

23 MS. EARLE: Margaret Earle, E-A-R-L-E.

24 COURT REPORTER: All right.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. KEMP: Page Kemp, K-E-M-P.

2 COURT REPORTER: K-E-M-P. Thank you
3 very much.

4 MR. KEMP: Correct.

5 COURT REPORTER: That's all I need.

6 CHAIRMAN HILAND: Okay. With that, this
7 meeting is concluded and we'll be terminating the
8 phone conversation. Thank you all. Off the record.

9 (Whereupon, at 1:55 p.m., the above-
10 entitled matter was concluded.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com