

Enclosure 1
ADAMS Accession
No. ML12060A018
Monthly 10 CFR 2.206,
“Requests for Action
Under This Subpart,”
Status Report

PETITIONS CLOSED DURING THIS PERIOD

FACILITY	PETITIONER/EDO No.	Page
No petitions were closed during this period.		
CURRENT STATUS OF OPEN PETITIONS		
Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 3	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20090690	2
U.S. Nuclear Power Reactors (Related to Japan Earthquake)	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20110171	3
Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 1, 2, and 3	Eric Schneiderman, Office of the Attorney General, State of New York G20110221	4
General Electric Boiling-Water Reactor Mark I and Mark II Units	David Lochbaum, Union of Concerned Scientists G20110563	5
General Electric Boiling-Water Reactor Mark I Units (Related to Japan Earthquake)	Paul Gunter, Reactor Oversight Project and Kevin Kamps, Nuclear Waste Specialist G20110262	6
All licensees of power reactors	Natural Resources Defense Council G20110579	7
Cooper Nuclear Station	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20110506	8
Omaha Public Power District, Fort Calhoun Station, Unit 1	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20110492	9
North Anna Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20110668	10
CURRENT STATUS OF OPEN PETITIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION		
Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station	Mary Lampert G20100454	11
Callaway Nuclear Generating Station	Lawrence Criscione G20110740	12
North Anna Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2	Beyond Nuclear G20110757	13
Palisades	Michael Mulligan G20120022	14
Peach Bottom Atomic Power Stations, Units 2 and 3	Michael Mulligan G20120052	15
Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 3 and 4	Mark Leyse G20120142	16

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20090690 (Petition Age: 27 months)

Facility:	Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 3
Licensee Type:	Reactor
Petitioner(s):	Thomas Saporito, SaproDani Associates
Date of Petition:	December 5, 2009
DD To Be Issued by:	Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance:	December 3, 2012
Final DD Issuance:	To Be Determined (TBD)
Last Contact with Petitioner:	February 21, 2012
Petition Manager:	Farideh Saba
Case Attorney:	Michael Clark

Issues/Actions Requested:

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 Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 3, containment building.

Background:

- On December 5, 2009, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- For a complete summary of NRC actions before July 31, 2011, please refer to the August 2011 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML112490132).
- On August 23, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to inform him that the staff's review was still in progress.
- On November 8, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to inform him that the staff's review was still in progress.
- On January 13, 2012, the petitioner emailed the NRC supplementing his petition with "expert" testimony to be given at public hearings in Florida this summer.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On January 17, 2012, the petition manager requested the petitioner to submit supplemental information to the NRC in writing and discuss how it supports the original petition request.
- On February 21, 2012, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to inform him that the planned issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision has remained unchanged (December 3, 2012).

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20110171 (Petition Age: 12 months)

Facility: U.S. Nuclear Power Reactors
Licensee Type: Reactor
Petitioner(s): Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates
Date of Petition: March 12, 2011
DD To Be Issued by: Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance: January 31, 2013
Final DD Issuance: TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner: January 5, 2012
Petition Manager: Peter Tam
Case Attorney: Michael Clark

Issues/Actions Requested:

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner seeks immediate enforcement action as it requests that the NRC issue an order for 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:

- On March 12, 2011, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- For a complete summary of NRC actions before July 31, 2011, please refer to the August 2011 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML112490132).
- On August 26, 2011, the petition manager left a message with Mr. Saporito to inform him that the staff's review of this petition is in progress (ADAMS Accession No. ML11238A087).
- On October 18, 2011, the Office of the Executive Director for Operations (OEDO) approved an extension to January 31, 2012, to support issuance of the proposed Director's Decision since the issues raised in the petition pertain to the resolution of Near Term Task Force Recommendations associated with the Fukushima Dai-ichi Accident.
- On October 24, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the extension.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On January 5, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner that the petition review board (PRB) is continuing to evaluate the petition and expects to extend the current target date of January 31, 2012, into the future.
- On January 9, 2012, the OEDO approved an extension until January 31, 2013, to issue the proposed Director's Decision since the issues raised in the petition pertain to the resolution of Near Term Task Force Recommendations associated with the Fukushima Dai-ichi Accident.

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20110221 (Petition Age: 11 months)

Facility: Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 1, 2, and 3
Licensee Type: Reactor
Petitioner(s): Eric Schneiderman, Office of the Attorney General, State of New York
Date of Petition: March 28, 2011
DD To Be Issued by: Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance: April 30, 2012
Final DD Issuance: TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner: February 1, 2012
Petition Manager: Doug Pickett
Case Attorney: Brett Klukan and Bob Rader

Issues/Actions Requested:

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

- Identify the violations of 10 CFR 50.48, "Fire Protection," and Sections III.F and III.G of Appendix R, "Fire Protection Program for Nuclear Power Facilities Operating Prior to January 1, 1979," to 10 CFR Part 50, that exist as of the date of the petition (i.e., March 28, 2011), at Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 1, 2, and 3.
- Compel Entergy and its affiliates to comply on or before September 20, 2011, with the requirements in 10 CFR 50.48 and Sections III.F and III.G of Appendix R to 10 CFR Part 50, for all the fire zones in Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 2 and 3, and any Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Unit 1 fire zone or system, structure, or component relied on by Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Unit 2 or 3.
- Convene an evidentiary hearing before the Commission to adjudicate the violations by Entergy and its affiliates of 10 CFR 50.48 and Sections III.F and III.G of Appendix R to 10 CFR Part 50, at Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 1, 2, and 3.

Background:

- On March 28, 2011, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- For a complete summary of NRC actions before July 31, 2011, please refer to the August 2011 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML112490132).
- For a summary of NRC actions from August through October 2011, see the November 2011 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML11340A112).

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On February 1, 2012, the petitioner was informed that the NRC had concluded its review of the proposed exemptions and associated operator manual actions that were the focus of the 2.206 petition.

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20110563 (Petition Age: 7 months)

Facility:	General Electric (GE) Boiling-Water Reactor (BWR) Mark I and Mark II Units
Licensee Type:	Reactor
Petitioner(s):	David Lochbaum, Union of Concerned Scientists
Date of Petition:	July 29, 2011
DD To Be Issued by:	Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance:	January 31, 2013
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	February 8, 2012
Petition Manager:	John Lamb
Case Attorney:	Christopher Hair

Issues/Actions Requested:

The petitioner requests that the NRC issue a demand for information to the licensees of BWRs with Mark I and Mark II containment designs on how the facility complies with General Design Criterion 44, "Cooling Water," of Appendix A, "General Design Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants," to 10 CFR Part 50, and 10 CFR 50.49, "Environmental Qualification of Electric Equipment Important to Safety for Nuclear Power Plants," with respect to spent fuel pools.

Background:

- On July 29, 2011, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- For a complete summary of NRC actions before February 1, 2012, please refer to the January 2012 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML120370197).

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On February 8, 2012, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to inform him that the topic of his petition, the effects of the spent fuel pool during accidents, is still under an ongoing NRC review as part of the lessons learned from the Fukushima event and that the NRC intends to inform the final decision on whether to implement the actions requested in the petition by the results of that review.
- On February 23, 2012, the OEDO approved an extension until January 31, 2013, to support issuance of the proposed Director's Decision since the issues raised in the petition pertain to the resolution of Near Term Task Force Recommendations associated with the Fukushima Dai-Ichi Accident.

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20110262 (Petition Age: 11 months)

Facility: All General Electric Boiling-Water Reactor Mark I Units
Licensee Type: Reactor
Petitioner(s): Paul Gunter, Reactor Oversight Project; Kevin Kamps, Nuclear Waste Specialist
Date of Petition: April 13, 2011
DD To Be Issued by: Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance: April 11, 2012
Final DD Issuance: TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner: February 28, 2012
Petition Manager: Siva Lingam
Case Attorney: Michael Clark

Issues/Actions Requested:

For reasons specified within the petition request, the petitioner requests that the NRC immediately suspend the operating licenses GE BWR Mark I units to ensure that public health and safety are 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:

- On April 13, 2011, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- For a complete summary of NRC actions before July 31, 2011, please refer to the August 2011 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML112490132).
- For a summary of NRC actions from August through November 2011, see the December 2011 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML 120120145).
- On December 13, 2011, an acknowledgement letter was issued accepting the petition in part for review (ADAMS Accession Numbers (Package No. ML11339A077)).
- On December 28, 2011, the petitioner manager updated the petitioner on the status of his petition.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On January 27, 2012, the petitioner submitted a letter to JLD [Japanese Lessons Learned Project Directorate] raising concerns about the implementation of the Near-Term Task Force recommendation 5 associated with reliable direct torus vent system (hardened vent system). JLD considered this as a 2.206 petition, and forwarded the letter to the project manager because of its relevance to this 2.206 petition.
- On February 28, 2012, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to inform him that the JLD will consider the concerns raised in his January 27, 2012, letter and will consider the letter as supplemental information to his original petition dated April 13, 2011.

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20110579 (Petition Age: 7 months)

Facility: All U.S. Reactors
Licensee Type: Reactor
Petitioner(s): Natural Resources Defense Council
Date of Petition: August 1, 2011
DD To Be Issued by: Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance: April 26, 2012
Final DD Issuance: TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner: February 28, 2012
Petition Manager: Merrilee Banic
Case Attorney: Michael Clark

Issues/Actions Requested:

The petitioner requests that the NRC order licensees to take actions corresponding to recommendations in the "Near-Term Task Force Review of Insights from the Fukushima Dai-ichi Accident," dated July 12, 2011 (ADAMS Accession No. ML111861807). The petition consists of 12 letters.

Background:

- On August 1, 2011, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- For a summary of NRC actions from August through October 2011, see the November 2011 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML 11340A112).
- On November 15, 2011, the PRB met internally to make the initial recommendation and determined that the petition met the criteria for review. Therefore, the petition will be accepted for review.
- On November 15, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's initial recommendation. The petitioner declined an opportunity to address the PRB since the petition was being accepted for review.
- On December 28, 2011, the NRC issued an acknowledgment letter (ADAMS No. ML113260081).

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On February 28, 2012, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to inform him that the staff is still evaluating his petition.

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20110506 (Petition Age: 8 months)

Facility: Cooper Nuclear Station (CNS)
Licensee Type: Reactor
Petitioner(s): Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates
Date of Petition: July 3, 2011
DD To Be Issued by: Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance: May 12, 2012
Final DD Issuance: TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner: January 13, 2012
Petition Manager: Lynnea Wilkins
Case Attorney: Christopher Hair

Issues/Actions Requested:

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC take escalated enforcement action against the CNS and issue a confirmatory order requiring the licensee to bring CNS to cold shutdown. The basis for the petition is that on June 19, 2011, the licensee declared an unusual event in connection with the Missouri River flooding its banks. In summary, the petition contends that the installed flood-protection measures and systems and barriers at CNS are not sufficient to adequately protect the reactor from a full-meltdown scenario; the licensee's station blackout procedures are not sufficient to meet a challenging extended loss of offsite power caused by flooding, natural disasters, or terrorist attacks; the licensee failed to notify the NRC of the declaration of an unusual event within a 1 hour period; and the licensee continues to jeopardize public health and safety by failing to bring CNS to a cold shutdown.

Background:

- On July 3, 2011, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- For a complete summary of NRC actions before July 31, 2011, please refer to the August 2011 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML112490132).
- For a summary of NRC actions from August through October 2011, see the November 2011 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML 11340A112).
- On November 28, 2011, the PRB met internally to make the initial recommendation and determined that the petition met the criteria for review. Therefore, the petition will be accepted for review.
- On December 13, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's initial recommendation. The petitioner declined an opportunity to address the PRB since the petition was being accepted for review.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On January 13, 2012, the NRC issued the acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML120030022).

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20110492 (Petition Age: 8 months)

Facility: Fort Calhoun Station, Unit 1
Licensee Type: Reactor
Petitioner(s): Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates
Date of Petition: June 26, 2011
DD To Be Issued by: Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance: May 12, 2012
Final DD Issuance: TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner: January 13, 2012
Petition Manager: Lynnea Wilkins
Case Attorney: Christopher Hair

Issues/Actions Requested:

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC take escalated enforcement action against the Omaha Public Power District and Fort 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 offsite power caused by floods and other natural disasters or terrorist attacks.

Background:

- On June 26, 2011, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- For a complete summary of NRC actions before July 31, 2011, please refer to the August 2011 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML112490132).
- For a summary of NRC actions from August through October 2011, see the November 2011 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML 11340A112).
- On November 28, 2011, the PRB met internally to make the initial recommendation and determined that the petition met the criteria for review. Therefore, the petition will be accepted for review.
- On December 13, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's initial recommendation. The petitioner declined an opportunity to address the PRB since the petition was being accepted for review.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On January 13, 2012, the NRC issued the acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML120030022).

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20110668 (Petition Age: 6 months)

Facility: North Anna Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2
Licensee Type: Reactor
Petitioner(s): Thomas Saporito, SaproDani Associates
Date of Petition: September 8, 2011
DD To Be Issued by: Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance: February 22, 2012
Final DD Issuance: April 28, 2012
Last Contact with Petitioner: February 22, 2012
Petition Manager: Jon Thompson
Case Attorney: Mauri Lemoncelli

Issues/Actions Requested:

In the wake of the August 23, 2011, earthquake at the North Anna Nuclear Plant, which exceeded the design basis earthquake peak ground acceleration for the plant, and for reasons described in the petition, the petitioner requests: (1) escalated enforcement action to suspend or revoke the North Anna Nuclear Plant licenses, (2) issuance of a notice of violation proposing a \$1M fine, and (3), issuance of an order to keep North Anna Nuclear Plant in cold shutdown until the completion of 4 sets of activities to ensure the safety of the plant which are described in the petition.

Background:

- On September 8, 2011, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- For a summary of NRC actions from August through October 2011, see the November 2011 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML 11340A112).
- On November 7, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB in a teleconference. The PRB made no changes to its initial recommendation that the petition met the criteria for review and plans to accept the petition for review.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On February 22, 2012, the NRC issued the combined acknowledgement letter/proposed Director's Decision (ADAMS Accession No. ML11356A164) to document the PRB's decision to accept the petition for review and offer an opportunity for the petitioner and licensee to comment on the proposed Director's Decision. The petitioner has been given 21 days to review the proposed Director's Decision.

OPEN PETITION UNDER CONSIDERATION

EDO # G20100454 (Petition Age: 20 months)

Facility:	Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station
Licensee Type:	Reactor
Petitioner(s):	Mary Lampert
Date of Petition:	July 19, 2010
DD To Be Issued by:	Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance:	TBD
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	February 6, 2012
Petition Manager:	Richard Guzman
Case Attorney:	Mauri Lemoncelli

Issues/Actions Requested:

For detailed reasons described in the petition (G20100454), the petitioner requested that the NRC issue a demand for information order requiring Entergy, the licensee for Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, to 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 Nuclear Power Station, 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:

- On July 19, 2010, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- For a complete summary of NRC actions before July 31, 2011, please refer to the August 2011 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML112490132).
- According to the NRC's letter dated May 31, 2011 (ADAMS Accession No. ML111160334), this petition is still being held in abeyance with respect to the portion of the petition related to inaccessible cables, until an outcome of the contention submitted by Ms. Lampert is made under the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station license renewal hearing process.
- On November 28, 2011, the petition manager e-mailed Ms. Lampert notifying her that there has been no change in the status of the petition and that this petition is still being held in abeyance with respect to the portion of the petition related to inaccessible cables, until an outcome of the contention submitted by Ms. Lampert is made under the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station license renewal hearing process.
- On December 7, 2011, the OEDO approved an extension until June 29, 2012, to issue the proposed Director's Decision.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On February 6, 2012, the petition manager e-mailed Ms. Lampert notifying her that there has been no change in the status of the petition since the last contact on November 28, 2011.

OPEN PETITION UNDER CONSIDERATION

EDO # G20110740 (Petition Age: 5 months)

Facility: Callaway Nuclear Generating Station
Licensee Type: Reactor
Petitioner(s): Lawrence Criscione
Date of Petition: October 7, 2011
DD To Be Issued by: Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance: TBD
Final DD Issuance: TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner: January 9, 2012
Petition Manager: Mohan Thadani
Case Attorney: Michael Clark

Issues/Actions Requested:

For reasons described in the petition, the petitioner states that the reactor shutdown procedure (OTG-ZZ-00005) at the Callaway Nuclear Generating Station is not compliant with the plant Technical Specifications and requests that the NRC take enforcement action against the licensee by prohibiting the licensee from shutting down the plant for the refueling outage, until the practice of bypassing the P-4/564 Feedwater Isolation Signal is reviewed and approved by NRC, and the plant is determined to be in compliance with Technical Specification 3.3.2.

Background:

- On October 7, 2011, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- For a summary of NRC actions from October through November 2011, see the December 2011 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML120120145).
- A public meeting was held January 9, 2012, at which the petitioner addressed the PRB. The meeting notice is available in ADAMS under Accession No. ML120030087.
- On January 20, 2012, DORL requested from the OEDO an extension of the due date from January 31, 2012, to February 28, 2012, to permit additional time to address the petition supplements and discussion provided by Mr. Criscione, as provided in multiple interrelated requests, as appropriate.
- On January 23, 2012, the OEDO approved an extension until February 28, 2012.
- On January 31, 2012, and February 13, 2012, the PRB met internally to further discuss the petition and to make an initial recommendation on whether to accept the petition for review.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On February 23, 2012, the OEDO approved an extension until March 30, 2012, to permit additional time to address the petition supplements and discussion provided by Mr. Criscione.
- The PRB will meet next on March 5, 2012, to further discuss the petition.
- The next step is for the petition manager to notify the petitioner of the PRB's initial recommendation and offer the petitioner a second opportunity to address the PRB.

OPEN PETITION UNDER CONSIDERATION

EDO # G20110757 (Petition Age: 4 months)

Facility:	North Anna Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2
Licensee Type:	Reactor
Petitioner(s):	Beyond Nuclear (Joint Petitioners)
Date of Petition:	October 20, 2011
DD To Be Issued by:	Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance:	TBD
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	February 2, 2012
Petition Manager:	Jon Thompson
Case Attorney:	Mauri Lemoncelli

Issues/Actions Requested:

In the wake of the August 23, 2011, earthquake at the North Anna Nuclear Plant, which exceeded the design basis earthquake peak ground acceleration for the plant, and for reasons described in the petition, the petitioners request suspension of the operating license and restart contingent upon specific actions listed in the petition.

Background:

- On October 20, 2011, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- For a summary of NRC actions from October through December 2011, see the January 2012 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML120370180).
- On January 10, 2012, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition, as supplemented by the petitioner, and to make an initial recommendation on whether to accept the petition for review.
- On January 19, 2012, the petition manager e-mailed the petitioner the PRB initial recommendation to partially accept the petition for review.
- On February 2, 2012, a public meeting was held at which the petitioner addressed the PRB. The meeting notice is available in ADAMS under Accession No. ML12018A228.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- The PRB decided not to modify its initial recommendation to partially accept the petition for review, and therefore, the initial recommendation became the final recommendation.
- The petition manager is preparing an acknowledgement letter for signature by the NRR Office Director.

OPEN PETITION UNDER CONSIDERATION

EDO # G20120022 (Petition Age: 2 months)

Facility:	Palisades
Licensee Type:	Reactor
Petitioner(s):	Michael Mulligan
Date of Petition:	January 10, 2012
DD To Be Issued by:	Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance:	TBD
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	January 31, 2012
Petition Manager:	Mahesh Chawla
Case Attorney:	Brett Klukan

Issues/Actions Requested:

The petitioner requested immediate shutdown of Palisades. As the basis for this request, the petitioner is listing all the equipment failures at Palisades and making accusations of falsification of records by Entergy Personnel. He also considers the Reactor Oversight Process to be inadequate, in part due to personnel resource limitation in NRC.

Background:

- On January 10, 2012, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- On January 19, 2012, the PRB met and rejected the petitioner's request for immediate shutdown.
- On January 24, 2012, 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 in person or by teleconference.
- On January 31, 2012, the PRB held a teleconference with the petitioner before the internal PRB meeting to make an initial recommendation on the petition.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On February 22, 2012, the PRB met internally to make an initial recommendation on whether to accept the petition for review.
- The next step is to notify the petitioner of the PRB's initial recommendation regarding whether to accept the petition for review.

OPEN PETITION UNDER CONSIDERATION

EDO # G20120052 (Petition Age: 1 month)

Facility:	Peach Bottom Atomic Power Stations (PBAPS), Units 2 and 3
Licensee Type:	Reactor
Petitioner(s):	Michael Mulligan
Date of Petition:	January 24, 2012
DD To Be Issued by:	Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance:	TBD
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	February 17, 2012
Petition Manager:	John Hughey
Case Attorney:	Christopher Hair

Issues/Actions Requested:

The petitioner requests immediate shutdown of PBAPS, Units 2 and 3, and that all safety relief valve (SRV) seals and actuators be replaced with a design with sufficient margin of safety before start-up. As the basis for this request, the petitioner references the Licensee's LER 3-11-03 (ADAMS Accession No. ML11325A383) associated with the failure of the Unit 3, 71B Automatic Depressurization System (ADS) SRV on 9/25/2011.

Background:

- On January 24, 2012, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- On January 31, 2012, 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 in person or by teleconference.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On February 3, 2012, the PRB met and rejected the petitioner's request for immediate shutdown.
- On February 17, 2012, the PRB held a teleconference with the petitioner before the internal PRB meeting to make an initial recommendation on the petition.
- On February 23, 2012, the OEDO approved an extension until April 24, 2012, to permit additional time to make an initial recommendation, to allow the petitioner a second opportunity to address the PRB, and to prepare the acknowledgement letter informing the petitioner of the PRB's initial decision.
- The next step is to hold a PRB meeting to make an initial recommendation regarding whether to accept the petition for review.

OPEN PETITION UNDER CONSIDERATION

EDO # G20120142 (Petition Age: 1 month)

Facility: Vogtle Electric Generating Plants (Vogtle), Units 3 and 4
Licensee Type: Reactor
Petitioner(s): Mark Leyse
Date of Petition: February 28, 2012
DD To Be Issued by: Office of New Reactors
Proposed DD Issuance: TBD
Final DD Issuance: TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner: TBD
Petition Manager: Denise McGovern
Case Attorney: TBD

Issues/Actions Requested:

The petitioner requests that the NRC order the licensee of Vogtle, Units 3 and 4 to conduct safety analyses of severe accident scenarios in which the AP1000 hydrogen igniter system would be actuated too late, after a local hydrogen concentration of eight percent or greater was reached in the containment, which could cause a fast hydrogen deflagration, and after a local detonable concentration of hydrogen developed in the containment, which could cause a hydrogen detonation. The petitioner also requests that the NRC order the licensee of Vogtle, Units 3 and 4 to demonstrate that actuating hydrogen igniters in a severe accident after the core-exit temperature exceeds a predetermined temperature (1200 °F) is a productive and safe emergency response guideline for all severe accident scenarios.

Background:

- On February 28, 2012, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- The next step is to contact the petitioner informing him that the 10 CFR 2.206 process is a public process and to provide the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB before the PRB holds its initial internal meeting to make an initial recommendation.

Enclosure 2
ADAMS Accession
No. ML12060A018
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	Petition Review Board (PRB) Meeting/Days from Incoming Petition ¹	Acknowledgment Letter/Days from Incoming Petition ²	Proposed Director's Decision(DD)/Age in Days ³	Final Director's Decision/Age in Days ⁴	Comments on the Completion Goal Status
NRR	Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 3 Thomas Saporito G20090690	12/05/09	01/07/10 33 days	03/04/10 86 days			The goal to issue the acknowledgment letter was not met. The PRB meeting was delayed to support a request from the petitioner to address the PRB by phone before the Board met internally to make an initial recommendation. The delay in holding the PRB meeting impacted the NRC's ability to issue an acknowledgment letter in accordance with the NRC's timeliness goals. NRR obtained an extension, which was approved by the OEDO, to support the PRB with scheduling of the initial conference call with the petitioner, the PRB initial meetings, a possible second presentation by the petitioner to the PRB by phone, and issuance of the acknowledgement letter.
NRR	U.S. Nuclear Power Reactors (Related to Japan Earthquake) Thomas Saporito G20110171	03/12/11	04/14/11 33 days	06/28/11 108 days			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. Because of the complexity of the petition, and the ongoing staff workload associated with the earthquake in Japan, the earliest availability for the PRB members to meet (to coincide with the petitioner's availability) was April 14, 2011. 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 the NRC's ability to issue an acknowledgment 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

¹ Goal is to hold a PRB 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 DD within 120 days of the acknowledgment letter.

⁴ Goal is to issue a final DD within 45 days of the end of the comment period.

							<p>an additional conference call with the petitioner, and to coordinate the internal PRB discussions which involved a significant number of staff throughout the entire agency.</p> <p>In addition, milestones are taking longer to meet for Fukushima related petitions such as this one because decisions will depend on the staff's Fukushima review.</p>
NRR	<p>Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 1, 2, and 3</p> <p>Eric Schneiderman, Office of the Attorney General, State of New York</p> <p>G20110221</p>	03/28/11	<p>05/09/11 42 days</p>	<p>06/30/11 94 days</p>			<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 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 the NRC's ability to issue an acknowledgment letter in accordance with the agency'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>
NRR	<p>General Electric Boiling-Water Reactor Mark I Unit (Related to Japan Earthquake)</p> <p>Paul Gunter</p> <p>G20110262</p>	4/13/11	<p>07/12/11 90 days</p>	<p>12/13/11 154 days</p>			<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 because of the complexity of the petition and the number of co-petitioners, and the time needed to plan and hold a public meeting before the PRB met.</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, planning and holding a 2nd public meeting, and the need to evaluate new information submitted by the co-petitioners impacted the NRC's ability to issue an acknowledgment letter in accordance with the agency's timeliness goals.</p> <p>In addition, milestones are taking longer to meet for Fukushima related petitions such as this one because decisions will depend on the staff's Fukushima review.</p>

NRR	General Electric Boiling-Water Reactor Mark I and Mark II Units David Lochbaum, Union of Concerned Scientists G20110563	7/29/11	09/08/11 41 days	11/10/11 104 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 delay in holding the PRB meeting impacted the NRC's ability to issue an acknowledgment letter in accordance with the agency's timeliness goals.</p> <p>In addition, milestones are taking longer to meet for Fukushima related petitions such as this one because decisions will depend on the staff's Fukushima review.</p>
NRR	All licensees of power reactors Natural Resources Defense Council G20110579	8/1/11	11/15/11 107 days	12/28/11 150 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 delay in holding the PRB meeting impacted the NRC's ability to issue an acknowledgment letter in accordance with the agency's timeliness goals. The delay was caused because the petitioner requested time to review NTTF task force recommendations and Commission direction regarding them before meeting with the PRB.</p> <p>In addition, milestones are taking longer to meet for Fukushima related petitions such as this one because decisions will depend on the staff's Fukushima review.</p>
NRR	Cooper Nuclear Station Thomas Saporito G20110506	7/3/11	11/28/11 148 days	01/13/12 194 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 delay in holding the PRB meeting impacted the NRC's ability to issue an acknowledgment letter in accordance with the agency's timeliness goals. The delay was caused by scheduling conflicts between the petitioner and PRB members. The delay was also due to the PRB's determination that additional information was needed prior to making a decision on the initial recommendation and request for immediate action.</p> <p>In addition, milestones are taking longer to meet for Fukushima related petitions such as this one because decisions will depend on the staff's Fukushima review.</p>

NRR	Fort Calhoun Thomas Saporito G20110492	6/26/11	11/28/11 155 days	01/13/12 201 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 delay in holding the PRB meeting impacted the NRC's ability to issue an acknowledgment letter in accordance with the agency's timeliness goals. The delay was caused by scheduling conflicts between the petitioner and PRB members. The delay was also due to the PRB's determination that additional information was needed prior to making a decision on the initial recommendation and request for immediate action.</p> <p>In addition, milestones are taking longer to meet for Fukushima related petitions such as this one because decisions will depend on the staff's Fukushima review.</p>
NRR	North Anna Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 Thomas Saporito G20110668	9/8/11	12/12/11 95 days	02/22/12 167 days	2/22/12 167 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 delay was caused by the time needed to plan and hold a public meeting before the PRB met. The delay in holding the PRB meeting, the request by the petitioner for a 2nd meeting with the PRB, and the decision to issue a combined acknowledgement letter and proposed Director's Decision, impacted the NRC's ability to issue an acknowledgment letter in accordance with the agency's timeliness goals.</p>