

Enclosure 1
ADAMS Accession
No. ML12244A060
Monthly 10 CFR 2.206,
“Requests for Action
Under This Subpart,”
Status Report

PETITIONS CLOSED DURING THIS PERIOD

FACILITY	PETITIONER/EDO No.	Page
Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station	Mary Lampert G20120327	1
St. Lucie Nuclear Generating	David Findlay G20120522	2
Callaway Nuclear Generating Station	Lawrence Criscione G20110740	3

CURRENT STATUS OF OPEN PETITIONS

Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 3	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20090690	4
U.S. Nuclear Power Reactors (Related to Japan Earthquake)	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20110171	5
Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 1, 2, and 3	Eric Schneiderman, Office of the Attorney General, State of New York G20110221	6
General Electric Boiling-Water Reactor Mark I and Mark II Units	David Lochbaum, Union of Concerned Scientists G20110563	7
General Electric Boiling-Water Reactor Mark I Units (Related to Japan Earthquake)	Paul Gunter, Reactor Oversight Project and Kevin Kamps, Nuclear Waste Specialist G20110262	8
All licensees of power reactors	Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) G20110579	9
Cooper Nuclear Station	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20110506	10
Fort Calhoun Station, Unit 1	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20110492	11
North Anna Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2	Beyond Nuclear G20110757	12
Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station	Mary Lampert G20100454	13
Byron Station Units 1 and 2; Braidwood Station Units 1 and 2	Barry Quigley G20120269	14
St. Lucie and Turkey Plant Nuclear Generating	Thomas King G20120317	15

CURRENT STATUS OF OPEN PETITIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION

Peach Bottom Atomic Power Stations, Units 2 and 3	Michael Mulligan G20120052	16
Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 3 and 4	Mark Leyse G20120142	17
James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant	Beyond Nuclear et al. G20120172	18
Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Unit 2	NRDC G20120253	19

Palisades Nuclear Plant	Michael Mulligan G201200443	20
Fort Calhoun Station	Sierra Club G201200458	21
Palisades Nuclear Plant	Michael Mulligan G201200492	22
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant	David Lochbaum G20120489	23
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station	Joan Hershowitz G20120373	24
All NRC licensees	Thomas Saporito G20120557	25
Callaway Nuclear Generating Station	Lawrence Criscione G20110611	26

CLOSED PETITION

EDO # G20120327 (Petition Age: 4 months)

Facility:	Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station
Licensee Type:	Reactor
Petitioner(s):	Mary Lampert
Date of Petition:	May 16, 2012
DD To Be Issued by:	Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance:	N/A
Final DD Issuance:	N/A
Last Contact with Petitioner:	August 13, 2012
Petition Manager:	Richard Guzman
Case Attorney:	Michael Clark

Issues/Actions Requested:

The petitioner requests that the NRC require Pilgrim to cease operation due to the threat to public safety due to: the current lock out of its non-essential workers; a likely strike; and Entergy's refusal to honor the demands of U.W.U.A. local 369 workers.

Background:

- On May 16, 2012, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- On May 18, 2012, the petitioner supplemented her petition.
- For a complete summary of NRC actions through May 2012, see the May 2012 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML12157A166).
- On June 6, 8, 12, 13, 16, 17, 20, and 25, 2012, the petitioner supplemented her petition.
- On June 13, 2012, the OEDO approved an extension until August 18, 2012, to issue an acknowledgement or closure letter.
- On June 20, 2012, the PRB met internally to make an initial decision and recommended to not accept the petition for review.
- On June 25, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's decision and offered her a second chance to address the PRB, which she declined.

Current Status/Next Steps:

On August 13, 2012, the NRC issued a closure letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML122120274) rejecting the petition because it did not meet the criteria for review. All NRC actions on this petition are closed.

CLOSED PETITION

EDO # G20120522 (Petition Age: 2 months)

Facility: St. Lucie Nuclear Generating
Licensee Type: Reactor
Petitioner(s): David Findlay
Date of Petition: June 9, 2012
DD To Be Issued by: Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance: N/A
Final DD Issuance: N/A
Last Contact with Petitioner: June 9, 2012
Petition Manager: Jason Paige
Case Attorney: Patricia Jehle

Issues/Actions Requested:

The petitioner requests that a mandatory qualification program testing be developed and implemented using various methods including written, hands on & performance tests and that the testing be performed by a 3rd party non-governmental agency.

Background:

- On June 9, 2012, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On August 16, 2012, the NRC issued a closure letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML12223A077) due to being unable to contact the petitioner. The contact information that the petitioner provided was an invalid email address. No alternate contact information was provided such as a mailing address or phone number, by the petitioner. In addition, the petition raises similar issues as petition number G20120317, which has been accepted for review. All NRC actions on this petition are closed.

CLOSED PETITION

EDO # G20110740 (Petition Age: 11 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:	N/A
Final DD Issuance:	N/A
Last Contact with Petitioner:	August 28, 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 through March 2012, see the March 2012 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML12093A128).
- On May 23, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner that the PRB met on May 22, 2012, and made a final determination that the petition does not meet the criteria for review, issues raised will be considered in other NRC processes, and that details regarding this determination will be provided in a closure letter.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On August 28, 2012, the NRC issued a closure letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML12223A077). All NRC actions on this petition are closed.

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20090690 (Petition Age: 33 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:	August 27, 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 through January 2012, see the January 2012 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML120370197).
- 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).
- On April 26, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner that the planned issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision has not changed.
- On June 26, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner that the planned issuance date for the proposed Director's Decision remains December 3, 2012.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On August 27, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner by email that there have not been any changes to the schedule for the issuance of the proposed Director's Decision.
- The next step is for the petition manager to prepare a proposed Director's Decision documenting the NRC's response to issues raised in the petition. The petitioner and licensee will receive an opportunity to comment on the proposed Director's Decision. The estimated issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision is December 3, 2012. The target issuance date of the final Director's Decision is 75 days after the issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision.

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20110171 (Petition Age: 18 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:	July 3, 2012
Petition Manager:	Peter Tam
Case Attorney:	Michael Clark

Issues/Actions Requested:

For reasons specified within 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 through December 2011, see the December 2011 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML120120145).
- 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.
- On May 10, 2012, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to inform him that the PRB is continuing to evaluate his petition and currently has a target date of January 31, 2013, to complete its review.
- On July 3, 2012, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to inform him that the PRB is continuing to evaluate his petition and currently has a target date of January 31, 2013, to complete its review.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- The next step is for the petition manager to prepare a proposed Director's Decision documenting the NRC's response to issues raised in the petition. The petitioner and licensee will receive an opportunity to comment on the proposed Director's Decision. The estimated issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision is January 31, 2013. The target issuance date of the final Director's Decision is 75 days after the issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision.

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20110221 (Petition Age: 17 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: July 3, 2012
Final DD Issuance: September 19, 2012
Last Contact with Petitioner: July 3, 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, Units 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 through May 2012, see the May 2012 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML12157A166).
- On July 3, 2012, the NRC issued the proposed Director's Decision (ADAMS Accession No. ML120880156) for comment. Written comments were received from both the petitioner and the licensee.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- The staff has drafted the final Director's Decision in response to the comments provided by the petitioner and the licensee. The target date for issuing the final Director's Decision is September 19, 2012.

OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20110563 (Petition Age: 13 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: July 24, 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 GE 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 through February 2012, please refer to the February 2012 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML12060A018).
- On May 1, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner that the NRC is continuing to evaluate his petition.
- On July 6, 2012 (ADAMS Accession No. ML12172A157), a letter was sent to the BWR Mark I & II licensees (with a copy to the petitioner) requesting a voluntary response to the petition within 45 days of the date of the letter.
- On July 24, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner that the NRC is continuing to review his petition.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- The next step is for the petition manager to prepare a proposed Director's Decision documenting the NRC's response to issues raised in the petition. The petitioner and licensee will receive an opportunity to comment on the proposed Director's Decision. The estimated issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision is January 31, 2013. The target issuance date of the final Director's Decision is 75 days after the issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision.

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20110262 (Petition Age: 17 months)

Facility: All GE BWR 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: January 31, 2013
Final DD Issuance: TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner: August 30, 2012
Petition Manager: Siva Lingam
Case Attorney: Michael Clark

Issues/Actions Requested:

For reasons specified within the petition 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 through February 2012, see the February 2012 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML12060A018).
- On April 3, 2012, the OEDO approved an extension to prepare the proposed Director’s Decision until January 31, 2013.
- On April 23, 2012, the petitioner manager informed the petitioner that the proposed Director’s Decision due date was extended to January 31, 2013.
- On June 26, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner that NRC issued orders for Japan Lessons Learned Project Directorate (JLD) recommendations 4.2, 5.1, and 7.1 on March 12, 2012, issued a 50.54(f) letter regarding JLD recommendations 2.1, 2.3, and 9.3 (partial) on March 12, 2012.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On August 30, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner that the NRC is still evaluating the petition.
- The next step is for the petition manager to prepare a proposed Director’s Decision documenting the NRC’s response to issues raised in the petition. The petitioner and licensee will receive an opportunity to comment on the proposed Director’s Decision. The estimated issuance date of the proposed Director’s Decision was extended to January 31, 2013. The target issuance date of the final Director’s Decision is 75 days after the issuance date of the proposed Director’s Decision.

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20110579 (Petition Age: 13 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:	January 31, 2013
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	August 27, 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 complete summary of NRC actions through February 2012, see the February 2012 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML12060A018).
- On March 28, 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.
- On April 2, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner that an extension until January 31, 2013, was obtained to evaluate the petition.
- On June 27, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner that the PRB is continuing to evaluate the petition and the target date remains January 31, 2013.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On August 27, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner that the PRB is continuing to evaluate the petition and the target date remains January 31, 2013.
- The next step is for the petition manager to prepare a proposed Director's Decision documenting the NRC's response to issues raised in the petition. The petitioner and licensee will receive an opportunity to comment on the proposed Director's Decision. The estimated issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision is January 31, 2013. The target issuance date of the final Director's Decision is 75 days after the issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision.

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20110506 (Petition Age: 14 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, 2013
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	August 27, 2012
Petition Manager:	Lynnea Wilkins
Case Attorney:	Christopher Hair

Issues/Actions Requested:

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. 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 through May 2012, see the May 2012 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML12157A166).
- On June 19, 2012, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to inform him that the staff is still evaluating his petition and has set a target response date of May 12, 2013.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On August 27, 2012, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to inform him that the staff is still evaluating his petition and has set a target response date of May 12, 2013.
- The next step is for the petition manager to prepare a proposed Director's Decision documenting the NRC's response to issues raised in the petition. The petitioner and licensee will receive an opportunity to comment on the proposed Director's Decision. The estimated issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision is May 12, 2013. The target issuance date of the final Director's Decision is 75 days after the issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision.

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20110492 (Petition Age: 15 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, 2013
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	August 27, 2012
Petition Manager:	Lynnea Wilkins
Case Attorney:	Christopher Hair

Issues/Actions Requested:

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 through May 2012, see the May 2012 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML12157A166).
- On June 19, 2012, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to inform him that the staff is still evaluating his petition and has set a target response date of May 12, 2013.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On August 27, 2012, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to inform him that the staff is still evaluating his petition and has set a target response date of May 12, 2013.
- The next step is for the petition manager to prepare a proposed Director's Decision documenting the NRC's response to issues raised in the petition. The petitioner and licensee will receive an opportunity to comment on the proposed Director's Decision. The estimated issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision is May 12, 2013. The target issuance date of the final Director's Decision is 75 days after the issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision.

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20110757 (Petition Age: 10 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:	October 31, 2012
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	July 10, 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 through June 2012 see the June 2012 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML12180A086).
- On July 10, 2012, a proposed partial Director's Decision (ADAMS Accession No. ML12165A205) was issued documenting the NRC's response in part to issues raised in the petition. The petitioner and licensee will receive an opportunity to comment on the proposed partial Director's Decision. Those issues not closed out by the partial Director's Decision, will be addressed by future NRC actions associated with the Japan Lessons Learned initiative. The NRC will provide periodic status updates to the petitioners on the resolution of those issues.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- The next step is for the petition manager to prepare another proposed Director's Decision documenting the NRC's response to issues not closed out in the partial Director's Decision. The petitioner and licensee will receive an opportunity to comment on the proposed Director's Decision. The estimated issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision is October 31, 2012. The target issuance date of the final Director's Decision is 75 days after the issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision.

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20100454 (Petition Age: 25 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:	October 31, 2012
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	August 2, 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 through May 2012, see the May 2012 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML12157A166).
- On June 5, 2012, a PRB meeting was held to continue with processing the petition. An acknowledgement letter is being prepared.
- On June 6, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner that the petition is no longer being held in abeyance and that an acknowledgement letter is being prepared.
- On June 14, 2012, the OEDO approved an extension until October 31, 2012, to issue a proposed Director's Decision.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On August 2, 2012, the NRC issued an acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML121910227) accepting the petition for review.
- The next step is for the petition manager to prepare a proposed Director's Decision documenting the NRC's response to issues raised in the petition. The petitioner and licensee will receive an opportunity to comment on the proposed Director's Decision. The estimated issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision is October 31, 2012. The target issuance date of the final Director's Decision is 75 days after the issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision.

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20120269 (Petition Age: 5 months)

Facility:	Byron Station Units 1 and 2; Braidwood Station Units 1 and 2
Licensee Type:	Reactor
Petitioner(s):	Barry Quigley
Date of Petition:	April 20, 2012
DD To Be Issued by:	Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance:	December 18, 2012
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	August 23, 2012
Petition Manager:	Joel Wiebe
Case Attorney:	Michele Albert

Issues/Actions Requested:

The petitioner requests that the NRC require that Byron and Braidwood, Units 1 and 2 be immediately shutdown until all Turbine Building High Energy Line Break concerns are identified and those important to safety are corrected.

Background:

- On April 20, 2012, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- For a complete summary of NRC actions through June 2012, see the June 2012 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML12180A186).
- On July 17, 2012, the EDO approved an extension until August 6, 2012, to issue acknowledgement letter accepting the petition for review.
- On July 24, 2012, the PRB met to determine that additional information on high energy line break concerns is needed. Once the appropriate process is determined, and management approval received, the petition manager will contact the licensee to obtain the necessary information

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On August 2, 2012, the OEDO approved an extension until August 24, 2012, to issue an acknowledgement letter to the petitioner.
- On August 23, 2012, the NRC issued an acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML12167A336) to petitioner.
- The next step is for the petition manager to prepare a proposed Director's Decision documenting the NRC's response to issues raised in the petition. The petitioner and licensee will receive an opportunity to comment on the proposed Director's Decision. The estimated issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision is December 18, 2012. The target issuance date of the final Director's Decision is 75 days after the issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision.

OPEN PETITION

EDO # G20120317 (Petition Age: 4 months)

Facility:	St. Lucie Plant Unit and Turkey Plant Nuclear Generating Stations
Licensee Type:	Reactor
Petitioner(s):	Thomas King
Date of Petition:	April 23, 2012
DD To Be Issued by:	Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance:	December 18, 2012
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	August 2, 2012
Petition Manager:	Jason Paige
Case Attorney:	Patty Jehle

Issues/Actions Requested:

The petitioner requests that the NRC not allow the subject plants to start up until all documents and work performed on safety related equipment at the plants is independently verified and all critical work and MOV testing is redone.

Background:

- On May 11, 2012, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- For a complete summary of NRC actions through June 2012, see the June 2012 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML12180A186).
- On July 9, 2012, a teleconference was held with the petitioner and the PRB.
- On July 24, 2012, the PRB met to make an initial recommendation.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On August 2, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner that the petition was accepted but is being held in abeyance pending the outcome of an examination by Region II.
- On August 29, 2012, the NRC issued an acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML12233A634) to petitioner.
- The next step is for the petition manager to prepare a proposed Director's Decision documenting the NRC's response to issues raised in the petition. The petitioner and licensee will receive an opportunity to comment on the proposed Director's Decision. The estimated issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision is December 18, 2012. The target issuance date of the final Director's Decision is 75 days after the issuance date of the proposed Director's Decision.

OPEN PETITION UNDER CONSIDERATION

EDO # G20120052 (Petition Age: 7 months)

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:	June 12, 2012
Petition Manager:	John Hughey
Case Attorney:	Catherine Scott

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 SRV on September 25, 2011.

Background:

- For a summary of NRC actions through May 2012, see the May 2012 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML12157A166).
- On June 12, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the delay in processing the petition owing to need for the Region to issue the LER evaluation in the second quarter inspection report.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On August 14, 2012, the LER evaluation was issued and the petitioner acknowledged via e-mail on the same day that the LER evaluation had been completed. Per previous e-mail correspondence, petitioner was apprised that the petition would continue to be processed once the LER evaluation had been completed. Now that the LER evaluation has been completed, consideration of the petition request is expected to be completed in September 2012.

OPEN PETITION UNDER CONSIDERATION

EDO # G20120142 (Petition Age: 6 months)

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:	July 20, 2012
Petition Manager:	Denise McGovern
Case Attorney:	Marcia Simon

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.
- For a summary of NRC actions through May 2012, see the May 2012 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML12157A166).
- On July 17, 2012, the OEDO approved an extension until September 28, 2012, to allow time to finalize the initial recommendation.
- On July 20, 2012, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to inform him that the staff is still evaluating his petition.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On August 30, 2012, the PRB Chairman and petition manager briefed the Office Director.
- The next step is for the PRB to brief the Deputy and the Office Director regarding the justification of the PRB's initial recommendation.

OPEN PETITION UNDER CONSIDERATION

EDO # G20120172 (Petition Age: 6 months)

Facility: James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant (FitzPatrick)
Licensee Type: Reactor
Petitioner(s): Beyond Nuclear et al. (Joint Petitioners)
Date of Petition: March 9, 2012
DD To Be Issued by: Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance: TBD
Final DD Issuance: TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner: August 27, 2012
Petition Manager: Bhalchandra Vaidya
Case Attorney: Carrie Safford

Issues/Actions Requested:

The joint petitioners request that the FitzPatrick operating license be immediately suspended as the result of the undue risk to the public health and safety presented by the operator's reliance on non-conservative and wrong assumptions that went into the analysis of the capability of FitzPatrick's pre-existing ductwork containment vent system. The joint petitioners state that the risks and uncertainty presented by FitzPatrick's assumptions and decisions, in regard to NRC Generic Letter 89-16, as associated with the day-to-day operations of this nuclear power plant now constitute an undue risk to public health and safety. The joint petitioners request that the suspension of the operating license be in effect pending final resolution of a public challenge to the adequacy of the pre-existing vent line in light of the Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear accident. The joint petitioners do not seek or request that FitzPatrick operators now install the Direct Torus Vent System as it is demonstrated to have experienced multiple failures to mitigate the severe nuclear accidents at Fukushima Dai-ichi.

Background:

- On March 9, 2012, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- For a complete summary of NRC actions through May 2012, see the May 2012 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML12093A166).
- On June 7, 2012, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail concerning the submission and coordination of e-mails and hard copy letters from co-petitioners.
- On July 19, 2012, an internal PRB Meeting was held to arrive at a consensus for an initial recommendation.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On August 27, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner by email that the staff is still evaluating the petition.
- The next step is for management to approve the initial recommendation.

OPEN PETITION UNDER CONSIDERATION

EDO # G20120253 (Petition Age: 5 months)

Facility:	Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Unit 2
Licensee Type:	Reactor
Petitioner(s):	Natural Resources Defense Council
Date of Petition:	April 16, 2012
DD To Be Issued by:	Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance:	TBD
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	July 30, 2012
Petition Manager:	Douglas Pickett
Case Attorney:	Christopher Hair

Issues/Actions Requested:

The petitioner requests that the NRC order the licensee of Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Unit 2 remove the passive autocatalytic recombiner (PAR) system from the unit, because the PAR system could have unintended ignitions in the event of a severe accident, which, in turn, could cause a hydrogen detonation.

Background:

- On April 16, 2012, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- For a complete summary of NRC actions through May 2012, see the May 2012 monthly 10 CFR 2.206 status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML12157A166).
- On June 14, 2012, the petitioner made its initial presentation to the PRB by teleconference.
- On June 22, 2012, the PRB met to make an initial recommendation for management approval.
- On July 23, 2012, NRR management concurred with the initial recommendation to reject the petition, based on (1) the issues have previously been reviewed and resolved, and (2) the petitioner identified deficiencies within NRC's regulations.
- On July 30, 2012, the petitioner was informed that the PRB's initial recommendation is to reject the petition. The petitioner will decide whether to address the PRB a second time.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- The petitioner has requested the opportunity to address the PRB a second time. The teleconference has been scheduled for September 12, 2012.

OPEN PETITION UNDER CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20120443 (Petition Age: 3 months)

Facility: Palisades Nuclear Power Station
Licensee Type: Reactor
Petitioner(s): Michael Mulligan
Date of Petition: June 18, 2012
DD To Be Issued by: Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance: TBD
Final DD Issuance: TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner: August 29, 2012
Petition Manager: Terry Beltz
Case Attorney: Christopher Hair

Issues/Actions Requested:

The petitioner requests that Palisades not be allowed to restart based on past performance issues. As the basis for this request, the petitioner focuses on the recent leak of the Safety Injection Refueling Water tank and refers to past events at both Palisades and other Entergy-owned facilities. The Petitioner also discusses a lack of adequate safety culture environment at Palisades.

Background:

- On June 18, 2012, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- On June 27, 2012, the petitioner modified his petition.
- On July 9, 2012, the PRB held a meeting on the request for immediate action, and denied it.
- On July 17, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner that the request for immediate action was denied.
- On July 17, 2012, the OEDO granted an extension until September 21, 2012, to issue a closure or proposed Director's Decision.
- On July 17, 2012, the petitioner informed the petition manager that he would like to discuss the petition with the PRB.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On August 6, 2012, the PRB received approval from the Office Director to consolidate this petition with G20120492.
- On August 8, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner that this petition would be consolidated with G20120492.
- On August 29, 2012, the PRB held a teleconference with the petitioner.
- The next step is for the PRB to meet to make an initial recommendation. A meeting is scheduled for September 24, 2012.

OPEN PETITION UNDER CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20120458 (Petition Age: 3 months)

Facility:	Fort Calhoun Station
Licensee Type:	Reactor
Petitioner(s):	Sierra Club
Date of Petition:	June 21, 2012
DD To Be Issued by:	Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance:	TBD
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	August 27, 2012
Petition Manager:	Lynnea Wilkins
Case Attorney:	Patricia Jehle

Issues/Actions Requested:

The petitioner requests that the license for Fort Calhoun be revoked because the licensee has failed to correct problems identified years ago. The petitioner cites a history of various violations dating 1992-2012, including several gleaned from inspection reports.

Background:

- On June 21, 2012, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- On July 12, 2012, the petition manager acknowledged receipt of the petition and offered the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB, which the petitioner accepted on the same day.
- On July 20, 2012, the OEDO approved an extension until October 31, 2012, to issue a closure or acknowledgement letter

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On August 23, 2012, the petitioner supplemented his petition by email to the petition manager (ADAMS Accession No ML12240A099).
- On August 27, 2012, a teleconference was held with the petitioner.
- The next step is for the PRB to meet to make an initial recommendation. The meeting is expected to be held in September.

OPEN PETITION UNDER CONSIDERATION

EDO # G20120492 (Petition Age: 2 months)

Facility:	Palisades Nuclear Power Station
Licensee Type:	Reactor
Petitioner(s):	Michael Mulligan
Date of Petition:	June 28, 2012
DD To Be Issued by:	Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance:	TBD
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	August 29, 2012
Petition Manager:	Terry Beltz
Case Attorney:	Christopher Hair

Issues/Actions Requested:

The petitioner is concerned about roof leaks and the safety culture at Palisades. He requests that the plant be prevented from starting up until all the safety problems at the site have been publicly identified and the safety culture repaired and a completion of several actions including replacement of personnel and addition of public oversight.

Background:

- On June 28, 2012, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- On July 17, 2012, the petition manager acknowledged receipt of the petition.
- On July 31, 2012, the PRB met on the request for immediate action and denied it. It also proposed consolidating this petition with the petitioner's petition dated June 18, 2012 (tracked under G20120443).

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On August 8, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner that the request for immediate action was denied; that the two petitions would be consolidated; and that the petitioner could address the PRB.
- On August 29, 2012, a teleconference was held with the petitioner.
- The next step is for the PRB to meet to make an initial recommendation. A meeting is scheduled for September 24, 2012.

OPEN PETITION UNDER CONSIDERATION

EDO # G20120489 (Petition Age: 2 months)

Facility:	Brunswick Steam Electric Plant
Licensee Type:	Reactor
Petitioner(s):	David Lochbaum, Mary Olson, and Jim Warren
Date of Petition:	July 10, 2012
DD To Be Issued by:	Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance:	TBD
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	August 15, 2012
Petition Manager:	Farideh Saba
Case Attorney:	Molly Barkman Marsh

Issues/Actions Requested:

The petitioners request that NRC redress the technical specifications deficiencies regarding irradiated fuel stored in spent fuel pools at Brunswick.

Background:

- On July 10, 2012, the petitioners filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- On July 12, 2012, the petition manager acknowledged receipt of the petition and offered a public meeting or teleconference.
- On July 16, 2012, the petitioner requested a teleconference or public meeting.
- On July 23, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner of a teleconference scheduled for August 15, 2012.
- On July 27, 2012, the OEDO approved an extension until October 31, 2012, to issue a closure or acknowledgement letter

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On August 15, 2012, a teleconference was held with the petitioner.
- The next step is for the PRB to meet to make an initial recommendation. The meeting is scheduled for September 4, 2012.

OPEN PETITION UNDER CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20120373 (Petition Age: 2 months)

Facility:	San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station
Licensee Type:	Reactor
Petitioner(s):	Joan Herskowitz
Date of Petition:	May 18, 2012
DD To Be Issued by:	Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance:	TBD
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	July 23, 2012
Petition Manager:	Jason Paige
Case Attorney:	Michael Clark

Issues/Actions Requested:

The petitioner requests that the plant not be allowed to restart until several actions are completed, including determining the cause and remedies for the recent radiation leak, conducting seismic studies, and increasing oversight.

Background:

- On May 18, 2012, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- On July 23, 2012, the petition manager contacted the petitioner, who declined her opportunities to address the PRB.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On August 22, 2012, the PRB met to make an initial recommendation.
- The next step is to inform the petitioner of the PRB's recommendation.

OPEN PETITION UNDER CONSIDERATION

EDO # G20120557 (Petition Age: 1 month)

Facility:	All NRC Licensees
Licensee Type:	All
Petitioner(s):	Thomas Saporito
Date of Petition:	July 30, 2012
DD To Be Issued by:	Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance:	TBD
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	August 20, 2012
Petition Manager:	Tanya Mensah
Case Attorney:	Carrie Safford

Issues/Actions Requested:

The petitioner requests that the NRC take escalated-enforcement action against all NRC licensees as a result of information provided on a Bloomberg News Agency broadcast which described a cyber security incident at Diablo Canyon.

Background:

- On July 30, 2012, the petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.
- On July 31, 2012, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the NRC's receipt of his petition. The petitioner requested an opportunity to address the PRB in person prior to its internal meeting to make the initial recommendation.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- On August 7, 2012, the OEDO granted an extension until November 20, 2012, to support Mr. Saporito's request for a public meeting in September 2012.
- On August 20, 2012, the petition manager sent a copy of the public meeting notice to the petitioner.
- The next step is to conduct a public meeting between the petitioner and the PRB, scheduled for September 10, 2012.

OPEN PETITION UNDER CONSIDERATION

EDO # G20120611 (Petition Age: 1 month)

Facility:	Callaway
Licensee Type:	Reactor
Petitioner(s):	Lawrence Criscione
Date of Petition:	August 15, 2012
DD To Be Issued by:	Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Proposed DD Issuance:	TBD
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	August 30, 2012
Petition Manager:	Fred Lyon
Case Attorney:	Michael Clark

Issues/Actions Requested:

The petitioner requests the NRC cite Callaway Plant for allowing inaccurate information to be entered into a Quality Assurance record following a passive reactor shutdown event that occurred on October 21, 2003.

Background:

- On August 15, 2012, the petitioner filed a letter to the EDO that requested enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206. Previously, the petitioner has filed petitions regarding the same event (e.g., G20100592).
- On August 30, 2012, the petition manager sent Mr. Criscione an email acknowledging receipt of his letter to the EDO.

Current Status/Next Steps:

- The NRC staff is currently evaluating the petition.

Enclosure 2
ADAMS Accession
No. ML12244A060
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) ³ /Ag e in Days	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. In addition, milestones are taking longer to meet for because decisions will depend on licensee's concrete containment repair plans and activities.
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

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>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 number of staff throughout the entire agency. 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>
<p>NRR</p>	<p>Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 1, 2, and 3 Eric Schneiderman, Office of the Attorney General, State of New York G20110221</p>	<p>03/28/11</p>	<p>05/09/11 42 days</p>	<p>06/30/11 94 days</p>	<p>7/3/12 368 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> <p>The goal to issue a proposed Director's Decision within 120 days of the acknowledgement letter was not met. The petition was submitted on March 28, 2011, and focused on the ongoing staff review of proposed exemptions to fire protection regulations and associated proposed operator manual actions. The PRB originally took the traditional approach which would defer issuance of the Proposed Director's Decision until all issues associated with the petition were resolved. This would include NRR review (i.e., technical resolution of issues), regional inspections, applicable enforcement actions, and final licensee actions. NRR staff review of the proposed exemptions was not completed until February 1, 2012. Furthermore, the licensee's projected schedule to complete modifications to be in compliance would be following the Spring 2014 refueling outage</p>

<p>because some of the modifications can only be performed during a plant shutdown. During a special PRB meeting on March 21, 2012, the PRB agreed to issue the Proposed Director's Decision at this time based upon current knowledge rather than keeping the action open for another two years.</p>						<p>NRR</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>			<p>12/13/11 154 days</p>	<p>07/12/11 90 days</p>	<p>04/13/11</p> <p>General Electric Boiling-Water Reactor Mark I Unit (Related to Japan Earthquake) Paul Gunter G20110262</p>	<p>NRR</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 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>			<p>11/10/11 104 days</p>	<p>09/08/11 41 days</p>	<p>07/29/11</p> <p>General Electric Boiling-Water Reactor Mark I and Mark II Units David Lochbaum, Union of Concerned Scientists G20110563</p>	<p>NRR</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 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</p>			<p>12/28/11 150 days</p>	<p>11/15/11 107 days</p>	<p>08/01/11</p> <p>All licensees of power reactors Natural Resources Defense Council G20110579</p>	<p>NRR</p>

NRR	Cooper Nuclear Station Thomas Saporito G20110506	07/03/11	11/28/11 148 days	01/13/12 194 days			<p>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	Fort Calhoun Thomas Saporito G20110492	06/26/11	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							<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 Beyond Nuclear (Joint Petitioners) G20110757	10/20/11	12/12/11 53 days	03/16/12 148 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. 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 and the request by the petitioner for a 2 nd meeting with the PRB impacted the NRC's ability to issue an acknowledgment letter in accordance with the agency's timeliness goals.
NRR	Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station Mary Lampert G20100454	7/19/10	8/23/2010 34 days	8/2/2012 2 years			Timeliness goals were not met because the petition was being held in abeyance owing to the petitioner submitting a late-filed contention in the Pilgrim renewal hearing regarding inaccessible cables. It was necessary to wait for the outcome of the contention.
NRR	Byron Station Units 1 and 2; Braidwood Station Units 1 and 2 Barry Quigley G20120269	4/20/12	5/30/12 40 days	8/23/12 123 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. The delay was caused by the time needed to hold a teleconference before the PRB met and the need to determine the action to take regarding the petition. These activities impacted the NRC's ability to issue an acknowledgment letter in accordance with the agency's timeliness goals.
NRR	St. Lucie and Turkey Plant Nuclear Generating Thomas King G20120317	4/23/12	7/24/12 91 days	8/29/12 125 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. The delay was caused by the time needed to hold a teleconference before the PRB met. This impacted the NRC's ability to issue an acknowledgment letter in accordance with the agency's timeliness goals. This petition will be held in abeyance pending the outcome of an examination by Region II.