Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: 10 CFR 2.206 Petition RE

Palisades Nuclear Generating Station

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: (teleconference)

Date: Wednesday, October 24, 2012

Work Order No.: NRC-1968 Pages 1-39

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

	1
1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	10 CFR 2.206 PETITION REVIEW BOARD (PRB)
5	CONFERENCE CALL
6	RE:
7	PALISADES NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION
8	+ + + +
9	WEDNESDAY
10	OCTOBER 24, 2012
11	+ + + +
12	The conference call was held, Michele
13	Evans, Chairperson of the Petition Review Board,
14	presiding.
15	
16	PETITIONER: MIKE MULLIGAN
17	
18	PETITION REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS
19	MICHELE EVANS, NRR/DORL, PRB Chairperson
20	TERRY BELTZ, NRR/DORL, Petition Manager for
21	2.206 petition
22	LEE BANIC, NRR/DPR/PGCB, Petition Coordinator
23	ROBERT CARLSON, NRR/DORL
24	STEVE FRANKL, RES/DSA/RSAB
25	
ı	

1	NRC REGIONAL STAFF:
2	JACK GIESSNER, RIII
3	JAY LENNARTZ, RIII
4	ALSO PRESENT:
5	JIM KUEMIN, Palisades/Entergy
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	NEAL R. GROSS

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

(3:07 p.m.)

MR. BELTZ: I think we're ready to go. I think we have everyone we need either here at headquarters or on the line. So I'll start off. I'd like to thank everyone for attending this meeting. is Terry Beltz, and I'm a senior project My name manager in the Division of Operating Reactor Licensing at NRC headquarters.

We're here today to allow the petitioner, Mr. Mike Mulligan, to address the Petition Review Board regarding 2.206 petitions dated July 27th and July 28, 2012. I'm the petition manager for the petition, and the Petition Review Board chairman is Michele Evans.

As part of the PRB's review of this petition, Mr. Mulligan has requested this opportunity to address the PRB. This meeting's scheduled from 3:00 to 4:00 p.m. Eastern Time. The meeting is being recorded by the NRC Operations Center and will be transcribed by a court reporter.

MR. MULLIGAN: Plus eight minutes, right, because we started late?

MR. BELTZ: Yes, we'll allow you sufficient time.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you.
2	MR. BELTZ: The transcript will become a
3	supplement to the petition, and the transcript will
4	also be made publicly available.
5	Is the court reporter on the line?
6	COURT REPORTER: This is the court
7	reporter. Yes, I am.
8	MR. BELTZ: Okay. Good afternoon.
9	I'd like to go ahead and open the meeting
10	with introductions. As we go around the room, please
11	be sure to clearly state your name, your position and
12	the office that you work for within the NRC, for the
13	record. And I'll start off.
14	As I said, my name is Terry Beltz. I'm a
15	project manager in the Division of Operating Reactor
16	Licensing. I am the petition manager.
17	MS. EVANS: Michele Evans, and I am the
18	PRB chairman.
19	MR. CARLSON: Bob Carlson. I am the
20	branch chief within DORL.
21	MS. BANIC: Lee Banic, 2.206 petition
22	coordinator.
23	MR. FRANKL: Steve Frankl, former branch
24	chief at DORL.
25	MR. BELTZ: Okay, that completes

1	introductions at NRC headquarters. Are there any
2	additional participants from headquarters on the
3	phone? Are there any NRC participants from the
4	regional office on the phone?
5	MR. LENNARTZ: Yes, this is Jay Lennartz
6	from Region III. I'm the project engineer in Branch
7	4.
8	MR. BELTZ: Hi, Jay.
9	MR. LEONARDS: Hello.
10	MR. BELTZ: Are there any representatives
11	for the licensee on the phone?
12	MR. KUEMIN: This is Jim Kuemin from
13	Palisades/Entergy.
14	MR. BELTZ: Okay. Mr. Mulligan, will you
15	please introduce yourself for the record?
16	MR. MULLIGAN: Hi, I'm Mike Mulligan. I
17	live in Hinsdale, New Hampshire, and I'm a
18	whistleblower.
19	MR. BELTZ: Okay, thank you. Okay, it is
20	not required for other members of the public to
21	introduce themselves for this call. However, if
22	there are any members of the public on the phone that
23	wish to do so at this time, please state your name
24	for the record.

Okay, did I miss anyone else who may be

on the phone?

Okay, I'd like to emphasize that we each need to speak clearly and loudly to make sure that the court reporter can accurately transcribe this meeting. If you do have something that you would like to say, please first state your name for the record.

For those who are dialing into the meeting, please remember to mute your phones to minimize any background noise or distractions. If you do not have a mute button, this can be done by pressing the keys, star, 6. To unmute, press the star, 6, keys again. Thank you.

At this time I'll turn the discussion over to Michele Evans, the PRB chairman.

MS. EVANS: Good afternoon. I'm Michele Evans. I'm the PRB chairman. I'd like to welcome everyone to this meeting regarding the 2.206 petition submitted by Mr. Mulligan. And I apologize for being late. Honestly, my watch stopped, so I didn't realize until just now that I had been like nine minutes late. Sorry about that.

I'd like to first share some background on our process. Section 2.206 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations describes the petition

NEAL R. GROSS

process, the primary mechanism for the public to request enforcement action by the NRC in a public process.

The process permits anyone to petition NRC to take enforcement type action related to NRC licensees or license activities. Depending on the results of this evaluation, the NRC could modify, suspend or revoke an NRC issued license or take any other appropriate enforcement action to resolve a problem. The NRC staff guidance for the disposition of 2.206 petition requests is in Management Directive 8.11 which is publicly available.

The purpose of today's meeting is to give the petitioner an opportunity to provide any additional explanation or support for the petitions before the Petition Review Board's final consideration and recommendation.

This meeting is not a hearing nor is it an opportunity for the petitioner to question or examine the PRB on the merits of the issues presented in the petition request. No decisions regarding the merits of this petition will be made at this meeting. Following the meeting the Petition Review Board will conduct its internal deliberations. The outcome of this internal meeting will be discussed with the

petitioner.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Petition Review Board typically consists of a chairman, usually a manager at the Senior Executive Service level at the NRC, and has a petition manager and a PRB coordinator. Other members of the Board are determined by the NRC staff based on the content of the information in the petition request.

At this time I'd like to introduce the Board and advisors. As I said, I'm Michele Evans, the Petition Review Board chairman. Terry Beltz is the petition manager for the petitions Lee Banic is the Office's PRB discussion today. Dave Pelton is the branch coordinator. chief Generic for the Communications responsible for coordination of the 2.206 petition Bob Carlson is the branch chief for Plant Licensing Branch 3-1, which includes Palisades. Steve Frankl is formerly the acting branch chief for Plant Licensing Branch 3-1.

The following individuals are involved from the regional office. Jack Giessner is a branch chief of Project Branch 4 in Region III, and Jay Lennartz is a project engineer in Project Branch 4 in Region III Division of Reactor Projects.

NEAL R. GROSS

We also obtain advice from our Office of General Counsel represented by Christopher Hair. As described in our process, the NRC staff may ask clarifying questions in order to better understand the petitioner's presentation and to reach a reasoned decision whether to accept or reject the petitioner's request for review under the 2.206 process.

I would like to summarize the scope of the two petitions under consideration and the NRC activities to date. Petition Number 1, on June 27th Mr. Mulligan submitted to the NRC a petition regarding concern associated with leakage from the safety injection refueling water tank at the Palisades Nuclear Plant.

In his petition, Mr. Mulligan requested that Palisades remain shut down. Mr. Mulligan is critical of Entergy, the NRC and the programmatic aspects of the regulatory program based upon recent events at Palisades and other Entergy plants as to the values of Entergy and a lack of NRC regulatory oversight.

He focuses on the recent leak of the safety injection refueling water tank at Palisades, but also discusses past events at both Palisades and other Entergy owned facilities. The petitioner also

discusses a lack of adequate safety culture environment at Palisades and specifies a number of actions to be taken.

The second petition filed on June 28th by Mr. Mulligan submitted to the NRC a petition associated with roof leakage at the Palisades Nuclear Plant. In this petition Mr. Mulligan requested that the Palisades plant remain shut down.

Mr. Mulligan focuses on roof leaks at Palisades and also discusses past events at both Palisades and other Entergy owned facilities. He discusses a lack of adequate safety culture environment at Palisades and is also critical of the NRC staff for tolerating and covering up very serious safety problems at Palisades and throughout the Entergy organization.

is critical of final Не also determinations made in past 2.206 petitions and that Entergy and the NRC processes failed to detect and resolve safety culture issues. Mr. Mulligan includes specific questions related to roof leaks at He also specified additional actions to Palisades. be taken in addition to those in Petition 1.

So I'd like to give a description of the NRC activities to date. The PRB met internally on

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

July 10th and July 31st to discuss the request for immediate action associated with the June 27th and 28th petitions. The PRB denied his request for immediate action on the basis that there was no immediate safety concern identified that would prohibit a Palisades reactor plant start-up or had an effect on the health and safety of the public.

His request also did not provide any new information or information specific enough for the NRC to further consider making an immediate action determination. He was informed on July 17th and again on August 8th of the PRB's decision to deny his request for immediate action related to the two petitions under consideration.

August 8th, the petition manager contacted him to discuss the 2.206 process and to offer an opportunity to address the PRB by phone or in person. He was also informed that the petitions submitted would be consolidated since he petitions were submitted at or about the same time, the requested actions were against the same licensee, and with a few unique issues addressed essentially the same specific concerns.

Consolidation of the petitions does not reduce the importance of the circumstances being

NEAL R. GROSS

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

discussed but does streamline the NRC staff review process and response.

Okay, and then on August 9th, the petitioner informed the petition manager of his desire to address the PRB by phone prior to its internal meeting to make the initial recommendation to accept or reject the petition for review.

In Petition 2, the petitioner requested with the Palisades inspector and other inspectors to discuss the conditions at Palisades before the Petition Board pre-hearing. On August 21st the phone call was held between the petitioner members of the regional inspection and regarding ongoing issues at Palisades.

On August 29th, the petitioner addressed the PRB. The purpose of the call was to give the petitioner an opportunity to provide additional information supporting the petition. On September 24th, the PRB met internally to review the petition and make an initial recommendation. The PRB rejected the petition using the criteria of Management Directive 8.11.

On September 27th, petition manager provided the PRB's initial recommendation to the petitioner and offered the petitioner a second

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

opportunity to address the PRB. And on October 4th, the petitioner requested an additional opportunity to address the PRB.

As a reminder for the phone participants, please identify yourself if you make any remarks, as this will help us in the preparation of the meeting transcript that will be made publicly available. Thank you.

Mr. Mulligan, I'll now turn the meeting over to you to allow you to provide any information you believe the PRB should consider as part of these petitions. Please bear in mind that you will have approximately 45 minutes to address the PRB.

MR. LENNARTZ: Excuse me, Mr. Mulligan.

Before you start, this is Jay Lennartz in the Region.

Jack Giessner, the Region III branch chief, will be joining the call shortly and I just wanted to announce him.

MR. MULLIGAN: Oh, thank you. And I wanted to thank Jack Giessner and the two inspectors at Palisades for talking with me. We had a, I thought was a very nice conversation and stuff like that so it was very appreciative that the NRC had provided me with that opportunity.

I'm just reading the Markey letter, the

NEAL R. GROSS

recent Markey letter that went up on the NRC internet site, and a critical element in the conduct of safety culture surveys is confidentiality.

Employees must believe that they share their observation in complete confidentiality for the sole purpose of improving the quality of their workplace. That's the NRC's response to Markey's letter.

What I'm saying is, you know, what all we've seen is that the NRC and the utility has taken hostage the confidentiality and anonymity of employees. You know, they've twisted this thing around and stuff like that where they're using confidentiality against us.

And the question is, how come we can't have an industry where a professional, and many of these guys have high degrees or are licensed and they have in the control of their fingers enormous powers, why can't we trust them to speak on their own without fear of retaliation or confidentiality?

This confidentiality issue as far as the NRC's concerned is with the employees that can say over a period of history they feel intimidated by many of these plants, and, you know, a lot of these intimidations can't be, have triplicate proof and so

NEAL R. GROSS

they go to the wayside and stuff like that. The agency can't act on these things to make sure that an employee is free to say whatever he wants and stuff.

And so lot of this stuff with confidentiality and anonymity drives these employees to, you know, the only entry to their concerns is the utility and stuff and maybe, if they're lucky, NRC, which has shown themselves not to be too sensitive to not preventing an intimidated atmosphere where everybody needs this super-duper confidentiality type of stuff.

And I can see the world of an environment where these highly trained and professional employees, like I said, have enormous power at their fingertips whether it's through a dial on the powers at the reactor or on the internet. You know, we should treat them specially. We should give them the power to say whatever is on their mind to whoever they think we'll listen to them.

And I just want to make sure everybody knows that generally confidentiality and anonymity, the way the industry plays the game is to submerge what's really going on a lot of times with the employees. They don't have the freedom to figure out which routes they can use.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Can I talk to my utility? A lot of utilities will listen very decently, some won't, and so you give them the opportunity to talk to the NRC. And then some employees, you know, feel that they can't talk to the NRC. So why can't these employees, you know, use their common decency to go with wherever they think is the best route and stuff? So that's one thing.

We also know that in the safety injection refueling water tank, you know, at best this is sloppy engineering for years and stuff, and really you have to say to yourself, would the NRC tolerate that on a new plant? If a new plant was just before startup they had leaking safety refueling injection tanks, would they accept that kind of stuff? How come they accept it from an operating plant and stuff when they wouldn't accept that from a new plant and things?

We know that Palisades has a host of confirmatory orders and escalated enforcement actions across the board. We know that Palisades has with their cracks in their CRDM mechanisms, you know, the fuels and the cracks in the mechanisms, they have a history of, you know, tolerating these degraded conditions and not replacing them with, you know,

NEAL R. GROSS

good components like the rest of the, like the good players in the industry.

What I've been trying to do, you know, I'm not, was it an immediate action I was asking for?
Was it an immediate shutdown I was asking for with Palisades? And those generally are hurdles I have to go, you know, to get past in order to go into a 2.206 process.

You know, all I'm trying to do is get Entergy to change their heart, to act in a good way, to act in the long term interest of their employees and their ratepayers and stuff. That's all I'm trying to do. I mean, you know, you flipping these procedures at me and policies and stuff like that, all I'm trying to get to do is have the NRC force Entergy to act in the right way, to act in a good manner. That's all I'm trying to do.

And I don't know why we always turn this around to procedures. I don't meet some sort of procedures, or I want an immediate shutdown. I want people to act good and behave well, and think about our common good of our nation and stuff like that not the common good of a policy that nobody can see. But that's what I've been trying to do.

And so from 2010 essentially, you know,

NEAL R. GROSS

until the red finding that's what I was trying to do was to get, maybe I could say a couple words that Entergy might take to heart and it would change their behavior.

Then post the red finding, you know, you have the safety injection refueling tank, a couple of shutdowns, CRDM cracks and stuff like that. This is still, I don't care if it's approved by the NRC, this is not acting in a professional engineering manner to allow this sloppiness to continue on.

The model we see with this sloppiness is like San Onofre where they have bad behavior over a number of years and possibly decades, and they end up buying faulty steam generators and then that gets them the shutdown and stuff like that.

Is this what we're going to see with Palisades? One of these days we're going to see a fatal error and that's what shuts them down? Is that what turns their behavior and stuff? I mean I don't, I just, you know, what is the object of having the NRC?

You know, are the opaque economics behind Palisades causing this entrenched bad behavior? What if all the plants in the United States were behaving as bad as Palisades or Browns Ferry or Fort Calhoun?

If this is the floor we're putting under these plants, what if they all said, you know, this is the way we've got to, you know, this is the only way we can survive in the economic conditions we have We can only, you know, the bad plants are now. making more money than us, they're getting, you know, the financial people like quys they're shortcuts that we can't see, and so we've all got to behave in that kind of, you know, meeting minimal regulatory requirements.

It's interesting, Entergy's business strategy prior to 2008. You know, we think about the 2000, California energy debacle. Most of this stuff was about people gaining electric prices, so also gaining the natural gas prices. That's essentially what, that made that market go crazy in 2010.

Post that basically the utilities have, and there was a startling increase in Dow Jones utility average stock prices until 2008. It was just astonishing, a speculatory bubble with the utilities. Some utilities didn't take part in it but most of them did and stuff. And this is what I think Entergy was chasing. They were chasing speculations by buying a bunch of merchant plants.

And it should be noted that on December

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

7th, 2007, the Dow Jones utility averages was 550. Five years later, today, it's 476. I mean that just gives you an idea of this speculation bubble that the utilities undertook. And that's when Palisades bought a lot of their merchant plants in that period and stuff.

The rise in prices of electricity are basically keyed off natural gas prices. You know, they had a really small share of the market but the prices of natural gas set the price of electricity in general throughout the nation from 2000 to 2008.

And there were bottlenecks and not enough piping capacity and price spikes and stuff through those years, and the price of electricity, generally, until 2008 drastically increased and stuff. Natural gas was the prime driver of rising electricity prices throughout the nation, and then we had fracking and, you know, just recently, 2009, 2010.

So I think a lot of this is driving on, you know, not paying for our grid system in electric. This is all speculation and people trying to make money, and the whole function of the utility market is in big trouble as far as thinking about the future.

Here's a statement of John Herron at the Transportation and Storage Subcommittee

NEAL R. GROSS

Blue Ribbon Commission. "Chairman Meserve, Chairman Sharp and distinguished members of the committee, I am John Herron, president and CEO and chief nuclear officer of Entergy Nuclear. Entergy Corporation is an integrated energy company engaged primarily in electric power production and retail electric distribution operations.

Entergy owns and operates power plants approximately 30,000 megawatts of electric generating capacity, including 11 nuclear plants in seven states. As the second largest nuclear in the United States we also provide generator management services operating a 12th nuclear plant in Nebraska."

Entergy has annual revenues of \$10 billion and more than 15,000 employees. Five of our nuclear plants are part of our rate-regulated utility area in the southern United States. The remaining six including Palisades --

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. This is the court reporter. I'm sorry to interrupt, Mr. Mulligan, but could you please speak directly into the phone?

MR. MULLIGAN: You know, I was hearing some scratchy stuff before. Where do you want me to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

start? Do you want me to start over again?

COURT REPORTER: Oh no, I didn't lose anything. Just please try to --

MR. MULLIGAN: Okay.

COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

MR. MULLIGAN: Yes, you're right. You're right.

COURT REPORTER: Sorry to interrupt.

MR. MULLIGAN: I was getting nervous and winded. Five of our nuclear plants are part of our rate-regulated utility service area in the southern United States. The remaining six are merchant plants in the northeast and Michigan. When we purchased these units from their former owners, we also acquired Big Rock and Indian Point 1 in New York, Indian Point Unit 1.

So a lot of these stuff we're talking about merchant plants. You know, here's the Attorney General of Mississippi. In the wake of, this is, that last thing was in, can I say that, November 2, 2010? This one's in February 26th, 2010. In the wake of the Vermont Senate's Entergy decision on Wednesday to shutdown an Entergy Corp.-owned nuclear plant, Mississippi, Attorney General Jim Hood is questioning the company's recent --

NEAL R. GROSS

1 MS. EVANS: Mr. Mulligan? 2 MR. MULLIGAN: Yes? Yes, this is Michele Evans. 3 MS. EVANS: For some reason the last like a few minutes you've 5 been fading. Either you're not as close to the phone anymore, but could you, it was going really well 6 7 until about a minute ago. So if you could maybe get a little closer to the speaker or whatever so that we 8 9 can get everything that you're saying. I appreciate that. 10 MR. MULLIGAN: Thank 11 you. 12 MS. EVANS: Yes. MR. MULLIGAN: The Mississippi Attorney 13 General business, is that a good place to start back 14 15 on? Yes, it must be. 16 MS. EVANS: That's fine. 17 Mississippi Attorney MR. MULLIGAN: General follows \$1.3 billion money trail from Entergy 18 19 to a faltering Vermont Yankee nuclear plant. 20 Can you hear me all right there? MS. EVANS: Yes, that's good. 21 So I'm not going to read 22 MR. MULLIGAN: kind of spent some time on this, 23 generally, Mississippi, Alabama and Louisiana 24 25 complaining because, you know, they're wondering, all

this money going to the faltering merchant fleet of Entergy is stealing money from the Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana ratepayers and stuff.

So he's worrying about his, you know, a lot of money, weak northeast Entergy nuclear plants are weakening the southern part of their company. And we have, recent news is the Dominion Wisconsin plant closed due to low natural gas prices. This is on October 22nd.

Dominion Resources, Incorporated, plans to shut down its Kewaunee Plant in Wisconsin in the second quarter of 2013. The first nuclear plant to fall victim due to steep natural drop in power prices as rising natural gas production redefines U.S. power markets.

You know, it goes on to talk about power prices in the Midwest and across the nation have plunged to ten-year lows this year due to surging U.S. natural gas output and weak demand due to the struggling economy. So here we go with the natural gas business undermining so many other players. The natural gas guys are even undermining the coal people and stuff.

And the New York Times basically says, if I can find it, "According to an internal industry

NEAL R. GROSS

document from the Electric Utility Cost Group, for the period of 2008 to 2010, maintenance and fuel costs for one quarter of the reactor fleet with the highest cost averages \$51.42 per megawatt hours."

This is perilously close to the electrical costs these days.

So basically, you know, we've got really low electric rates are challenging a lot of these merchant plants like Palisades. They're in a fight for survival and everybody knows it.

And the question is, is that the model we're going to use? Is when a plant gets into financial troubles is everybody going to do back flips over trying to be good and trying to save these guys? And then they get themselves, then they go deeper and deeper into troubles and they finally, they're taken out by an accident and stuff that embarrasses the whole industry. Is that's what going on here with Palisades with the NRC?

Does everybody feel sorry for Palisades?

They feel sorry for Entergy, how they speculated in the early 2000s time frame, in the early part of 2000 to the 2008 period or even before that and stuff?

And they had their sights on this speculation and making money on electricity and all that sort of stuff, and that era's over with.

NEAL R. GROSS

You know, that was a business choice that Entergy made and stuff and, you know, that's their prerogative to do that. But here we are in a different environment now and stuff and it's not your job to save them. It's your job to maintain the integrity of the nuclear industry as far as the NRC is concerned.

And that should be Entergy's responsibility. Their primary job is to maintain the credibility of the nuclear industry nationwide and stop this nonsense with plants like Palisades and TVA and Fort Calhoun and stuff like that. This should be the responsibility of all these utilities to be thinking of the bigger picture, you know, what's good for our nation?

Does running these plants to the ground, is that good for our nation? Is that what all, you know, we should all think of that. What are our behaviors? Do we all just think about self-interest and putting a couple of pennies in our pockets or do we think about the big picture?

We belong to the greatest nation on the planet, and we have responsibilities as citizens to think about what's in our greater national good. And more than responsibilities, we're compelled to act on

making sure that everything's aligned to our national interest and not to, you know, chasing pennies. And I think people should ought to be really thinking about that.

I'm still going through some of my paperwork. As I talked about the San Onofre model, they had terrible operational problems many years before they even tried starting to purchase their steam generators. And, you know, again the NRC was there and they were trying to, I don't know what they were doing. Obviously it wasn't productive.

They were trying to change the culture of San Onofre and then, you know, I don't know, somebody that wasn't watching or something like that and they went and purchased these steam generators.

You know, is this model unit stuff like that, is that all penny-pinching behind the scenes? Is that how people do the penny-pinching nowadays? You know, they don't hide it in the paperwork, they hide it in the modeling, you know, that nobody can understand.

You know, that risk modeling, you know how we do risk modeling, you know, that's essentially the same thing. Nobody can understand how this risk business goes and stuff and it's an excuse to do

NEAL R. GROSS

anything you want in the nuclear industry. It's a tool to excuse bad behavior, it's not a tool to make people behave in the right way and stuff. And I think that's how this regulation is performed in the nuclear industry today.

Will San Onofre be the model of the future? Will we have a bunch of plants get into trouble because of natural gas prices? And the NRC will be ineffective on changing this bad behavior and they'll trip into an accident that either shuts them down or throws some more black eyes at the industry in general?

And I'll tell you, you know, like Commissioner Jaczko said, you know, your defenses is all in the fence barrier radiation levels, you know, all just keyed in on that and stuff, and you guys aren't keyed into the lot lesser accidents that don't challenge a release.

And San Onofre is a nuclear accident, really. It's an accident that took out two nuclear plants. Fort Calhoun's a similar kind of a less than design basis accident, nuclear accident. You know, the NRC's not watching them, and then their bad behaviors are not being contained is the reason why Fort Calhoun can't be started up.

NEAL R. GROSS

So is that the model of the future where a plant like Palisades behaves in a bad manner over and over again and then they trip into this accident thing where it finally shuts them down or less than an off site fence release type of a situation? You know, and it's just marginally less worse.

You know, an off site release is bad but a shutdown like Fort Calhoun or San Onofre is almost as bad. It feels just as bad for the employees who are going to lose their jobs and are in turmoil over the future of the plant and stuff like that. You know, it is for many people around the plant and stuff like that, and I think we should consider that very carefully when you're thinking about regulating the plant.

I think these silly rules you've got and procedures and this untransparency and gaming rules and gaming the models and stuff like that, that's not in the interest of the United States when you do that. The truth and honesty and integrity and people having faith in your work, that's the most important thing. That's what carries us through our bad times is this truth and honesty.

And, you know, I know the NRC is going to behave in a decent way and stuff like that and the

NEAL R. GROSS

people know that and they have faith in you. This business of playing with rules and secrecy and all this sort of stuff is very damaging to us as a nation because the rest of the world doesn't, can see right through that and it's damaging to us.

And you think about TVA and Browns Ferry, you know, they blame their troubles on a minimalist approach. And Entergy's, the NRC says that troubles Entergy is that, is they're putting power production over safety. You know, are they in a fight for survival with natural gas, and that's what they're really doing with this putting production over safety? Is that what's hiding? that the monster under the sheets that is causing all these bad behaviors and stuff like that? I think a lot of plants it is and stuff.

And I'll tell you, most of the accidents the last 20 years historic, our truth of what's happened is everybody starts playing a tune that's penny-pinching and austerity stuff and thinking they're doing good, and that drives a plant into all these troubles. I mean that's behind it to the one.

That's the way I see it, it's all economics. It's when you start starving these plants below when they're sustainable is it drives these

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

plants into the ground. You know, that's the history of nuclear power for the last 20 years and you guys better get a hold of it.

And so putting power production over safety and meeting minimal regulatory requirements, as I said, jesus, if every plant in the United States was forced to do this, you know, if they said, oh man, Palisades and TVA they're all getting advantage because they're just meeting the minimum requirements and stuff like that, how can we survive in a world if they're doing that and we're not, and we're being honest and truthful and spending money on these plants to keep them up in a good image of the public?

compete in that kind we environment? We won't. Well, so then we have to do what Palisades and TVA does. And I tell you the truth, that's what they say, right? That's what Palisades and TVA says, the minimalist approach and putting power production over safety and meeting the requirements. minimal regulatory That's what Palisades, TVA and the NRC think what's going on, you know, basically just doing what's barely required of them and stuff like that.

But, you know, at the bottom of this is Fort Calhoun. What's that going to be? What's the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

reason for Fort Calhoun doing all that stuff there or not doing their stuff they're required to do and stuff? What will that be? Will that be some component of this, you know, these guys terrified of the economy in front of them, and everybody closing their eyes because they're afraid of the economy and afraid of the low electric prices and stuff?

Is that, you know, the bad behavior of the industry in general in recent years, is that what's going on behind the scenes, behind this cloud that the NRC doesn't want to confront and think about, and most of these utilities don't either? Is that what's really driving a lot of this bad behavior?

And I'll tell you, as I said, that's what the NRC says is the problem with these plants and the utilities. Just meeting minimum requirements, putting power production over safety, what that other one? Minimum regular was requirements and stuff, I mean that's what the NRC and the utilities say.

But what does it transfer to the employees? And I'll tell you what it transfers to the employees. That gives them a license to be well, you know, well, we know that that's the utilities.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

That's what the utility tells us is our strategy, wink, wink, wink. So it's okay, you guys, you can all violate the rules underneath the blankets and just as long as, you know, you obscure who's responsible for it and stuff.

And these minimalist approaches, does that give these utility employees and bottom level NRC inspectors and stuff like that, does that give them the excuse to violate rules and engineering policies and regulations and good plant operations and stuff like that? I think it is.

I think you can make a case that TVA and Palisades and Fort Calhoun, you know, all of them guys, they face a crisis and then all of sudden out of the woodwork pops up a lot of regulations that weren't being carried out. I think a lot of it's intentioned and stuff like that. Oh well, the NRC won't ever catch us.

And then when the NRC catches them they fiddle with this footsy policies and rules that kind of just pats them on the head and, don't do that again, type of attitude and stuff like that. And then you see an enormous amount of rule violations after the fact that the NRC didn't catch.

How come the NRC can't catch all these

NEAL R. GROSS

things? Then the NRC, you know, basically says, they only violate them on one issue or two, and then the utility is allowed to find the other problems and it's, they're given credit for finding their own problems when the initiator was usually the accident, and the NRC having to reflexively spank the utilities because, you know, in front of the public eye and stuff like that.

So, you know, what's going on behind all this stuff, the bad behavior of Palisades, the safety injection refueling water tank not being right? Everybody knows that's not being right what's happened. It's okay according to the rules, and the NRC is certainly the god of the rules, but it's not right.

Everybody can see that that's not right and the nuclear industry will not survive if we have all this confusion and leaking and all that sort of stuff. You guys can dance around and say it's according to the rules and stuff like that but I'll tell you, you won't survive if a lot of these plants show up like that. And a lot of employees are going to get hurt and a lot of the surrounding communities are going to get hurt also.

And like I said, I mean it's astonishing

NEAL R. GROSS

when these really troubled plants, red finding plants get into trouble, you know, all of the violations post red findings show up. You know, it's like somebody opened their eyes and stuff and all these violations. You know, I don't know why the NRC doesn't catch these violations one-by-one and doesn't hold them accountable to all of the violations post red finding and stuff.

But I just know this kind of patting people on the back, you know, patting them on the head saying, I understand it, you're my friend, and stuff like that and it just doesn't work. It doesn't work to change behavior. You know, when they start doing this stuff, to be their friend you have to be tough and a tough love. And that's not destructive love that is tough love. And you make these guys do what they're supposed to do, and not meeting the minimal requirements or the minimalist approach and stuff like that.

You know, this is 20 percent of our electricity supply and we're entering the prices as far as the electric prices and stuff like that. I just hope at the bottom of all this is these plants were in a survival mode and they were breaking rules in order to survive and in order to have families and

in order to feel good about being in the group.

I hope it all doesn't turn out to be that that's what's happening here and nobody could be the tough regulator, the guy that, you know, stands away from the punch bowl and becomes strong, set the goalpost line and do what's in the interest of our country. I hope that's not what's going to happen here. And I'm afraid that that's exactly what's happening.

You know, it's like this liberalism stuff in the '70s where, you know, we let everybody, we don't hold anybody accountable and it creates all this craziness and stuff like that. I hope this isn't nuclear liberalism, really, in its heart, you know, dressed up as Republican ideology.

You know, I hope this isn't what's happening in the nuclear industry where it's everybody for themselves and you don't have to be honorable and have integrity and talk the truth. Everybody can, you know, tell half-truths and hide behind the shadows and all that stuff. I hope that's not where the nuclear industry is heading.

I hope for the world's sake that we don't get tagged as the country and the regulator who doesn't, destroys the atmosphere on a worldwide basis

NEAL R. GROSS

of safety and nuclear power and integrity and the regulators on a worldwide basis.

And again, thank you very much for listening to me. I appreciate a lot of the times I spent with a lot of the inspectors and the managers and stuff like that. I know there's 90 percent of the employees are really good people, especially guys close to the plants, because you can't play politics over a lot of this nuclear stuff. They see the results of this kind of behavior.

The same thing is like the plants, you know, you play the ideological game that's kind of like living in fantasyland. That's not living in the truth and stuff, and that's on both sides and stuff. You've got to get out of this ideology, ideological rules and this fantasyland that's created by these ideological games, and you've got to face the truth and stuff.

And I hope people see that that you just, you can't do that anymore. Thank you very much for this opportunity to talk. I'm done.

MS. EVANS: Okay. Yes, thank you, Mr. Mulligan.

At this time does the staff here at headquarters have any questions for Mr. Mulligan?

NEAL R. GROSS

No? How about the regional office?
MR. LENNARTZ: I have no comments. Thank
you, Mr. Mulligan.
MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, sir.
MS. EVANS: Does the licensee have any
questions?
MR. KUEMIN: No, thank you.
MS. EVANS: Mr. Mulligan, thank you again
for taking time to provide the NRC staff with
clarifying information on the petitions you
submitted. Before we close, does the
court reporter need any additional information for
the meeting transcript?
COURT REPORTER: Hello, this is the court
reporter. I was wondering if Mr. Kuemin from Entergy
could tell me how to spell his name, please?
MR. KUEMIN: Yes, it's K-U-E-M-I-N.
MR. KUEMIN: Yes, it's K-U-E-M-I-N. COURT REPORTER: Thank you. And I heard
COURT REPORTER: Thank you. And I heard
COURT REPORTER: Thank you. And I heard Mr. Jay Lennartz from the Region? Is that name
COURT REPORTER: Thank you. And I heard Mr. Jay Lennartz from the Region? Is that name correct?
COURT REPORTER: Thank you. And I heard Mr. Jay Lennartz from the Region? Is that name correct? MR. LENNARTZ: That's correct.
COURT REPORTER: Thank you. And I heard Mr. Jay Lennartz from the Region? Is that name correct? MR. LENNARTZ: That's correct. COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

Ī	39
1	That's all I needed.
2	MR. MULLIGAN: Hey, Jack.
3	MR. GIESSNER: Hi, Mr. Mulligan. Good to
4	hear from you.
5	MR. MULLIGAN: Same to you.
6	MS. EVANS: Okay, with that the meeting
7	is concluded and we'll be terminating the phone
8	connection. Thanks again.
9	MR. MULLIGAN: Thank you, everyone, bye.
L O	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
1	the record at 4:00 p.m.)
_2	
L3	
4	
_5	
L 6	
_7	
8 .	
_9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1

2

3

4

NEAL R. GROSS