

**Official Transcript of Proceedings**  
**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title: 10 CFR 2.206 Petition Review Board  
RE Entergy Nuclear Operations

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: (teleconference)

Date: Monday, July 15, 2013

Edited by Richard V. Guzman, NRC Petition Manager

Work Order No.: NRC-073

Pages 1-33

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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

10 CFR 2.206 PETITION REVIEW BOARD (PRB)

CONFERENCE CALL

RE

ENTERGY NUCLEAR OPERATIONS, INC.

+ + + + +

MONDAY

JULY 15, 2013

+ + + + +

The conference call was held, Michael C. Cheok, Chairperson of the Petition Review Board, presiding.

PETITIONERS: MARY LAMPERT

REBECCA CHIN

ARLENE WILLIAMSON

PAUL GUNTER

PETITION REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS

MICHAEL C. CHEOK, Deputy Director

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

(NRR), Division of Engineering

RICHARD GUZMAN, Petition Manager for 2.206

petition

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

NRC STAFF  
  
TANYA MENSAH, Petition Coordinator, NRR,  
  
Division of Policy and Rulemaking  
  
MARCIA J. SIMON, Attorney, Office of  
  
General Counsel  
  
RAJENDER AULUCK, Japan Lessons Learned Project  
  
Directorate  
  
FRED L. BOWER, Acting Branch Chief, Region I  
  
ELIZABETH M. KEIGHLEY, Project Engineer, Region I  
  
NEIL A. SHEEHAN, Public Affairs, Region I

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

(1:03 p.m.)

1  
2  
3 MR. GUZMAN: Good afternoon. This is  
4 Rich Guzman. I'll go ahead and get started with our  
5 Petition Review Board teleconference with Petitioner  
6 Mary Lampert, Pilgrim Watch.

7 Again, my name is Rich Guzman. I am the  
8 project manager for Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station in  
9 the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. I'd like  
10 to thank everyone for attending this meeting. The  
11 purpose of today's teleconference is to allow the  
12 Petitioner, Mary Lampert, and her associates, to  
13 address the Petition Review Board or PRB regarding a  
14 2.206 petition, dated June 14, 2013, concerning the  
15 NRC orders on reliable hardened containment vent,  
16 namely EA-12-050 and EA-13-109, and the  
17 implementation of its provision by Entergy Nuclear  
18 Operations, Inc. for Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station or  
19 Pilgrim.

20 The teleconference is being recorded by  
21 the NRC Operations Center and will be transcribed by  
22 a court reporter. The transcript will become a  
23 supplement to the petition and will also be made  
24 publicly available.

25 Before I briefly go over today's agenda,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 I'd like to open the teleconference with  
2 introductions. As we go around the room and bridge  
3 line, please be sure to clearly state your name, your  
4 position, and your office or organization for the  
5 record.

6 I'll start off. Again, it's Rich Guzman.

7 I'm a project manager in NRR.

8 MS. SIMON: Marcia Simon, attorney in the  
9 NRC Office of General Counsel.

10 MR. AULUCK: Rajender Auluck, project  
11 manager in the Division of Japan Lessons Learned  
12 Project Directorate.

13 CHAIRPERSON CHEOK: I'm Mike Cheok. I'm  
14 the deputy director in Division of Engineering in  
15 NRR.

16 MS. MENSAH: I'm Tanya Mensah. I'm the  
17 Petition Coordinator in the Division of Policy and  
18 Rulemaking in NRR.

19 MR. GUZMAN: That would complete  
20 introductions at NRC headquarters. At this time are  
21 there any NRC headquarters participants who have  
22 dialed in on the phone? Okay, hearing none, will the  
23 NRC participants from the regional office introduce  
24 themselves?

25 MS. KEIGHLEY: This is Beth Keighley,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 project engineer from Region I.

2 MR. BOWER: Fred Bower. I'm the acting  
3 branch chief in Region I.

4 MR. SHEEHAN: Neil Sheehan, Public  
5 Affairs, Region I.

6 MR. GUZMAN: Okay, at this time will the  
7 representatives for Entergy, the licensee for Pilgrim  
8 introduce themselves?

9 Hearing none, Ms. Lampert, will you  
10 please introduce yourself and your associates for the  
11 record?

12 PETITIONER LAMPERT: Yes, this is Mary  
13 Lampert, director of Pilgrim Watch and others on the  
14 phone can introduce themselves.

15 PETITIONER CHIN: This is Rebecca Chin.  
16 I co-chair the Duxbury Nuclear Advisory Committee.

17 PETITIONER WILLIAMSON: Arlene  
18 Williamson, Pilgrim Coalition.

19 PETITIONER GUNTER: Beyond Nuclear.

20 MR. GUZMAN: Can you state your name for  
21 Beyond Nuclear?

22 PETITIONER LAMPERT: I believe it's Paul  
23 Gunter.

24 MR. GUZMAN: Okay.

25 PETITIONER GUNTER: Paul Gunter is on.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. GUZMAN: Thanks, Paul. It's not  
2 required for members of the public to introduce  
3 themselves for this call, but if there are any  
4 members of the public on the phone that wish to do so  
5 at this time, please state your name for the record?

6  
7 (No response.)

8 With that, for our court reporter, can  
9 you also please state your name?

10 COURT REPORTER: This is Toby Walter from  
11 Neal Gross. I'm the court reporter.

12 MR. GUZMAN: Okay, as a brief overview of  
13 the agenda, this teleconference is scheduled from 1  
14 o'clock to 2 o'clock p.m. Eastern Time. Following my  
15 introduction, I will turn it over to the PRB Chairman  
16 who will provide opening remarks and briefly  
17 summarize the scope of the petition under  
18 consideration. Ms. Lampert will then give her  
19 presentation and finally, the PRB Chairman will  
20 conclude the conference call with closing remarks.

21 I'd like to emphasize that we each need  
22 to speak up clearly to ensure that the court reporter  
23 can accurately transcribe the teleconference. Also,  
24 if you have something you would like to say, please  
25 state your name first for the record.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   For       those       dialing       into       the  
2                   teleconference, please remember to mute your phones  
3                   to minimize any background noise or distractions. If  
4                   you don't have a mute button this can be done by  
5                   pressing the key \*6 and then to unmute press the \*6  
6                   keys again. Thank you.

7                   At this time, I'll turn it over to the  
8                   PRB Chairman Mike Cheok.

9                   CHAIRPERSON CHEOK: Thanks, Rich. Good  
10                  afternoon, again. I would like to thank everyone and  
11                  I'd like to welcome you to this meeting regarding the  
12                  2.206 petition submitted by Mary Lampert.

13                  First, let me share some background in  
14                  our process. Section 2.206 of Title 10 of the Code  
15                  of Federal Regulations describes the petition  
16                  process. This is the primary mechanism for the  
17                  public to request enforcement action by the NRC in  
18                  our public process. The process permits anyone to  
19                  petition the NRC to take enforcement-type action  
20                  related to the NRC licensees or licensee activities.

21                  Depending upon the results of the evaluation, the  
22                  NRC can modify, suspend, or revoke an NRC-issued  
23                  license or take any other appropriate enforcement  
24                  action to resolve a problem.

25                  The NRC staff's guidance for the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 disposition of a 2.206 petition is found in  
2 Management Directive 8.11 which is publicly  
3 available.

4 The purpose of today's teleconference is  
5 to give the Petitioner an opportunity to provide any  
6 additional explanation of the support for the  
7 petition before the PRB's initial consideration and  
8 recommendation.

9 This meeting is not a hearing, nor is it  
10 an opportunity for Petitioner to question or examine  
11 the PRB on the merits or the issues presented in the  
12 petition request. No decisions regarding the merits  
13 of this petition will be made at this teleconference.

14 Following this teleconference, the PRB  
15 will conduct its internal deliberations. The outcome  
16 of this internal meeting will be discussed with the  
17 Petitioner. The PRB typically consists of a  
18 chairman, usually a manager at the Senior Executive  
19 Service level at the NRC. It has a petition manager  
20 and a PRB coordinator. Other members of the Board  
21 are determined by the NRC staff based on the content  
22 of the information in the petition request.

23 At this time, I would like to introduce  
24 the Board. I am Mike Cheok, the PRB chairman.  
25 Richard Guzman is the petition manager for the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 petition under discussion today. Tanya Mensah is the  
2 PRB coordinator. Our technical staff includes:  
3 Rajender Auluck from the NRC's Japan Lessons Learned  
4 Project Directorate; Fred Bower and Steve Schaffer  
5 from the NRC Region I, Division of Reactor Projects.

6 We also obtain advice from the Office of General  
7 Counsel represented today by Marcia Simon, and from  
8 the Office of Enforcement which will be represented  
9 by Bob Fretz.

10 As described in our process, the NRC  
11 staff may ask clarifying questions in order to better  
12 understand the Petitioner's presentation and to reach  
13 a reasoned decision whether to accept or reject a  
14 Petitioner's request for review under the 2.206  
15 process.

16 Additionally, the licensee may ask  
17 questions to clarify issues raised by the Petitioner.

18 I understand that the licensee is not on the phone  
19 today.

20 Next, I would like to summarize the scope  
21 of the petition under consideration and the NRC's  
22 activities to date. On June 14, 2013, Ms. Lampert  
23 submitted to the NRC a petition under 2.206  
24 concerning NRC orders EA-12-050 and EA-13-109 related  
25 to hardened containment vents for Pilgrim Nuclear

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 Power Station.

2 In her petition, Ms. Lampert requests  
3 that NRC immediately suspend the operating license of  
4 Entergy Nuclear operations at Pilgrim Nuclear Power  
5 Station until the provisions of the NRC orders are  
6 fully implemented and until the containment vents at  
7 Pilgrim are augmented with filters and rupture discs.

8 The Petitioner requests this enforcement  
9 action on the basis that the existing design of  
10 Pilgrim and other MARK 1 and 2 reactors that they are  
11 not sufficient to protect the public health and  
12 safety. The Petitioner also states that the NRC is  
13 not meeting its statutory obligations by allowing  
14 Pilgrim and other reactors with like design to  
15 operate without fully implementing the requirements  
16 of NRC orders.

17 In terms of NRC activities to date, the  
18 PRB met on June 27, 2013 to review the Petitioner's  
19 request for immediate action. The PRB concluded that  
20 there is no immediate safety concern to Pilgrim or to  
21 the health and safety of the public to warrant the  
22 requested immediate action, that is, the immediate  
23 suspension of the Pilgrim operating license. Ms.  
24 Lampert was informed of this decision on June 28,  
25 2013.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1                   Next is a reminder for phone  
2 participants, please identify yourself if you make  
3 any remarks as this will help us in the preparation  
4 of the meeting transcript that will be made publicly  
5 available.

6                   Ms. Lampert, I will now turn it over to  
7 you to allow you and your associates to provide any  
8 information you believe the PRB should consider as  
9 part of its petition.

10                   PETITIONER LAMPERT: Yes, this is Mary  
11 Lampert and thank you for the opportunity. We agree  
12 that the NRC is statutorily required to adequately  
13 protect public health and safety. That is not a  
14 question.

15                   I assume you agree with that. If you do  
16 not agree with that, you would explain your reasons  
17 why you don't agree and the decision.

18                   This would seem to include requiring  
19 measures so that the reactor will not blow up, breach  
20 its walls, as occurred at Pilgrim sister reactors at  
21 Fukushima, and measures to prevent and monitor  
22 radiation in excess of allowable limits related to  
23 the site.

24                   Our petition provided, I believe, 14  
25 direct quotes from EA-12-050 and EA-13-109 where both

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 orders themselves admit that the status quo does not  
2 protect public health and safety. If again you do  
3 not agree with the statements quoted as being fully  
4 accurate, or if you do not agree that what the order  
5 said in this regard is inaccurate, I request that you  
6 make your reasons clear in your written decision.

7           It's important to note what was said  
8 contrary to the orders in an introductory letter by  
9 Eric Leeds to licensee that accompanied the order.  
10 It said "the NRC staff has determined that continued  
11 operations does not pose an imminent risk to public  
12 health and safety, however, the additional  
13 requirements outlined in EA-13-109 are necessary in  
14 light of insights gained from the events at Fukushima  
15 Daiichi" page 2 of the letter. The key words are  
16 "imminent risk" and "necessary."

17           Imminent as defined in the dictionary,  
18 The Free Dictionary as "about to occur, impending as  
19 an imminent danger." Dictionary.com: "likely to  
20 occur at any moment." Webster: "ready to take  
21 place." Oxford: "About to happen."

22           So therefore, the only sensible  
23 interpretation of Eric Leeds use of the word  
24 "imminent" could only mean that NRC staff has  
25 determined that continued operation does not pose a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 risk to public health and safety, that it's likely to  
2 occur at any moment, any time soon because NRC  
3 believes, despite Fukushima, that we assume the  
4 Japanese believed there was no imminent risk until it  
5 happened despite the fact that Pilgrim is the same  
6 design as Fukushima's reactors, despite the fact that  
7 Pilgrim has many, many times more spent fuel in its  
8 pool than Unit 4 and despite the fact that Pilgrim  
9 has had 13 event reports since January 1st of this  
10 year, the most recent, the malfunctioning of the  
11 annunciators in the control room that is they were  
12 flying blind. Despite all that, none of this is  
13 going to happen for six or so years. In other words,  
14 NRC is crossing their fingers. What else could it  
15 mean?

16 To boot, the order says these events are  
17 necessary. To use Eric Leeds' words "to protect  
18 public health and safety." That means now, tomorrow,  
19 next week, a year from now, two years from now that  
20 there indeed can be a problem where the vent would be  
21 required to operate and where hopefully if they did  
22 operate, they would be filtered so that my house, six  
23 miles across open water from Pilgrim, would not be  
24 rendered worthless and the health of my community at  
25 grave risk.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           The order also says in regard to venting  
2 from the wetwell that in regard to filtering for Mark  
3 I containment the preferred venting path is from the  
4 wetwell portion of the containment because the water  
5 in the suppression pool provides a degree, key word,  
6 degree, of decontamination before release to the  
7 environment. EA-13-109 at 7.

8           A degree of contamination from venting  
9 the wetwell was explained in our petition at pages 6  
10 through 7. The wetwell vent can release anywhere  
11 from zero to close to 99 percent via scrubbing. We  
12 noted that throughout the world reactors, licensees  
13 either have a filter or like the Japanese have chosen  
14 to install a filter because they learned the lessons  
15 from their accidents, despite the fact that they have  
16 scrubbing, so it's in addition to which is what the  
17 Petitioners are requesting.

18           On the other hand, the proposed drywell  
19 vent obviously has no scrubbing, so it will not  
20 filter any releases. Therefore, we believe that it  
21 is accurate to say if venting occurs, public health  
22 and worker health will be negatively impacted. If  
23 you don't believe this, please explain in your  
24 written response.

25           The order also discusses NRC's process

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 for further reviewer action on filtering. It says at  
2 5: "issues relating to filtering will be addressed  
3 through the rulemaking process."

4 I have a couple of questions regarding  
5 the rulemaking process based on NRC Atomic Safety and  
6 Licensing Board Judge Rosenthal's conclusion made  
7 during the prehearing in Boston that I brought  
8 challenging EA-12-050. He said "that with one  
9 possible exception, the NRC has not granted a Section  
10 2.206 petition that substantive relief is sought for  
11 at least 37 years." Key word, substantive.  
12 Therefore, we would like to know and have it  
13 explained in your response what the NRC's track  
14 record for granting the full substance sought in any  
15 rulemaking petition. And second, what is the range  
16 of time it has taken to issue a full decision on a  
17 rulemaking petition? You could say this is important  
18 to me. I am 71 years old. I cannot wait 10, 20 or  
19 whatever the range in time it is for NRC to respond  
20 to a rulemaking petition, number one.

21 And also, it is important to know how  
22 successful this is. We find that we are offered  
23 opportunities to file a 2.206 which I am doing, but  
24 the chances of success there are close to zero.  
25 Rulemaking petitions during the prehearing in Boston

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 on EA-12-050, the licensee's lawyer said in the  
2 transcript that forget rulemaking petitions being  
3 appropriate avenue because they take too long and  
4 everybody laughed. These are important questions.

5 We also asked in the petition that the  
6 vent remain captive. Attachment 2 of the order, that  
7 is 13-109 says in this regard HCVS functional  
8 requirement at 1.1.1 "the HCVS shall be designed to  
9 minimize the reliance on operator action." I would  
10 ask whether you agree that a rupture disc would, in  
11 fact, minimize the reliance on operator action to the  
12 extent of eliminating operator actions making the  
13 system passive. What does minimize mean at 1.1.1?  
14 Please explain in your decision. How is that  
15 sufficient when operator actions may not work out in  
16 a sufficiently timely manner and when the order  
17 itself say sin reference to Fukushima at 2 "in  
18 particular, the operators were unable to successfully  
19 operate the containment venting system. These  
20 problems with venting the containment contributed to  
21 the hydrogen explosion that destroyed the reactor  
22 building. The loss of various barriers led to the  
23 release of radioactive material that further hampered  
24 operator efforts to arrest the accident." Not  
25 sufficient.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           In regard to implementation, the orders  
2 require implementation of Phase 1 at the outset, 5  
3 years; Phase 2, 6 years. So this leaves us to wonder  
4 the following and hopefully it will be explained in  
5 your response. When the orders are implemented, we  
6 want to know whether the licensee, the reactor has to  
7 be shut down and for how long? We also want an  
8 understanding, it would seem that they would be  
9 required in our mind to send a plan to the NRC which  
10 shouldn't take forever, and for approval, then order  
11 the parts and install when the parts arrive. If the  
12 NRC were to tell Pilgrim's owners to start fixing the  
13 issue now and Pilgrim's owners cooperated, went to  
14 work as quickly as possible, and continued to work  
15 diligently on the fix until it was completed, how  
16 long would it take? In other words, what is the  
17 justification for six years?

18           I have talked to some engineers such as  
19 Dave Lochbaum who did work with you guys and asked  
20 how long would it take? He said there would be a  
21 range, but about two years should be doable. If that  
22 is not the case, can you explain and I think you have  
23 an obligation to explain why the six years? Not  
24 requiring full implementation until six years said to  
25 me and I think it says to our community that the NRC

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 is simply crossing its fingers, saying a few prayers,  
2 hoping for the best, and that is no assurance,  
3 clearly, that you are fulfilling your statutory  
4 obligations to protect public health and safety.

5 We want to know specifically sometimes  
6 the PRB's written response denying or denying in part  
7 2.206 petition are less than substantive. There are  
8 feel good, general words.

9 I would hope that (a) you will reconsider  
10 and not deny in full the petition; and whatever your  
11 response be, that it's substantive, so you answer the  
12 important questions, you answer the important  
13 questions of if the orders themselves say public  
14 health and safety is required by these orders, how  
15 health and public safety is being protected now? It  
16 makes no sense. A reasonable person would say look,  
17 it doesn't take six years to get this going. A  
18 reasonable person would say in regard to filtering a  
19 rule change petition is something I will never live  
20 long enough to see. It does not provide any  
21 satisfaction or redress to petitioners as most 2.206  
22 petitions were shown by Judge Rosenthal's  
23 investigation not to either.

24 We hope that since Fukushima that we will  
25 see a change which the recommendation of Option 3 to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 the Commissioners indicated. If you have any  
2 questions, I'd be happy to answer or others on the  
3 call might want to make a comment. And again, thank  
4 you for the opportunity.

5 CHAIRPERSON CHEOK: Thank you, Ms.  
6 Lampert. Let me start with the staff in the room at  
7 headquarters if you have any questions? Does anybody  
8 have any questions?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRPERSON CHEOK: We have no questions  
11 in this room. Does anybody participating by phone --  
12 do we have any questions from the regions for Ms.  
13 Lampert.

14 MR. BOWER: No question from Region I.

15 CHAIRPERSON CHEOK: Thank you. Are there  
16 any members of the public who would like to provide  
17 comments regarding the petition and to ask questions  
18 about the 2.206 process?

19 PETITIONER GUNTER: Yes, this is Paul  
20 Gunter, Beyond Nuclear.

21 CHAIRPERSON CHEOK: Go ahead, Paul.

22 PETITIONER GUNTER: The petition requests  
23 that the NRC Petition Review Board respond in writing  
24 to its questions. I'd like to get a response from  
25 you as to how you determine how thorough your answer

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 in writing is determined?

2 PETITIONER LAMPERT: May I make a  
3 question there? I did not ask for a response in  
4 writing, specifically to my questions. I  
5 specifically asked in the written response regarding  
6 the petition from the PRB that they address every  
7 question and issue I brought forward.

8 PETITIONER GUNTER: Okay, I'm happy to  
9 reframe the question as Ms. Lampert has provided.  
10 But again, how do you -- my question is the petition  
11 is expecting a written response in answer to these  
12 questions. My question to you is how do you  
13 determine by what criteria do you determine your  
14 level and thoroughness of response?

15 MS. MENSAH: This is Tanya Mensah and I'm  
16 not sure who asked the question, but I'm the 2.206  
17 coordinator for the process. If you look in the  
18 Management Directive, there are a couple of exhibits  
19 that are contained in the back for either closure  
20 letters or acknowledgement letters. Now the level of  
21 detail that is provided depends on what phase of the  
22 process you're in. So generally, when we're at this  
23 phase in the process, the PRB is looking at the  
24 information that the Petitioner has provided to  
25 determine if it meets the criteria for review. If it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 meets the criteria for review, normally that letter  
2 will just say we are expecting it for review. I mean  
3 in terms of questions there are some coordination  
4 that we consider if the Petitioner had questions that  
5 perhaps have already been addressed through our  
6 Office of Public Affairs. We try not to duplicate  
7 work that other offices in our agency are currently  
8 pursuing. And so if we've already addressed certain  
9 questions, you may be receiving feedback that because  
10 we've addressed these through our Office of Public  
11 Affairs, here are the specific answers to those  
12 questions.

13 In some cases, it depends on information  
14 that the Petitioner has provided. I mean it's really  
15 hard for me to say from a generic point of view  
16 because each petition is different. But the sense  
17 that I'm getting from Ms. Lampert here is that she  
18 has specific facts as documented in her petition, but  
19 then there are also specific questions and the  
20 answers specifically depend upon what you see here in  
21 the exhibits as far as what our criteria are where we  
22 explain our bases.

23 Now what we have done is Ms. Lampert or  
24 any Petitioner per our process will receive an  
25 initial recommendation which is provided by petition

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 manager. And then the PRB's goal is to explain what  
2 the basis is addressing all aspects of the submittal.

3 Generally, what we have received in the past is that  
4 if the Petitioner believes that well, I don't  
5 understand or this doesn't address the concerns I  
6 had, then the PRB can expand at that point and then  
7 typically we might even have a second call or a  
8 meeting with the Petitioner to make sure that the PRB  
9 is explaining itself and what its basis is for its  
10 recommendation.

11 PETITIONER GUNTER: I'm Mary Lampert, let  
12 me make clear that passing the buck to Public Affairs  
13 would be totally unacceptable and it would just  
14 reinforce the perception that NRC is following the  
15 same path as identified by Judge Rosenthal which  
16 would be a very sad comment and I would like to  
17 believe otherwise.

18 If there isn't a full disclosure of why  
19 the Board has decided what it should do by providing  
20 facts, providing references, then we get no  
21 satisfaction. I'm thinking back to the Vilotty, for  
22 example, where it was suggested there that Vilotty,  
23 instead of challenging the sufficiency of an order,  
24 had other avenues, had the 2.206 petition. Well, we  
25 want to see that that is, in fact, an avenue.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1           The idea of a rulemaking petition for  
2 filtering when it doesn't take a mental genius and  
3 the NRC staff themselves appreciated the importance  
4 of filtering to put any bets on how that's going to  
5 turn out. So if we're going to make progress, if the  
6 NRC is going to start to regain any faith in itself  
7 by the public, I think the request for full response  
8 and opportunity is required. I'm sorry, Paul, for  
9 interfering.

10           PETITIONER GUNTER: No, I think it's all  
11 clarification. It's our concern that as the NRC  
12 addresses the 2.206 review process, if it is  
13 dismissing the petition concerns and direct  
14 questioning, we're expecting that you're going to  
15 provide citations, not generic dismissals. And I  
16 think this is particularly important in context that  
17 this is all public health and safety related and a  
18 part of your stated mission that you uphold that  
19 first. So we're expecting citations to the dismissal  
20 of the petition's direct questions to you and the  
21 technical issues that these questions represent.

22           PETITIONER LAMPERT: Mary Lampert.  
23 Specifically, if the orders themselves said the order  
24 is necessary to protect public health and safety, how  
25 can it mean that between now and six years not to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 worry? So therefore, we're standing naked just at  
2 Pilgrim without the annunciators. We're flying blind  
3 in the interim. Now there has to be a step-by-step,  
4 well thought out response to us if you disagree with  
5 what the order says. It defies common sense.

6 PETITIONER WILLIAMSON: This is Arlene  
7 Williamson from Pilgrim Coalition. What I would like  
8 to ask is how can you basically say the public is in  
9 danger or not in danger, but would be safer if you  
10 implemented EA-12-050 and EA-13-109, what are your  
11 reasons for waiting six years to do something that  
12 clearly will protect the public if an event occurred?

13 In fact, Mary had mentioned there was an  
14 occurrence that happened today, as a matter of fact,  
15 and we hear about these things and being very close  
16 to this reactor I'm concerned as to why you would  
17 issue something and then clearly avoid putting any  
18 implementation for six years when it's something as  
19 serious as this. And that's why we don't have faith  
20 in the NRC is because your boards recommend doing  
21 things and things just either are delayed or they're  
22 not taken into consideration and I'd like to know why  
23 you would give these GE Mark I boiling reactors all  
24 over the country six years to do anything. Thank  
25 you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1                   PETITIONER LAMPERT:   Mary Lampert.   I'd  
2     like to make a statement to qualify.   This is not  
3     about making them safer.   Because that implies  
4     they're safe now.

5                   PETITIONER WILLIAMSON:   Exactly.

6                   PETITIONER LAMPERT:   I haven't finished.

7     And the orders clearly do not say that.   12-050,  
8     reliable hardened venting systems in the BWR  
9     facilities of Mark I and Mark II containment are  
10    needed to ensure that adequate protection of public  
11    health and safety is maintained.

12                   Further, the Commission has determined  
13    that ensuring adequate protection of public health  
14    and safety required.   Further, these measures are  
15    necessary to ensure adequate protection of public  
16    health and safety at 7.   Additional requirements must  
17    be imposed at 4.   Then you go to EA-13-109,  
18    implementation of the order were necessary to provide  
19    reasonable assurance of adequate protection of public  
20    health and safety.   And then there are one, two,  
21    three, four, five, six further quotes.   It's not a  
22    matter of making them safer.   It's a matter that they  
23    are not safe now.

24                   CHAIRPERSON CHEOK:   This is Mike Cheok.

25    Thanks for your comments.   I understand your comments

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that the reactors are not safe now and that you want  
2 the staff to address why we think the reactor, the  
3 plant should continue to operate.

4 PETITIONER LAMPERT: And also why six  
5 years? Things can be put on a fast forward and also  
6 when they finally, if we have no satisfaction, if you  
7 will, and you finally after six years it's going to  
8 happen, how long is it going to take Pilgrim to  
9 actually do it when they get off the dime, and if so  
10 how long? They're going to have to shut down when  
11 they get near the six year drop dead point. Why  
12 can't they do that now? Why can't they give you the  
13 plan? Why can't you be on their neck? We want to  
14 know what you're going to do. We're going to discuss  
15 it, this is what we think. Order the parts and get  
16 off the dime to provide what you're required to do  
17 which is assurance of public health and safety which  
18 the orders say do not exist now.

19 MS. MENSAH: Ms. Lampert, this is Tanya  
20 Mensah again. I just had a quick question for you  
21 and I don't have the transcript in front of me, so  
22 forgive me if I misquoted you, but I thought I heard  
23 you mention earlier that you spoke with or you  
24 coordinated with an engineer or somebody that you  
25 knew regarding the orders?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 CHAIRPERSON CHEOK: That was Dave  
2 Lochbaum.

3 MS. MENSAH: Dave Lochbaum, okay, and you  
4 said that they were recommending that at the most it  
5 should take two years?

6 PETITIONER LAMPERT: There was a range  
7 and it certainly seemed possible to do it within a  
8 couple of years.

9 MS. MENSAH: Okay.

10 PETITIONER LAMPERT: The only issue, let  
11 me get it back from my screen would be if they had to  
12 go back in the containment that would take longer to  
13 check fittings, how things fit. Not six years.

14 MS. MENSAH: Okay, my line of questioning  
15 was just intended to see if you had additional facts  
16 provided through that source as to the basis for that  
17 two-year time frame and any other details that could  
18 be provided to the PRB?

19 PETITIONER LAMPERT: I'll get back to  
20 Dave and shoot it out to you.

21 PETITIONER GUNTER: This is Paul Gunter  
22 again.

23 CHAIRPERSON CHEOK: Go ahead, Paul.

24 PETITIONER GUNTER: Just to add to the  
25 response to Tanya's question about the timing and the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 concern for what the public views as stonewalling.  
2 The direct torus vent system that is currently  
3 installed on most Mark Is with the exception of  
4 Fitzpatrick, the installation times were on the order  
5 of two years beginning in 1987 or so with Pilgrim  
6 installing a DTVS on the wet well and then by Generic  
7 Letter 89-16, this was followed up in two-year repair  
8 cycles or backfit cycles to install the direct torus  
9 vent system.

10 So by the NRC's own records we've seen  
11 these installation times to be a much shorter  
12 duration and it's more particularly egregious that  
13 the Mark I, Mark II plants in Japan have already  
14 reached agreement with AREVA for the installation of  
15 severe accident capable filtered vents on their  
16 boiling water reactors. So the public is pretty  
17 shocked by the fact that the NRC intends to  
18 deliberate a minimum of six years. These time frames  
19 often slip and you know while we see engineered high-  
20 capacity filtered systems being installed by  
21 contractual agreements to date between AREVA and the  
22 Japanese boiling water reactor fleet. So it's  
23 particularly of concern, as this petition notes, that  
24 these time frames do not represent reasonable  
25 assurance for protecting public health and safety on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 unreliable systems that are operating today.

2 PETITIONER LAMPERT: Yes, I would add to  
3 that, Mary Lampert. I'd add also for your  
4 consideration if I were Entergy, I would draw this  
5 process out, whine and moan and groan and come up  
6 with my engineer's guesses, estimates on how long all  
7 this is going to take. And why? Because Pilgrim,  
8 like Fitzpatrick, like Vermont Yankee, are not  
9 competing in this deregulated electric market here  
10 where the price is being set by cheaper sources of  
11 electricity. So the rumor mill is that they're even  
12 wondering whether they're going to be around very  
13 long and I think the NRC has to be cognizant of this  
14 and not kowtow to it.

15 The issue is not let's not make the  
16 industry spend money and get moving ASAP which is  
17 possible because you know, who knows? They might be  
18 closing so all that money for naught. So again,  
19 whose side are you on? We'd like to believe, we  
20 hope, on the public side on satisfying your statutory  
21 requirements.

22 CHAIRPERSON CHEOK: Okay, thanks. This  
23 is Mike Cheok again. I understand your comment that  
24 six years for implementation is too long and that you  
25 would like to see the NRC act in a faster manner.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Are there other comments?

2 PETITIONER CHIN: Yes, this Rebecca Chin,  
3 Town of Duxbury. I spoke seven years ago on this  
4 topic at an Atomic Energy Licensing Board hearing in  
5 Plymouth and the same song is being sung today.  
6 We're concerned with our public health, safety and  
7 our regional economy. And we understand that  
8 unfiltered venting has been judged unsafe by all  
9 regulatory agencies outside of the United States,  
10 even back then. And if we are the only ones that are  
11 sitting on our hands and waiting, that's not okay.  
12 And we do expect prompt attention to this requirement  
13 for Pilgrim and that they do act upon it  
14 expeditiously and we do want filters and automatic  
15 passive vents.

16 We're aware that the purpose of  
17 containment is to provide a barrier between the  
18 lethal radiation inside the reactor and the public.  
19 And if something is going wrong inside that reactor  
20 and venting is called for, you're going to blow  
21 everything you can right up the stack, unfiltered and  
22 unmonitored, and that is not okay.

23 PETITIONER LAMPERT: Mary Lampert.  
24 Another thing that is not okay, when the most recent  
25 order 13-109 explained that if it's necessary to add

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 water because you're now having melt, that in fact  
2 the vent that is at Pilgrim right now would be  
3 inoperable. And so therefore absent the capability  
4 to vent that the order itself described, we're in  
5 trouble, because if our reactors explode, it's not  
6 good for the neighborhood. And you have identified  
7 the problem that why venting is required and then say  
8 okay, you have a vent in the wet well, but that might  
9 not work in certain circumstances. So in plain  
10 English, you're screwed. Not to mention the problem  
11 of the lack of filter, lack of passivity that you  
12 describe in the order is and was a problem at  
13 Fukushima. So we don't understand why these issues  
14 are hard. And we expect a full explanation with  
15 references, not generalities.

16 I'm sorry if I sound perhaps a little  
17 emotional or angry. I've been doing this for over 25  
18 years. That could explain it. It's not because I  
19 dislike or even know who you are. It is just the  
20 seriousness of the issue and total frustration with  
21 NRC. So I hope you understand it's nothing personal.

22 PETITIONER GUNTER: This is Paul Gunter.

23 One quick final question. Again, with regard to the  
24 specificity that the Petition Review Board should  
25 respond to the Petitioners' concerns, Ms. Lampert has

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 outlined the petition's concern for the level of  
2 adequacy of protection to public health and safety on  
3 current operations with a drywell vent, as she's  
4 pointed out would be relied upon when the wet well  
5 vent was precluded by flooding of the drywell as a  
6 result of part of the operator actions.

7 So the Petitioners are concerned about  
8 the specifications on the drywell ductwork system  
9 that would then be relied upon. And we're requesting  
10 a level of specificity in response to these concerns  
11 that would provide the pressure ratings on the  
12 drywell ductwork which is currently not a hardened  
13 system that would be relied upon for public health  
14 and safety response if and when that wet well vent  
15 would be precluded from use by your own operations.

16 I think you owe the public the level of  
17 transparency to show exactly how robust your  
18 oversight is of these technical specifications.

19 CHAIRPERSON CHEOK: Okay, this is Mike  
20 Cheok. Let me summarize again. I think the comment  
21 that was in dispositioning the petition, the request  
22 is for the NRC to be specific in terms of -- and to  
23 be open in terms of documenting what our reasons for  
24 the dispositioning of the petition.

25 PETITIONER GUNTER: With specificity.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)

1 CHAIRPERSON CHEOK: Thank you.

2 PETITIONER LAMPERT: That's one issue.  
3 And let's not forget the basic issue which is the  
4 request actually made in the petition. There are  
5 three. One involves passivity. One involves  
6 filtration. And the other involves the time.

7 CHAIRPERSON CHEOK: Good thank you. Any  
8 additional comments? Okay, thank you. Ms. Lampert  
9 and all the Petitioners on the call, thank you again  
10 for taking your time out to provide us with your  
11 comments and with clarifying information.

12 Before we do close though ,does the court  
13 reporter need any additional information for the  
14 meeting transcript?

15 COURT REPORTER: This is the court  
16 reporter. No, I do not need any additional  
17 information.

18 CHAIRPERSON CHEOK: Okay, well, this  
19 meeting is concluded and we will be terminating the  
20 connections. Thanks, again.

21 PETITIONER LAMPERT: Thank you and thanks  
22 to the court reporter.

23 (Whereupon, at 1:56 p.m., the  
24 teleconference in the above-entitled matter was  
25 concluded.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

**NEAL R. GROSS**  
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

[www.nealrgross.com](http://www.nealrgross.com)