

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

Title: 10 CFR 2.206 Petition Review Board  
RE Florida Power and Light

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: teleconference

Date: Monday, July 18, 2016

Work Order No.: NRC-2491

Pages 1-22

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

10 CFR 2.206 PETITION REVIEW BOARD (PRB)

TELECONFERENCE REGARDING  
COOLING WATER INTAKE SECURITY  
AFFECTING ALL NRC LICENSEES MONDAY

JULY 18, 2016

+ + + + +

The teleconference was held, at 11:00 a.m.,  
Jane Marshall, Chairperson of the Petition Review  
Board, presiding.

PETITIONER: THOMAS SAPORITO

PETITION REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS

JANE MARSHALL, Office of Nuclear Reactor  
Regulation, Acting Director for Division  
of License Renewal

LEE BANIC, 2.206 Petition Coordinator

PERRY BUCKBERG, Petition Manager for 2.206

petition, Senior Project Manager,

Division of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

DENNIS GORDON, Security Specialist, Office of

Nuclear Security and Incident Response

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

MATT RING, Attorney, Office of the General  
Counsel

RYAN TAYLOR, Senior Project Inspector, Region  
II

JOHN TORNOW, Physical Security Inspector,  
Region II

NRC STAFF

STEPHEN ROBERTS, Resident Inspector, St. Lucie  
LUNDY PRESSLEY, Senior Project Engineer,  
Region II

ON BEHALF OF THE LICENSEE

STEVE HAMRICK, Counsel, Florida Power and  
Light

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

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

(11:01 a.m.)

1  
2  
3 MR. BUCKBERG: I'd like to thank everybody  
4 for attending this meeting. My name is Perry Buckberg.  
5 I'm a NRC Senior Project Manager in the Division of  
6 Nuclear Reactor Regulation. I'm also the Petition  
7 Manager for this petition we'll be discussing today.

8 We're here today because the petitioner,  
9 Thomas Saporito, requested a second opportunity to  
10 address the Petition Review Board regarding the 2.206  
11 petition dated March 6, 2016, as supplemented.

12 This teleconference was scheduled to begin  
13 at 11:00 a.m. Eastern time. And after introductory  
14 remarks we'll allow Mr. Saporito 45 minutes to address  
15 the Board.

16 The meeting is being recorded by the NRC  
17 Operations Center, and will be transcribed by a court  
18 reporter who is present today. The transcript will  
19 become a supplement to the petition, as did the first  
20 one. The transcript will also be made publicly  
21 available.

22 I'd like to open this meeting with  
23 introductions. I'd like the rest of the Petition  
24 Review Board to first introduce themselves, first  
25 headquarters, and then on the phone.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           Please be sure to state your name, your  
2 position, and the office that you work for within the  
3 NRC for the record. So, within this room first, please.

4           MR. GORDON: Dennis Gordon, Office of  
5 Nuclear Security Incident Response, Security  
6 Specialist.

7           CHAIR MARSHALL: Jane Marshal, Office of  
8 Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Acting Director for the  
9 Division of License Renewal.

10          MS. BANIC: Lee Banic, 2.206 Petition  
11 Coordinator.

12          MR. RING: Matt Ring, Attorney, Office of  
13 the General Counsel.

14          MR. BUCKBERG: Thank you. Members of the  
15 Petition Review Board only that are on the phone, please  
16 introduce yourselves.

17          MR. TORNOW: John Tornow, Physical  
18 Security Inspector, Region II, Atlanta, Georgia.

19          MR. BUCKBERG: Thank you.

20          MR. TAYLOR: Ryan Taylor, Senior Project  
21 Inspector, Region II, Division of Reactor Projects.

22          MR. BUCKBERG: Thanks, Ryan. Anybody  
23 else on the phone who's a member of -- I'm sorry, go  
24 ahead.

25          MR. PRESSLEY: Lundy Pressley, Senior

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Project Engineer, Region II.

2 MR. BUCKBERG: Thanks, Lundy. We  
3 identified everybody in the room here. Anybody else on  
4 the phone from the NRC?

5 MR. ROBERTS: Stephen Roberts, Resident  
6 Inspector, Port St. Lucie.

7 MR. BUCKBERG: Besides the NRC staff, is  
8 anybody else, any members of the public on the phone?

9 MR. HAMRICK: This is Steve Hamrick,  
10 Counsel for Florida Power and Light Company.

11 MR. BUCKBERG: Thank you. Anybody else on  
12 the phone? Free for all. Anybody? Mr. Saporito,  
13 would you please introduce yourself for the record?

14 MR. SAPORITO: Yes. My name's Thomas  
15 Saporito. I represent Saprovani Associates. And I'm  
16 the petitioner in this proceeding.

17 MR. BUCKBERG: Thank you. It is not  
18 required for members of the public to introduce  
19 themselves for this call. However, if there are any  
20 members of the public on the phone that wish to do so  
21 at this time, please state your name for the record.

22 (No response.)

23 MR. BUCKBERG: I'd like to emphasize that  
24 we each need to speak clearly and loudly to make sure  
25 that the court reporter can accurately transcribe this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 meeting. If you do have something that you would like  
2 to say, please first state your name for the record.

3 For those dialing into the meeting, please  
4 remember to mute your phones to minimize any background  
5 noise or distractions. If you do not have a mute  
6 button, this can be done by pressing the keys star 6 to  
7 mute the phone. And then to un-mute, press star 6  
8 again. Thank you.

9 At this time I'd like, I'll turn it over to  
10 the PRB Chair, Jane Marshall.

11 CHAIR MARSHALL: Thank you, Perry.  
12 Welcome to this meeting regarding the 2.206 petition  
13 submitted by Thomas Saporito. I'd like to first share  
14 some background on our process.

15 Section 2.206 of Title 10 of the Code of  
16 Federal Regulations describes the petition process.  
17 The primary mechanism for the public to request  
18 enforcement action by the NRC in a public process. This  
19 process permits anyone to petition NRC to take  
20 enforcement type action related to NRC licensees, or  
21 licensed activities.

22 Depending on the results of its evaluation  
23 NRC could modify, suspend, or revoke an NRC issued  
24 license, or take any other appropriate enforcement  
25 action to resolve a problem. The NRC staff's guidance

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 for the disposition of a 2.206 petition request is in  
2 Management Directive 8.11, which is publicly available.

3 The purpose of today's meeting is to give  
4 the petitioner a second opportunity to provide any  
5 additional explanation or support for the Petition  
6 Review Board's consideration and recommendation.

7 This meeting is not a hearing. Nor is it  
8 an opportunity for the petitioner to question or examine  
9 the PRB on the merits or the issues presented in the  
10 petition request.

11 No decisions regarding the merits of this  
12 petition will be made at this meeting. Following this  
13 meeting the Petition Review Board will conduct  
14 deliberations. The outcome of this internal meeting  
15 will be discussed with the petitioner.

16 The Petition Review Board typically  
17 consists of a Chairman, usually a manager at the senior  
18 executive service level at the NRC. It has a petition  
19 manager and a PRB coordinator.

20 Other members of the Board are determined  
21 by the NRC staff, based on the content of the information  
22 in the petition request. The members have already  
23 introduced themselves.

24 As described in our process, the NRC staff  
25 may ask clarifying questions in order to better

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 understand the petitioner's presentation, and to reach  
2 a reasoned decision whether to accept or reject the  
3 petitioner's request for review under the 2.206  
4 process.

5 I would like to summarize the scope of the  
6 petition under consideration, and the NRC activities to  
7 date.

8 On March 6, 2016 you submitted to the NRC  
9 a petition under 2.206, in which you requested a number  
10 of actions. The concern reflected in the petition is  
11 unauthorized access to the protected area via the  
12 cooling water intake structure piping and/or facility.

13 On March 30, 2016 the petition manager  
14 contacted you to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process, and  
15 to offer you an opportunity to address the PRB prior to  
16 its internal meeting, where it would make the initial  
17 recommendation to accept or reject the petition for  
18 review.

19 You requested to address the PRB by  
20 teleconference. The resulting May 19th, 2016  
21 teleconference transcript is now public record. The  
22 petition manager communicated to you on June 29th, 2016  
23 that the PRB would recommend rejecting your petition,  
24 but offered you a second opportunity to address the  
25 Board. You accepted, and today's teleconference was

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 scheduled as a result.

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

7 Mr. Saporito, I turn it over to you to allow  
8 you the opportunity to provide any information you  
9 believe the PRB should consider as part of this  
10 petition. You have 45 minutes for your presentation.

11 MR. SAPORITO: Thank you, Chairman. And  
12 thank you for the second opportunity to address the  
13 Petition Review Board in this important matter. So,  
14 for the record, my name is Thomas Saporito, and I  
15 represent myself, Saprodani Associates, the petitioner  
16 in this matter.

17 Our initial teleconference call regarding  
18 the 2.206 enforcement petition I explained in great  
19 detail about security matters related to the Florida  
20 Power and Light Company St. Lucie nuclear plant, and  
21 emphasized that the security concerns apply to all NRC  
22 licensees with similar nuclear power plant design.

23 In particular I explained to the NRC that  
24 the St. Lucie nuclear plant experienced two incidents  
25 where a diver was sucked into the intake water pipes,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 which extend from the ocean into the plant's intake  
2 water system, which is part of the licensee's protected  
3 area of the plant, requiring a security clearance for  
4 access.

5 In addition, I explained to the NRC, with  
6 demonstrative attachments, the vulnerability of a  
7 terrorist attack at the west end of the facility, where  
8 an apparent man made dam could be blown up with a boat  
9 laden with explosives crashing into that area.

10 Moreover, I explained to the NRC that  
11 terrorists, specifically radical Islamic terrorists,  
12 were hell bent on killing as many Americans as they can.

13 Since that time of the initial  
14 teleconference call between the petitioner and the NRC  
15 another terrorist attack occurred on June 12th, 2016.  
16 Omar Mateen, a 29 year old American security guard,  
17 killed 40 people, and wounded 53 others in a terrorist  
18 attack.

19 Mateen called 911 during the attack to  
20 pledge allegiance to ISIS, a well-known terrorist  
21 organization, and mentioned the Boston Marathon bomber,  
22 according to a U.S. official. The terrorist attack  
23 occurred in Orlando, Florida, a few miles north of the  
24 St. Lucie nuclear power plant.

25 On July 13th, 2016, following a celebrated

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 event with fireworks in Nice, Florida, N-I-C-E, France,  
2 excuse me, Nice, France, another terrorist used a huge  
3 box truck to kill approximately 84 people, including  
4 children. Many others were injured. The terrorists  
5 and others were linked to ISIS by the French Government.

6 The Obama Administration continues to  
7 allow migrants from known terrorist areas of the world  
8 to enter the USA, despite knowing that terrorists take  
9 advantage of any means brought to the USA to kill  
10 Americans. The FBI director recently explained to  
11 Congress that the agency has active terrorist  
12 investigations in every state.

13 On June 29th, 2016 Perry H. Buckberg of the  
14 NRC sent petitioner an email explaining, and I'll read  
15 this into the record so the public can fully understand  
16 the context of this petition. It says, this is dated  
17 June 29, 2016, addressed to Mr. Saporito.

18 It says, "The Petition Review Board, PRB,  
19 that was selected to consider your 2.206 petition  
20 regarding license security for cooling water intake  
21 structures, licensee security for cooling water intake  
22 structures, piping, and facilities has concluded that  
23 your petition should be rejected, because it meets the  
24 following rejection criteria in NRC Management  
25 Directive MD 8.11."

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           And then in italics it states, "The  
2 petitioner raises issues that have already been the  
3 subject of NRC staff review and evaluation either on  
4 that facility, other similar facilities, or on a generic  
5 basis, for which a resolution has been achieved. The  
6 issues have been resolved. And the resolution is  
7 applicable to the facility in question."

8           It goes on to state, "Specific to plant  
9 security nuclear plant operating licenses and existing  
10 federal regulation require the physical security threat  
11 be assessed and addressed by all NRC licensees.

12           Protection against a water born (boat)  
13 attack, or an attack with hand carried equipment (diver)  
14 falls specifically under 10 CFR 73.1 (a) (1) (E) (iv), and  
15 10 CFR 73.1 (a) (1) (D) respectively.

16           The petition as recorded included  
17 discussion of water born terrorist attack in general,  
18 and the two St. Lucie diver incidents. NRC security  
19 staff advised that these attacks are well within the  
20 current scope of consideration for any plant's physical  
21 security, which is under constant review by well  
22 qualified security specialists.

23           In addition, nuclear power plants have  
24 several security layers of increasing surveillance and  
25 defense protecting those facilities."

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           Now, in researching the regulations that  
2           the NRC specified in that email, I understand CFR Part  
3           783.1, Section (A) is, I'll just state the relevant  
4           portion. It says, "Purpose".

5           This part describes requirements with the  
6           establishment and maintenance of a physical protection  
7           system, which will have capabilities for the protection  
8           of special nuclear material at fixed sites and in  
9           transit, and at a plant in which special nuclear  
10          material is used.

11          And then further down that section the NRC  
12          pointed out in paragraph (D), it states, "Hand carried  
13          equipment, including incapacitating agents and  
14          explosives for use as tools of entry, or for otherwise  
15          destroying reactor facility, transporter, or container  
16          integrity, or features of the safeguard system."

17          And that's, continuing lower under Section  
18          (iv) it says, "A water born vehicle bomb assault, which  
19          may be coordinated with an external assault."

20          This email response by the NRC amply  
21          demonstrates that the agency continues to be a passive  
22          agency, acting only after the fact where a clear  
23          violation of the agency's regulation or requirements  
24          have been violated by one of its licensees.

25          Such complacency by United States

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Government agencies will ultimately cause the death and  
2 injury of tens of thousands of Americans from a  
3 terrorist attack at one or more of the current operating  
4 nuclear plants in the United States.

5 Moreover, the resultant radioactive  
6 contamination from such a terrorist attack would render  
7 massive areas of land uninhabitable for many, many years  
8 into the future.

9 The NRC must evolve with a radically  
10 changing world, where terrorist organizations exist  
11 around the entire planet. The NRC must become a  
12 proactive Government agency, utilizing its personnel to  
13 reach beyond its regulations under 10 CFR Part 50, and  
14 other regulations, to anticipate the (what if)  
15 scenarios where terrorists can attack a commercial  
16 nuclear power station.

17 With respect to the instant 2.206  
18 enforcement petition, the NRC failed to properly  
19 justify its rejection of the petition, and relies on its  
20 regulations under 10 CFR 73.1 (a) (1) (E) (iv) and 10 CFR  
21 73.1 (a) (1) (D), as delineated in the Buckberg email to  
22 petitioner.

23 Notably, a small power boat laden with high  
24 explosives could easily crash into the west end intake  
25 structure dam, and cause a loss of coolant water to the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 twin reactors at the St. Lucie nuclear power plant.  
2 Moreover, terrorists could simply blow up the offsite  
3 transmission line structure extending west from the  
4 nuclear plant over the river.

5 Terrorists could simply drive a truck laden  
6 with explosives to the plant's security gate entrance,  
7 and blow up the reactor building, or the central storage  
8 building. There does not appear to be any tire slashing  
9 devices in place at the nuclear plant to prevent such  
10 an attack.

11 The licensee's security personnel are not  
12 likely to be able to stop an aggressive attack by  
13 well-armed terrorists, where the licensee's security  
14 personnel has not likely killed a human being, and may  
15 freeze during a real terrorist attack, despite their  
16 training and their practice drills.

17 The licensee has made public statements  
18 about placing a grating type device at the intake pipes  
19 under the ocean. However, the licensee's design of the  
20 grating device was stated to have two foot openings to  
21 permit sufficient water to flow to the plant.

22 Such a design would not prevent a terrorist  
23 from physically entering the pipe and traveling to the  
24 protected area of the plant. Moreover, such a design  
25 would not prevent terrorists from placing explosives

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 into the intake pipe.

2 As stated earlier, petitioner's 2.206  
3 enforcement petition is applicable to all NRC licensees  
4 with similar plant design to the FPL St. Lucie nuclear  
5 plant.

6 As the terrorist organization continue to  
7 evolve and adapt in using different weapons of mass  
8 destruction, the NRC can no longer maintain a passive  
9 policy with respect to its Congressional mandate to  
10 protect public health and safety, and protect the  
11 environment related to operation of commercial nuclear  
12 power reactors in the United States.

13 Notably, there currently exists numerous  
14 ways and methods to damage a U.S. based nuclear power  
15 plant, where the NRC licensees simply cannot prevent,  
16 or have not anticipated.

17 And I say for this record, I have no  
18 military background or experience whatsoever. This is  
19 just common sense.

20 For example, Islamic, radicalized Islamic  
21 terrorists, they might attack simultaneously the St.  
22 Lucie nuclear plant, for example, using a heavy truck  
23 which crashes into the entrance gate, neutralizing the  
24 security guards at that point, while simultaneously  
25 attacking the switch yard to neutralize offsite power

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 coming into the facility, and going up the west dam that  
2 I previously talked about, with a power boat laden with  
3 explosives.

4 As a way of attack they, destroy the spent  
5 fuel building, and its twin reactor buildings. And  
6 then finally, they could destroy the offsite  
7 transmission line structures extending over the river.

8 These scenarios are very feasible. These  
9 terrorists are skilled. They're crazy people. They  
10 have no value on life as it exists in this world. And  
11 they are, they kill themselves. They take on suicide  
12 missions to accomplish their task.

13 So the NRC's regulations and policies, and  
14 requirements that they place on their licensees, like  
15 Florida Power and Light, to ensure that their power  
16 plants can stand off a terrorist attack, are flawed in  
17 many, many ways. And I don't have time to go into all  
18 those ways in detail.

19 However, I want to supplement my 2.206  
20 petition with two more requests. The first request  
21 will be that the NRC require its licensees to extend the  
22 protected area of their nuclear plant to include intake  
23 pipes under the ocean.

24 And supplemental request number 2, that the  
25 NRC requires licensees to extend the protected area of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 their nuclear plants to include the area one mile around  
2 the entire facility.

3 The rationale and reasoning behind these  
4 requests is to ensure a more protected area to fend off  
5 a terrorist attack. If you extend the protected area  
6 as I have stated here, it gives the licensee better  
7 surveillance of the protected area because it's wider.  
8 It gives them more time to react.

9 Because even if the terrorists were to  
10 crash through a one mile perimeter, they have ample  
11 time, and they could have ample assets and resources  
12 stationed ahead of the critical safety rated equipment  
13 at the nuclear plant to fend them off.

14 As it exists, you know, I would  
15 guesstimate, you know, three terrorist attacks would  
16 sufficiently damage -- Not three terrorist attacks,  
17 three terrorist people could inflict sufficient damage  
18 to, and to take St. Lucie nuclear power plant as an  
19 example.

20 And this is applicable, like I say, at all  
21 NRC licensed nuclear power plants across the United  
22 States. But just taking on the St. Lucie plant at this  
23 point. If you just had three crazy, radicalized  
24 Islamic terrorists, they could take down St. Lucie  
25 nuclear plant themselves.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           They could attack the facility at night.  
2           And you don't even have to crash your truck into the main  
3           gate, you know. They could, all three of them could be  
4           strapped, you know, load their bodies up like they do  
5           with explosives.

6           And they could fly into the plant using hang  
7           gliders. There's hang gliders on the ocean, east of the  
8           power plant, all the time. So they could come in with  
9           hang gliders, you know.

10          One could take out the switch yard.  
11          Another take out the fuel building. And another could  
12          set a detonation between the two twin reactors. So  
13          three people could cause significant damage, and a  
14          release of the nuclear radiological particulates into  
15          the environment.

16          And they also could nullify both those  
17          reactor cores. That's just one example. And it's a  
18          very feasible example. And, you know, internally, the  
19          licensee, FPL, has no reasonable protection to fend off  
20          such a scenario as that, for an example. And there's  
21          many more.

22          In closing, I would like to say for the  
23          record, and I brought this to the attention of the NRC,  
24          and one or more other instances of the entire electric  
25          grid of the United States.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           The entire electric grid of the United  
2 States can be taken down by a handful of terrorists,  
3 resulting in multiple reactor cores around the country  
4 melting down, and spewing radioactive particles into  
5 the environment, harming millions of Americans.

6           The NRC should recommend the FERC, which is  
7 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, who has  
8 jurisdiction over the grid, that each state in the  
9 United States separate itself from the national  
10 electric grid.

11           This would ensure that each state could  
12 maintain power to its nuclear reactors, and it would not  
13 be affected in a harmful way should the electric be  
14 taken down by very, those same terrorist attacks.

15           And that's all I have. And I will take any  
16 questions if anybody has any. Thank you.

17           CHAIR MARSHALL: Thank you. At this time  
18 does the staff here at headquarters have any questions  
19 for Mr. Saporito?

20           (No response.)

21           CHAIR MARSHALL: What about NRC staff on  
22 the phone?

23           MR. TORNOW: Region II has no questions.

24           CHAIR MARSHALL: Thank you. Does the  
25 licensee have any questions?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. HAMRICK: This is Steve Hamrick for  
2 FPL. No, I don't have any questions. Thank you.

3 CHAIR MARSHALL: Thank you. If there are  
4 any members of the public on the line I'd like to remind  
5 you before I conclude the meeting, members of the public  
6 may provide comments regarding the petition, and ask  
7 questions about the 2.206 petition process.

8 However, as stated at the opening, the  
9 purpose of this meeting is not to provide an opportunity  
10 for the petitioner or the public to question or examine  
11 the PRB regarding the merits of the petition request.

12 Mr. Saporito, thank you for taking the time  
13 to provide the NRC staff with clarifying information on  
14 the petition that you've submitted. Before we close,  
15 does the court reporter need any additional information  
16 for the meeting transcript?

17 COURT REPORTER: No, thank you.

18 CHAIR MARSHALL: Thanks. With that, this  
19 meeting is concluded. And we will be terminating the  
20 phone connection. Thank you.

21 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went  
22 off the record at 11:30 a.m.

23

24

25

**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