

November 19, 2003

MEMORANDUM TO: William D. Travers  
Executive Director for Operations

FROM: Brian W. Sheron, Associate Director */RA/*  
for Project Licensing and Technical Analysis  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: OCTOBER 2003 REPORT ON THE STATUS OF PUBLIC PETITIONS  
UNDER TITLE 10 OF THE *CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS*,  
SECTION 2.206

The attached reports give the status of petitions submitted under Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Section 2.206. As of October 31, 2003, there were three open petitions, which were accepted for review under the 2.206 process in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

Attachment 1 provides a detailed status of the open petitions.

Attachment 2 provides the status of incoming letters that the staff has been reviewing to determine if they meet the criteria for review under the 2.206 process.

Attachment 3 shows the age statistics for the open 2.206 petitions as of October 31, 2003.

Attachment 4 shows the age trend of closed petitions for the last 3 years.

This report, Director's Decisions, and other 2.206-related documents are placed in the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System. In making these readily accessible to the public, the staff has identified another vehicle to address one of our performance goals, i.e., to enhance public confidence.

Attachments: As stated

CONTACT: Donna Skay, NRR  
415-1322

November 19, 2003

MEMORANDUM TO: William D. Travers  
Executive Director for Operations

FROM: Brian W. Sheron, Associate Director */RA/*  
for Project Licensing and Technical Analysis  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: OCTOBER 2003 REPORT ON THE STATUS OF PUBLIC PETITIONS  
UNDER TITLE 10 OF THE *CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS*,  
SECTION 2.206

The attached reports give the status of petitions submitted under Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Section 2.206. As of October 31, 2003, there were three open petitions, which were accepted for review under the 2.206 process in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

Attachment 1 provides a detailed status of the open petitions.

Attachment 2 provides the status of incoming letters that the staff has been reviewing to determine if they meet the criteria for review under the 2.206 process.

Attachment 3 shows the age statistics for the open 2.206 petitions as of October 31, 2003.

Attachment 4 shows the age trend of closed petitions for the last 3 years.

This report, Director's Decisions, and other 2.206-related documents are placed in the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System. In making these readily accessible to the public, the staff has identified another vehicle to address one of our performance goals, i.e., to enhance public confidence.

Attachments: As stated

CONTACT: Donna Skay, NRR  
415-1322

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

Accession No.: ML033110334

OFFICE	PM:PDI-1	LA:PDI-1	D:PDII	D:DLPM	<del>NMSS</del>	ADPT:NRR
NAME	DSkay	SLittle	HBerkow	TMarsh	<del>PGoldberg</del>	BSheron
DATE	11/10/03	11/10/03	11/12/03	11/14/03		11/18/03

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DISTRIBUTION FOR JULY 2003 REPORT ON THE STATUS OF PUBLIC PETITIONS UNDER  
TITLE 10 OF THE *CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS*, SECTION 2.206

Dated: November 19, 2003

PUBLIC

SCollins, DEDR/OEDO

CPaperillo, DEDMRS/OEDO

PNorry, DEDM/OEDO

WKane, DEDH/OEDO

WDean, AO/OEDO

JShea, ODEO

PAnderson, OEDO (Email after this document has been put into ADAMS)

EJulian

RLauffer

CHolden

JDyer, NRR

RBorchardt, NRR

JCraig, NRR

BSheron, NRR

CMohrwinkel, NRR

KCyr, OGC

LChandler, OGC

JGoldberg, OGC

JCordes, Jr., OCAA

FCongel, OE

PLohaus, STP

MVirgilio, NMSS

PGoldberg, NMSS

CAbrams, NMSS

BBoger, NRR

GCaputo, OI

LMarsh, NRR

HBerkow, NRR

RClark, NRR

DSkay, NRR

OCA

OPA

Regional Administrators

PDI-1 Reading

SLittle

# Attachment 1

## Status of Open Petitions

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Petitioner/EDO No.</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
Indian Point Units 2 and 3	Richard Blumenthal, Attorney General of the State of Connecticut G20030216.....	1
Davis Besse Nuclear Power Station	David Lochbaum, Union of Concerned Scientists G20030298.....	3
Indian Point Units 2 and 3	Riverkeeper G20030545.....	5

# Attachment 1

## Report on Status of Public Petitions Under 10 CFR 2.206

---

Facility: Indian Point Units 2 and 3  
Petitioner: Richard Blumenthal, Attorney General of the State of Connecticut  
Date of Petition: April 23, 2003, as supplemented on June 3, 2003, and October 15, 2003  
Director's Decision to be Issued by: NRR  
EDO Number: G20030216  
Proposed DD Issuance: 01/09/04  
Final DD Issuance: TBD  
Last Contact with Petitioner: 11/05/03  
Petition Manager: Harold Chernoff  
Case Attorney: Jack Goldberg

Issues/Actions requested:

That the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC):

- a. Order the licensee to conduct full review of vulnerabilities, security measures, and evacuation plans and to suspend operations, revoke the operating license, or adopt other measures resulting in temporary shutdown of Indian Point Units 2 and 3.
- b. Require the licensee to provide sufficient information to document the existing security measures which provide protection against terrorist attacks.
- c. Modify the licensee's operating license to mandate specifically a defense and security system sufficient to protect the entire facility, including electric equipment, containment, spent fuel storage, and the control room from a land or water based terrorist attack.
- d. Order the revision of the licensee's Emergency Response Plan and the Radiological Emergency Response Plans of the State of New York and nearby counties to account and prepare for terrorist attacks. These revisions must contemplate not only the full range of realistic effects of a terrorist attack on the Indian Point facility, but also a comprehensive response to multiple attacks on the region's infrastructure that could affect execution of the evacuation plans.
- e. If, after taking the above actions, the NRC cannot adequately ensure the security of the Indian Point facility against terrorist threats, or cannot ensure the safety of New York and Connecticut citizens from terrorist attacks, that it take prompt action to permanently retire the facility.

Background:

A closed PRB meeting was held on May 8, 2003, to discuss whether the petition satisfies the criteria for review under 10 CFR 2.206. During this meeting the PRB decided that no immediate action was necessary.

By letter dated June 3, 2003, the Petitioner filed a Supplement to his original 2.206 Petition. The supplement provided additional information in support of the petition in three major areas: (1) shadow evacuation effects, (2) family separation, and (3) recent design basis threat changes.

On June 19, 2003, the PRB held a conference call with the petitioner's representative (Assistant Attorney General, Robert Snook) to afford the petitioner the opportunity to provide additional information or clarification with regards to the original petition and the recently submitted supplement.

Following the conference call, the PRB determined that the petition satisfied the criteria for review under 10 CFR 2.206. An acknowledgment letter was sent to the petitioner on July 3, 2003, stating that the petition has met the criteria for evaluation under 10 CFR 2.206

Current Status:

The licensee submitted a response to the petitioner's first supplement (dated June 3, 2003) on October 15, 2003.

The petitioner filed a second supplement to his petition on October 16, 2003.

Based on the significant additional amount of information contained in the licensee's response and the supplement to the petition, the staff requested and was granted an extension of time to respond to the petition. The staff now plans to issue the proposed Director's Decision on January 9, 2004. The petition manager contacted the attorney general's staff on November 5, 2003, and offered him an opportunity to discuss the supplement with the PRB. This request was declined.

---

Facility:	<u>Davis Besse</u>
Petitioner:	David Lochbaum, Union of Concerned Scientists James Riccio, Greenpeace Paul Gunter, Nuclear Information & Resource Service
Date of Letter:	August 25, 2003
EDO Number:	G20030508
Proposed DD Issuance:	February 3, 2004
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	October 7, 2003
Petition Manager:	Mel Fields
Case Attorney:	Antonio Fernandez

Issues/Actions requested:

That the NRC:

(1) take enforcement action against FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company for failure to live up to its commitments made in response to the NRC's October 1996 10 CFR 50.54(f) letter. Since the 50.54(f) letter was issued in direct response to the problems at Millstone that netted its owner a record \$2.1 million fine from the NRC, failure to heed the Millstone warning should carry at least an equivalent sanction.

(2) take enforcement action against First Energy for the numerous design basis violations dating back to the date of licensing with penalties for each day that the licensee was out of compliance with NRC regulations.

(3) suspend the license and prohibit restart of the Davis-Besse reactor unless and until FirstEnergy has adequately addressed all 1,000 design basis deficiencies identified in 1997,

(4) suspend the license and prohibit restart of the Davis-Besse reactor unless and until FirstEnergy has updated its Probabilistic Risk Assessment to reflect the flaws in its design and licensing basis, and

(5) suspend the license and prohibit restart of the Davis-Besse reactor with any systems in a "degraded but operable" condition.

Background:

A public meeting was held between the petitioners and the Petition Review Board on September 17, 2003. The transcript from the meeting will also be treated as a supplement to the petition. Following the conference call, the PRB determined that the petition satisfied the criteria for review under 10 CFR 2.206.

Current Status:

The staff issued a letter to the petitioner on October 7, 2003, acknowledging receipt of the petition. The staff will supplement the acknowledgment letter to address the requests for immediate action prior to the NRC granting approval for restart.

By letter dated October 20, 2003, the licensee provided its response to the petition.



Facility: Indian Point Units 2 and 3  
Petitioner: Alex Matthiessen, Riverkeeper  
David Lochbaum, Union of Concerned Scientists  
Date of Petition: September 8, 2003, as supplemented on  
September 22, 2003  
Director's Decision to be Issued by: NRR  
EDO Number: G20030545  
Proposed DD Issuance: February 18, 2004  
Final DD Issuance: TBD  
Last Contact with Petitioner: October 22, 2003  
Petition Manager: Brian Benney  
Case Attorney: Antonio Fernandez  
Issues/Actions requested:

That the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC):

1. Issue an Order requiring Entergy to immediately shut down Indian Point Units 2 and 3 and maintain the reactors shut down until such time that the containment sumps are modified to resolve the Generic Safety Issue 191 problem; or
2. Issue an Order requiring Entergy to prevent restart of Indian Point Units 2 and 3 from their next scheduled refueling outages until such time that the containment sumps are modified to resolve the GSI-191 problem, and

Require Entergy to (a) maintain all equipment needed for monitoring leak-before-break of reactor coolant pressure boundary components within containment fully functional and immediately shutdown the affected reactor upon any functional impairment to monitoring equipment, and (b) refrain from any activity under 10 cFR 50.59, 10 CFR 50.90, Section VII.C, or GL 91-18 Revision 1 that increases or could increase the probability that a loss of coolant accident occurs.

Background:

A public PRB meeting was held with the petitioners on September 24, 2003. The petitioners presented the staff with a supplement to their petition dated September 22, 2003. The transcript from the meeting will also be treated as a supplement to the petition. The licensee stated that it would be submitting a response to the petition. Following the conference call, the PRB determined that the petition satisfied the criteria for review under 10 CFR 2.206.

Several letters have been received by the NRC separately in support of the Riverkeeper petition. The NRC staff will inform the authors of those letters of the status of its review of the Riverkeeper petition but will not open separate 2.206 reviews for the additional letters.

Current Status:

The staff issued a letter to the petitioner on October 22, 2003, acknowledging receipt of the petition and addressing the need for immediate action. The staff concluded that there is no need to take immediate action. By letter dated October 29, 2003, the petitioner responded to the acknowledgment letter. The October 29, 2003, letter included an additional assertion that the licensee is not complying with 10 CFR 50.46 regarding analysis and reporting of emergency core cooling system performance. The staff is reviewing this response.

## Attachment 2

### Status of Potential Petitions Under Consideration

---

Facility: Seabrook  
Petitioner: Debbie Grinnell, C-10 Research and Education Foundation  
Date of Letter: October 7, 2003  
Responsible Office: NRR  
PRB meeting: October 15, 2003

Issues/Actions requested:

That the NRC modify the license to include a thorough inspection of Seabrook's S/Gs during the plant's 2003 refueling outage and that restart only be permitted on the basis of a new license condition calling for quarterly inspections.

Resolution:

The petitioner declined an opportunity to address the PRB. The PRB evaluated the incoming request and determined that it does not meet the criteria for review under 2.206 because the facts that constitute the basis for taking the requested actions are not specified or are insufficient. In addition, the petition raises issues that have already been the subject of NRC staff review and the staff resolutions are documented. The petitioner's concerns will be addressed as controlled correspondence.

---

Facility: Maine Yankee  
Petitioner: Randall Speck, Special Counsel for the State of Maine  
Date of Letter: November 15, 2002  
Responsible Office: NMSS  
PRB meeting: To be scheduled

Issues/Actions requested:

That the NRC conduct a hearing on the efficacy of indefinite, long-term spent fuel storage at Maine Yankee.

Resolution:

The petitioner has also requested a hearing, pursuant to 10 CFR 2.202, regarding the October 16, 2002, safeguards order and interim compensatory measures. On December 10, 2002, the staff sent a letter to the petitioner stating that a decision on the acceptability of the 2.206 petition will be held in abeyance until the staff makes a determination on the hearing request. This letter remains as a potential 2.206 petition but the staff cannot consider whether it will be treated as a 2.206 petition until the Licensing Board settles the issues before it.

**Attachment 3**

**AGE STATISTICS FOR AGENCY 2.206 PETITIONS**

ASSIGNED ACTION OFFICE	FACILITY	Incoming petition	PRB meeting <sup>1</sup>	Acknowledgment letter / days from incoming <sup>2</sup>	Proposed DD issuance Date/ age <sup>3</sup>	Scheduled date for final DD/ age <sup>4</sup>	Comments if not meeting the Agency's Completion Goals
NRR	Indian Point	04/23/03	05/08/03	07/03/03 70	01/09/04	TBD	<sup>2</sup> Staff delayed issuing acknowledgment letter pending submittal of a supplement by the petitioner (received on June 3). Due to scheduling conflicts a teleconference with the petitioner was not completed until June 19. <sup>3</sup> Proposed DD issuance date was extended due to a supplement to the petition, and a response from the licensee that were received within 2 weeks of the original due date.
NRR	Davis Besse	08/25/03	9/17/03	10/07/03 43	2/03/04	TBD	
NRR	Indian Point	09/08/03	9/24/03	10/22/03 37	2/18/04	TBD	

- 1) Goal is to hold a PRB meeting, which the petitioner is invited to participate in, within 2 weeks of receipt of petition (there is often a delay of up two weeks from the date that the letter is issued until it is received by the reviewing organization).
- 2) Goal is to issue acknowledgment letter within 5 weeks of the date of incoming petition.
- 3) Goal is to issue proposed DD within 120 days of the acknowledgment letter.
- 4) Goal is to issue final DD within 45 days of the end of the comment period.

Attachment 4

Average Days to Issuance of Proposed Directors Decisions

