

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

Title: Petition Review Board Meeting

Docket Number: (not applicable)

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: Wednesday, September 24, 2003

Work Order No.: NRC-1092

Pages 1-25

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

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

3 + + + + +

4 PETITION REVIEW BOARD (PRB)

5 MEETING

6 + + + + +

7 WEDNESDAY,

8 SEPTEMBER 24, 2003

9 + + + + +

10 ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

11 + + + + +

12 The Petition Review Board met at 3:00 p.m. at  
13 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, One White Flint  
14 North, Room 09B4, 11555 Rockville Pike, Eric Leeds,  
15 Chairman, presiding.

16  
17 PETITION REVIEW BOARD:

18 ERIC LEEDS, Chairman

19 BRIAN BENNEY, Petition Manager

20 HERB BERKOW

21 JACK GOLDBERG

22  
23  
24  
25  
**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

## 1 NRC STAFF PRESENT:

2 RALPH ARCHITZEL

3 SUZANNE BLACK

4 MOLLY BUPP

5 T.Y. CHANG

6 ROB ELLIOTT

7 ANTONIO FERNANDEZ

8 SUE GAGNOR

9 MICHAEL JOHNSON

10 DONNIE HARRISON

11 JOHN LAMB

12 DAVID LEW, via teleconference

13 MICHAEL MARSHALL

14 DONNA SKAY

15 SUNIL WEERAKKODY

## 16 LICENSEE:

17 ALAIN GROSJEAN, Entergy

18 JOHN McCANN, Entergy, via teleconference

19 JAY SILBERG, Shaw Pittman, on behalf of Entergy

## 20 PETITIONERS:

21 DAVID LOCHBAUM, Union of Concerned Scientists

22 KYLE RABIN, Riverkeeper, Inc.

## 23 ALSO PRESENT:

24 JENNY WEIL, McGraw Hill

25

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(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

I-N-D-E-X

3

Page

<u>Opening Remarks</u>	3
Mr. Benney	
Chairman Leeds	5
<u>Presentation by Petitioners</u>	
Mr. Lochbaum, Union of Concerned Scientists	6
Mr. Rabin, Riverkeeper, Inc.	15
<u>Questions and Remarks</u>	19

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

3:08 p.m.

MR. BENNEY: On the record. I want to welcome everybody to today's meeting. My name is Brian Benney. I've been assigned as the Petition Manager. The Petition Review Board Chairman is Eric Leeds. He's seated to my right.

This meeting is being transcribed. The transcription will be a supplement to the Petition and will be made publicly available. Representatives from the NRC's Region I Office and the Licensee, Entergy Nuclear Northeast (also known as "Entergy") are participating via a recorded phone line. If we could go around the room and present ourselves. My name is Brian Benney.

CHAIRMAN LEEDS: My name is Eric Leeds.

MR. JOHNSON: Mike Johnson.

MR. WEERAKKODY: Sunil Weerakkody.

MR. FERNANDEZ: Antonio Fernandez.

MR. BERKOW: Herb Berkow.

MS. BLACK: Suzie Black.

MR. LOCHBAUM: Dave Lochbaum with the Union of Concerned Scientists ("UCS").

MS. GAGNOR: Sue Gagnor, NRC Public Affairs.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MS. BUPP: Molly Bupp, NRC OGC.

2 MR. GROSJEAN: Alain Grosjean, Entergy  
3 Nuclear Northeast.

4 MR. SILBERG: Jay Silber, Shaw Pittman  
5 representing Entergy.

6 MR. ARCHITZEL: Ralph Architzel, NRC.

7 MR. ELLIOTT: Rob Elliott, NRC.

8 MR. HARRISON: Donnie Harrison, NRC.

9 MR. LAMB: John Lamb, NRC.

10 MR. CHANG: T.Y. Chang, NRC.

11 MR. MARSHALL: Michael Marshall, NRC.

12 MS. SKAY: Donna Skay, NRC.

13 MR. GOLDBERG: Jack Goldberg, NRC OGC.

14 MR. BENNEY: Again, this is Brian Benney.

15 If everyone on the phone can introduce themselves  
16 please.

17 MR. RABIN: Kyle Rabin, Environmental  
18 Group, Riverkeeper.

19 MR. McCANN: John McCann, Entergy.

20 MS. WEIL: Jenny Weil, McGraw Hill.

21 MR. LEW: David Lew, Region I.

22 MR. BENNEY: Thank you. I just ask that  
23 anyone making a statement please state their name  
24 first so that the court reporter can put your name  
25 attached with your statement correctly. I'll pass it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 on now to Eric Leeds, the Petition Review Board  
2 Chairman.

3 CHAIRMAN LEEDS: Thank you. Again my name  
4 is Eric Leeds. I'm the NRC Petition Review Board  
5 Chairman. Some opening comments before we get  
6 started. The subject of this meeting is the 2.206  
7 petition ("Petition") submitted by Riverkeeper and the  
8 Union of Concerned Scientists (to be referred to  
9 collectively as the "Petitioners") on September 8,  
10 2003.

11 The purpose of today's meeting is to allow  
12 the Petitioners to address the Petition Review Board.  
13 This is an opportunity for the Petitioners to provide  
14 additional explanations or support for the Petition.  
15 This is also an opportunity for the Staff and Licensee  
16 to ask any clarifying questions. The purpose of this  
17 meeting is not to debate the merits of the Petition  
18 nor whether the NRC agrees or disagrees with the  
19 contents of the Petition.

20 The Petitioners requested that the NRC  
21 take enforcement actions against Entergy Nuclear  
22 Northeast, the Licensee for Indian Point Units 2 and  
23 3 in Buchanan, New York to immediately shut down  
24 Indian Point Units 2 and 3 and to maintain the  
25 reactors shutdown until such time that the containment

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 sumps are modified to resolve Generic Safety Issue  
2 191. The Petitioners requested as an alternative  
3 enforcement action that the NRC prevent plant restart  
4 until certain conditions have been met with additional  
5 restrictions in the interim.

6 Following this meeting, the PRB will meet  
7 to determine whether the NRC accepts the Petition  
8 under the 2.206 process or whether it will be dealt  
9 with under another mechanism. The PRB's meeting will  
10 not determine whether we agree or disagree with the  
11 contents of the Petition, merely the process the NRC  
12 will use to evaluate the Petition.

13 I also want to make the public aware  
14 before we get into the meeting that there is  
15 additional information on the sump issue on the NRC's  
16 website. We'll continue to update that as current  
17 information becomes available. So without any further  
18 adieu, let me turn it back over to David Lochbaum and  
19 UCS.

20 MR. LOCHBAUM: David Lochbaum with Union  
21 of Concerned Scientists. I appreciate that. I also  
22 want to start to express our appreciation to Brian  
23 Benney and the NRC staff for rescheduling this  
24 meeting. Originally it was scheduled for Monday. It  
25 was hard for us to get the Supplement done by then so

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433



1 I appreciate it. I know it took some work to make  
2 that happen and we appreciate that.

3 Also we would like to acknowledge our co-  
4 Petitioner, Riverkeeper. Riverkeeper in general and  
5 Kyle Rabin in particular has been subjected to  
6 unwarranted and unjustified attacks in recent letters  
7 to "The Editor." While UCS cherishes a open and  
8 unfettered press and believes that everybody is  
9 entitled to their opinion, our opinion is that  
10 Riverkeeper is an organization providing an invaluable  
11 public service to the people living in New York and  
12 that Kyle Rabin is a competent, capable and dedicated  
13 individual with unimpeachable integrity. We are  
14 honored and pleased to partner with Riverkeeper on  
15 this Petition.

16 Also I must apologize to Entergy for  
17 having to use Indian Point to force the NRC to take  
18 this safety issue seriously. If the NRC even remotely  
19 resembled an effective regulator, a safety issue  
20 identified affecting 69 power reactors deemed to high  
21 priority in September of 1996 would still not be  
22 opened seven years later. It may be unfair or seem  
23 unfair for us to single out Indian Point in trying to  
24 get the NRC to take this issue seriously. We fully  
25 agree. We have plans for the other plants that we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 will set in motion very soon so Indian Point will be  
2 alone for only a few more days.

3 With that, I would like to just point out  
4 a few things in the Petition and the Supplement. I  
5 think it was fairly clear. We will glad to entertain  
6 any questions about it in case it's not. On page  
7 eight of our September 8<sup>th</sup> Petition, we provided what  
8 we thought was a relevant precedent for our requested  
9 actions and that was the dual unit shutdown at the  
10 D.C. Cook plant in September of 1997.

11 Although the exact nature of the reasons  
12 for the shutdown were a little bit different, the  
13 basic fundamental causes were the same. That was  
14 uncertainty about whether that plant could  
15 successfully enter the long-term recirculation phase  
16 or the low pressure recirculation phase of ECCS  
17 operation. There was an absolute proof of that. In  
18 fact, there was less proof of that then than there is  
19 today of the sump issue, but it was uncertainty  
20 nonetheless that led the plant owner to voluntarily  
21 shut down both units until that issue could be  
22 determined one way or the other.

23 On page 11 of our September 8<sup>th</sup> Petition,  
24 we cite the limiting condition for operation for the  
25 Indian Point reactors that says if the LCO can't be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 met, the required action is to place the reactor in at  
2 least hot shutdown within seven hours. The  
3 containment sump issue was identified seven years ago  
4 and clearly seven hours is within that timeframe.

5 Page 14 of our September 8<sup>th</sup> Petition, we  
6 note that the NRC's bulletin that was issued in June  
7 2003 licensees such as Entergy would consider taking  
8 various steps to lessen the likelihood of containment  
9 sump clogging or subsequent loss of ECCS function. We  
10 noted that the bulletin did not request Entergy or any  
11 other plant on earth to consider taking any steps to  
12 maintain the leak-before-break monitoring equipment or  
13 to minimize the likelihood of a loss-of-coolant  
14 accident that would potentially challenge the  
15 containment sumps. We felt that it was a necessary  
16 compliment to the steps that the NRC took in that  
17 bulletin. That in fact is why we cited that as basis  
18 and included that in the alternative enforcement  
19 actions we are seeking.

20 On page 15 of the September 8<sup>th</sup> Petition,  
21 one of the things we were a little confused about is  
22 we've seen some of the press accounts since the  
23 Petition about the low likelihood that an event could  
24 occur that would the containment sumps. There were  
25 words to the effect from the NRC spokespersons saying

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 the containment sump has never been challenged in the  
2 past. That's a basis for not having to worry about  
3 this in the immediate timeframe today.

4 Whether there was any analysis that  
5 supported the bulletin going out in June this year  
6 looks like it would be equally valid for this Petition  
7 now. That does not seem like it's a fine enough line  
8 to allow the bulletin to go out and keep the Petitions  
9 actions for going through. We can't understand how  
10 that could possibly happen.

11 Turning to the Supplement to the Petition  
12 that we sent in on September 22<sup>nd</sup>, basically it should  
13 have been in the Petition, but the question we ask  
14 ourselves that led to the Petition was everything  
15 we've heard is that at the end of the day or decade or  
16 whenever there will be physical modifications made at  
17 Indian Point to resolve GSI-191. If that's the case,  
18 how was the safety justification for continuing to  
19 operate until then?

20 So we went through those three possible  
21 outcomes. One is the GSI-191 resolution for Indian  
22 Point will require physical modifications. If that's  
23 the case, what's the justification for operating  
24 between now and then with that impairment? We haven't  
25 seen anything in NOED ("Notice of Enforcement

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Discretion"), a Generic Letter 91-18 analysis or  
2 anything that would support continued operation of the  
3 plant if that's the expected outcome.

4 On page 2 of our Supplement, we looked at  
5 the next outcome which was the resolution of GSI-191  
6 for Indian Point could be made with no physical  
7 modifications. Basically the existing configuration  
8 is okay or will be okay as is based on further  
9 walkdowns and analysis. If that's the expected  
10 outcome, then we don't see any preliminary assessment  
11 or engineering judgment again per 91-18, Supplement 1,  
12 that would support such a notion.

13 The third outcome we've also heard some  
14 media speculation about is that the outcome of GSI-191  
15 can't be determined at the moment because there's not  
16 enough plant-specific information available to know  
17 whether physical modifications are required or not.  
18 For that outcome, we haven't seen anything that would  
19 override or negate the Los Alamos work that suggests  
20 that there's a high likelihood of problems with high  
21 consequence. It looks as a minimum that Los Alamos  
22 yelled "Fire" in a crowded theater and nothing's been  
23 done to look at the people in the audience.

24 On page 4 of the Supplement to our  
25 Petition, we did cite some previous precedence that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 the NRC has done. The NRC has not issued a lot of  
2 shutdown orders. This may not be a comprehensive  
3 list. These are the ones that we could find in our  
4 files and in the NRC's files.

5 Pilgrim in December of 1973 did a fuel  
6 channel boxware. It was the result of UCS-New England  
7 Coalition Against Nuclear Pollution petition. Cook  
8 Unit 1 in spring of 1978 due to electrical connector  
9 concerns. Beaver Valley, Surrey Units 1 and 2,  
10 FitzPatrick and Maine Yankee in March of 1979 due to  
11 seismic concerns or computer code used to do seismic  
12 analysis. Peach Bottom Units 2 and 3 in March of 1987  
13 due to operator attentiveness associated issues.

14 Again in all of those the case doesn't  
15 seem as strong as the containment sump issue today and  
16 yet they all led to NRC issuing shutdown orders and  
17 immediate repairs. So I think that's precedence that  
18 should be followed in this case.

19 One counterpoint combo that we left out of  
20 this of this list we heard of the NRC telling a  
21 reporter just yesterday was that we based a lot of our  
22 petition on Los Alamos' August 2002 report. The NRC  
23 issued Los Alamos' more recent study in February 2003  
24 that outlined a number of measurements that could be  
25 taken to reduce the risk values that were reported in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 the August 2002 report.

2 We recognize that to be true and in fact  
3 that February 2003 report was a significant input to  
4 the NRC's Bulletin 2003-01 that was issued in June  
5 2003. But in looking at Entergy's response to the  
6 Bulletin, Entergy politely declined to implement  
7 virtually any of the Los Alamos risk reduction  
8 measures. We don't think any credit should be given  
9 to the steps not taken.

10 Page 5 of our Supplement to the Petition.  
11 We look at the case of what happens if the NRC denies  
12 this petition in its entirety today and Entergy  
13 enlarges the containment sump screens and/or replaces  
14 installation and coding inside containment at any  
15 point somewhere down the road. We would look at those  
16 modifications as prima facie evidence, of regulatory  
17 malpractice because enough information is know today  
18 to suspect that's going to be the outcome. We would  
19 say that it's a proof positive that the public health  
20 hazard was both real and ignored by the NRC in the  
21 interim.

22 We do have some new information that's  
23 related to the Petition. That's the Westinghouse  
24 Owners Group Standard Technical Specifications Section  
25 3.5.2 specifically. It's available on the NRC's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 website and on ADAMS. Citing data from the Revision  
2 2 dated April 30, 2001, it talks about three phases of  
3 ECCS operation. This is the bases section, not the  
4 tech spec section.

5 The three phases of ECCS operation are  
6 injection, cold leg recirculation and hot leg  
7 recirculation. It says that in the injection phase  
8 water is taken from the refilling water storage tank  
9 and injected into the reactor coolant system through  
10 the cold legs. When sufficient water is removed to  
11 the refilling water storage tank to ensure that enough  
12 boron has been added to maintain the reactor sump is  
13 critical and the containment sumps have enough water  
14 to supply the required net-positive suction head to  
15 the ECCS pumps, the section is switched over to the  
16 containment sump for cold leg recirculation.

17 It says that during the recirculation  
18 phase of LOCA recovery, RHR pump suction is  
19 transferred into the containment sump. The RHR pumps  
20 then supply the other ECCS pumps. Initially  
21 recirculation is through the same paths as the  
22 injection phase. Subsequently recirculation  
23 alternates injection between the hot and cold legs.

24 The reason for that in the applicable  
25 safety analysis section of the bases says that this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 LCO helps to ensure that the following acceptance  
2 criteria for the ECCS established by 10 CFR 50.46 will  
3 be met following a LOCA. Maximum fuel element  
4 cladding temperature remains below or equal to 2,200  
5 degrees Fahrenheit. Maximum cladding oxidation is  
6 less than 17 times the total cladding thickness before  
7 oxidation and three other related issues.

8 Again as the LCO specific for Indian Point  
9 says if you don't with one or more trains inoperable,  
10 at least 100 percent of the ECCS flow equivalent to a  
11 single operable ECCS train available the inoperable  
12 components must be returned operable within 72 hours  
13 or you shut down. As we see it right now, that  
14 question of whether the plants are operable or not  
15 hasn't been asked or answered.

16 We understand that President Clinton  
17 instituted the "Don't ask, don't tell" policy for gays  
18 in the military, but we don't think it should be  
19 applied to nuclear safety and the containment sump  
20 issue. The NRC must ask if Indian Point's ECCS are  
21 operable today and Entergy must tell you. That's all  
22 we have. I believe Riverkeeper has some input also,  
23 Kyle.

24 MR. RABIN: Yes, thank you. This is Kyle  
25 Rabin, Policy and the Environmental Group from

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Riverkeeper. I want to thank you for the opportunity  
2 to join this via telephone. I'll start out by giving  
3 a little bit of background on our organization,  
4 Riverkeeper.

5 CHAIRMAN LEEDS: Kyle, could you speak up?  
6 We're having a little trouble hearing you.

7 MR. RABIN: Yes. I'll do my best.

8 CHAIRMAN LEEDS: Thank you.

9 MR. RABIN: Sorry about that. I'm going  
10 to start out by providing you just a little bit of  
11 background on Riverkeeper. Riverkeeper is an  
12 independent member-supported not-for-profit  
13 organization whose mission is to protect the Hudson  
14 River, safeguard the New York City water supply that  
15 serves over nine million New Yorkers.

16 Since its founding in 1966, Riverkeeper  
17 has led the battle to restore the Hudson River and has  
18 successfully prosecuted hundreds of environmental law  
19 breakers. Riverkeeper uses law, science and education  
20 to extend every citizen's right for clean water and  
21 healthy children.

22 I think I want to first start out by  
23 reiterating a point that Dave had mentioned earlier on  
24 which Entergy's response to the Petition which as you  
25 can see has been very initiated. That's been simply

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 to dismiss it and attack Riverkeeper's credibility and  
2 in some cases attack UCS's credibility. It's worth  
3 noting this because the concern here is that this is  
4 the operator of these reactors. Their initial  
5 response is this Petition, highly unprofessional even  
6 with the fact that they dismissed it readily without  
7 delving into the issues in a more professional  
8 fashion. It's a concern for us that this is the owner  
9 and operator of a plant that's situated just 35 miles  
10 north of New York City. This is the response. It  
11 calls in question their ability to safely run the  
12 plant.

13 I want to go into real quickly some of the  
14 support that we have received from elected officials  
15 in the region. On September 9<sup>th</sup>, Senator Clinton  
16 submitted a letter to the NRC and in the letter she  
17 called on the Agency urgently to review the Petition.  
18 She noted that the plant which is situated in such a  
19 densely populated area should be required to meet the  
20 highest standards for safety and security in order to  
21 protect the people of the region.

22 On September 12<sup>th</sup>, Congresswoman Lowey  
23 sent a letter to the NRC and she gave her support for  
24 the immediate repair of the containment sump of the  
25 reactors at Indian Point.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 CHAIRMAN LEEDS: We can't hear. Kyle, you  
2 are dropping out.

3 MR. RABIN: Sorry. Do I need to repeat  
4 myself?

5 CHAIRMAN LEEDS: Please.

6 MR. RABIN: My last point was that on  
7 September 12<sup>th</sup> Congresswoman Nita Lowey sent a letter  
8 to the NRC expressing her support for the immediate  
9 repair of the containment sump at the two reactors at  
10 Indian Point. She noted immediate upgraded safety  
11 systems at the plant is required to protect that  
12 nearly 20 million people that live within a 50 mile  
13 radius of Indian Point.

14 On September 24<sup>th</sup> in a letter to the NRC,  
15 Congressman Maurice Hinchey urges the NRC to  
16 immediately shut down a plant in order to deal with  
17 the concerns in the Indian River petition. On  
18 September 11<sup>th</sup>, Rockland County Legislator Harriet  
19 Cornell submitted a letter to the NRC again urging the  
20 Agency to order the immediate shutdown of the plant  
21 and instruct Entergy to fix the problem which poses a  
22 direct threat to public health and the environment.

23 On September 17<sup>th</sup>, sixteen of the  
24 seventeen Rockland County legislators sent a letter to  
25 Chairman Diaz again urging the NRC to order the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 immediate shutdown of Indian Point to address these  
2 concerns. Lastly again today Westchester County  
3 Legislator Michael Kaplowitz submitted a letter to the  
4 NRC again purporting the immediate shutdown of the  
5 plant to fix the problem that was addressed in the  
6 Riverkeeper-UCS Petition.

7 I want to convey that the initial response  
8 of the officials who are working on this issue --

9 CHAIRMAN LEEDS: I'm losing him again. Mr  
10 Rabin, if you could speak up again. I'm sorry.

11 MR. RABIN: I'm sorry. I am yelling.

12 CHAIRMAN LEEDS: Yes, I apologize.

13 MR. RABIN: I thought I was coming through  
14 okay.

15 CHAIRMAN LEEDS: We have a bad phone  
16 connection or something.

17 MR. RABIN: I just wanted to convey to the  
18 NRC the concern that some of the elected officials  
19 have raised in support of the UCS-Riverkeeper  
20 position. I will end there unless there's any  
21 questions I can address.

22 CHAIRMAN LEEDS: Does the staff have any  
23 questions for Mr. Rabin about the Petition or Mr.  
24 Rochbaum?

25 MR. ROCHBAUM: I do have more.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 CHAIRMAN LEEDS: You have more?

2 MR. ROCHBAUM: Kyle Rabin went through a  
3 list of letters of support. I have most of those  
4 except for one that I can provide as an attachment.

5 CHAIRMAN LEEDS: Thank you. We'll take  
6 them and we'll docket them.

7 MR. ROCHBAUM: Sure.

8 CHAIRMAN LEEDS: I think we have received  
9 some. We'll make sure they get docketed on the  
10 record. Thank you. Let me go back. Does the staff  
11 have any questions for Mr. Lochbaum or Mr. Rabin?

12 MR. ARCHITZEL: I just have one question  
13 on the supplement on page two. The number on the  
14 bottom, was that out of the same table as the -- to  
15 that paragraph --

16 MR. LOCHBAUM: This is Dave Lochbaum, UCS.  
17 You're talking about the 99.9 percent number.

18 MR. ARCHITZEL: No, the 4 times 10 to the  
19 minus 3 to .3, those numbers.

20 MR. LOCHBAUM: That's correct. They also  
21 came from Table F-10 in Appendix F. They came from  
22 the same place. Sorry about that. Lack of cite  
23 there.

24 CHAIRMAN LEEDS: Any other questions? Any  
25 questions from Entergy.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. SILBERG: We have none here.

2 MR. McCANN: It's not a question but I  
3 would like to make one brief statement for the record  
4 if that's okay, Brian.

5 MR. BENNEY: Is that John McCann?

6 MR. McCANN: Yes, this is John McCann,  
7 Entergy. I take it you will docketing a response to  
8 the petition in the near future that will describe  
9 some of our basis for the conclusion that the sump  
10 systems are capable of performing their intended  
11 safety function and some of the unique design features  
12 at the plant.

13 While waiting for that though I would say  
14 that from our perspective it doesn't appear to be  
15 anything new or unique in the petition that has been  
16 presented. NRC is already well aware of this issue  
17 and has been taking action on it. Entergy is fully  
18 and responsibly cooperating with NRC's action on the  
19 issue. I guess from our perspective the total NRC  
20 process seems to be in place and working for this  
21 issue.

22 CHAIRMAN LEEDS: Thank you for your  
23 statement.

24 MS. BLACK: May I say something too?

25 CHAIRMAN LEEDS: Please.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MS. BLACK: Suzanne Black. I'm the  
2 Director of DSSA, the division responsible for  
3 resolving this generic issue. We put a website out  
4 for the public to get information on this and we have  
5 been struggling with the resource issues trying to  
6 deal with the problem and have a good communication  
7 plan on this. We realize at this point that our  
8 website is not the most helpful. We plan in the very  
9 near future to add additional information which will  
10 explain to the public the basis for our schedule and  
11 our actions.

12 Also I would like to state that in  
13 addition to that just this week I've asked a separate  
14 group of independent people who work for me and for  
15 Eric Leeds to take a look at the schedule and the plan  
16 to advise me whether they think anything else is  
17 needed. I appreciate, David, your bringing this issue  
18 to us for consideration. We'll keep you informed as  
19 well as the rest of the public hopefully of our  
20 actions.

21 CHAIRMAN LEEDS: All right. Thank you,  
22 Suzanne. I think you can tell from the lack of  
23 questions from the staff that the petition pretty much  
24 stands on its own merits. It's well explained. I  
25 know when I went through it I didn't have specific

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 questions. I had questions at the beginning. You  
2 answered them later on in the petition so I have no  
3 further questions for you either. Unless you have  
4 other clarifying remarks you'd like to make or  
5 statements you'd like to make.

6 MR. LOCHBAUM: The only additional thing  
7 I will add is we were monitoring the GSI-191 with  
8 attending some of the meetings and so on. We're a  
9 little concerned that absent a petition or something  
10 that could go on forever.

11 There's no commitment to meet 2007. It  
12 could be anything. There's no chance at all for the  
13 public to formally have any participation in that  
14 process to either speed it, slow it down or agree or  
15 disagree. It's basically a process between the agency  
16 and the industry.

17 The 2.206 process is one of the few  
18 mechanism the public has if they disagree with  
19 schedules or scope or anything like that. That was a  
20 way we used the only tool we have to look out for the  
21 public outcry which will continuing.

22 CHAIRMAN LEEDS: I understand you  
23 mentioned that in the petition specifically that there  
24 is no public input to the GSI process.

25 MR. LOCHBAUM: Exactly.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 CHAIRMAN LEEDS: Point taken.

2 MR. LOCHBAUM: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN LEEDS: Thank you. If there are  
4 no other questions from Entergy or the staff, I'll  
5 conclude this meeting and then if there are any  
6 questions from the public or the press, the NRC staff  
7 would be willing to stay afterwards and respond to  
8 your questions. Any other questions before we end the  
9 meeting? We'll conclude the meeting then and take  
10 questions from the public or the press. Off the  
11 record.

12 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter was  
13 concluded at 3:37 p.m.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25