

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: 10 CFR 2.206 Petition
RE St. Lucie Units 1 and 2

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: (telephone conference)

Date: Tuesday, August 16, 2011

Work Order No.: NRC-1082

Pages 1-27

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)

CONFERENCE CALL

RE

ST. LUCIE UNITS 1 & 2

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

AUGUST 16, 2011

+ + + + +

The conference call was held at 1:00 p.m.,
Samson Lee, Chairperson of the Petition Review Board,
presiding.

PETITIONER: THOMAS SAPORITO

PETITION REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS

SAMSON LEE, Chairperson, NRR

MERRILEE BANIC, Petition Coordinator, NRR

TRACY ORF, Petition Manager for 2.206

Petition, NRR

GERARD PURCIARELLO, NRR

MARCIA SIMON, OGC

NRC REGION STAFF

STEPHEN ROSE, Region II

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

P R O C E E D I N G S

1:06 p.m.

MR. ORF: Good afternoon. This is Tracy Orf. It sounds like we've got everybody on the line now. So, we'll go ahead and get started. Okay.

I would like to thank everybody for attending this meeting and again, my name is Tracy Orf and I am the St. Lucie Project Manager.

We are here today to allow the Petitioner Thomas Saporito to address the Petition Review Board regarding the 10 CFR 2.206 petition dated May 12th, 2011.

I am the Petition Manager for this petition and the Petition Review Board Chairman is Sam Lee.

As part of the Review Board or PRB's review of this petition, Thomas Saporito has requested this opportunity to address the PRB.

This meeting is scheduled from 1:00 to 2:00 p.m. Eastern Time and the meeting is being recorded by the NRC Operations Center and will be transcribed by a court reporter. The transcript will become a supplement to the petition and a transcript will also be made publicly available.

I'd like to open this meeting with

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 introductions and as we go around the room, please be
2 sure to clearly state your name, your position and the
3 office that you work for with the NRC for the record.

4 I'll start it off. My name is Tracy Orf
5 and I work in NRR.

6 MS. SIMON: Marcia Simon, Office of the
7 General Counsel.

8 MS. BANIC: Lee Banic, NRR, Petition
9 Coordinator.

10 MR. PURCIARELLO: Gerry Purciarello,
11 Balance of Plant in NRR.

12 CHAIRMAN LEE: Samson Lee, Deputy
13 Director, Division of Risk Assessment, NRR.

14 MR. ORF: Okay. At this time, are there
15 any NRC participants from headquarters on the phone?
16 Are there any NRC participants from the regional
17 offices on the phone?

18 MR. ROSE: This is Steven Rose. I was the
19 Component Design Basis Inspection Team Lead for the
20 St. Lucie Inspection, Region II.

21 MR. ORF: Are there any representatives
22 from the Licensee on the phone?

23 And, Mr. Saporito, would you please
24 introduce yourself for the record?

25 MR. SAPORITO: Yes, my name is Thomas

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 Saporito. I'm a Senior Consultant with Saproani
2 Associates in Jupiter, Florida and I'm the Petitioner
3 in these proceedings.

4 MR. ORF: It is not required for members
5 of the public to introduce themselves for this call.
6 However, if there are any members of the public on the
7 phone who wish to do so at this time, please state
8 your name for the record.

9 I'd like to emphasize that we each need to
10 speak clearly and loudly to insure that the court
11 reporter can accurately transcribe this meeting.

12 If you do have something that you would
13 like to say, please state your name for the record.

14 For those dialing into the meeting, please
15 remember to mute your phones to minimize any
16 background noise or distraction. If you do not have a
17 mute button, this can be done by pressing the keys *6.
18 To un-mute, press the *6 keys again. Thank you.

19 At this time, I'll turn it over to the PRB
20 Chairman Sam Lee.

21 CHAIRMAN LEE: Good afternoon. Welcome to
22 this teleconference regarding the 2.206 petition
23 submitted by Mr. Saporito.

24 I would like to first share some
25 background on our process. Section 2.206 of Title 10

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 of the Code of Federal Regulations describes the
2 petition process, a primary mechanism for the public
3 to request enforcement action by the NRC in a public
4 process. This process permits anyone to petition NRC
5 to take enforcement-type action related to NRC
6 licensees or licensed activities.

7 Depending on the result of this
8 evaluation, NRC could modify such plant or revoke an
9 NRC issued license or take any other appropriate
10 enforcement action to resolve the problem.

11 The NRC staff guidance for the disposition
12 of 2.206 petition request is the Management Directive
13 8.11 which is publicly available.

14 The purpose of today's meeting to give the
15 Petitioner an opportunity to provide any additional
16 explanation or support for the petition following the
17 Petition Review Board's initial recommendation.

18 This meeting is not a hearing nor is it an
19 opportunity for the Petitioner to request or examine
20 the PRB on the merits or the issues presented in the
21 petition request.

22 No decisions regarding the merits of this
23 petition will be made at this teleconference.
24 Following this teleconference, the Petition Review
25 Board will conduct internal deliberations. 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 outcome of this initial teleconference will be
2 discussed with the Petitioner.

3 The Petition Review Board typically
4 consists of the Chairman, usually a member at the
5 Senior Executive Service level at NRC. It has a
6 Petition Manager and a PRB Coordinator.

7 Other members of the Board are determined
8 by the NRC staff based on the content of the
9 information in the petition request.

10 At this time, I would like to introduce
11 the Board. I'm Samson Lee, the Petition Review Board
12 Chairman. Tracy Orf is the Petition Manager for the
13 petition under discussion today. Lee Banic is filling
14 in as the Office PRB Coordinator. Our technical staff
15 includes Gerry Purciarello from the Office of Nuclear
16 Reactor Regulations, Balance Plant Branch. Steven
17 Rose from the NRC Region II's Division of Reactor
18 Projects.

19 As described in our process, the NRC staff
20 may ask clarifying questions in order to better
21 understand the Petitioner's presentation and to reach
22 a reasoned decision whether to accept or reject the
23 Petitioner's request for review under the 2.206
24 process.

25 I would like to summarize the scope of 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 petition under consideration and the NRC activities to
2 date.

3 On May 12, 2011, Mr. Saporito submitted to
4 the NRC a petition under 2.206 regarding the St. Lucie
5 Plant. In this petition request, Mr. Saporito's area
6 of concern was with the design of the component
7 cooling water system at St. Lucie Plant Units I and
8 II.

9 Mr. Saporito requests that the NRC suspend
10 or revoke the NRC licenses granted to the Licensee for
11 operation of the St. Lucie Plant Units I and II, issue
12 a notice of violation with the proposed civil penalty
13 against the Licensee and order the immediate shutdown
14 of St. Lucie Plant Units I and II.

15 Please allow me to discuss the NRC
16 activities to date. On May 25th, the Petition Manager
17 contacted you to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and
18 to offer you an opportunity to address the PRB by
19 phone or in person. Because you requested the
20 immediate shutdown of the St. Lucie Plant, the PRB met
21 on June 2nd to discuss those actions to determine if
22 immediate actions were required. The PRB denied the
23 request for immediate action because there was no
24 immediate safety concern to the plant or to the health
25 and safety of the public. The Petition Manager

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 informed you of this decision on June 8th.

2 On July 7th, you addressed the PRB to
3 present additional information regarding your
4 petition. On August 2nd, the PRB met and determined
5 that in accordance with Management Directive 8.11,
6 your petition meets the criteria for rejection because
7 the petition raises issues that have already been the
8 subject of NRC staff review and evaluation for which
9 a resolution has been achieved. The issues have been
10 resolved and the resolution is applicable to the
11 facility in question. Specifically, the Petitioner
12 references notice of violation EA-09-321 dated April
13 19th, 2010.

14 The inspection related to the component
15 cooling water system was conducted on December 10th,
16 2009 and the inspection report was issued on January
17 19th, 2010 with the regulatory conference held on
18 February 19th, 2010.

19 A supplemental inspection was conducted as
20 documented in an inspection report dated November 3,
21 2010. The supplemental inspection resulted in no open
22 items.

23 On August 3, 2011, the Petition Manager
24 contacted you and provided you with the PRB's initial
25 recommendation. Subsequently, you requested 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

1 address the PRB to provide additional information to
2 support your petition.

3 As a reminder for the phone participants,
4 please identify yourself if you make any remarks and
5 this will help us in the preparation of the
6 teleconference transcript that we make publicly
7 available.

8 Thank you.

9 Mr. Saporito, I'll turn it over to you to
10 allow you to provide any information you believe the
11 PRB should consider as part of this petition.

12 MR. SAPORITO: All right. Thank you, Mr.
13 Chairman.

14 For the record, my name is Thomas
15 Saporito. I am the Petitioner in this proceeding. I
16 am the Senior Consultant with Saproani Associates
17 based in Jupiter, Florida.

18 First of all, let me correct the record as
19 the NRC misstated the accuracy of the petition date.
20 The date of the petition filed in this instant matter
21 is April 3rd, 2011.

22 Now, first before I get into the heart of
23 this discussion, let me put on the record an email
24 that I received from Tracy Orf of the NRC dated
25 Wednesday, August the 3rd, 2011. I'm just going to go

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 through the relevant portion of this which says this
2 is responding to my petition. This is your petition
3 dated May 12th, 2011.

4 I don't know where the NRC keeps getting
5 that date, but that date is not correct. The date of
6 the petition is April 3rd, 2011.

7 Nonetheless, he goes on in this email and
8 states "In relevant part that I want to put on this
9 record that the NRC staff has concluded that your
10 submittal does not meet the criteria for consideration
11 under 10 CFR 2.206 because per MD 8.11 the issue
12 raised has already been subject of NRC staff review
13 and evaluation for which a resolution has been
14 achieved. The issues have been resolved and the
15 resolution is applicable to the facility in question.
16 You have not provided any significant new information
17 to justify the NRC varying from its enforcement
18 policy."

19 Now, that's the reason that the NRC gave
20 to me, a member of the public, for rejecting my 2.206
21 petition dated April 3rd, 2011 in connection with the
22 air intrusion event at the St. Lucie Nuclear Plant.

23 Now, let's make this public record
24 perfectly clear. Management Directive 8.11 requires
25 the Petition Review Board of the United States 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

1 Regulatory Commission to consider the petition in its
2 full context and what that means is, just like as the
3 opening remarks by the NRC on this record today
4 stated, that at this Petition Review Board meeting all
5 my comments and submittals verbally or in writing are
6 a supplement to the written petition. Just like my
7 initial meeting with the Petition Review Board on July
8 7th, 2011, all those comments and the record, the
9 transcribed record created on that date, is a
10 supplement to the original petition. Just the same as
11 if I had written those words and submitted it as part
12 of the original petition.

13 Nonetheless, this Petition Review Board
14 refused to entertain those comments and accept those
15 comments on the record and refused to consider those
16 comments, evaluate those comments and analyze those
17 comments.

18 So, the NRC Petition Review Board failed
19 to follow its own regulations under Management
20 Directive 8.11 and to that extent, I request a copy of
21 this record be forwarded to the NRC Office of the
22 Inspector General.

23 Now, before I get into the specifics of
24 what the NRC failed to address, let me just state that
25 the original petition as documented in the NRC 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

1 transcripts of July 7th, 2011. My copy, for some
2 reason, the pages were not enumerated. So, I counted
3 them. There's suppose to be 38 pages here.

4 So, I'm going to reference page 17. Where
5 I contended to the NRC Petition Review Board on that
6 date of July 7th, 2011, I stated "With respect to the
7 instant enforcement petition, the Licensee apparently
8 admitted to the NRC that when the St. Lucie Nuclear
9 Plant Unit I was licensed the facility was not
10 required to incorporate a single-failure design
11 capacity for nonsafety-related system and FPL
12 concluded that a violation of 10 CFR Part 50 Appendix
13 B Criterion 3 did not occur as found by the NRC
14 inspector."

15 Petitioners contend here that the
16 Licensee's admission supports a finding that the
17 Licensee is operating the St. Lucie Nuclear Plant well
18 outside the NRC's nuclear safety regulations under 10
19 CFR Part 50 and that the component cooling water
20 system employed at the St. Lucie Nuclear Plant Unit I
21 and II is a nuclear safety-related system to the
22 extent that it serves to remove heat from the reactor
23 core in various manners and modes of operation.
24 That's on page 17 and 18 of the record transcript
25 dated July 7th, 2011.

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 So, clearly, that's an issue that the
2 Petition Review Board for whatever reason didn't want
3 to address. We have a Licensee saying that our plant
4 is designed a certain way. The NRC's saying no, it's
5 designed this way. The Licensee's saying no, this is
6 a -- component cooling water isn't a safety-related
7 system. The NRC's saying it is.

8 Well, subsequent to that meeting on July
9 18th, 2011, the United States Nuclear Regulatory
10 Commission issued NRC Information Notice 2011-14
11 entitled Component Cooling Water System Gas
12 Accumulation and Other Performance Issue and at the
13 bottom of page 1 of that document, it states "The
14 component cooling water system is a safety-related
15 system. That provides cooling and seal make-up to the
16 non-safety related containment 1A compressors. Air
17 intrusion into the component cooling water system
18 began after a routine shift to the other standby
19 containment 1A compressor" and the NRC's talking about
20 the St. Lucie Plant here.

21 It says "Air leaked at a slow rate into
22 the component cooling water system and took several
23 hours to initiate alarm. Operators initially believed
24 that the component cooling water surge tank high level
25 alarm condition resulted from reactor coolant system

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 leaking into the component cooling water system rather
2 than air intrusion. Subsequent alarms and indication
3 of fluctuating pump motor current and component
4 cooling water header flow lead operators to conclude
5 that air intrusion was occurring."

6 Okay. So, what this is saying here is the
7 Licensee's wrong and I was correct. This is a safety-
8 related system. The component cooling water system is
9 a safety-related system.

10 The contention by the Licensee that it's
11 not should be a red flag to the NRC and that's part of
12 this petition the Petition Review Board didn't
13 address.

14 As I've just read into this record, the
15 NRC's information notice, it shows here the severity
16 of this incident and that the operators initially
17 believed one aspect of plant operations which was
18 incorrect and then later determined that it was an air
19 intrusion event. So, this is a very significant
20 safety-related issue which could have caused an
21 adverse problem operating that nuclear reactor because
22 the operators are contending one thing because of
23 whatever training they had and it was really an air
24 intrusion event and so, it was a significant delay in
25 actions and the determination happened sometime after

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 the event occurred.

2 On page 2 of the NRC's July 18th, 2011
3 notice at paragraph 2, it states "The Licensee's root
4 cause evaluation determined that these repetitive
5 events resulted from a latent design issue that did
6 not consider the potential for gas intrusion into the
7 component cooling water system and from the Licensee's
8 failure to recognize or understand the potential
9 impact of the component cooling water and other
10 safety-related systems that component cooling water
11 supports during the initial condition report screening
12 process. The original component cooling water design
13 was vulnerable to gas intrusion that could result in
14 a common mode system failure.

15 "Gas intrusion was not typically
16 considered in the component cooling water system
17 design when the St. Lucie's plants were designed as is
18 evident from Licensee basis documents. Consequently,
19 St. Lucie operating procedure did not address
20 detection and mitigation of gas intrusion occurrences.
21 The component cooling water system's vulnerability to
22 gas intrusion from the containment 1A compressor was
23 not recognized because the leakage path required a
24 failure of the 1A compressor unloading valve and air
25 leakage through multiple components. Licensee

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 corrective actions included a design change to isolate
2 the air intrusion path into the component cooling
3 water system from the containment 1A compressors,
4 procedure revisions to identify and mitigate air
5 intrusion into the component cooling water system and
6 revisions to licensed operator and non-licensed
7 operator lesson plans and engineering procedures to
8 reflect lessons learned."

9 So, here you have -- and this is part of
10 the original petition because I'm going to go back to
11 the transcript record which was made on July 7th, 2011
12 at page 18 paragraph 2 which I stated at that time to
13 this Petition Review Board that "Petitioner further
14 contends that since the Licensee admitted to the NRC
15 that the St. Lucie Nuclear Plant Unit I was licensed
16 by the NRC for operations not requiring incorporation
17 of a single failure design capability for the
18 component cooling water system, the Licensee's NRC
19 operational licenses for Unit I and Unit II are
20 invalid and that the NRC should order the Licensee to
21 immediately bring the St. Lucie Nuclear Plant Unit I
22 and Unit II to a cold shutdown mode of operation to
23 protect public health and safety in these
24 circumstances."

25 So, what I contended to the NRC back in

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 July 7th, 2011 is exactly the same issues which the
2 Licensee admits to through this NRC July 18th, 2011
3 notice that since this plant was licensed and we're
4 talking about -- I'm referring to a NRC document here
5 on the NRC's website for the St. Lucie Nuclear Plant
6 Unit I. Now, the operating license was issued on the
7 March 1st, 1976. So, since March 1st, 1976, the
8 Licensee, the Florida Power and Light Company has been
9 operating Unit I and subsequently later Unit II in
10 violation of the NRC safety parameters standards and
11 regulations set out under 10 CFR Part 50.

12 Because the plant wasn't properly
13 designed, you had a design flaw in the component
14 cooling water system which allowed air intrusion which
15 caused operators to take the wrong course of action in
16 operating the plant. That is an issue that this
17 Petition Review Board is required to address and to
18 accept as a valid issue under Management Directive
19 8.11 as a matter of law. You can't just ignore it
20 because you don't want to deal with it. It's part of
21 this petition because I put it on the record on July
22 7th, 2011.

23 In addition, the second issue which this
24 Petition Review Board has failed to acknowledge,
25 address and consider again going back to the official

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 NRC transcript record July 7th, 2011 at page 18
2 paragraph 3 "Petitioner further contends that the
3 metal in the nuclear reactor vessel at the St. Lucie
4 Nuclear Plant Unit I and Unit II has become
5 dangerously brittle from bombardment of high level
6 neutron radiation during normal operation over years
7 and years of operation and that neither the Licensee
8 nor the NRC has any accurate and meaningful data
9 measurement of just how brittle the nuclear reactor
10 vessels have become at the St. Lucie Nuclear Plant.

11 "Petitioners are concerned that should one
12 or both of the nuclear vessels at the St. Lucie
13 Nuclear Plant crack or shatter, that a full-core
14 meltdown would immediately occur similar to the
15 ongoing meltdown with the three nuclear reactors in
16 Japan. Such an event at the St. Lucie Nuclear Plant
17 would rapidly release an abundant amount of hydrogen
18 which would inundate any action mitigation systems
19 designed to dissipate such gaseous build up and that
20 a dangerous explosion at the St. Lucie Nuclear Plant
21 containment building would occur and spew high level
22 nuclear particles directly into the environment and
23 adversely affect public health and safety just like
24 what happened in Japan."

25 The NRC Petition Review Board was required

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 to consider this issue just as if it was written into
2 the original petition on April 3rd, 2011, but the NRC
3 Petition Review Board failed to do so as they were
4 required under Management Directive 8.11.

5 All right. Let's see. So, I also on page
6 20 paragraph 2 stated that "Petitioner supplements the
7 original petition filed in the instant action to
8 request that the NRC order FP&L and the St. Lucie
9 Nuclear Plant to immediately or within a reasonable
10 short period of time bring the Unit I and Unit II
11 nuclear reactors to a cold shutdown mode of operation.
12 Until such time as the Licensee can have the Unit I
13 and Unit II nuclear reactor vessel metal tested to
14 determine exactly how brittle the metal has become and
15 to determine how many years, if any, the nuclear
16 reactors can be safely operated."

17 The Petition Review Board has to address
18 that issue. They didn't address that issue. They
19 rejected the entire petition out of hand without
20 properly evaluating the petition as they were required
21 to do under Management Directive 8.11.

22 And on the bottom of page 20, very
23 significantly halfway through that paragraph, I stated
24 on the record on July 7th, 2011 that all the comments
25 made today on this public record are to be considered

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 and to be construed and to be implemented as a
2 supplement to the original petition dated April 3rd,
3 2011 just the same as if they were placed in writing
4 and submitted to the NRC along with the initial
5 petition.

6 It couldn't have been made more clear to
7 the NRC Petition Review Board what the issues were
8 that I was asking for the NRC's review and the NRC
9 Petition Review Board just decided not to review it
10 even though the record was made in writing for them to
11 read and read and read and review and they didn't do
12 so.

13 You know, that's a violation of the public
14 and my due process right for fair and balanced
15 adjudication of the NRC's process under 2.206. I mean
16 why would the public engage the NRC and ask for the
17 NRC to take enforcement actions against the Licensee
18 if the NRC's not even going to follow their own
19 regulations to do that. I mean it just don't make any
20 sense and I think the NRC is way out of line.

21 The Petition Review Board -- when I say
22 the NRC, I'm talking about the NRC Petition Review
23 Board and that's why I'm asking the transcript record
24 to be forwarded to the NRC Office of the Inspector
25 General to make an intelligent and informed decision

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 as to whether the NRC's Petition Review Board's action
2 or is in violation of the NRC's own protocol and
3 regulations under Management Directive 8.11 because
4 they failed to address these issues that I put on the
5 record.

6 So, again, here today, I'm asking this
7 Petition Review Board to go back and look at those
8 record transcripts and to consider the record
9 transcripts to be made on this record here today and
10 to apply the NRC Management Directive 8.11, make a
11 determination that this petition is a valid petition
12 and the enforcement action requested is reasonable in
13 these circumstances where you have a nuclear power
14 plant, two of them, St. Lucie Unit I and II, which
15 have been licensed for two or more decades now and
16 have been operating for that lengthy period of time
17 where at least one of the units has a design basis
18 flaw in it that went undetected by the Licensee and it
19 went undetected by the United States Nuclear
20 Regulatory Commission since the day the plants were
21 licensed decades ago.

22 That's a major issue because it's a
23 safety-related system that was designed and it was a
24 flawed design which caused operators to improperly
25 address the events that occurred in connection with

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 air intrusion event.

2 So, what other -- you know, what other
3 systems safety related out there at the St. Lucie
4 Nuclear Plant on either Unit I or II are not designed
5 properly? How many other systems are just accidents
6 waiting to happen?

7 The NRC didn't look at that. The NRC
8 didn't require the Licensee to go back and review the
9 entire final safety analysis review of the plant to
10 determine if any other systems have problems. They
11 weren't properly designed. Were there any other
12 procedures that need to be upgraded so that the
13 operators can properly address events that happened in
14 the operation of those two nuclear reactors?

15 So, that's another request we're going to
16 make on the NRC Petition Review Board. We want you to
17 make enforcement to a confirmatory order. Require the
18 Licensee to review this entire final safety analysis
19 report for both units and to review all safety-related
20 systems within those documents and their technical
21 specifications relevant to both plants to make an
22 assessment whether there are other safety related
23 systems which have a design flaw in them, which
24 weren't properly designed, which could fail or cause
25 some aspect of the operation of either of those

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 nuclear reactors to fail.

2 I mean that's a reasonable request because
3 decades and decades these plants have been operating
4 improperly with a design that was a failed design,
5 improper design and that nuclear safety-related system
6 involved and you got to look at these things.

7 Events that happened in Japan, everybody
8 thought those plants were fine. The regulator out
9 there said oh, they're safe. Told the public don't
10 worry about it and now, you have three nuclear
11 reactors melting down. They're out of control.
12 They'll never be brought under control. I don't care
13 what the government of Japan says and people are going
14 to have to be evacuated more and more and more until
15 finally there will be nobody living in the whole
16 country. That will become the world's nuclear
17 depository eventually because you're not going to gain
18 control of those three reactors and you got 104 of
19 them here in the United States.

20 The public cannot have a regulator like
21 the NRC who refuses to make a thorough inspection
22 under these circumstances where you have a nuclear
23 power plant with a design flaw in it which has existed
24 for decades and the NRC knew about this design flaw
25 back in 2008 and they just now as of July 18th, 2011

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 put out an information bulletin for other nuclear
2 power plants that have similar designs to see if they
3 have problems. I mean that just goes to show you the
4 complacency of the NRC and it's role as a regulator
5 and that's exactly -- although there was an earthquake
6 and a tsunami, a contributing factor to those
7 meltdowns in Japan was the failed regulator to oversee
8 nuclear operations in Japan.

9 The United States does not need a failed
10 regulator here in this country. We have enough
11 political rhetoric in Washington which is harming this
12 economy. All we need now is a nuclear plant to
13 meltdown and you're going to have decades of problems
14 with the economy because the radiation it can take
15 this economy down a lot further than a little debate
16 in Washington can.

17 So, I implore this Petition Review Board
18 to review the July 7th, 2011 record transcript, review
19 today's record transcripts, go back and review that
20 July 18th, 2011 information notice sent out by the NRC
21 and issue a confirmatory order to have St. Lucie
22 Nuclear Plant review its documents. Its final safety
23 analysis review reports for both units, the technical
24 specifications for both plants and the procedure for
25 its training of its operators because there may be

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 other safety-related systems that are in jeopardy
2 right now.

3 And at that, I'll answer any questions
4 anybody might have.

5 CHAIRMAN LEE: Okay. Thank you very much.
6 At this time, let's just stop here. Headquarters,
7 have any questions for Mr. Saporito?

8 MR. ORF: I do. This is Tracy Orf.

9 Mr. Saporito, did you have any other
10 sources of information on this component cooling water
11 event other than those that were already presented on
12 the docket?

13 MR. SAPORITO: Just those documents I've
14 mentioned today.

15 MR. ORF: All right. Thanks. One other
16 question. Do you have any metallurgical analysis on
17 the reactor vessel on embrittlement due to neutron
18 fluence or the phenomenon of pressurized thermal
19 shock?

20 MR. SAPORITO: Well, that's the issue I'm
21 presenting to the NRC. My contention is that the NRC
22 doesn't have accurate and sufficient data nor does the
23 Licensee have that information to date and that's
24 important to have to make a determination just how
25 brittle those reactor vessels are. Because it's my

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 assertion here that neither the Licensee or the NRC
2 has sufficient, accurate information through this
3 destructive testing of representation metal in those
4 vessels to make that determination to date.

5 MR. ORF: Okay. But, you, yourself, do
6 not have any evidence to that effect. Is that
7 correct?

8 MR. SAPORITO: Well, I don't have
9 permission to go on site and make measurements.

10 MR. ORF: Okay. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN LEE: Does the NRC staff at the
12 region have any questions?

13 MR. ROSE: No questions.

14 MR. ORF: Excuse me. The NRC Headquarters
15 is going to go on mute for just a moment.

16 CHAIRMAN LEE: At this time, does the
17 Licensee have any questions?

18 Before I conclude the teleconference,
19 members of the public might provide comments regarding
20 the petition and ask questions about the 2.206
21 petition process.

22 However, as stated at the opening, the
23 purpose of this teleconference is not to provide an
24 opportunity for the Petitioner or the public to
25 question or examine the PRB regarding the merits of

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 the petition request.

2 So, does the public have any comments?

3 Mr. Saporito, thank you for taking time to
4 provide the NRC staff with clarifying information on
5 the petition you have submitted.

6 Before we close, does the court reporter
7 need any additional information for the teleconference
8 transcript?

9 COURT REPORTER: Yes, I caught all the
10 names of the Petition Review Board except for one. It
11 sounded like Gerry first name. I didn't catch the
12 last name. If you could spell that for me.

13 MR. PURCIARELLO: Purciarello. I'll spell
14 it. P as in papa U-R-C-I-A-R-E-L-L-O.

15 COURT REPORTER: All right. Thanks a lot.

16 CHAIRMAN LEE: With that, this meeting is
17 concluded and we will be terminating the telephone
18 connection.

19 (Whereupon, at 1:44 p.m., the meeting was
20 adjourned.)

21

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

www.nealrgross.com