

Enclosure 1
ADAMS Accession
No. ML112490132
Monthly 10 CFR 2.206,
“Requests for Action
Under this Subpart,”
Status Report

PETITIONS CLOSED DURING THIS PERIOD

FACILITY	PETITIONER/EDO No.	Page
Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 2 and 3	Deborah Brancato, Esq., Riverkeeper G20110218	2
Limerick Generating Station	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20090570	3
Progress Energy, William D. Johnson, H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20110367	4
NextEra Energy, Florida Power & Light Company, St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 and 2	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20110365	5
Honeywell Uranium Conversion plant	Manfred Varda and David Shier G20110576	6

CURRENT STATUS OF OPEN PETITIONS

Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 2 and 3; Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station; River Bend Station	Sherwood Martinelli G20090487	7
Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 3	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20090690	8
U.S. Army Installation Command	Isaac Harp G20100136	9
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20110043	10
U.S. Nuclear Power Reactors (Related to Japan Earthquake)	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20110171	11
Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 1, 2, and 3	Eric Schneiderman, Office of the Attorney General, State of New York; G20110221	12

CURRENT STATUS OF OPEN PETITIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION

Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station	Mary Lampert G20100454	13
General Electric Boiling-Water Reactor Mark I Units (Related to Japan Earthquake)	Paul Gunter, Reactor Oversight Project & Kevin Kamps, Nuclear Waste Specialist G20110262	14
Exelon Generating, Exelon Nuclear, Limerick Nuclear Generating Station, and John Rowe	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20110398	15
Entergy Nuclear Generation, Entergy Nuclear, Inc., Entergy Nuclear Northeast, Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Entergy Nuclear Palisades, LLC., Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC., Entergy Operations, Inc., and J. Wayne Leonard	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20110477	16
Omaha Public Power District, Fort Calhoun Station, Unit 1	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20110492	17
Cooper Nuclear Station	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20110506	18
General Electric Boiling-Water Reactor Mark I & Mark II Units	David Lochbaum, Union of Concerned Scientist G20110563	19
All licensees of power reactors	Natural Resources Defense Council G20110579	20
All licensees of power reactors	Thomas Saporito, Saprodani Associates G20110625	21

Limerick Generating Station	Thomas Saporito, Saprohani Associates G20110628	22
-----------------------------	--	----

FACILITY: Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 2 & 3
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Deborah Brancato, Esq., Riverkeeper, Inc.



CLOSED PETITION
EDO # G20110218

DATE OF PETITION: MARCH 28, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: AUGUST 15, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: JOHN BOSKA
CASE ATTORNEY: BRETT KLUKAN



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For reasons specified within the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC lower the licensing-basis peak cladding temperatures of Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 2 and 3, in order to provide necessary safety margins in the event of loss-of-coolant accidents.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS PETITION AGE: ~5 MONTHS	
The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	03/28/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 18, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to discuss the petition and provide additional information to the PRB. 	04/18/11
On March 31, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by phone to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB. On April 1, 2011, the petitioner requested an opportunity to address the PRB by telephone.	03/31/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 25, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition. On June 7, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's initial recommendation that the petition did not meet the criteria for review on the basis that there is another NRC proceeding available in which the petitioner is or could be party and through which the petitioner's concerns could be addressed. The petition applies to all power reactors, not just IP2 and IP3, and should be addressed through rulemaking. The NRC is reviewing identical concerns submitted by Mr. Leyse under Rulemaking petitions (PRM 50-93 and 50-95). On June 8, 2011, the petitioner requested a second opportunity to address the PRB by telephone to provide additional information. On July 11, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by teleconference to provide additional information in support of the petition. On August 15, 2011, the PRB issued a closure letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML111990531) to the petitioner to convey the PRB's final recommendation. All NRC actions on this petition are closed. 	04/25/11 06/07/11 06/08/11 07/11/11 08/15/11

FACILITY: Limerick Generating Station
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



CLOSED PETITION
EDO # G20110570

DATE OF PETITION: AUGUST 1, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: AUGUST 17, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: PETER BAMFORD
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

The petitioner requested that the NRC take escalated enforcement action and deny licensee's application for renewal of operating licenses.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS	
		PETITION AGE: ~1 MONTH	
The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	08/01/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none">On August 17, 2011, the PRB issued a closure letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML112231351) to the petitioner stating that the petition did not meet the criteria for review because the petitioner's concerns could be addressed through another proceeding. All actions on this petition are closed.	08/17/11

FACILITY: H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



CLOSED PETITION
EDO # G20110367

DATE OF PETITION: APRIL 17, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: AUGUST 31, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: TRACY ORF
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For reasons specified within the petition request, the petitioner requests that the NRC take escalated enforcement action against Progress Energy, William D. Johnson, and H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant and either suspend or revoke the NRC license granted to the licensee for operation of H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant. The petitioner also requests that the NRC issue a notice of violation with a proposed civil penalty against those collectively and singularly named above. The petitioner's basis for the requested action is that on March 28, 2010, the NRC sent a special inspection team to investigate the circumstances of a significant event that occurred at H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant and caused a condition that increased the chance of reactor core damage. The petitioner claims that Progress Energy informed the NRC in writing that certain diagnostics and testing had been performed at H.B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, when, in fact, those activities had not occurred.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	04/17/11
On May 12, 2011, the petitioner submitted a letter to the NRC stating that the NRC had taken no action under MD 8.11 on the petition dated April 17, 2011. Because the NRC staff was not in receipt of the April 17, 2011, petition, the staff plans to proceed in accordance with MD 8.11 to evaluate the petition.	05/12/11
On May 25, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and to offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB, prior to the PRB's initial recommendation. The petitioner accepted this opportunity to address the PRB.	05/25/11
On June 14, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to discuss the petition request. The PRB plans to review the information provided in the petition, as supplemented, when making the initial recommendation.	06/14/11

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~4 MONTHS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 27, 2011, the PRB met to discuss the petition and made an initial recommendation that the petition met the criteria for rejection, because the issues raised have already been the subject of NRC review for which a resolution has been achieved. 	06/27/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On July 8, 2011, the petitioner was informed of the PRB's initial recommendation and requested a second teleconference to address the PRB. 	07/08/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On July 28, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB during a teleconference to provide additional information in support of the petition. The PRB will consider the additional information before making its final recommendation. 	07/28/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On August 31, 2011 a closure letter was issued (ADAMS Accession No. ML11237A081) to the petitioner to convey the PRB's final recommendation. All NRC actions on this petition are closed. 	08/31/11

FACILITY: St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 and 2
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



CLOSED PETITION
EDO # G20110365

DATE OF PETITION: APRIL 3, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: AUGUST 29, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: TRACY ORF
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For reasons specified within the petition request, the petitioner requests that the NRC take escalated enforcement action against NextTera Energy, Florida Power & Light Company, and St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 and 2 and either suspend or revoke the NRC license granted to the licensee for operation of St. Lucie, Units 1 and 2. The petitioner also requests that the NRC issue a notice of violation with a proposed civil penalty against those collectively and singularly named above. The petitioner's basis for the requested action is that on April 19, 2010, the "licensee admitted to the NRC that when St. Lucie, Unit 1 was licensed, the facility was not required to incorporate a single failure design capability for a non-safety system." The petitioner contends that the licensee's admission and the NRC's inspection (Inspection Report EA-09-321, dated November 3, 2010) supports a finding that the licensee is operating outside the NRC's regulations. Finally, the petitioner requests that the NRC immediately Order the licensee to bring the St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 and 2, to a cold shutdown mode of operation.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS PETITION AGE: ~4 MONTHS	
The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	04/03/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 2, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the request for immediate action only. The PRB denied the request for immediate action because there was no immediate safety concern to the plant, or to the health and safety of the public. 	06/02/11
On May 12, 2011, the petitioner submitted a letter to the NRC stating that the NRC had taken no action under MD 8.11 on the petition dated April 3, 2011. Because the NRC staff was not in receipt of the April 3, 2011, petition, the staff plans to proceed in accordance with MD 8.11 to evaluate the petition.	05/12/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 9, 2011, the petitioner confirmed his availability to address the PRB by telephone on July 7, 2011. 	06/09/11
On May 25, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and to offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB, prior to the PRB's initial recommendation. The petitioner accepted this opportunity to address the PRB.	05/25/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On July 7, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by teleconference to provide additional information. On August 2, 2011, the PRB determined that the petition met the criteria for rejection. The issue raised has already been the subject of NRC staff review and evaluation, for which a resolution has been achieved, the issues have been resolved, and the resolution is applicable to the facility in question. On August 29, 2011 a closure letter was issued (ADAMS Accession No. ML11237A080) to the petitioner to convey the PRB's final recommendation. All NRC actions on this petition are closed. 	07/07/11 08/02/11 08/29/11

FACILITY: Honeywell Uranium Conversion Plant, Metropolis, Ill
LICENSEE TYPE: Uranium Conversion Plant
PETITIONER: Manfred Warda of ICEM and David Shier of INWUN



CLOSED PETITION
EDO # G20110576

DATE OF PETITION:	JULY 18, 2011	
DD TO BE ISSUED BY:	NMSS	
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE:	N/A	NO IMAGE AVAILABLE
FINAL DD ISSUANCE:	N/A	
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER:	AUGUST 16, 2011	
PETITION MANAGER:	KEVIN MATTERN	
CASE ATTORNEY:	N/A	

ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

The petition addresses the Honeywell facility in Metropolis, Illinois, describes safety concerns related to the use of replacement workers, and specifically requests that the NRC exercise its authority to shut the plant down until the plant can be operated safely by experienced workers.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS PETITION AGE: ~1 MONTH	
On August 3, 2011, NMSS was assigned a green ticket to place a July 18, 2011, letter from International Federation of Chemical, Energy, Mine, and General Workers Unions (ICEM) to the Chairman Jaczko of the NRC into the 2.206 process.	08/03/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NRC staff emailed the petitioner to explain the 2.206 process, and gather additional information. The email did not receive an immediate reply, so the staff agreed to contact the petitioner telephonically the next day, due to the time difference between Washington, DC and Geneva, Switzerland (6 hours). 	08/04/11
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The staff telephoned the petitioner and discussed the 2.206 process, the current plant status and its effect on the issues addressed in the letter. The petitioner agreed to contact the petition manager by August 9, 2011, to say whether to pursue the 2.206 process, or withdraw the request if the change in plant status warranted this. 	08/05/11
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> After contacting the petitioner, the petition manager informed the licensee by phone of the publicly available parts of the potential 2.206 petition. 	08/12/11
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A teleconference was held to provide the current status of actions to date and planned future actions. On August 16, 2011, the staff received an email from the petitioner stating that pursuit of the 2.206 process is no longer requested, thus the staff exited the 2.206 process at that time. 	08/16/11
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On Aug 25, 2011, a letter acknowledging that the petitioner no longer wished to pursue the action through the 2.206 process was sent to the petitioner. All NRC actions on this petition are closed. 	08/25/11

FACILITY: Indian Point Nuclear Generating Units 2 & 3; Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station;
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Sherwood Martinelli



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20090487

DATE OF PETITION: AUGUST 22, 2009
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: OCTOBER 31, 2011
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: AUGUST 1, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: DOUG PICKETT
CASE ATTORNEY: PATRICIA JEHL



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

The petitioner requests that the NRC suspend the operations of Entergy-owned plants (specifically Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 2 and 3, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, and River Bend Station) until Entergy brings the decommissioning funds for all of its licensed nuclear reactors to the adequate minimum levels required by NRC regulations.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	08/22/09
For a complete summary of NRC actions before December 17, 2009, please refer to the August 2010 monthly status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML102510120).	12/17/09
On December 17, 2009, the PRB issued an acknowledgement letter to the petitioner, accepting the petition in part for review for Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station and River Bend Station, under 10 CFR 2.206 (ADAMS Accession No. ML093440334).	12/17/09
On December 22, 2009, the petitioner provided supplemental information in support of his petition by e-mail.	12/22/09
On December 28, 2009, Mr. Martinelli submitted an e-mail to the NRC, which was tracked under G20090722 (now a closed petition). In G20090722, Mr. Martinelli referenced his petition of August 22, 2009 (G20090487), and voiced objections to the PRB denying his petition with respect to Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 2 and 3.	12/28/09
The PRB met internally on January 14, 2010, and concluded that, in accordance with MD 8.11, Mr. Martinelli's e-mail dated December 28, 2009 (G20090722), would be better handled as a supplement to G20090487. Therefore, the information provided in G20090722 will be reviewed as a supplement to G20090487. The Office of the Executive Director for Operations (OEDO) terminated G20090722.	01/14/10

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~24 MONTHS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On March 2, 2010, OEDO approved an extension request until May 28, 2010, to support the NRC's staff's resolution of decommissioning funding issues. 	03/02/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 14, 2010, OEDO approved an extension request until August 20, 2010, to support the NRC staff's resolution of decommissioning funding issues. 	05/14/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On July 26, 2010, OEDO approved an extension request until January 21, 2011, to support the NRC staff's resolution of decommissioning funding issues. 	07/26/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On September 2, 2010, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the schedule change. 	09/02/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On December 21, 2010, OEDO approved an extension request until June 24, 2011, to support the NRC staff's resolution of decommissioning funding issues. The petition manager informed the petitioner of this schedule change on December 28, 2010. 	12/21/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 17, 2011, OEDO approved an extension request until October 31, 2011, to support the NRC staff's resolution of decommissioning funding issues at River Bend Station. The petition manager informed the petitioner of this schedule change on May 23, 2011. 	05/17/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On August 1, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by email to inform him that the staff's review was still in progress. 	08/01/11

FACILITY: Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 3
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20090690

DATE OF PETITION: DECEMBER 5, 2009
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: DECEMBER 2, 2012
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: AUGUST 23, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: FARIDEH SABA
CASE ATTORNEY: MICHAEL CLARK



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For reasons specified within the petition request, the petitioner requests that the NRC take enforcement action against Progress Energy Company, the licensee for Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit 3, in the interest of protecting public health and safety regarding the structural failure of the Crystal River, Unit 3, containment building.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~21 MONTHS

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	12/05/09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On November 23, 2010, OEDO approved an extension request until June 3, 2011, to permit additional time for the staff to issue the proposed director's decision. The petition manager informed the petitioner of this change on November 23, 2010. On May 27, 2011, OEDO approved an extension request until December 2, 2012, to permit additional time for the staff to issue the proposed director's decision. The petition manager informed the petitioner of this change on May 27, 2011. On August 23, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by email to inform him that the staff's review was still in progress.
For a complete summary of NRC actions before March 1, 2010, please refer to the April 2011 monthly status report (ADAMS Accession No. ML111220348).	03/01/10	
On March 4, 2010, the PRB issued an acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML100471416) to the petitioner. The acknowledgement letter conveyed the final recommendation to accept the petition for review, in part.	03/04/10	
On June 24, 2010, OEDO approved an extension request until December 4, 2010, to permit additional time for the staff to issue the proposed director's decision. An extension was needed because of the complexity of the activities that the licensee needs to complete and for the NRC to review and evaluate these actions. The petition manager informed the petitioner of this change on June 24, 2010.	06/24/10	
In an e-mail dated October 17, 2010, the petitioner requested another opportunity to present additional information to the PRB as a direct result of information shared during an NRC public meeting held with the licensee on June 30, 2010. In accordance with MD 8.11, the petition manager informed the petitioner that additional information should be submitted in writing to the OEDO for PRB consideration. If the PRB determines that a call is warranted with the petitioner to clarify any additional information provided, a conference call will be coordinated. To date, the petitioner has not provided any new information to the EDO for PRB consideration.	10/17/10	
		<div>11/23/10</div> <div>05/27/11</div> <div>08/23/11</div>

FACILITY: U.S. Army Installation Command
LICENSEE TYPE: Materials
PETITIONER: Isaac Harp



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20100136

DATE OF PETITION: MARCH 4, 2010
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: FSME
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: AUGUST 9, 2011
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A **NO IMAGE AVAILABLE**
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: AUGUST 9, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: KENNETH KALMAN
CASE ATTORNEYS: BRETT KLUKAN & KIMBERLY SEXTON

ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner filed a notice of appeal in the matter of the Atomic Energy Safety and Licensing Board Memorandum and Order (Denying Requests for Hearing) LBP-10-04, U.S. Army Installation Command, Docket No. 40-9083, served February 24, 2010. In the notice of appeal, the petitioner requested that the NRC take enforcement action by initiating an investigation into a potential violation of License SUB-459 and, if it is determined that a violation has occurred, to apply the full penalty permissible by law. In addition, the petitioner requests that any monetary fines should go toward environmental remediation of depleted uranium contamination at Schofield and Pohakuloa, if the law provides for such action.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS	
		PETITION AGE: ~19 MONTHS	
The petitioner filed a petition for a notice of appeal, which was referred to the 10 CFR 2.206 process for review.	03/04/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By letter dated April 5, 2011, the staff requested the Army's response to unresolved questions/issues related to the 10 CFR 2.206 enforcement action. 	04/05/11
To review the status of this petition before January 1, 2011, please refer to prior 10 CFR 2.206 monthly status reports.	01/01/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 28, 2011, the petition manager notified the petitioner that a pre-decisional enforcement conference was scheduled for May 10, 2011, to discuss apparent violations of NRC requirements involving possession of source material (depleted uranium from Davy Crockett spotting rounds) without a license. 	04/28/11
On January 27, 2011, the NRC staff held an enforcement panel to disposition some recently identified potential issues as a prerequisite to a possible preliminary enforcement conference with the U.S. Army.	01/27/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 10, 2011, the NRC staff held a pre-decisional enforcement conference with the Army. 	05/10/11
On February 2, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner to address the petitioner's January 22, 2011, e-mail concerning the Army's intent to modernize the Pohakuloa Training Area and to provide an update on the status of the 10 CFR 2.206 petition.	02/02/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By email dated June 29, 2011, the petition manager notified the petitioner that the NRC is in the process of finalizing its enforcement decision and is considering all available information in the decision making process. The petition manager also provided additional information regarding the Army's license. 	06/29/11
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On August 9, 2011, the proposed director's decision was provided to the petitioner and the licensee for comment. The petitioner and licensee were provided with 30 days to comment. 	08/09/11

FACILITY: Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20110043

DATE OF PETITION: JANUARY 14, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: JULY 14, 2011
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: AUGUST 1, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: JAMES KIM
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner is concerned with the safety of the plant and requested that “the NRC take escalated enforcement action against the licensee, to include, but not to be limited to, (1) issuing a confirmatory order requiring the licensee to immediately bring the reactor in question to a cold shutdown mode of operation; (2) issuing a civil penalty against the licensee; (3) cause the removal of licensee employees responsible for this matter from NRC licensed activities for a period of no less than 5 years; and (4) cause an immediate NRC investigation and inspection of the licensee’s Vermont Yankee facility to ensure that all nuclear safety-related systems are properly operational in accordance with the licensee’s technical specifications and NRC license.”

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS PETITION AGE: ~9 MONTHS	
The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	01/14/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On February 2, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition and made an initial recommendation that the petition meets the criteria for review. On February 8, 2011, the NRC informed the petitioner of the PRB’s initial recommendation to accept his petition for review. The petitioner requested a second opportunity to address the PRB by teleconference. On February 14, 2011, the petitioner provided additional information to the PRB in support of his request for an immediate shutdown. The additional information provided did not change the PRB’s decision to deny the request for immediate action. By letter dated March 28, 2011, the NRC issued an acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML110601262) to document the PRB’s final recommendation that the petition met the criteria for review. On July 14, 2011, the NRC issued a proposed director’s decision (ADAMS Accession No. ML111710398). The petitioner and the licensee were given 30 days to provide written comments on the proposed director’s decision. On August 1, 2011, the petitioner provided comments on the proposed director’s decision (ADAMS Accession No. ML11223A004). His comments will be addressed in the final director’s decision. 	02/02/11
On January 19, 2011, the petitioner requested a teleconference with the PRB to provide additional relevant information in support of his petition before the PRB met internally to make the initial recommendation.	01/19/11		02/08/11
On January 24, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the request for immediate action only. The PRB determined that there was no immediate safety concern to the public health and safety and no technical basis to warrant an immediate shutdown of Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station. The petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB’s decision to deny the request for immediate action.	01/24/11		02/14/11
On January 26, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by teleconference to provide additional information in support of his petition request.	01/26/11		03/28/11
			07/14/11
			08/01/11

FACILITY: U.S. Nuclear Power Reactors
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20110171

DATE OF PETITION: MARCH 12, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: OCTOBER 25, 2011
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 28, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: PETER TAM
CASE ATTORNEYS: MICHAEL CLARK

NO IMAGE AVAILABLE

ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner seeks immediate enforcement action for the NRC to issue an order requesting the immediate shutdown of all nuclear power reactors in the United States that are known to be located on or near an earthquake fault line.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~6 MONTHS

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	03/12/11	
On March 21, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB. On March 21, 2011, the petitioner accepted this opportunity to address the PRB.	03/21/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 14, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone. During the call, the petitioner provided supplemental information in support of the petition request. Directly following the teleconference, the petitioner e-mailed supplemental information to the petition manager for PRB consideration.
On April 4, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the request for immediate action only. The PRB denied the request for an immediate shutdown because there is no immediate safety concern for public health and safety. The petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's decision to deny the request for immediate action on April 4, 2011.	04/04/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 28, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition, including supplemental information provided, and made an initial recommendation to accept the petition, in part. On May 12, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's initial recommendation. The petitioner requested a second teleconference to address the PRB. On May 25, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone. The PRB reviewed the additional information provided by the petitioner during the teleconference and made a final recommendation to accept the petition for review, in part. On June 28, 2011, the PRB issued an acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML11137A213) to the petitioner, to convey the PRB's final recommendation to accept the petition for review, in part. A proposed director's decision will be issued within 120 days of issuance of the acknowledgement letter.

FACILITY: Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 1, 2, & 3
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Eric Schneiderman, Office of the Attorney General
 State of New York



OPEN PETITION
EDO # G20110221

DATE OF PETITION: MARCH 28, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: OCTOBER 27, 2011
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 30, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: DOUGLAS PICKETT
CASE ATTORNEY(S): BRETT KLUKAN & BOB RADER



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For reasons specified within the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC to immediately issue an Order that takes the following actions with respect to Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 1, 2, and 3:

1. Identify the violations of 10 CFR 50.48, Appendix R, Sections III.F and III.G, that exist as of the date of the petition (i.e., March 28, 2011) at Indian Point Units, 1, 2, and 3.
2. Compel Entergy and its affiliates to comply on or before September 20, 2011, with the requirements contained in 10 CFR 50.48, Appendix R, Sections III.F and III.G, for all the fire zones in Indian Point, Units, 2 and 3 and any Indian Point, Unit 1 fire zone or system, structure, or component relied on by Indian Point, Unit 2 or 3.
3. Convene an evidentiary hearing before the Commission to adjudicate the violations by Entergy and its affiliates of 10 CFR 50.48, Appendix R, Sections III.F and III.G, at Indian Point, Units 1, 2, and 3.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	03/28/11
On March 31, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB. The petitioner accepted this opportunity to address the PRB in person.	03/31/11
On April 5, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the request for immediate action only. The PRB denied the request for immediate action because (1) the licensee's actions are within the NRC-defined process, (2) enforcement discretion is applicable, (3) there are no identifiable safety concerns, and (4) there is no basis to take immediate action.	04/05/11

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~5 MONTHS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On April 12, 2011, the NRC informed the petitioner of the PRB's decision to deny the request for immediate action. 	04/12/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 9, 2011 (ADAMS Accession No. ML111090949), the petitioner addressed the PRB during a public meeting at NRC Headquarters to provide additional information and support for the petition request. 	05/09/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 19, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition. The PRB's initial recommendation was that the petition met the criteria for review. 	05/19/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On May 27, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's initial recommendation. The petitioner did not request a second opportunity to address the PRB. Thus, the initial recommendation is the PRB's final recommendation. 	05/27/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 30, 2011, an acknowledgement letter (ADAMS Accession No. ML111520393) was issued accepting the petition for review. A proposed director's decision will be issued within 120 days of issuance of the acknowledgement letter. 	06/30/11

FACILITY: Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Mary Lampert



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20100454**

DATE OF PETITION: JULY 19, 2010
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: MAY 31, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: RICHARD GUZMAN
CASE ATTORNEY: MAURI LEMONCELLI



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition (G20100454), the petitioner requested that the NRC issue a demand for information order that Entergy, the licensee for Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, demonstrate that all inaccessible cables at Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station are capable of performing their required function, be it safety or non-safety related.

As supplemented on August 13, 2010 (G20100527), the petitioner requested that the NRC issue an order that requires Entergy, the licensee for Pilgrim, to immediately perform an updated hydro-geologic analysis. On November 15, 2010 (G20100689), the petitioner requested that the Commission review the PRB's decision with respect to G20100527.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES		CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS PETITION AGE: ~14 MONTHS	
Please refer to prior 10 CFR 2.206 monthly status reports (on the NRC public Web site) to review the status of this petition before November 2010.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The petitioner submitted a late-filed request for hearing of a contention related to Entergy's management of inaccessible cables under the Pilgrim license renewal review proceeding on December 13, 2010. Per MD 8.11 (Part III, Section C.1.a(iii)), a 10 CFR 2.206 petition request will not be treated under the 10 CFR 2.206 process if there is an ongoing licensing hearing/proceeding through which the petitioner's concerns could be addressed. The PRB reconvened on January 4, 2011, and determined that the petitioner's concerns related to inaccessible cables would be held in abeyance until an outcome of the contention is made under the Pilgrim license renewal hearing process. 	01/04/11
On November 4, 2010, the PRB met internally to discuss the supplemental information (G201000527) received before making the final recommendation. The PRB determined that the information submitted under G20100454 met the criteria for review. The supplemental information provided under G20100527 met the criteria for rejection because the NRC reviewed, evaluated, and resolved the issues raised about the hydro-geologic analysis.	11/04/10		
On November 5, 2010, OEDO approved an extension request until December 30, 2010.	11/05/10		
On November 10, 2010, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's final recommendation and of the schedule change.	11/10/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On January 25, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's determination and confirmed that the aforementioned PRB determination would be documented in a letter. 	01/25/11
By letter dated November 15, 2010 (G20100689), the petitioner requested that the Commission review the PRB's decision to reject the portion of the petition relevant to the hydro-geologic analysis for review under 10 CFR 2.206. The NRC acknowledgement letter to the petitioner will address G20100454, G20100527, and G20100689.	11/15/10		02/23/11
On December 22, 2010, OEDO approved an extension request until February 26, 2011, to support the staff's ability to document the PRB's final recommendation.	12/22/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By letter dated February 23, 2011 (ADAMS Accession No. ML103400692), the NRC issued a letter to the petitioner, which stated that the portion of her petition related to the hydro-geologic analysis met the criteria for rejection, and that the portion related to inaccessible cables was being held in abeyance until an outcome of the contention is made under the Pilgrim license renewal hearing process. 	
On December 28, 2010, the petition manager informed the petitioner of this schedule change to issue the acknowledgement letter.	12/28/10		05/31/11

FACILITY: All General Electric Boiling-Water Reactor Mark I Units
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONERS: Paul Gunter, Reactor Oversight Project
 Kevin Kamps, Nuclear Waste Specialist
COPETITIONERS: Noted Below Under "Current Status and Next Steps"



**OPEN PETITION
 UNDER
 CONSIDERATION
 EDO # G20110262**

DATE OF PETITION: APRIL 13, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A **NO IMAGE AVAILABLE**
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: AUGUST 19, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: SIVA LINGAM
CASE ATTORNEY: MICHAEL CLARK

ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For reasons specified within the petition request, the petitioner requests that the NRC immediately suspend the operating licenses of General Electric (GE) boiling-water reactor (BWR) Mark I units to ensure that public health and safety is not unduly jeopardized. As stated by the petitioner, this petition focuses on "the unreliability of the GE BWR Mark I containment system to mitigate a severe accident and the lack of emergency power systems to cool high density storage pools and radioactive reactor fuel assemblies."

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~5 MONTHS

The petitioners filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	04/13/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In a letter dated May 31, 2011 (G20110396), Marvin Lewis and David Kraft (G20110400) requested to be added as co-petitioners. 	05/31/11
On April 19, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioners to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and to offer them an opportunity to address the PRB before it meets internally to make the initial recommendation to accept or reject the petition for review. The petitioners requested an opportunity to address the PRB in a public meeting before it makes its initial recommendation. In addition, on April 19, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the request for immediate action only. The PRB denied the request for immediate action because there was no immediate safety concern for the plant or for public health and safety. The petitioners expressed a general safety concern about the GE BWR Mark I units but did not provide any facts or information that would lead the NRC to immediately shut down these plants.	04/19/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A public meeting was held on June 8, 2011, so that the petitioners could address the PRB in person. The NRC issued a public meeting notice, which contained the agenda (ADAMS Accession No. ML11126A096). Over 3,000 co-petitioner requests were received by the NRC following the June 8, 2011, public meeting with Beyond Nuclear representatives. Due to the large volume received, those requests cannot be individually listed in this status report. 	06/08/11
On April 21, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioners of the PRB's decision to deny the request for immediate action.	04/21/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On July 12, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition. A subsequent internal PRB meeting will be scheduled to support the PRB's ability to make the initial recommendation. 	07/12/11
In a letter dated May 14, 2011 (G20110355), Pilgrim Watch requested to be added as a co-petitioner.	05/14/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On August 16, 2011, the petitioner was informed of the PRB's decision to accept the petition for review, in part, and was offered another public meeting. 	8/16/11
In a letter dated May 18, 2011 (G20110366), the New England Coalition requested to be added as a co-petitioner.	05/18/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On August 17, 2011, the petitioner replied by e-mail that he requests another public meeting. 	08/17/11
In a letter dated May 27, 2011 (G20110395), the GE Stockholders' Alliance requested to be added as a co-petitioner.	05/27/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Per a telephone conversation between the petition manager and petitioner on August 19, 2011, the petitioner prefers the public meeting at the end of September, or the beginning of October 2011. The petitioner will follow up with the petition manager with the proposed dates and timings. 	08/19/11

FACILITY: Limerick Nuclear Generating Station
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20110398**

DATE OF PETITION: JUNE 1, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: N/A
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: JUNE 30, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: PETER BAMFORD
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC take enforcement action against Exelon Generation, Exelon Nuclear, Limerick Nuclear Generating Station, and John Rowe. The basis for the petition is that on, or about, May 30, 2011, Limerick Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 2, experienced an unexpected shutdown (or SCRAM) event where two reactor recirculation pumps tripped offline during reactor startup operations. A similar event occurred less than 36 hours earlier on the same reactor. The petitioner states that the fact that the licensee failed to properly analyze, determine, and correct the root cause of the initial SCRAM event prior to restarting the reactor significantly undermines any confidence that the NRC can have that the licensee will comply with the NRC's regulations under 10 CFR Part 50. In a teleconference dated June 13, 2011, the petitioner cited additional Limerick events dated February, 25, April 2, and June 3, 2011, as part of the basis for the requested actions.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~3 MONTHS

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	06/01/11
On June 2, 2011, the petition manager contacted the petitioner by e-mail to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process and offer the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB. The petitioner accepted this opportunity to address the PRB.	06/02/11
On June 13, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to discuss the petition before the PRB met internally to make an initial recommendation.	06/13/11
On June 20, 2011, the PRB met internally to discuss the petition.	06/20/11
On June 23, 2011, OEDO approved an extension request to support the staff's ability to reach a final recommendation. An extension was granted until September 2, 2011.	06/23/11

- | | |
|---|----------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 27, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the PRB's initial recommendation that per MD 8.11, the facts that constitute the basis for taking the particular action must be specified and the petitioner must provide some element of support beyond the bare assertion. The petitioner did not provide any element of support beyond the basic assertions, to warrant further inquiry. Thus, the PRB's initial recommendation is that the petition does not meet the criteria for review. The petitioner requested a second opportunity to address the PRB by telephone. | 06/27/11 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On June 30, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to discuss the PRB's initial recommendation. The PRB plans to meet internally to discuss the petition, as supplemented during the June 30th teleconference. | 06/30/11 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PRB met on August 17, 2011, to consider the information provided in the second petitioner teleconference held on June 30, 2011. | 08/17/11 |

FACILITY: Palisades Nuclear Plant & Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20110477**

DATE OF PETITION: JUNE 20, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: N/A
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: AUGUST 4, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: LYNNEA WILKINS
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC take enforcement action against Entergy Nuclear Generation, Entergy Nuclear, Inc., Entergy Nuclear Northeast, Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., Entergy Nuclear Palisades, LLC., Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC., Entergy Operations, Inc., and J. Wayne Leonard. The basis for the petition stems from an NRC public meeting discussion, held with licensees on June 20, 2011. The discussion was related to a change in the structure for which quality control (QC) and quality assurance (QA) licensed activities are conducted at nuclear power plants. The petitioner states that the licensee failed to comply with the NRC regulations and standards when making material changes to their QC/QA programs and the licensees failed to submit a license amendment request, failed to update the Final Safety Analysis Report, and failed to update the Technical Specifications for each material change made to the QC/QA program.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~2MONTH

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	06/20/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On July 15, 2011, the petitioner confirmed his availability to address the PRB by teleconference on August 4, 2011. The petitioner plans to provide additional information in support of the petition request before the PRB meets internally to make the initial recommendation. On August 4, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to discuss the petition before the PRB met internally to make an initial recommendation. On August 31, 2011, the PRB met internally to make the initial recommendation which is that the petition meets the criteria for rejection because the issues/concerns raised have already been reviewed, evaluated, and resolved by the NRC. 	07/15/11
The petition manager contacted the petitioner on July 5, 2011, to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process.	07/05/11		
			08/04/11 08/31/11

FACILITY: Fort Calhoun Station, Unit 1
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20110492**

DATE OF PETITION: JUNE 26, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: N/A
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: AUGUST 29, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: LYNNEA WILKINS
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A



ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC take escalated enforcement action against the Omaha Public Power District and Ft. Calhoun Station, Unit 1. The basis for the petition is that on June 26, 2011, a 2,000-foot berm at Fort Calhoun Station, Unit 1, collapsed from the forces of flood waters. The petitioner states that the licensee's installed flood-protection measures and systems and barriers at Fort Calhoun Station, Unit 1, are insufficient to adequately protect the reactor from a full meltdown scenario and that the licensee's station blackout procedures are not sufficient to meet the challenging extended loss of offsite power due to flood-waters and other natural disasters or terrorist attacks.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	06/26/11
The petition manager contacted the petitioner to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process.	07/21/11

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~2 MONTHS

- | | |
|---|----------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">Per MD 8.11, the petitioner requested an opportunity to provide additional information in support of the petition request before the PRB meets internally to make the initial recommendation. The petitioner plans to address the PRB by teleconference on August 29, 2011. | 07/22/11 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">On August 29, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to discuss the petition before the PRB met internally to make an initial recommendation. | 08/29/11 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">The PRB plans to meet internally to make the initial recommendation. | 08/31/11 |

FACILITY: Cooper Nuclear Station
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20110506**

DATE OF PETITION: JULY 3, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: N/A
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: AUGUST 29, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: LYNNEA WILKINS
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A

NO IMAGE AVAILABLE

ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

For detailed reasons described in the petition, the petitioner requests that the NRC take escalated enforcement action against the Cooper Nuclear Station (CNS) and issue a confirmatory order requiring the licensee to bring CNS to cold-shutdown. The basis for the petition is that on June 19, 2011, the licensee declared an unusual event in connection with the Missouri river flooding its banks. In summary, the petition contends that the installed flood –protection measures and systems and barriers at CNS are not sufficient to adequately protect the reactor from a full-meltdown scenario, the licensee's station blackout procedures are not sufficient to meet a challenging extended loss of offsite power due to flooding, natural disasters, or terrorist attacks, the licensee failed to notify the NRC of the declaration of an unusual event within a one-hour period, and the licensee continues to jeopardize public health and safety by failing to bring CNS to a cold-shutdown.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.	07/03/11
The petition manager contacted the petitioner to discuss the 10 CFR 2.206 process.	07/21/11

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~2 MONTHS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Per MD 8.11, the petitioner requested an opportunity to provide additional information in support of the petition request before the PRB meets internally to make the initial recommendation. The petitioner plans to address the PRB by teleconference on August 29, 2011. 	07/22/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On August 29, 2011, the petitioner addressed the PRB by telephone to discuss the petition before the PRB met internally to make an initial recommendation. 	08/29/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PRB plans to meet internally to make the initial recommendation. 	08/31/11

FACILITY: General Electric Boiling-Water Reactor Mark I & II Units
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: David Lochbaum, Union of Concerned Scientists



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20110563**

DATE OF PETITION:	JULY 29, 2011	
DD TO BE ISSUED BY:	NRR	
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE:	N/A	NO IMAGE AVAILABLE
FINAL DD ISSUANCE:	N/A	
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER:	AUGUST 16, 2011	
PETITION MANAGER:	ED MILLER	
CASE ATTORNEY:	N/A	

ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

The petitioner requests that the NRC issue a demand for information to the licensees of boiling water reactors with Mark I and Mark II containment designs on how the facility complies with GDC 44 and 10 CFR 50.49 with respect to spent fuel pools.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.

07/29/11

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~1 MONTH

- On August 16, 2011, the assigned petition manager informed the petitioner on the 10 CFR 2.206 process and offered the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB before it meets internally to make an initial recommendation, in accordance with MD 8.11. The petitioner declined the first opportunity for a public meeting.

8/16/11

FACILITY: All
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20110579**

DATE OF PETITION: AUGUST 1, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: AUGUST 31, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: M. BANIC
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A

NO IMAGE AVAILABLE

ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

The petitioner requests that the NRC order licensees to take actions corresponding to recommendations in the Near Term Task Force Report on post Fukushima. The petition consists of 12 letters.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~1 MONTH

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.

08/01/11

The assigned petition manager informed the petitioner on the 10 CFR 2.206 process and offered the petitioner an opportunity to address the PRB before it meets internally to make an initial recommendation, in accordance with MD 8.11. The petitioner replied he wanted a public meeting

08/05/11

- On August 22, 2011, the petition manager scheduled a public meeting for September 7, 2011. The meeting notice is posted on the NRC's public website.
- The public meeting will be rescheduled per the petitioner's request.

08/22/11

8/31/11

FACILITY: ALL
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20110625**

DATE OF PETITION: AUGUST 23, 2011
DD TO BE ISSUED BY: NRR
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE: N/A
FINAL DD ISSUANCE: N/A
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER: AUGUST 26, 2011
PETITION MANAGER: ANDREA RUSSELL
CASE ATTORNEY: N/A

NO IMAGE AVAILABLE

ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

The petitioner requests that the NRC issue orders and penalties regarding security issues.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~.25 MONTHS

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.

08/23/11

- On August 26, 2011, the petition manager informed the petitioner of the 10 CFR 2.206 process and offered an opportunity for the petitioner to address the PRB before the initial recommendation is made. The petitioner accepted the opportunity. A date for this meeting is being coordinated.

08/26/11

FACILITY: Limerick
LICENSEE TYPE: Reactor
PETITIONER: Thomas Saporito



**OPEN PETITION
UNDER
CONSIDERATION
EDO # G20110628**

DATE OF PETITION:	AUGUST 20, 2011	
DD TO BE ISSUED BY:	NRR	
PROPOSED DD ISSUANCE:	N/A	NO IMAGE AVAILABLE
FINAL DD ISSUANCE:	N/A	
LAST CONTACT WITH PETITIONER:	N/A	
PETITION MANAGER:	PETER BAMFORD	
CASE ATTORNEY:	N/A	

ACTIONS REQUESTED AND ISSUES

The petition is a follow-up to G2011570, taking issue with the PRB's decision that that petition did not meet criteria for review.

BACKGROUND, ACTIONS, & KEY MILESTONES

The petitioner filed a petition for an enforcement action under 10 CFR 2.206.

08/20/11

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

PETITION AGE: ~1 MONTH

- The PRB is evaluating the petition.

08/31/11

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Enclosure 2
ADAMS Accession
No. ML112490132
Age Statistics for Open
10 CFR 2.206 Petitions

AGE STATISTICS FOR AGENCY 10 CFR 2.206 OPEN PETITIONS

Assigned Action Office	Facility/ Petitioner	Incoming Petition	PRB Meeting/Days from Incoming Petition ¹	Acknowledgment Letter/Days from Incoming Petition ²	Proposed Director's Decision/Age in Days ³	Final Director's Decision/Age in Days ⁴	Comments on the Completion Goal Status
NRR	Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 2 and 3; Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station Sherwood Martinelli G20090487	8/22/09	12/08/09 109 days	12/17/09 118 days			The goal to issue the acknowledgement letter was not met. The PRB meeting was delayed to support a request from the petitioner to address the PRB by phone before it met internally to make an initial recommendation. The delay in holding the PRB meeting impacted our ability to issue an acknowledgement letter in accordance with the NRC's timeliness goals.
NRR	Crystal River Nuclear Generating Plant Thomas Saporito G20090690	12/05/09	01/07/10 33 days	03/04/10 86 days			The goal to issue the acknowledgement letter was not met. The PRB meeting was delayed to support a request from the petitioner to address the PRB by phone before it met internally to make an initial recommendation. The delay in holding the PRB meeting impacted our ability to issue an acknowledgement letter in accordance with the NRC's timeliness goals.

¹ Goal is to hold a Petition Review Board meeting, in which the petitioner is invited to participate, within 2 weeks of receipt of the petition.

² Goal is to issue an acknowledgment letter within 35 days of the date of the incoming petition.

³ Goal is to issue a proposed director's decision within 120 days of the acknowledgment letter.

⁴ Goal is to issue a final director's decision within 45 days of the end of the comment period.

FSME	U.S. Army Installation Command Isaac Harp G20100136	03/04/10	04/14/10 41 days	04/26/10 53 days			The goal to issue the acknowledgement letter was not met. This letter was originally submitted to the NRC as a petition for a notice of appeal, which was subsequently referred to the 10 CFR 2.206 process for review. The additional time required to ensure that this letter was in the correct process, in addition to time needed to coordinate a call with the petitioner, contributed to the delay in holding a call with the PRB within 2 weeks of receipt of the petition and in issuing the acknowledgement letter in accordance with the NRC's timeliness goals.
NRR	Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station Thomas Saporito G20110043	01/14/11	01/26/11 12 days	03/28/11 73 days	07/14/11 78 days		The goal to issue the proposed director's decision was met.
NRR	All U.S. Nuclear Reactors Thomas Saporito G20110171	03/12/11	04/14/11 33 days	06/28/11 108 days			The goal to hold a PRB meeting, in which the petitioner is invited to participate, within 2 weeks of receipt of the petition, was not met. Due to the complexity of the petition, and the ongoing staff workload associated with support of the earthquake in Japan, the earliest availability for the PRB members to meet (to coincide with the petitioner's availability) was April 14, 2011. The goal to issue an acknowledgment letter within 35 days of the date of the incoming petition

							<p>was not met. The delay in holding the PRB meeting impacted our ability to issue an acknowledgment letter in accordance with the NRC's timeliness goals. NRR obtained an extension, which was approved by the OEDO, to support the PRB's ability to hold an additional conference call with the petitioner, and to coordinate the internal PRB discussions which involved a significant amount of staff throughout the entire agency.</p>
NRR	<p>Indian Point Nuclear Generating, Units 1, 2, and 3</p> <p>Eric Schneiderman, Office of the Attorney General, State of New York; G20110221</p>	03/28/11	<p>05/09/11 42 days</p>	<p>06/30/11 94 days</p>			<p>The goal to hold a PRB meeting, in which the petitioner is invited to participate, within 2 weeks of receipt of the petition, was not met. The petitioner requested this first opportunity and the earliest availability which coincided with the petitioner's availability was May 9, 2011.</p> <p>The goal to issue an acknowledgment letter within 35 days of the date of the incoming petition was not met. The delay in holding the PRB meeting impacted our ability to issue an acknowledgment letter in accordance with the NRC's timeliness goals. NRR obtained an extension, which was approved by the OEDO, to support the PRB's ability to hold a public meeting with the petitioner, and to coordinate the internal PRB discussions.</p>

