# Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: 10 CFR 2.206 Petition Review Board

RE: Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: teleconference

Date: Tuesday, June 11, 2013

Work Order No.: NRC-004 Pages 1-41

Edited by Richard V. Guzman, NRC Petition Manager

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

| 1   | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA                            |
|-----|---|
| 2   | NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION                       |
| 3   | + + + +   |
| 4   | 10 CFR 2.206 PETITION REVIEW BOARD (PRB)            |
| 5   | CONFERENCE CALL                                     |
| 6   | RE  |
| 7   | PILGRIM NUCLEAR POWER STATION                       |
| 8   | + + + +   |
| 9   | TUESDAY   |
| 10  | JUNE 11, 2013                                       |
| 11  | + + + +   |
| 12  | The conference call was held, Joe                   |
| 13  | Giitter, Chairperson of the Petition Review Board,  |
| 14  | presiding.  |
| 15  |   |
| 16  | PETITIONER: MICHAEL MULLIGAN                        |
| 17  |   |
| 18  | PETITION REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS                       |
| 19  | JOE GIITTER, Director, Division of Risk Assessment  |
| 20  | in the Office of Nuclear Reactor                    |
| 21  | Regulation  |
| 22  | RICHARD GUZMAN, Petition Manager for 2.206 petition |
| 23  | EMILY MONTEITH, Office of General Counsel           |
| 24  |   |
| 25  |   |
| - 1 | 1   |

|    | 2   |
|----|---|
| 1  | NRC HEADQUARTERS STAFF                              |
| 2  | LEE BANIC, Petition Coordinator, Division of Policy |
| 3  | and Rulemaking, NRR                                 |
| 4  | JOHN BILLERBECK, Component Performance and Testing  |
| 5  | Branch, NRR   |
| 6  | MUHAMMAD RAZZAQUE, Reactor Systems Branch, NRR      |
| 7  |   |
| 8  | NRC REGION I OFFICE                                 |
| 9  | FRED BOWER  |
| 0  |   |
| 1  | ALSO PRESENT  |
| _2 | JOSEPH LYNCH, Entergy                               |
|    |   |

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

(3:06 p.m.)

MS. RIVERA: Good afternoon. I would like to thank everybody for attending the teleconference.

My name is Alison Rivera, and I am the Facilitator for this teleconference. My role is to help ensure today's teleconference is informative and productive.

The purpose of today's teleconference is to allow the Petitioner, Mr. Michael Mulligan, to address the Petition Review Board, or PRB, regarding a 2.206 petition dated March 7, 2013, as supplemented by emails dated March 20th and April 5, 2013, regarding his concerns with safety relief valves at Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station.

This teleconference is scheduled for one hour, from 3:00 to 4:00 p.m., Eastern Time. It 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. Prior to placing the transcript in ADAMS, the PRB will review it to ensure that it does not contain any allegations or sensitive information.

For those dialing in to this

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

teleconference, please remember to mute your phone to minimize any background noise or distraction. If you do not have a mute button, this can be done by pressing the keys \*6. To unmute, you will press \*6 again.

I'd like to emphasize that we each need

I'd like to emphasize that we each need to speak clearly and loudly, to make sure that the court reporter can accurately transcribe the teleconference.

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

Now, I would like to have the NRC meeting participants to introduce themselves. I ask that all of the participants clearly state for the record your name, your position, and your organization.

I will start with myself, and then turn it over to the other NRC participants here in the room.

My name is Alison Rivera, and I am a Technical Assistant for the Division of Intergovernmental Liaison and Rulemaking, the Office Federal Materials of and State and Environmental Management Programs.

CHAIR GIITTER: Okay. I'm Joe Giitter,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| 1  | I'm the Director of the Division of Risk Assessment, |
|----|--|
| 2  | in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulations.        |
| 3  | MR. BILLERBECK: This is John Billerbeck.             |
| 4  | I'm a Mechanical Engineer in the Division of         |
| 5  | Engineering in NRR.                                  |
| 6  | MR. BANIC: Lee Banic, Petition                       |
| 7  | Coordinator, NRR.                                    |
| 8  | MR. GUZMAN: Rich Guzman. I'm a Senior                |
| 9  | Project Manager in the Division of Operating Reactor |
| 10 | Licensing, in the Office of NRR.                     |
| 11 | MS. RIVERA: That completes the                       |
| 12 | introductions of the NRC staff in this room. At this |
| 13 | time, are there any NRC participants from            |
| 14 | Headquarters on the phone?                           |
| 15 | MR. RAZZAQUE: This is Mohammed Razzaque,             |
| 16 | from Reactor Systems Branch, NRR.                    |
| 17 | MS. MONTIETH: Emily Montieth, Office of              |
| 18 | General Counsel.                                     |
| 19 | MS. RIVERA: Are there any NRC                        |
| 20 | participants from the regional offices on the phone? |
| 21 | MR. BOWER: Yes, this is Fred Bower. I'm              |
| 22 | an Acting Branch Chief from Region 1.                |
| 23 | MS. RIVERA: At this time, will the                   |
| 24 | representatives for Entergy Nuclear Operations,      |
| 25 | Incorporated, Licensee for program, introduce        |
|    |  |

| 1   | themselves?  |
|-----|--|
| 2   | MR. LYNCH: This is Joe Lynch, Licensing              |
| 3   | Manager, Pilgrim Station.                            |
| 4   | MS. RIVERA: Mr. Mulligan, would you                  |
| 5   | please introduce yourself for the record?            |
| 6   | MR. MULLIGAN: I'm Mike Mulligan. I'm a               |
| 7   | whistle blower. I was in the Navy on an experimental |
| 8   | pass protect submarine. I worked as a Reactor        |
| 9   | Operator for a number of years, and I've worked at a |
| L O | nuclear power plant.                                 |
| 1   | Thank you.   |
| _2  | MS. RIVERA: Thank you.                               |
| L3  | Are there any other, such as members of              |
| 4   | the public, on the phone?                            |
| L 5 | And, for our court reporter, can you also            |
| L 6 | please state your name?                              |
| L 7 | COURT REPORTER: This is Sam Wojack. I'm              |
| 8 ـ | the court reporter.                                  |
| L 9 | MS. RIVERA: Before we begin, I'd like to             |
| 2 0 | first share some general background on the 2.206     |
| 21  | process.   |
| 22  | Section 2.206 of Title X of the Code of              |
| 23  | Federal Regulations, describes the petition process, |
| 24  | the primary mechanism for the public to request      |
| 25  | enforcement action by the NRC in a public process.   |

This process permits anyone to petition NRC to take enforcement-type action related to NRC licensees or license activities. Depending on the results of this

evaluation, NRC could modify, suspend, or revoke an NRC issued license, or take any other appropriate enforcement action to resolve the problem.

The NRC staff quidance for the disposition of a 2.206 petition request is Management Directive 8.11, which is publicly available.

Again, the purpose of today's teleconference is to give the Petitioner opportunity to provide any additional support for the petition, in light of the Petition Review Board's initial recommendation.

This teleconference is not a hearing, nor is it an opportunity for the Petitioner to question examine the PRB on the merits or the issues presented in the petition request.

No decisions regarding the merits of this petition will be made at this teleconference.

Following this teleconference, the Board will Petition Review conduct its internal deliberations. outcome of these internal The

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

deliberations will then be discussed with the Petitioner.

The Petition Review Board, typically, consists of a chairman, usually a manager at the Senior Executive Service level at the NRC. It has a petition manager and other members of the Board, as determined by the NRC staff, based on the content of the information in the petition request.

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

Also, as described in our process, the Licensees have been invited to participate in today's teleconference, to ensure that they understand the concerns about their facility or activity.

While the Licensees may also ask questions to clarify the issues raised by the Petitioner, I would like to stress that the Licensees are not a part of the PRB's decision-making process.

I will now turn the teleconference over to Joe Giitter, the PRB Chairman, who will discuss the specific petition under consideration.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

CHAIR GIITTER: Okay, thank you, Alison.

I would like to begin by summarizing the PRB's understanding of the scope of the petition under consideration, and described the NRC's activities to date.

On March, 2013, Mr. Mulligan submitted to the NRC a petition on 2.206 regarding concerns with the safety relief valves, or SRVs, at the Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station.

In his petition request, Mr. Mulligan requests that the NRC immediately shut down Pilgrim Nuclear Station on the basis of the Licensee is operating the plant in an unsafe condition with defective or inoperable safety relief valves.

also indicates The Petitioner that incapable of maintaining safety Entergy is In addition, the plant. Petitioner quality of requests the NRC to not allow the Pilgrim Plant to restart following shutdown until they understand past failure mechanisms of the defective SRVs at Pilgrim.

As support for this request, Mr. Mulligan states, in short, that the repeated nature of the failure of the SRVs at Pilgrim demonstrates that Entergy does not understand the mechanism of the failure and that defective or inoperable SRVs at a

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

nuclear power plant is unsafe.

Mr. Mulligan also states that the NRC is allowing the plant to operate with unsafe SRVs until the next refueling outage, and is covering up an unsafe condition at Pilgrim.

Mr. Mulligan requests an investigation by the Office of the Inspector General for his concern.

Now, I would like to talk about what NRC has done to date on this.

On March 14, 2013, 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 by phone or in person.

The Petitioner requested to address the PRB by phone, prior to its internal meeting to make the initial recommendation to either accept or reject the petition for review.

On April 11, 2013, Mr. Mulligan addressed the PRB via teleconference. The PRB then held its internal PRB meeting on May 6, 2013, and on May 22, 2013, Mr. Mulligan was informed of the PRB's initial recommendation regarding the petition, which is to reject the petition for review, because in accordance with Management Directive 8.11 Petitioner did not provide sufficient facts, or any element of support,

beyond the basic assertion for the inquiry.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In addition, the PRB notes that the Petitioner did not identify a violation of an NRC requirement, or did Petitioner provide significant new information to warrant the request of enforcement action.

As for its initial support recommendation, the PRB notes that the Licensee's operability evaluation for SRVs that have leaked at Pilgrim have been reviewed by the NRC inspectors, and determined to be adequately justified. The Licensee has also complied with the applicable tech specs, and demonstrated t.hat. SRVs monitored has are maintained in a condition that ensures that they will perform their safety function.

Additionally, the NRC staff continues to monitor and collect operating experience on SRV leakage problems. While the staff acknowledges that industry has seen, and is investigating leaking SRVs of this specific design, the NRC staff's evaluation no industry operational data to date indicates that the specific SRV model or design at Pilgrim poses a real significant safety concern.

As a reminder for the phone participants, please identify yourself if you make any remarks, as

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 this will help us in the preparation of the meeting 2 transcript that will be made publicly available. 3 Thank you. Mr. Mulligan, I'll now turn it over to 5 you, to allow you to provide any information you believe the PRB should consider as part of 6 decision. 7 8 MR. MULLIGAN: Okay. You talked about an that you 9 going allegation were to submit, 10 allegation note or something. What was that about? I'm just curious. 11 12 MS. RIVERA: The PRB will review transcript to ensure that there is no allegation with 13 sensitive information. 14 15 MR. MULLIGAN: Okay, thank you. I will just say that, you know, like I've 16 always been talking about the NRC kind of says I have 17 no proof about the system as far as the access to the 18 19 information is zilch, and you give LERs, you give inaccurate, falsified information to the public as 20 far as disclosures and stuff like that. 21 somebody like me 22 So, how can have confidence in the NRC doing their job? 23 Here's a June 11th Forbes article on San 24 Onofre, and southern California citizens problems 25

with their entire nuclear energy sector. So, a nuclear energy sector has taken a blow now that Southern California Edison has decided to permanently close this troubled nuclear plant. Safety is a key concern. So is honesty and transparency.

So, you know, you can take -- you guys talk about risk, this doesn't have any risk and stuff like that, and I'm telling you this has enormous risk for the community and you guys.

You know, if you keep going on in this direction, where, you know, a dual plant like San Onofre, you know, we get the feeling that the NRC is not enforcing their regulations correctly, and their perceptions of what the regulations state is so grossly obscene that, you know, we mistrust the agency. I mean, that's a risk of a different sort, that you don't even take into consideration.

And, this risk business, as far as giving me the information, you know, as far as what is going on with those valves, seeing the, you know, internal documents and stuff like that, that is the same as San Onofre had at its deepest core. You guys can hide your information away from the public, and you can have these special interpretations of rules and regulations, as far as, you know, not having a proper

license amendment request and stuff like that, you can bend the rules, and stuff like that, you know, that's atrocious to think that that -- you know, all you guys deal with is the risk associated with, you know, as far as these engineers' calculations nobody can understand.

And, you don't look at the holistic risk, as far as your behavior, how we, the public, see this, and what garbage you've got in your document and stuff like that that's the essence of, you know, I talk about the tree-wise monkey architecture of Federal rules. I would include the way you interpret things, you know, the see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil, the idea that you interpret things behind the scenes that nobody can make sure that you are telling the truth and disclosing everything, and all that sort of stuff.

And, that's what I'm talking about. That's what we are seeing in front of us, you know, a Pilgrim plant here, they've had a lot of protests, a lot of towns, you know, have given their hope as far as wanting to shut that down, and, evidently, nobody feels, you know, with San Onofre and a whole bunch of other events everybody feels nervous about disclosing things. And, you know, you keep your things in your

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

desk, and I mean that seems to be what's going on here. The more you get frightened about events happening in front of us, the more you hide things, and the more destructive it's going to be, as far as hiding events, and not taking care of these things right, and turning off the public in ways.

So, you know, the new LER, I forget what the most recent one, is startling, things that were disclosed in that. And, of course, I put this to 2.206 before the LER came in, was written up.

Anyways, Ι get а joke out of the Frankenstein Pilgrim SRV valve 3B, in an inspection report of 2013, 00 May 8th, the inspectors observed a plant shutdown on January 20, after operators had identified significant leakage on SRV 3B pilot valve. First stage temperature indicated a temperature greater than 35 degrees. This exceeded the limits in their procedures, and required the operating crew to declare SRV 3B inoperable. And, you consequently shut down and stuff like that.

And, you either repaired it or replaced it, but, certainly, you must have tested it. And then, you know, so on January 20th, January, February, I don't know, two, three weeks later on, operators responded to further shut down the plant.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

They started it back up, and on February 3rd operators responded and affirmed indications of pilot leakage on SRV 3B, following its repair and forced outage 1906. Pilgrim remained at 80 percent power until Blizzard Nemo took the plant down.

And so, you know, this is atrocious behavior, that's one example, you know. You so-called fixed the valve, and, I mean, you know, is it risky as far an engineering calculation on the relative work on the component, involved with the component, and stuff like that, do you guys deal with risk? Or, is it risky, the actual behavior or Entergy not to be able to have a leak, fix it, and with days of starting up the valve starts leaking again, and then they are forced to have a power restriction and stuff like that.

So, you guys interpret this as there's no safety issues, and what you can see over the period when they purchased these valves, and stuff like that, it's just atrocious utility and NRC behavior, as far as, you know, engineering quality, and, you know, you know what's going on with your plant, and you have the tools in front of you that you could quickly repair it. You know, this risk business is an excuse to do nothing, and that's how this turns

out.

This risk business and calculation is an excuse to do nothing, and it's not an excuse to pay attention to our plant. I mean, it's not a tool that forces you to pay attention to your plant, and purchase the quality of valve that is necessary and stuff, and to repair it correctly, and test it. You know, like this business here, it was started up and it leaked again. And, this isn't the first time.

When they purchased them brand new valves and put them in for the first time, they had leaks within weeks of starting up again. Can you imagine that, how that looks, as far as people like me outside, the way we see this. You know, you guys want the most important valve components in the nuclear plant, and you can't figure out the quality that is necessary for their duty, and they start failing within two weeks, the new valves start failing within two weeks. And then, you people have the gall to come back and say, oh, well, this doesn't meet any of our -- this is all safe, and this is real good stuff, everything is okay.

Even to this day, even to this day with two shutdowns over these valves, you are heading for a third shutdown, you have an association of power

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

restrictions and stuff like that, almost three shutdowns and six or eight power restrictions at different times and all that sort of stuff.

And, the last LER states that we still don't know what's wrong with those valves, and we are doing further investigation. Is that what nuclear power has come to, as far as, you know, you guys don't have the sense of quality and expertise and honesty to deal with these things relatively immediately, and the analysis gives you the excuse that nothing ever matters, that we can run these things into the ground, into the dirt.

I mean, you know, most of the public doesn't really understand what's going on here, but I do, and you do, too. And, allowing this stuff to go on here, and somebody not raising a stink is astonishing, especially, within the NRC.

I'm going to go back to the first LER for a few comments there. At this time, the most -- this is the first LER, LER 2011 007-00, right? At this time, the most probably root cause are problems during the initial manufacturing and their assembly of the pilot at the Target Rock prior to installation at the site.

CHAIR GIITTER: Could you restate that?

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 MR. MULLIGAN: At the time, the most 2 probable root cause were problems during the initial manufacturing or assembly of the pilot at the Target 3 Rock prior to installation on the site. 5 Wile Labs, Target Rock and Entergy are looking into these problems. 6 The identified condition, is a leaking 7 8 SRV pilot, based on the only pilot -- you know, 9 you've got to say this, what this is, the report date, the event date, 12/26, right, 12/26, yes, the 10 pilot leaks, and this is what I'm talking about. This 11 12 is gross falsification of Federal documents. gross falsification of Federal documents by NRC, by 13 Entergy, and the NRC doesn't call them on it. 14 15 Based on the review of the data, the only 16 pilot to exhibit leakage is RV --17 MS. RIVERA: Mr. Mulligan? MR. MULLIGAN: Yes. 18 19 MS. RIVERA: This is Alison Rivera. We about your previous 20 question over here trying to figure if 21 statement, out that's an additional allegation. 22 23 MR. MULLIGAN: Yes, it is. CHAIR GIITTER: Could you, specifically, 24 state the allegation again, Mr. Mulligan? 25

| Т   | MR. MULLIGAN: Okay, based on the plant                |
|-----|---|
| 2   | data, the only "The only pilot valve that exhibits    |
| 3   | signs of leakage is RV 203-3B."                       |
| 4   | And, let me see if I can the last LER                 |
| 5   | indicates that within weeks of starting up the plant  |
| 6   | they had a leak they had a leak on a valve, and       |
| 7   | then a month before the first LER they had another    |
| 8   | leak on it.   |
| 9   | And, when I get to that LER, I'll                     |
| L 0 | identify that, the time frame.                        |
| 1   | CHAIR GIITTER: Okay. Could you just                   |
| L2  | restate the allegation again? I'm not sure I got      |
| L3  | everything.   |
| 4   | MR. MULLIGAN: Okay. The LER that I'm                  |
| _5  | talking about, 2007 007-00 it quotes right here, "The |
| 16  | only pilot valve to exhibit signs of leakage is RV    |
| L 7 | 2003-3." 2003-3, RV 2003-3B.                          |
| 8 . | "The only pilot valve to exhibit signs of             |
| 9   | leakage is RV 2003-3," and they had two prior leaks   |
| 20  | that they didn't disclose in this LER.                |
| 21  | You got it?   |
| 22  | CHAIR GIITTER: Yes, the LER was 2007-                 |
| 23  | 007?  |
| 24  | MR. MULLIGAN: 2011.                                   |
|     | CHAIR GIITTER: 2011, I'm sorry.                       |

MR. MULLIGAN: So, this guy is -- the event date is 12/26/2011 and two prior events before that -- there was two prior events before that, that they had leaks that they didn't disclose, that they later disclosed on the most recent LER.

Okay?

CHAIR GIITTER: Thank you.

MR. MULLIGAN: And, this is another one. This is another allegation. Because the leakage established by procedure did not affect the SRV set pressure, or capacity, the SRV would have been able to respond if needed to meet core cooling or reactor vessel over pressure, over pressure detection function.

And, the most recent LER says that there was a leakage effect of the SRV open set point. And so, I mean, the idea that they are saying it did not affect the SRV set pressure or capacity set pressure, you have to meet set pressure.

So, and then later on, because of the leakage you did have an SRV that exceeded its plus or minus 3 percent opening set point level. And, if you would have known about that, I believe it was 3.8, if you would have known about that they would have been required to shut the plant down.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

And so, you now, you are sitting here -you know, he makes a kind of a simple statement that the procedure did not affect the SRV set point pressure. So, what is thinking of these guys, you Okay, we've got leaks here and stuff like know? If it hasn't reached its set -- it hasn't been inaccurate yet, but, you know, is the engineers going down there anticipating the future, can we opening set points inaccuracy problems that we can't see and stuff like that. We could, essentially, have a set of SRVs that would not be able to reach -- be at their accuracy level, plus or minus 3 percent, and stuff like that.

So, you know, the idea that these guys can say to themselves do an analysis and say, oh, and one of the issues we could have in the future with our crazy SRVs that keep malfunctioning on us, is we could have an inaccurate opening of an SRV. We could have an inaccurate opening of an SRV for an over pressure condition caused by the leak. I mean, is anybody thinking about these things, about how set pressure could become inaccurate?

And then you say to yourself, well, do they even test for set pressure on all these leaking valves that they had, and stuff like that. Do they

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

check themselves and say, hey, we are going to do a an opening, with these defective leaking valves we are going to do -- and, you know, we are going to raise up questions to the valve opening and see where it begins to open, and see if the leakage has caused set pressure problems and stuff like that.

Is anybody doing that kind of stuff?

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You know, so there's an issue that, you know, they really assumed that the leaking wouldn't cause any SRV set pressure problems in the future, and, of course, we know that they did.

and here's another one with leaking -- the leaks that they didn't disclose. There is no previous first-stage leakage occurring at these safety relief valves since all four safety relief valves were newly installed in May April/May, 2011, during refueling outage 18.

But, you know, they made the assertion in Federal documents that there was no prior leakage, and you know there's two other -- there's two other leakages that, you know, I should have been, you know, outsiders should have been notified. And, we should have seen how inaccurate these safety relief valves are, and how unreliable, and how incompetently Entergy has dealt with the -- Entergy and Target Rock

has dealt with these safety relief valves.

Now, just like San Onofre, if you hide things it's going to be ten times worse when something bad happens, instead of being open and out front, and making, you know, people want to talk about things, and making an effort to talk about those issues, instead of just kind of -- you know, hiding, you know, the politicians above us, Congress and, you know, the hateful Republicans and all that sort of stuff, they are going to vaporize us if we open our mouths, or if we enforce regulation and stuff like that. And so, I'll be quiet, you know, see no evil, hear no evil, and speak no evil.

If you get into that San Onofre mindset, that's more destructive than a meltdown, as far as I'm concerned.

And, here's another one. However, the industry has experienced leakage with other Target rock model safety relief valves at other plants. Other, you know, there's Entergy, how come they didn't -- you know, it sounds like there was that they admit in that last LER, the newest LER, that there was a set of issues which are three-stage Target Rock relief valves. Again, you know, taking the narrow thing that, you know, maybe it's not an

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

other model, you know, being this model isn't leaking, or however they want to term it, but there was leaks with three-stage Target Rock. However, the industry has experienced leakage with other Target rock model safety relief valves.

You know, they are saying that the three-stage relief valve, the three-stage doesn't have leakage problems in the industry, when in reality there was a host of Target Rock model safety relief valves that were leaking, and it's not full disclosure.

You know, how do you -- how do you -- you know, if there was widespread issues in the industry with three-stage safety relief valves, how is outsiders, like a guy like me, supposed to, you know, utilize it, if you guys don't want to, you know, deal with your problems, it's just up to me to try and figure out what's going on and trying to help you guys do the right thing.

With these issues in the 2.206, I mean, if you hide information on me, and stuff like that, then it negates the 2.206 process. It makes me -- it makes me -- I don't have any information. And, you keep coming back at me that, you know, I don't have any information, that type of thing, and stuff like

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

that.

So, everybody feels comfortable that I don't have any evidence. You know, is that because there's no evidence, or is that because a whole ton of evidence is being hidden from me. Those are completely different things.

You know, the OE business, and all the internal documents that Entergy has, the OE, you know, safety relief temperature phenomenon at Target Rock, and stuff like that, you know, it's all hidden from me. It's all hidden from guys like me, and when you do that you prevent a guy like me from stopping you from doing the San Onofre, you know, as far as, you know, harassing you, and making you slow down, and making you do the right thing, and stuff like that, you hide it. And that, in essence, causes these big events where you end up losing the trust of people around the plant, and you have to shut down the plant, or the plant operation.

You know, and then we go into the -- I've already talked about this, then we go into the following, you know, this is the next -- this was the update on that LER of 2011, Level 2, and, you know, there was -- and it talks about all the different, you know, testing and all that sort of stuff, like,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

you know, no big deal, everything is cool. We looked over and we find no -- who was it, there was a whole bunch of you guys involved, Southern Company, Wile Labs, Entergy, and who else, there was another one, and stuff, and you made a big deal over that first LER, that first leak and stuff, and you had another shutdown, shutdown another new with the NEMO blizzard, with that bad valve, and then like I told you, then you replaced the valve with a new, fully tested valve, and within days it leaks up, it has leaks again, just like when you installed that valve for the first -- these valves for the first time, within two weeks you have an indication of leakage.

You had, before the first shutdown you had two leakages and stuff like that. This is heightened, and in the NRC's mind this is right? This is the right outcome to deny me a 2.206 because I don't have enough evidence and stuff like that? This is right, that you don't fix this thing?

I don't know, it's still up in the air as far as what's causing all these shutdowns and stuff like that, not only at Pilgrim, but other plants, and stuff. It's right?

We are the United States of America, the best country on the planet, and stuff like that, and

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

this doesn't reflect well on us at all as a democracy, and the essence of being truthful, honest to each other, especially, with these endeavors that have a lot of energy in them and stuff like that. It's wrong.

So, here we go. We have in the update, no additional corrective actions are recommended on the results of testing, inspection and evaluation of the leaking pilot valve, by a three team of Wile Labs, Target Rock and Entergy. You know, these things -- you know, and then we talk about 10 CFR 21, that for the first time in the industry it's ever happened that the bellows had a crack in it, and we don't know -- we are not clear whether that came from a -- it came from directly from plant operation, you know, they shut down, then they tested it, and then whether it was, certainly it up, certainly, heading back to the plant, and then you say that these valves, in an emergency, you know, can operate between 250 to 500 times, you know, in a dire accident, you know, the worst accident you imagine, no electricity and stuff like that.

And, you know, you've got this defect in the bellows that, you know, nobody still -- and it's just astonishing, you guys are educated, and you've

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

got a whole bunch of processes and stuff like that, and you can't -- it takes you years. I mean, the LER process sounds like the engineer, it's not engineering to engineer these documents to tell the truth, it's giving them the excuse to hide it, you know, we'll do another update, and we'll just ignore it, and we'll falsify documents in front of you. And, the NRC will, you know, hear no evil, see no evil, and speak no evil.

They have a ton of rules, but interpret them in a special way that nobody can see if they are doing it right. I just -- it's mind boggling, when you consider how big this thing is. and you have the update, and however You know, industry has experienced leakage with other Target -you know, however, the industry has experienced leakage with other Target Rock model safety relief valves at other plants. Why isn't there a thing, we have -- let's be honest, you know, and up front, instead of giving you a baloney sentence like that, why couldn't they give a list of all the plants, you know, all the plants that had problems with threestage relief valves.

In the LER, they've got the three-stage guys in there, you know, San Onofre again, how come

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

nobody -- how come in that license amendment request, put these three-stage guys in there, how come they didn't talk about all the vulnerability of three-stage valves. How come they didn't talk about all the leakages with three-stage Target Rock relief valves in that LER. You know, how come, you know, they quoted regulations business and all that sort of stuff, you know, and happy land, these are new valves replacing old valves, how come you never talk about, you know, the thermability of these three-stage valves, what problems there were in the industry, and that type of thing.

How come -- is that all the documents, you know, all the NRC's documents and LERs in the industry, the happy land, this is the happy land version of documentation, and we are the professional class of incomplete and inaccurate Federal documents and stuff like that. Is that what this -- is that what's going on here with LERs in general and stuff like that, or, you know, like for like processes and stuff like that, is anybody going behind the scenes and talking and interpreting these things in a way for themselves, and not for what's in the interest of our country.

That stuff, it asks so much of us, it

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

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

asks so much of us to be better people, and so we'll go to the new one. This is the quy that is kind of interesting, you know. I did write my 2.206 before this, right, and I did have my first transcript thing there, so this is a new one. And, you know what it's talking about, SRV 3B, safety relief valve declared inoperable due to leakage and set point drift, right? This guy is still going to say, at the end of it, after all of this in the industry we still don't know what's wrong with these safety relief valves. We are still investigating it. Is that what we've come down it takes two years and you are still that investigating it? Is it going to be another ten years before you come to a solution with this, and you've become honest with people and stuff like that? Do you know how dangerous this kind of

Do you know how dangerous this kind of stuff is to you guys, you know, if an accident shows up, and it turns off everybody, this is extraordinarily dangerous stuff. You see the problem we face if all of a sudden everyone has lost faith in the NRC, and we start turning off these plants nillywilly, you know, we lose a tremendous amount of electricity, electrical capacity, because you guys are mistrustful.

You say you follow the rules, and you

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

create meticulously accurate documents, but you play these document games and selective disclosures, you space these things for a date, you know, months down the line. Your fine LER is obscenely inaccurate and falsified, and it's all staged to not come up with a solution or accurately describe what's It's an excuse to delay fixing these going on. things and keeping a plant in operation, when they shouldn't be in operation. It's an excuse for, you know, Entergy, or any other plant in the United we've got a problem and States, you know, shouldn't play these document dancing games whenever we feel like it and stuff like that, and we can delay admitting what's going on here for months.

Now, with Vermont Yankee with the safety relief threaded seal business, you won't admit to it, but you did the same thing. And so, then we go down, automatic depressuring provides for tanks interpreting the thermocoupling data and determine valve operating, based in part on testing performed by Target Rock. Can I see that? Can I see that -can I talk to somebody in Target Rock and say, you what is your indications when you have a leaking relief valve, what is the failure rate of set point inaccuracy problems, you know, about not

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

lifting plus or minus three at the right pressure.

See, and remember, this is the guy that you asked me the question about. So, as far as the installation of RF2, oh, man, I'm getting all excited, the installation in RF018 and prior to this Pilgrim experience, minor second stage valve leakage from SRV, RV203-3C. We know, from this one, too, it's the first stage and the second stage, different components here. So, and, basically, you know, you've got the inaccuracy problems, and then you've got the bellows issues. You know, these things are all broken up into little pieces with you guys, and you see the happy tune side of it, and stuff like that.

What happens if you put everything together? Do you think the bellows thing was just a coincidence? Do you think this whole cycle was just a coincidence that just happened? Hey, you know, almost three shutdowns and all these things, can you imagine the money associated with this, with these three shutdowns, three-day shutdowns, a million and a half, maybe \$2 million a day or more, and stuff like that. Is this competency?

I don't understand how the CEO gets away with this stuff, that he can have an organization

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that's so incompetent, and they can't see each other that he is sabotaging the operation of this plant because he's losing money on full-quality valves, you know, in a host of ways. I can't understand, I hope this isn't going on throughout the whole fleet, where these guys are so incompetent and, you know, reckless, as far as with money, with Entergy, I don't see how they get away with it.

So, we are going to get done reading that Pilgrim experience minus second-stage pilot valve leakage from SRV RV203-3C on May 18, 2011. That's two weeks, wasn't anybody astonished, brand new valves, this is a mature design of valves. We've had these valves in the system for many decades, and two weeks after installing brand new valves they start leaking.

And then November 2nd, they start leaking again and stuff like that, and nobody does nothing? You know, no, it will go away, we'll just ignore it and it will go away. Every time they have a shutdown, or whatever stuff, we don't have to tell anybody, and it will go away. We don't have to --you know, all this my interest and stuff like that, you'd think before they start it up they would have, you know, said, oh, we found the problem, and it's

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

taken care of, fixed for sure this time. Would you trust them, though, with falsifying documents like they've done, and the NRC sitting back and playing, what is that one, the wise monkey stuff.

November 25th and December So, 26th, 2011, the first two leaks, that was never disclosed until this last -- you know, and then they -- I never got to see this LER until the plant was shut down, you know. Do you know what that stinks of? You quys were structuring closure of this valve in a safe shutdown, and stuff like that. Is that what was going on here with Entergy is saying, well, we don't want to admit this when the plant was in operation. We don't want to, you know -- we probably have some -- we don't have to disclose these things within a certain amount of time, they just have to do it when they feel like it, when it's convenient, when the plant is in a safe condition, a shutdown condition, and they won't be threatened by a shutdown, you know.

As I said, do we have to get in this environment where everybody is so scared, you know, the San Onofre shutdown, and a host of other threats going on and stuff like that, and then pretty soon, you know, they are pulling in the horns, and we come in a dictatorship state, essentially, with releasing

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

information. The security causes us to close down, to be like a -- not the great United States America, our country, we are with our legal systems and all that sort of stuff, are we becoming something that we shouldn't be, because we are fearful, and because, you know, it has to -- you know, it becomes a turmoil, and troubles like that, do we hinder to our basic instincts, or do we come bigger than we are, we have to be, we come bigger and better than we normally are. Does our character ask us or tell us into being more open? I don't feel I should be closed, I try to be bigger than that. got to be bigger in front of my family, in front of my Nation, and I've got to set my sites to a standard that purports to our Constitution, that this is the ideals of our Constitution, openness, earnestness, integrity, trustworthy, and I'm a man of my honor, or a woman.

Or, do I fiddle around with these rules, I twist them around, and, you know, we all think we are following the rules, but the product is that we are getting falsified and inaccurate information out there. We sit back and be happy that we are following the rules, and nobody can -- not outsiders can really understand if you are following the rules,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

or you are misinterpreting the rules and regulations and stuff like that.

And, you know, it goes down to this thing of character and honor and stuff. If you don't have that, you know, I'd rather have character and honor than rules, really, when you get down to it. I believe you can be good people, and being good, and honest, and transparent, and stuff like that, can bail you out of a lot of trouble type of thing.

And, you know, fiddling around with rules, and disclosures, and, you know, playing it safe, you are asking for a disaster of enormous magnitude, and it doesn't have to, necessarily, be a core meltdown, it could be an integrity meltdown, like at San Onofre.

So, with the condition potentially high, here we go, condition potentially placed on all four states SRV valves that were installed in RF018, how come that ain't raising back the hairs on everybody's head. This is common mode failure. It's diagnosed and they don't know what's causing it, or they won't admit it, is that what -- I mean, like I said, is that what's going on here, they know what's going on her but they just holding it for money reasons, not to lay the blame disclosing what's going on here and

stuff.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I know I've got three minutes left.

You know, that bugs me, May 18, 2011, two weeks after the start-up of brand new valves, and November 22nd, then they lied about it on December They lied about it in documents. 2.206 problem is supposed to give a guy like me the ability to create transparency and change your mind, change your hearts and minds and stuff like that. That's what the 2.206 -- it's bigger -- I'm an idiot, and I'm a peon and an ant, but it's supposed to be something that is bigger than me, and bigger than you, and it's supposed to be a tool of transparency, where our Nation gets to see what's going on, and give support to the ideals of what a great nation is, great character, and honor, and integrity. That's what the 2.206 problem is.

And, the way this thing is instituted now is that, it's a tool of the devil, and then we get to talk about my deviation 3.8, if they would have seen that, if they would have magically had the God's-eye view of seeing that 3.8, they would have had to shut down.

I know, these guys don't test it until they are shut down, but there's a requirement if it

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

goes past the 3.8 -- 3.0, you are supposed to shut down, but you don't test it. It's mind boggling.

Additional corrective actions will be implemented based on the results of testing, inspection and evaluation of the first -- leaking first stage from the 2B valve.

You know, the risk of operating the valves, the risks of operating the SRV characterized by increased chance, right? They had problems this last time, you didn't know if the valve was open or shut because they couldn't hear the noise monitor, or the noise detector, acoustical detector, you know. I don't know what that was all about.

But, having an inadvertent open SRV would increase chance of valve failure to reclose. That's important, but, you know, you guys don't talk about putting an accurate set point pressure on it. They maybe talk about -- talking about the set point drift, and they don't even talk about -- you know, you were quiet once it got back 3.0, we are supposed to -- and then, you know, industry has experienced numerous instances where SRV leakage has occurred at other plants with other Target Rock three-stage relief valves. I'd like to know what that means, with other -- you know, so you could have other

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Target Rock model three-stage relief valves, I mean, there's more than one model for three-stage relief valves, you know.

But, here they start talking about, you know, three-stage relief valves at Plant Hatch, and other things, and then they start talking about the three stage, you know. Oh, we've had other problems, even that first LER talks to us about we have leakage in that other valve, not the model we are using here type of language, and now they are talking about, oh, well, you know, here's a list of three-stage relief valves that we've had.

You know, that whole thing, honesty, integrity, and I'm a man of character type of thing, you know, an organization, I never would write a bad report, an organization never forces me to write a bad or an inaccurate report, because I'm a man of integrity. I will not tolerate that kind of business type of thing.

And, I guess, you know, you know my issues with the Navy rock that go shut down with the weather instrumentation.

Yes, I'm done.

CHAIR GIITTER: Thank you, Mr. Mulligan.

At this time, does any staff here at

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 Headquarters have any questions for Mr. Mulligan? CHAIR GIITTER: Thank you. What about 2 the region? 3 MR. BOWER: None. 5 CHAIR GIITTER: Thank you. Before I conclude the meeting -- well, we 6 7 don't have any members of the public, or we didn't, 8 so I just want to make sure there's no members of the 9 public on the bridge. Okay. As stated in the opening, the purpose of 10 this meeting is not to provide an opportunity for the 11 12 Petitioner or the public to question or examine the PRB regarding the merits of the petition request. 13 Mr. Mulligan, I thank you for taking time 14 to provide the NRC staff with verifying information 15 on the petition you submitted. The PRB plans to meet 16 17 internally, and discuss the matter one more time. Before we close, does the court reporter 18 any additional information for the meeting 19 need transcript? 20 COURT REPORTER: No, I've got everything, 21 thanks. 22 CHAIR GIITTER: Thank you. With that, 23 the meeting is concluded, and we'll be terminating 24 25 the phone connection.

42 MR. MULLIGAN: And, thank you very much 1 2 for this opportunity. CHAIR GIITTER: Okay, thank you, Mr. 3 Mulligan. 5 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter was concluded at 4:03 p.m.) 6 8 9 10 11 12