

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: 10 CFR 2.206 Petition Review Board re:
Petition Dated September 13, 2017

Docket Number: N/A

Location: Telephonic

Date: January 31, 2018

Work Order No.: NRC-3496

Pages 1-57

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

10 CFR 2.206 PETITION REVIEW BOARD (PRB)

CONFERENCE CALL RE

PETITION DATED SEPTEMBER 13, 2017

FOR ALL RENEWED

REACTOR OPERATING LICENSEES AND APPLICANTS

FOR REACTOR RENEWED OPERATING LICENSES

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

JANUARY 31, 2018

+ + + + +

The conference call was held, Joseph
Donoghue, Chairperson of the Petition Review Board,
presiding.

PETITIONER: SAMUEL MIRANDA

PETITION REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:

JOSEPH DONOGHUE, Deputy Director, Division of
Materials and License Renewal

LOIS JAMES, Petition Manager for 2.206
Petition

MARCIA SIMON, Senior Attorney, Office of
General Counsel

ERIC OESTERLE, Branch Chief, Division of
Materials and License Renewals, License
Renewal Projects Branch

DAVID JONES, Office of Enforcement

JERRY DOZIER, Senior Risk Analyst, Division of
Risk Assessment; Radiation
Protection and Consequences Branch

NRC HEADQUARTERS STAFF:

MERRILEE BANIC, Office of Nuclear Reactor
Regulation

ROBERT BEATON, Office of Nuclear Reactor
Regulation

DOUGLAS BROADDUS, Branch Chief, NRR

CRIS BROWN, Facilitator

KENNETH CLAIR, Office of the Inspector General

MEG GOLD, Facilitator

ALSO PRESENT:

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

JAN BOUDART, Nuclear Energy Information
Service
JESSIE COLLINS

C O N T E N T S

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

Page

Opening Remarks and Introduction.....	5
Discussion of Position Under Consideration.....	12
Petitioner Addresses PRB.....	17
Questions from NRC for Petitioner.....	37
Public Questions/Comments Regarding	
2.206 Process.....	47
Closing Remarks.....	52
Adjourn.....	56

NEAL R. GROSS

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

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

2 3:11 p.m.

3 MS. BROWN: All right. Good afternoon
4 everyone. I appreciate your patience. Welcome to
5 the January 31, 2018 Petition Review Board meeting
6 with the Petitioner, Mr. Samuel Miranda.

7 I'd like to thank everybody for attending
8 today. My name is Cris Brown. And with me is Meg
9 Gold. We are the co-facilitators for today's
10 meeting.

11 Our role is to ensure that today's
12 meeting is informative and productive. And we'll do
13 our best to make sure that everyone who wants to
14 participate, has a chance to express their views
15 without concern as to how those views will be
16 received.

17 We appreciate your assistance in
18 accomplishing this goal.

19 As a brief safety message for those of us
20 in the room, in the event of an emergency, please
21 exist to the doors behind us. And proceed as
22 directed by NRC staff.

23 The purpose of this meeting is for
24 Petitioner, Mr. Samuel Miranda, to address the
25 Petition Review Board, or PRB, regarding the PRB's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 initial recommendation to deny the September 13, 2017
2 petition, whether license renewal reviews address a
3 potential increase in the frequency of infrequent
4 incidents by 50 percent as a result to the extension
5 of the operating lifetime by 20 years, i.e., 50
6 percent.

7 In order words, the petition states that
8 a license renewal will significantly increase the
9 probability of a previously evaluated condition III
10 accident.

11 This meeting is scheduled from 3:12 to
12 4:12 p.m. Eastern time. It is being recorded by the
13 NRC Operations Center.

14 And it's being transcribed by a court
15 reporter. We've already confirmed that the court
16 reporter is on the line.

17 And the transcript will become a
18 supplement to the petition. The transcript will also
19 be made publically available. Prior to placing the
20 transcript in ADAMS, the PRB will review it to ensure
21 that it does not contain any allegations or sensitive
22 information.

23 To get a good transcript and to minimize
24 distractions, we ask that you turn off or mute any
25 device that rings, buzzes, beeps, or alarms. If you

NEAL R. GROSS

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

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 must answer any emergency call, we ask that you exit
2 the room before answering.

3 For those dialing into the meeting,
4 please remember to mute your phone. If you do not
5 have a mute button, this can be done by pressing the
6 key star six. And to unmute, press the star six key
7 again.

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

12 If you do have something that you would
13 like to say, please state your name for the record.
14 We also ask that you minimize any side conversations
15 during the meeting. We'll try to have only one
16 speaker at a time.

17 Now I'd like to have the NRC participants
18 introduce themselves. I ask all of you to clearly
19 state for the record, your name, your position, and
20 your organization.

21 For those here in the room, please speak
22 up so that those on the phone can hear. And that the
23 court reporter can accurately record your name.

24 I'll start with myself and the other NRC
25 participants in the room. So again, my name is Cris

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Brown. And I am one of the facilitators of this
2 meeting.

3 MS. GOLD: My name is Meg Gold. Also
4 with the NRC.

5 MR. DOZIER: I'm Jerry Dozier from the
6 Division of Risk Assessment.

7 MR. OESTERLE: Eric Oesterle, Chief of
8 the Licensing Projects Branch in the Division of
9 Materials and License Renewal, the Office of Nuclear
10 Reactor Regulation.

11 MR. BEATON: Robert Beaton, Reactor
12 Systems Branch.

13 MS. BANIC: Merrilee Banic, Office of
14 Nuclear Reactor Regulations.

15 MR. BROADDUS: Doug Broaddus, I'm the
16 Branch Chief in NRR's Division of Operation Reactor
17 Licensing.

18 MS. SIMON: Marcia Simon, I'm a Senior
19 Attorney in the Office of General Counsel.

20 MR. DONOGHUE: I'm Joe Donoghue, I'm the
21 Chair of the Petition Review Board for this Petition.

22 MS. JAMES: Lois James, Petition
23 Manager.

24 MS. BROWN: All right. Thank you.

25 MR. CLAIR: Ken Clair, Office of the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Inspector General as well.

2

3 MS. BROWN: Thank you. Thank you. Are
4 there any other participants from Headquarters on the
5 phone besides Ken?

6 (No response)

7 MS. BROWN: Are there any participants
8 from the Regional Offices on the phone?

9 (No response)

10 MS. BROWN: Okay. In view of the
11 potential number of licensees on the phone, instead
12 of each of you introducing yourselves, I'd like for
13 each of you to email your name, position, and
14 organization to Lois James, the Petition Manager.

15 And likewise for the public, it's not
16 required for members of the public to introduce
17 themselves. But if there are any on the phone that
18 wish to do so, email your name, position, and
19 organization to the Petitioner Manager, Lois James.

20 And she can be reached at
21 Lois.James@NRC.gov. That's L-O-I-S-J-A-M-E-S at
22 NRC.gov.

23 And finally, Mr. Miranda, will you
24 introduce yourself?

25 MR. MIRANDA: My name is Samuel Miranda.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And I'm the Petitioner, member of the public.

2 MS. BROWN: Thank you. Before we begin,
3 I'd like to share some general background on our
4 processes.

5 Section 2.206 of the Title 10 of the Code
6 of Federal Regulations describes the petition
7 process. The primary mechanism for the public to
8 request enforcement action by the NRC in a public
9 process.

10 This process permits anyone to petition
11 the NRC to take enforcement actions related to NRC
12 licensees or licensed activities.

13 Depending on the results of its
14 evaluation, the NRC could modify, suspend, or revoke
15 an NRC issued license, or take any other appropriate
16 enforcement actions to resolve a problem.

17 The NRC's staff guidance for the
18 disposition of 2.206 petition requests is in
19 Management Directive 8.11, which is publically
20 available.

21 The purpose of today's meeting is to give
22 the Petitioner an opportunity to provide a response
23 to the PRB's initial recommendation regarding the
24 September 13, 2017 Petition. This meeting is not a
25 hearing.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Nor is it an opportunity for the
2 Petitioner, licensees, or members of the public to
3 question or examine the PRB on the merits or the
4 issues presented in the petition request. No
5 decisions regarding the merits of this petition will
6 be made at this meeting.

7 Following this meeting, the PRB will
8 conduct follow up internal deliberations. The
9 outcome of this internal meeting will be discussed
10 with the dist -- the Petitioner, sorry, and
11 documented in a response letter.

12 The Petition Review Board typically
13 consists of a Chairman, usually a manager at the
14 Senior Executive Service Level at the NRC. The Board
15 also has a petition manager and a petition review
16 board coordinator.

17 Other members of the Board are determined
18 by the NRC staff based on the content of the
19 information in the petition request. The members of
20 the Board have already introduced themselves.

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 process.

2 Also as described in our process, the
3 licensees have been invited to participate in today's
4 meeting to ensure that they understand the concerns
5 about their facility or activities.

6 While the licensees may also ask
7 questions to clarify the issues raised by the
8 Petitioner, I want to stress, the licensees are not
9 part of the PRB's decision making process. Licensees
10 will have the opportunity to ask the Petitioner
11 questions after his presentation.

12 And then finally, members of the public
13 will have an opportunity to provide comments
14 regarding the petition, and ask the Petition Review
15 Board questions about the 2.206 process.

16 I'd like to now turn the meeting over to
17 Joseph Donoghue, the Chair of the Board, who will
18 discuss the specific position under consideration.
19 Joe.

20 MR. DONOGHUE: Thank you. Welcome Sam.
21 Welcome everybody here in the room and on the phone.

22 I would like to begin by summarizing the
23 Board's understanding of the scope of the Petition
24 under consideration. And the NRC activity to date.

25 On September 13, 2017, Petitioner

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 requested the NRC to suspend -- to one, suspend
2 licensees' authorizations to operate their plants for
3 any period beyond their originally licensed plants'
4 lifetimes until they can demonstrate that their
5 license renewals are not causing significant increase
6 in the probability of an accident previously
7 evaluated. Particularly with respect to Condition
8 III events.

9 Number two, suspend the review of
10 licensees' applications for authorization to operate
11 their plants for any period beyond their original
12 licensed lifetime, until they can demonstrate that
13 their license renewals will not cause a significant
14 increase in the possibility of an accident previously
15 evaluated. Particularly with respect to Condition
16 III events.

17 And number three, allow licensees who are
18 already operating a plant at their originally
19 licensed plant lifetime, a maximum of one year from
20 the date of the Petition to submit a plan and
21 schedule that produce a verifiable demonstration that
22 continued operation of their plant will not cause a
23 significant increase in probability of an accident
24 previously evaluated. Particularly with respect to
25 Condition III events.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 The Petitioner requested these actions
2 based on the statement, and I quote, "an extension of
3 the operating lifetime by 20 years, that is 50
4 percent, will cause a --

5 MS. BROWN: For those of you on the
6 phone, can I ask that you mute your line, please?

7 UNKNOWN: That we do -- I'm sorry, that
8 we do what?

9 MS. BROWN: Can you mute your phone for
10 us, please.

11 UNKNOWN: Mute it. Oh, sure.

12 MS. BROWN: Thanks.

13 COURT REPORTER: Hi. Sorry, this is the
14 Court Reporter. If I could just interrupt. Mr.
15 Donoghue, if you could get any closer to the phone,
16 that would be great.

17 I am just having a little trouble hearing
18 you.

19 MR. DONOGHUE: Okay. Thank you. All
20 right. I'll start that last statement again.

21 The Petitioner requested these actions
22 based on a statement, "an extension of the operating
23 lifetime by 20 years, that is by 50 percent, will
24 cause an increase in the frequency of infrequent
25 incidents by 50 percent."

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 In other words, if a license renewal will
2 significantly increase the probability of a
3 previously evaluated Condition III accident.
4 Consequently, an applicant for a license renewal
5 cannot truthfully claim that there is no significant
6 hazard associated with the proposed license renewal.

7 Petitioner defines no significant hazard
8 in accordance with 10 CFR Section 50.92, issuance of
9 an amendment, which specifies that a proposed license
10 amendment would not pose a significant hazard if
11 operation of the facility in accordance with the
12 proposed amendment would not involve a significant
13 increase in the probability of an accident previously
14 evaluated.

15 On October 5, 2017, the Petition Manager,
16 that's Lois James, offered the Petitioner an
17 opportunity to address the Petition Review Board
18 prior to its internal meeting to make the initial
19 recommendation to accept or reject the Petition for
20 review.

21 On October 10, the Petitioner stated he
22 wanted to address the PRB at a public meeting. On
23 November 17, 2017, the PRB held that meeting with Mr.
24 Miranda, the Petitioner, to hear directly from him,
25 his concerns and thoughts, and any additional

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 information regarding the Petition.

2 The discussion was documented in a
3 meeting summary with the Petitioner's slides and the
4 transcript attached. And that's in ADAMS accession
5 number ML17331A285.

6 On December 5 the PRB met internally to
7 discuss the Petition and the information provided by
8 the Petitioner during the November 17 public meeting.
9 And the criteria for reviewing petitions under 10 CFR
10 2.206.

11 The outcome of this meeting was an
12 initial recommendation regarding the Petition. And
13 the recommendation is that the Petition does not meet
14 the criteria for consideration under 10 CFR 2.206,
15 because the issues raised are not fact or constitute
16 the basis for taking the enforcement action specified
17 or that warrant further inquiry.

18 On January 3, 2018, the Petition Manager
19 informed the Petitioner of the PRB's initial
20 recommended decision. At that time the Petitioner
21 requested the opportunity to provide additional
22 information to the PRB at a public meeting, which is
23 the purpose of today's meeting.

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

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 this will help us in the preparation of the meeting
2 transcript that will be made publically available.

3 Since this is a public meeting, I would
4 like to remind the PRB members, the licensees, and
5 the Petitioner and any other meeting participants of
6 the need to refrain from discussing any NRC sensitive
7 or proprietary information during today's meeting.

8 Mr. Miranda, I will turn it over to you
9 to allow you the opportunity to provide any
10 information you believe the PRB should consider.
11 Since we started late, the meeting will last until
12 4:12.

13 I ask you to keep your remarks to no more
14 than 30 minutes to allow the other participants the
15 opportunity to ask questions about your remarks
16 during our meeting.

17 I'll help keep time along with the
18 facilitators. And when you have five minutes or so,
19 we'll let you know.

20 All right?

21 MR. MIRANDA: Okay.

22 MR. DONOGHUE: Well, Mr. Miranda, your
23 presentation.

24 MR. MIRANDA: Let's start with the
25 questions asked. What the basis was for not

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 accepting this Petition.

2 I did get an email from Ms. Lois James
3 that referred for example to ANS Standard N18.2
4 having been withdrawn. Is that one of your basis?

5 MR. DONOGHUE: Yes. It's not part of
6 the requirements in the Regulations. And it has been
7 withdrawn.

8 MR. MIRANDA: What does that mean?

9 MR. DONOGHUE: Well, it was withdrawn by
10 the ANS if I understand.

11 MR. MIRANDA: Yes. What does that mean?

12 MR. DONOGHUE: Okay. ANS no longer
13 considers that a standard that they --

14 MR. MIRANDA: Yes. What -- why did the
15 ANS withdraw that standard?

16 MR. DONOGHUE: I'm not sure why. But
17 that may have updated it. It may be they use another
18 standard.

19 MR. MIRANDA: Well, when I started my
20 career in 1970, I was working my first supervisor at
21 Westinghouse, was a member of the standards committee
22 for ANS 18.2. And that was issued in 1973.

23 It was superseded in 1983 by ANS 51.1.
24 And it's the ANS policy to withdraw a standard if
25 it's not revised within ten years.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 So that's why it was withdrawn.

2 MR. DONOGHUE: Okay.

3 MR. MIRANDA: ANS 51.1, same policy. So
4 that's probably been withdrawn as well.

5 However, all of this is irrelevant
6 because the licensees have performed accident
7 analysis for Chapter 15 of their FSARs based upon the
8 categories of events and the accepted criteria that
9 are specified in ANS 18.2.

10 So whether there is a standard in
11 existence, or if it ever was in existence or if it
12 was withdrawn, is not relevant. Because it's in the
13 licensing basis because the licensees put it there.

14 The NRC staff reviewed it. And issued
15 the licenses based on that. So if you were to
16 withdraw the standard and say that it's not in the
17 Regulations, then these licensees have no license.

18 So, I would ask you, should I be filing
19 another Petition asking for every plant in the U.S.
20 to have their license suspended because they have no
21 licensing basis?

22 MR. DONOGHUE: No. Let's talk about the
23 basis for our initial recommendation. There were two
24 things that we focused on in our discussion.

25 First was the connection you made of Part

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 50 to a Part 54 license renewal action. And we have
2 legal representative here as part of the PRB.

3 But, my understanding is that the most
4 significant hazard statement in Part 50 was not part
5 of the consideration of Part 54 action. That was one
6 point.

7 Another point was that when considering
8 license renewals, one of the principals of license
9 renewals that we apply when we're doing those reviews
10 is approving renewed licenses, is that the management
11 programs at the plants and their systems are going to
12 maintain its current licensing basis at the plant.

13 So, that concludes the, what you just
14 recited, Chapter 15 analyses. So, any information
15 to review that had to be supplied by licensees in
16 their applications, and supplemented as needed by
17 their programs on proving that system.

18 MR. MIRANDA: Well, I would point out
19 that 10 CFR 54, which governs license renewal
20 applications, the first thing it says and the first
21 thing it does is define the current licensing basis,
22 CLB. Current licensing basis.

23 And among the 10 CFR parts in the current
24 licensing basis is Part 50. So, 10 CFR 50.92 is part
25 of 10 CFR 50.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 So it's in the current licensing basis.
2 And I used to do -- I used to do, when I was working
3 at the NRC, one of my responsibilities was to review
4 license renewal applications.

5 And I was concerned at that time, and I'm
6 sure you are too still at this time, with aging
7 management. And which is a rather narrow-minded
8 approach to license renewals where you attempt to
9 find every component in the plant and determine
10 whether or not it can be affected by aging.

11 And for example, rubber gaskets and seals
12 get replaced and so on. But that is only part of the
13 license renewal, because 10 CFR 54, which pays so
14 much attention to continuing the current licensing
15 basis, there are two principals of license renewal
16 expressed in 10 CFR 54.

17 And, I think they both -- they both go to
18 the point that if you extend the operating span of a
19 plant, which has a design life of 40 years, if you
20 extend it to 60 years, and now they're talking about
21 80 years, the objective is to have that plant, in
22 order to protect the public health and safety, which
23 is your responsibility, in order to do that, this
24 plant operating in the 60th year of its lifetime has
25 to be just as safe as it was in its first year.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Part of that is aging management. But
2 there's a lot more to it. And one of those things
3 that I think the NRC has neglected in issuing, what,
4 more than 80 license renewals now?

5 One of the things they've got -- the NRC
6 has neglected, is the original current licensing
7 basis. Which is the definition of Condition III
8 events as expressed in ANS N18.2.

9 Condition III events are not to occur
10 during the lifetime of a plant. Maybe one or two.
11 At most one or two. They do occur.

12 Three Mile Island was a Condition III
13 event. They do occur. But no more than about one
14 or two times in the lifetime of a plant.

15 That's a 40-year span. Now it's a 60-
16 year span. So, you can expect to have more Condition
17 III events occurring during the extended life span.

18 In fact if you go to subsequent license
19 renewal of 80 years, you can expect the incidents of
20 Condition III events to double.

21 Let me give you an example of a Condition
22 III event. In 1974, five years before Three Mile
23 Island, there was a plant in Switzerland, Beznau
24 Units 1 and 2. B-E-Z-N-A-U, Beznau, is a small
25 Westinghouse designed plant in Switzerland.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 One of these plants had a turbine trip.
2 It so happens that it's a two turbine plant, so if
3 one of the turbines trip, it amounts to the equivalent
4 of a 50 percent reduction in load.

5 This should not be a problem. This would
6 be a Condition II event. It should not even cause a
7 reactor trip.

8 But in this case it did. It caused a
9 reactor trip because the steam dump system was not
10 operating.

11 A reactor trip is also not a serious
12 event. In this case the reactor trip would allow the
13 operators to diagnose the problem and fix the
14 turbine. And then resume operation.

15 However, -- however, since there was a
16 reactor trip and there was no steam dumping available
17 to take care of the steam generated by the reactor,
18 the pressure went up.

19 And it went up high enough to open -- to
20 pressurize the power operated relief valves. This
21 is also normal. That should not be a serious event.

22 However, one of those valves and then
23 failed to reseal. It was stuck open. Now that's a
24 problem.

25 The operators at Beznau recognized the

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 event. And they dealt with it. They isolated the
2 power operator relief valve and they fixed it. And
3 they resumed operation.

4 It turns out that power operated relief
5 valve was broken. It was a design problem.

6 I was working at Westinghouse at the
7 time. I was not involved in this. But I know the
8 people who were. It was handled out of the Brussels
9 Office.

10 And they wrote a report where they
11 analyzed the event. And the report was filed.

12 This was five years before Three Mile
13 Island. No report to the NRC. After all, it was a
14 foreign plant.

15 It turns out it was three American plants
16 using exactly the same design of power operated
17 relief valves. This was a -- I think it was a broken
18 stem, yoke stem on that valve.

19 There were three plants in New York, the
20 State of New York that used the same valve. NRC
21 didn't know about it.

22 Then in 1979 another Condition III event
23 occurred at Three Mile Island. And in that case the
24 power operator relief valve opened and it stuck
25 opened.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 However, the operators at Three Mile
2 Island didn't know what was going on. They didn't
3 understand they had a stuck open relief valve.

4 And they failed to deal with it. And
5 that error, that failure to deal with that Condition
6 III event led to a partial melt down of the core.

7 These are also called infrequent events.
8 And they're defined by the standard as events that
9 are not to occur more than once or twice during a 40-
10 year design lifetime of a plant.

11 And I don't think you've considered this.
12 You were so concerned with aging management, and
13 replacing gaskets and rubber seals, you didn't look
14 at it.

15 I know I didn't look at it when I was
16 doing this work. It's easy to overlook.

17 The question that needs to be --

18 MS. BROWN: Excuse me. For those of you
19 that are on the phone, can you mute your lines please?
20 Thank you. Sorry.

21 MR. DONOGHUE: Let me make sure I
22 understand your point then. We didn't look at the
23 operating experience from that event?

24 MR. MIRANDA: No. No.

25 MR. DONOGHUE: Or --

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. MIRANDA: No, I'm only guessing here.
2 And my guess is that you didn't look at ANS standard
3 N18.2. You didn't look at the definition of a
4 Condition III event.

5 You didn't notice that these are defined
6 in terms of plant lifetime. Now Condition II events
7 and Condition I events, they're defined in terms of
8 reactor years of operation.

9 So, if you extend the lifetime of a
10 plant, those probabilities won't change. There are
11 so many Condition II events that will occur per year
12 of operation.

13 And you could have -- you could have up
14 to a dozen of these per year. They're not serious
15 events.

16 In fact I have information from the
17 Nuclear Energy Institute that indicates that in the
18 year 2015 every plant -- the incidents of reactor
19 trips at American plants in 2015 there were 64 of
20 them.

21 You spread those out over 100 plants and
22 you have, you know, a three-fifths chance of having
23 a reactor trip at any given plant. And that is not
24 a serious concern.

25 I'm just saying that these things happen.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And Condition II events are reactor trips. Reactor
2 trips -- unplanned reactor trips are Condition II
3 events.

4 They should be handled by the plant
5 without too much delay. And the plant should be
6 restarted. No problem.

7 But Condition III events are different.
8 Condition III events could end the lifetime of a plant
9 as it did for Three Mile Island for example.

10 By the way, when this came to light in
11 1979 after Three Mile Island, the NRC issued an
12 information notice. I think it was 79-45.

13 Where they copied the entire Westinghouse
14 report of the incident into the record. And sent it
15 out to every licensee in the United States so that
16 they would know about it.

17 So, when I read 10 CFR 54, when I look at
18 the current licensing bases, that current licensing
19 basis, I think the purpose of 10 CFR 54, which governs
20 license renewal applications, the purpose of that is
21 to maintain the current licensing basis.

22 And all the standards that are involved
23 with it. And whether you want to consider ANS N18.2
24 as part of that or not, it really doesn't matter.
25 Because the licensees have made it part of that either

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 by reference or by copying and pasting it, it's in
2 every -- every PWR licensing basis.

3 And there's another equivalent, N212,
4 which is in the licensing basis of every PWR. Well,
5 it's there.

6 And furthermore, I'd like to point out to
7 you that this withdrawn standard has been referenced
8 by the IAEA in 1999 and by the ONR, the Office for
9 Nuclear Regulations of the United Kingdom, in their
10 AP1000 design certification documents.

11 And that was in November 2015. So
12 they're referencing a withdrawn standard.

13 So, I would like -- so there is also a
14 distinction that was drawn by Brian Holian. Do you
15 know Brian Holian? Yeah, the Director of License
16 Renewal.

17 He was quoted in 2011, he said -- he was
18 quoted in a Wall Street Journal article. I'll
19 provide this to you, Lois. I'll send you all of
20 that, yeah.

21 MS. JAMES: Can you send that attachment
22 to me.

23 MR. MIRANDA: Sure. He said in 2011,
24 its called license renewal, not relicensing, said
25 Brian Holian, Director of License Renewal at the NRC.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 And the agency's rules dictate what is reviewed.

2 He goes on to say, the public often is
3 not satisfied by that explanation he admits.
4 Sometimes they want the opportunity to reevaluate
5 whether the plant should even be there.

6 So that's one view. That's his view of
7 License Renewal. Which is to limit -- limit the
8 review of a license renewal application. Okay?

9 And the limit, as I understand it, is
10 looking at aging management. But as I said, there's
11 a lot more to that.

12 And what I'm saying is, relicensing does
13 not have to be a question of whether the plant should
14 even be there. But relicensing should include
15 concerns in addition to aging management.

16 There are things that happen that are not
17 related to aging. I would point out to you for
18 example Davis-Besse.

19 Have you considered the Davis-Besse
20 situation in your aging management? Where you have
21 the drip, drip, drip of boric acid on the reactor
22 vessel head.

23 Which bore a hole in the reactor vessel
24 head, which was stopped only by the stainless steel
25 inner lining. Is that part of aging management?

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I can give you another example from my
2 own experience. I drive a 15-year old car. I do
3 aging management. I replaced the timing belt on my
4 car.

5 If you want to drive your car past one
6 hundred thousand miles, you need to change the timing
7 belt. But things went wrong with that car that has
8 nothing to do with aging.

9 For example, my radio was getting very
10 poor reception. It turned out that my car has four
11 antennae. Four antennae.

12 And it has a little part in the back,
13 it's like a piece of plastic with wire wound around
14 it. No moving parts. And that component selects
15 the strongest of the four signals and sends that to
16 the radio. It's a signal selector.

17 Do you know that nuclear power plants
18 have signal selectors? Westinghouse is famous for
19 the median signal selector.

20 Is that part of aging management?

21 MR. OESTERLE: Mr. Miranda, this is Eric
22 Oesterle from the NRC. I have a clarifying question
23 if you don't mind.

24 MR. MIRANDA: Sure.

25 MR. OESTERLE: The example that you gave

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 about the -- about your car and replacing the timing
2 belt.

3 Would you characterize that, being able
4 to replace the timing belt -- well, you had mentioned
5 that if you don't replace your timing belt, you can't
6 operate the vehicle anymore.

7 MR. MIRANDA: Probably should not.
8 Yeah.

9 MR. OESTERLE: Would you characterize
10 the ability to replace the timing belt as being able
11 -- equivalent to extending the lifetime of your
12 vehicle?

13 MR. MIRANDA: That is one of the things
14 you need to do if you want to extend the lifetime of
15 the vehicle. But it's not -- not everything.

16 MR. OESTERLE: Thank you.

17 MR. MIRANDA: Just a brief -- a brief
18 lecture if you will on Conditions I and II versus
19 Conditions III and IV. And this is in the ANS
20 Standard.

21 Conditions I and II are what you might
22 call conditions of normal operation. Condition I is
23 normal operation.

24 Condition I are events that happen during
25 the normal operation of the plant, such as

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 maneuvering of the plant, reducing load, increasing
2 load, repositioning rods. Things you need to do
3 every day as part of operating the plant.

4 They are not things that require
5 protective action. But -- but, you keep track of
6 these things, as well as Condition II events.

7 Condition II events are more extreme
8 versions of Condition I events. These might require
9 reactor trip -- at most a reactor trip.

10 This is defined in the ANS Standard.
11 Condition II events are accommodate -- shall be
12 accommodated, I'm quoting now, shall be accommodated
13 by at most a reactor shut down with the plant being
14 able to be returned to normal operation within a short
15 time.

16 This is in the Standard. But all of
17 these things are tracked. Sometimes they called a -
18 - the design transients. And you can find these in
19 the reactor's FSAR.

20 They're part of the licensing basis. So
21 during a 40-year design lifetime of a plant, that
22 plant is designed to have as many as say, for example,
23 four hundred reactor trips.

24 Why does this matter? Well, components
25 in the reactor, some thick metal components for

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 example, can only take so many thermal transients or
2 pressurization transients before the components
3 themselves become brittle and subject to break.

4 You can compare this to a, for example,
5 a paperclip. If you bend a paperclip back and forth,
6 you can only do it so many times before it breaks.

7 But you might design when you're
8 designing your paperclip that it should not be bent
9 more than five times. Otherwise, it's subject to
10 break.

11 So you put that in the design specs. No
12 more than five bends of this paperclip. When you
13 reach five, you stop.

14 And that's called a cumulative usage
15 factor. That's also in the FSAR. Each of these
16 components has a cumulative usage factor. And that
17 is the percentage of such transients you can have for
18 each component.

19 When you reach one point off, you stop.
20 Well, these are things that could limit the lifetime
21 of a plant. And in some cases it could even reduce
22 it to below 40 years, let alone below 60 years.

23 I'm getting to the end of my time. So,
24 I will end with just another story that I don't think
25 you know about this. Maybe I'm wrong.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. GOLD: You've still got five minutes.

2 MR. MIRANDA: Okay.

3 MR. DONOGHUE: Yeah, you've got five.

4 MR. MIRANDA: I'm aware -- and I'm aware
5 and maybe some of the licensees can verify this. You
6 know, when you're operating a plant for a long time,
7 you're operating things like charging pumps, they're
8 in operation all the time.

9 And the time may come when you need to
10 replace a component like a charging pump. And you
11 go out into the marketplace and you want to buy
12 another pump with the characteristics that match the
13 pump you have.

14 Okay. But that -- the pump you have was
15 built in 1975. And they don't make it anymore. But
16 you go to a reliable supplier, you know, who can give
17 you a pump with an N stamp on it.

18 But it doesn't match exactly the
19 characteristics of the pump you're trying to replace.
20 So what are you supposed to do?

21 They want exactly that pump. Because if
22 they don't get exactly that pump with exactly those
23 characteristics that requires a license amendment.
24 That's another year delay in getting that pump
25 replaced.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 To put this in more practical terms, in
2 terms of accident analysis in Chapter 15, suppose you
3 get a real good pump. It's an improvement over the
4 old one.

5 It will produce more flow at higher
6 pressures. Which is great for loss of coolant
7 accidents to make up water that's lost due to a break
8 in the piping.

9 However, there are other accidents, the
10 mass addition accidents where this is bad. Now that
11 better pump is going to fill the pressurizer sooner.

12 That requires a new analysis. That
13 requires -- it would be the first instance with the
14 loss of cooling accident, you've got better
15 equipment, you can take care of that with 10 CFR
16 50.59.

17 However, for the mass addition accident
18 where the result is actually worse, where the
19 pressurizer fills sooner because you have a better
20 pump, now you need a new analysis.

21 You need a license amendment request.
22 And you've got -- you've got basically about a year
23 to wait for that amendment to be issued.

24 So we are -- to conclude, we are
25 basically -- the NRC is reviewing -- this is basically

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 philosophical. You're reviewing license renewals,
2 and I question, I've always questioned this, what
3 does a license renewal have to do with protecting the
4 health and safety of the public?

5 How does that improve the health and
6 safety of the public? It improves the bottom line
7 of the utilities. And if you're perfect, if you did
8 your aging management properly and you've considered
9 every possibility that could occur, all the known
10 unknowns, I'm quoting Robert McNamara now.

11 The known unknowns and the unknown
12 unknowns, if you can do all of that, if you're
13 perfect, you have not done -- you still have not done
14 anything to improve the public health and safety.

15 At best you can -- you're right where you
16 started. You're at 100 percent of the public health
17 and safety that was existing at year one of
18 operations. More likely you're less than that.

19 So, we've got countries like China and
20 South Korea building new plants, AP1000 plants. And
21 the United States is refurbishing old plants.

22 So if it were up to me, if I were going
23 to compare the U.S. to China and South Korea, I would
24 say the U.S. is the asshole country.

25 So that's the -- by the way, everything

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 that's sent for renewals, that goes for upgrades too.

2 By the way that Beznau plant that I
3 mentioned, with the accident in 1974, that's going to
4 be shut down beginning -- all the Swiss plants are
5 going to be shut down beginning in 2019. All of the
6 German plants have already been shut down.

7 That's the end of mine.

8 MS. GOLD: Thank you. Again, I'm Meg
9 Gold, co-facilitating with Cris Brown.

10 And at this time since this is a public
11 meeting, I'd like to remind the PRB members,
12 licensees, Petitioner and other meeting participants
13 the need to please refrain from discussing any
14 sensitive or proprietary information during today's
15 meeting.

16 And as a reminder, if you need to speak
17 from the phone, if you don't have a mute button,
18 please press the star six key to unmute your phone.
19 And then again star six to remute.

20 At this time, does anybody here from
21 headquarters have any questions for Mr. Miranda? If
22 so, please state your name first.

23 MR. OESTERLE: So, Eric Oesterle from
24 NRC, so you had mentioned the statements about
25 license renewal does not improve the public health

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 and safety.

2 Are you aware that the NRC's mission is
3 to ensure that there's no adverse impact to the public
4 health and safety. And that we are not -- we're not
5 here to ensure that public health and safety is
6 improved.

7 MR. MIRANDA: Exactly. Yes. To protect
8 the public health and safety. So that's why I said,
9 at best, if you take into consideration every aspect
10 of a license renewal, aging management and everything
11 else, at best you'll be protecting the public health
12 and safety.

13 MR. DONOGHUE: And this is Joe Donoghue.
14 In that statement you also added that, at best it
15 could be, but it's likely that we're not.

16 What's your base -- do you have a basis
17 for that?

18 MR. MIRANDA: The basis for my petition.

19 MR. DONOGHUE: Okay.

20 MR. MIRANDA: I don't think and I could
21 be wrong, but I don't think you've looked at Condition
22 III events and their incidents over an extended plant
23 lifetime.

24 If you have, then I'd be glad to withdraw
25 the petition. If you have, just send me the ADAMS

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 accession number with the report of how you
2 considered this and how you resolved it.

3 MR. BROADDUS: This is Doug Broaddus
4 again. I'm just looking for a clarification from the
5 standpoint of -- that you talked about the definition
6 of current licensing basis in Part 54.3.

7 Could you clarify why you believe that
8 definition is relevant to your request? I'm not sure
9 I fully understand the relevance of that.

10 MR. MIRANDA: Well, that goes back to
11 what I told Mr. Oesterle. That this is -- you need
12 to consider the entire licensing basis. But you're
13 not.

14 When you do a license renewal, when
15 you're extending the lifetime of a plant by 50
16 percent, you're not relaxing any requirements. It's
17 going to be just as safe in the 60th year of operation
18 as it was in the first year.

19 MR. BROADDUS: But I thought originally
20 when you referenced that that you were referring to
21 the requirement under 50.92 and the statement that
22 was made that you were apply -- your Petition here to
23 comply that that 50.92 requirement was applicable to
24 part 54 license renewal.

25 MR. MIRANDA: Yes. I still believe that

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 it is. I think it is applicable.

2 Even if you don't ask for a no
3 significant hazards evaluation from the licensee,
4 which would be filed under 50.92, even if you don't
5 ask for that, it's in the licensing basis. It's part
6 of 10 CFR part 50.

7 And it maintains the current licensing
8 basis. And the ultimate, in my opinion, you may have
9 found an exception for this, but the ultimate license
10 amendment, the ultimate, meaning the last one, the
11 last license amendment that a plant will have, will
12 be the one that asks for the plant life extension.

13 Okay. You want to call it a license
14 renewal application. I call it the last amendment.
15 Okay.

16 And in any case, even if you don't
17 require a no significant hazards evaluation, even if
18 you have it written in 10 CFR part 54, thou shall not
19 need a no significant hazards evaluation. Okay. So
20 then you go ahead and you issue the license renewal.
21 Okay.

22 And sometime during the extended lifetime
23 of that plant, it could be -- it could be a one week
24 later, or it could be three years later, at some time
25 that plant is going to come in for a license

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 amendment.

2 It's going to what to change its tech
3 specs. Or it's going to change that charging pump I
4 mentioned earlier.

5 As soon as they come in for that license
6 amendment, now you're into this 10 CFR 50.92, no
7 significant hazards.

8 MR. BROADDUS: Okay. But that's a
9 definite -- that's exactly what I was getting at. Is
10 that it maybe still applicable for license amendments
11 that are submitted at any other time.

12 So, I mean, so it remains applicable for
13 those licensees. If they submit a license amendment
14 whether it's before or after license renewal, they're
15 required to meet the requirement of 50.52.

16 But, if -- what I was getting at is, you
17 believe it is applicable to the license renewal
18 itself. So, I think you've answered that question.

19 MR. MIRANDA: Well, it's just my opinion.
20 But I could ask you a question.

21 I could ask you since you've already
22 renewed the licenses of more than 80 plants, have you
23 looked at license amendment requests from plants that
24 are already operating in their extended life period?

25 And looked at most significant hazards

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 evaluations from these plants? And have these plants
2 told you that Condition III events are not going to
3 be increased in likelihood?

4 MR. BROADDUS: So, I am not going through
5 all of them. I can tell you as one of the branch
6 chiefs that's responsible for signing out amendments
7 that come into us, to our office that in every case
8 they always do address the no significant hazards
9 determination that's required under part 50.92.

10 MR. MIRANDA: Right.

11 MR. BROADDUS: And part of my review that
12 analysis needs to be applicable to the change that
13 they're requesting in the amendment.

14 MR. MIRANDA: Right. And what -- the
15 reason I'm here for this Petition is, does that no
16 significant hazards evaluation, does that include an
17 evaluation of Condition III events?

18 Like the one that occurred at Three Mile
19 Island.

20 MR. BROADDUS: And I would have to say
21 it depends upon the request.

22 MR. MIRANDA: Um-hum. Right. It
23 depends on the changes they're asking for.

24 MR. BROADDUS: Yes.

25 MR. MIRANDA: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. BROWN: Any other questions in the
2 room from headquarters staff? State your name.

3 MR. DOZIER: My name is Jerry Dozier from
4 the Division of Risk Assessment. And one of the
5 things that you were talking about was, now what did
6 we do and consider in license renewal before we
7 decided to kind of isolate it to passive components
8 and adverse effects of age? That was kind of where
9 license renewal ended up.

10 And those active features like you were
11 talking about as a -- as active feature of a valve,
12 if we were not subject to an aging management review
13 and I was just going to ask -- just going to say,
14 were you aware in the statements of consideration
15 where, you know, realize there was an earlier license
16 renewal rule around the '95 time frame.

17 That was also about the time that
18 maintenance rule was coming around in 1996. So that
19 was when, you know, the MPAR studies were earlier and
20 they were actually looking at that component.

21 And then in '96 during that statement of
22 consideration when they changed the rules, they said
23 that while maintenance rules, which was going to look
24 at, you know, the maintenance assembled function
25 failures and the routine failures and all this types

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 of stuff to take care of the aging on active
2 components.

3 And then so what we're missing now is the
4 passive components.

5 MR. MIRANDA: Um-hum.

6 MR. DOZIER: That we're going to do. And
7 all that's actually explained in the statement of
8 consideration which I think it was a '95 or '96 rule.

9 I wondered if you were aware of that?

10 MR. MIRANDA: Yes. I used to do -- I
11 used to do Mr. Beaton's job. I used to write the
12 safety evaluations for license renewal applications
13 from the DSS standpoint.

14 MR. DOZIER: That was really like built
15 into the writing.

16 MR. MIRANDA: Well, a lot of it had to
17 do with, you know, the components that were affected.
18 Yeah.

19 MR. DOZIER: Okay.

20 MR. MIRANDA: That's right. But I think
21 what you just said reiterates what I've been saying.
22 That there's a lot more to this than just aging
23 management.

24 And active components like valves, while
25 you can argue that yeah, active components are always

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 surveilled and tested. And they operate once in a
2 while, so you know they're working. Or they're
3 supposed to work.

4 But that leaves -- that leaves a lot of
5 other things that are not considered. And the thing
6 that I believe is not being considered is the
7 definition of a Condition III event.

8 And a Condition IV event by the way,
9 that's also defined in terms of plant lifetime. The
10 difference between a Condition III event and a
11 Condition IV event is that a Condition IV event is
12 not supposed to happen at all. Ever.

13 The only reason a Condition IV is
14 analyzed is to size safeguards equipment like safety
15 injection pumps for example. To be sure that if it
16 happens once in a million years or whatever, if it
17 happens, you have the equipment that is capable of
18 dealing with it.

19 So the worse credible, I'm using
20 quotation marks in the air by the way for the
21 transcript, I'm making quotation marks. The
22 "credible accident" the "worst credible" accident is
23 a Condition III event. This is the one that can
24 happen.

25 And this is the one that is responsible

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 so far for at least the core melt down at Three Mile
2 Island.

3 MS. GOLD: Okay. Any other questions
4 from -- yes, go ahead.

5 MR. BROADDUS: I have one final question.

6 MS. GOLD: Okay.

7 MR. BROADDUS: This is Doug Broaddus.
8 So, I just want to make sure we fully understand your
9 basis for what you're asking in your Petition.

10 And you've referred back to the ANS
11 standards you know, a number of times that many would
12 be considered that that's a requirement decision.

13 So is there something specific in that
14 standard or in any of the current licensing basis for
15 any of the plants that have been renewed or are going
16 through license renewal that indicate that those
17 events, those Condition III, Condition IV, Conditions
18 I and II, that those would increase as a result of
19 the license renewal?

20 Especially given what Mr. Oesterle, what
21 he stated previously about the ability to repair or
22 replace, you know, do maintenance on the components
23 and equipment.

24 MR. MIRANDA: I have two answers for your
25 question. First I would say that the ANS standard,

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 as I said earlier, is irrelevant.

2 It's relevant only in so far as it is in
3 the licensing basis and is placed there by the
4 licensee. By the way, this ANS standard has
5 intersections with 10 CFR part 50, Appendix A, and
6 with Reg Guide 1.70.

7 Which was Appendix A, I believe, was
8 issued in 1971. And Reg Guide 1.70, I think the
9 first draft was in 1968. And the last draft was in
10 1978.

11 And they also -- both they also talk
12 about categorization of events and the acceptance
13 criteria for each of these categories of events.

14 So that is all in the licensing basis.
15 That is all in Chapter 15. And whether a licensee
16 refers to the ANS standard or not is irrelevant as
17 long as those criteria are in there.

18 It's like playing pool. A licensee says,
19 I'm going to make this shot. And he better make that
20 shot. If he misses it then he has, you know, he has
21 not met those licensing criteria.

22 So he's telling you in -- the licensee is
23 saying in Chapter 15, no Condition II event is going
24 to cause fuel damage. Then he has to do the analysis
25 to show that no Condition II event is going to cause

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 fuel damage.

2 And whether that comes from ANS 18.2 or
3 whether it comes from 10 CFR part 50, Appendix A, and
4 it's in there as well, it doesn't matter. He told
5 you what he's going to do and now he needs to show
6 you that he did it.

7 MS. GOLD: So, can we move to the phone
8 please? Are there any questions from headquarters
9 staff on the phone? Did anybody join?

10 And if so, please say your name first and
11 ask your question.

12 MR. JONES: This is David Jones. Yeah,
13 I do not have any questions at this time.

14 MS. GOLD: Thank you. And was there any
15 staff in the region who joined the phone who wanted
16 to ask any questions at this time? Or any licensees
17 on the phone who want to ask any questions at this
18 time?

19 (No response)

20 MS. GOLD: Okay. Then before we
21 conclude the meeting, members of the public may
22 provide comments regarding this Petition. And ask
23 questions about the 2.206 petition process.

24 As was stated at the opening of the
25 meeting, the purpose is not to provide an opportunity

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 for the Petitioner, the licensees, or the public to
2 question or examine the PRB regarding the merits of
3 the Petition request.

4 Are there any members of the public that
5 want to ask any questions?

6 MS. COLLINS: Yes. Jessie Collins here.
7 I would like to say that -- make a statement. I
8 don't have a question I just have a statement.

9 That I believe Mr. Miranda knows the laws
10 better than any of you. And I'd say you're going to
11 have a hard time to dismiss his Petition because of
12 that.

13 Thank you.

14 MS. GOLD: Lois, would you like the name
15 as to --

16 MS. JAMES: Well, could you repeat your
17 name and spell it for me? I had a little trouble
18 with one of the names in the previous meeting.

19 MR. MIRANDA: That's Jessie Collins.

20 MS. JAMES: Jessie Collins. Thank you.

21 MR. MIRANDA: And I have her contact
22 information. Because she's been in touch with me.

23 MS. JAMES: Yes. Thank you.

24 MR. MIRANDA: I have a question to the
25 PRB. And my question is, --

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MR. DONOGHUE: Well, before you go on
2 with that, you should make sure that any more members
3 of the public --

4 MR. MIRANDA: Oh, okay. All right.

5 MS. GOLD: Okay. Are there any more
6 members of the public that have any questions at this
7 time?

8 (No response)

9 MS. GOLD: Okay. So at that point we
10 can -- through with the questions. Joe, if you'd
11 like to take it back to --

12 MR. DONOGHUE: So I'm going to give you
13 a chance in a second for your question. All right,
14 Sam.

15 This is Joe Donoghue. I want to thank
16 everybody for their participation today. And for the
17 assistance to make -- making this an efficient and
18 productive meeting.

19 Thank you Lois for getting everybody on
20 the phone at the beginning. And sorry about that Sam
21 and everybody that we had a slight delay.

22 Before we go on, I'm just going to
23 summarize what the -- I think the significant points
24 you made Mr. Miranda. And make sure we have an
25 understanding of what we talked about today.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 You made a point early on that 10 CFR 54,
2 it defines the current licensing basis of a plant.
3 And that that is a connection to part 50.

4 You went on to explain that in your view
5 the license renewal review approach that we take
6 focuses on aging management and excludes other
7 considerations. Which is a -- that's the basis of
8 your concern where --

9 MR. MIRANDA: Well --

10 MR. DONOGHUE: Go ahead.

11 MR. MIRANDA: Not exclude, neglect.

12 MR. DONOGHUE: Neglects. Okay, neglects
13 the CLB. And specifically looking at the frequency
14 of these Condition III events.

15 You gave us several examples. I won't
16 go through all of them on how it illustrates your
17 point. But, another point you made was that the
18 NRC's approach doesn't improve safety in anyway.

19 And you also --

20 MR. MIRANDA: But I presented -- deferred
21 to Mr. Oesterle that he's correct. It doesn't
22 improve safety. But the NRC's responsibility is not
23 to improve it but to protect it.

24 MR. DONOGHUE: Okay. Okay, thank you.
25 So, thank you for, you know the discussion, with all

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 the people who were asking clarifying questions.

2 Is that, you know, the summary I gave
3 you, is that the essence of that -- basically the
4 point you wanted to make today?

5 MR. MIRANDA: Yeah. It's a very simple
6 Petition. And I have not seen any evidence that
7 Condition III events have been considered.

8 And there are other things besides aging
9 management that ought to be considered. And we will
10 find out if they need to be considered.

11 As these plants progress into their
12 extended lifetimes, these things are going to come
13 up. And they're not going to be things that were
14 considered during the license renewal application
15 process.

16 MR. DONOGHUE: Okay. Fine.

17 MR. MIRANDA: That's the hard way to
18 learn.

19 MR. DONOGHUE: Did you have a question
20 about the process here from the PRB?

21 MR. MIRANDA: I do. Yeah. Yeah. If
22 the PRB, well you had a meeting on December 5 and I
23 expect you'll have another meeting --

24 MR. DONOGHUE: Right.

25 MR. MIRANDA: For your final decision.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 Do you have in these meetings representative of
2 licensees?

3 MR. DONOGHUE: No. No, the PRB -- it's
4 the PRB members are here.

5 MR. BROADDUS: Okay. This is Doug
6 Broaddus. It specifically states in the management
7 directive that these are closed meetings for the NRC
8 staff. And the members of the PRB.

9 MR. MIRANDA: Well, I didn't see that.
10 I was looking for it.

11 MR. BROADDUS: Well, I'll look into it
12 and makes sure to get you that citation so you can.

13 MR. DONOGHUE: Okay. Mr. Miranda, thank
14 you for taking the time to provide the staff with
15 additional clarifying information on your Petition
16 and to discuss the PRB's initial recommendation.

17 The Board plans to meet internally to
18 discuss the information that you've provided in your
19 Petition and supplemented. And make its final
20 recommendation on your Petition.

21 Following that meeting, the Petition
22 Manager, Lois, will inform you of our recommendation
23 to either accept or reject the Petition for review
24 and issue the NRC's response letter in accordance
25 with the Management Directive 8.11.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 I have one more question for you. Do you
2 have feedback for us on today's meeting that you'd
3 like to provide?

4 MR. MIRANDA: Feedback. Don't you have
5 a form for that?

6 (Laughter)

7 MR. DONOGHUE: We can get you the form.
8 I just wanted to check and see if you had any --

9 MR. MIRANDA: Let me put it this way. I
10 don't have anything to complain about.

11 MR. DONOGHUE: Okay. Thank you.

12 MR. MIRANDA: I don't have negative
13 feedback.

14 (Off mic comments)

15 MR. MIRANDA: Well, you stuck to the time
16 schedule. And you gave everyone a chance to talk.
17 And we've had an exchange where each per -- each
18 participant listened to the other and addressed --
19 and addressed their concerns.

20 So I don't --

21 MS. BOUDART: Is it too late for me to
22 say something? Hello?

23 MS. GOLD: Yes. You can say something.
24 Please say your name first.

25 MS. JAMES: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. BOUDART: I'm Jan Boudart. And I'm
2 a Board Member of the Nuclear Energy Information
3 Service.

4 And I'm wondering if -- I have two
5 questions. When will this recording of the meeting
6 come out?

7 And the second one is, what are Mr.
8 Miranda's coordinates so that we can get hold of him
9 if we want to?

10 MS. JAMES: The transcripts will be
11 attached to the meeting summary. And that will be
12 out within 30 days of today.

13 MS. BOUDART: Okay.

14 MS. JAMES: Can I get you to spell your
15 last name?

16 MS. BOUDART: B- as in baby, O-U-D- as
17 in David, A-R-T.

18 MS. JAMES: Okay. Thank you. And I
19 guess I will leave it up to Mr. Miranda on -- if he
20 wants to give his contact information.

21 MR. MIRANDA: Go ahead and give Janet my
22 email address.

23 MS. JAMES: Okay. Janet, if you could
24 email me at Lois, L-O-I-S.J-A-M-E-S@NRC.gov, and I
25 will forward you his information.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 MS. BOUDART: Okay. I'm missing --
2 could you -- do you mind spelling me your last name?

3 MS. JAMES: Sure. It's James, J-A-M-E-
4 S, just like the boy's first name.

5 MS. BOUDART: Oh, James. Lois James at
6 NRC.gov.

7 MS. JAMES: Yes. And I will forward you
8 --

9 MS. BOUDART: Okay.

10 MS. JAMES: That information.

11 MS. BOUDART: Thank you so much.

12 MR. DONOGHUE: Okay. We're not --

13 MS. GOLD: Just what -- before we close,
14 Court Reporter, if you have anything quickly that you
15 couldn't hear that you want somebody to repeat
16 themselves while we're all here.

17 COURT REPORTER: This is the Court
18 Reporter. No, I think I'm all right. Would it be
19 possible to get just a list of participants?

20 MS. JAMES: Yes. Yes. I will contact
21 you, Lois James, or you can contact me with a phone
22 number I can call you at.

23 COURT REPORTER: Okay. Sure. I can
24 send you an email as soon as we're done.

25 MS. JAMES: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

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

1 COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

2 MR. MIRANDA: I do have one bit of
3 feedback.

4 MR. DONOGHUE: Yes?

5 MR. MIRANDA: I want to compliment Lois
6 James for her more than -- more than what shall I
7 say, her meeting minutes of the first meeting were
8 more detailed and more comprehensive than I'm
9 accustomed to seeing.

10 So, I thought that was very good. And
11 I've made reference to it several times.

12 MS. JAMES: Thank you.

13 MR. DONOGHUE: Okay.

14 MS. GOLD: So with that the meeting is
15 concluded. And we will terminate the phone
16 connection. Thank you very much.

17 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
18 went off the record at 4:17 p.m.)

19

20

21

NEAL R. GROSS

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