

January 28, 1997

MEMORANDUM TO: Hugh L. Thompson, Jr.
Acting Executive Director for Operations

FROM: Roy P. Zimmerman
Associate Director for Projects
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: DECEMBER 1996 REPORT ON THE STATUS OF PUBLIC PETITIONS UNDER
10 CFR 2.206

Orig. signed by R. Zimmerman

The attached monthly report reflects the status of 10 CFR 2.206 petitions as of the end of December 1996. This report may not reflect changes in status that have occurred since petition managers submitted data on the December status. Attachment 1 gives the status of petitions before the Offices of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Nuclear Reactor Regulation, and Enforcement. Attachment 2 lists decisions before the Commission and the courts. Attachment 3 lists other sensitive matters which are for internal distribution only.

By issuing the monthly report on the status of pending 10 CFR 2.206 petitions, the staff is documenting its responsiveness to petitioners.

To enhance staff responsiveness to the public, those parts of the monthly report not of a sensitive nature will be placed in the Public Document Room and on the electronic bulletin board system, making them readily accessible to the public.

Attachments: 1. Report on Status of Public Petitions Under 10 CFR 2.206
2. Decisions Pending Before the Commission and the Courts
3. Internal Distribution Only

cc w/atts: E. L. Jordan, EDO
P. G. Norry, EDO
J. Blaha, EDO
K. D. Cyr, OGC
F. J. Miraglia, NRR
C. J. Paperiello, NMSS
J. Lieberman, OE
E. Julian, SECY

R. L. Bangart, OSP
G. P. Caputo, OI
J. F. Cordes, Jr., OCAA
J. R. Goldberg, OGC
L. J. Chandler, OGC
Regional Administrators
OCA
OPA

Change:
LTR ENCL
PDR 1 1 w/o non-public
Litig Bryce 1 1 w/o non-public

DR03
1/1

CONTACT: Janet Kennedy, NRR
415-3267

Distribution:

Central Files J. Roe (e) M. Mattia, NMSS P. Lohaus P. Anderson/EDO
PUBLIC w/att 1 & 2 only (Att 3 is "NOT FOR EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION")
B. McCabe E. Adensam (e) F. Cameron/OGC A. Chaffee G. Deegan/NMSS
R. Zimmerman M. Thadani C. Jamerson J. Kennedy

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy DOCUMENT NAME: P:\206\JAN97RPT.WP

OFFICE	PM:PD41	E	LA:PD31	E	NMSS:RMB	E	OE	E	ADPR:NRR	E
NAME	J. Kennedy		C. Jamerson		M. Mattia		J. Lieberman		R. Zimmerman	
DATE	01/21/97		01/11/97		01/27/97(e)		01/17/97(e)		01/24/97 RPT	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY (e) e-mail concurrence

310002

9701310140 970128
PDR ORG NRRA
PDR

CENTER COPY

Don't RPTs
X Oem-6-1
X 2-4-1 P2



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

January 28, 1997

MEMORANDUM TO: Hugh L. Thompson, Jr.
Acting Executive Director for Operations

FROM: Roy P. Zimmerman *Roy P. Zimmerman*
Associate Director for Projects
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: DECEMBER 1996 REPORT ON THE STATUS OF PUBLIC PETITIONS UNDER
10 CFR 2.206

The attached monthly report reflects the status of 10 CFR 2.206 petitions as of the end of December 1996. This report may not reflect changes in status that have occurred since petition managers submitted data on the December status. Attachment 1 gives the status of petitions before the Offices of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Nuclear Reactor Regulation, and Enforcement. Attachment 2 lists decisions before the Commission and the courts. Attachment 3 lists other sensitive matters which are for internal distribution only.

By issuing the monthly report on the status of pending 10 CFR 2.206 petitions, the staff is documenting its responsiveness to petitioners.

To enhance staff responsiveness to the public, those parts of the monthly report not of a sensitive nature will be placed in the Public Document Room and on the electronic bulletin board system, making them readily accessible to the public.

Attachments: 1. Report on Status of Public Petitions Under 10 CFR 2.206
2. Decisions Pending Before the Commission and the Courts
3. Internal Distribution Only

cc w/atts: E. L. Jordan, EDO
P. G. Norry, EDO
J. Blaha, EDO
K. D. Cyr, OGC
F. J. Miraglia, NRR
C. J. Paperiello, NMSS
J. Lieberman, OE
E. Julian, SECY

R. L. Bangart, OSP
G. P. Caputo, OI
J. F. Cordes, Jr., OCAA
J. R. Goldberg, OGC
L. J. Chandler, OGC
Regional Administrators
OCA
OPA

CONTACT: Janet Kennedy, NRR
415-3267

Report on Status of Public Petitions
Under 10 CFR 2.206

December 1996

Contents*

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Petitioner/EDO No.</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
Vogtle	Hobby and Mosbaugh/5836	1,26
Advanced Medical Systems, Inc.	Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District/8663	2
Advanced Medical Systems, Inc.	Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District/10395	3
Oyster Creek	Gunter and de Camp, Jr./10473	3
Georgia Tech and All Licensees	Blockey-O'Brien/10598	5
Millstone	Ross/10600	7
Millstone	Ross/15	8
Millstone	Galatis et al./603	9,27
Palisades	Sinclair and Skavroneck/665	11
National Institutes of Health	Ma and Zheng/721	14,27
Palisades Plant, Point Beach Units 1 and 2, and Arkansas Nuclear One, Units 1 and 2	Shillinglaw/872	15
Davis-Besse	Toledo Coalition for Safe Energy, et al./886	17
Oyster Creek	de Camp/GT96345	26
Westinghouse Electric Corporation	Doyle/GT96400	18
Oyster Creek	de Camp/GT96452	26
Shieldalloy and Cypress Foote	Bauman/GT96596	19
Maine Yankee and All Other Plants Using the RELAP Code for ECCS Analyses	Sears/GT96659	20
Northern States Power Company Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation	Florence Township/GT9669 /GT96670	20
Point Beach, Units 1 and 2	Dums, Wisconsin's Citizens' Utility Board/GT96774	21
Shieldalloy	Bauman/GT96775	22
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station	Dwyer/GT96778	23
All Users of the VSC-24 Nuclear Waste Storage Cask	Sinclair and Roemer/GT96801	23
Connecticut Yankee and Millstone	Katz, Citizens Awareness Network/GT96919	24
Vermont Yankee	Block, Citizens Awareness Network/GT96950	25

*Includes Attachments 2 and 3.

Report on
Status of Public Petitions
Under 10 CFR 2.206

Facility: Vogtle
Petitioners: M. Hobby and A. Mosbaugh
Date of Petition: 9/11/90

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NRR
Date Referred to Review Organization: 9/21/90
EDO Number: 5836
OGC Number: P-90-009
Scheduled Completion Date: 1/31/97
Last Contact with Petitioner(s): 1/8/97
Petition Manager: D. Wheeler
Case Attorney: M. Young/C. Barth

Issues/Action Requested: Take immediate action regarding alleged "illegal transfer" of operating licenses, repeated and willful violations of NRC requirements, and unsafe management practices at operating reactors.

Current Status: An acknowledgment letter was issued on 10/23/90. The Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation issued a partial Director's Decision on 4/23/93 (DD-93-08). On 7/14/93, the Commission vacated the partial Director's Decision and requested that a final Director's Decision await completion of a related hearing (CLI-93-15). On 2/18/94, the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board (ASLB) granted intervenor status to petitioner Mosbaugh, admitting him as a party in the license amendment proceeding concerning the proposed transfer of operating licenses from Georgia Power to Southern Nuclear Operating Company. The contention admitted encompasses some of the issues in the 2.206 petition. The hearing on the "illegal transfer" issue was held 1/4-13/95. The hearing on the final issue (an alleged misrepresentation of diesel generator test results) began on 4/17/95. On 2/1/96 the NRC issued a Board Notification, 96-01, to the petitioners' attorney advising them of pending actions. On 4/10/96, OGC telephoned the petitioner's legal counsel in the ASLB proceeding to provide a status update on the 2.206 petition and inform the legal counsel that there were no new developments.

The hearings were completed and the final filings from all parties were submitted to the ASLB by 12/22/95. On 6/20/96 Georgia Power Company and intervenor Mosbaugh filed a joint motion informing the Board that they had arrived at a settlement "in principle" and asked the Board to defer issuing any decision until 9/20/96. One of the conditions of the settlement was that the Board terminate the proceedings without a decision. On 8/2/96, petitioner

Mosbaugh filed a withdrawal of his intervention and, on the same day, petitioner Mosbaugh and the licensee filed a joint motion requesting that the ASLB issue an order terminating the proceedings without issuing a decision. The ASLB issued an order on 8/16/96 dismissing the case without a decision. The staff received an extension for the scheduled completion date until 10/31/96. The staff has received several extensions since October 1996 to allow additional time for staff review of the draft Director's Decision. On 7/1/96, 8/27/96, 10/18/96, and 1/8/97, the staff telephoned petitioner Hobby's legal counsel to provide an update on the status of the petition.

Facility: Advanced Medical Systems, Inc.
Petitioner: Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District (W. Schatz)
Date of Petition: 3/3/93

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NMSS
Date Referred to Review Organization: 3/17/93
EDO Number: 8663
OGC Number: P-93-003
Scheduled Completion Date: 1/31/97
Last Contact with Petitioner(s): 12/20/96
Petition Manager: J. DeCicco
Case Attorney: R. Weisman

Issues/Action Requested: Modify license for AMS to (1) assume all costs resulting from offsite release of cobalt-60 that has been deposited at the Southerly Treatment Plant and (2) decontaminate the sewer connecting AMS with public sewer system.

Current Status: An acknowledgment letter was issued on 4/2/93. Extensive environmental surveys were completed by Region III during the week of 5/24/93 and an inspection report was issued on 7/29/93. A Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District (NEORS) site characterization report was submitted on 6/30/94. A NEORS letter of 9/13/94 contained supplemental requests to this petition. An acknowledgment letter was issued on 10/14/94. A NEORS letter of 10/13/94 contained a second supplemental request to this petition; an acknowledgment letter was issued on 11/2/94. The scheduled completion date was extended several times in 1995 to allow preparation and staff review of an options paper for the Commission's consideration.

The staff provided status updates to the petitioner by telephone on 5/30/95, 8/1/95, 10/3/95, 12/4/95, 2/12/96, 4/16/96, and 6/18/96. Because of the agency-wide implications of waste disposal, the completion date was again extended several times in 1996 to continue staff review of the Commission Options Paper. The staff contacted the petitioner by telephone on 8/20/96, 10/22/96, and 12/20/96 to discuss the status of the

petition. The options paper for the Commission's consideration has been completed by the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards. However, an out-of-court settlement occurred on 12/20/96 for cost recovery action NEORSD brought against AMS and the other defendants. This settlement agreement addresses the majority of issues raised in the petition.

Facility: Advanced Medical Systems, Inc.
Petitioner: Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District
Date of Petition: 8/19/94

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NMSS
Date Referred to Review Organization: 8/29/94
EDO Number: 10395
OGC Number: P-94-020
Scheduled Completion Date: 1/31/97
Last Contact with Petitioner(s): 12/20/96
Petition Manager: J. DeCicco
Case Attorney: R. Weisman

Issues/Action Requested: Amend AMS license to install, maintain, and operate alarms on all drains from London Road facility.

Current Status: An acknowledgment letter was issued on 9/7/94. The staff completed its research of Picker Corporation's (previous licensee) license file to establish use/discontinuance of flow-rate alarms in the 1970s. On 12/29/94 the Sewer District requested a license renewal hearing per Subpart L, 10 CFR 2.1205. The staff met on 3/14/95 to discuss the petition. The scheduled completion date was delayed in June 1995 because of a license amendment request from AMS on 3/22/95, which requested installation of a sampling system on a proposed lateral sewer line. The completion date was extended in August 1995 to allow time for completion of the staff's review. The staff provided status updates to the petitioner by telephone on 5/30/95, 8/1/95, 10/3/95, 12/4/95, 2/12/96, 4/16/96, 6/18/96, 8/20/96, 10/22/96, and 12/20/96.

Facility: Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station
Petitioners: P. Gunter and W. de Camp, Jr.
Date of Petition: 9/19/94, as supplemented 12/13/94

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NRR
Date Referred to Review Organization: 9/29/94
EDO Number: 10473
OGC Number: P-94-023
Scheduled Completion Date: 2/3/97
Last Contact with Petitioner(s): 1/10/97
Petition Manager: R. Eaton
Case Attorney: G. Longo

Issues/Action Requested: Immediately suspend Oyster Creek license until the licensee (1) inspects and repairs or replaces all safety-class reactor internal component parts subject to embrittlement and cracking, (2) provides an analysis on the synergistic effects of through-wall cracking of multiple safety-class components, and (3) addresses generic spent fuel pool design deficiencies of Oyster Creek.

Current Status: An acknowledgment letter was issued on 10/27/94. On 12/13/94, the petitioners sent a letter appealing NRC's denial to immediately suspend Oyster Creek's operating license. The petitioners stated that the staff did not address their concerns regarding reactor vessel internal cracking and spent fuel pool cooling. The staff indicated that it is treating the 12/13/94 letter as a supplement to the 9/26/94 petition. A letter responding to the petitioners' appeal was issued on 4/10/95. The staff also indicated that NRC regulations make no provisions for appeal or reconsideration of such administrative determinations. The staff advised the petitioners that they provided no bases for revisiting the denial of the 9/19/94 request for immediate suspension of the license.

On 3/20/95, a letter was sent to the petitioners, for information only, transmitting an NRC letter dated 3/8/95 to Messrs. Lochbaum and Prevatte relating to the safety of spent fuel pool storage at the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station. On 5/22/95, Paul Gunter called to request information regarding Oyster Creek shroud bracket fabrication. The petition manager provided the requested information by telephone on 5/23/95.

On 6/16/95, Paul Gunter called to ask why GPUN was moving fuel. The NRC staff advised Mr. Gunter that to the best of its knowledge, the fuel was being moved to a different area of the spent fuel pool to prepare for moving fuel to the dry fuel storage facility. The staff advised Mr. Gunter that GPUN did not intend to transfer the failed fuel element into the dry fuel storage facility.

The staff issued a partial Director's Decision (DD-95-18) on 8/4/95 denying Requests (1) and (2) of the 9/19/94 petition and Request (1) of the 12/13/94 supplemental petition. In a letter of 9/1/95, the Secretary of the Commission advised the petitioners that the allowed time provided by NRC regulations within which the Commission may act to review Director's Decision 95-18 had expired; accordingly, Director's Decision 95-18 became a final agency action on 8/28/95. Paul Gunter called on 9/14/95 to make sure that the staff was continuing to review the spent fuel pool cooling concern. The petition manager advised Mr. Gunter that the staff is reviewing this issue generically and that upon completion of its review, NRC will provide him with its evaluation.

In a letter of 11/22/95 to the petitioners, the staff updated the status of its generic review and indicated that it had completed onsite assessments of spent fuel operations at four sites in addition to the detailed review at Susquehanna Steam Electric Station in response to the 10 CFR Part 21 report. The scheduled completion date was extended in January 1995 to 1/30/96, and again in January 1996 to 7/31/96 because of additional time required for staff review and resolution of issues on a generic action plan on spent fuel storage. In a letter to the petitioners of 1/24/96, the staff updated the status of the petition and enclosed a copy of Information Notice (IN) 95-54, "Decay Heat Management Practices During Refueling Outages," dated 12/1/95. The staff provided a status update to the petitioners by telephone on 2/29/96. On 4/24/96, the staff informed the petitioner of a change in the NRC petition manager.

The staff received several completion date extensions in 1996 to allow for staff review of the draft Director's Decision. The petitioner was contacted by telephone on 7/16/96, 10/8/96, and 1/10/97 and informed of the changes in the scheduled completion date.

Facility:	<u>Georgia Tech and All Licensees</u>
Petitioner:	P. Blockey-O'Brien
Date of Petition:	10/23/94; supplemented 11/12/94, 12/4/94, 2/21/95, 2/23/95, 3/6/95, 3/28/95, 4/18/95, 5/18/95, 6/27/95, 7/18/95, 8/18/95, 8/21/95, 8/28/95, 8/31/95, 9/17/95, 10/27/95, 1/10/96, 1/27/96, 3/14/96, and 5/24/96
Director's Decision To Be Issued by:	NRR
Date Referred to Review Organization:	11/15/94
EDO Number:	10598
OGC Number:	P-94-027
Scheduled Completion Date:	6/30/97
Last Contact with Petitioner(s):	12/31/96
Petition Manager:	M. Mendonca
Case Attorney:	M. Stein
Issues/Action Requested:	Withdraw license from, shut down, and decommission the Neely Nuclear Research Reactor at the Georgia Institute of Technology; revoke all licenses to discharge radioactive wastes to sewers and waters of the United States and oceans of the world, and revoke all licenses that use as low as reasonably achievable criterion; and add requirements to license for the transportation of radioactive material and to prohibit the transport of radioactive material by mail.
Current Status:	The petitioner was informed on 11/21/94 that the 2.206 process is a public process. An acknowledgment letter was issued on 11/22/94. The petitioner was contacted and has responded with supplemental letters dated 11/12/94,

12/4/94, 2/21/95, 2/23/95, 3/6/95, 3/28/95, 4/18/95, 5/18/95, 6/27/95, and 7/18/95. The scheduled completion date of the initial response letter was delayed in February 1995 because of the increased scope as a result of supplements and potential hearing issues. A status update letter was sent to the petitioner on 6/5/95. The scheduled completion date was extended in July 1995 to accommodate the remaining necessary reviews.

The staff issued a partial Director's Decision (DD-95-15) on 7/31/95 denying the requested actions based on the petition issues considered to date. The final Director's Decision will depend on the license renewal process, including potential Atomic Safety and Licensing Board hearings and appeals. In a letter dated 8/29/95, the Secretary of the Commission informed the petitioner that the partial Director's Decision constituted the final action of the Commission on the petition issues considered to date.

On 9/12/95, the staff responded to the petitioner's additional letters of 8/18/95, 8/21/95, 8/28/95, and 8/31/95. The staff received additional letters dated 9/17/95, 10/27/95, 1/10/96, 1/27/96, and 3/14/96. The staff provided a status update to the petitioner by letter dated 9/12/95. On 11/15/95, the petitioner was again informed of the status of the response to the petition via personal interaction at a Georgia Tech Research Reactor prehearing conference. The petition manager provided a status update to the petitioner by telephone on 1/22/96. A written update responding to the petitioner's 10/27/95, 1/10/96, 1/27/96, and 3/14/96 letters was sent to the petitioner on 3/22/96. The petitioner was contacted on 5/22/96 by the petition manager at a limited appearance hearing for the ongoing license renewal proceeding. The petitioner was informed that evaluation of the petition was pending completion of the ongoing Atomic Safety and Licensing Board (ASLB) proceeding. The petitioner sent in a supplement dated 5/24/96, which was docketed and provided to the ASLB panel for the license renewal proceeding during the limited appearances on 5/22/96.

In a telephone conversation on 5/31/96, the petitioner indicated to an NRC Region II official that she disagreed with the partial Director's Decision of 7/31/95. This was responded to by letter dated 9/26/96. On 6/17/96, the petitioner called the NRC Chairman to indicate that her supplement of 5/24/96 included all the information that the petitioner felt was related to the petition. The petition manager returned the call on 6/18/96 and discussed the status of the 2.206 review with the petitioner.

Because of delays in the scheduled completion of the ASLB hearing on the remaining contention, the completion date for this petition was extended to 6/30/97. The petitioner was contacted by telephone on 8/16/96 to discuss the

status of the petition. A status update letter was sent to the petitioner on 10/24/96. The petitioner was contacted by telephone on 12/31/96 and informed of the status of the petition which is awaiting the ASLB decision.

Facility: Millstone
Petitioner: A. Ross
Date of Petition: 1/15/95; supplements of 10/28/94 and 10/14/95

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NRR
Date Referred to Review Organization: 2/7/95
EDO Number: 10600
OGC Number: P-95-007
Scheduled Completion Date: 3/30/97
Last Contact with Petitioner(s): 1/8/97
Petition Manager: J. Andersen
Case Attorney: S. Chidake

Issues/Action Requested: Take "accelerated" enforcement action against Northeast Utilities for violations at Millstone involving procedure compliance, work control, and tagging control.

Current Status: An acknowledgment letter was issued on 2/23/95. The petitioner submitted additional information on 2/8/95, 2/20/95, and 2/23/95. In the 2/23/95 letter, the petitioner requested that the EDO act on the petition as soon as possible. The staff responded to the additional submittals on 3/20/95. Status update letters were sent to the petitioner on 5/9/95, 7/19/95, and 10/4/95. The status of the petitions was discussed in telephone calls with the petitioner on 5/25/95, 6/2/95, 7/24/95, 8/14/95, 9/22/95, and 5/29/96. On 5/30/95 and 6/2/95, the NRC staff discussed Northeast Utilities' letters of 3/15/95, 3/24/95, and 5/12/95 in telephone calls with the petitioner. Based on a copy of the petition obtained by Northeast Utilities, the licensee voluntarily provided a response to the petition on 5/12/95. An inspection (50-245/95-22, 50-336/95-22, 50-423/95-22) was conducted at the site in May and June 1995 to audit the licensee's response to the petitioner's concerns. The licensee responded with its investigation into the matters during the first quarter of 1995. Because the results from the inspection were needed to prepare the Director's Decision, the scheduled completion date was extended in 1995.

In a letter dated 10/9/95, the petitioner stated that the NRC update letters were inadequate. In a letter dated 10/16/95, Congressman Gejdenson requested information concerning the petitioner's 10/9/95 letter. The staff responded to the petitioner on 12/12/95 (and to Congressman Gejdenson on 12/14/95) and provided a status update on his petitions.

In a letter dated 10/14/95, the petitioner submitted an additional 10 CFR 2.206 request. On 11/24/95 the staff responded to the petitioner's 10/14/95 letter and informed the petitioner that its 10/14/95 letter will be treated as a supplement to this petition. On 2/7/96, 4/16/96, 8/12/96, 10/11/96, and 1/8/97, the staff sent status update letters to the petitioner. The completion date was extended several times in 1996 to allow time for further staff review.

Facility: Millstone
Petitioner: A. Ross
Date of Petition: 1/5/95

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NRR
Date Referred to Review Organization: 1/20/95
EDO Number: 15
OGC Number: P-95-004
Scheduled Completion Date: 1/31/97
Last Contact with Petitioner(s): 1/8/97
Petition Manager: J. Andersen
Case Attorney: S. Chidake

Issues/Action Requested: Institute sanctions against department manager, first-line supervisor, and two co-workers for engaging in deliberate misconduct in violation of 10 CFR 50.5; investigate procedure violations.

Current Status: An acknowledgment letter was issued on 2/23/95. Status update letters were sent to the petitioner on 5/9/95, 7/19/95, and 10/4/95. On 5/30/95 and 6/2/95, the NRC staff discussed Northeast Utilities' letters of 3/15/95, 3/24/95, and 5/12/95 in telephone calls with the petitioner. An inspection (50-245/95-22, 50-336/95-22, 50-423/95-22) was conducted at the site in May and June 1995 to audit the licensee's response to the petitioner's concerns. The licensee responded with its investigation into the matters during the first quarter of 1995. Because the results from the inspection were needed to prepare the Director's Decision, the scheduled completion date was extended several times in 1995. Based on a copy of the petition obtained by Northeast Utilities, the licensee voluntarily provided a response to the petition on 8/31/95. In a letter dated 10/9/95, the petitioner stated that the NRC update letters were inadequate. In a letter dated 10/16/95, Congressman Gejdenson requested information concerning the petitioner's 10/9/95 letter. The staff responded to the petitioner on 12/12/95 (and to Congressman Gejdenson on 12/14/95) and provided a status update on his petitions. The status of the petitions was discussed in telephone calls with the petitioner on 5/25/95, 6/2/95, 7/24/95, 8/14/95, 9/22/95, and 5/29/96. The completion date was again extended several times in 1996 to allow additional time for staff review.

On 2/7/96, 4/16/96, 8/12/96, 10/11/96, and 1/8/97, the staff sent status update letters to the petitioner. The draft Director's Decision is being reviewed by the staff.

Facility: Millstone
Petitioners: G. Galatis, and E. Hadley on behalf of We the People, Inc.
Date of Petition: 8/21/95, supplemented 8/28/95

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NRR
Date Referred to Review Organization: 8/30/95
EDO Number: 603
OGC Number: P-95-015
Scheduled Completion Date: 5/31/97
Last Contact with Petitioner(s): 12/26/96
Petition Manager: S. Dembek
Case Attorney: R. Hoefling

Issues/Action Requested: The petitioners allege that Northeast Utilities (NU) has offloaded more fuel assemblies into the spent fuel pool than permitted under License Amendments 39 and 40; that NU has knowingly operated Millstone in violation of its operating licenses; and that NU has submitted material false statements. Petitioners seek institution of a proceeding to suspend the operating license for Millstone Unit 1 for 60 days after the unit is brought into compliance with the license and the design basis. In addition, the petitioners request that the operating license be revoked until the facility is in full compliance with the terms and conditions of its license; before reinstatement of the license, a detailed independent analysis of the offsite dose consequences of total loss of spent fuel pool water be conducted; that enforcement action be taken against NU pursuant to 10 CFR 50.5 and 50.9; that actions be taken regarding a proposed license amendment pending before the Commission wherein NU seeks to increase the amount of spent fuel it may offload and that the amendment be denied; that the NRC retain an independent expert, at NU's expense, to prepare a safety analysis report on the proposed amendment; and that, before the issuance of any amendment, an analysis including both the probability and consequences of applicable events be conducted. In the supplement, Mr. Galatis raises additional concerns. These concerns are that NU also committed violations by offloading more than one-third of a core of fuel at Millstone Units 2 and 3 and Seabrook Unit 1. In addition, with regard to Millstone Unit 3, Mr. Galatis is concerned that NU submitted a material false statement to the NRC associated with a license amendment and that an unanalyzed condition exists with regard to system piping for full-core offload

events. With regard to Seabrook Unit 1, Mr. Galatis is concerned about technical specification violations associated with a criticality analysis. Finally, the petitioners make the additional request that a public hearing be held in the vicinity of Millstone Unit 1 to permit comment by the public on the issues raised in the petition.

Current Status: Northeast Utilities (NU) voluntarily provided its response to the 8/21/95 letter on 9/22/95 and to the 8/28/95 supplement on 10/11/95. On 9/22/95, the staff contacted the petitioner to inform him that issuance of the acknowledgment letter had been delayed because of ongoing investigations by the Office of Investigations (OI) and the Inspector General (IG) as well as independent NRC reviews. The staff also informed the petitioner that if he wanted to intervene in the Millstone Unit 1 spent fuel pool amendment, he had until 9/29/95 to do so. The acknowledgment letter was issued on 10/26/95.

The staff completed its review of the licensee's amendment request and on 11/9/95 issued the amendment and safety evaluation. The staff reviewed the IG and OI reports to determine if future inspections at Millstone were needed. A spent fuel pool inspection was conducted at Millstone in March 1996 to review the 10 CFR 2.206 concerns as well as other spent fuel pool issues. The scheduled completion date was extended in February 1996 to 7/30/96 because of technical issues requiring further staff review. On 2/1/96 and 4/9/96, the staff issued status update letters to the petitioner. On 2/5/96, a *Federal Register* notice was issued announcing a 10 CFR 2.206 informal public hearing to be held on 3/7/96. The 3/7/96 meeting was postponed because of poor weather. The meeting that was subsequently held on 4/8/96 was well attended and there was considerable public interest in the issues raised in the petition. However, the staff did not identify any significant new safety issues requiring further staff action. On 4/12/96 the staff mailed the petitioners and the licensee an advance copy of the 4/8/96 meeting transcript. On 4/24/96 the staff mailed the petitioners the official transcript.

On 6/7/96 the staff issued a status update letter to the petitioners. The update letter included a 5/21/96 report on the NRC's survey of refueling practices and a 5/17/96 letter from NU that answered an NRC question raised during the 4/8/96 informal public hearing. On 7/19/96 the staff issued a status update letter to the petitioners and sent the petitioners a copy of the NRC inspection report for the Millstone 1 spent fuel pool issues. The completion date was extended in August 1996 to 10/31/96, and again in October 1996 to 5/31/97 to allow for additional staff review. On 9/19/96 the staff issued a status update letter to the petitioners and sent the petitioners an NRC

memorandum dated 7/26/96 informing the Commission of the resolution of the spent fuel storage pool action plan issues. On 11/15/96 the staff issued a status update letter to the petitioners which included an example of a 10 CFR 50.54(f) letter sent to all plants (except Millstone) requiring information that will provide the staff with added assurance that plants are operated and maintained in accordance with their design bases and any deviations are reconciled in a timely manner. On 12/26/96, the staff issued a partial Director's Decision (DD-96-23) that addressed the technical aspects of the petitioners' requests. The wrongdoing aspects are still under review and will be addressed in a subsequent Director's Decision. See Attachments 2 and 3 for further information.

Facility: Palisades Plant
Petitioners: M. Sinclair and S. Skavroneck on behalf of Don't Waste Michigan and Lake Michigan Federation, respectively
Date of Petition: 9/19/95, as amended 9/30/96

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NRR
Date Referred to Review Organization: 10/4/95
EDO Number: 665
OGC Number: P-95-019
Scheduled Completion Date: 1/14/97
Last Contact with Petitioner(s): 12/4/96
Petition Manager: W. Reckley
Case Attorney: L. Clark

Issues/Action Requested: (1) Determine that Consumers Power Company violated the requirements of 10 CFR 72.212(b) by using the general license provided by 10 CFR 72.210 prior to establishing that conditions set forth in Certificate of Compliance Number 1007, Revision 0, for a cask unloading procedure had been met. (2) Suspend Consumers Power Company's use of the general license until (a) the safety issues have been resolved, (b) NRC has documented review and approval of the revised cask unloading procedure, and (c) Cask No. 4 has been unloaded. (3) Require a penalty of \$1,300,000 be paid by Consumers Power Company. (4) Allow petitioners to participate in the review of the procedures and any other hearings and proceedings initiated in response to this petition.

Current Status: The petition manager spoke with the petitioners by telephone on 10/15/95 to inform them that the 10 CFR 2.206 process is public and to obtain clarification on one issue. The staff issued an acknowledgment letter on 10/24/95. The petition manager, the Palisades project manager, and a member of the Plant Systems Branch spoke to the petitioner and another member of the public on

11/15/95. Most of the questions asked by the petitioner concerned transportation casks and were not directly related to the petition. On 11/20/95 the staff sent Consumers Power Company a request for information on cask unloading procedures. A copy of the request was forwarded to the petitioner. The petition manager provided an update to the petitioners on 12/15/95 and 12/18/95. Consumers Power Company responded to the request for additional information on 12/20/95. The staff sent a copy of the request for additional information and the licensee response of 12/20/95 by letter to the petitioners on 2/14/96. In response to a request from Petitioner Sinclair, the staff sent a letter dated 12/28/95, documenting that the staff is not aware of any reactor licensee who has offloaded a spent fuel dry storage cask. In a letter dated 6/18/96, the staff identified the subsequent offloading of a cask at Point Beach and corrected the record by identifying two additional occurrences of cask unloadings in the 1980's.

The scheduled completion date was delayed because of the staff review (begun before the petition was received) of Revision 1 to the Palisades cask unloading procedure. On 2/14/96, the staff extended the due date for the Director's Decision to 6/28/96 on the basis of the current status of the staff's review of Revision 1 of the unloading procedure. The staff provided a status update by telephone to Petitioner Skavroneck on 2/21/96, and to Petitioner Sinclair on 3/25/96. The completion of the review of Revision 1 slipped pending additional review of the 5/28/96 hydrogen ignition event at Point Beach. In addition, a second request for additional information was sent to the licensee in a letter dated 6/20/96. The licensee responded to this request in a letter dated 7/19/96.

In a phone conversation between the NRC case attorney and the attorney for the Lake Michigan Federation, the Lake Michigan Federation attorney indicated that she felt there were documents the petition manager should have forwarded that had not been sent. The NRC case attorney agreed to look at recent documents associated with this docket and send any required by NRC procedures. The Lake Michigan Federation attorney also indicated that she believed the staff's denial of the Petition to Intervene from the Michigan Attorney General was inappropriate because she considers this to be a proceeding. The NRC case attorney explained the staff's position that it is not a proceeding based on Section 2.206. The petitioner's attorney did not agree and sent a letter to that effect on 5/8/96.

The staff received the 5/8/96 letter from the attorney for the Lake Michigan Federation questioning the staff's handling of this petition and the 2.206 process in general. The staff responded on 6/6/96 and explained that the NRC's review of the petition is not the subject of a formal proceeding. On 7/18/96, the staff responded to a

similar letter dated 5/15/96 from the Assistant Attorney General for the State of Michigan. The staff also received a letter dated 7/12/96 from the Attorney General of Michigan regarding the timeliness of the staff's response to the petition and the event at Point Beach. Chairman Jackson responded to the Attorney General in a letter dated 8/26/96.

The public exit meeting for the inspection of Revision 1 of the Palisades cask unloading procedure has been delayed due to the event at Point Beach. Based on the anticipated technical and resource implications of the Point Beach event, the staff extended the due date for this petition to 10/31/96. Following routine update discussions with the petitioner on 6/17/96, the staff provided, by letter dated 7/2/96, a list of documents received or transmitted by the staff pertaining to the petition. On 6/17/96 the staff received a letter from the petitioners regarding the hydrogen ignition event at Point Beach. The staff responded to the 6/17/96 letter in a letter dated 8/8/96.

The staff review of the original Palisades cask unloading procedure performed in support of this petition will be documented in a routine NRC inspection report. The status of the staff's review was conveyed to petitioner Sinclair in a telephone conversation on 8/28/96. A telephone conversation was held with petitioner Roemer on 9/25/96 regarding related documents, processes related to confirmatory action letters, and the status of the petition review. Additional documents related to the petition were sent to the petitioners on 9/30/96. The petitioners amended the petition on 9/30/96 to include issues identified following the hydrogen ignition event at Point Beach. The scheduled completion date was extended twice in late 1996 in order to address the amendment to the petition.

Additional material and a status of the petition were provided to the petitioners in a letter dated 11/7/96. A telephone conversation was held with petitioner Sinclair on 11/13/96 to discuss NRC processes for confirmatory action letters and the NRC response to a letter from Senator Levin. Status update letters were sent to the petitioners on 11/14/96 and 11/18/96. The staff informed the petitioners by telephone on 12/3/96 and 12/4/96, that loading of a VSC-24 cask would be performed at Arkansas Nuclear One. The staff's response to Senator Levin's inquiry was sent to the petitioners on 12/18/96. Related inspection findings will be included in NRC Region 3 inspection report 50-355/96014. The scheduled completion date for the Director's Decision was extended to 1/14/97 to accommodate issuance of the inspection report and final staff reviews of the draft Director's Decision.

Facility: National Institutes of Health (NIH)
Petitioners: Drs. M. Ma and B. Zheng (D. Katz)
Date of Petition: 10/10/95

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NMSS
Date Referred to Review Organization: 10/10/95
EDO Number: 721
OGC Number: P-95-021
Scheduled Completion Date: 2/28/97
Last Contact with Petitioner(s): 1/14/97
Petition Manager: C. Jones
Case Attorney: G. Longo

Issues/Action Requested: (1) Suspend or revoke materials license of NIH because of willful, reckless, and deliberate violation of numerous regulatory requirements resulting in internal contamination of the petitioner, the petitioner's fetus, and other NIH employees; (2) take other appropriate enforcement action against NIH for its willful and reckless violation of 10 CFR Part 20.

Current Status: The petitioner was informed on 10/17/95 that the 2.206 process is a public process. An acknowledgment letter was issued on 10/30/95. The request that license no. 19-00296-10 be immediately suspended or revoked pending resolution of the petition was denied in the acknowledgment letter. On 11/2/95, the NRC issued a demand for information to NIH in which it requested that NIH submit a complete and thorough response to each of the issues raised in the petition. The response was received by the NRC on 12/11/95. The NRC, in a letter to NIH dated 1/29/96, forwarded to NIH a redacted version of a 1995 augmented team inspection (AIT) report and scheduled an open predecisional enforcement conference at NRC Headquarters on 2/26/96. NIH responded in a letter dated 2/14/96 requesting an extension of the predecisional enforcement conference until the middle of April. In a letter dated 3/19/96 to NIH's General Council, the NRC stated that the open predecisional enforcement conference had been set for 4/19/96 at NRC Headquarters and that several apparent violations identified during the 1995 NRC AIT, as well as during a special inspection conducted in late 1995, would be discussed at the conference.

The petitioners submitted a reply (dated 3/25/96) to NIH's response to NRC's Demand for Information which discusses a number of concerns raised by NIH's submittal to the NRC (dated 12/11/95). On 3/25/96 NIH wrote to NRC's General Counsel requesting, among other items, that the NRC hold the predecisional enforcement conference in Region I, and that the meeting be held as a closed meeting not open to the public. Subsequently, a representative from NRC's Office of the General Counsel informed NIH that NRC's plans were to go forward with an open conference on 4/19/96. NIH responded in writing (letter dated 4/16/96)

and informed the NRC that NIH would not attend the enforcement conference scheduled on 4/19/96 in order to preserve privacy interests associated with the issues raised and would instead make a written submission to the NRC AIT inspection report by 5/24/96.

The staff extended completion of this 2.206 by 3 months due to the delay in receiving the NIH submittal and notified the petitioner of the delay by telephone on 5/6/96. NIH submitted its response on 5/23/96 (which was received by NRC on 5/28/96) to the apparent violations as described in an NRC letter dated 1/29/96. The staff reviewed the document and on 6/6/96 placed a copy of the NIH redacted response in the NRC Public Document Room. The petition manager provided a status update to the petitioner by telephone on 6/5/96. The staff issued a Notice of Violation (NOV) and proposed imposition of civil penalty on 8/23/96 regarding the failure to secure from unauthorized removal or limit access to licensed materials that were stored in unrestricted areas. The petitioner was contacted by telephone on 8/23/96 and informed that the staff was extending the completion date by 3 months to allow time for additional staff review of the exposure events.

On 9/23/96, NIH responded to the above-referenced NOV, and protested the proposed imposition of civil penalty for violations of security requirements, as well as other violations cited in the 8/23/96 NOV. The staff extended the completion date for this petition to 2/28/97 to allow sufficient time for review of the NIH response and appropriate staff action. On 1/14/97 the staff forwarded to both NIH and the petitioner a complete version of a 1995 augmented inspection team report along with a copy of the final medical consultant's report. See Attachment 3 for further details.

Facilities: Palisades Plant, Point Beach Units 1 and 2, Arkansas Nuclear One, Units 1 and 2

Petitioner: F. Shillinglaw

Date of Petition: 11/17/95

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NRR
Date Referred to Review Organization: 12/28/95
EDO Number: 872
OGC Number: P-95-023
Scheduled Completion Date: 1/31/97
Last Contact with Petitioner(s): 12/3/96
Petition Manager: W. Reckley
Case Attorney: L. Clark

Issues/Action Requested: NRC take action to prohibit loading of VSC-24 casks at any nuclear site until the MSB #4 cask with indications in a weld, located at the Palisades nuclear plant, is unloaded and the

lessons learned are incorporated into the unloading procedures. In support of this request the petitioner pointed out that a dry cask storage action plan issued by the NRC on 7/28/95, states that the unloading procedures developed by licensees tend to be simplistic in that they do not consider certain contingencies and assumptions. The petitioner asserts that because these types of problems are discovered through experience, the proper way to unload the casks will not be known until the defective cask at Palisades is actually unloaded. In addition, the petitioner states that matters such as cooling, radiation exposure control during cutting, shim removal, and pool contamination require detailed NRC evaluation and, therefore, should not be simply left to the licensees to perform without NRC oversight.

Current Status:

The staff discussed the 10 CFR 2.206 process with the petitioner on 12/7/95 because the letter submitted was not clearly a petition. The petitioner was informed that the 2.206 process is a public process. The petitioner indicated she wanted the letter handled as a 10 CFR 2.206 petition. The acknowledgment letter to the petitioner was issued on 1/18/96. The staff plans to use the results of a similar 2.206 petition dated 9/19/95 (EDO 665) and the separate staff review of Revision 1 of the Palisades cask unloading procedure in responding to this petition.

The staff has reviewed information submitted by the Palisades licensee in letters dated 12/20/95 and 7/19/96 in response to an NRC request for additional information on a related petition (EDO 665). The staff provided an update to the petitioner by letter dated 4/10/96. The completion of the review of Revision 1 to the cask unloading procedure has been delayed due to the 5/28/96 hydrogen ignition event during loading of a cask at Point Beach.

Based on the anticipated technical and resource implications of the Point Beach event, the staff extended the due date for this petition to 10/31/96. The staff provided the petitioner with a status update in a letter dated 6/11/96. Due to concerns related to the timeliness of responding to the petition, the staff has decided to pursue completion of the Director's Decision prior to completion of the inspection of the revised cask unloading procedure. The staff's review of the original unloading procedure will be documented in a routine NRC inspection report. The status of the staff's review was conveyed to the petitioner in a telephone conversation on 8/26/96. A collection of documents related to the petition were sent to the petitioner on 9/30/96. The draft Director's Decision for the related Palisades petition (EDO 665) is being reviewed by the staff. The response to this petition will be provided after EDO 665 is completed.

Additional petitions related to dry cask storage have been received by the staff in recent weeks. These factors have caused an additional delay in responding to this petition. The petitioner was informed by letter dated 11/7/96 that the staff had extended the scheduled completion date for this petition to 12/31/96. The petitioner was contacted by telephone on 12/3/96 to inform her that the confirmatory action letter had been closed for Arkansas Nuclear One and that cask loading would be initiated at that facility. The scheduled completion date was again extended in December 1996 to 1/31/97 to allow additional time for staff review of the draft Director's Decision.

Facility: Davis-Besse
Petitioners: Toledo Coalition for Safe Energy, et al.
Date of Petition: 12/5/95

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NMSS
Date Referred to Review Organization: 12/15/95
EDO Number: 886
OGC Number: P-95-024
Scheduled Completion Date: 1/31/97
Last Contact With Petitioner(s): 12/10/96
Petition Manager: E. Shum
Case Attorney: L. Clark

Issues/Action Requested: Requests the NRC to immediately issue orders to prevent the loading of spent nuclear fuel into the VECTRA Technologies Inc., NUHOMS-24P dry shielded canisters at the Davis-Besse nuclear power station until an NRC rulemaking and/or license modification hearing is conducted on all safety-related changes which have been made to the canisters, as described in the Safety Analysis Report.

Current Status: The petitioner was informed that the 2.206 process is a public process. An acknowledgment letter was issued on 12/18/95 denying the petitioner's request to immediately issue orders to prevent cask loading. A status update letter was sent to the petitioner on 1/23/96. The petitioner was contacted by telephone on 4/18/96 and informed of the status of the petition.

The staff extended the completion date in May 1996 from 5/6/96 to 9/30/96. This extension was needed to support a staff inspection of the cask manufacturer which took place in August 1996. The petitioner was contacted by telephone on 6/19/96 and informed of the delay in the completion date. The inspection report will be referenced in the final Director's Decision. The staff contacted the petitioner by telephone on 9/17/96 and provided him a status update report. The scheduled completion date was further extended in September 1996 to allow additional

time for staff review. The petitioner was informed of the status of the petition by telephone on 12/10/96.

Facility: Westinghouse Electric Corporation
Petitioner: Shannon T. Doyle
Date of Petition: 5/30/96

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: OE
Date Referred to Review Organization: 6/5/96
EDO Number: GT96400
OGC Number: P-96-014
Scheduled Completion Date: 1/31/97
Last Contact with Petitioner(s): 11/5/96
Petition Manager: N. Mamish
Case Attorney: S. Chidake

Issues/Action Requested: Requests the NRC to take immediate action and issue a show cause order or civil penalty pertaining to Westinghouse's allegedly providing false information to the Department of Labor (DOL) Administrative Law Judge concerning qualifications for health physics (HP) technicians at Westinghouse.

Current Status: The petitioner was contacted by telephone on 7/7/96. An acknowledgment letter was issued on 8/16/96 that (1) denied the petitioner's request to institute a show cause order or civil penalty; (2) requested additional information from the petitioner relating to missing pages from an enclosure from the National Registry of Radiation Protection Technologists (NRRPT); (3) requested a complete copy of the transcript of the testimony given in the hearing before the DOL Administrative Law Judge; and (4) requested additional clarification regarding the alleged false statement by Westinghouse. A separate letter was sent to Westinghouse on 8/16/96 requesting a response within 30 days to the issues raised in the petition.

The petitioner contacted the NRC's Office of Enforcement on 9/5/96 to determine if Westinghouse was required to respond to the staff's letter of 8/16/96, and whether the petitioner could get a copy of Westinghouse's letter before responding to the staff's letter to him of 8/16/96. The staff contacted the petitioner on 9/6/96 and informed him that Westinghouse is not a licensee of the Commission and therefore is not required to respond to the staff's letter, and that the petitioner could get a copy of Westinghouse's response, but that the petitioner cannot wait on the Westinghouse response before responding to the NRC's letter to him.

On 9/30/96, the staff contacted the petitioner by telephone to identify whether he had responded to the

staff's letter of 8/16/96. The petitioner stated that he would mail his response by 10/4/96. On 10/15/96, the staff received the petitioner's response to the staff's letter of 8/16/96. In addition, the staff spoke with the petitioner on 10/15/96 and informed him that the staff had received his response and that it was being reviewed by the staff. Also on 10/15/96, Westinghouse contacted the staff and requested an extension (until 11/8/96) to respond to the staff's letter of 8/16/96. The staff granted Westinghouse's request. The scheduled completion date was extended in November 1996 to 1/31/97 to allow time for additional staff review.

Facility: Shieldalloy and Cypress Foote (previously Foote Mineral)
Petitioner: S. Bauman
Date of Petition: 7/22/96

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NMSS
Date Referred to Review Organization: 8/27/96
EDO Number: GT96596
OGC Number: P-96-019
Scheduled Completion Date: 3/31/97
Last Contact with Petitioner(s): 1/7/97
Petition Manager: J. Kennedy
Case Attorney: M. Rafky

Issues/Action Requested: Requests that Foote Mineral's license be reinstated, and that Shieldalloy and Cypress Foote be made co-responsible licensees with regard to the proper remediation and decommissioning of the Shieldalloy site. Also requests that any and all parties found to be involved in any wrongdoing as alleged in this complaint be terminated from employment, and that where appropriate, criminal charges be pursued. Requests that the environmental impact statement now being performed for the Shieldalloy site be terminated, and that Shieldalloy and Cypress Foote be jointly ordered to submit a decommissioning plan for licensed materials that includes only a plan to remediate licensed materials (to include grading and evaluation of all various assorted options, including disposal at a licensed disposal facility). Finally, the petition requests that the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency and Department of Health evaluate all unlicensed slag found at the Shieldalloy site. In Section Two of the petition, the petitioner alleges that Shieldalloy's decommissioning plan would wrongfully mix licensed and unlicensed waste.

Current Status: The petitioner was contacted on 10/2/96 and informed that the 2.206 process is a public process. An acknowledgment letter was issued on 10/11/96. The scheduled completion date was revised in December 1996 to 3/31/97 to allow

additional time for staff review. The petitioner was informed of the change in status by telephone on 1/7/97.

Facility: Maine Yankee and All Other Plants Using the RELAP Code for ECCS Analyses

Petitioner: P. Sears

Date of Petition: 8/19/96

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NRR

Date Referred to Review Organization: 9/6/96

EDO Number: GT96659

OGC Number: P-96-020

Scheduled Completion Date: ~~1/31/97~~ 4/20/97

Last Contact with Petitioner(s): ~~9/24/96~~ 1/27/97

Petition Manager: P. Tam

Case Attorney: G. Longo

Issues/Action Requested: Requests the NRC take action with regard to the Maine Yankee Nuclear Power Station and all users of the RELAP computer code for emergency core cooling systems (ECCS). Specifically, the petitioner requests that the NRC fine Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company and Yankee Atomic Electric Company if computer runs have not been kept in accordance with YAEC's computer code quality assurance procedures, and that the NRC inspect all users of RELAP and fine those users not operating within required computer code verification procedures.

Current Status: An acknowledgment letter was issued on 9/24/96. The petitioner manager was changed in December 1996 and the scheduled completion date was extended to 4/20/97. A status update letter was issued on 1/27/97 informing the petitioner of the status of the petition.

Facility: Northern States Power Company ISFSI

Petitioner: Florence Township, MN

Date of Petitions: 8/26/96

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NMSS

Date Referred to Review Organization: 9/13/96

EDO Number: GT96669/GT96670

OGC Number: P-96-021

Scheduled Completion Date: 2/15/97

Last Contact with Petitioner(s): 11/22/96

Petition Manager: M. Delligatti

Case Attorney: L. Clark

Issues/Action Requested: Two petitions request that the NRC take various actions regarding Northern States Power Company's (NSP) application for an Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI). Specifically, petitioner requests that the NRC reject NSP's

application for an ISFSI, or, in the alternative, suspend taking any action on the application pending the completion of litigation in the State courts. Requests that NSP be required to name the local governments expected to respond in the event of an emergency and allow 60 days for local governments to comment on the proposed emergency plan. Requests the NRC take enforcement action against NSP for violating the requirements of 10 CFR 72.32(a)(14) by not permitting the petitioner to comment on the proposed emergency plan before submission to the NRC. Specifically, the NRC is asked to impose a penalty in the amount of one million dollars and require NSP to compensate petitioner in the amount of \$7500 for time expended by its Board and attorney in attempting to obtain the emergency plan before submission to the NRC.

Current Status: The attorney for the petitioner was informed on 10/3/96 that the 2.206 process is a public process. The staff has determined that only the request for enforcement action falls within the purview of 10 CFR 2.206. All other aspects of the petition will be considered as part of NSP's application for the offsite ISFSI. An acknowledgment letter is being prepared.

The petitioner's attorney was informed by the staff on 11/22/96 that the petition addressed issues that were also part of adjudicatory proceedings associated with petitions to intervene. Therefore, no Director's Decision could be made until the adjudicatory proceedings were completed. Furthermore, the applicant has requested, and the staff has granted, a request that the license application review be suspended pending completion of Minnesota State judicial proceedings which could critically impact the continuation of the project. Subsequently, the Atomic Safety Licensing Board Panel which had scheduled a pre-hearing conference on the petitions to intervene also suspended its proceedings until the State court action is completed.

Facility: Point Beach
Petitioner: D. Dums on behalf of Wisconsin's Citizens' Utility Board
Date of Petitions: 9/30/96

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NRR
Date Referred to Review Organization: 10/2/96
EDO Number: GT96774
OGC Number: P-96-022
Scheduled Completion Date: 2/15/97
Last Contact with Petitioner(s): 12/10/96
Petition Manager: W. Reckley
Case Attorney: L. Clark

Issues/Action Requested: (1) Order Wisconsin Electric Power Company (WEPCO) to retain 24 empty and available spaces in the Point Beach spent fuel pool to provide the capability to permit retrieval of spent fuel from a VSC-24 cask in the event of an accident requiring removal of spent fuel from the cask or in the event that conditions of the Certificate of Compliance (COC) for the VSC-24 require removal of spent fuel from the cask, until such time that WEPCO has other options available to it to remove spent fuel from a cask in the event conditions warrant it.

(2) Order users of the VSC-24 cask not to load VSC-24 casks until the COC, Safety Analysis Report (SAR) and Safety Evaluation Report (SER) are amended to contain operating controls and limits that prevent hazardous conditions, including but not limited to the generation of explosive gases, due to VSC-24 material reactions with environments encountered during loading, storage, and unloading of the VSC-24 cask.

Current Status: The petitioner was informed on 10/3/96 that the 2.206 process is a public process. An acknowledgment letter addressing the petitioner's immediate concern regarding offloading of the reactor core during the Point Beach Unit 2 refueling outage was issued on 10/11/96. The current status of staff reviews related to NRC Bulletin 96-04, potential loading dates for VSC-24 casks, and staff activities related to the petition were discussed with the petitioner during a telephone conversation on 10/31/96. The petitioner was contacted by telephone on 12/3/96 to inform him that the confirmatory action letter had been closed for Arkansas Nuclear One and that cask loading would be initiated at that facility. An acknowledgment letter denying the petitioner's second request was issued on 12/10/96.

Facility: Shieldalloy
Petitioner: S. Bauman
Date of Petitions: 10/11/96

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NMSS
Date Referred to Review Organization: 10/23/96
EDO Number: GT96775
OGC Number: P-96-023
Scheduled Completion Date: 3/17/97
Last Contact with Petitioner(s): 11/14/96
Petition Manager: G. Comfort
Case Attorney: M. Rafky

Issues/Action Requested: Requests that Shieldalloy's license for its Newfield, New Jersey site be revoked and "downgraded" to one permitting possession of low-

level radioactive wastes for the purpose of decommissioning only. Petition also asserts, as a basis for this request, that Shieldalloy cannot meet NRC financial assurance requirements.

Current Status: An acknowledgment letter was issued on 11/14/96.

Facility: San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station
Petitioner: S. Dwyer
Date of Petition: 9/22/96, as supplemented 12/10/96

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NRR
Date Referred to Review Organization: 10/24/96
EDO Number: GT96778
OGC Number: P-96-024
Scheduled Completion Date: 3/14/97
Last Contact with Petitioner(s): 11/22/96
Petition Manager: M. Fields
Case Attorney: H. McGurren

Issues/Action Requested: Requests the NRC shut down the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station "as soon as possible" pending a complete review of the "new seismic risk."

Current Status: The petitioner was contacted by internet electronic mail on 10/16/96 and informed that the 2.206 process is a public process. An acknowledgment letter was issued on 11/22/96. A second letter was sent to the staff from the petitioner on 12/10/96 which provided additional information regarding the petition.

Facility: All Users of the VSC-24 Nuclear Waste Storage Cask
Petitioners: M. Sinclair and E. Roemer on behalf of Don't Waste Michigan and Lake Michigan Federation, respectively
Date of Petition: 10/18/96

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NMSS
Date Referred to Review Organization: 11/13/96
EDO Number: GT96801
OGC Number: P-96-025
Scheduled Completion Date: 3/31/97
Last Contact with Petitioners: 12/10/96
Petition Manager: M. Bailey
Case Attorney: L. Clark

Issues/Action Requested: Prohibit the loading of any and all VSC-24 nuclear waste storage casks by users of the cask under the general license, until the NRC, following an independent third party review of the VSC-24 cask design, has amended the Safety Analysis Report (SAR), Safety Evaluation Report (SER), and Certificate of Compliance (COC) to address the significant safety concerns raised in the petition.

Current Status: The petitioners were contacted by telephone on 11/26/96 and informed that the 2.206 process is a public process. On 12/3/96 and 12/4/96, the petitioners were informed by telephone that the confirmatory action letter for Arkansas Nuclear One (ANO) had been closed and that ANO would begin loading spent fuel into a VSC-24 cask. An acknowledgment letter was issued on 12/10/96.

Facility: Connecticut Yankee and Millstone Units 1, 2, and 3
Petitioners: D. Katz, Citizens Awareness Network and P. Gunter, Nuclear Information and Resource Service
Date of Petition: 11/25/96, as amended 12/23/96

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NRR
Date Referred to Review Organization: 12/20/96
EDO Number: GT96919
OGC Number: P-96-026
Scheduled Completion Date: 5/31/97
Last Contact with Petitioners: 12/19/96
Petition Manager: D. McDonald
Case Attorney: R. Hoefling

Issues/Action Requested: Petitioners request the staff to take the following actions: (1) immediately suspend or revoke Northeast Utilities' (NU) license to operate the Connecticut Yankee (CY) and Millstone reactors due to chronic mismanagement; (2) investigate the possibility that NU made material misrepresentations to the NRC concerning engineering calculations and other information or actions relied upon to assure the adequacy of safety systems at CY and Millstone; (3) if an investigation determines that NU deliberately provided insufficient and/or false or misleading information to the NRC, revoke NU's operating licenses for CY and Millstone, or, if not, keep the reactors off-line pending a Department of Justice independent investigation; (4) if the reactors remain operating, petitioners request that they remain on the NRC's "watch list"; (5) keep CY and Millstone off-line until NU's chronic mismanagement has been analyzed, remedial management programs put into effect and the NRC has evaluated and approved the effectiveness of NU's actions; (6) in the event NU decides to decommission any or all of the reactors at issue, petitioners request the NRC not to permit any decommissioning activity to take place until the above issues are resolved; and (7) commence an investigation into how the staff allowed the illegal situation at NU's Connecticut reactors to exist and continue over a decade.

Current Status: The petitioners were contacted by telephone on 12/19/96 and informed that the 2.206 process is a public process. An acknowledgment letter is being prepared.

Facility: Vermont Yankee
Petitioners: J. Block on behalf of Citizens Awareness Network, Inc.
Date of Petition: 12/6/96

Director's Decision To Be Issued by: NRR
Date Referred to Review Organization: 1/23/97
EDO Number: GT96950
OGC Number: P-96-027
Scheduled Completion Date: 5/31/97
Last Contact with Petitioners:
Petition Manager: V. Rooney
Case Attorney: R. Hoefling

Issues/Action Requested: Petitioners request the staff to evaluate two memoranda concerning the Vermont Yankee (VY) nuclear power station and take enforcement action, if it is warranted, based upon the information contained therein. The first document is a Citizens Awareness Network (CAN) memorandum reviewing information presented by the licensee at an enforcement conference involving the VY residual heat removal (RHR) system minimum flow valves. The petitioner raises a concern that the corrective action taken by the licensee in opening these valves may have introduced an unreviewed safety question with regard to containment isolation. The second document is a CAN memorandum reviewing certain licensee event reports (LERs) submitted by the licensee on a variety of issues such as fire protection, tornado protection, thermal protection for piping lines, equipment operability and equipment testing.

Current Status: This petition was recently received by the staff and is being reviewed for appropriate action.

END OF STATUS REPORT

Decisions Pending Before the Commission and the Courts

Petitioners: M. Hobby/A. Mosbaugh
Facility/EDO No.: Vogtle/5836
Decision No./(Date): DD-93-08 (4/23/93) (Partial)
Comments: Denied. DD-93-08 was vacated and remanded to staff (CLI-93-15).

Petitioner: W. deCamp, Oyster Creek Nuclear Watch
Facility/EDO No.: Oyster Creek/GT96345
Decision No./(Date): DD-96-22 (12/11/96) (Final)
Comments: Denied.

Petitioner: W. deCamp, Oyster Creek Nuclear Watch
Facility/EDO No.: Oyster Creek/GT96452
Decision No./(Date): DD-96-22 (12/11/96) (Final)
Comments: Denied.

Petitioner: E. Hadley on behalf of G. Galatis and We the People, Inc.
Facility/EDO No.: Millstone Unit 1/603
Decision No./(Date): DD-96-23 (12/26/96) (Partial)
Comments: Requests (1), (2), and (3) were granted in part. Request (4) will be addressed in a Final Director's Decision following completion of the staff's review.

END OF DECISIONS PENDING
