

RAS 2257

RECEIVED CORRESPONDENCE

DOCKETED

October 2, 2000

'00 OCT -5 AM 127

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**
Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

In the Matter of)
)
CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT) Docket No. 50-400-LA
COMPANY)
(Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant)) ASLBP No. 99-762-02-LA

**ORANGE COUNTY'S FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO
APPLICANT'S FIRST SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS
REGARDING CONTENTION EC-6**

Orange County hereby responds to the document production requests contained in the Applicant's First Set of Discovery Requests Regarding Contention EC-6 Directed to the Orange County Board of Commissioners (August 30, 2000).

I. GENERAL OBJECTIONS

These general objections apply to the County's responses to all of the Applicant's First EC-6 Discovery Requests.

1. The County objects to Applicant's instructions and definitions on the grounds and to the extent that they request or purport to impose upon the County any obligation to respond in manner or scope beyond the requirements set forth in 10 C.F.R. §§ 2.740, 2.741 and 2.742.

Template = SECY-035

SECY-02

2. The County objects to Applicant's discovery requests to the extent that they request discovery of information or documents protected under the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work product doctrine, and limitations on discovery of trial preparation materials and experts' knowledge or opinions set forth in 10 C.F.R. § 2.740 or other protection provided by law. The County will provide the Applicant with a Privilege Log that identifies documents subject to these privileges and protections, which the County reserves the right to supplement.

3. The County objects to Applicant's discovery requests to the extent they seek discovery beyond the scope of BCOC contention EC-6, as admitted by the Board in this proceeding. The Applicant is permitted only to obtain discovery on matters that pertain to the subject matter with which the Applicant is involved in this proceeding. 10 C.F.R. § 2.740(b).

III. RESPONSE TO DOCUMENT PRODUCTION REQUESTS

REQUEST NO. 1. All documents that are identified, referred to or used in responding to all of the above general interrogatories and any subsequent interrogatories and requests for admissions relating to contention EC-6.

RESPONSE NO. 1. Orange County will make available documents responsive to this request at the offices of Harmon, Curran, Spielberg & Eisenberg in Washington, D.C., beginning October 2, 2000.

REQUEST NO. 2. All documents relevant to, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information regarding, the probability of a degraded core accident with containment failure or bypass at the Harris Nuclear Plant.

RESPONSE NO. 2. Orange County is in the process of conducting a literature review regarding the subject matter of Contention EC-6. To date, in the course of this review, Orange County has identified a number of documents that are responsive to this request, consisting of reports prepared by the NRC, NRC contractors, and other parties. These documents are listed in Appendix A, Bibliography for Contention EC-6, 26 September 2000.

Copies of responsive documents listed in Appendix A, which have not been prepared by the NRC or one of its contractors, will be produced at the offices of Harmon, Curran, Spielberg & Eisenberg on October 2, 2000.

Orange County objects to producing copies of responsive documents listed in Appendix A, which are authored by the NRC or its contractors on the grounds that (a) the documents are currently in use by Orange County's expert, Dr. Thompson; (b) it would be unduly costly and burdensome for Dr. Thompson to have to copy thousands of pages of these documents for CP&L; (c) the documents contain no handwritten notes or any other information that would supplement the contents of the reports; and (d) copies of these documents may be readily obtained by CP&L by ordering them from the PDR. CP&L should contact counsel for Orange County if it has difficulty in obtaining them.

Orange County notes that its expert is still in the process of reviewing documents to determine their usefulness in preparing an evidentiary presentation regarding Contention EC-6. Therefore, the County may not have identified all responsive documents at this time. The County will update this discovery response if and when any additional responsive documents are identified.

REQUEST NO. 3. All documents relevant to, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information regarding, mechanisms for a degraded core accident that could affect accessibility of spent fuel pool cooling and makeup systems at the Harris Nuclear Plant.

RESPONSE NO. 3. See response to Request No. 2.

REQUEST NO. 4. All documents relevant to, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information regarding, mechanisms for containment failure or bypass that could affect accessibility of spent fuel pool cooling and makeup systems at the Harris Nuclear Plant.

RESPONSE NO. 4. See response to Request No. 2.

REQUEST NO. 5. All documents relevant to, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information regarding, radiation doses at the Harris Nuclear Plant that would occur following a degraded core accident with containment failure or bypass.

RESPONSE NO. 5. See response to Request No. 2.

REQUEST NO. 6. All documents relevant to, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information regarding, the inability to restart any pool cooling or makeup systems at the Harris Nuclear Plant due to extreme radiation doses.

RESPONSE NO. 6. See response to Request No. 2.

REQUEST NO. 7. All documents relevant to, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information regarding, the loss of most or all pool water at the Harris Nuclear Plant through evaporation following the loss of pool cooling and makeup systems.

RESPONSE NO. 7. See response to Request No. 2.

REQUEST NO. 8. All documents relevant to, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information regarding, the initiation of an exothermic oxidation reaction in pools C and D at the Harris Nuclear Plant following a partial or complete loss of spent fuel pool water.

RESPONSE NO. 8. See response to Request No. 2.

REQUEST NO. 9. All documents relevant to, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information regarding, the probability of an accident involving the initiation of an exothermic oxidation reaction in pools C and D at the Harris Nuclear Plant following a partial or complete loss of spent fuel pool water.

RESPONSE NO. 9. See response to Request No. 2.

REQUEST NO. 10. All documents relevant to, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information regarding, the probability of the propagation of an exothermic oxidation reaction between adjacent assemblies in pools C and D at the Harris Nuclear Plant following the initiation of such a reaction.

RESPONSE NO. 10. See response to Request No. 2.

REQUEST NO. 11. All documents relevant to, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information regarding, whether the likelihood of the chain of seven events in contention EC-6 (see page 13 of the Board's August 7, 2000 Memorandum and Order) is "remote and speculative" and BCOC's position on the definition or quantification of "remote and speculative."

RESPONSE NO. 11. Orange County objects to this document production request to the extent it calls for the production of documents relating to the County's legal research and thinking on the definition of "remote and speculative." To the extent that this request seeks a factual evaluation of the probability of the chain of events discussed in Contention EC-6, see response to Request No. 2.

REQUEST NO. 12. All documents relevant to, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information regarding, any communication between BCOC, including its experts and consultants, with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, including any members, consultants, staff or support personnel (together, "ACRS"), regarding contention EC-6 or the subject matter of contention EC-6.

RESPONSE NO. 12. Documents responsive to this request will be available for review and copying at the offices of Harmon, Curran, Spielberg & Eisenberg in Washington, D.C., beginning October 2, 2000.

REQUEST NO. 13. All documents relevant to, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information regarding contention EC-6 that were used to develop the February, 1999 report by Dr. Gordon Thompson entitled "Risks and Alternative Options Associated with Spent Fuel Storage at the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant." This includes any documents relevant to, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information regarding probabilities, dose consequences, and inaccessibility to reestablish cooling within the scope of contention EC-6.

RESPONSE NO. 13. Copies of responsive documents that have not been prepared by the NRC or one of its contractors will be produced at the offices of Harmon, Curran, Spielberg & Eisenberg on October 2, 2000. All responsive documents generated by NRC or its contractors, are identified in the Thompson Report. For the same reasons discussed in response to Request No. 2, Orange County objects to producing these documents.

REQUEST NO. 14. All documents relevant to, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information regarding contention EC-6 that are referenced in the February, 1999 report by Dr. Gordon Thompson entitled "Risks and Alternative Options Associated with Spent Fuel Storage at the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant." This includes any documents relevant to, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information regarding probabilities, dose consequences, and inaccessibility to reestablish cooling within the scope of contention EC-6.

RESPONSE NO. 14. See response to Request No. 13.

REQUEST NO. 15. All documents relevant to, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information regarding, any proceeding in which Dr. Gordon

Thompson has been a witness or a consultant on any subject within the scope of contention EC-6. This request includes, but is not limited to: any deposition transcripts, testimony, affidavits, declarations, or expert reports sponsored in whole or in part by Dr. Gordon Thompson; any documents considered or relied on by Dr. Gordon Thompson in developing such testimony, affidavits, declarations, or expert reports documents; any deposition transcripts, testimony, affidavits, declarations, or expert reports filed by other parties to the proceedings; and any documents turned over by Dr. Gordon Thompson or any party in discovery.

RESPONSE NO. 15. Copies of responsive documents will be produced at the offices of Harmon, Curran, Spielberg & Eisenberg on October 2, 2000.

REQUEST NO. 16. All documents relevant to, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information regarding, the questions posed in Point #1 on page 17 of the Board's August 7, 2000 Memorandum and Order.

RESPONSE NO. 16. See response to Request No. 2.

REQUEST NO. 17. All documents relevant to, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information regarding, the questions posed in Point #2 on page 17 of the Board's August 7, 2000 Memorandum and Order.

RESPONSE NO. 17. See response to Request No. 2.

REQUEST NO. 18. All documents relevant to, or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information regarding, the questions posed in Point #3 on page 17 of the Board's August 7, 2000 Memorandum and Order.

RESPONSE NO. 18. Orange County objects to this request to the extent that it calls for legal analyses or conclusions regarding the appropriate scope of an EIS for the proposed Harris license amendment. To the extent that the request calls for factual information regarding environmental impacts other than the severe accident risk posed by the proposed expansion of spent fuel capacity at Harris, Orange County currently has no responsive information.

REQUEST NO. 19. All documents (including experts' opinions, workpapers, affidavits, and other materials used to render such opinion) supporting or otherwise relating to the written filing and oral argument that you intend to use in your Subpart K presentation on contention EC-6.

RESPONSE NO. 19. See response to Request No. 2.

REQUEST NO. 20. All documents relating to any meeting of the Board of Commissioners of Orange County at which the subject of contention EC-6 was discussed.

RESPONSE NO. 20. With respect to meetings of the Orange County Board of Commissioners prior to and including October 31, 1999 (the date when discovery closed in the first phase of this proceeding), Orange County will produce responsive documents at the offices of Harmon, Curran, & Spielberg starting October 2, 2000. With respect to documents generated after that date, Orange County is still in the process of assembling and reviewing documents to determine whether they are protected by privilege. Orange County will update this response as soon as it has completed this review.

Respectfully submitted,



Diane Curran
Harmon, Curran, Spielberg & Eisenberg
1726 M Street N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/328-3500

October 2, 2000

**APPENDIX A TO ORANGE COUNTY'S FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL
RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S FIRST SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS**

**Bibliography for Environmental Contention EC-6
26 September 2000**

(ANS/IEEE, 1983)

American Nuclear Society and Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, PRA Procedures Guide, NUREG/CR-2300 (2 volumes) (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, January 1983).

(Barker, 1982)

C D Barker, A Virtual Source Model for Building Wake Dispersion in Nuclear Safety Calculations (United Kingdom: Central Electricity Generating Board, March 1982).

(Benjamin et al, 1979)

Allan S Benjamin and 3 other authors, Spent Fuel Heatup Following Loss of Water During Storage, NUREG/CR-0649 (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, March 1979).

(Budnitz et al, 1997)

R J Budnitz and 6 other authors, Recommendations for Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis: Guidance on Uncertainty and Use of Experts, NUREG/CR-6372 (2 volumes) (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, April 1997).

(Burke et al, 1982)

Richard P Burke and 2 other authors, In-Plant Considerations for Optimal Offsite Response to Reactor Accidents, NUREG/CR-2925, (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, November 1982).

(Chen, 1993)

John T Chen, "Consideration of external events in the individual plant examination program", Nuclear Engineering and Design, Volume 142, 1993, pp 231-237.

(CP&L, 1998)

Carolina Power and Light Company, Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Docket No. 50-400/License No. NPF-63, Request for License Amendment, Spent Fuel Storage (New Hill, NC: CP&L, 23 December 1998).

(CP&L, 1993)

Carolina Power & Light Company, Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1: Individual Plant Examination Submittal, August 1993.

(CP&L, 1995)

Carolina Power & Light Company, Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 1: Individual Plant Examination for External Events Submittal, June 1995.

(Cramond and Spulak, 1981)

Wallis R Cramond and Robert G Spulak, Analysis of Nuclear Power Plant Systems Containing Radioactivity in a Core Damage Accident, NUREG/CR-2270 (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, November 1981).

(Darby et al, 1995)

John L Darby and 2 editors, Shearon Harris: Technical Evaluation Report on the Individual Plant Examination Front End Analysis (location unknown: Science and Engineering Associates, 16 June 1995).

(DiSalvo et al, 1985)

R DiSalvo and 3 other authors, Management of Severe Accidents, NUREG/CR-4177, Volume 1 (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, May 1985).

(Finch, 1987)

Stuart C Finch, "Acute Radiation Syndrome", *JAMA*, 7 August 1987, Volume 258, Number 5, pp 664-667.

(Gale, 1987)

Robert P Gale, "Immediate Medical Consequences of Nuclear Accidents", *JAMA*, 7 August 1987, Volume 258, Number 5, pp 625-628.

(Hirsch et al, 1989)

H Hirsch and 3 other authors, IAEA Safety Targets and Probabilistic Risk Assessment (Hannover, Germany: Gesellschaft fur Okologische Forschung und Beratung, August 1989).

(Leigh et al, 1986)

Christi Leigh and 5 other authors, Analyses of Plume Formation, Aerosol Agglomeration and Rainout Following Containment Failure, NUREG/CR-4222 (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, August 1986).

(Linnemann, 1987)

Roger E Linnemann, "Soviet Medical Response to the Chernobyl Nuclear Accident", *JAMA*, 7 August 1987, Volume 258, Number 5, pp 637-643.

(Lochbaum, 2000)

David Lochbaum, Nuclear Plant Risk Studies: Failing the Grade (Washington, DC: Union of Concerned Scientists, August 2000).

(McKenna et al, 1987)

T J McKenna and 8 other authors, Pilot Program: NRC Severe Reactor Accident Incident Response Training Manual, NUREG-1210 (5 volumes) (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, February 1987).

(Molina and Cochrell, 1986)

Toni Molina and Ruby Cochrell (editors), Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Containment Integrity, NUREG/CP-0076 (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, August 1986).

(Molina and Cochrell, 1984)

Toni Molina and Ruby Cochrell (editors), Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Containment Integrity, NUREG/CP-0056 (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, August 1984).

(Niemczyk, 1987)

S J Niemczyk (editor), Proceedings of the Symposium on Chemical Phenomena Associated with Radioactive Releases During Severe Nuclear Plant Accidents, NUREG/CP-0078 (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, June 1987).

(Nourbakhsh et al, 1998)

H P Nourbakhsh and 2 other authors, Analysis of Spent Fuel Heatup Following Loss of Water in a Spent Fuel Pool, A Users' Manual for the Computer Code SHARP, Draft Report for Comment, NUREG/CR-6441 (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, May 1998).

(NRC/EPA, 1978)

NRC/EPA Task Force on Emergency Planning, Planning Basis for the Development of State and Local Government Radiological Emergency Response Plans in Support of Light Water Nuclear Power Plants, NUREG-0396 (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, December 1978).

(NRC/FEMA, 1980)

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission and Federal Emergency Management Agency, Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants, NUREG-0654 (Washington, DC: NRC, November 1980).

(NRC, 1997a)

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Individual Plant Examination Program: Perspectives on Reactor Safety and Plant Performance, NUREG-1560 (3 volumes) (Washington, DC: NRC, December 1997).

(NRC, 1997b)

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, The Use of PRA in Risk-Informed

Applications, Draft Report for Comment, NUREG-1602 (Washington, DC: NRC, June 1997).

(NRC, 1990)

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Severe Accident Risks: An Assessment for Five US Nuclear Power Plants, NUREG-1150 (2 volumes) (Washington, DC: NRC, December 1990).

(NRC, 1984)

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA) Reference Document, Final Report, NUREG-1050, (Washington, DC: NRC, September 1984).

(NRC, 1983)

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Final Environmental Statement Related to the Operation of Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant Units 1 and 2, NUREG-0972, (Washington, DC: NRC, October 1983).

(NRC, 1982)

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NRC Report on the January 25, 1982 Steam Generator Tube Rupture at R E Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, NUREG-0909, (Washington, DC: NRC, April 1982).

(NRC, 1981)

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement related to decontamination and disposal of radioactive wastes resulting from March 28, 1979, accident, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2, NUREG-0683 (2 volumes) (Washington, DC: NRC, March 1981).

(NRC, 1979)

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Generic Environmental Impact Statement on Handling and Storage of Spent Light Water Power Reactor Fuel, NUREG-0575 (2 volumes), (Washington, DC: NRC, August, 1979).

(NRC, 1975)

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Reactor Safety Study, WASH-1400 (NUREG-75/014), Appendix VI (Washington, DC: NRC, October 1975).

(Pelto et al, 1985)

P J Pelto and 2 other authors, Reliability Analysis of Containment Isolation Systems, NUREG/CR-4220 (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, June 1985).

(Pisano et al, 1984)

Nicola A Pisano and 3 other authors, The Potential for Propagation of a Self-Sustaining Zirconium Oxidation Following Loss of Water in a Spent Fuel Storage

Pool, rough draft report prepared for the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, January 1984.

(Prassinos et al, 1989)

P G Prassinos and 8 other authors, Seismic Failure and Cask Drop Analyses of the Spent Fuel Pools at Two Representative Nuclear Power Plants, NUREG/CR-5176 (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, January 1989).

(Rogovin et al, 1980)

Mitchell Rogovin (director), Three Mile Island: A Report to the Commissioners and the Public (2 volumes) (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, January 1980).

(Sailor et al, 1987)

V L Sailor and 3 other authors, Severe Accidents in Spent Fuel Pools in Support of Generic Safety Issue 82, NUREG/CR-4982 (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, July 1987).

(Shleien, 1983)

Bernard Shleien, Preparedness and Response in Radiation Accidents (Rockville, MD: US Department of Health and Human Services, August 1983).

(Siu et al, 1996)

N Siu and 4 other authors, Loss of Spent Fuel Pool Cooling PRA: Model and Results, INEL-96/0334 (Idaho Falls, ID: Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, September 1996).

(Thompson, 1999)

Gordon Thompson, Risks and Alternative Options Associated with Spent Fuel Storage at the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Institute for Resource and Security Studies, February 1999).

(Throm, 1989)

E D Throm, Regulatory Analysis for the Resolution of Generic Issue 82, "Beyond Design Basis Accidents in Spent Fuel Pools", NUREG-1353 (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, April 1989).

(Travis et al, 1997)

R J Travis and 3 other authors, A Safety and Regulatory Assessment of Generic BWR and PWR Permanently Shutdown Nuclear Power Plants, NUREG/CR-6451 (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, August 1997).

(Vijaykumar et al, 1995)

R Vijaykumar and 2 other authors, Technical Evaluation Report of the Shearon Harris Individual Plant Examination Back-End Submittal (Rockville, MD: Energy Research Inc, May 1995).

(Wreathall et al, 1985)

J Wreathall and 2 other authors, Management of Severe Accidents, NUREG/CR-4177, Volume 2 (Washington, DC: US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, May 1985).

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of)	
)	
CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT)	Docket No. 50-400 -OLA
(Shearon Harris Nuclear)	ASLBP No. 99-762-02-LA
Power Plant))	
)	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on October 2, 2000, copies of Orange County's First Supplemental Response to Applicant's First Set of Discovery Requests Regarding Contention EC-6 were served on the service list below by e-mail and/or first class mail as indicated below:

Secretary of the Commission
Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications
Staff
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555
E-mail: hearingdocket@nrc.gov

Steven Carr, Esq.
Carolina Power & Light Co.
411 Fayetteville Street Mall
Post Office Box 1551 - CPB 13A2
Raleigh, NC 27602-1551
E-mail: steven.carr@cplc.com

Susan L. Uttal, Esq.
Jennifer M. Euchner, Esq.
Office of the General Counsel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555
E-mail: slu@nrc.gov, jme@nrc.gov

Moses Carey, Chair
Orange County Board of Commissioners
P.O. Box 8181
Hillsborough, NC 27278
E-mail: Mcarey@mindspring.com

Paul Thames
County Engineer
Orange County Board of Commissioners
P.O. Box 8181
Hillsborough, NC 27278

Adjudicatory File
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Dr. Peter S. Lam
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Mail Stop T 3F-23
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555
E-mail: psl@nrc.gov

Thomas D. Murphy
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Mail Stop T 3F-23
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555
E-mail: fjs@nrc.gov

John H. O'Neill, Jr., Esq.
William R. Hollaway, Esq.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
2300 N Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-1128
E-mail: john_o'neill@shawpittman.com,
william.hollaway@shawpittman.com

G. Paul Bollwerk, III, Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Mail Stop T 3F-23
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555
E-mail: gpb@nrc.gov



Diane Curran