

From: "Raymond Shadis" <shadis@ime.net> PUBLIC
To: GATED.nrcsmtp("undisclosed-recipients:;", "nrc_conc...
Date: Thu, Jul 1, 1999 11:59 PM
Subject: Re: [NRC_CONCERNS] Public Meeting Notices

From: Raymond Shadis <shadis@ime.net>

Dave,

On your copy to me, the attached file was not attached. But, hey, if you're talking about the day long-day long, two day meeting in Gaithersburg, MD. on the 15th and 16th of July, it is a shameful episode for NRC staff in which the political muscle of the NEI is being used to get them to draft the essence of a rule making faster than Federal Express could send you a copy. The topic of all the recent "risk-informed" decommissioning meetings has been narrowed to "spent fuel pool accident scenarios leading to zirc fire and why we should put this and all other issues with off site impact away after 100 days". The staff's draft technical paper outlining assumptions can be had from Richard Dudley of NRR/NRC. After three days at the American Nuclear Society Executive Conference on Decommissioning, June 28,29, 30, I can tell you for a fact that taking them down cheaply is a key element to keeping them running cheaply.

After the last NEI/NRC decom meeting I attended I overheard John Zwolinski reassuring NEI that most of the SFP safety issues raised by staff would likely "go away" upon further review. (Is he treating his technical people like idiots or what?) By contrast, We, citizen advocates, have never received reassurance that upon further review our concerns would likely be justified- especially when John and his team were acting as public apologists for the thoroughly screwed up and soon to be canned Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station.

This time, at the Commission's behest, the staff started to review SFP issues pursuant to an expedited rule making on a proposed " risk-informed" decommissioning rule. When they(the staff) proposed to do a fresh look at the issues and assumptions as preparatory work, they were crushed and hustled by their management. Although, just to be fair, it must be said that nothing(zero) of public input is reflected in the staff draft.

Meanwhile, NEI is sanguine that the two day workshop listed above will pretty much wrap up the rule making. If they let this one slide by, our congressional people, investigative media, OIG, and nuclear safety advocates are, like NRC and NEI, simply pulling their respective or common pods. The least we can do is bring a little grit to the process to heighten their tactile awareness.

Ray

At 08:06 AM 6/30/99 -0500, dlochbaum@ucsusa.org wrote:

>From: dlochbaum@ucsusa.org
>
> June 30, 1999
>
>Mr. Anthony J. Galante
>Chief Information Officer
>United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
>Washington, DC 20555-0001
>

0/70

>SUBJECT: PUBLIC NOTICES

>

>Dear Mr. Galante:

>

>Attached is the meeting notice dated June 18, 1999, for an upcoming meeting
>between NRC senior management and representatives of the Nuclear Energy
>Institute. The stated purpose of this meeting is:

>

> "To discuss items of mutual interest."

>

>This notice also stated:

>

> "Meetings between NRC technical staff and applicants or licensees are
open

>for

> interested members of the public, petitioners, intervenors, or other
parties

>to attend

> as observers pursuant to Commission Policy Statement on Staff Meetings
Open

>to

> the Public."

>

>How can any reasonable person read the stated purpose for this allegedly
public

>meeting and make an informed decision on whether to observe it or not?

"Items of

>mutual interest" may encompass golf, the recent NBA finals, nuclear plant

>decommissioning, gardening, risk-informed regulation, or virtually anything

>under the sun.

>

>But the actual meeting agenda is not so broad. The meeting notice
specified that

>NEI would be represented by "Ralph Beedle, et al." I will wager that Mr.
Beedle

>will not show up at this meeting with every person who works at NEI.

Instead, he

>will undoubtedly show up with only those NEI individuals who are working
on the

>"items of mutual interest" on that meeting's agenda. Clearly, the NRC
staff and

>NEI have conspired on the topics that will be discussed during this
upcoming

>meeting. The NRC failed to let the public in on this secret.

>

>For a public notice to be useful, it must provide: (1) the time and date,

(2)

>the location, (3) the parties to the meeting, and (4) the issues that will
be

>covered. The omission of one or more of these necessary elements makes the

>public notice incomplete. The attached public notice is incomplete, and

>therefore useless.

>

>I respectfully request that you initiate appropriate actions to
immediately stop

>the issuance of meaningless public notices. The public deserves better.

>

>Sincerely,

>

>Original signed by

>

>David A. Lochbaum

>Nuclear Safety Engineer

>Union of Concerned Scientists

>

>

>----- ONElist Sponsor -----

>

>Having difficulty getting "in synch" with list members?

><http://www.onelist.com>

>Try ONElist's Shared Calendar to organize events, meetings and more!

>

>-----

>

>

----- ONElist Sponsor -----

Attention ONElist list owners.

<http://www.onelist.com>

We've just added a "NO ATTACHMENTS" option. See homepage for details.
