

**From:** "Michael Mulligan" <steamshovel685@earthlink.net>  
**To:** "Victor L Dricks" <vld@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** 12/3/01 2:49PM  
**Subject:** In addition to my Vermont Yankee 10 CFR2.206.

Mr. Dricks,

This is in relation to my recent LaSalle and Vermont Yankee 2.206. The recent stakeholders meeting on 10 CFR 50.46 reflects my general concerns at Vermont Yankee. Nowhere does the safety enhancement express because of a reduction ECCS robustment, just what is the magnitude of the change of safety, as in risk informed analysis.

As in a slowing down in the DG startup requirement, just what is the safety enhancements quantified in risk informed. As in the DG load sequencing, what is the change in risk reduction from this, from a DG failure in an accident.

What we are talking here, is a reductions in the current levels of safety for the convenience of the industry. The NRC has become so influenced by the industry, that you are prohibited from expressing the same level of truth, whether it's going to increase the cost to the nuclear industry for an safety enhancement, or the industry, when the they are asking the NRC for a payback because of political favors. When it comes to political favors to the industry, you always look through the wrong end of the binoculars.

In risk terms, these benefits are less than insignificant. I guess a whole list of "less than insignificant" items, but positive enhancements, is enough to overpower the delicate scales of justice and safety. You guys just don't have the courage to ask for a license change because of just of a convenience to the utility, or as a situation to increase profits. And that is an enormous corruption to your system. It is a shame that your NRC employees haven't been able to critique issues as these.

mike mulligan  
Hinsdale, NH

Enclosure 2