

**CORR: 00-0061**

*Merrifield*  
**CORR: 00-0061**

## **COMMISSION CORRESPONDENCE**

### **Correspondence Response Sheet**

**Date:** **April 3, 2000**

Approve with edits.

**To:** **Chairman Meserve**  
**Commissioner Dicus**  
**Commissioner Diaz**  
**Commissioner McGaffigan**  
**Commissioner Merrifield**

*[Signature]*  
~~Jeffrey S. Merrifield, 4/5/00~~

**From:** **Annette Vietti-Cook, Secretary**

**Subject:** **Letter to Congresswoman Nita Lowey concerns status of Indian Point 2 nuclear power facility**

**ACTION:** **Please comment/concur and respond to the Office of the Secretary by:**

**Time:** **C.O.B.**  
**Day:** **Tuesday**  
**Date:** **April 11, 2000**

**Comment:**

**Contact:** **George Wunder, EDO/NRR**  
**415-1494**

**Entered in STARS Tracking System**  **Yes**  **No**

*W/18*



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Nita M. Lowey  
United States House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congresswoman Lowey:

I am responding to your letter of March 22, 2000, regarding your concerns about the status of Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2 (IP2) in Buchanan, New York. In your letter, you joined scientific and community advocacy groups in requesting that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) ensure that IP2 remain shut down until (1) all four steam generators are replaced, (2) the concerns raised in Dr. Joram Hopfeld's differing professional opinion regarding steam generator tube integrity are resolved, and (3) potassium iodide tablets are distributed to residents and businesses within the 10-mile emergency planning zone or stockpiled in the vicinity of IP2. You also requested that the NRC hold a public meeting in Westchester County to discuss these three issues and other public concerns.

In a letter dated March 14, 2000, the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Nuclear Information and Resource Service, the PACE Law School Energy Project, and Public Citizen's Critical Mass Energy Project, filed a Petition pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 requesting that the NRC issue an order preventing IP2 from restarting until the three issues you mentioned are resolved. The Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation will advise the Petitioners of his decision on their request and of the reasons for that decision as soon as he completes his review. We will ~~ensure that you are~~ <sup>keep you fully</sup> informed of all developments on this issue and we will ~~send you a copy of~~ <sup>promptly provide</sup> our response to the Petitioners as soon as it is available.

In regard to your request that we hold a public meeting to discuss these three issues and other public concerns, we have already arranged to meet with the Petitioners on April 7, 2000, in our offices in Rockville, Maryland. We will also hold a public meeting at the Indian Point site before restart. Members of the NRC staff who are responsible for the review of the Petition will attend this meeting

I trust this response addresses your concerns.

Sincerely,

and will be prepared to answer questions from members of the public.

Richard A. Meserve