

**From:** Neil Sheehan, *NI*  
**To:** Patrick Milano  
**Date:** 2/15/02 10:51AM  
**Subject:** Re: story on IP2 containment

Pat,

As I feared, Witherspoon left readers with a distorted impression of the containment situation. He wrote that we have told Entergy to "prove that the rusted spots were not the result of a 6.5-inch-inch leak area that would release radiation into the atmosphere in an emergency." This despite the fact that I explained to him several times that the 6.5-inch area was theoretical and used just for risk analysis purposes. I did this both verbally and via e-mail. The good news is that Entergy's Fred Dacimo states unequivocally in the third paragraph that there is no hole in the containment building. However, I still feel like I should talk to Witherspoon about this once again in an effort to set the record straight.

Here are some other inaccuracies I spotted in the story that I'd like your help in responding to:

\* He writes that during a catastrophic accident at a nuclear power plant, "fuel would melt through the nuclear reactor's steel walls, creating a radioactive lava that would flow into water pooled on the building's floor. That would generate a radioactive steam explosion, instantly doubling or tripling the pressure inside and sending a steady plume of radiated steam through any hole in the containment building." Even at TMI the reactor vessel wasn't breached. Can we safely tell him the scenario he describes is beyond any design basis accident?

\* David Lochbaum is quoted as saying that as a result of the service water leak in the 1980s, the water level inside containment "reached nine feet around the reactor." Isn't that greatly exaggerated? Wasn't it only several inches at the bottom of containment?

\* Lochbaum also says the company didn't look at the damage from the water back then. Is that true?

\* The last paragraph of the story contains a quote from me stating that the "administration" believes it is prudent to formalize security requirements. I would never speak for the administration but did tell him the NRC considered those changes to be prudent.

If you spot any other inaccuracies I should mention to Roger, please let me know.

Thanks,  
Neil

**CC:** Diane Screnci; Hubert J. Miller; Pete Eselgroth; Scott Barber

3/4