

From: "Michael Mulligan" <steamshovel@adelphia.net>
To: "Victor Dricks" <vld@nrc.gov>
Date: 8/4/02 9:22PM
Subject: Fw: Cooper Nuclear Station

Published Saturday
August 3, 2002

Cooper Nuclear fights for survival

BY NANCY GAARDER

WORLD-HERALD STAFF WRITER

----- Original Message -----

From: Michael Mulligan
To: news@owh.com
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2002 1:09 PM
Subject: Cooper Nuclear Station

Nancy Gaardner:

There is no doubt that Cooper station is in operational and economic troubles. You are also in an extreme drought. For the last four or five years, we've been telling the NRC that global weather extremes are real, and that many nuclear power plants cooling systems are right next to their limits-like in the summer.

As you know, these federal agency's have many public processes in which to engage the truth of the operations of these facilities. You could call me an expert with the industry and the NRC. I tried engaging the NRC about the Cooper plant license amendment request- that the Missouri river water temperature has the potential to exceed plant design limits this summer. We have a lot of ears throughout the Nation.

Basically, the NRC through my comments, and my official attempt to engage the Cooper station, was deemed to be too controversial within the legal and economic problems of Cooper. You see all of the bureaucrats and corporate officials never want to be held accountable for their actions. That is why Cooper station is in such bad shape.

If you want to have some fun- and get educated a little about this issue- just show this e-mail to the Corporate and NRC officials. Ask them just who is this "nut" and what are his issues. There is no doubt that they know who I am. They know I am in contact with many plant employee- and I have an accurate take on what is bothering the employees. Basically, they see my name, and they know many millions of dollars are heading out the door. I am a nuclear safety expert.

Thanks,
Mike Mulligan
Hinsdale, NH

From: "Michael Mulligan" <steamshovel@adelphia.net>
To: "Victor Dricks" <vld@nrc.gov>; "
Subject: Cooper and the Country
Date: Tuesday, June 18, 2002 8:40 AM

Mr. Dricks

The Cooper heat sink TS temperature change is pathetic. Maybe they do it on purpose waiting for the last minute, so that it gets stuffed down the public throat. Wonder when they first became aware of this concern and when was this TS report completed. Is this not the second plant this year. I've asked for many years now that heat sink temperatures were trending up nationwide, asking for an official warning and characterization on this so that they can plan for it with material changes for the facilities. The Cooper heat sink has been trending up for a decade now- with you turning it into an emergency request for this summer- thus gaming the system towards a self made emergency fortifying the justification and rationale of the inexpensive rule change.

This agency contempt for grid reliability is passed pathetic. It shows your agency and the corporation internally perceived illusionary "self interest" has become your highest yearning- with your agency being dangerous to both nuclear safety and grid security (reliability). That is a very high national security concern. It indicates blindly putting the survival of the nuclear ideology and corporation's interest- CEO bonuses and corporate profits- over the welfare of the country.

Are you trying to keep the cost per kilowatt hour prices of the aging nuclear plants so low- such that this policy is dangerously throttling resources to the industry- as a strategy of making economics of the current fleet of nuclear plant "to cheap to meter" and recklessly increasing the risk to the public nationwide- so that the economical running of the current fleet becomes the illusionary justification of the new fleet. Is it just you boys getting together to "game" the new nuc's and CEO bonuses? Would you do that against your country for your own self interest?? By the way, this is putting a inhumane burden on the employees of these facilities where you cowoast them with enormously abusive "hidden" power- where you make them choose between the country's interest and the corporation interest.

mike mulligan
Hinsdale, NH

From: "Michael Mulligan" <steamshovel@adelphia.net>
To: "Dave Lochbaum" <dlochbaum@ucsusa.org>; "Victor Dricks" <vld@nrc.gov>
Subject: NRC and Cooper Ethical and safety concern.
Date: Monday, July 22, 2002 11:13 PM

Mr. Dricks,

It's like a bank robber going to a teller with a note, saying give me all you money or something bad will happen. Then, two police officers enter the bank with the intention of just cashing their paychecks. The robber sees this and walks out of the banks without any cash. Just because he was unsuccessful, should we not be concerned with his behavior in the bank or worried about her future potential criminality.

The issue of why Cooper did not answer the requirement of addressing "why they could not avoid this situation" per the regulations is very problematic. As I've mentioned in the recent past, these employees are highly skilled and educated, and thus an error like this needs to be thought of as intentional. These utilities interact with Tech Spec changes all the time and are highly experienced with the requirements of the regulations. I imagine they could go to the NRC before the submittance-to ask them to critique the completeness of it. There is never a legitimate reason for errors in an tech spec change. Does the NRC have an interactive tech spec change guidance computer program, the NEI, or anybody else?

Is it the NRC's fault that Cooper was not prepared for this drought- and the effects of Global Warming. The NRC should do an internal assessment on their accountability with this issue. As I've made clear in the past, we know that heat sink parameters and climatology has been widely erratic passed the norms in the recent past- there is objective evidence of this across the nation. Has the NRC been responsive to this and characterized "what is happening out there"? It is intentional that I am using parameters and not just temps.

We know that many utilities answer issues like this in a very selective and narrow manner- witness Oyster Creek and the refueling interlocks and Pairie Island with their Diesel Generators. Their intention is to try to feel out how slack the NRC will be, with a less than the full application of NRC regulations. There is no question that the utilities have a preconceived expectation on how ambiguous the NRC will allow them to be in meeting regulatory requirements. Cooper made a prediction that the NRC just might let them get away with not answering the full regulatory requirements, and even if caught, their would be absolutely no consequences. It is not much different than the illusionary games of the NRC and Davis-Besse There would be an expectation that the NRC would make a special effort in a recovery from this fumble.

Issues like this has a huge consequence for the industry. You hold the lower level employee strictly accountable for a poor decision that he was trained and educated on. He might get fired, demoted, get a poor eval, not get a bonus, and not be consider for a future promotion. You have got two tiers of responsibility and accountability- the employees can see this. It leads to a huge power imbalance and employees have less faith in the integrity of the system. Just when the "high bullshit alarm" is reached, should be a large-scale concern to the NRC- when they can clearly see the blatant hypocrisy of high level NRC and corporate integrity.

The "high bullshit alarm" can be defined as this. It is when the NRC and the utility have a book full of mindless rules and regulation, and have strict accountability to the lower level employees- and these insane rules that are too complex to be followed. Meanwhile the NRC and the utility has next to zero accountability with following any rules or to the larger issues of being ethical to the public at large. Most of these rules do nothing to make the employees conform to a set of standards- it is to provide cover on accountability to the high level managers. It is to make the lower level employees always at fault -and the upper level managers a "get out of jail card" on responsibility of following any rule. Truth be told, most employees end up breaking more than a few rules in every eight hour period- and thus management always have a full reservoir of issues to throw up as lower level employ errors- it is called magic dust -and thus accountability is never dishd out to management. The NRC knows this game very well. If you don't shut up- we will find something wrong that you did -is a well known issue at any plant. Everyone has done something wrong at these complex machines-except the exec's who are protect at the corporate office and the NRC.

We wonder about the torus temperature trends of the Cooper station- in the summer. Is there or has there been any relief valve leakage into the torus? Do they normally have to use suppression pool cooling in the summer to control temperature? Will safety equipment have to be run more for non safety reasons? Why can't you have a reduced reactor power limit when a plant is exceeding the heat sink limit- as a means to buy some time with the minimum consequences? Are there any degraded conditions present and not have exceeded limits, but with a relationship to the cooling and heat sink? How high is the threat to grid reliability with the shutdown of Cooper- is it just a threat to Nebraska Public Power District's profits? Does an "emergency" always equate to a normal controlled shutdown?

thanks,

mike mulligan
Hinsale, NH

Mail Envelope Properties (3D4DD351.585 : 5 : 50565)

Subject: Fw: Cooper Nuclear Station
Creation Date: 8/4/02 9:19PM
From: "Michael Mulligan" <steamshovel@adelphia.net>

Created By: steamshovel@adelphia.net

Recipients

nrc.gov
owf1_po.OWFN_DO
VLD (Victor Dricks)

Post Office
owf1_po.OWFN_DO

Route
nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	9646	08/04/02 09:19PM
Part.001	13321	
black.gif	67	
Mime.822	26104	

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard