

## Attachment 6

**From:** Alex Murray  
**To:** Robert Nelson  
**Date:** 8/25/03 4:22PM  
**Subject:** Chemical COnsequences at MOX

Bob,

Thanx for the feedback last Thursday. I am still not sure of what you have been tasked with or the objectives of management. Some of what youo're looking for seems to be more in line with an IG approach and not a line management approach.

Be that as it may, I find it particularly ironic, offensive, and potentially intimidating that you have stated I am the "only one" who recalls premature closing of CS-05 and that you fallaciously imply I should have raised it to management prior to writing the DPV - that I did not do my job!! Hogwash!! The fact is I did raise the concerns multiple times in the January 2002 to January 2003 timeframe. Instead of scrutinizing me, the DPV author, you should be scrutinizing and questioning local management and staff as to why this issue was closed prematurely and how to improve conditions so that the staff feel free to raise safety concerns and issues with management. I note that actions against staff who raise safety issues contradicts NRC management policy and the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Remember, a DPV panel picked by upper management reviewed the DPV and numerous documentation, and interviewed people involved in the program, and concluded the DPV had merit. The DPV panel made the recommendation you have been tasked to investigate.

As I have stated, meeting summaries and reports are usually heavily sanitized and do not completely reflect what actually occurred. Staff questions are sometimes restricted or rephrased by management. As I told you, the question labeled as CS-05 at the meeting is a subset of the CS-05 issue in the April 2002 DSER and the Part 70 regulation, and the applicant only provided information to close this subset, not the whole issue.

I do not know the specific questions that you asked other attendees at the December 2002 MOX public meeting. However, I am not surprised that no one else has stated recalling premature closure of CS-05 by management given the potentially intimidating conditions that have existed. As I told you, I have had colleagues confide that they agree with me but they are afraid to do so in meetings because they want career advancement, and fear such agreement (i.e., raising open issues) will negatively impact their career opportunities. I note that this is consistent with the recent OIG safety climate survey.

I recommend that, instead of scrutinizing me - the DPV author, you poll the other attendees and ask them if they felt the information in the December 2002 meeting report closed the CS-05 issue as stated in the April 2002 DSER and met the requirements of the regulation. Clearly, the DPV panel concluded it did not.

Alex.