

From: "Tom Gurdziel" <tgurdzie@dreamscape.com>
To: <opa@nrc.gov>
Date: 6/15/04 4:05AM
Subject: Nine Mile Point License Extension Meeting

Good morning,

I would appreciate you sending these comments to Meeting 2004-0372 for the public comment part of the meeting on 6-16-2004. The NRC contact is Rajender Auluck.

Here are the comments:

Before Nine Mile Point, Unit 1 receives a license extension, I would like to see the permanent solution to the stub tube rolling problem on the Control Rod Drive penetrations through the lower reactor vessel head completely implemented and the effectiveness accepted as satisfactory by the NRC.

Before Nine Mile Point, Unit 1 receives a license extension, I would like to see a check made that the actual plant configuration matches the applicable drawings by checking the Interconnection drawing for the ASCO switch in the Diesel Fire pump room with the landing of EACH wire. (It is my opinion that they should match.)

Before Nine Mile Point, Unit 2 receives a license extension, I want to know that the feedwater pumps are being properly maintained, run, repaired, aligned, and supplied with auxiliary services such as seal water. (I think that 3 electric motors in about 18 years is about 2 too many for a plant staff with sufficient problem identification skills.)

Before Nine Mile Point, Unit 2 receives a license extension, I want to know that every nut on every core shroud tie rod is not loose each time it is checked, or that additional compensating actions have been taken and accepted by the NRC as effective.

Before Nine Mile Point, Unit 2 receives a license extension, all the important Uninterruptible Power Supplies (UPS) should be shown to be normally lined up to the most reliable source of power. (This should NOT be offsite power, in my opinion.)

Before either Unit 1 or Unit 2 receives a license extension, I want their standards of communication explained, and determined to be acceptable by the NRC. For example, why shouldn't the local public be informed that a person working at the plant was taken from the site and died, even if the person's name is kept confidential? Most importantly, is it honest to close commitments when they are not done? (The reference is the bottom paragraph of page 8 of Supplemental Inspection Report 05000410/2004006.)

Thank you,

Tom Gurdziel

CC: "James M. Trapp" <jmt1@nrc.gov>, "Gordon K. Hunegs" <GKH@nrc.gov>, "Ed Stronski" <ESTRONSKI@aol.com>