

From: jim\_hoerner@hotmail.com  
To: <nrc\_concerns@yahoogroups.com>  
Date: 9/16/04 8:50PM  
Subject: [NRC\_CONCERNS] Re: Protecting Our Nation - Since 9/11/01 (NUREG/BR-0314)

[Replies to Dave and Ray]

>From: "Dave Lochbaum" <dlochbaum@ucsusa.org>

>Mr. Lochbaum formally requested that the NRC allow Mr. Blanch to represent  
>UCS in the NRC's closed-door security deliberations.

>The NRC turned down that request.

>The NRC also turned down a formal request by Mr. Lochbaum for a meeting  
>where they would listen -- just listen -- to the concerns from UCS and  
>other public interest groups.

Hi, Dave.

I was going to ask, "Upon what basis? (Would prefer to see their words, not paraphrased)", but I think I found it. Please advise if I erred...

[http://adamswebsearch.nrc.gov/scripts/rwisapi.dll/@pip.env?CQ\\_SESSION\\_KEY=LYGRALUSVOTR&CQ\\_QUERY\\_HANDLE=126533&CQQNUM=1&CQ\\_DOCUMENT=YES&CQ\\_SAVE\[ResultsReturnPage\]=results\\_list.html&CQ\\_CUR\\_DOCUMENT=6](http://adamswebsearch.nrc.gov/scripts/rwisapi.dll/@pip.env?CQ_SESSION_KEY=LYGRALUSVOTR&CQ_QUERY_HANDLE=126533&CQQNUM=1&CQ_DOCUMENT=YES&CQ_SAVE[ResultsReturnPage]=results_list.html&CQ_CUR_DOCUMENT=6)

or

<http://tinyurl.com/7xcu3>

Looks to me like they agreed with you, other than the silly request for polygraphs\*. Even willing to consider to have Paul B. attend some meetings, but not willing to give a blanket clearance. Personally, I thought it was an excellent reply on their part

\* <http://antipolygraph.org/lie-behind-the-lie-detector.pdf> - I encourage anyone who thinks the polygraph is anything more than an interrogation device to read this.

Regards,  
Jim

PS I really wish NRC\_CONCERNS had archives.

---

[Reply to Ray]

>Jim,

>You are avoided, not because you are witty or good looking, it is because  
>of your apparent inability to follow the thread of a discussion. The site  
>is NRC CONCERNS. Get it? It's about regulating NUKES! The thread was about  
>threats, then insider threats at NUCLEAR plants. The discussion is not; was  
>not about the comparable risks of fossil and nuclear. Though if we wanted  
>to  
>have that discussion with you, we could probably find a site for it. You,

C-68

>Paul Primavera, Alex Tuttle  
>and I. I could then bask in your gratuitous, personally insulting and  
>ignorant remarks about my motives and politics, which also have so little  
>to do with the topic of discussion. Maybe some other time. In the  
>meanwhile, please try to focus on NRC CONCERNS and if you can't, please  
>don't take it hard when you are ignored.  
>  
>Thanks, Ray

Hi, Ray.

Pardon me for not being direct enough. Sorry if my important points went right over your head. I was quite on-topic. Let me type more slowly this time...

Firstly, I don't care if you ignore me; I expect it. Particularly when you are asked to back up your insinuations with a reference.

Despite all your screaming while laying down on the floor with arms wailing and feet stomping, the record shows the NRC is doing a decent job. You insinuate they are not. What better way to measure the effectiveness of an organization designed to protect the public other than to actually measure the effect on the public?

If nuclear power plant produce about 1/5 the energy of fossil plants (it's actually more, but whatever), then one should expect about 1/5th the public fatalities from nuclear plant operation, if the NRC is doing a decent job, right? If they are doing a poor job, it should be more, if they are doing a fantastic job, it might be a factor of 10,000 lower. Sure, they might make mistakes, like me and unlike you, but let's look at the record since we have thousands of reactor years of experience.

BTW, people claim history repeats itself. In the case of US nuclear power, one can only hope.

So some hunter shot a duck and some buckshot rained down on a guard shack. I hear there's plenty of mildly-radioactive wildlife safe for consumption near nukes that the NRC makes owners monitor. What's your lack of point got to do with NRC\_CONCERNS? It's on-topic I suppose, but what are you saying? He could have caused a meltdown if he reloaded, drove through the fence and charged containment?

I recently took a picture of other terrorists staking out a NPP. Check it out... <http://www.calpoly.edu/~jpoling/Nuclear/mushlarson.gif>

Rant on, dude!

Jim

PS: As for good looking, that would be my wife. I'm a half-brained ugly geek... <http://home.att.net/~hoerners/images/summer2004/index.html>

--

Hold the door for the stranger behind you. When the driver in the adjacent lane signals to get over, slow down. Smile and say "hi" to the folks you pass on the sidewalk. Give blood. Volunteer.

---

Express yourself instantly with MSN Messenger! Download today - it's FREE!  
<http://messenger.msn.click-url.com/go/onm00200471ave/direct/01/>

----- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor ----->  
Make a clean sweep of pop-up ads. Yahoo! Companion Toolbar.  
Now with Pop-Up Blocker. Get it for free!  
<http://us.click.yahoo.com/L5YrjA/eSIIAA/yQLSAA/xYToIB/TM>  
----->

#### Yahoo! Groups Links

<\*> To visit your group on the web, go to:  
[http://groups.yahoo.com/group/nrc\\_concerns/](http://groups.yahoo.com/group/nrc_concerns/)

<\*> To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:  
[nrc\\_concerns-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:nrc_concerns-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com)

<\*> Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to:  
<http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

CC: <Know\_Nukes@yahoogroups.com>