

**COMMENTS ON NRC PROPOSED RULE REGARDING DESIGN BASIS THREAT FOR  
PROTECTION OF NUCLEAR FACILITIES AGAINST  
SABOTAGE AND THREAT OF STRATEGIC SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIAL**

100

DOCKETED  
USNRC

To: Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001  
Attn: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff

February 23, 2006 (3:29pm)

January 2006

**DOCKET NUMBER  
PROPOSED RULE # 73  
(70FR 67380)**

OFFICE OF SECRETARY  
RULEMAKINGS AND  
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

The following comments regard the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's ("NRC's") proposed rule entitled "Design Basis Threat" ("DBT"), RIN 3150-AH60. The proposed rule was published in the Federal Register on November 7, 2005, at 70 Fed. Reg. 67,380. For the reasons stated below, we find the proposed rule unacceptable, and we unreservedly support the more precise comments submitted by the San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace and the Union of Concerned Scientists.

The proposed rule is the first NRC security-related rulemaking since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and we find it grossly deficient. The Commission promised the public a complete re-evaluation of its security regulations over four years ago, and this belated proposal is unclear, incomplete, and dishonest.

The NRC has failed to meet the challenges of the post-9/11 environment, for the revised DBT excludes the crucial adversary characteristics of the 9/11 attackers: the ability to operate as more than two teams or the capacity to carry out an airborne attack. By failing to include any proposal for protecting nuclear facilities from these characteristics, the NRC makes it clear that it has no plans to ensure that the public will be protected from a 9/11-style terrorist attack. Moreover, despite its claims to have "enhanced" the "adversary characteristics" of the pre-9/11 DBT, the NRC has actually weakened the standard for protection of strategic special nuclear material against theft by reducing the maximum number of hypothetical adversary teams from three to two.

We are also concerned that the NRC appears to have relied on unlawful cost considerations to limit the scope of the DBT by stating that a licensee should only have to defend against a DBT "which a private security force could reasonably be expected to defend." NRC safety and security regulations must be based on a determination of what is necessary to protect public health and safety, not a judgment of what is affordable to the licensee. And if the NRC has relied on some considerations other than costs, it has failed to explain its rationale, which constitutes a violation of the Administrative Procedure Act. Furthermore, it appears that the NRC's limitations on the scope of the DBT are based on secret comments from the nuclear industry which the NRC has not summarized for the general public. This is also a violation of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Submitted by:

Name	Address
Nancy Norwood	467 Luneta Drive San Luis Obispo, CA 93405
Barry Scott	75 BENTON WAY, San Luis Obispo, CA 93405
Michael M... Garry Kellie	2615 Meadow ST San Luis Obispo CA 93401
David K... Dale J. Kelley	37 17th St. Cayucos, CA 93430
Shirley Backman	4677 Waterfalls Road - Salinas, Michigan 48176
John Brannon	4677 Waterfalls Road - Salinas, Michigan 48176
Quayle J. Sext	421 Tahiti St. Morro Bay CA 93442
John Z	P.O. Box 84, Cambria, CA, 93428
	9211 Huer Huer Rd. Creston CA 93432
	2622 Raccolona Shell Beach, CA 93959

Template=SECY-067

SECY-02

**COMMENTS ON NRC PROPOSED RULE REGARDING DESIGN BASIS THREAT FOR  
PROTECTION OF NUCLEAR FACILITIES AGAINST  
SABOTAGE AND THREAT OF STRATEGIC SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIAL**

**To: Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001  
Attn: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff**

**January 2006**

The following comments regard the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's ("NRC's") proposed rule entitled "Design Basis Threat" ("DBT"), RIN 3150-AH60. The proposed rule was published in the Federal Register on November 7, 2005, at 70 Fed. Reg. 67,380. For the reasons stated below, we find the proposed rule unacceptable, and we unreservedly support the more precise comments submitted by the San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace and the Union of Concerned Scientists.

The proposed rule is the first NRC security-related rulemaking since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and we find it grossly deficient. The Commission promised the public a complete re-evaluation of its security regulations over four years ago, and this belated proposal is unclear, incomplete, and dishonest.

The NRC has failed to meet the challenges of the post-9/11 environment, for the revised DBT excludes the crucial adversary characteristics of the 9/11 attackers: the ability to operate as more than two teams or the capacity to carry out an airborne attack. By failing to include any proposal for protecting nuclear facilities from these characteristics, the NRC makes it clear that it has no plans to ensure that the public will be protected from a 9/11-style terrorist attack. Moreover, despite its claims to have "enhanced" the "adversary characteristics" of the pre-9/11 DBT, the NRC has actually weakened the standard for protection of strategic special nuclear material against theft by reducing the maximum number of hypothetical adversary teams from three to two.

We are also concerned that the NRC appears to have relied on unlawful cost considerations to limit the scope of the DBT by stating that a licensee should only have to defend against a DBT "which a private security force could reasonably be expected to defend." NRC safety and security regulations must be based on a determination of what is necessary to protect public health and safety, not a judgment of what is affordable to the licensee. And if the NRC has relied on some considerations other than costs, it has failed to explain its rationale, which constitutes a violation of the Administrative Procedure Act. Furthermore, it appears that the NRC's limitations on the scope of the DBT are based on secret comments from the nuclear industry which the NRC has not summarized for the general public. This is also a violation of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Submitted by:

Name	Address
James A. Sexton	467 LUNNET SLO CA 93405
Elie Axelroth	260 Rocky Creek Lane, SLO, CA. 93401
Sherri Gooding	324 Cerro Romandito Ave SLO, Ca 93405
Mark Miller	6667 Twinkberry Avila, CA 93424
Jeanette Myself	8600 SANTA LUCIA RD. ATASCADERO, CA 93422
	P.O. Box 2168, Avila 93424

**COMMENTS ON NRC PROPOSED RULE REGARDING DESIGN BASIS THREAT FOR  
PROTECTION OF NUCLEAR FACILITIES AGAINST  
SABOTAGE AND THREAT OF STRATEGIC SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIAL**

**To: Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001  
Attn: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff**

**January 2006**

The following comments regard the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's ("NRC's") proposed rule entitled "Design Basis Threat" ("DBT"), RIN 3150-AH60. The proposed rule was published in the Federal Register on November 7, 2005, at 70 Fed. Reg. 67,380. For the reasons stated below, we find the proposed rule unacceptable, and we unreservedly support the more precise comments submitted by the San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace and the Union of Concerned Scientists.

The proposed rule is the first NRC security-related rulemaking since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and we find it grossly deficient. The Commission promised the public a complete re-evaluation of its security regulations over four years ago, and this belated proposal is unclear, incomplete, and dishonest.

The NRC has failed to meet the challenges of the post-9/11 environment, for the revised DBT excludes the crucial adversary characteristics of the 9/11 attackers: the ability to operate as more than two teams or the capacity to carry out an airborne attack. By failing to include any proposal for protecting nuclear facilities from these characteristics, the NRC makes it clear that it has no plans to ensure that the public will be protected from a 9/11-style terrorist attack. Moreover, despite its claims to have "enhanced" the "adversary characteristics" of the pre-9/11 DBT, the NRC has actually weakened the standard for protection of strategic special nuclear material against theft by reducing the maximum number of hypothetical adversary teams from three to two.

We are also concerned that the NRC appears to have relied on unlawful cost considerations to limit the scope of the DBT by stating that a licensee should only have to defend against a DBT "which a private security force could reasonably be expected to defend." NRC safety and security regulations must be based on a determination of what is necessary to protect public health and safety, not a judgment of what is affordable to the licensee. And if the NRC has relied on some considerations other than costs, it has failed to explain its rationale, which constitutes a violation of the Administrative Procedure Act. Furthermore, it appears that the NRC's limitations on the scope of the DBT are based on secret comments from the nuclear industry which the NRC has not summarized for the general public. This is also a violation of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Submitted by:

Name	Address
Barbara H. Smith	14080 San Antonio Rd, Los Altos CA 94022
MARCIA MCCOY	2615 MEADOW ST, SAN LUIS OBISPO CA 93401
Brandy Pacheco	511 Hayley Ct. Nipomo, CA 93444
Nancy Nicholson	600 Downing St. AB
Jeanette Blyth	174 Village Crest, AB (mail POB 2446)
Courtney Coleman	823 Murray St. SLO 93405