

From: Mitzi Young
To: D. Ashley
Date: 09/28/2006 12:16:48 PM
Subject: Fwd: Re: Details regarding water incident

>>> "Richard Webster" <rwebster@kinoy.rutgers.edu> 09/26/2006 4:16 PM >>>
Thanks. Having read the report, we still have very serious concerns about the water incident. Please find below a non-exhaustive list of questions that remain. Please provide a written response to these questions as soon as possible.

Key Questions

1. Who emptied the water collection jugs and when?
2. How and when did the inspectors know that the jugs had been emptied?
3. Were the contents of the jugs radioactive?
4. Where are the jugs and can they be tested for residues?
5. Where were the contents dumped?
6. Where did the overflow from the jugs documented by the State of New Jersey drain to?
7. Did radioactive water leave the facility and enter groundwater in the surrounding area?
8. Were all the drains leaking water?
9. Did the leaking water originate from the pool of water above the reactor that stores the spent fuel?
10. What is the longest that any part of the epoxy coating has gone without inspection?
11. How are the visual inspections of the epoxy coating carried out? How are they documented? Please provide a schedule of when visual monitoring has occurred and the reports and data generated.
12. What penalties will the NRC impose on AmerGen as a result of this incident?
13. Is the proposed measurement of 1% of the area of the sandbed region sufficient to determine whether the thickness of the containment vessel at Oyster Creek meets current safety margins?
14. Please repeat your explanation provided at the meeting as to how you concluded that the aging management of the drywell shell in the embedded region is adequate. If, as I understood at the time, you are relying on an expert opinion or report to draw this conclusion, please release the opinion and a resume of the expert.
15. At the meeting you claimed to be an expert on corrosion. Please provide a copy of your resume to demonstrate your expertise.
16. If NRR has not yet completed its analysis of whether the current safety margins are adequate, how can you be reasonably sure that the proposed inspection regime for the drywell shell will be sufficiently accurate to detect with a high degree of certainty whether the shell thickness in the sandbed region is within any revised safety margins that may be established after NRR's work is complete?

Should you decide not to answer any of these questions, please provide a written explanation of the basis for your refusal. I look forward to hearing from you.

Thanks

Richard Webster
Staff Attorney
Rutgers Environmental Law Clinic
123 Washington Street
Newark, NJ 07102
Phone: 973-353-5695
Fax: 973-353-5537

CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL COMMUNICATION/WORK PRODUCT
This e-mail may contain privileged and confidential attorney-client communications and/or attorney work product. If you receive this e-mail inadvertently, please reply to the sender and delete all versions on your system.
Thank you.

>>> "Michael Modes" <MCM@nrc.gov> 09/26/06 9:02 AM >>>

>>> "Richard Webster" <rwebster@kinoy.rutgers.edu> 09/22/2006 1:54 PM
>>>
That document number is not yet available in public Adams. Could you e-mail me a copy ASAP?

Thanks

Richard Webster
Staff Attorney
Rutgers Environmental Law Clinic
123 Washington Street
Newark, NJ 07102
Phone: 973-353-5695
Fax: 973-353-5537

CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL COMMUNICATION/WORK PRODUCT
This e-mail may contain privileged and confidential attorney-client communications and/or attorney work product. If you receive this e-mail inadvertently, please reply to the sender and delete all versions on your system.
Thank you.

>>> "Michael Modes" <MCM@nrc.gov> 09/22/06 11:26 AM >>>
Our inspection report was issued last night and can be extracted from the NRC document system, ADAMS, using the ascension number ML062650059.

<http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.htm>

>>> "Richard Webster" <rwebster@kinoy.rutgers.edu> 09/15/2006 12:30 PM
>>>

Mr. Modes,

On reflection we realized that we have many outstanding questions about the issues you discussed at the meeting on Wednesday. I would therefore like to get details from you about the details of how and when the water was poured away, its ultimate fate, how NRC came to know that the jars had been emptied etc. Do you have a written account you could provide?

If not, please call me on Monday at 973 353 3189 to give me a full account.

We believe that the integrity of the drywell shell is now in question and that NRC must take decisive action to ensure that a full inspection is carried out immediately to check whether safety margins have been violated. Where there is a divergence of expert opinion, the NRC cannot simply decide to credit one expert over the other, when there are empirical means of determining the current safety margins. Should you decide not to immediately demand empirical evidence of current drywell shell thickness from the operator, please justify in writing why NRC believes that there is no possibility that the drywell shell could have corroded to beyond safety margins in the ten years since the last UT measurements were taken.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Richard Webster

Richard Webster
Staff Attorney
Rutgers Environmental Law Clinic
123 Washington Street
Newark, NJ 07102
Phone: 973-353-5695
Fax: 973-353-5537

CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL COMMUNICATION/WORK PRODUCT
This e-mail may contain privileged and confidential attorney-client communications and/or attorney work product. If you receive this e-mail inadvertently, please reply to the sender and delete all versions on your system.
Thank you.

Mail Envelope Properties (451BF56A.9EF : 6 : 35368)

Subject: Fwd: Re: Details regarding water incident
Creation Date 09/28/2006 12:16:42 PM
From: Mitzi Young

Created By: MAY@nrc.gov

Recipients
nrc.gov
DJA1 (D. Ashley)

Post Office

Route
nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	10447	28 September, 2006 12:16:42 PM

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
ReplyRequested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results

Message is not eligible for Junk Mail handling
Message is from an internal sender

Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered

Junk Mail handling disabled by User
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator
Junk List is not enabled
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled
Block List is not enabled