

EDO Principal Correspondence Control

FROM: DUE: 05/21/07

EDO CONTROL: G20070250  
DOC DT: 04/15/07  
FINAL REPLY:

Tom Gurdziel

TO:

Boska, OPA

FOR SIGNATURE OF :

\*\* GRN \*\*

CRC NO:

Dyer, NRR

DESC:

ROUTING:

2.206 - Entergy/Indian Point

Reyes  
Virgilio  
Kane  
Silber  
Johnson  
Cyr/Burns  
Collins, RI  
Cyr, OGC  
Mensah, NRR  
Jones, OGC

DATE: 04/16/07

ASSIGNED TO:

CONTACT:

NRR

Dyer

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS OR REMARKS:

Template: EDO-001

E-RIDS: EDO-01

## Cathy Jaegers - FW: Death, Taxes, and Another Entergy/Indian Point Extension Request

---

**From:** "Tom Gurdziel" <tgurdziel@twcny.rr.com>  
**To:** "John Boska" <JPB1@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** 04/15/2007 3:54 PM  
**Subject:** FW: Death, Taxes, and Another Entergy/Indian Point Extension Request

---

**From:** Tom Gurdziel [mailto:tgurdziel@twcny.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 14, 2007 11:07 PM  
**To:** 'opa@nrc.gov'; 'OPA1 OPA1'  
**Cc:** David Lochbaum (dlochbaum@ucsusa.org); 'Inzirillo, Frank A'; 'McMullin, Kathleen M'; 'Bostian, Bonnie'; Ed Stronski (ESTRONSKI@aol.com); 'ewc@nrc.gov'; 'dej1@nrc.gov'; 'preisman@lohud.com'  
**Subject:** Death, Taxes, and Another Entergy/Indian Point Extension Request

Good morning Scott and Diane,

(I guess I was wrong about them being finished with the new sirens. Maybe Senator Clinton was right about the need for a total top to bottom inspection.)

I read both letters, (which I appreciate you putting on your website so quickly). Did you notice that this time, instead of just asking for 2 ½ months, they are asking for 4 1/2 months? Do you remember what I said last time an extension was requested? I said it was alright with me, as long as the NRC reduced the licensed power of both plants to ZERO. (You might remember that I also gave the alternate suggestion of a 10% power reduction each month until the sirens were installed, tested, fixed, retested, and accepted.) The basis for my recommendation then was my conclusion that risk for the people in the Indian Point area would actually be higher than it should be, starting January 31, 2007. My reasoning was that the battery backup should be more reliable and thus reduce risk.

I am interested in what comes next. The NRC says it has to be operable by April 15<sup>th</sup>. Entergy says it is not. Wouldn't you think that some a-c-t-i-o-n is now required by the NRC? I do. In fact, let me suggest that if the NRC does not do something, it is, at the least, showing the industry and the public that there is no NRC enforcement, and its regulation is promise-based.

Here is what I suggest: effective noon, April 16, 2007 set the maximum licensed power of each Entergy/Indian Point reactor at zero. After Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. demonstrates that the installed equipment does perform according to the already established requirements, a meeting can be held during which Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. management (above the plant/site level) can request that the NRC raise the Indian Point plant power levels above zero.

Please send this e-mail to the EDO as a 10CFR2.206 request that the NRC take some action to either support its Confirmatory Action Order program or dissolve it.

Thank you,

Tom Gurdziel

**Mail Envelope Properties** (462282E1.2FA : 1 : 58106)

**Subject:** FW: Death, Taxes, and Another Entergy/Indian Point Extension Request  
**Creation Date** 04/15/2007 3:54:13 PM  
**From:** "Tom Gurdziel" <tgurdziel@twcnny.rr.com>  
**Created By:** tgurdziel@twcnny.rr.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
 OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
 JPB1 (John Boska)

**Post Office**

OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2496	04/15/2007 3:54:13 PM
TEXT.htm	7887	
Mime.822	12674	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None  
  
**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard