

NRCREP - docket # 72-26

From: henriette groot <hplgroot@kcbx.net>
To: <NRCREP@nrc.gov>
Date: 06/22/2007 3:55:04 PM
Subject: docket # 72-26
CC: "debbie.arnold-asm.ca.gov" <debbie.arnold@asm.ca.gov>

5/31/07
72 FR 30398

(11)

RECEIVED

2007 JUN 22 PM 4:22

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
USIIRC

To: James R. Hall
 re: docket # 72-26

Having studied the supplemental EA regarding ISFISIs at Diablo Nuclear Power Plant I have the following comments:

1. section 3.2 p.5: "The NRC determined that the proposed security plan revisions and facility design features met the requirements of Part 73, "Physical Protection of Plants and Materials," *which were the same requirements for ISFISIs that were in effect before September 11, 2001*" (my italics)

DO YOU MEAN THERE WAS NOT EVEN ANY UPGRADING OF THE REQUIREMENTS? JUST "REVIEW"?

2. section 4.0, p. 7: The "plausible threat scenarios" considered were that of a large aircraft and ground assaults. WHAT ABOUT ATTACKS FROM THE SEA - DIABLO IS RIGHT ON THE SHORE AND HIGHLY VISIBLE. WHAT ABOUT ATTACKS BY SMALL PLANES? IRAQ IS TEACHING US THAT IE'S DO NOT HAVE TO BE LARGE AND CAN BE COMPOSED OF A VARIETY OF INCENDIARY OR EXPLOSIVE MATERIALS.

3. section 5.0, p. 7: No additional consultation with outside agencies were conducted. WHY FOR HEAVENS SAKE NOT?? HOMELAND SECURITY THESE DAYS LINKS SO MANY AGENCIES, COAST GUARD, FAA, ETC. DOWNRIGHT SLOPPY NOT TO DO THIS.

4. section 4.0 p.6: In the middle paragraph you state the "probability of ...an attack.....cannot readily be quantified", yet you assert in the same paragraph that "This protective strategy reduces the risk.....to an acceptable level".! YOU CAN'T HAVE IT BOTH WAYS, EITHER YOU QUANTIFY OR YOU DON'T. IN EITHER CASE WHAT IS "AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL" ?? YOU DIE A LITTLE BIT? YOU DIE FROM CANCER? - WHEN?

5. section 6.0, p. 7: No "significant effect on the human environment". EVEN IF THAT WERE THE CASE: THE ENVIRONMENT CONSISTS OF MORE THAN US HUMANS.!

MY CONCLUSION. I FIND YOUR ANALYSIS TOTALLY DEFICIENT AND YOUR CONCLUSION NEGLIGENT.

Henriette Groot, PhD

SUNSI Review Complete
 Template = ADM-013

E-REDS = ADM-03
 ADM = J. Hall (JRH)

Mail Envelope Properties (467C2905.8FC : 6 : 2300)

Subject: docket # 72-26
Creation Date Fri, Jun 22, 2007 3:48 PM
From: henriette groot <hplgroot@kcbx.net>

Created By: hplgroot@kcbx.net

Recipients

nrc.gov
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
NRCREP

asm.ca.gov
debbie.arnold CC (debbie.arnold-asm.ca.gov)

Post Office

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov
asm.ca.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
TEXT.htm	2062	
Mime.822	3715	

Options

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

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

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