

From: Jacob Zimmerman
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2008 1:00 PM
To: Dave Lochbaum
Cc: 'Paul Gunter'; 'Debbie Grinnell'; 'Mary Lampert'; 'Jim Warren';
Scott Burnell;
'Lisa Rainwater van Suntum'; 'Phillip Musegaas'; 'Rochelle Becker'; 'Jim
Ricchio'; Lauren Quinones; Theodore Quay; Michael Case; Arlon Costa
Subject: RE: NGO perspective on NRC's EP rulemaking process

David

Thanks for taking the time to provide feedback on the rulemaking process. We appreciate your feedback and are interested in suggestions that can contribute to the improvement of the rulemaking process. In the attachment to your email you described comments and concerns from several non-governmental organizations (NGOs) regarding the NRC rulemaking process. The NRC staff read your email and would like to discuss these concerns further. We would like to extend an offer to you and the NGO representatives to come to NRC headquarters in Rockville, MD and meet with us in a Category 3 public meeting to discuss your comments and suggestions regarding the NRC rulemaking process. This meeting will help the NRC staff better understand and respond to your concerns by having a face-to-face discussion.

The staff also appreciates your interest and support in various emergency preparedness (EP) activities, including the past public meetings and the current EP rulemaking. We value the input you and other NGOs provided at the August 31 and September 1, 2005, and the May 19, 2006 meetings. The staff used the insights gained at these meetings to influence the current EP rulemaking, as well as set the stage to possibly conduct a future rulemaking on those issues not incorporated into the current rulemaking. In addition, the NRC staff has an open door policy and welcomes discussions with all stakeholders.

EP is a dynamic process and we are continually applying lessons learned to better protect public health and safety. Many of these lessons learned have been incorporated into the EP rulemaking. SECY-06-0200, "Results of the Review of Emergency Preparedness Regulations and Guidance," dated September 20, 2006, outlined the stakeholder input for several of the key issues discussed at the 2005 and 2006 meetings, including those provided by the NGOs. The NRC is acting on some of these issues in the current EP rulemaking. For example, it will propose a significant enhancement to the incorporation of security drills and exercises into the drill and exercise program. Also, it will propose to require a backup for the alert and notification

systems and more specific requirements for the periodicity and quality of evacuation time estimate updates. We would also like to meet with you regarding your concerns with the EP rulemaking. The EP staff will be contacting you soon to arrange for this meeting and establish the agenda.

If you are interested in having a meeting to discuss the rulemaking process, please contact Lauren Quiñones at 301-415-2007 or lauren.quinones@nrc.gov . She will be responsible for arranging the logistics of the meeting and developing the agenda.

Thanks again for you feedback. We look forward to hearing from you.

Jake

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Lochbaum [mailto:dlochbaum@ucsusa.org]

Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2008 1:31 PM

To: Jacob Zimmerman

Cc: Paul Gunter; Debbie Grinnell; Mary Lampert; Jim Warren; Scott Burnell; Lisa Rainwater van

Suntum; Phillip Musegaas; Rochelle Becker; Jim Riccio

Subject: NGO perspective on NRC's EP rulemaking process

Hello Jake:

I can't tell you how shocked I was at last week's RIC panel to hear that the NRC staff considers the EP rulemaking process to be an example of how the process should work.

Okay, so I did tell you. But I cannot convey the depth of that surprise. And I own a dictionary.

I contacted the NGO representatives who attended the 2005 workshop and the sole follow-up meeting the NRC held with the public. With the exception of Eric Epstein of TMI Alert, who is engaging the NRC on EP via separate rulemaking, the NGO representatives have all signed on to the attached statement with our votes that this EP rulemaking process was not good. Of course, as we note in the statement that our input was utterly disregarded, we anticipate our votes will find the same black hole.

We also note in the statement that the NRC plays musical chairs. If you are unable to get to this issue before your next rotation, would you be so kind as to pass it along to whoever takes on the assignment next?

Thanks,

Dave Lochbaum
Director, Nuclear Safety Project
Union of Concerned Scientists

NEW ADDRESS AS OF MARCH 31, 2008:
1825 K Street NW Suite 800
Washington, DC 20006-1232
(202) 223-6133 (office)
(202) 331-5430 (direct line)
(202) 223-6162 (fax)

E-mail Properties

Mail Envelope Properties (CEEA97CC21430049B821E684512F6E5E60196E3D3C)

Subject: RE: NGO perspective on NRC's EP rulemaking process
Sent Date: 4/21/2008 1:53:51 PM
Received Date: 4/14/2008 12:59:55 PM
From: Jacob Zimmerman

Created By: Jacob.Zimmerman@nrc.gov

Recipients:

dlochbaum@ucsusa.org (Dave Lochbaum)
Tracking Status: None
paul@beyondnuclear.org ('Paul Gunter')
Tracking Status: None
debbie@c-10.org ('Debbie Grinnell')
Tracking Status: None
mary.lampert@comcast.net ('Mary Lampert')
Tracking Status: None
jim@ncwarn.org ('Jim Warren')
Tracking Status: None
Scott.Burnell@nrc.gov (Scott Burnell)
Tracking Status: None
lisa@riverkeeper.org ('Lisa Rainwater van Suntum')
Tracking Status: None
phillip@riverkeeper.org ('Phillip Musegaas')
Tracking Status: None
beckers@thegrid.net ('Rochelle Becker')
Tracking Status: None
jim.riccio@wdc.greenpeace.org ('Jim Riccio')
Tracking Status: None
Lauren.Quinones@nrc.gov (Lauren Quinones)
Tracking Status: None
Theodore.Quay@nrc.gov (Theodore Quay)
Tracking Status: None
Michael.Case@nrc.gov (Michael Case)
Tracking Status: None
Arlon.Costa@nrc.gov (Arlon Costa)
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	19008	4/21/2008

Options

Expiration Date:

Priority: olImportanceNormal
ReplyRequested: False
Return Notification: False

Sensitivity: olNormal
Recipients received: