

**March 10, 2017**

ADAMS Accession No: 17069A049

---

**From:** Deborah Grinnell <grinnelldebbie2@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 01, 2017 10:14 AM  
**To:** Buford, Angela  
**Subject:** [External\_Sender] The NRC acceptance of the SLA

Angela,

NextEra has not answered the questions you asked. In research The NRC still can not state Seabrook is operating with ASR under their license and never will be able to operate safely under their UFSAR and current license. NextEra's SLA has not addressed **how** they will monitor ASR in the complexity required ( which is a guess) nor have they been reliable in monitoring ASR at Seabrook in all the NRC documentation. Since 2011 without the NRC inspector's violations or NRC RAI's to push them to learn and you learn and understand the requirements to monitor or even monitor under NRC pressure to corrective actions or violations or rewriting their responses to the NRC RAI. Will they?? NO. The NRC studies are not complete or peer reviewed, right?? BUT you know you needed the NIST study done and peer reviewed in a gold standard.

I can not believe the NRC accepted NextEra's license amendment. Did you accept the SLA ?? Did the NRC research division accept the SLA?? Did anyone? How?

Is the decision based on on basis....you don't have an ASR basis to accept it. The operative determination is singularly based on a single day....ASR at Seabrook will collapse...and to continue to operate the plant you will only continue to report SEABROOK's ASR until the one report about a collapse. Hopefully it will not be at a ground level radiation release and the public radiation health exposure

lot of people are at risk...isn't that your job to protect us...or is it to primarily to release the plant?? I has been proven, hasn't it?? Lawyers can not morally cover your responsibly, can they?

Debbie