

EDO Principal Correspondence Control

FROM: DUE: 03/16/01 EDO CONTROL: G20010099
DOC DT: 03/05/01
FINAL REPLY:

James Riccio
Public Citizen

TO:

Chairman Meserve

FOR SIGNATURE OF : ** PRI **

CRC NO: 01-0147

Chairman

DESC:

ROUTING:

Indian Point 2 Nuclear Reactor

Travers
Paperiello
Kane
Norry
Reiter
Craig
Burns
Miller, RI
Cyr, OGC
Bell, OIG

DATE: 03/07/01

ASSIGNED TO: CONTACT:
NRR Collins

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS OR REMARKS:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL TICKET

Date Printed: Mar 07, 2001 08:57

PAPER NUMBER: LTR-01-0147 LOGGING DATE: 03/06/2001
ACTION OFFICE: EDO

AUTHOR: JAMES RICCIO
AFFILIATION: PUB CIT
ADDRESSEE: RICHARD MESERVE
SUBJECT: REQUEST OF PUBLIC CITIZEN TO MEET WITH THE COMMISSION TO DISCUSS
CONCERNS RE INDIAN POINT 2 REACTOR

ACTION: Signature of Chairman
DISTRIBUTION: COMRS, OIG, SECY TO ACK

LETTER DATE: 03/05/2001

ACKNOWLEDGED No

SPECIAL HANDLING: ALLEGATION MATERIAL

NOTES: COMISSION
CORRESPONDENCE*****CHAIRMAN'S MEETING
WITH PUBLIC CITIZEN AND UNION OF CONCERNED
SCIENTISTS 3/7/2001.....

FILE LOCATION: ADAMS

DATE DUE: 03/20/2001 DATE SIGNED:

EDO --G20010099

Public Citizen

Buyers Up • Congress Watch • Critical Mass • Global Trade Watch • Health Research Group • Litigation Group
Joan Claybrook, President

March 5, 2001

Chairman Richard A. Meserve
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Dear Chairman Meserve:

I am writing to urgently request that David Lochbaum of the Union of Concerned Scientists and I meet with you to discuss our concerns regarding the Indian Point 2 nuclear reactor at your earliest possible convenience.

We are extremely concerned that the NRC staff and Consolidated Edison have, once again, failed to identify significant safety problems at the reactor. We are concerned that the lack of a questioning attitude demonstrated by both the NRC staff and Consolidated Edison that resulted in the steam generator tube rupture has not been rectified and that this same attitude has resulted in incorrect and inaccurate information being disseminated by your agency.

The conclusions of an inspection report recently issued by your agency are in direct conflict with information we now have in hand. Your inspector reviewed only three condition reports generated by the licensee and determined that there was no safety significance associated with the Reactor Protection System (RPS) issues identified. Either your inspector chose not to review or Consolidated Edison failed to provide condition reports which called into question the design basis of the RPS. This raises issues with Consolidated Edison's 1997 50.54 (f) response to the NRC made under oath or affirmation and the ability of both NRC and Consolidated Edison to track commitments regarding adequacy and availability of design basis documentation at the Indian Point 2 nuclear reactor.

Since we have already provided this information to congressional oversight committees and the NRC's Inspector General, we thought it was only fair that we appraise you of our concerns. I am aware that you intend to visit Indian Point later this week and thought it would be appropriate to make you aware of these issues prior to your visit.

Sincerely,



James Riccio

Senior Policy Analyst

Public Citizen's Critical Mass Energy & Environment Program

Ralph Nader, Founder

CC:

Commissioner Nils J. Diaz
Commissioner Greta J. Dicus
Commissioner Edward McGaffigan, Jr.
Commissioner Jeffrey S. Merrifield
U.S. NRC Office of the Inspector General