

From: C. Vernon Hodge
To: Kotzalas, Margie; Reckley, William
Date: Wed, Mar 6, 2002 11:17 AM
Subject: Re: Review of GL and Bulletins

> NRR

I looked at these gc. I think they can be reposted, largely because they don't include plant-specific information and they discuss the obvious (sure, a fire, flood, or earthquake will challenge a plant and access of people to a nuclear power plant should be controlled).

BI 7916, gl 9602, and gl 8708 may represent more need for caution. Again, they do not include plant-specific information. The bulletin discloses an action that would hurt new fuel and that may not be detected, depending on the timing of the action. Surely it would be detected after the hurt fuel was used in the core for a while. Consequences should not be different from those of burning bad fuel. Such an action would require a terrorist to hurdle all the usual barriers. I vote for reposting even these gc.

On info notices, I haven't gotten started yet. Bear with me.

>>> Margie Kotzalas 03/01/02 05:03PM >>>

I reviewed all the Bulletins and GL today and I found a couple that I'm not sure about. Can one of you check them out.

Bulletin 79-16 on vital access control

GL 96-02 on security requirements associated with internal threat

GL 91-14 on emergency telecommunications (identifies essential communication links)

GL 88-20 on IPE for severe accident vulnerabilities (attachment contains accident scenario)

GL 88-20 supplement 3 on containment vulnerabilities

GL 88-20 supplement 4 on IPEEE

GL 87-08 on access controls

GL 83-21 (says cops can carry their guns into the plant....it makes me think of the movies where terrorists dress up as cops then shoot up the place.)

Those early GLs are very interesting. The NRC has changed a lot. It was like a history lesson.

Margie

L-156