

**From:** Rick Ennis *MLK*  
**To:** Allen Howe; Cliff Anderson; Cornelius Holden; Diane Screnci; Donna Skay; Herbert Berkow; James Lyons; John Stang; Neil Sheehan; Robert Pettis; Stephen Lewis; Tad Marsh; William Ruland  
**Date:** 8/30/04 3:43PM  
**Subject:** Fwd: FW: UCS letter on VY's GDC compliance

Attached is a letter from UCS related to the 2.206 petition from Paul Blanch and Arnie Gundersen on the GDC issue.

*E-86*

**Mail Envelope Properties (4133835B.4C8 : 15 : 20516)**

**Subject:** Fwd: FW: UCS letter on VY's GDC compliance  
**Creation Date:** 8/30/04 3:43PM  
**From:** Rick Ennis

**Created By:** RXE@nrc.gov

Recipients	Action	Date & Time
kp1_po.KP_DO	Delivered	08/30/04 03:43PM
CJA (Cliff Anderson)	Opened	08/30/04 03:52PM
DPS (Diane Screnci)	Opened	09/07/04 09:23AM
NAS (Neil Sheehan)	Opened	08/30/04 03:45PM
owf2_po.OWFN_DO	Delivered	08/30/04 03:43PM
DMS6 (Donna Skay)	Opened	08/30/04 03:43PM
RLP4 (Robert Pettis)	Opened	08/30/04 05:07PM
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	Delivered	08/30/04 03:43PM
AGH1 (Allen Howe)	Opened	08/30/04 04:12PM
CFH (Cornelius Holden)	Opened	08/30/04 04:51PM
HNB (Herbert Berkow)	Opened	08/30/04 03:43PM
JEL (James Lyons)	Opened	08/30/04 03:56PM
JFS2 (John Stang)	Opened	08/31/04 02:41PM
LBM (Tad Marsh)	Opened	09/09/04 05:13PM
WHR (William Ruland)	Opened	08/30/04 03:43PM
owf5_po.OWFN_DO	Delivered	08/30/04 03:43PM
SHL (Stephen Lewis)	Opened	08/30/04 03:56PM
<b>Post Office</b>	<b>Delivered</b>	<b>Route</b>
kp1_po.KP_DO	08/30/04 03:43PM	
owf2_po.OWFN_DO	08/30/04 03:43PM	
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	08/30/04 03:43PM	
owf5_po.OWFN_DO	08/30/04 03:43PM	

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	601	08/30/04 03:43PM
Mail		

**Options**

<b>Auto Delete:</b>	No
<b>Expiration Date:</b>	None
<b>Notify Recipients:</b>	Yes
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard

<b>Reply Requested:</b>	No
<b>Return Notification:</b>	None
<b>Concealed Subject:</b>	No
<b>Security:</b>	Standard
<b>To Be Delivered:</b>	Immediate
<b>Status Tracking:</b>	Delivered & Opened

**From:** "Paul Blanch" <pmb Blanch@comcast.net>  
**To:** <Vermont\_Yankee\_Power\_Uprate@yahoogroups.com>  
**Date:** 8/30/04 3:32PM  
**Subject:** FW: UCS letter on VY's GDC compliance

The following was sent to Jim Dyer this afternoon. Dave and I decided that a FOIA request was not appropriate at this time because the NRC's response only states that the plant is licensed to the draft criteria and this is clear and unambiguous. They never addressed where or how the criteria are addressed or where deviations are justified.

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

**From:** Dave Lochbaum [mailto:dlochbaum@ucsusa.org]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 30, 2004 3:12 PM  
**To:** JED2@nrc.gov  
**Cc:** arniegundersen@adelphia.net; pmb Blanch@comcast.net; DPS@nrc.gov; NAS@nrc.gov; SRB3@nrc.gov  
**Subject:** UCS letter on VY's GDC compliance

Hello Jim:

Attached is an electronic copy of a letter placed in the mail to you today. It regards your recent rejection of the 2.206 petition submitted by Paul Blanch and Arnie Gundersen.

Thanks,

Dave Lochbaum  
Nuclear Safety Engineer  
Union of Concerned Scientists  
1707 H Street NW Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20006-3962  
(202) 223-6133 x113  
(202) 223-6162 fax



# Union of Concerned Scientists

Citizens and Scientists for Environmental Solutions

August 30, 2004

James E. Dyer, Director  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

**SUBJECT: COMMUNICATIONS – COMMON UNDERSTANDING OF THE  
MESSAGE: VERMONT YANKEE PETITION**

Dear Mr. Dyer:

At the session on Communications you chaired during the Regulatory Information Conference earlier this year, I made a presentation titled, "Communicating the Proper Safety Perspective." I made the point that the goal of NRC's communications should not be agreement by all audience members with the message but rather common understanding of the message. While agreement should be encouraged whenever possible, achieving common understanding would at least focus the dialogue on legitimate areas of dispute.

I read your recent letter to Messengers Paul Blanch and Arnold Gundersen rejecting their petition submitted pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206. I probably do not understand the message you attempted to convey. In your letter, you wrote:

*You requested that the NRC issue a Demand for Information requiring Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC, and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (Entergy or the licensee) to provide information that clearly and unambiguously describes how Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station (Vermont Yankee) complies with the General Design Criteria (GDC) specified in 10 CFR 50 Appendix A, or the draft GDC published by the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) in 1967.*

Having also read the petition submitted by Blanch and Gundersen, I share your understanding that they sought information regarding Vermont Yankee's compliance with the General Design Criteria (GDC). Since there seems to be consensus on the information being sought via the petition, I did not understand your response:

*Based on information available in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR), and letters submitted to the NRC by the licensee, the NRC staff asserts that the design bases of Vermont Yankee are clear and unambiguous. Correspondence between the licensee and the NRC clearly indicate that Vermont Yankee is licensed to the draft GDC published in 1967.*

As you stated in the letter, Blanch and Gundersen were not petitioning the NRC to issue Entergy a Demand For Information to answer the question of whether Vermont Yankee was licensed to the draft GDC or the final GDC. They sought information relative to how Vermont Yankee complied with the applicable GDC including how deviations were addressed.

Washington Office: 1707 H Street NW Suite 600 • Washington DC 20006-3919 • 202-223-6133 • FAX: 202-223-6162  
Cambridge Headquarters: Two Brattle Square • Cambridge MA 02238-9105 • 617-547-5552 • FAX: 617-864-9405  
California Office: 2397 Shattuck Avenue Suite 203 • Berkeley CA 94704-1567 • 510-843-1872 • FAX: 510-843-3785

Thus, while it is "clear and unambiguous" that Vermont Yankee is licensed to the draft GDC published in 1967, that fact is irrelevant. It does not answer the compliance question raised by Blanch and Gundersen that was the key point of their petition.

To hopefully attain that elusive goal of common understanding on this topic, I respectfully seek your answers to the following questions:

1. Is the NRC aware of any publicly available docketed material, other than Appendix F to the Vermont Yankee Updated Final Safety Analysis Report, where exceptions to and/or deviations from the draft GDC are detailed?
2. If so, what are the publicly available docketed materials?
3. If not, is it the NRC's regulatory position that, absent docketed exceptions and/or deviations, Vermont Yankee must conform to every single aspect and nuance of the draft GDC?

I would appreciate your response to these questions as promptly as convenient.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "David A. Lochbaum". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large, prominent 'D' and 'L'.

David Lochbaum  
Nuclear Safety Engineer  
Washington Office