

From: A. Randolph Blough *ry*  
To: David Vito; Eileen Neff; Scott Barber  
Date: 1/27/04 2:04PM  
Subject: Calls with SCWE allegor and UCS, FYI

This note informs you of my recent telephone conversations on the SCWE case. I am not requesting any action.

Yesterday, Hub and I called Dave Lochbaum, UCS, and I later called the allegor. In both cases, the purpose of our call was to inform them that NRC would soon be ready to issue some interim results of our SCWE review at Salem/Hope Creek, yet to reassure them that this action would not reveal any details of on-going investigations of ~~SCWE~~. During the calls, Dave and the allegor were both *7C*

complimentary of OI and the Region's efforts, and appreciative of the info we provided in yesterday's calls. -- Dave mentioned that, despite his general strong approval of R1's efforts thusfar, UCS feels that these reviews generally take too long and therefore UCS had been considering a 2.206 petition that might expedite the NRC's work.

-- The allegor was worried that our interim results might be so vague that the company would not feel compelled to respond constructively to address their SCWE issues, and, further, that the licensee might simply argue that, under the recent mangement changes, that nothing else need be done. I said that I thought our results would be sufficiently compelling on both those points.

-- The allegor indicated that she and UCS are advising a group of current and former employees that want to bring their concerns to the press in the nearterm. I thanked her for that info and stressed how important it is that any immediate safety concern be aired quickly to the licensee, NRC or some other rapid conduit so that it may be immediately assessed. She was well-versed on this point and assured me that any issues of that ilk had already been provided to us, and that she would endeavor to continue ensuring that any newly emerging ones are treated likewise.

The next day (today) the allegor called back and (1) thanked us again for our efforts to date, (2) opined that any interim results should be sent to Ferland, not Anderson (Note: that's the way we plan it anyhow), and (3) informed me that they were advising the employee group to wait.

regards,  
randy

CC: Brian Holian; Daniel Holody; Ernest Wilson; Glenn Meyer; jtw1; Richard Urban

Information in this record was deleted  
in accordance with the Freedom of Information  
Act, exemptions *K*  
FOIA- 2025-194

*T-47*