

EDO Principal Correspondence Control

FROM: DUE: 05/15/12 EDO CONTROL: G20120279  
DOC DT: 05/09/11  
FINAL REPLY:

Ralph Nader  
Washington DC

TO:

Chairman Jaczko

FOR SIGNATURE OF : \*\* PRI \*\* CRC NO: 11-0297

Chairman Jaczko

DESC:

ROUTING:

New York Times Article on the Laxity of the  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission During Visit to  
Public Citizen - Differential Situation in each  
of the 104 Nuclear Plants following Fukushima  
(EDATS: SECY-2012-0208)

Borchardt  
Weber  
Virgilio  
Ash  
Mamish  
OGC/GC  
Leeds, NRR  
Wiggins, NSIR  
Zobler, OGC  
Doane, OIP  
Chen, OEDO

DATE: 04/27/12

ASSIGNED TO:

CONTACT:

RES

Sheron

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS OR REMARKS:

Please coordinate with NRR and NSIR.

**EDATS Number:** SECY-2012-0208

**Source:** SECY

## General Information

**Assigned To:** RES

**OEDO Due Date:** 5/15/2012 11:00 PM

**Other Assignees:**

**SECY Due Date:** 5/17/2012 11:00 PM

**Subject:** New York Times Article on the Laxity of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission During Visit to Public Citizen - Differential Situation in Each of the 104 Nuclear Plants following Fukushima

**Description:**

**CC Routing:** OGC; OIP; NRR; NSIR

**ADAMS Accession Numbers - Incoming:**  
ML12118A485

**Response/Package:** NONE

## Other Information

**Cross Reference Number:** G20120279, LTR-11-0297

**Staff Initiated:** NO

**Related Task:**

**Recurring Item:** NO

**File Routing:** EDATS

**Agency Lesson Learned:** NO

**OEDO Monthly Report Item:** NO

## Process Information

**Action Type:** Letter

**Priority:** Medium

**Sensitivity:** None

**Signature Level:** Chairman Jaczko

**Urgency:** NO

**Approval Level:** No Approval Required

**OEDO Concurrence:** YES

**OCM Concurrence:** NO

**OCA Concurrence:** NO

**Special Instructions:**

## Document Information

**Originator Name:** Ralph Nader

**Date of Incoming:** 5/9/2011

**Originating Organization:** Citizens

**Document Received by SECY Date:** 4/27/2012

**Addressee:** Chairman Jaczko

**Date Response Requested by Originator:** NONE

**Incoming Task Received:** Letter

**OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL TICKET**

*Date Printed: Apr 27, 2012 08:01*

---

**PAPER NUMBER:** LTR-11-0297  
**ACTION OFFICE:** EDO

**LOGGING DATE:** 05/16/2011

**AUTHOR:** Ralph Nader  
**AFFILIATION:** DC  
**ADDRESSEE:** Chairman Jaczko

**SUBJECT:** Ref New York Times articles regarding visit to Public Citizen..differential situation in each of the 104 nuc plants following the Fukushima events

**ACTION:** Signature of Chairman  
**DISTRIBUTION:** RF

**LETTER DATE:** 05/09/2011

**ACKNOWLEDGED** No

**SPECIAL HANDLING:** Commission Correspondence

**NOTES:**

**FILE LOCATION:** ADAMS

**DATE DUE:** 05/17/2012

**DATE SIGNED:**

Gregory Jaczko, Chairman  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Mail Stop O-16G4  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

May 9, 2011

Dear Mr. Jaczko:

Against the background of yesterday's front page New York Times article on the laxity of the NRC, the discussion during your visit last week to Public Citizen was hampered by insufficient time (the nature of noontime presentations) and three restrictions.

First, you could not respond to questions about pending or possible rule-makings and other decisions such as relicensing requiring agency determinations by the Commissioners.

Second, you would not respond, I would expect, to hypotheticals about various nuclear plants, such as a serious accident—due to natural disasters, design, construction or aging causes or human error. That would be speculating.

Third, if there have been any questions about policy such as critics asserting that atomic energy is unsafe, unnecessary, uninsurable, and economically unsustainable and unlikely to attract investors without government loan and other guarantees, you probably would have referred such policy inquiries to the Department of Energy since you are a law enforcement agency bound to focus on "adequate protection."

Beyond these exclusionary areas, you did indicate that the NRC is in the early stages of updating the AEC's worse case scenario studies from the Nineteen Fifties and Nineteen Sixties regarding casualties, economic costs and areas contaminated. The AEC surmised that an area the size of Pennsylvania would be contaminated in an earlier study. An update is long overdue and you estimated that it would take about a year to complete once underway.

You also responded to my question about real life evacuation drills ten miles around the 104 nuclear plants presently operating. No evacuation plan can be a realistic one—whether for fire prevention, civil defense or nuclear meltdown if it is detached from how the people would or could react to the detailed action plans for evacuation. Otherwise it is just a paper plan no matter how many drills by the emergency personnel. You thought such a real life drill would be too severe. I responded that perhaps a petition to the NRC would prompt a more detailed explanation.

You also noted that you were inclined to favor a review and response to the thus far ignored Yablokov report, translated into English and produced in 2009 under the auspices of the New York Academy of Sciences. This report seriously questions the IAEA's estimates of fatalities since the Chernobyl catastrophe which continues to cost lives, sickness and money in that wide region. The report summarizes some 5000 studies,

mostly in the Slavic languages, and comes to the general estimate of over one million lives lost in the 25 years since the reactor blew up in Ukraine in 1986. When Academician Alexey Yablokov, a member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, was in Washington at the National Press Club last March, he observed that the report he compiled with other scientists has been met with public silence by regulatory, academic and industry scientists. He found the absence of engaging the data not to be in the scientific tradition. Of course, it is well known that a negative whispering campaign has been underway to sow enough seeds of doubt as to deter the mainstream media from covering its contents. That, it is hoped, will not be the behavior of the NRC under your Chairmanship. The interested public needs the NRC's considered response, given the vast disparity in official casualty estimates by the IAEA and the more detailed Yablokov report. These estimates flow from a vast disparity of data between the two evaluations.

The attendees at the Public Citizen Forum await the review the NRC is undertaking regarding the differential situation in each of the 104 nuclear plants under its jurisdiction following the Fukushima breakdowns. Also, they await the nature of your desire to provide an advisory role to the stakeholder group you intend to bring together.

Finally, I spoke with you about the repeated attempts of groups such as Friends of the Earth, Public Citizen, U.S. PIRG, Sierra Club, Union of Concerned Scientists to meet with Energy Secretary Steven Chu over the past two years. If you have the occasion to indicate to him that you have so met with such groups and that a useful exchange transpired, it would be welcomed. Secretary Chu has met with various industry groups and should not repeatedly discriminate against the civic community simply because it is critical of the nuclear power mode of boiling water to produce steam.

Sincerely,



Ralph Nader

PO Box 19312  
Washington DC 20036

## Champ, Billie

---

**From:** Bradford, Anna  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 26, 2012 4:16 PM  
**To:** Champ, Billie  
**Cc:** Coggins, Angela  
**Subject:** Response to R. Nader letter  
**Attachments:** IBMgetContent.pdf

Billie,

This letter came in quite a long time ago and was for appropriate action, and I don't believe the staff responded. The Chairman would like to re-assign this to the OEDO to prepare as Commission correspondence. Can you please do that?

Thanks!

Anna Bradford  
Deputy Chief of Staff  
Office of Chairman Jaczko  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
301-415-1827