

From: William Huffman *NRR*
To: Diane Jackson, George Hubbard, Michael Masnik *NRR*
Date: Thu, Nov 16, 2000 10:27 AM
Subject: Response to Lochbaum Resignation Letter Issue

Mike, George, or Diane,

do you have any problems with the attached writeup before I send it onto John Monniger??

Thanks.....Bill

CC: David Wrona, Phillip Ray, Richard Dudley, Stuar...

B/17

November 16, 2000

TO: John Monninger

FROM: Bill Huffman

SUBJ: Decommissioning Issue Raised in November 6, 2000, Lochbaum Letter

In Mr. Lochbaum's resignation letter from the IIEP, he raised concerns about the NRC not seriously considering public stakeholder comments. As an example, he specifically cited a decommissioning workshop (July 1999) in which he participated and where he claims his comments were ignored. Mr. Lochbaum's issue with the way his comments from the decommissioning workshop were addressed has already been reviewed by staff. In a letter to the NRC dated March 15, 2000 (see attachment 1), he made the same comment about the staff ignoring his comments. The NRC responded to his concern in a letter dated April 11, 2000 (attachment 2), in which we acknowledged that a draft report on decommissioning spent fuel pool risk did not explicitly identify how his issues were considered but committed to specifically address and identify Mr. Lochbaum's concerns in the final version of the spent fuel pool risk report.

The final technical study on spent fuel pool accident risk at decommissioning nuclear power plants (to be issued shortly) has an appendix which documents specific stakeholder concerns and staff responses. Attachment 3 to this memo contains excerpts from the report appendix where the concerns raised by Mr. Lochbaum are addressed. Although Mr. Lochbaum may not agree with our responses, we believe we have made a conscientious effort to document and address each of his concerns. It should be noted that some significant positions captured by industry commitments and staff assumptions in the final report reflect possible issue resolutions that favor Mr. Lochbaum's position on these issues. For example, the staff concluded that direct measurement of spent fuel pool temperature and water level should be indicated in the control room at decommissioning plants - a comment raised by Mr. Lochbaum. The staff also concluded that the spent fuel pool should be inspected shiftily at decommissioning sites which is a position that Mr. Lochbaum has advocated. Finally, the industry committed to provide a remote method of adding water to spent fuel pools that would reduce potential risk to plant workers during a spent fuel pool drainage event. Again, this was a concern also raised by Mr. Lochbaum.

In conclusion, as we stated in comment response #105 of the report (attachment 3), "The NRC seriously considers public comments received on all issues within its jurisdiction. In this case, the staff regrets the appearance that a public comment had been ignored."