

1

DRAFT

Memoorandum To: William Travers, EDO

From: Ross Landsman

Subject: DPO on <sup>Cook</sup> Containment Walls

In your memo to me dated 4/20/01, you requested NRR to address the issues that the DPO Panel identified in Section 2.1.2 of their report. Specifically, the fact that the staff did not document in writing that we did not agree with the licensee's method of analysis # in our <sup>Unit 2</sup> meeting summary of June 1, 2000. <sup>INSERT</sup>  
In the final <sup>Unit 1 & 2</sup> meeting summary from June 11, 2001, on the same subject, the staff again did not document their basis for accepting the licensee's analysis. It should be noted, that none of the final meeting attendees were any of <sup>B/3</sup>

INSERT

I was afraid that the licensee would sharpen their pencils and get the walls to be ok, even though we didn't agree with what they were doing with their assumptions. That generated the DPU.

(get the interaction coefficients over 1.5)

Subsequent to the DPU, the licensee continued using the same methods that we didn't accept. In fact, the DPO Report states, the licensee is using the same methods (of analysis) for its Unit 1 assessments that the staff had not accepted for Unit 2 (Ref. 17 and 18). I assume its still using and we accept!

that generated the DPO.



I'm writing you this because I just read the 10 test issue of the NRC News Letter which indicated the DPO ~~was~~ panel chairman just finished his SES candidate development program was his potential career path cause for him to ensure that the DPO Report language was politically correct and did not point the blame at any of your staff? Was all the member's input used for the report or was it edited?

2001 Meeting  
Our ~~summary~~ summary report states the licensee "indicated that all calculations had been complete and all structures have adequate margin and comply with the design basis requirements stated in the FSAR." Did the licensee use

yield line theory analysis, a dynamic increase factor, increased reinforcing steel strength without supporting data, better yet, did they meet the design basis interaction coefficients of 1.5?

All these were issues that we disagreed with in the 2000 meeting that were never documented. One still cannot tell from the 2001 meeting summary what they used.

I requested to go to the site and inspect/review the actual calculations to determine if the assumptions used were appropriate and to see if the factors were really acceptable since it appears nobody actually looked at them. However the Cook Branch chief told me that there were no hours in the inspection program

to support me going to the site, Case closed!

I am writing you this memo because I think the licensee pulled the wool over your staff's eyes at the Junell, 2001 meeting. Neither the original reviewer, or me, were there to question anything. I think the CEQ Fan Room Walls are still unacceptable and do not meet our requirements. Therefore, the Cook containments would not protect the health, welfare, and safety of the public from the design basis accident!