

From: Jack Rosenthal RES  
To: Stacey Rosenberg OEDO  
Date: 9/2/03 3:25PM  
Subject: Differing Professional Opinion Panel Re: Dry Cask Storage Campaign at Dresden

Of course we can discuss all this on Thursday.

Rephrasing: Was there a basis for continued operation during an extended period in which the safety of operations was questioned.

The answer is clearly yes. The probability of a seismic event of the magnitude of a DBE convoluted with the probability of lifting a heavy load at the time of the earthquake is low. The probability of lifting a heavy load at the far spans of the crane are low. Furthermore, the issues involve adequate margin. In no case was the load less than the capability of the system. Rather the issue centers on how large the safety factor needs to be. For example, is the reactor building crane cable safety factor of 7.9 good enough or need it be 8, or even 10 by more recent standards. Again the probabilities of failure are low. Furthermore the operating experience is very good for the whole industry, with those few incidents dominated by human error rather than mechanical margins. Continued operation was justified while these compliance and conformance issues were addressed.

OEDO

>>> Stacey Rosenberg 09/02/03 01:53PM >>>  
Thanks for your views, Jack.

The question about continuing with the loading campaign is more of a historical one. Between the time the DPV was filed to the time the DPO Panel completed its assessment was over two years. The question is that should the loading campaign have been held in abeyance (from 2001 on) until the issues were resolved. I agree with you that at this point most of the technical issues have been resolved.

Thanks,  
Stacey

RES

>>> Jack Rosenthal 09/02/03 12:53PM >>>

The DPO panel was independent of all prior reviews, involvement, etc. The DPO panel did not make a judgement on the independence of the DPV panel which was the fillers contention. This is a process issue for the keepers of the Management Directive in my view. I had discussed keeping the panel technical rather than process at a meeting with W Dean and I Schoenfeld several months ago (perhaps April).

In any case the filler said that he wanted a DPO because the DPV was not independent and he got what he requested.

With regards to continuing spent fuel loading, Dresden can continue loading. With the restrictions on crane travel imposed by NRR, limitation of the maximum load by NRR and independently confirmed by the DPO panel, and various inspections cited in several places, Dresden will be in compliance with its' license.

I would be pleased to provide further assistance, and we can discuss the form of the documentation.

OEDO

>>> Stacey Rosenberg 08/29/03 02:27PM >>>  
Hi Jack,

Thank you for serving as the DPO Review Panel Chair for the DPO on the Dry Cask Storage Campaign at Dresden. Your report to Bill Travers was very thorough in addressing all of the technical issues.

The EDO's office is now in the process of dispositioning the DPO in accordance with the management directive. The DPO filer asked for resolution of the following two issues: 1) "continuing to allow the

24

licensee to load casks when there are numerous technical issues that have not been resolved per the DPV report," and 2) whether the DPV Panel was independent.

We are now trying to roll up the results of the DPO panel's findings and we are hoping you would help by summarizing your findings in relation to the filers issue of continuing the with loading campaign. This summary could be in the form of a supplement to the Panel report.

Also, I was not involved when the DPO panel was formed, and therefore I have the following question for you: Was the DPO panel asked specifically not to address the issue of DPV panel independence?

I am going to try to set up a meeting for early next week with you, Sam Collins and me to discuss this further.

Thanks again for your help,  
Stacey Rosenberg  
X1733

CC: Jack Rosenthal