

**From:** Marc Dapas R111  
**To:** Jim Dyer R111  
**Date:** 8/22/03 12:41PM  
**Subject:** DPO on Dresden Heavy Loads Handling System

Attached are my high level comments on the subject DPO panel report. I have left a message with Ho Nieh and Joe Shea in the EDO's Office. I am available next week to talk to either one (it is my understanding that Joe may be out-of-the-office next week) in person when I am back at HQs for the DNMS/NMSS counterpart meeting. I can answer any questions that the EDO's office may have on the issues in the DPO report and provide clarification based on my detailed review of that document. I also have some more detailed comments on selected statements that are inaccurate in the report (no show stoppers).

P.S. As I was generating this e-mail I received a call from Ho Nieh. He asked me to cc him on the comments I generated and we will be sitting down next Wednesday morning when I am back at HQs to discuss the subject report in detail.

**CC:** Ho Nieh; James Caldwell

22

### Region III Comments on August 6<sup>th</sup>, 2003 Differing Professional Opinion Concerning the Dry Cask Storage Campaign at Dresden Units 2 and 3

- The subject document is not "user friendly" in terms providing a clear understanding of the scope and associated regulatory history of each issue. The document is difficult to follow even with a detailed knowledge of the issues and content of the referenced supporting documentation. The document could have been packaged differently to facilitate a clear understanding of the issues and sequence of activities in arriving at the agency position for each issue. NRC inspection report 50-237/03-02; 50-249/03-02 (issued by DRP on April 30, 2003) contains a clear summary of the regulatory history associated with the issues and provides the basis for the final agency disposition of those issues. It does not appear that the DPO panel reviewed this report.
- The conclusions of the DPO panel on each issue are consistent with the agency disposition, i.e., the DPO panel did not take issue with the final technical resolution by the agency of any of the issues associated with the DPO.
- The discussion in selected sections of the DPO panel report would indicate that the DPV was the driver in resolving specific heavy loads handling issues, i.e., Region III and NRR had reached closure on the various technical issues and the DPV process resulted in the NRC revisiting those issues. Examples include the seismic qualification of the reactor building superstructure and Unit 2/3 reactor building crane. In actuality, the unresolved items contained in DNMS Inspection Report 0720003/2001-002, issued on August 13, 2001, which related to the reactor building superstructure and crane, formulated the basis for a proposed backfit as documented in the associated regulatory analysis. The backfit analysis reflected an overarching concern with the long-term viability of the Dresden Unit 2/3 heavy loads handling system given the seismic qualification issues. Region III forwarded the backfit analysis to NRR and requested technical review via the Task Interface Agreement (TIA) process. In developing a response to the TIA, NRR initiated a request for additional information (RAI) to the licensee. The licensee responded with revised calculations that demonstrated that the reactor building crane and associated superstructure could not meet design allowables for stress without crane travel restrictions. The DPV and DPO filer was of the view that there is an immediate safety concern with continued use of the crane for heavy loads handling. The agency did not agree, i.e., there was not an immediate safety concern that justified NRC issuance of an order prohibiting crane use for the cask loading campaign. The agency concern was over long-term use and that concern was resolved with the licensee's response to the RAI..
- Individuals in the Region III line organization involved in the agency resolution of the heavy loads handling issues were not interviewed by the DPO panel. Consequently, an opportunity to provide some clarification on the sequence of events pertaining to the resolution of selected issues and to inform the DPO panel of the DRP inspection report referenced above, was lost.