

Release

From: Charles Mullins *DGC*  
To: David Solorio; Meena Khanna *MR*  
Date: 2/4/04 1:25PM  
Subject: Re: Hi there - comments on letter to Mr. Shadis regarding NUREG-1738

TO: David, Meena, et al.

I would respectfully suggest that your second paragraph (first operative paragraph) start something like this:

**You have already received a response to your first question from Mr. Mullins. As his letter noted, NUREG-1738 is still considered an official NRC report and is publically available in ADAMS .... [etc.]. You should note that this NUREG .... [etc].**

I am not sure the next paragraph is necessary, as it restates some of the points that I made, but it is your letter. If you are going to include it, you would be more correct to say:

**"Two Commissioners have have stated publically (speeches available through the NRC web site) that .... [etc].**

√ >>> David Solorio 02/04/04 11:23AM >>> *NMR*  
Hi Meena,

Steve Jones and I reviewed the letter you prepared (using our input and perhaps input from others) and had a few comments. One of the comments is simply to put a little bit more in there, beyond what was already there, that describes the purpose of 1738. I didn't try to dream up any new words, I just copied them from the Executive Summary of the NUREG itself.

I have attached a redline/strikeout file showing what I added (red text) and removed (blue struck out text). Some of what I struck out must have been added by others.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Tim - I suspect you might not have time to review attached, but since all the goings on are related to something you worked on a bit a while back I just wanted you to be aware. For that reason I attached the incoming.

Thanks  
Dave

CC: John Hannon; Robert Palla; Steve Jones; Timothy Collins

A/17

Mr. Raymond Shadis  
Post Office Box 76  
Edgecomb, Maine 04556

Dear Mr. Shadis:

I am responding to your facsimile and email dated January 21, 2004, to Mr. Charles E. Mullins, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). In your facsimile and email you indicated that you have been seeking to establish the status of NUREG-1738, "Technical Study of Spent Fuel Pool Accident Risk at Decommissioning Nuclear Power Plants," as an official U.S. NRC document and requested that the NRC respond to your questions regarding this NUREG.

With respect to your first question regarding whether the study remains an official document of the NRC, NUREG-1738 is an official NRC report and is publicly available in ADAMS under accession number ML010430066. It should be noted that this NUREG is comprised of technical and administrative reports prepared by the staff or agency contractors, but does not include or revise regulations or describe acceptable methods or techniques to meet the Commission's regulations. Regulations are promulgated via the Code of Federal Regulations. In addition, Regulatory Guides are issued to describe and make available to the public such information as methods acceptable to the NRC staff for implementing specific parts of the Commission's regulations, techniques used by the staff in evaluating specific problems or postulated accidents; however, regulatory guides are not substitutes for regulations, and compliance with them is not required. The Commission has not endorsed NUREG-1738 as part of the considerations underlying any rule or regulation, or in any other official manner. Therefore, the report contains no official agency policy, conclusions, or recommendations.

Members of the Commission (McGaffigan and Diaz) have stated publicly (speeches available through NRC web site) that NUREG-1738 is too conservative. The staff used many conservative assumptions in preparing the report to simplify the analyses. Therefore, the results of the report should be used only in such a way that the report's underlying assumptions are satisfied and the conservatisms provide an additional margin of safety. Other applications of the report results may produce invalid conclusions.

With respect to your second question of whether the NRC has promulgated any official notice or determination that the public and/or other agencies of the government not placing reliance on the representations contained within NUREG-1738, as described in the forward executive summary of NUREG-1738, the report was prepared for staff use in rulemaking and exemption proceedings documents a study undertaken to support development of a risk-informed technical basis for reviewing exemption requests and regulatory framework for integrated rulemaking. Other users of the report results should carefully consider the underlying assumptions used in the preparation of the report in developing conclusions.

R. Shadis

-2-

With respect to your third question of whether Congress or any Committee of Congress has determined that it is necessary to replace NUREG-1738 with a study and/or report from the National Academy of Science, Congress has mandated (via an appropriations earmark) that the NRC contract with the National Academy of Sciences for an independent review of the overall safety of interim spent fuel storage in pools and dry casks. NRC staff results, including NUREG-1738, will likely be considered in that review.

With respect to your last question regarding whether the NUREG was peer reviewed, requests for public comment were consistent with the intended purpose of NUREG-1738 in supporting potential rulemaking and exemption activities.

I hope that this adequately addresses your questions. If you need further clarification on this matter, please contact me at 301-415-1455.

Sincerely,

Stephen Dembek, Chief, Section 2  
Project Directorate IV  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

R. Shadis

-2-

With respect to your third question of whether Congress or any Committee of Congress has determined that it is necessary to replace NUREG-1738 with a study and/or report from the National Academy of Science, Congress has mandated (via an appropriations earmark) that the NRC contract with the National Academy of Sciences for an independent review of the overall safety of interim spent fuel storage in pools and dry casks. NRC staff results, including NUREG-1738, will likely be considered in that review.

With respect to your last question regarding whether the NUREG was peer reviewed, requests for public comment were consistent with the intended purpose of NUREG-1738 in supporting potential rulemaking and exemption activities.

I hope that this adequately addresses your questions. If you need further clarification on this matter, please contact me at 301-415-1455.

Sincerely,

Stephen Dembek, Chief, Section 2  
Project Directorate IV  
Division of Licensing Project Management  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

**DISTRIBUTION:**

PUBLIC  
PDIV-2 Reading  
RidsNrrADPT (BSheron)  
RidsNrrDlpm (TMarsh/ELeeds)  
RidsNrrDlpmPdiv (HBerkow)  
RidsNrrLaEPeyton  
RidsOgcRp  
RidsACRSACNWMailCenter  
Mike Webb  
Robert Gramm  
Robert Palla  
David Solorio  
Charles Tinkler  
Charles Mullins, OGC  
RidsNrrPMMKhanna

**ACCESSION NO.: ML**

OFFICE	PDIV-2/PM	PDIV-1/PM	DSSA/SPLB	PDIV-2/LA	PDIV-2/SC
NAME	MKhanna*	MWebb*	DSolorio	EPeyton	SDembek
DATE	01/30/2004	01/30/2004	01/ /2004		

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\DLPM\PDIV-2\yellow ticket on NUREG-1738.wpd

\*previously concurred      OFFICIAL RECORD COPY