

From: Richard Barrett , *NR*
To: Glenn Kelly , *NR*
Date: Monday, June 14, 1999 09:39 AM
Subject: Re: Fwd: SECY paper

Glenn:

I agree that the analyses are credible, and represent an excellent piece of technical work, particularly given the short time available. The decision to hold back the results is based on a desire to work with the industry and other stakeholders to reach agreement on a final resolution of this issue. They have expressed a concern about giving these numerical results an NRC stamp of approval before further public interaction on actual design/operational commitments that could bound the final risk numbers. Putting the numbers in a SECY gives them a level of finality that I don't think we want to convey. However, the SECY clearly states our conclusion based on risk that the issue cannot be dismissed.

It makes sense to me that we should spend our effort defining an acceptable configuration for future decommissioning plants rather than conducting a battle over current plant configurations and PRA assumptions. (Our own report states that no current plant matches the assumptions of the analysis). We have an opportunity to move directly to the solution if we display some sensitivity for our stakeholders' concerns.

Please be patient. The work you have done has brought us forward by leaps and bounds from where we were in March. Your continued involvement is essential to bringing this to resolution. If industry holds up their end of the bargain, we will have accomplished a great deal through this effort.

--Rich

>>> Glenn Kelly 06/14 8:48 AM >>>
Rich,

I wanted to let you know that I am strongly disappointed that the insights and results of the risk assessment for decommissioned plant spent fuel pools was effectively stripped from the SECY paper being forwarded to the Commission. This was a very good piece of work, done in a very short time. If the numerical results were $1.5E-7$ per year for fuel uncover, projects would be trumpeting this as the near final result and would feature the value on the first line of the SECY. Now, since the result is higher than expected, everyone is running away from telling the Commission what we found.

We showed the numerical results to the Commissioner Assistants. Why are we denying it to the Commissioners? We are coming out with the complete draft in a week or so. How can we not let the Commission know what is going to be going out shortly that MAY cause a big ruckus? What we did is not only defensible, but good PRA analysis.

Glenn

>>> Richard Barrett 6/14/99 08:27 AM >>>

I see that you are also commenting. Here are the comments I sent in.

--Rich

CC: MPR

B/170