

September 23, 2002

Mr. Oscar Shirani

 *rc*
SUBJECT: ALLEGATION - NMSS-2002-A-0002
Holtec International / U. S. Tool & Die, Inc.

Dear Mr. Shirani:

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has completed its review of comments you provided in an email letter dated August 19, 2002, in which you stated your disagreement with the staff's conclusions in my letter to you dated July 10, 2002.

NRC had previously completed its review of two of your concerns about activities at Holtec International and U. S. Tool & Die, Inc., and documented the staff's response in my letter to you dated May 28, 2002. That letter stated that, based on reviews of the information provided by you and on the results of an NRC inspection conducted in response to your allegation, the staff determined that your concerns were substantiated, but that there was not a resulting safety or regulatory concern requiring further NRC action. Consequently, the allegation file was closed. Subsequently, you sent by email on June 13, 2002, a letter indicating that you did not agree with the staff's conclusions reported in my May 28, 2002 letter. You had also previously sent additional comments in emails to the NRC dated May 8, 2002, and May 30, 2002. My letter to you dated July 10, 2002, provided the results of the staff's review of the information you provided in emails dated May 8, 2002, May 30, 2002, and June 13, 2002, and its determination that, although you stated that you disagreed with the staff's findings, you did not provide new information that would cause the NRC to change its conclusions, and the file remained closed.

As is more fully set forth in Enclosure 1, the staff has determined, based on a review of the comments in your August 19, 2002, letter, that no new information has been provided that would cause the NRC to change its conclusions, and the file remained closed.

Since you have not submitted any new information that causes the staff to change its conclusions, the allegation file remains closed. Unless the NRC receives additional information that suggests that our conclusions should be altered, we plan no further action on this matter.

CERTIFIED MAIL *P 313 829 985*
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Information in this record was deleted
in accordance with the Freedom of Information
Act, exemptions *7c*
FOIA- *2003-295*

D/8

Mr. Oscar Shirani

- 2 -

Allegation: NMSS-2002-A-0002

We appreciate your bringing these matters to our attention. Safety and safeguards concerns from concerned individuals serve a vital role in the protection of public health and safety. If you have any questions, you may contact me at 1(800) 368-5642 (toll free) or (301) 415-7877.

Sincerely,



Robert L. O'Connell
Allegation Coordinator
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

DISTRIBUTION:
NMSS-2001-A-0002

OFC	SFPO		SFPO	C	SFPO		NMSS OAC	
NAME	PNarbut		M. J. Kar		M. W. Hodges		RLO'Connell	
DATE	9/16/02		9/16/02		9/16/02		09/23/02	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Comments and Staff Response

In the 8/19/02 letter, the Concerned Individual (CI) changes the focus from his previous allegation that *US Tool and Die was dispositioning nonconformances as use-as-is without Holtec review, to Holtec was dispositioning nonconformance reports for use-as-is with vague statements and accepting them only by engineering judgment.* Also, the CI seems to believe that design changes always involve changes to calculations. Also, the CI says that, in the past, engineering judgment was not accepted by the NRC without proper documentation.

Staff Response: Holtec nonconformance report (NCR) dispositions were examined at inspections conducted at Holtec in September 2001 and May 2002. The inspectors found that the dispositions were adequately explained, although sometimes followup questions were required for a fuller understanding. NRC does not have an absolute requirement for the degree of completeness of explanations of rationale for NCR dispositions. As a general rule, inspectors look to determine if the disposition makes technical sense. If the disposition is technically adequate, the inspectors do not engage the question of the adequacy of the explanation. If the disposition does not appear reasonable, the inspectors explore the rationale more deeply. Licensees and certificate holders are encouraged to record adequate rationale, but there is no NRC requirement to do so for NCRs. Design changes do not always involve changes to calculations. Often design changes are approved based on engineering judgment, and that is an acceptable engineering practice. However, in the cases described by the CI, and examined during the inspections, design changes were not required for the use-as-is dispositions, as explained in our earlier responses. Therefore, we conclude no additional inspection is warranted based on the additional supplemental information.

The letter also describes audits findings involving General Electric Nuclear Energy, Sargent and Lundy, and ComEd. The CI also forwarded the letter to the Region III office, which has stated that no new information was provided regarding that matter that would change the staff's conclusions.

Finally, the letter states:

"All the details that I previously provided to you regarding welding and the temperature changes affecting the material yield strength intended to highlight the reasons that the Repair should be treated as design change and the engineers should properly document their review of the changes made to the original design of dry cask storage and avoid making vague engineering judgment statements. Your staff need to answer the above concerns before prematurely conclude that this allegation is closed."

Staff Response: The staff has previously reviewed the concerns and concluded that there is not a significant safety or regulatory concern requiring further NRC action. The CI has not provided any new information that would refute the staff's conclusions, but has simply, for the third time, restated his perception of a problem. No new information has been provided. The staff has determined that there is not a significant safety or regulatory concern requiring further NRC action. Consequently, this file remains closed.

Is your RETURN ADDRESS completed on the reverse side?

SENDER:

- Complete Items 1 and/or 2 for additional services.
- Complete Items 3, 4a, and 4b.
- Print your name and address on the reverse of this form so that we can return this card to you.
- Attach this form to the front of the mailpiece, or on the back if space does not permit.
- Write "Return Receipt Requested" on the mailpiece below the article number.
- The Return Receipt will show to whom the article was delivered and the date delivered.


I also wish to receive the following services (for an extra fee):

1. ☐ Addressee's Address
2. ☐ Restricted Delivery

Consult postmaster for fee.

3. Article Addressed to:

Mr. Oscar Shirani



4a. Article Number

p 373 869 935

4b. Service Type

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Registered | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certified |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Express Mail | <input type="checkbox"/> Insured |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Return Receipt for Merchandise | <input type="checkbox"/> COD |

7. Date of Delivery

5. Received By: (Print Name)

8. Addressee's Address (Only if requested and fee is paid)

6. Signature: (Addressee or Agent)

X(1) Shirani

Thank you for using Return Receipt Service.

PS Form 3811, December 1994

Domestic Return Receipt