

7/19/99

WHAT DID WE LEARN?

1. May need to broaden our report to better encompass the industry. This is true for the deterministic T/H calculations. We will want to be able to umbrella as many plants as possible.
2. It may be wist to expand the PRA to look at other SFP cooling configurations. We could look at the benefit of design features such as an onsite EDG. (not necessarily safety grade) or an onsite external piping connection to provide out of building makeup to the SFP.
3. Gary H asked if we need to put in a spectrum of heat loads and pool volumes in our analysis.
4. We need to identify what kinds of things can "reset" operator eyes to the problem at hand.
5. Operations won't follow one strategy, but will follow several parallel paths. Is this true? Is it proceduralized? How should it be credited?
6. Industry asserted that if equipment is in the FSAR it needs to be functional. To what extent is this true?
7. How do we credit security rounds?
8. We need to address "new" information on seismic (e.g., Merimeeche Fault in New England (spelling?)). *increased aircraft*
9. Check what is in the proposed generic BWR and PWR TS for decommissioning plants.
10. Evaluate design and operational information presented by industry panel. Consult with NRC human factors specialists.
11. Assessment of waste dispersal, fuel handling accidents, and other more likely accidents.
12. Consider falling crane rail (seismic or otherwise).
13. ⁵precipitation of boron crystals a concern at decommissioning plants?
14. Ed Burns and truncation.
15. From Bob Kennedy, 1.5 times variance in fragility from the "gross average" implies plus or minus a factor of 5 in scale.
16. It is acknowledged that the transfer tube in BWR 4s , and some BWR- 5's and 6s , may not have been analyzed for seismic shear and connections.
17. Some spent fuel ppls cannot take 5 days of pool boiling.

B/190

18. (Need to have Decommissioning PMs check that DFSARs call for implementation of NUREG-0612. Do we need it in the license?)
19. Calculate what is the credit to be given for NR-0612 compliance. Bill Henries said 1 to 2 orders of magnitude reduction is "ok" if staff doesn't use upper bounds for its inputs.
20. Staff to do a better job of documenting why it chooses to use certain numbers as inputs or point estimates.
21. Concern over foreign material exclusion and its impact on cooling.
22. Concern about what else is going on at the plant. Check with Regional inspectors?
23. What additional training commitments do we need? How good is the Certified Fuel Handler training?
24. Address concrete ageing and fluence concerns with respect to temperature. Does concrete only cure for a few years?
- ~~25. Written criticality response~~
26. Provide consequences of a zirconium fire.
27. Would NRC accept a total blackout at a decommissioning plant that has no extra or even any DGs or other loss of offsite power equipment capable of providing cooling in the event of a sustained station blackout?
28. Address organizational factors on PRA.

HOW DID OUR PLANS IN PHASE 3 CHANGE?

WHAT DO I HAVE TO DO?

7/19/99

1. Work with Safeguards people on write up on sabotage and safeguards.
2. Explain why we are not looking at low consequence/higher probability events in our report.
3. Explain in report why NR 1353 is not applicable to decommissioning plants.
4. Explain there is no difference in doses between a boildown and a rapid loss of water.
5. Read Regulatory Guide 1.33.
6. Review Ed Burns' report and comment and incorporate as appropriate.
7. Explain how and when we used upper bound numbers.