From: Glenn Kelly / NRR
To: Charles Tinkler, Christopher Boyd, Farouk Eltawi...
Date: Wed, May 10, 2000 1:50 PM
Subject: Re: GT Respone to ACRS on SFP Risk for Decommissioning Plants

Note on Question 3: The ten hours is not a number that can be applied universally for "fast" transients such as heavy load drop (You can confirm this with Falk Cantor). For example, while the staff found 10 hours was ok for adhoc evacuation for Maine Yankee, the same staff found that a plant sited like Zion would need 24 hours to evacuate adhoc.

>>> George Hubbard 5/10/00 11:45 AM >>>
Based on my notes from out meeting on the ACRS letter on April 19, 2000, we need input for our response to the ACRS in the areas provided below. Let me know if you see things differently

Our schedule is for our response to the ACRS to be to Gary by May 19. Therefore, Diane and I need input no later than **FIRST THING Monday** so that we can put the response together and start getting concurrences. If possible we would like to have your input this week. Please note that people I need input from are in bold below. I would like Gareth, Mark, Joe, and Glenn to take the lead in pulling together the information and getting the information to us. Glenn, can you take the lead in working with Goutam in providing words on seismic conservatism? (We may jsut want to say we will provide further discussion in the final report).

To help I attached the slides we used at the TA brief.

Diane will be doing the first draft but be sure and provide you input to me also.

Thanks for your help

Basic Questions to Address relative to ACRS Letter

1.What is the effect of ACRS issues on frequency of fuel uncovery/zirconium fire?
2.Is the proposed pool performance guideline (LERF - 1 X 10-5) of acceptable?
3.Do we still believe we have 10 hours after fuel uncovery to take evacuation actions before having a zirconium fire?
4.Can we truly walk away from the plant after 5 years of decay time considering a zirconium fire?

Prepare response to ACRS with following points:

Question #1 Answer:No, provide reasons why frequency is not affected - input to George by **Gareth/ Mike**

Question #2 Answer:PPG using LERF criteria is acceptable - explain why - input to George by **Mark /Charlie**

Issues to address:With or without ruthenium consequences are similar to operating reactor LERF

Based on findings of study, values at decommissioning plants are way below LERF values

Discuss that we will include the additional analysis on ruthenium and the implications of it in the final report.

Discuss that we will included data for 95% (vs 99.5% previously used) evacuation efficiency in final version of report.

Discuss potential for confirmatory research and/or ongoing research relative to plume and decrepitation

4/170

(fines).

Discuss land contamination as policy issue.

Question #3 Answer:10 hours is an acceptance time for ad hoc protective actions - input to George by **Joe/Farouk/Chris**

Provide data from ANL in response stating why hydride formation and other phenomena don't change 10 hours.
Discuss that additional discussion on concerns will be put in final report.

Is this an area for confirmatory research???????

Question #4 Answer:Discuss that chances for zirc fire after five 5 years is remote and why we believe 5 years is good. - Input to George by **Joe/Glenn**

Discuss that additional data will be put in final report, including additional work on partial drain down.

Acknowledge that we will look at performing confirmatory research. (Is this right ??????)

Attendees:
Mark Rubin Gareth Parry Mike Cheok
Goutam Bagchi Glenn Kelly Joe Staudenmeier
Chris Boyd Farouk Eltawila Charlie Tinkler
Joe Murphy Rich Barrett John Hannon
Gary Holahan George Hubbard

George Hubbard
2870

CC: Diane Jackson, Frank Akstulewicz, Gary Holahan, ...