

From: John Hannon ^{NRR}
To: Bagchi, Goutam, ^{NRR} Barrett, Richard, Basu, Sudhamay...^{RES}
Date: Mon, Jul 24, 2000 8:17 AM
Subject: Re: Items from Last Week's Meetings on TWG Report

Just one thought on the ventilation assumption. I talked to our fire protection engineers about the O2 requirements (and/or Nitrogen) under a Zirc oxidation scenario. They tell me that the assumption that the building could fall in such a way that it would limit the flow of air to the reaction is highly suspect - a chimney effect would be established and a suction of air would occur that would not be limited by the building collapse should it occur (sufficient cracks and crevices would exist such that the oxidation reaction would not be substantially affected, and a path for air ingress would also exist through the hypothetical crack in the pool that allows the water to drain out). All this suggests that maybe our original assumption wasn't that horrible after all.....

>>> George Hubbard 07/24 7:16 AM >>>

Please review the attached file on my understanding of actions we need to take based on last weeks meetings and give me your feedback.

Thanks,

George Hubbard
2870

CC: Akstulewicz, Frank, Flack, John, Wermiel, Jared

9/21/8