

From: Alex Murray *AM*
To: Amy Cabbage; Donald Carlson; Howard Faulkner; Stuart Rubin; Undine Shoop
Date: Fri, Aug 17, 2001 11:40 AM
Subject: Re: Transmittal of Draft Trip Report

FYI,

Many earlier comments were not addressed - they are repeated at the end of the message.

Major Comment 1: parts of the report seem overly optimistic - the pragmatic comments and insights from the researchers and presenters need to be included.

Major Comment 2: we tend to repeat and take the statements from the researchers at face value without a closing sentence or two from the NRC/U.S. perspective.

Major Comment 3: we need a disclaimer or similar statement(s) that the NRC has not reviewed this work in detail and neither agrees/disagrees with the results of the work and inferences made by the German organizations.

Major Comment 4: a major theme of many presentations (including Kugeler's presentations, which are not well presented in the draft - see previous comment 4) is the reactor preservation system. This is not well discussed in the draft.

Major Comment 5: the findings need to be at the beginning or also summarized in the cover letter.

Major Comment 6: some of the findings are too trite - additional findings may be needed. I will try to forward some suggestions soon.

Alex.

Original Message from 6/14/01 with comments:

FYI,

I have taken a quick look at today's version of the trip report. I realize it is still under development and the findings may change. I have some comments and suggestions:

1. General Comment 1 - It's a bit weak on conclusions - we tend to repeat the statements/comments of the researchers without a closing sentence or two from the NRC/U.S. perspective.
2. General Comment 2 - the front half of the report is overly optimistic - the pragmatic comments and other factors from the researchers and presenters need to be included.
3. General Comment 3 - it needs page numbers, maybe section numbers, and maybe a Table of Contents. Also, minor typos and syntax errors in the document - these can be caught on a more final draft.
4. For the enclosures/references, the following need to be added and referenced in the text: **After page 27 now**
 - Kugeler's writeup on "Concept of inherently safe ..." and "Large Test Facilities"
 - Schroeder et al on "Ceramic Coatings ..."
 - one or two of the papers on D&D of the AVR/THTR.
 - Kalinowski's handwritten ones on pebble flow
 - Kugeler's writeup on waste management
 - There may be another one on AVR SNF management

I-11

5. The syntax needs correcting on the last sentence of the transmittal memo. **Done**

6. In the Introduction to the Summary, we may want to add a short paragraph on a chronological basis and then lead into the topic based part of the main trip report. **Not Done**

7. Under the section "High Temperature Reactor Research at Julich ..." we need to add statements regarding the effect of helium upon materials, fusing of the metals, bearings etc. The Nacok facility should be listed here as well (referring to another section for the discussion). The last paragraph should also reference the presentation by Kugeler, the use of prestressed concrete (not steel), the potential for uneven expansion of coatings on the macroscopic fuel pebble, and the steel bands that could open for pressure relief during an event. Kugeler also brought up the functioning reactor preservation system, which should be mentioned here and leading to the isolation with sand or other granular materials. **It's not clear why this section has disappeared in the 8/17 draft**

8. Under "High Temperature Reactor Design ..." -

- the second paragraph mentions the double steel reactor vessel. This should be clarified and put in context - for R&D work, accident testing, different fuels, TRISO was developed at the start of AVR ops etc.
- there should also be a discussion about confinement vs containment vs stout confinement in here.
- check the 80 MWe power rating in the last paragraph - 100 MWe was also mentioned.
- in the last paragraph, it is incorrect to state that the HTR-M is an entirely passive design. The reactor preservation system should be mentioned, and that the HTR-M has passive safety features that function after active safety systems function. **Page 3 now - mostly not addressed**

9. Under "Safety Assessment ..." the fourth paragraph needs improvement. Again, several of the key statements from the enclosures and the presentations should be included - the reactor preservation system functions, reactor shutdown, isolation valves, containment vs strong confinement, release via filters, emergency power etc. The text should also mention the passive coolers in the reactor building that use natural circulation of cooling water via three independent trains - these protect the concrete although overtemperatures may result.

On page 4 now - mostly unaddressed

10. Under "Pebble Fuel Element Research ..." - suggest referring to the attachment upfront or directly incorporating the attachment in this section.

pages 4-5 now

11. Under "Pebble Fuel Element Irradiation ..."

- the particle fuel failure range from manufacture was consistently mentioned as 1E-4 to 1E-5 - this should be mentioned in the second paragraph.

- in addition, several of the presenters mentioned 1E-3 after irradiation at temperature - perhaps we should just say that the rate increases with reactor irradiation/use.

- suggest leaving in the 1,600 C impact sentence on cesium release in paragraph 3.

- note potential differences in release mechanisms, silver and cesium by diffusion through "changed SiC" while fission gas release appears to be due to failure of the SiC (paragraphs 3-5).

Pages 5-6 now - mostly unaddressed

12. The graphite and pebble/heat xfer sections look fine.

13. Under "AVR operating experience", we should clarify if the LOCA test in paragraph 2 also represented the conditions after the actuation of the reactor preservation system. **On page 9 - mostly unaddressed**

14. The THTR sections look OK.

15. Under "THTR Licensing ..." the first paragraph should note the higher cost share/burden that the utility would have incurred with continued THTR operation. Also, it started with a shutdown, with a program to decommission the THTR (many components are still onsite due to the SAFESTOR approach). **On page**

13 - partially addressed

16. Under "... Facility Tours" paragraph 4 should be incorporated into paragraph 3 (there is an overlap). Also, paragraph 7, first sentence should have "horizontal" replaced with "vertical" for the Nacok cross-section. **On page 13 - partially addressed - change horizontal to vertical**

17. Under SNF, include the original paragraph or a suitable modification that explains the difficulties of decommissioning to SAFESTOR a reactor that could have fuel pebbles stuck in the system. Also, perhaps mention the graphite dust again. **On page 16 - not addressed**

18. In the pebble fuel attachment, last paragraph, 2nd page - check if that is 200 mm or 200 microns. **On page 23 - not addressed - the 1 mm particles do not have a 200 mm coating**

19. The last attachment on "Safety Assessment ..." should include disclaimer like language from the NRC - "specific details of the analysis were not provided" - "The delegation did not review the calculations." Also, there should be an acknowledgement that some of these systems would potentially have safety significance in the NRC's regulatory approach. **not addressed**

Alex.

>>> Stuart Rubin 08/17/01 08:44AM >>>

Attached is the latest draft of the trip report. Don is still working on the references (and the reference section) which are due this morning to be incorporated. The DRAFT report will be sent to John Craig about noon today to forward to the Commissioners. Please look over the report for any "MUST Stop the Draft Report Transmittal" item. Non-critical improvements and additions will be made as time allows between now and when we transmit to the report.

Your concurrence will be requested before we transmit the FINAL report next week.

Sorry for the delay.

Thanks.

Stu

CC: John Flack; Thomas King

Mail Envelope Properties (3B7D3ACE.4A8 : 14 : 19085)

Subject: Re: Transmittal of Draft Trip Report
Creation Date: Fri, Aug 17, 2001 11:39 AM
From: Alex Murray) NMSS
Created By: AXM2@nrc.gov

Recipients

nrc.gov
 owf1_po.OWFN_DO
 HJF (Howard Faulkner)

nrc.gov
 owf2_po.OWFN_DO
 AEC (Amy Cabbage)

nrc.gov
 owf4_po.OWFN_DO
 USS (Undine Shoop)

nrc.gov
 twf5_po.TWFN_DO
 DEC1 (Donald Carlson)
 JHF CC (John Flack)
 SDR1 (Stuart Rubin)
 TLK CC (Thomas King)

Post Office

owf1_po.OWFN_DO
 owf2_po.OWFN_DO
 owf4_po.OWFN_DO
 twf5_po.TWFN_DO

Route

nrc.gov
 nrc.gov
 nrc.gov
 nrc.gov

Files

MESSAGE

Size

13067

Date & Time

Friday, August 17, 2001 11:39 AM

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard