

EDO Principal Correspondence Control

FROM: DUE: 07/05/12 EDO CONTROL: G20120390  
DOC DT: 05/31/12  
FINAL REPLY:

Tom Gurdziel

TO:

Chairman Jaczko

FOR SIGNATURE OF : \*\* GRN \*\* CRC NO: 12-0268

Leeds, NRR

DESC:

ROUTING:

Fukushima Comment - Cool-Down Rate in Accident  
Conditions (EDATS: SECY-2012-0292)

Borchardt  
Weber  
Johnson  
Ash  
Mamish  
OGC/GC  
Merzke, OEDO

DATE: 06/05/12

ASSIGNED TO:

CONTACT:

NRR

Leeds

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS OR REMARKS:

# EDATS

Electronic Document and Action Tracking System

**EDATS Number:** SECY-2012-0292

**Source:** SECY

## General Information

**Assigned To:** NRR

**OEDO Due Date:** 7/5/2012 11:00 PM

**Other Assignees:**

**SECY Due Date:** NONE

**Subject:** Fukushima Comment - Cool-Down Rate in Accident Conditions

**Description:**

**CC Routing:** NONE

**ADAMS Accession Numbers - Incoming:** NONE

**Response/Package:** NONE

## Other Information

**Cross Reference Number:** G20120390, LTR-12-0268

**Staff Initiated:** NO

**Related Task:**

**Recurring Item:** NO

**File Routing:** EDATS

**Agency Lesson Learned:** NO

**OEDO Monthly Report Item:** NO

## Process Information

**Action Type:** E-mail

**Priority:** Medium

**Signature Level:** No Signature Required

**Sensitivity:** None

**Approval Level:** No Approval Required

**Urgency:** NO

**OEDO Concurrence:** NO

**OCM Concurrence:** NO

**OCA Concurrence:** NO

**Special Instructions:**

## Document Information

**Originator Name:** Tom Gurdziel

**Date of Incoming:** 5/31/2012

**Originating Organization:** Citizens

**Document Received by SECY Date:** 6/5/2012

**Addressee:** Chairman Jaczko

**Date Response Requested by Originator:** NONE

**Incoming Task Received:** E-mail

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL TICKET

Date Printed: Jun 05, 2012 08:26

---

PAPER NUMBER: LTR-12-0268 LOGGING DATE: 06/05/2012

ACTION OFFICE: EDO

AUTHOR: Tom Gurdziel  
AFFILIATION: NY  
ADDRESSEE: Chairman Resource  
SUBJECT: Fukushima-related comments for 5-31-2012 - 100 degrees F. per hour

ACTION: Appropriate

DISTRIBUTION:

LETTER DATE: 05/31/2012

ACKNOWLEDGED No

SPECIAL HANDLING:

NOTES:

FILE LOCATION: ADAMS

DATE DUE:

DATE SIGNED:

## Joosten, Sandy

---

**From:** Tom Gurdziel [tgurdziel@twcny.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 31, 2012 8:29 AM  
**To:** CHAIRMAN Resource  
**Cc:** hillsc@INPO.org; Bridget.Frymire@dps.ny.gov; Screnci, Diane; P.Kaiser@iaea.org; jicc@ws.mofa.go.jp; JLD\_Public Resource; 'Newal Agnihotri'; 'Tom Henry'; 'Vanags, Uldis'; Bowman, Gregory; ESTRONSKI@aol.com  
**Subject:** Fukushima-related Comments for 5-31-2012

Good morning,

100 degrees F. per hour

Suppose you are an on-duty plant operator. If you knew you had a choice to either cooldown the reactor vessel at 100 degrees F. per hour or prevent the reactor core from melting, I am sure that you would choose to save the core. But suppose that choice was not apparent, as it was not at Fukushima Daiichi Unit 1 on March 11, 2011?

Does it make sense for us to continue to require a cooldown rate of 100 degrees F. per hour (or less) in accident conditions when time is critical, given that this was instrumental in destroying the Unit 1 reactor core?

Yet, after more than a year, I have still not seen any identification that the existing cooldown rate is no longer defensible in accident situations. Or is it?

How about somebody taking a look at the possible (accident) value of a fast cooldown by emergency condensers, (which is a passive system)?

Thank you,

Tom Gurdziel