

NRR-PMDAPEm Resource

From: Michael Mulligan [steamshovel2002@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2015 12:39 PM
To: Rankin, Jennivine
Subject: Re: Issuance of proposed director's decision associated with your 10 CFR 2.206 petition regarding impellers

Mrs. Rankin,

Additional Concerns:

I think an accident coming out of broken PCP impeller blades is basically too complex to understand. I honestly don't think anyone really understands completely how or why these blades fail. What can happen in the future not contrary to licensing. The normal way they handle this is they make a quality requirement over the global uncertainties. Why isn't there a quality requirement where these impellers are supposed to be replaced before cracks and broken blades shows up?

Why isn't this an adverse to quality" violation? I am not certain how the USFAR and licensing treats quality for the PCP components "Why isn't this related to a 10 CFR 50.59 or licensing amendment request? I considered the PCP impeller problem contrary to plant licensing and the USFAR. Why didn't "not operating to plant licensing", the NPSH issue...not cycle through a 50.59 or licensed amendment request change. I request the Palisades Plant immediately comply with all NRC regulations and UFSAR requirements.

As far as the Salem plant primary coolant pump problem and Palisades plant PCP problems being dissimilar...I disagree. Basically defects have shown up in prior outage and inspections at both plants. The licensees and the NRC failed to immediately correct the problem. I fear this attitude would carry over to a much larger problem...where the licensee and the NRC would detect an incipient early problem and decide not to repair it. Then it leads to a much larger problem later on or it become a runaway repetitive problem. It is noticed the NRC doesn't do a comprehensive inspection write up about the early problems. You wait until to you are hunting around inside the core and coolant piping for broken off blades and missing screws to comprehensively report on it. I could make a case these inspection reports are still rather skimpy.

Does the NRC have any actually testing with these 4000 hp pumps...proof...that the loose ductile blades won't shatter the impeller?

I have issues with the transparency of the OIG. Your staff reports these issues to the OIG. But there is no paperwork trail (like on the docket) that I can see showing you sent documents to the OIG and OIG never contacts me indicating they'd seen my concern and it taken into consideration one way or another?

I wish I had an industry wide perspective on PCP impeller blade problem? The blade problem seems only related to Palisades. I request the LERs and inspection reports report on PCP problem more comprehensively. This is an early indicator with licensee problems and safety culture problem. The public should see this.

Sincerely,
Mike Mulligan
Hinsdale, NH
16033368320

Hearing Identifier: NRR_PMDA
Email Number: 1853

Mail Envelope Properties (921762476.2508485.1422553151936.JavaMail.yahoo)

Subject: Re: Issuance of proposed director's decision associated with your 10 CFR 2.206
petition regarding impellers
Sent Date: 1/29/2015 12:39:11 PM
Received Date: 1/29/2015 12:39:16 PM
From: Michael Mulligan

Created By: steamshovel2002@yahoo.com

Recipients:
"Rankin, Jennivine" <Jennivine.Rankin@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: mail.yahoo.com

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2685	1/29/2015 12:39:16 PM

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received: