From: Mark Leyse <markleyse@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 21, 2015 4:10 PM
To: Doyle, Daniel
Cc: CHAIRMAN Resource; CMRSVINICKI Resource; CMROSTENDORFF Resource; CMRBARAN Resource; bobleyse@aol.com; shadis@prexar.com; Burnell, Scott; Bladey, Cindy; DeJesus, Anthony; Inverso, Tara; Dave Lochbaum; Ed Lyman; michal_freedhoff@markey.senate.gov; Matthew G. McKinzie; Thomas B. Cochran; Geoffrey Fettus; Alemayehu, Bemnet; RulemakingComments Resource; PDR Resource; Deborah Brancato; Paul Gallay
Subject: [External_Sender] Re: Re: Status of PRM-50-93/95

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Doyle:

With all due respect, I do not understand why you cannot clarify that TRACE predicted the **peak** cladding temperature at each elevation.

The NRC's "Draft Interim Review" (in ADAMS at ML12265A277) states: "Results for the TRACE simulations are listed in Table 1, which shows **the cladding temperatures** at five elevations 18 seconds into the transient."

In TRACE simulations of loss-of-coolant accidents, one is usually concerned with the **peak** cladding temperature. Please clarify that the TRACE simulation did indeed predict the **peak** cladding temperature at each elevation.

Again, with all due respect, I would like to remind you that on August 25, 2011, the NRC issued Press Release No. 11-158, regarding Petition for Rulemaking, PRM-50-93/95. The press release is in ADAMS at ML11237A083.

Press Release No. 11-158 states: "To increase transparency and meet public interest, the NRC will soon begin posting preliminary conclusions and other material related to a petition [PRM-50-93/95] about NRC regulations for reactor core emergency cooling systems. We are doing so because of…the goal of providing a more transparent review process."

The NRC states that it has "the goal of providing a more transparent review process." I believe it would be in the interest of increasing transparency, if you clarified that TRACE predicted the **peak** cladding temperature at each elevation.

Thank you,

Mark Leyse

On Wed, Oct 21, 2015 at 11:18 AM, Doyle, Daniel <Daniel.Doyle@nrc.gov> wrote:

Mr. Leyse,

I am unable to provide a detailed response to your questions about the TRACE computer code simulation discussed in the draft interim review because the NRC has not completed its evaluation. Your email and this response will be added to ADAMS. In addition, when finalizing its evaluation, the NRC will consider whether the discussion of the simulation should be clarified.

Dan Doyle

Project Manager

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

daniel.doyle@nrc.gov

(301) 415-3748

From: Mark Leyse [mailto:markleyse@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 16, 2015 11:46 AM
To: Doyle, Daniel
Cc: CMRSVINICKI Resource; CMROSTENDORFF Resource; CMRBARAN Resource; bobleyse@aol.com; shadis@prexar.com; Burnell, Scott; Bladey, Cindy; DeJesus, Anthony; Inverso, Tara; Dave Lochbaum; Ed Lyman
Subject: [External_Sender] Re: Re: Status of PRM-50-93/95

Dear Mr. Doyle:

Thank you for your response and for placing my e-mail in ADAMS.

I have two simple questions about the TRACE simulation of FLECHT Run 9573. The questions are just to clarify work the NRC has *already completed* in its draft interim review.

As stated in the draft interim review, the TRACE simulation had results for cladding temperatures at five different elevations of the test bundle, at 18 seconds. For example, the TRACE simulation using Baker-Just predicted that the cladding temperature would be 1598.4 K at the six foot elevation.

First) Were the TRACE results the peak cladding temperature (PCT) at each of the five different elevations?

Second) Was the value of 1598.4 K that TRACE predicted (using Baker-Just) the PCT at the six foot elevation?

Thank you,

Mark Leyse

P.S. As previously stated, the TRACE simulation is discussed in the "Draft Interim Review" in ADAMS at ML12265A277.

I figure that the TRACE results are the predicted PCT at each of the five different elevations. But I would just like to have that confirmed.