

## CHAIRMAN Resource

---

**From:** Tom Gurdziel <tgurdziel@twcny.rr.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 04, 2016 9:53 AM  
**To:** CHAIRMAN Resource  
**Cc:** Michelle Gaylord; JNappi@entergy.com; T Holden; Lyon, Jill:(NMP); ESTRONSKI@aol.com; Bridget Frymire  
**Subject:** [External\_Sender] What does the word "Leak" mean to you?

Good morning,

Yesterday I read a comment about the February, 2016 Indian Point leakage into site groundwater there in the article "Fukushima Lessons Learnt" in the current, (May - June 2016) issue of the "Nuclear Plant Journal". It is :

"And so they found one at Indian Point, were able to identify the source of it, terminated the source of it." (from page 36)

This is misleading because it leads the reader to conclude that the source was identified first, then the flow was terminated. I do not believe that happened. As I understand the event, it was only after groundwater monitoring wells on the Indian Point site showed an increase that site employees started looking for the source. (And I am almost thinking that, by then, the water was gone into the site groundwater.)

Then I thought about my imprecise use of the word "leak". I use "leak" to mean the active loss of a fluid, but also the existence of an unintended flow path, whether or not fluid is present at that time. So, if you have a fluid leak, you can stop it by stopping the flow, BUT that does not mean that you have identified the leak pathway. And unfortunately, that appears to be the continuing case at the Entergy/Indian Point Unit 2 plant.

With no action taken by Entergy/Indian Point Unit 2 to (first, identify, then), plug the leak pathway(s) of contaminated water beyond the limits of the "containment" building, water will seem likely to escape the next time similar initiating conditions occur.

Thank you,

Tom Gurdziel

It would seem reasonable that somebody would suggest a containment building Integrated Leak Rate Test after the leak paths have been repaired, even though, I believe, they have gotten an extension past when they might have expected a license extension to be issued.



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

[www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)