

David A. Lochbaum  
Nuclear Engineer  
(914) 287-3558, work

80 Tuttle Road  
Watchung, NJ 07060  
(908) 754-3577

February 10, 1995 7:49am

## FAX MESSAGE

TO: Joe Shea (NRC)

FROM: Dave Lochbaum *DL*NUMBER OF PAGES: 1

50-298, 387, 388

By Licensee Event Report 50-298/94-035, Nebraska Public Power reported that they had discovered the potential for loss of the Standby Gas Treatment System and therefore secondary containment at the Cooper Nuclear Station due to the failure of non-safety related components. Following a postulated DBA coincident with a LOOP, the non-safety related elevated release point drain sump pumps would not operate. According to their calculations, condensation in these lines would accumulate and backflow into the SGTS discharge lines ~6.7 hours after the DBA - potentially resulting in an unfiltered ground release of radioactivity from secondary containment in excess of 10 CFR 100 limits.

It is interesting to note that Cooper:

- 1) Did NOT claim that scenario was beyond design/licensing basis,
- 2) Did NOT claim that postulating source terms with DBA & LOOP was beyond design/licensing basis,
- 3) Did NOT claim that since NRC had issued SER for as-built mistake, that deficient configuration was therefore acceptable.

Instead, Cooper submitted an LER under 10 CFR 50.72/50.73. reclassified the sump system components as essential, and implemented appropriate testing and preventative maintenance measures.

Except in the Susquehanna SFP cooling case, I have never experienced a "statute of limitations" on nuclear safety issues. Cooper, which is at least 10 years older than Susquehanna, finds a deficiency in the original plant design and fixes it. Susquehanna finds a deficiency in the original plant design and claims it is acceptable since the NRC issued its SER on the plant containing the problem. I sincerely do not understand.

AT ALL

Attachment 2

9502270175 950221  
PDR ADDCK 05000387  
PDR

TOTAL P.01



11-2-2

(111)