

CHAIRMAN Resource

From: Tom Gurdziel <tgurdziel@twcny.rr.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 9:28 PM
To: CHAIRMAN Resource
Cc: Bridget Frymire; techols@psc.state.ga.us; Screnci, Diane; Baval, Rochelle; 'Ed Stronski'; qainfo@nsr.go.jp; Lyon, Jill:(NMP); Holden, Tammy L:(GenCo-Nuc)
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC Briefing on Accident Tolerant Fuel, (second half)

Good morning,

I was just tonight able to finish listening to this recorded meeting. First, let me say that, (and you may have picked up on this), I think the U.S. commercial nuclear industry is completely wasting its resources pursuing accident tolerant fuel. Since their plants are not cash cows right now, I think using the present fuel would be the proper choice for them. However, since they have made that decision, I believe you need to be ready to review and accept or reject each new, accident tolerant fuel presented. Over time, I have listened to a number of live meetings and an even greater number of recorded meetings. It appeared to me that those NRC people sitting across the table from you are especially well equipped for this project, especially based on their responses to questions asked after about 2:22. I feel very comfortable with those people on the project.

I do have a few comments, though.

In the recent past, I told Mr. T. Fanning that he should plan for success based only on events he could control. (At the time, newspapers were saying something like Southern's, (Georgia Power's), decision to proceed might be predicated on a decision by SCANA to continue construction of V.C. Summer Units 2 & 3.) In other words, don't depend on SCANA for your success. Let me give you the same advice: don't depend on that Halden(?) Test reactor unless you own at least a part of it. (That was from about 2:31).

At 2:24 there was a comment about it taking 3 to 6 years to develop codes for this new fuel AFTER sufficient data is first accumulated. If you need to do this, could I suggest that everybody in a group be prohibited from working at home? Also, as I suggested to the Transformation group, consider using two groups to achieve the same goal, at the same time and without communicating with the other group until their efforts are complete.

I appreciate the need, (2:33:21), to maintain the right skill sets. How about acquiring more anticipated needed skills by the present employees? This would mean tuition assistance and time off to go to class or even short term assignments with more knowledgeable groups. (There was a comment about this at 2:53).

At about 2:45 a rather strange thought occurred to me. Is the term "accident tolerant fuel" actually a ruse or code words for allowing the use of a level of fuel enrichment higher than allowed today? How would that make the fuel more accident tolerant?

Has anyone considered if any abilities or concepts of artificial intelligence, (AI), can be helpfully used in this effort?

Finally, I cannot accept that no change (in fuel) is acceptable unless it ALWAYS increases margin. (2:55) And, if that is the case with advanced reactors, could somebody tell me why nothing is ever enough?

Thank you,

Tom Gurdziel



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

www.avast.com