

Duplicate copy on NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION microfiche

October 10, 1980

Ellyn R. Weiss, Esquire Harmon & Weiss 1725 I Street, N.W. Suite 506 Washington, DC 20006

IN RESPONSE REFER TO F01A-80-455

Dear Ms. Weiss:

This is in regard to the telephone call on October 2, 1980, from Diane Curran of your office during which she requested a copy of the list of addressees of a memorandum of April 6, 1979, by S. H. Hanauer. (You had previously requested copies of any staff responses to that memorandum in your letter of August 25, 1980, our file FOIA-80-455.)

We have enclosed a copy of the list of addressees for Mr. Hanauer's memorandum.

Sincerely.

J. M. Felton, Director

Division of Rules and Records Office of Administration

Enclosure: As stated

HARMON & WEISS 1725 | STREET, N. W. SUITE 506 TELEPHONE GAIL M. HARMON WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006 (202) 833-9070 ELLYN R. WEISS WILLIAM S. JORDAN, III LEE L. BISHOP August 25, 1980 FREEDOM OF INFORMATION FOIA-80-455 Nec'd 9-2-80 J. M. Felton, Director Office of Administration U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555 RE: Freedom of Information Act Request Dear Mr. Felton: Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. §552, as amended, and 10 C.F.R. §2.790, the Union Concerned Scientists requests all NRC Staff reponses to the .ttached memorandum from S.H. Hanauer, dated April 6, 1979, concerning environmental qualification of components and systems, accident instrumentation and backfitting. Staff responses shall include but not be limited to all responses from the following Staff personnel: G. Arlotto R. Boyd R. DeYoung R. Mattson D. Ross J. Sniezek V. Stello Thank you for your prompt consideration of this request. Very truly yours, RW Ellyn R. Weiss Counsel for Union of Concerned Scientists ERW/1c Attachment Dupe of 8009250452 (1Pg)

STATE OF THE STATE

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSIO. WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

APR 6- 1979

POOR ORIGINAL

NOTE TO: Attached List

FROM: S. H. Hanauer, Assistant Director for Plant Systems, DSS

SUBJECT: 1. ENVIRONMENTAL QUALIFICATION

2. INSTRUMENTATION TO FOLLOW THE COURSE OF AN ACCIDENT

I believe that as a result of the TMI accident, we have to rethink:

1. Environmental Qualification envelope

2. Things which have to be qualified

3. RG 1.97 implementation

4. Backfitting

Changes in my thinking include:

1. Core damage is credible

 Long-term plant operation is essential; initiation isn't enough

3. LOCA and SLB may not give an envelope that includes the TMI experience

4. We are relying heavily on things not defined as "safety-related" (I ns Ferry was like that, also)

I believe that we will be required, justifiably, to hasten the pace of review and backfitting decisions. We can't be definitely quantitative until we have better data than now available (for example, dose rates), but we can start thinking in principle.

Please start thinking about this problem. I will set a due date for your ideas as soon as we get off the night shift.

S. M. Hanauer, Assistant Director

for Plant Systems

Division of Systems Safety

cc: G. Arlotto

Linear State of the state of th

R. Boyd

R. DeYoung

R. Mattson

D. Ross

J. Sniezek

V. Stello

Dage of .860925 \$453 (2pp)