



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

~~50-228~~
50-228

May 20, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR: William V. Johnston, Assistant Director
for Materials & Qualifications Engineering
Division of Engineering

FROM: Robert L. Tedesco, Assistant Director
for Licensing
Division of Licensing

SUBJECT: DRAFT SSER INPUT - SEQUOYAH 2



There is a need to clarify a certain portion of your recent SSER input in a memorandum to me dated May 13, 1981. We discussed the write-up at a meeting we held on May 18, 1981, where we made certain assumptions that needed to be verified.

On page 3 of the May 13, 1981 memo, it is indicated that ..."(2) it is likely that equipment important to maintain containment integrity and to maintain degraded core in a stable shutdown condition will be able to survive the effects of a hydrogen burn; and ..." On the other hand in SSER No. 4 page 22-28, the first paragraph indicated that "... the staff concludes that there is a reasonable assurance that this equipment will survive repeated hydrogen burns and function properly to mitigate the consequences of a degraded core event and prevent breach of containment." The concern between these two statements rests with whether they are basically equivalent or if different, then we need to discuss any difference. It is my understanding that the view of DE is that they are the same. Consequently, we would process SSER No. 5 on this basis unless otherwise notified.

Robert L. Tedesco, Assistant Director
for Licensing
Division of Licensing

cc: D. G. Eisenhut
R. H. Vollmer
E. Adensam
C. Stahle
Z. Rosztochy

8106010 223

E

May 20, 1981

DISTRIBUTION

NRC PDR
L Reading
RLTedesco
EAdensam
CStahle
OELD

MEMORANDUM FOR: William V. Johnston, Assistant Director
for Materials & Qualifications Engineering
Division of Engineering

FROM: Robert L. Tedesco, Assistant Director
for Licensing
Division of Licensing

SUBJECT: DRAFT SSER INPUT - SEQUOYAH 2



There is a need to clarify a certain portion of your recent SSER input in a memorandum to me dated May 13, 1981. We discussed the write-up at a meeting we held on May 18, 1981, where we made certain assumptions that needed to be verified.

On page 3 of the May 13, 1981 memo, it is indicated that ..."(2) it is likely that equipment important to maintain containment integrity and to maintain degraded core in a stable shutdown condition will be able to survive the effects of a hydrogen burn; and ..." On the other hand in SSER No. 4 page 22-28, the first paragraph indicated that "... the staff concludes that there is a reasonable assurance that this equipment will survive repeated hydrogen burns and function properly to mitigate the consequences of a degraded core event and prevent breach of containment." The concern between these two statements rests with whether they are basically equivalent or if different, then we need to discuss any difference. It is my understanding that the view of DE is that they are the same. Consequently, we would process SSER No. 5 on this basis unless otherwise notified.

Original signed by
Robert L. Tedesco

Robert L. Tedesco, Assistant Director
for Licensing
Division of Licensing

CC: D. G. Eisenhut
R. H. Vollmer
E. Adensam
C. Stahle
Z. Rosztoczy

OFFICE	DL:lv						
SURNAME	RLTedesco:lb						
DATE	5/20/81						