Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title:	Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Open Session
Docket Number:	(n/a)
Location:	teleconference
Date:	Friday, July 10, 2020

Work Order No.: NRC-0962

Pages 1-182

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC. Court Reporters and Transcribers 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 234-4433

	1
1	
2	
З	
4	DISCLAIMER
5	
6	
7	UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION'S
8	ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REACTOR SAFEGUARDS
9	
10	
11	The contents of this transcript of the
12	proceeding of the United States Nuclear Regulatory
13	Commission Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards,
14	as reported herein, is a record of the discussions
15	recorded at the meeting.
16	
17	This transcript has not been reviewed,
18	corrected, and edited, and it may contain
19	inaccuracies.
20	
21	
22	
23	
	1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
	(202) 234-4433 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

	1
1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + + +
4	675TH MEETING
5	ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REACTOR SAFEGUARDS
6	(ACRS)
7	+ + + + +
8	OPEN SESSION
9	+ + + +
10	FRIDAY
11	JULY 10, 2020
12	+ + + +
13	The Advisory Committee met via Video-
14	Teleconference, at 11:30 a.m. EDT, Matthew W. Sunseri,
15	Chairman, presiding.
16	COMMITTEE MEMBERS:
17	MATTHEW W. SUNSERI, Chairman
18	JOY L. REMPE, Vice Chairman
19	WALTER L. KIRCHNER, Member-at-large
20	RONALD G. BALLINGER, Member
21	DENNIS BLEY, Member
22	VESNA B. DIMITRIJEVIC, Member
23	JOSE MARCH-LEUBA, Member
24	DAVID A. PETTI, Member
25	PETER RICCARDELLA, Member

		2
1	ACRS CONSULTANT:	
2	MICHAEL CORRADINI	
3	STEPHEN SCHULTZ	
4		
5	DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICIAL:	
6	CHRISTOPHER BROWN	
7	CHRISTIANA LUI	
8	QUYNH NGUYEN	
9	MICHAEL SNODDERLY	
10		
11	ALSO PRESENT:	
12	ANTONIO BARRETT, NRR	
13	BRUCE BAVOL, NRR	
14	JOSHUA BORROMEO, NRR	
15	TRAVIS BOYCE, NRR	
16	ANNA BRADFORD, NRR	
17	BEN BRISTOL, NuScale	
18	LARRY BURKHART, ACRS	
19	MARK CHITTY, NuScale	
20	PAUL DEMKOWICZ, Idaho National Laboratory	
21	MICHAEL DUDEK, NRR	
22	SARAH FIELDS, Public Participant	
23	CRAIG HARBUCK, NRR	
24	JORDAN HOELLMAN, NRR	
25	PAUL INFANGER, NuScale	
	I contraction of the second seco	

1	MARIELIZ JOHNSON, NRR
2	SHANLAI LU, NRR
3	MICHAEL MELTON, NuScale
4	SCOTT MOORE, Executive Director, ACRS
5	ETIENNE MULLIN, NuScale
6	TONY NAKANISHI, NRR
7	STEVEN NESBIT, EPRI
8	RYAN NOLAN, NRR
9	REBECCA NORRIS, NuScale
10	REBECCA PATTON, NRR
11	TOM SCARBROUGH, NRR
12	JEFFREY SCHMIDT, NRR
13	JOHN SEGALA, NRR
14	ALEXANDRA SIWY, NRR
15	ANDREW SOWDER, EPRI
16	DINESH TANEJA, NRR
17	CARL THURSTON, NRR
18	CHRISTOPHER VAN WERT, NRR
19	YUKEN WONG, NRR
20	PETER YARSKY, RES
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	I

3

	4
1	PROCEEDINGS
2	11:45 a.m.
3	CHAIR SUNSERI: This is Chair Sunseri.
4	It's 11:45 and we are going to reconvene the ACRS
5	meeting. Let's start with a roll call.
6	Ron Ballinger?
7	MEMBER BALLINGER: Here.
8	CHAIR SUNSERI: Dennis Bley?
9	MEMBER BLEY: Here.
10	CHAIR SUNSERI: Vesna Dimitrijevic?
11	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Here.
12	CHAIR SUNSERI: Walt Kirchner?
13	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Here.
14	CHAIR SUNSERI: Jose March-Leuba?
15	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I'm here.
16	CHAIR SUNSERI: Dave Petti?
17	MEMBER PETTI: Here.
18	CHAIR SUNSERI: Joy Rempe? Joy Rempe?
19	Pete Riccardella?
20	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: I'm here.
21	CHAIR SUNSERI: Okay, we have a quorum.
22	So, let me first start off by saying I appreciate
23	everyone's patience with the Committee as we work
24	through the previous P&P agenda. We ran slightly over
25	and we needed to take a short break before we
1	

(202) 234-4433

5 reconvened this session, so I do appreciate everyone's 1 2 patience on that. 3 We are going to start the letter, the 4 report preparation phase of our review of the boron 5 distribution issue regarding the NuScale DC This is going to be a little different 6 application. 7 than what we have historically done. 8 We don't have a draft letter yet to 9 review, so I've asked Walt. He's going to conduct, 10 Member Kirchner is going to conduct a facilitated discussion of what the content of that letter should 11 be with the members. 12 During that discussion, we are going to 13 14 have transcription going on. So, we have а transcriber that will capture this discussion so that 15 we will have the information available to us as we 16 17 prepare our report, and it will also be of public interest, I am sure, as well. 18 19 So, we will keep the transcription running until the point of which we have either ended our 20 discussion or are ready to put up some kind of draft 21 letter in front of everyone, which I don't anticipate 22 that happening until very late this afternoon, if at 23 all. 24 So, let me ask members, are there any 25

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

	6
1	questions with where we're proceeding before we get
2	started? Okay, and let me just confirm that the
3	public line is open.
4	MR. SNODDERLY: The public line is open.
5	CHAIR SUNSERI: Okay, and with this, I
6	will now turn it over to Member Kirchner, lead for the
7	NuScale DCA review.
8	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
9	Good morning, everyone. I want to keep my opening
10	remarks brief because, as the Chairman has indicated,
11	we would wish to have a facilitated discussion with
12	the Committee, but before we get there, I want to do
13	the following.
14	I just want to thank both the applicant
15	and the staff. I know there has been a lot of work
16	done in a very compressed time. We are aware of that
17	and appreciate it.
18	The preparations over the last several
19	months, the presentations I should say, have been very
20	informative, and that will help our discussion today.
21	I again think we're at a point now I
22	don't want to get into my personal views at this
23	point. There will be a chance for me to also join the
24	conversation in a bit, but I'd like to summarize where
25	I think we are.
	1

(202) 234-4433

7 We had a very nice summary from Meghan McCloskey of NuScale yesterday morning. Thank you, That was a good summation of where things are, and we had excellent presentations from the I would single out -- I shouldn't single

7 out anyone, but I do want to point out that in Jeff Schmidt's presentations, we had what I'll call figures 8 9 of merit for qauging the boron dilution issue, and it 10 appears, at least in this member's opinion, that the design changes that have been made by the applicant 11 certainly address the DHRS cooling part of 12 the 13 equation.

14 I think in general, the concern now turns to the post-ECCS boron dilution of the downcomer, 15 dilution of the downcomer, and I'm going to turn next 16 to Jose March-Leuba, who has been our lead on this 17 issue. He is going to try and establish some points 18 19 of reference, I'll call them, as to where we are.

20 And I'm then also going to turn to Member David Petti who has put together a nice flowchart that 21 may also help facilitate focusing our discussion, and 22 then turn to you, the members, for your input, and 23 also to our two consultants. 24

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

And with that, I will hand the microphone

(202) 234-4433

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

Meghan.

staff.

	8
1	over to Jose.
2	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Here I am. Mike, did
3	you get my write up?
4	MR. SNODDERLY: Yes. Sandra, if you could
5	share your screen? In that same folder where Dr.
6	Petti's flowchart, I have placed Dr. March-Leuba's BD
7	summary. Could you please bring that up? Thank you.
8	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: All right, so while
9	Sandra is working on that, I think what
10	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Jose, just one quick
11	thing. In my opening remarks, I didn't I wanted to
12	call special attention both to Dr. Peter Yarsky's
13	presentation and a differing view from Dr. Shanlai Lu.
14	Those both were excellent and will help inform our
15	discussions, so thank you both.
16	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: So, before the
17	Committee writes a letter, we have to have an
18	underlying agreement on what the facts are as we know
19	them today.
20	To start with, there is very little
21	documentation on this issue. All almost everything
22	you're going to see now on my write up is either I
23	rationalized myself or it was said orally by either
24	the applicant or the staff, okay. Sandra, are we
25	making any progress?

(202) 234-4433

	9
1	MS. WALKER: It's loading.
2	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yeah, there it goes.
3	Now, I made an effort to not put any numbers in here
4	that I wasn't 100 percent sure they were not
5	proprietary, so I think I'm pretty sure this is not
6	proprietary, but at any moment, if anybody sees
7	something proprietary, please let's stop sharing the
8	screen and we'll go into closed session, okay.
9	So, again, this is trying to establish
10	facts so we can then transfer them to our letter,
11	right? On the positives, they're having two design
12	modifications.
13	Number one is the riser holes which
14	prevent downcomer deboration during controlled passive
15	cooling events, and both the applicant and the staff
16	have done analysis that show that they're effective.
17	That's good. That's excellent.
18	An additional problem was ECCS actuation
19	too late, and for that, they changed the ECCS end
20	points, and through exhaustive analysis, both the
21	applicant and the staff confirmed that that problem
22	has been solved.
23	So, we have two positives, okay? When you
24	end up into uncontrolled passive cooling events, you
25	don't deborate anymore, and ECCS involves, not mainly,
	•

(202) 234-4433

	10
1	the RRV opens early enough so that the rush of
2	deborated water does not get into the core.
3	Sandra, can you move up to 17, line 17?
4	All right, however, the modifications fix those two
5	problems. Late ECCS actuation or deboration of the
6	downcomer or with circulation with DHRS did not fix
7	the problem with ECCS actuation.
8	So, after ECCS actuates, we now know from
9	NuScale, they admitted yesterday, it's not only
10	possible, it will deborate, and it will deborate in a
11	few hours. NuScale or the staff have not performed an
12	accurate calculation of how many hours it takes.
13	So, they used conservative numbers from a
14	calculation that was performed for something else,
15	okay, but we know it deborates and we know it
16	deborates certainly within the 72-hour period we
17	considered.
18	We also know that the downcomer volume
19	that has been deborated now is 14 times larger than
20	the core volume. So, if we push any of that downcomer
21	into the core and some mixing occurs, which it will
22	even though we don't have any evidence that it does
23	because we don't have any calculations, you still have
24	14 volumes, 14 core volumes coming behind it. So,
25	even if the fresh run mixes and gets some boron, you
1	1 I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I

(202) 234-4433

1 keep bringing deborated water behind it. It is 2 unreasonable to say that you are not going to end up 3 with a non-deborated, a non-borated core if you start 4 CFDS or CVCS.

Furthermore, there were some statements yesterday that we don't believe that 20 dollars, that there are -- it's going to shut down by 10 dollars.

There were a lot of blanket statements 8 9 orally by the applicant, but when the staff asked the 10 applicant to calculate what is the probability, what conditions would result in criticality in the core 11 using the standard methodologies that they would ask 12 Browns Ferry, or Brunswick, of Susquehanna to use, the 13 14 return to power is predicted and a critical boron 15 concentration that requires minimum deboration.

And I can't tell you the number because that's proprietary, but it does not require to deborate the whole downcomer down to zero. I mean, it is a very small deboration of the downcomer that gets you to the CVC.

Furthermore, the return to power is possible for the whole cycle, beginning of cycle, middle of cycle, and end of cycle. The end of cycle was analyzed. Maybe that's Chapter 15.0.6, I believe, and we agree that was GDC-27.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

5

6

7

	12
1	We agree that that was okay, that that
2	could not violate SAFDLs and everything would be okay,
3	but BOC and MOC return to power has not been analyzed.
4	The consequences are known, but the potential core
5	damage cannot be discarded.
6	You have 20 dollars worth of reactivity
7	with 14 times the volume of the core coming into the
8	core, coming into the core, coming into the core. It
9	has not been analyzed, okay, but the consequences are
10	terrifying.
11	Furthermore, the MCNP calculation, when
12	the staff asked the
13	MEMBER KIRCHNER: For the record, Jose,
14	the consequences are unanalyzed.
15	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: The consequences are
16	unanalyzed, but 20 dollars worth of reactivity coming
17	into the core are terrifying, okay. I mean, it is
18	MEMBER KIRCHNER: One more time, we need
19	to let's be objective, and this is just one
20	member's view. We're on the record.
21	CHAIR SUNSERI: And I would just add,
22	Jose, I mean, you are asking us or describing to us
23	facts as you put it, as you said. I don't know that
24	it's been established that the 20 dollars is a fact.
25	It's a supposition on your part. We heard a
1	

(202) 234-4433

	13
1	supposition from others of a different value, so
2	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Oh, no, no, hold on
3	a minute. Hold on a minute. That is a fact. At the
4	beginning of cycle, you have 1,200 ppm of boron in the
5	holders, and the boron coefficient varies from seven
6	to 14, and the recommended value to use from NuScale
7	is ten.
8	So, 1,200 ppm of boron results in 12,000
9	pcm of reactivity, which is 20 dollars, maybe 25
10	dollars. Some people said 21 dollars. Some people
11	said 29 dollars, and the staff in their SER says it's
12	29 dollars. That is a fact.
13	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: I object to the word
14	terrifying. I don't think that's a fact.
15	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Okay, that terrifying
16	is not a fact, but if you insert that much reactivity
17	into the core and you don't do an analysis that tells
18	me that you have sufficient feedback reactivity, what
19	do you think is going to happen? I don't have an
20	analysis.
21	MEMBER BLEY: Jose?
22	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yes, sir?
23	MEMBER BLEY: Maybe this would go better
24	if you stick to your bullets.
25	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yeah, okay. So, back
	I

(202) 234-4433

	14
1	to the ability to make the core critical with this
2	front. When the staff asked NuScale to calculate how
3	far the deborated front had to move into the core
4	before it would get critical, using the standard
5	methodology that any other reactor would have to use,
6	which includes this stack rod, for example, they
7	calculated that when you get, and I don't remember the
8	exact number and it's proprietary, but a few feet into
9	the core, not even halfway to the core, it would reach
10	criticality.
11	As the flow progresses toward the end to
12	the top of the core, a tremendous amount of reactivity
13	gets inserted into the core and nobody has bothered to
14	analyze that condition.
15	Okay, Sandra, can you move to line 36, to
16	the top? There have been some arguments made by the
17	applicant and the staff that no mechanism exists to
18	drive the deborated downcomer water into the core, and
19	to me, they are unconvincing.
20	First and foremost, they are opinions from
21	the applicant, not calculations and not documented.
22	So, we are to the point at which designing the safety
23	of the reactor based on engineers' opinions, I don't
24	know where we're at for that now, okay. Secondly,
25	actuation of non

(202) 234-4433

1 MEMBER KIRCHNER: Jose, this is Walt. Ι 2 don't want to quibble with words, but I'm going to say that engineering judgment, not calculations. Clearly 3 4 the applicant and the staff have thought about this 5 very hard. We may have a differing view of their interpretation, but I would not use the word opinion. 6 7 Let's give them the benefit of the doubt that good engineering judgment is being applied to this issue. 8 9 MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: It is undocumented, 10 unreviewed, and as far as we've been told orally by these members, there are no calculations behind it. 11 I mean, we were told in the record in 12 early June that no calculation had been performed for 13 14 this. We were told on the record that no calculation 15 This is my opinion. exists. I mean, calling it engineering judgment is 16 17 the same thing, but no calculation performed, no calculation recorded, no calculation documented, no 18 19 calculation reviewed. 20 In my opinion, if you actuate any of the three non-secondary systems that I talked about 21 yesterday, it would create sufficient extra pressure 22 in the top of the downcomer to push the 14 core 23 24 volumes of deborated water into the core, and on line 42 --25

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

15

	16
1	MEMBER KIRCHNER: No, stop. Stop, Jose.
2	Remember, you prefaced this by facts, so let's stick
3	to facts. That's what's available. There is no we
4	haven't there is no way that has been demonstrated
5	for the 14
6	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: It is on
7	(Simultaneous speaking.)
8	MEMBER KIRCHNER: times the core volume
9	to be instantaneously introduced to the core. So
10	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: No, no, you said
11	MEMBER KIRCHNER: And that's where we get
12	into what you're driving at, but don't
13	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: You said
14	instantaneous. I never said instantaneous. When you
15	turn in CFDS, that's 100 gpm of liquid on the top of
16	the CMV, which then drives flow positive to the left
17	on the RRV, which now raises the level on the
18	downcomer and pushes the bottom of the downcomer into
19	the riser to raise the level higher, and that
20	calculation has been performed
21	MEMBER KIRCHNER: That's a rate-dependent
22	thing if it's driven by external forces
23	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: It is
24	MEMBER KIRCHNER: and it may be a U-
25	tube manometer oscillation if it's driven by upsets

(202) 234-4433

	17
1	within the system, so that's
2	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Have you
3	MEMBER KIRCHNER: available. That's
4	available, I agree with you, but it's not clear that
5	all 14 volumes go through the core.
6	MR. NGUYEN: Excuse me, Chairman, we may
7	have a factual clarification that may aid in
8	discussion.
9	MR. BORROMEO: Yeah, hi, this is Josh
10	Borromeo from the staff. The volume of deborated
11	downcomer is 14 times the volume. It's the downcomer
12	plus the containment, and that's above the RV.
13	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Above the RV, okay.
14	So, and all of that water is deborated, correct, you
15	are sure?
16	MR. BORROMEO: That's what Shanlai stated
17	in his presentation yesterday.
18	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: All right, what is
19	your opinion?
20	MR. BORROMEO: I haven't reviewed that.
21	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Okay, my opinion is
22	all of that water is deborated. The bottom line is
23	whether it includes the CMV or not. It is a lot of
24	water that you can push into the core. Even if you
25	have some mixing, you are going to flash everything.

(202) 234-4433

	18
1	But I won't say the 14 anymore, okay, but
2	you do confirm that between downcomer and whatever is
3	on the core, on the containment above RRV, you have
4	that much volume of possibly unborated water? So,
5	where were we?
6	So, if you have I'm on line 42, okay?
7	So, there are four yes, sir?
8	MEMBER BLEY: A question. All of that
9	deborated water used to be borated
10	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Correct.
11	MEMBER BLEY: without putting it in the
12	flooding system.
13	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Correct.
14	MEMBER BLEY: And all of that boron that
15	used to be in that water remains in the core region,
16	right, or mostly?
17	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: In the core and
18	riser, correct.
19	MEMBER BLEY: Yeah, so back to what Walt
20	was saying, this really is a rate problem. Depending
21	on how fast you put in the borated water, either the
22	core sees unborated water or there's mixing, and if
23	there's good mixing, and we don't know that now, it
24	will never be worse than it started if you had
25	complete mixing.
	1

(202) 234-4433

	19
1	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: It is an interesting
2	theory. You have to have complete mixing with the
3	core and all of the riser because either can
4	accumulate in the core, either accumulated in the core
5	and riser.
6	So, you will have to mix all of that
7	deborated water. You have to mix it not just with the
8	core where it's coming through, but the other 15-foot
9	of riser. It's possible. It is possible. I don't
10	see any analysis that tells me that.
11	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yeah, so, Jose, Dennis
12	is right. It's a rate and mixing problem, and
13	depending on what upsets the status quo, that will be
14	a major factor in the rate of mixing and injection, so
15	
16	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Okay.
17	MEMBER KIRCHNER: It's a difficult
18	problem, as Jose said, without a lot of documentation.
19	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I'll agree. I'll
20	agree with everything you said, and now but I will ask
21	you, Walt and Dennis, have you seen any calculation of
22	what
23	(Simultaneous speaking.)
24	MEMBER KIRCHNER: already documented
25	it. We've also and it was presented in view graphs

(202) 234-4433

	20
1	by the applicant, and it's one of your upper bullets.
2	So, they did look at what the intrusion of clean
3	unborated water front into the core would do. And as
4	you point out
5	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: No, they have not.
6	MEMBER KIRCHNER: by the time it
7	penetrates the core, probably just a foot-and-a-half
8	or so, I won't hang up on the exact number, you would
9	go critical and return to power again. It's in your,
10	one of your facts above, so they did
11	(Simultaneous speaking.)
12	MEMBER KIRCHNER: do analysis.
13	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Are you talking about
14	the MCNP calculation?
15	(No audible response.)
16	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Okay, my point to all
17	of the members is
18	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Educate me. What is
19	MCNP?
20	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: MCNP is the Monte
21	Carlo
22	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Monte Carlo, yeah,
23	neutron particular code. It's the benchmark standard,
24	Pete, in the industry. By the way, it's a Los Alamos
25	code.
	I contract of the second se

(202) 234-4433

	21
1	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: All right, thank you.
2	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: And that MCNP
3	calculation, it probably was extremely conservative.
4	I'll give you that.
5	So, as I said yesterday, there are four
6	non-safety grade systems, no, safety grade systems and
7	four non-safety grade systems which can inject borated
8	water in the core. Three of them put the water on top
9	of the downcomer and push the deborated water into the
10	core, okay.
11	So, if the ECCS injection line fails and
12	is not repairable, for example, if it breaks its high
13	containment, all recorded mechanism created unborated
14	core flow into the core, and not a single one of them
15	has been analyzed.
16	The SER has a very short paragraph that
17	makes a high calculation that says that the injection
18	of reactivity from this event will be roughly one
19	dollar per minute depending on whether one or two CFDS
20	pumps are started, okay, and if two CFDS pumps are
21	started, then it takes half the time, and that one
22	dollar keeps coming like the tide, okay.
23	The argument the staff makes there, and
24	this is not on the bullets, is that because it's only
25	one dollar per minute, the core will reach thermal
l	1

(202) 234-4433

22 1 equilibrium with that reactivity, and that feedback reactivity will compensate for the positive reactivity 2 3 and everything will be okay, but no calculation is 4 performed of that. 5 I mean, 20 dollars of feedback reactivity is a lot when one considers that what we call the 6 7 power defect, which is the fuel temperature at nominal 8 conditions, it's only three dollars. 9 So, three dollars of reactivity is all the 10 feedback you get from the fuel if you reach 100 percent power, and we're putting 20, 25. 11 And there are other feedback mechanisms. 12 There is a super cool and there is -- and you shut 13 14 down maybe at .98. There are other things that you 15 can create for, and if you do the analysis, you might 16 see that you can survive it, but I have not seen any 17 analysis. You have not seen any analysis. We have been told in the June full 18 19 committee meeting that such analysis does not exist, or didn't exist in June, so this is basically what the 20 paragraph on 48 says. 21 May I add something? 22 MEMBER KIRCHNER: MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: 23 Yes. 24 MEMBER KIRCHNER: My concern is, having looked at this very hard like you have and a lot of 25

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

23 1 other people have, what we have here after ECCS actuation is a depressurized system, and we have a 2 3 standing manometer design at that point. We've got 4 two levels, one in the core, one in the downcomer. 5 So, with the perturbation of the system, for example, the containment fill and drain system 6 7 being actuated, as Jose says, that will come in at a 8 certain rate that a static analysis would suggest is 9 about a dollar a minute or something as the staff has 10 reported, if the system returns to power in any way, it will probably then create the potential for an 11 oscillation. 12 And then it's my -- this is not fact now. 13 14 I'm going into kind of just judgment and experience 15 with other systems, in this kind of situation where 16 you will get oscillations driven by power, the 17 feedback with power. So, that's a concern and that's something 18 19 to be avoided, and that doesn't seem to have been addressed either even --20 It really has. 21 MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Ιt has been addressed. I mean, the Peter Yarsky white 22 paper addresses those possibilities. 23 24 MEMBER KIRCHNER: Well, so, anyway, go on, 25 but --

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

	24
1	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Since you brought it
2	up
3	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: But Walt, wouldn't
4	those oscillations also enhance mixing?
5	MEMBER KIRCHNER: They would.
6	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Possibly.
7	MEMBER KIRCHNER: And this is where it
8	would be good to analyze whether they amplify or they
9	are self-extinguished, so to speak.
10	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: I understand. Thank
11	you.
12	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Not a single
13	calculation exists that A, manometer type of
14	oscillation will assist. I would claim, and I don't
15	want to waste your time, Walt, but you're not right on
16	this.
17	The creation of voids in the core that has
18	not produced any change in the manometer because it
19	doesn't change the weight of the column. The creation
20	of voids creates oscillation when you have another
21	circulation loop, and the riser is uncovered and you
22	have another
23	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Well, I disagree, but we
24	have neither of us analyzed the problem.
25	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yeah, yeah.
	1

(202) 234-4433

	25
1	MEMBER KIRCHNER: But the potential is
2	certainly there and
3	(Simultaneous speaking.)
4	MEMBER KIRCHNER: if you had a large
5	return to power, you definitely would get an
6	oscillation.
7	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: If it's fast and you
8	have dynamic loads, but if you are going through a
9	slow raising power like we claim it as, one dollar a
10	minute, it will be minimal. And Peter analyzed it in
11	his paper and he
12	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I don't claim it's a
13	dollar a minute. I'm just saying the potential exists
14	for it, so it
15	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Okay.
16	MEMBER KIRCHNER: remains unanalyzed.
17	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: All right, Dennis had
18	a question.
19	MEMBER BLEY: Yeah, I had a question and
20	a comment. So far, I don't have any objection to
21	anything I've seen in the written document you have
22	before us, except I agree with Walt. I'd change
23	opinion to engineering judgment.
24	Two other minor things, I know you like
25	talking in terms of dollars, but dollars are much more

(202) 234-4433

	26
1	complicated than they might appear to somebody
2	listening to the discussion, and the amount of dollars
3	you get into the core region really has to do with all
4	of this flow, and possible mixing, and the rate at
5	which things are going.
6	And the other thing is you talk about 100
7	gpm, and just for everybody, that sounds like more
8	than it is. It's a couple of garden hose flow vents
9	really, but it's still 100 gpm.
10	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: And that's why it's
11	coming in slowly. It takes 2,000 seconds to fill the
12	whole core. I mean, what
13	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Dennis' point though is
14	a good one for the record. These static equivalent
15	dollars of reactivity worth, this is a kinetics
16	problem. This is a dynamic problem.
17	It's not a static problem, so there is no
18	way physically to instantaneously introduce that much
19	reactivity, so it all depends, as Dennis said earlier,
20	on rate and mixing.
21	MEMBER BLEY: But the paper doesn't say
22	any of that so far. That's just been in the
23	discussion.
24	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I wrote this paper
25	this morning at 7:00 a.m., okay, so let's not give it

(202) 234-4433

	27
1	too much credit. The rate of if you enter CFDS,
2	there are three, two other ways that you could insert
3	deborated water into the core.
4	CFDS is the one that was addressed in the
5	SER and they calculated the flow rates, and estimated
6	that the front, if it doesn't mix, would take 2,000
7	seconds to cover the whole core, and that would result
8	in roughly one dollar a minute of reactivity
9	insertion, which is not dynamic.
10	I mean, that essentially causes static.
11	So, at every second as the ramp comes in, the reactor
12	will reach an equilibrium condition where it produces
13	sufficient feedback to compensate for however much
14	reactivity you have introduced.
15	And the only number we know for reactivity
16	is when before the front starts and the k-effective is
17	whatever, whenever the front reaches to the top and
18	you have a deborated condition in the core, that
19	number has been calculated in Chapter 4 of the FSAR
20	and is 10 pcm per ppm and is roughly 20 dollars.
21	So, at the outset, how whether the ramp
22	is linear, or exponential, or something in between, I
23	don't know, but all
24	MEMBER KIRCHNER: But that, again, Jose,
25	that's a very misleading thing to go to. That's just
	I

(202) 234-4433

	28
1	a static number. That's the potential maximum worth
2	if you somehow instantaneously replaced the black
3	boron concentration with a cold front in the entire
4	core. That's nice, but it's not relevant here to the
5	discussion.
6	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I don't understand
7	you, Walt. Anyway, can I continue?
8	MEMBER KIRCHNER: You can continue, but,
9	you know, we really need to be careful here because
10	there's no credible mechanism to take what's
11	essentially a heavily borated core and replace it
12	instantaneously with cold deborated water. That's the
13	only way you could get to that number you're citing.
14	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I
15	MEMBER KIRCHNER: So, I don't find that
16	very relevant to this discussion.
17	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Okay, Walt, let's try
18	to convince you because okay, so let's do a miracle
19	and we start injecting this ramp one dollar per
20	minute, we know that, slowly, and 2,000 seconds, and
21	according to you, nothing happened to the core, and
22	2,000 seconds later
23	MEMBER KIRCHNER: No, the core is going to
24	react to that. It's not
25	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: But listen

(202) 234-4433

29
MEMBER KIRCHNER: going to
MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Listen, listen, yeah.
MEMBER KIRCHNER: It's not going to be
passive.
MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yeah, listen to my
question. Two thousand seconds later after all of
those core reactions, the whole front will have moved
all the way to the top of the core. What
MEMBER KIRCHNER: Where will that have
gotten critical and returned to power long before
then.
MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Well, that's my
point. That's my point. Shandeth, you are muted.
That's my point, that you're never going to get here,
but
MEMBER KIRCHNER: At this point though,
let's stick with the facts as you have stated. Let's
not do the analysis here in real time. Let's go
through the rest of your
MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Walt, Walter
MEMBER KIRCHNER: talking points.
MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: You're questioning
basic physics, okay? If
MEMBER KIRCHNER: I'm not questioning
them. That's what's theoretically available. I'll

	30
1	agree with you.
2	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Try to think
3	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Let's move on and go
4	through this.
5	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Try to think through
6	this, through the problem, okay?
7	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I've thought through it
8	as much as you have, so go through the
9	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Okay, but at least
10	let me put it on the record for all of the people that
11	are willing to listen, okay? At the end of the 2,000
12	seconds, you will have, the front will have reached
13	the top of the core, and the k-effective, the
14	calculations from NuScale tells us, will be 12,000 pcm
15	higher than it was at the beginning.
16	That's what the boron so if nothing
17	happened to the core and you are able to reach, the
18	front is able to reach to the top of the core, the k-
19	effective will be 12,000 pcm higher, and that
20	MEMBER KIRCHNER: What I'm trying to say
21	is I agree with you, but in a physics sense, in a real
22	system when you analyze it, that's not what will
23	happen. The core will react to that
24	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yeah.
25	MEMBER KIRCHNER: and go critical

(202) 234-4433

	31
1	before as we you already and on the top, which
2	is out of view right now, the MCNP calculation
3	suggests that the reactor goes critical within a foot-
4	and-a-half or something of the entrance of the front
5	into the core.
6	So, you're not going to get that entire
7	core deborated. It's going to go critical and return
8	to power, and then what do you think is going to
9	happen? It's going to
10	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Well, what I think is
11	going to happen is the front will continue to borate
12	because you're still pushing it. You will continue to
13	put more borated water and it will increase, and it
14	will increase the k-effective which will have to be
15	compensated by some feedback from fuel temperature
16	voids, and it will continue to go up, and up, and up.
17	At the end, if you are able, if you
18	haven't been able, all of this racing of the core
19	slowly, in equilibrium because it's going slowly, if
20	you've been able to provide feedback, at the end, you
21	will have 12,000 pcm extra caused by the boron and you
22	will have to compensate those 12,000 pcm by reactivity
23	feedback from fuel temperature and void.
24	And I'll tell you that the total
25	reactivity feedback I have available from fuel, when

(202) 234-4433

	32
1	I reach the 100 percent operating power temperatures,
2	is three dollars.
3	MEMBER KIRCHNER: That's a static problem
4	you're describing. This is a dynamic situation.
5	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: It is okay, my
6	argument is I don't know what happens. I haven't seen
7	a calculation that shows that it's not a problem.
8	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Good.
9	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: And the potential
10	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I accept that.
11	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: And the potential
12	exists. These are outrageously high reactivity
13	numbers.
14	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Okay.
15	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: The potential exists
16	for
17	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I agree. That's it.
18	The potential exists, that's why we're concerned, that
19	we could have a reactivity insertion accident, return
20	to power, and potential core damage. I would prefer
21	we phrase it like that and not say we have make
22	these statements about dollars of reactivity that are
23	available.
24	MEMBER BALLINGER: This is Ron. Let me
25	ask a metallurgical question. Once the reactor goes

(202) 234-4433

ĺ	33
1	critical again, don't we start adding heat?
2	PARTICIPANT: Yeah.
3	MEMBER KIRCHNER: That's my point.
4	MEMBER BALLINGER: When we start adding
5	heat, don't we mix the daylights out of things?
6	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Well, to be analyzed,
7	Ron.
8	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: What do you mean by
9	that? Okay, what I'm telling you is whenever to
10	achieve three dollars worth of reactivity feedback
11	from the fuel, you need to raise it to the temperature
12	of 100 percent operating power. That's what is called
13	the power defect, okay.
14	And if you have the fuel at the conditions
15	of 100 percent power with no flow, the calculations
16	hasn't been performed, but I can tell you the specific
17	facts for the limits are going to be difficult to meet
18	with fuel at 100 percent power conditions and no flow,
19	and this is only three dollars. You got more water
20	coming.
21	This cannot be left unanalyzed, just
22	period. It cannot be left unanalyzed. The potential
23	is to be very bad.
24	MEMBER KIRCHNER: And I think there, we
25	agree, Jose. Let's go through the rest of the paper
	I contract of the second se

(202) 234-4433

	34
1	here.
2	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: All right, so
3	MEMBER KIRCHNER: We're in the analysis
4	mode, not in the facts mode.
5	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Okay, so we've said
6	that we don't have an analysis to guarantee that if
7	you start any of these three non-safety grade systems,
8	the CVCS or CFDS, we don't know if it is safe or not,
9	okay. I mean, we don't have any analysis. The
10	potential exists that it can be really bad, and we
11	don't have any analysis, okay.
12	And yesterday, the applicant said, well,
13	don't worry about it. We will start putting some
14	borated water in the downcomer and we will monitor the
15	core. When it gets critical, we'll stop putting it
16	and we'll let it mix, and then we'll let it wait for
17	an hour and then add more, and we will continue to
18	monitor
19	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Jose, Jose, they did not
20	say that, so
21	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yes, they said that.
22	MEMBER KIRCHNER: let's
23	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yes, they said that.
24	MEMBER KIRCHNER: They said they would
25	respond with these systems that were available to

(202) 234-4433
35 1 them. They didn't do the scenario you just did, so let's --2 They said the only 3 MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: 4 instrumentation they will have available to perform the recovery was the core monitoring instrumentation, 5 which is the source range, hopefully the source range 6 7 flux sensors, and the only time those respond is when 8 you reach criticality. So, that's what they were --9 MEMBER KIRCHNER: That's correct. 10 MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: proposing yesterday. 11 12 MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yeah. MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yeah, that's correct. 13 14 So, they will -- they say that you could -- I mean, 15 they were thinking on the fly because they don't have 16 procedures and they have not thought what you can possibly do as they say, but if we keep adding borated 17 water to the downcomer, it will eventually mix because 18 19 when the source range detectors tell us that we're critical, we'll stop. Jesus Christ, okay. 20 KIRCHNER: 21 MEMBER Jose, let's be Let's 22 professional, objective, and to the facts. stand down. 23 24 MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: These are the facts. These are the facts. The proposal that we had 25

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

	36
1	yesterday is we can possibly develop some procedures
2	that add borated water to the downcomer until we
3	detect criticality in the core, at which point, we'll
4	do something.
5	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yes, so, agreed, so
6	let's investigate that further. You haven't covered
7	your instrumentation.
8	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yeah, I know. So, in
9	line 63, I wanted to make a point, a clear point that
10	even though the procedures are developed, are at the
11	COL stage, I think it's incumbent on the applicant and
12	the staff to figure out that there is one clear
13	success path to position to move forward and later to
14	modify.
15	Because whenever you have a LOCA inside
16	containment, the only possible way to fix that is to
17	take the module to the refueling station. To take the
18	module to the refueling station, you have to be in
19	Mode 4 where you are requested to have something like
20	1,700 ppm of boron, which you don't, and you need to
21	add boron.
22	And any way you add borated water, if you
23	have a break on the injection line, it creates this
24	possibility of recriticality. So, I don't see a clear
25	success path to transition to Mode 4.
1	I contract of the second se

(202) 234-4433

MEMBER KIRCHNER: I do. I thought we were doing facts. I withheld my own. I have a suggestion to avoid this, but I thought we were doing facts and not --

MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Okay, it is fantastic 5 6 that you have some, and let me use the word again, 7 opinion, or engineering judgment. I want to see a final safety analysis report written under Appendix B 8 9 requirements that tells me what they're going to do. MEMBER KIRCHNER: Okay, right. So, let me 10 interject it then because I withheld earlier. Look, 11 the problem, as we're agreed, we feel -- once again, 12 I'm repeating myself. We feel with the riser holes, 13 14 they have solved the issues of deborating the 15 downcomer in the DHRS. That's for the record, the 16 decay heat removal system mode.

The analysis by the applicant and the staff, I think, are sound. A figure of merit was used by the staff on critical boron concentration at 72 hours, and they showed what, in my engineering judgment, not my opinion, is a sufficient margin to critical boron concentration.

Now, we're on the ECCS side of the scenarios. I had both the applicant and the staff estimate that the deborating of the downcomer would

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

	38
1	take hours. It probably would happen faster than the
2	envelope of 72 hours.
3	So, does one leave the system in this
4	passive mode or does one intervene? I suspect that
5	one can make a calculation just like was done for the
6	decay heat removal side of the equation and look at
7	the time that is available before, with margin, like
8	a 200 ppm equivalent at beginning of life, maybe 100
9	ppm margin again at middle of cycle.
10	Calculate what the time is to that point
11	and then just institute a tech spec that says you have
12	insufficient margin and you intervene. If they
13	intervene early, they can get out of this dilemma. If
14	they leave it passively
15	(Simultaneous speaking.)
16	MEMBER KIRCHNER: for a long time, then
17	you're exactly right. Then the, as you once put it
18	very eloquently, it's a very delicate set of
19	operations to get out of the fix you're in. So, I do
20	believe there is a fix, and I've suggested this
21	before.
22	I don't know if tech specs is the way you
23	accomplish this, but you have done the analysis, and
24	they have done analysis, and you know when you have
25	insufficient margin in the downcomer in terms of
	1 I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I

(202) 234-4433

	39
1	versus critical boron concentration, and one
2	intervenes.
3	And if one intervenes early enough, then
4	we don't have this potential of inserting this cold
5	front of deborated water in, a potential reactivity
6	insertion accident and potential core damage. So
7	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: And Walt
8	MEMBER KIRCHNER: that's my fix.
9	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yeah, I see. I
10	understand what you're saying. I have two questions
11	for you. First, where can I in which part of the
12	SER would I find the review of that procedure? That
13	procedure does not exist, right?
14	MEMBER KIRCHNER: No, it doesn't exist.
15	Like I said, now I'm going beyond facts to solutions.
16	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: And question two is
17	what safety-grade power would you be using to do that?
18	Okay, I'm sorry I was facetious with that. I have a
19	better solution, by the way.
20	MEMBER KIRCHNER: They do have a highly
21	reliable electrical power supply. We've reviewed
22	that.
23	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: So
24	MEMBER KIRCHNER: The options exist for
25	them to intervene.

	40
1	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: And AC power will
2	likely exist and they have DC generators, but those
3	are not the rules. I mean, if it's important to
4	safety, it has to be safety grade, and we don't
5	we're run analysis with what they say is safety grade,
6	and it's not safety-grade power to actuate any of this
7	equipment.
8	CHAIR SUNSERI: Walt
9	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: You can only actuate
10	them if they are bad for you. If they are good for
11	you, you cannot take credit for it.
12	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Well, let's get out of
13	Chapter
14	CHAIR SUNSERI: Walt, Walt, Walt, this is
15	Matt. Walt and Jose, I want to just know when are we
16	we need to wrap up the
17	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Okay.
18	CHAIR SUNSERI: the discussion from
19	Jose and allow other members to speak on this. And
20	I'm not trying to cut you off, but I'm starting to
21	hear circular discussions here, and we're going around
22	and around on the same old stuff.
23	And I don't mean to be so casual with this
24	important stuff, but I'd like to hear what other
25	members have to say about this.
1	I Contraction of the second

(202) 234-4433

	41
1	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Can I finish this?
2	I'm almost done
3	CHAIR SUNSERI: Yeah, yeah.
4	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: if Walt doesn't
5	interrupt me, okay.
6	CHAIR SUNSERI: Yeah.
7	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: So, instrumentation,
8	bottom line, there is no instrumentation that could
9	measure boron redistribution, period. There is a
10	single point where you can measure boron concentration
11	and it's not likely to work when you are
12	I have seen no evidence that it works when
13	you are in post-ECCS conditions, so the operator is
14	flying blind, okay.
15	I find the suggestion by the applicant
16	yesterday that they could use the source range flux
17	detectors to detect criticality and therefore assume
18	what the boron distribution is extremely dangerous.
19	Sandra, can you move to the next section?
20	And I thought this was not going to be an open
21	session. Well, positive void coefficient you heard me
22	say before nobody knows what the void coefficient is
23	when this front comes in.
24	I can argue that there is a critical boron
25	concentration above which it is positive. We know the

(202) 234-4433

	42
1	void coefficient is positive for concentrations larger
2	than 1,200 to 1,400 ppm. I cannot say the void
3	coefficient is negative when this front comes in, and
4	I have not seen an evaluation and I think that is
5	negligent. Risk evaluation
6	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Jose, Jose, since you've
7	used static reference points, I'll use one. The cold
8	front coming in will have a negative void coefficient.
9	It's only the boron, presence of boron that makes void
10	coefficient positive, and that's only under certain
11	circumstances.
12	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Can you point me to
13	the calculation that shows that it's negative?
14	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Jose, you've made the
15	point about the availability of calculations enough
16	times. I'm just saying that cold water in an under-
17	moderated core like this, forget there's any boron
18	present, is a negative void coefficient.
19	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: And I claim the
20	contrary when you have a highly heterogeneous core
21	with boron on top, but let's not waste time with
22	(Simultaneous speaking.)
23	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I said you're not
24	listening to me. I said when you have deborated
25	water, the void coefficient is negative.
	1 I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I

(202) 234-4433

1 MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: You don't have deborated water. You have half of the core 2 is 3 deborated and half of the core is highly borated, and 4 half of the --5 MEMBER KIRCHNER: I understand that. 6 MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: -- core happens to be

8 calculation, okay? I haven't seen a calculation, so 9 we don't know whether it's positive or negative. So, 10 taking credit for negative reactivity feedback when dollar is 11 that one per minute ramp comes in unsupported by facts, period. 12

and so

Ι

just haven't

Risk evaluation, the applicant chose not to do a risk analysis for deboration conditions, period. I mean, and in the diverging opinion that we heard yesterday, a cognizant staff engineer that has been reviewing this from the beginning thinks that the core damage frequency is seven orders, up to seven orders of magnitude larger than what is advertised.

That's what he thinks, and he has some calculation, hand calculation of that. I just cannot comprehend why this risk was not part of the scope of the PRA.

24 What we cannot say, and I thought we were 25 going to be doing this in a closed session among ACRS

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

7

on

top.

Okay,

(202) 234-4433

seen

а

	44
1	members, but if they have drilled four holes at the
2	RRV location, you will not have a boron deboration
3	issue, and you will not have to do all of these
4	calculations and you won't have to justify anything.
5	And it has minimal impact on anything
6	else, so I just cannot comprehend why they didn't do
7	it and that's what's driving me crazy.
8	So, my recommendation, right now, we don't
9	have any calculation whatsoever that suggests that
10	this situation is safe. Deborating the downcomer,
11	parking up to 20 dollars worth of reactivity at the
12	core inlet waiting for perturbation is, frankly,
13	irresponsible.
14	So, my recommendation is the staff should
15	care about the downcomer deboration and not certify it
16	as safe because they don't have the analysis to
17	justify that it is safe. Okay, I'm done. Matt, your
18	turn.
19	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Thank you, Jose. Thank
20	you very much actually, and for the spirited
21	discussion. I think I would like to turn, Mr.
22	Chairman, next to Dave Petti, who has given this also
23	considerable thought. And Dave, if you would like to
24	use the viewgraph you prepared, I think the staff is
25	ready to put it up.
1	I contract of the second se

(202) 234-4433

	45
1	MEMBER PETTI: Sandra, please put it up.
2	So I tried to categorize all the different things
3	we've heard, and we hear in words. And I'm a visual
4	person so I like these sorts of things because it
5	helps my thinking.
6	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Dave? Dave
7	MEMBER PETTI: Yes.
8	MEMBER KIRCHNER: pardon my
9	interruption. Can you speak more directly into your
10	microphone? We're getting a weak audio signal.
11	MEMBER PETTI: Is this better? Can you
12	hear me?
13	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Somewhat. Just a little
14	more
15	MEMBER PETTI: Oh, I know what the problem
16	is, hold on. It's a fan from the other computer
17	drowning out this. Give me a minute to move my
18	computer around. Is this better?
19	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yes.
20	MEMBER PETTI: Okay. So, on the top left
21	of the figure are the two event sequence families, if
22	you will. Those associated with decay heat removal
23	and then ECCS.
24	Come down from the decay heat removal by
25	show in yellow what the changes were in the design,

(202) 234-4433

	46
1	the setpoint changes in the riser holes that we talked
2	about, the two analytical bounding methods that were
3	presented by NuScale and confirmed by the Staff. And
4	so, that's sort of okay for those events.
5	If you come down for the ECCS or LOCA
6	event, before ECCS actuation, the setpoint changes in
7	the riser holes had to do the same thing. The real
8	question, as we've heard already, is what happens
9	after actuation of the ECCS and the deboration.
10	I just want people to realize that the
11	results that were presented by NuScale in the March
12	meeting were DBA calculations using conservative rule
13	sets. We heard about it in the March 2020
14	Subcommittee.
15	And those were okay, but they really
16	weren't addressing this issue, they were really
17	looking at the core and potential return to power.
18	And so, as is typical in DBA calculations, a bunch of
19	conservative assumptions were made that are highly
20	stylized in terms of when you think about what's
21	actually, what actually would happen versus what
22	happens in a stylized step, Chapter 15 analysis.
23	And the real question that came up as a
24	result of that, these recovery actions path of
25	strategy. And we'll come back to that.

(202) 234-4433

47 1 But after actuation there's a whole series of potential beyond design basis events that one needs 2 to consider the influence of the down, of deblowing 3 4 the downcomer. 5 The NRC Staff, Dr. Yarsky, put together a very nice White Paper I thought that did exactly what 6 7 Dennis and we were talking about earlier about looking 8 across the spectrum of events. Are there any events, 9 how could we have water get into the core, deborated 10 water get into the core. And he systematically went through all of 11 And he used engineering different options. the 12 judgement which I think is a good thing here. 13 14 But as we heard more about his analysis 15 and his engineering judgment, what struck me was that 16 a simple one-dimensional RELAP calculation with point 17 kinetics ain't going to get you there. And I'm worried that intuition, lots of us have intuitions 18 19 based on code calculations. And those intuitions can be long because 20 this is not like other reactors. We heard about the 21 mixing and the oscillatory flow behavior, how much and 22 how fast can the downcomer water come in. 23

24 There are all of these kinetically 25 activity issues. This is not a simple analysis. If

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

	48
1	it were a simple analysis I think someone would have
2	been able to develop some recovery actions that need
3	calculations to help guide what it is you're going to
4	do.
5	And so, that multi-dimensional analysis is
6	a 3-D, probably a RELAP-5 3-D or TRACE 3-D calculation
7	and I think it's probably space time kinetics.
8	I do appreciate the verbal discussion we
9	had yesterday with Dr. Yarsky where he, in the White
10	Paper talked about all these things and took what I
11	call the flow mixing approach and walked through how
12	we thought things would evolve.
13	Then verbally we went into this sort of
14	other end of the spectrum. Okay, let's assume we have
15	a stratified core with a very black area with the
16	borated water and unborated water coming in from the
17	bottom.
18	And he talked about the physics effects,
19	trying to look at it from both extremes. So the
20	question is, when you add this, when you boil this all
21	down, where are we really. I think it's hard to say.
22	I appreciate the comments about having to
23	do an analysis, but I don't think it's easy. This is
24	probably pushing nuclear codes more in a way that have
25	not been used in the past because of the uniqueness of
	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I

(202) 234-4433

	49
1	the system.
2	And so, getting to those recovery actions
3	is something that can't happen at the DCA stage but is
4	going to have to happen at the COL stage. And it's
5	going to take some calculations.
6	So that's, it's the red box where all the
7	discussion was. And we got a lot of different
8	opinions and engineering judgment on what actually
9	will happen there.
10	I'm not convinced that if three-
11	dimensional calculations are done that it just doesn't
12	confuse us on a higher plain, if you will. Because
13	people will argue that, well, it's a co-calculation
14	and I don't like this co-calculation for this reason,
15	I don't like it for that reason.
16	I appreciate Dr. Yarsky's analysis because
17	it was at a higher level and tried to stick with first
18	principles in the approach. I found my profession as
19	I found the analytical, a bounding method showed
20	NuScale refreshing.
21	And so, that was just sort of where I
22	thought we ended up. And so I thought this sort of
23	captured it, tried to capture it, to know where the
24	problem is and where the problem is not.
25	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Dave, I have

(202) 234-4433

	50
1	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Thank you, Dave.
2	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: a couple of
3	comments. Guys, go ahead, Walt.
4	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yes, go ahead.
5	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Everything I've been
6	talking about is a purple box on the top corner. I
7	didn't even know anything to be done to DBA.
8	So, everything I went through, obviously
9	I did not do a good job of communicating, is
10	MEMBER KIRCHNER: No, Jose, I think you
11	did.
12	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Well
13	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I agree with you, Jose,
14	that we don't need to go beyond DBA space to have the
15	purple box concerns.
16	MEMBER PETTI: Right.
17	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yes.
18	MEMBER PETTI: Because I think what my
19	point is, that you can't use the rule sets of DBA to
20	develop those actions, you're going to have to go best
21	estimate which is kind of DBA
22	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I agree, Dave.
23	MEMBER PETTI: So what I would have done
24	last night, I thought about this, is put a dotted line
25	from the red box up to the recovery because that's
	1 I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I

(202) 234-4433

	51
1	what's going to inform recovery because you need the
2	actual response of the core not the stylized DBA
3	response, if you will.
4	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Right. But my
5	question to you, Dave, is what, number one is
6	establish a fact. Do you believe that after ECCS is
7	actuated the downcomer will deborate?
8	MEMBER PETTI: Yes.
9	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: And it will do so
10	within 72 hours?
11	MEMBER PETTI: Yes.
12	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: So I hear a yes. And
13	then, what confidence do you have, the operator can
14	move into Mode 4 to start the recovery from the
15	accident.
16	What basis do you have to have confidence
17	that once you put yourself in this, first of all its
18	unstable, but precarious condition where you have all,
19	nothing but the water in the core, what confidence do
20	you have that the operator can move into Mode 4 and 5?
21	I have no confidence. I mean, I think, my
22	gut feeling, we figure out a way to do it. I just
23	have no documentary evidence that it can do that.
24	MEMBER PETTI: So to me, this gets down to
25	a question of how much do you need to make the

(202) 234-4433

	52
1	assessment. Does Dr. Yarsky's approach cover all the
2	basis and provide reasonable assurance.
3	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Well
4	MEMBER PETTI: Absolutely. Because when
5	I hear calculations, my mind thinks you're looking for
6	a much greater level of assurance than I, as I have
7	understood reasonable assurance.
8	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: We were captured
9	under the discussion yesterday with Dr. Yarsky. But
10	I still disagree with the statement in the SER on the
11	statement that Walt makes, that if you put \$1 per
12	minute of the activity with as much as 20 behind it,
13	that because it's slow miraculous feedback will
14	happen. And it will compensate for all those,
15	eventually \$20 when you reach it in 20 minutes.
16	I strongly disagree with that standard, I
17	did. Because it's, basically it's completely
18	baseless. He does not say that that's about to
19	happen.
20	What he says is that there won't be a
21	prompt criticality event, which will immediately cause
22	fuel failure. But he does not make a study of, do you
23	put in dollars and dollars in there, how much feedback
24	do you need to compensate for it.
25	Especially because he doesn't know where

(202) 234-4433

	53
1	the word coefficient is. Nobody has calculated it.
2	He doesn't know what coefficient is, nobody has
3	calculated it.
4	CHAIR SUNSERI: This is Matt. And I know
5	that there will be probably all kinds of reasons why
6	I'm not right on this but, at least in my mind, from
7	a operating perspective, I mean, the assumption here
8	is that you're putting on to be a course led trained
9	system or whatever.
10	And you're just kind of letting run at 100
11	gallons per minute. And
12	(Simultaneous speaking.)
13	CHAIR SUNSERI: So, can you hear me now?
14	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Go ahead, Matt.
15	CHAIR SUNSERI: Okay. So, I mean, there
16	is other ways to do that just besides turning on the
17	system and letting it run.
18	And I disagree with the fact that the
19	source range instrument if they're not going to be
20	that useful. I mean, we use them all the time to
21	monitor the approach to criticality.
22	So, I mean, why couldn't the operator turn
23	on the DRS, or whatever the system is, the flooding
24	system, monitor source range instrument, look for flex
25	doubling. If they think there is an approach to
	I

(202) 234-4433

	54
1	criticality, turn on the system and let it mix a
2	little bit. There are ways to recover this without
3	just turning it on and letting it run.
4	MEMBER BALLINGER: Well, yes, this is Ron.
5	I've been struggling with this for weeks now. And I'm
6	listening to people argue over, it's 100 gallons a
7	minute, if it's 50 gallons a minute, if it's this many
8	pcm or that many pcm.
9	The red box, at least in the metallurgist
10	outlook, is a quagmire, right. And we're reduced to
11	the point where it's the purple box that's important
12	in cutting off the head of the snake, which is the red
13	box.
14	And that is, now we're in to, we have a
15	tendency sometimes, applicants do, have a tendency to
16	say, we're going to push this off to the COL stage.
17	And that's all well and good.
18	It's just that what I worry about is that
19	when you say, in this particular case, that we push it
20	off to the COL stage, we need to be sure that in fact
21	if we do push it off to the COL stage that there
22	actually is a path to recovery considering human
23	reliability, now we're into all of that sort of
24	subjective stuff.
25	But it's important in this case, unlike
	I contraction of the second seco

(202) 234-4433

Í	55
1	other DCAs that we've seen, or at least that I've
2	seen, we're pushing certain things off to the COL
3	stage. You can do it because there's a pretty good,
4	there's a pretty good reasoning that in fact at the
5	COL stage it will be solved.
6	So my question would be, is it possible to
7	cut the head off of the red box snake by the recovery
8	actions path and can we assure ourselves that if that
9	is the COL stage that somebody wants to build one of
10	these things doesn't end up getting themselves in a
11	box with no exit.
12	You know, and that's a very simplistic
13	kind of discussion, but anyway.
14	MEMBER PETTI: So, Ron, my answer, which
15	is in some text that I've, well, that guys I think got
16	a copy of, is that you have to go into the quagmire to
17	inform the purple box. Because right now, any other
18	approach you're not going to know.
19	And so while we would like to have a
20	strategy, not necessarily a defined path or action,
21	it's called wildly overcoming a strategy, it's under-
22	informed right now until you, unless you can get into
23	the red box in some way.
24	MEMBER BALLINGER: Yes. I mean, I have no
25	doubt that we're going to get into the red box.
	I contraction of the second seco

(202) 234-4433

	56
1	MEMBER PETTI: Yes. I mean, I'm with you,
2	I'd like to
3	MEMBER BALLINGER: My question is
4	MEMBER PETTI: that.
5	MEMBER BALLINGER: My question is, I guess
6	I'm thinking along the same lines as Matt. That we
7	got to be sure that if we get into the red box and
8	never get out of the red box, to anybody's
9	satisfaction, to our satisfaction, that the recovery
10	path is still an option that will work. And that it
11	will work in a reliable fashion.
12	I know I keep saying PRA and human
13	reliability, but that's where we end up being.
14	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Okay, I agree. This
15	is
16	(Simultaneously speaking.)
17	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: I agree with Dave
18	Petti that we need to eventually, we need to get into
19	the red box and do that analysis to inform the purple
20	box. But I guess the question is, how much of that is
21	really necessary at the DCA stage.
22	They're not going to do the procedures
23	that are the recovery actions until the COL stage.
24	And there's plenty of time to do all of the analyses
25	in the red box between the DCA and the COL stage.

(202) 234-4433

	57
1	That's my opinion.
2	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Okay, I would like
3	to give some Chapter 19 perspective from the risk.
4	Can I do this, will everybody
5	CHAIR SUNSERI: Go ahead, Vesna.
6	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Okay. This is, I was
7	going to write this but I was hoping that I will have
8	a chance to ask Pete some questions.
9	So from the, but since I don't, and I did
10	not even provide the comment to describe that, but I
11	have it in front of me.
12	The PRA needs a clear, for PRA is very
13	good with facts because we need a pretty clear
14	definition, you know, to develop model, what's
15	happening.
16	So we need to understand process in order
17	to, process is not in the pH sense, like you guys are
18	discussing but is what is actually happening, which
19	could produce those power exclusion. In what we call
20	scenarios, right.
21	So, so the facts is that at this moment
22	I'm not sure because I heard the two contradictory
23	presentations. One is to say, and Pete did his study
24	assuming that we have a stuck rod. Right.
25	Is the version opinion assume that this

(202) 234-4433

	58
1	can also could without stuck rods. So, that's a very
2	important question from this perspective because stuck
3	rod put everything in the low frequencies.
4	So, I don't know, do we, I don't, at least
5	I don't in this moment know the issue is, prolong ECCS
6	injection issue without stuck rod.
7	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Vesna, I think, and Jose
8	will join in, I think you can have this potential
9	return to criticality without the stuck rod.
10	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Okay, that's, I just
11	want to say fact is that I don't know that for sure
12	because I heard the two different, I mean, analyzing
13	is, by the Dr. Yarsky, was clearly done for small-
14	break LOCAs with stuck rod.
15	All right, so that's my first question.
16	And very important from this perspective.
17	The second question is, main point here is
18	connected, it can happen with the delay ECCS injection
19	and also with prolong ECCS injection. Right?
20	And maybe stuck rod rule is different for
21	those two, I don't know.
22	In any case, in both cases, I mean, it
23	could be different events and it could be different
24	assumptions, but I don't really have any good feeling
25	about time brackets we are talking. Because sometimes
	I contraction of the second seco

(202) 234-4433

	59
1	I hear less than 72 hours, sometimes I hear 14 days
2	for prolong ECCS injection.
3	And it is a very important to know, I know
4	we cannot really determine the time because it's
5	depending of entering conditions that we have nearly
6	some feeling of what time bracket we are discussing.
7	So, I don't think that this is answered in this
8	moment, Pete, so I don't think I know this fact.
9	The second thing is, at least I am telling
10	what facts I don't know. Maybe some of the Committee
11	feels different about this.
12	Then we discuss CVCS or CFDS non-safety
13	injection. Obviously we can have delay CVCS and
14	potential CFDS to delay ECCS injection. And those are
15	very likely to happen because if ECCS does not
16	actuate, the operator help to actuate one of those
17	systems, CVCS in the normal LOCA and CFDS if you have
18	a LOCA outside of the containment.
19	I am not sure that, is it clear to me, is
20	that the issue or not. In the PRA presentation it was
21	defined not as the issued. That's one of the
22	scenarios very common in PRA.
23	And then when it comes to prolong ECCS
24	injection, where they stated that they don't see the
25	way to bring the water into the core, there was, in
	1

(202) 234-4433

	60
1	this divergent opinion there was the estimate or some
2	probability. That probability is very important.
3	The way to do, to bring this water, the
4	way to actuate those system there have to be some way
5	that something else fails to indicate to the operator.
6	So he doesn't even know.
7	We did not even see any discussion of the
8	way, how that reactor cool. And then when it comes to
9	recovery, all intervention, all, we really have not
10	any discussion on the instrumentation or what actually
11	needs to be done. And that's the fact.
12	So we know very little about that, put the
13	human error out of commission or all recovery from
14	this state. And that's definitely fact because I
15	didn't see anything specific on this. That covers
16	instrumentation with Jose.
17	So the facts I am missing is the, well, is
18	the stuck rod related both to delay and prolong ECCS
19	injection, what are the time brackets in these things,
20	CVCS delay injection or the injection after prolong,
21	the ECCS operation, which will be out of commission,
22	and then what type of recoveries, with what indication
23	we are talking about. So this is the summary of what
24	I feel I am missing in order to make Chapter 19
25	conclusions.
	1

(202) 234-4433

	61
1	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Thank you, Vesna.
2	Colleagues? Dennis, do you want to comment?
3	MEMBER BLEY: Well, sure. I look at
4	Dave's chart and I got to, I quibble with some parts
5	of it but the end points, the purple box and the red
6	box is clearly where we end up.
7	But I got back to Jose's presentation of
8	facts. And mostly I agree with those facts. There's
9	a couple of places where I think we polish the words
10	a bit.
11	But the place he ends up, Jose's analysis,
12	if you'll forgive me, is kind of like the Staffs.
13	It's an analysis without any analysis. And it's
14	expert judgement as well.
15	Oh, and it's a bounding case, I agree with
16	that. And I think that's sufficient to say this needs
17	to be dug into further.
18	The idea of making it a carve out doesn't
19	bother me. The idea of doing that helps because we'd
20	include the development of recovery actions.
21	And my problem, like I think most
22	everybody else's is, the documentation saying, this
23	remains a problem, isn't in the FSAR in way that makes
24	it clear. And the documentation that this really
25	needs to be a high priority for development of

(202) 234-4433

	62
1	procedures and recovery actions is also not in a clear
2	way in the FSAR.
3	So I think bringing it up in our letter
4	is, either as a carve out or some other way to make
5	sure it gets covered before they build one of these
6	things I think is important.
7	MEMBER BALLINGER: Yes. This is Ron.
8	MEMBER BLEY: Thank you guys.
9	MEMBER BALLINGER: I think Dennis has got
10	it. The purple box is going to be what we end up in.
11	The red box is great if you're a lawyer, but at some
12	point we are going to get to the point where it's your
13	PhD arguing with my PhD.
14	And without very, very, very extensive
15	analysis, which may actually not be possible, to the
16	degree that it needs to be done, the FSAR or whatever
17	document they have really needs to be very clear about
18	what Dennis is talking about. Because in thinking
19	through what you put in that, you have to, in your
20	mind, believe that there is a recovery path.
21	Again, I'm told that Occam was not a
22	metallurgist, but I thought I saw him in freshman
23	chemistry.
24	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Thank you, Ron. Other
25	Members of the Committee?

(202) 234-4433

	63
1	MEMBER REMPE: So, this is Joy. And I
2	tend to agree with what Dennis had said. And I have
3	a small nit.
4	And I checked the DCA to make sure I'm not
5	saying something proprietary, but in things I've seen
6	from Jose, as well as what I see Dave, it wasn't just
7	setpoint changes they actually do have a different
8	mechanism now too for initiating ECCS. Which I find
9	to be much more reliable and I'm very pleased to have
10	seen. And I hope that we can capture that.
11	But I didn't mention it earlier but there
12	were like many comments made in what Jose had said
13	that I hope we can capture, he's captured that I think
14	would make it easier to go forward with the letter
15	writing. Because there's only a couple of places
16	where we really need to be changed.
17	I really hate to see this as a carve out
18	but I don't see other ways to do it unless somebody
19	wants to change something.
20	MEMBER BALLINGER: This is Ron, one last
21	thing. I think I need to remember that we're talking
22	about Chapter 15 and we're talking about, basically
23	beyond design basis. And just need to remember that
24	I think.
25	(Simultaneous speaking.)
l	I

(202) 234-4433

	64
1	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Sorry
2	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Ron, I don't think we're
3	beyond design basis, we're in the AOO design basis
4	space when we get to the purple box.
5	MEMBER BALLINGER: Got it. Got it, okay.
6	But we're still in Chapter 15?
7	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Well, or coming out of
8	Chapter 15 with a successful glide path.
9	MEMBER BALLINGER: Right. Yes. Yes,
10	indeed.
11	MEMBER PETTI: Right. And I think in my
12	opinion the key rule is that the rule set and the
13	codes you use to demonstrate compliance in Chapter 15
14	is going to help you get the purple box. Because you
15	need to know the actual response to the plant. Which
16	means you got to go into your best estimate tools,
17	which are typically BDDA.
18	MEMBER BALLINGER: Yes. Yes.
19	MEMBER PETTI: That's what I meant to say.
20	I mean
21	MEMBER BALLINGER: Yes.
22	MEMBER PETTI: not perfectly.
23	MEMBER BALLINGER: Yes. But my question
24	is, from the conversation I've heard so far, does
25	anybody really believe that no matter how good our
	1

(202) 234-4433

65
best estimate tools are, are they adequate for this
task?
MEMBER KIRCHNER: Oh, that's a, I hate to
take up the defense of that but I will. This is Walt
Kirchner for the record.
Yes, there's a tool set that can be
applied. We do have very good systems, analysis
codes, whether it's TRACE or RELAP, that can do the
kind of multi-dimensional core treatment where there's
mixing and there are issues related to that, as well
as mixing coming into the core.
We have CFD tools that are at one's
disposal, if you want to look at boron concentrations.
And we have reactor kinetics and neutronics codes that
are, I think, up to the task.
The biggest challenge for most of the
systems codes, Ron, is that because of numerical
diffusion boron is difficult to account for
accurately. So if you remember that both the
presentations by the applicant and the staff review
and their work, a lot of the boron estimates are being
done as side calculations.
MEMBER BALLINGER: Right. Yes, I do, I
remember that.
MEMBER KIRCHNER: And so on. The basic

(202) 234-4433

	66
1	tool set is there. Certainly MCNP, for example, was
2	mentioned earlier.
3	That's a static code. But you can do
4	extraordinarily good analysis
5	MEMBER BALLINGER: Okay.
6	MEMBER KIRCHNER: of K effective with
7	that.
8	MEMBER BALLINGER: So, what you're saying
9	is
10	MEMBER KIRCHNER: As Jose pointed out
11	MEMBER BALLINGER: What you're saying is
12	there is a, that there would be a positive outcome.
13	MEMBER REMPE: So, Walt, I
14	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I think so.
15	MEMBER REMPE: validate those codes for
16	this type of situation. Do you think
17	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Well, that's where I was
18	going.
19	MEMBER REMPE: Okay.
20	MEMBER KIRCHNER: The problem right now
21	is, and again, the Applicant and the Staff pointed
22	this out, is that when you, you add the boron
23	tracking, so to speak, into the equation, that's the
24	part that's not well validated.
25	MEMBER BLEY: Walt, could I
	I contract of the second se

(202) 234-4433

	67
1	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Tool set, like Peter,
2	you know, Peter could, well, he's not, we shouldn't
3	turn to Peter here, but I think there's a basic tool
4	set that will allow you to bound the problem.
5	MEMBER BALLINGER: But is this a short-
6	term, aka, a year problem or is it
7	MEMBER KIRCHNER: No, these are
8	MEMBER BALLINGER: a decade problem?
9	MEMBER KIRCHNER: You have to setup an
10	input model, you have to check that, you got, these
11	are, you know, some of it could be done in the
12	relatively short-term, I believe. I'm talking months.
13	Obviously, some side calculations have
14	been done in the intervening past months. So there is
15	a, what I would say, I would characterize it, there's
16	a basic tool set available that would allow you to
17	frame and probably bound the problem for purposes of
18	the purple box there on the top.
19	MEMBER BALLINGER: Okay, good.
20	MEMBER BLEY: Walt, can I ask a
21	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Go ahead.
22	MEMBER BLEY: I'm asking a question or
23	just presenting an argument. I don't know those tools
24	very well but I know that if you try to design a
25	system that would run as a coherent front up through
	1

(202) 234-4433

68 1 the reactor of this water you'd play hell making it work. 2 But this really is a situation that's very 3 4 sarcastic. I think every time you did it, if you were 5 doing experiments, it would look different. Now, how different I don't know. And I don't know if these 6 7 tools are bounded. I think that would be a good 8 thing. 9 We're not in the role of presenting 10 solutions here. And we probably shouldn't do it. Ι like Jose's ideas of a few more holes. But then they 11 probably looked that, and maybe their 12 at in calculations they found a problem with putting holes 13 14 down, though I don't know what it would be. 15 But I don't think we're planning to do that, right? 16 17 MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I haven't heard anything from the Applicant on that, Brian, to do 18 19 that. I think, you know, 20 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: those holes would be in the core region. There might 21 be some complexities there where you're getting flow 22 through them during normal operation. 23 24 MEMBER KIRCHNER: No, no, it would be 25 above the core, Pete.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

	69
1	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Really?
2	MEMBER KIRCHNER: If you
3	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Yes, I thought the
4	RRVs were
5	MEMBER KIRCHNER: No, you can put them
6	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: right on top of
7	the core.
8	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Well, the design, this
9	is a nice design. So if you look at things, what they
10	did was, they made sure that any penetrations of the
11	containment and into the reactor vessel boundary were
12	always above the core level.
13	So you wouldn't put holes below the core
14	level, you would put them upper, at the lower steam
15	generator level.
16	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: So you say there's
17	room
18	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Or as Jose said
19	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: between top,
20	between top of fuel and
21	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Probably just above the
22	RRVs.
23	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: What? Jose said
24	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Just above the RRVs.
25	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: below the RRVs,
	1

(202) 234-4433

	70
1	right?
2	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yes. I said it has
3	to be there. They will have to be below the lowest
4	level, water level that you would expect. Which is at
5	or around the RRVs, which is roughly ten feet above
6	the core.
7	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Oh, I didn't realize
8	there was that much room.
9	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yes.
10	MEMBER REMPE: So, I've not heard anyone
11	from the ACRS say the SER should be issued as is.
12	We're saying doing a carve out. Everyone has kind of
13	said something is missing.
14	Add a true statement is there a Member
15	that's not yet spoken that feels like it's just fine?
16	CHAIR SUNSERI: I just don't know the
17	(Simultaneous speaking.)
18	CHAIR SUNSERI: yet.
19	MEMBER REMPE: I didn't hear, I heard two
20	responses.
21	CHAIR SUNSERI: Go ahead, Dave.
22	MEMBER PETTI: I don't know that we're
23	there yet, one way or the other.
24	MEMBER REMPE: Even your, Dave, has said,
25	hey, there is some things that are, you know, going to
	I contraction of the second

(202) 234-4433
	71
1	be complicated in the future. Are you still say, yes,
2	maybe they could issue it and they don't need a carve
3	out or they don't need something else. You're okay
4	with the SE?
5	MEMBER PETTI: What I'm saying is, to get
6	to the purple box, you can't get there today.
7	MEMBER REMPE: So that kind of sounds like
8	the SE, which kind of says go ahead and it's just
9	fine, you're differing with that.
10	And I'm kind of getting back to what
11	Dennis kind of tried to say yesterday about, there's
12	either going to be a letter that's not real positive
13	about the SE or there's going to be some differing
14	opinions. And I'm kind of trying to say, nope, there
15	may be differing opinions on what's needed but all of
16	us so far have said, no, the SE needs to have
17	something else done, don't issue it without some
18	changes.
19	MEMBER KIRCHNER: No, I said that. And I
20	think that's
21	MEMBER PETTI: No, I
22	MEMBER KIRCHNER: a premature
23	MEMBER PETTI: Yes.
24	MEMBER KIRCHNER: conversation. Joy,
25	the ACRS can issue a letter with or without the SE.

	72
1	MEMBER REMPE: Well
2	MEMBER KIRCHNER: So I don't think we have
3	to tie the conversation to yes or no on the SE. Let's
4	address, first, whether we can come to a consensus as
5	Dennis had outlined, and others, and then talk about
6	yes or no, issue the SE.
7	Because we can always, and we have in the
8	past
9	MEMBER REMPE: You're right, I overstated
10	what I'm saying. We're not happy with what we've
11	seen, but again, the Staff wrote up some things, well,
12	there was a White Paper, but this topic, as far as the
13	focus area goes, nobody is happy with what we've seen
14	from the Staff.
15	MEMBER KIRCHNER: No.
16	MEMBER REMPE: Changes throughout.
17	MEMBER KIRCHNER: No.
18	MEMBER PETTI: No, no, I don't think
19	that's
20	MEMBER KIRCHNER: That's not correct at
21	all.
22	MEMBER REMPE: Ah. Okay. So then we're
23	not there yet, I thought maybe we were.
24	MEMBER KIRCHNER: No, we're not there yet.
25	We've had very good input from the Staff. And I think
	1

```
(202) 234-4433
```

	73
1	that input, I will reinforce my opening comments.
2	If you look at Dave's picture, both the
3	design changes, the setpoint changes and such that
4	were proposed by the Applicant, appear to address that
5	whole set of sequences very successfully. And that's
6	all to the good.
7	And then we've heard from the Staff from
8	the, also on the right-hand side. And so, yes.
9	MEMBER REMPE: But I thought even Dave was
10	saying that with the recovery actions that haven't yet
11	been defined, I mean, Walt you had said, maybe a text
12	needed to be added. And I think, what I was kind of
13	interpreting what Dave was saying was, the
14	confirmatory action might need to have more because
15	right now they just, they need to identity something.
16	But if they had to be
17	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Well -
18	MEMBER REMPE: maybe a more in-depth
19	decision
20	MEMBER KIRCHNER: again, as Dennis
21	pointed out, we're not in the business of doing design
22	fixes or changes. But I think
23	MEMBER REMPE: I think that changes the
24	Staff
25	(Simultaneous speaking.)
1	I Contraction of the second

(202) 234-4433

	74
1	MEMBER KIRCHNER: One doesn't, one just
2	doesn't leave the system in post-ECCS actuating,
3	continuing to deborate. But let me stop there.
4	CHAIR SUNSERI: This is Matt. And my view
5	on it is I agree. I think it's still a little early
6	to be talking about carve outs and how we're going to
7	address this thing because, at least in my mind what
8	the situation is, is the Staff has completed their
9	safety evaluation report.
10	And through all of their deliberations and
11	engineering analysis and interactions with the
12	Applicant, they have come to the conclusion that they
13	are reasonably assured that the systems that exist, as
14	identified in the design certification documentation,
15	there's a reasonable assurance that those systems can
16	be operated to overcome the situation created by the
17	event as described.
18	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I don't think they're
19	saying that in the SER. And when
20	(Simultaneous speaking.)
21	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: surface
22	CHAIR SUNSERI: SER if they didn't
23	haven't reasonable assurance that
24	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: When you scratch
25	under the surface you find out they have no basis for

(202) 234-4433

	75
1	the conclusion.
2	CHAIR SUNSERI: I just said they used
3	reasonable, engineering analysis. And they've told us
4	what that evaluation is.
5	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Well
6	CHAIR SUNSERI: We heard from it
7	yesterday.
8	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: And that's why we're
9	here, to review the reasonable analysis. I don't see
10	any evidence that that is the case.
11	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Matt?
12	CHAIR SUNSERI: Yes.
13	MEMBER KIRCHNER: This is Walt. I forgot
14	that I also wanted to give our, I hope, did everyone
15	on the Committee have a chance to talk, and if so, I
16	would like to turn to our consultants. May I do that?
17	MR. CORRADINI: Are you asking or telling?
18	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Hearing no objection
19	that sounds like Mike Corradini for the record. Mike,
20	go ahead.
21	MR. CORRADINI: Okay. So, a lot of things
22	have been said, and I don't think it's appropriate or
23	time effective to repeat them.
24	Let me start off with Dave's figure
25	because I think Dave's figure at least outlines quite

(202) 234-4433

	76
1	well pathways. The one pathway that we are discussing
2	about after actuation DBA rule set conservative
3	calculations, is there is not a calculation that looks
4	at what apparently is going to be a delusion of the
5	downcomer, as time marches on, past actuation.
6	There is an analysis, 89.30. But that
7	wasn't the purpose of the analysis. And if anything,
8	it just looks to make sure that you have enough boron
9	concentration in the core to remain sub-critical.
10	Rather, it's not even conserving boron, it
11	loses boron from the system. It magically disappears.
12	Which tells me that it's probably in the downcomer but
13	I don't know how much is there.
14	So Step 1 would be, I would think, it's
15	appropriate that if we're going to talk about recovery
16	actions we have to have either a conservative or at
17	least an appropriate calculation that gives us an
18	opinion as to how rapidly we are diluting the
19	downcomer region.
20	Now, what we've been told by 89.30, and
21	I've got to be careful that we don't say words that,
22	or numbers that are inappropriate in open session, is
23	it's probably less than a day. It seems to me then I
24	would turn to an approach that Member Kirchner, that
25	Walt has discussed, which is, I don't know if the
1	I contraction of the second

(202) 234-4433

1 proper legality is carve out or whatever, but it seems 2 to me working the problem backwards, that if you want to have a short recovery actions you either have to 3 4 identify now that such recovery actions have to occur 5 before you have a chance of any sort of power increase or re-criticality or you come up with a strategy now 6 7 that says how you approach criticality and then 8 monitor your recovery actions.

9 As I think Jose indicated, there are four 10 recovery actions. Three of which require the CVCS in 11 operation. And the best of the three is essentially 12 injection into the riser region.

If the CVCS is not available, then you 13 14 have the CFDS to do it. And then you either have to 15 do, as Mark and Matt suqqest, are approach to 16 criticality, which is guite reasonable and logical. 17 And actually takes, I think, a much easier approach than some other required emergency actions that we 18 19 have reviewed in current operating reactors that have to occur in tens of seconds, not in hours. Or tens of 20 And you can do it that way. 21 hours.

But whatever the recovery action is has got to be identified within the, at least a structure for the recovery action that have got to be identified within the DCA.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

	78
1	And that leads me to the final thing which
2	is, when we were discussing with Staff yesterday, I
3	think I asked someone on Staff, is it their feeling
4	that this is inappropriate at this time but it can be
5	done in the COL stage. This is, I guess, where I
6	differ with the Staff's conclusion.
7	Is that I think something has got to be
8	defined here, either by a limitation or an additional
9	requirement, I'll call it requirement, that you
10	essentially have some sort of overall strategy that
11	then has to be backed up by a calculation. And then
12	I think we're good to go relative to the SER.
13	I can explain further but I thought I'd
14	try to be brief.
15	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Mike, I like what you
16	said very much.
17	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Thank you, Mike.
18	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: And I think you make
19	sense. This is what we would be calling, define a
20	success path.
21	Tell me how you're planning to do it and
22	show me that you can do that. That's fine.
23	MR. CORRADINI: I think, again, it's the
24	Members' decision here. But it seems to me that we're
25	not differing with, and in fact, I don't want to
	1

(202) 234-4433

	79
1	redesign the system, that's the Applicant's problem,
2	not our problem.
3	So to the extent that they're happy with
4	their design as they stated, then they have to show a
5	path to recovery that can be successful given the
6	potential chance that some of these systems would be
7	inoperable given whatever the initiating event would
8	be.
9	And so, that might be the limitation that
10	I would put on the current SER as written. And the
11	design as presented.
12	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: It is my
13	understanding that these types of SERs cannot have
14	limitation. They either approve or disapprove this
15	litigation, but you cannot have limitations and
16	conditions it will have to be a modification of the
17	FSAR.
18	MR. CORRADINI: Okay, I'm not going to
19	deal with whatever the right word is, but I think I've
20	made my point.
21	MEMBER BLEY: Mike
22	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Thank you, Mike.
23	MEMBER BLEY: a thought I had forgotten
24	about. And that is, at least a few of us have talked
25	about this.

(202) 234-4433

	80
1	I think that the Staff's point of view,
2	and I'd like to say something about this in our
3	letter, the Staff's absolute conviction that because
4	of their guidance they don't have to consider recovery
5	as part of Chapter 15 as inappropriate.
6	I think that's normally reasonable when
7	the paths of recovery are clear. Then once you've
8	stabilized at the end of Chapter 15 there is no big
9	issue about how you go forward.
10	In a case where there is a big issue and
11	it hasn't been proved, or designed out, that you
12	really need to do something, and it's not six months
13	later, I don't think the safety analysis is complete.
14	And I think we ought to make a point of that.
15	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Thank you, Dennis. Well
16	said. Let me turn and just check, because I'm not
17	monitoring the sidebars. Steve Schultz, are you on
18	the line?
19	MR. SCHULTZ: I'm here.
20	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Steve, do you wish to
21	add anything? I lost him. I think we might have lost
22	him.
23	CHAIR SUNSERI: Steve, are you on mute?
24	Let's take a moment
25	MR. SCHULTZ: Can you hear me now?
1	1 I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I

(202) 234-4433

	81
1	CHAIR SUNSERI: Yes. Go ahead, Steve.
2	MR. SCHULTZ: All right. I just wanted to
3	follow-up with what Mike's last comment associated
4	with moving forward and Dennis' wrap-up associated
5	with what needs to be done with regard to procedures.
6	I do think the combination of the
7	approaches that Matt mentioned, and you, Walter,
8	mentioned, associated with ways in which the purple
9	box can be addressed ought to be filled out by the
10	committee in the letter in some fashion. Not
11	suggesting that be done but rather that there be
12	closure associated with identifying what needs to be
13	done there.
14	The impression I had from the most recent
15	meetings is that the, both the Applicant and the
16	Staff, in fact as Dennis said, are relying upon the
17	fact that they're not required to do the recovery
18	action portion until later.
19	In fact, they seem to rely too heavily on
20	what's going to happen with the Applicant later on.
21	Which is certainly, I think, bothersome.
22	Also, my impression is that the Staff and
23	the Applicant, in the audits that have been, I'll call
24	it one audit, but it's been months of activity that's
25	gone on here to address the issues that came up
	I

(202) 234-4433

	82
1	earlier this year.
2	And it was mentioned yesterday, at least
3	then, and before from the presentations we've had,
4	they've been having daily discussions associated with
5	these. And I can't believe in the Staff's forming
6	their engineering judgements and their overall
7	analyses and the Applicant's review of what they
8	presented.
9	There's been a lot of back and forth
10	associated with what approaches would be taken, should
11	be taken with regard to this. And yet it's not
12	documented.
13	I agree with the, I wish it was going to
14	be documented in the audit report but I don't think it
15	is going to be to the level that we would like to see.
16	So I think there is more work that needs to be done
17	there.
18	On the technical side, I think that we
19	ought to be able to, as Walter said, there are
20	methodologies that could be used. If not to draw a
21	definitive conclusion, to help move things along in
22	the right direction with understanding the issues,
23	technical issues, better on the core recovery side.
24	And I also think that there must be some
25	simple evaluations that can be done with regard to

(202) 234-4433

boron tracking that could help address some of the best estimate beliefs of where the boron in fact is in It's the system. not clear what's been done specifically, even given the modifications that have taken place to help with the boron mixing in the downcomer during operation. MEMBER BLEY: That's great. This is Dennis again. And Steve just jogged another jog on my memory. And it goes along with my last comment a bit about safety analysis not quite being done. Part 52, although it's been around for 40 years now, we have, we, the ACRS, the Staff and the Commission have very limited experience with Part 52. We've got a handful of design certs that have been spread over the years, we've got less than a handful of continuations toward the operating, combined license. And we're still early in making this thing work well. I think that needs to be on everybody's

minds. 20

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

MR. MOORE: Member Kirchner? 21 MEMBER REMPE: Next could I add on? 22 Or Walt, could I add on something into that comment. 23 24 MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yes, and then I detest the Executive Director, 25 Scott Moore, to wants

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

83

	84
1	interject something too. Go ahead, Joy, if it's
2	short.
3	MEMBER REMPE: So, your comment would
4	bring up a comment that Harold Ray said about it's
5	very, Part 52 was meant for a reactor that's been
6	built. And we so far, and my understanding is that we
7	don't know evolutionary designs.
8	Isn't this one, this is a bit more than a
9	traditional evolution, it's a new design. And if
10	others with dramatically different designs, it may be
11	stretching its applicability even more. Right?
12	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Is that a statement or
13	a question?
14	MEMBER REMPE: Well, it's a question that
15	I think is a statement, but it's just another thought.
16	MEMBER KIRCHNER: It's something, Joy,
17	would you hold that because that certainly would fit
18	into our observation's lessons learned letter. And
19	maybe, so we don't divert from today's focus area, if
20	you save that, think about it and we can add that to
21	our observation's lessons learned.
22	MEMBER REMPE: You bet.
23	CHAIR SUNSERI: Hey, Walt, this is Matt.
24	It's almost 1:30, I think we need to take a lunch
25	break here pretty soon so if you can find an

(202) 234-4433

	85
1	appropriate cutoff point
2	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I think this is the
3	appropriate time, but I thought I detected Scott
4	wanting to make a comment.
5	CHAIR SUNSERI: Okay. All right.
6	MR. MOORE: Yes, Chairman Kirchner. Steve
7	Schultz mentioned the audit and the audit report. And
8	as the Chairman mentioned, we've asked for the audit
9	report.
10	We also have some information about the
11	audit report. Including, we've heard some about what
12	will and won't be in it.
13	And the Committee may, since they've asked
14	the Staff to be here, may want to ask the Staff what
15	will and won't be included in the audit report. But
16	I'd ask that Mike Snodderly be recognized about when
17	we will receive the audit report.
18	CHAIR SUNSERI: Yes.
19	MR. MOORE: Mike.
20	CHAIR SUNSERI: Go ahead, Mike.
21	MR. SNODDERLY: Yes, so the Staff notified
22	me this morning that they're planning on providing the
23	audit report to the Committee on July 17th. So that's
24	seven days from now. Next Friday.
25	As I've been closely watching the
I	I

(202) 234-4433

86 1 interactions between the Staff and NuScale during the audit I have the audit plan. And I think it's 2 3 important to recognize that one of the most important 4 purposes, or what I saw that came out of the audits, 5 was assuring that there was sufficient material in the FSAR, which is as we all know is the licensing basis 6 7 for the plant not the FSAR. 8 And that resulted in three important 9 submittals. The May 20th submittal, the May 28th submittal, which was the supplemental response to RAI 10 89.30, and then a June 19th submittal. 11 And it was that additional material that 12 NuScale intended to address the boron distribution 13 14 issue. Redistribution issue. So I think the Committee should be focused 15 that that is the material and the analysis that 16 17 supports the Staff's FSAR. I expect the audit report, this is, again, 18 19 this is just my opinion of the expectations, that I believe that the report will just mainly, the audit 20 report will just document that they did do what the 21 plant said and here's the documents they looked at. 22 And then it probably, we've referenced the resulting 23 submittals. 24 25

But I do not expect for that audit report

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

	87
1	to have discussions of analyses and an audit where
2	(audio interference)
3	CHAIR SUNSERI: Mike, I think we're losing
4	your audio.
5	MR. SNODDERLY: I'm sorry, but I wanted to
6	just share my observations on the (audio interference)
7	
8	MR. MOORE: So I can pick up from Mike.
9	I think Mike was saying, we didn't expect a lot more
10	detail in the audit report based on what we were
11	hearing then what Mike just mentioned.
12	But since the Staff is here in this
13	discussion the Committee can always ask the Staff
14	about what's in the audit report. Which is not yet
15	final.
16	That's all we really had to say. When it
17	was coming in and what we're hearing about will be in
18	the audit report. Thank you.
19	MEMBER PETTI: So, Scott, just a question.
20	I mean, that was my sense even though we didn't fully
21	understand Mike.
22	It just seems to me that there was a lot
23	of discussion in the last day about this 89.30
24	supplement and many members couldn't find it. They
25	could find earlier responses that were titled 89.30.
	•

```
(202) 234-4433
```

	88
1	But if we could have Mike make sure the
2	supplement gets put in the right folder and share
3	point
4	MR. SNODDERLY: Can you hear me now? Can
5	you hear me?
6	MR. MOORE: Yes.
7	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yes, we can, Mike.
8	MR. SNODDERLY: Okay, thank you. Yes, so
9	if, it is, I will send the link to your email, but it
10	is there under the June 3rd meeting under NuScale
11	documents. So it's not under the May 20th submittal
12	because it came in afterwards but if you look under
13	the documents folder all three 89.30 responses are in
14	there, and the supplemental response from May 28th.
15	But I'll send out a link for you all to,
16	well, so you can find it. But it's all there.
17	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Hey, Walt, are we
18	going to come back to this discussion after the lunch
19	break or are you going to cut me off?
20	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Well, I was going to
21	test the Members quickly to see, obviously we're not
22	going to turn a letter around for you, the Committee
23	to review by the end of the lunch break, that's not
24	realistic or desirable I don't think.
25	So

(202) 234-4433

	89
1	(Simultaneous speaking.)
2	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yes, but
3	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Do you want to continue
4	
5	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: the schedule
6	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Jose, do you wish to
7	continue deliberations
8	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: There is very short
9	
10	MEMBER KIRCHNER: in the public forum?
11	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: There is a very short
12	point I wanted to make. It is my impression that Dr.
13	Yarsky's conclusions are being misquoted.
14	Because Pete and I are very good friends
15	and we talk with each other. And often we know what
16	the other one is going to say and where they're not
17	saying it.
18	So I would like to explain to you what
19	actually Peter Yarsky said about the \$20 insertion
20	into the core. And maybe we have him, he can explain
21	to us what he meant. Because he's being misquoted.
22	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Okay. If we can do it
23	quickly then, because I think, wait a minute, let me
24	do a check with the Chairman.
25	CHAIR SUNSERI: Yes
	I

(202) 234-4433

	90
1	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Matt?
2	CHAIR SUNSERI: let's hold that for
3	after lunch because
4	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Okay.
5	CHAIR SUNSERI: it can only lead to
6	more discussion I think.
7	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Right.
8	CHAIR SUNSERI: And we've been at this a
9	long time. It's already 1:30 there on the east coast,
10	we need to give people a rest so they can have lunch.
11	And that would be my recommendation.
12	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Okay. Let's take the
13	break. And I just ask my colleagues, I've been taking
14	notes. I had a lot of good input.
15	If you have suggestions on, and directions
16	or input for this letter that we will pull together,
17	maybe we can collect that and then come up with a
18	tentative schedule, Matt, for us, a subset of us to go
19	off and pull together a letter for us.
20	CHAIR SUNSERI: Right. I think by the end
21	of the day, I think by the end of the day it would be
22	almost critical that we end up with a list of pretty
23	specific topics that are going to be included in the,
24	that we have consensus on to be addressed in the
25	report.
	1

(202) 234-4433

	91
1	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Right.
2	CHAIR SUNSERI: An outline essentially.
3	And then we can go fill in the details, the writers
4	can go fill in the details offline.
5	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Okay. Thank you.
6	MR. MOORE: And just to ask, we do want
7	the court reporter back after lunch, correct?
8	CHAIR SUNSERI: I think so, Scott. Yes.
9	MR. MOORE: Okay, thank you.
10	MEMBER REMPE: Could I ask about tomorrow?
11	What's, are we going to still try and do something
12	tomorrow too or do we know that yet?
13	CHAIR SUNSERI: If we can get to our
14	consensus on this outline by the end of the day that
15	will be the end of this week's meeting, so no session
16	tomorrow.
17	MEMBER REMPE: Thank you.
18	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yes, I concur, Matt. I
19	really think we need the time to do, offline, to do
20	this.
21	MEMBER BLEY: Quick question for Matt or
22	Scott, or somebody. Do we have any idea how expedited
23	this transcript will be because I think this is
24	important for us to have in hand as we finish this
25	stuff up?
1	

(202) 234-4433

	92
1	CHAIR SUNSERI: I understand it would be
2	three days.
3	MR. MOORE: At least
4	MEMBER BLEY: That would be fabulous. And
5	if Mike would get it to all of us right away I think
6	that would be helpful.
7	CHAIR SUNSERI: Alicia, can you confirm
8	that? I was told three days.
9	MR. MOORE: Yes, that's my understanding
10	too.
11	CHAIR SUNSERI: Yes, okay.
12	MR. SNODDERLY: I'm sorry, was I just
13	committed to something? I was, I lost myself.
14	MR. MOORE: No, just distributing the
15	transcript as soon as we get it.
16	MR. SNODDERLY: Oh. Oh, of course. Of
17	course. Yes, understood. And yes, my understanding
18	is that an expedited transcript is three days.
19	CHAIR SUNSERI: Okay, anything else before
20	we recess for lunch? All right
21	MEMBER BALLINGER: Are we back in open
22	session?
23	CHAIR SUNSERI: We'll come back in open
24	session at 2:30 eastern. Okay. So we are recessed
25	until 2:30 eastern. Thank you all.

(202) 234-4433

	93
1	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
2	off the record at 1:39 p.m. and resumed at 2:30 p.m.)
3	CHAIR SUNSERI: Okay. This is Matt
4	Sunseri. It is 2:30, and let's start with a roll
5	call. Ron Ballinger?
6	MEMBER BALLINGER: Here.
7	CHAIR SUNSERI: Dennis Bley? Was that
8	Dennis?
9	(No audible response.)
10	CHAIR SUNSERI: Vesna Dimitrijevic?
11	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Here.
12	CHAIR SUNSERI: Walt Kirchner?
13	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Here.
14	CHAIR SUNSERI: Jose March-Leuba?
15	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I am here.
16	CHAIR SUNSERI: Dave Petti?
17	MEMBER PETTI: Here.
18	CHAIR SUNSERI: Joy Rempe?
19	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Here.
20	CHAIR SUNSERI: Pete Riccardella?
21	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Here.
22	CHAIR SUNSERI: Dennis Bley?
23	(No audible response.)
24	CHAIR SUNSERI: Last call for Dennis.
25	(No audible response.)

	94
1	CHAIR SUNSERI: Okay. We do have a
2	quorum, and we will reconvene. Remember we're on the
3	transcript. And I'm going to before we begin
4	restart the deliberation on the report preparation, I
5	want to just say I was remiss for not giving NRC staff
6	a chance to make a comment earlier today. So I'm
7	going to call on Anna Bradford at this point for her
8	comment or statement.
9	MS. BRADFORD: Yes, thank you. Can you
10	confirm you can hear me?
11	CHAIR SUNSERI: Yes, Anna. We can hear
12	you.
13	MS. BRADFORD: Thank you very much. So I
14	appreciate the conversation earlier today and allowing
15	the staff to listen in. There's a lot really good
16	points. I just wanted to bring up a couple, I will
17	say, process thoughts that I had while you were
18	deliberating.
19	And one was someone had raised the idea of
20	a carve out for this issue. And I just wanted to let
21	you know this is really not a candidate for a carve
22	out. A carve out is a very, I'll say, specific
23	regulatory tool that can be used in certain
24	circumstances, and this is not one of those
25	circumstances.
	I contract of the second se

(202) 234-4433

I say that because the regulations do not 1 2 require that the applicant give us or show us any kind 3 of procedures for recovery at the design cert stage. 4 So a carve out is when we say we cannot give them 5 regulatory finality on some regulation that is required for a design certification. That's not the 6 So I just don't want you guys to start 7 case here. 8 thinking, okay, we'll say this should be a carve out, 9 because that's really not an open path for the staff 10 to use that regulatory tool.

In addition, the discussion about revising 11 the SE, I would have to think about how we would 12 revise the SE because, again, the SE as it is right 13 14 now shows that we believe we have reasonable assurance 15 against the regulations. And that argument is laid 16 out there in the SE. So again, I'm not sure how we 17 would revise the SE in accordance with what you quys were talking about earlier today. I'm not saying it 18 19 can't be done. I'm just struggling with what that would be since, like I said, we were already making 20 our regulatory findings against the regulations. 21

And my last thought is there seems to be some discomfort, I'll say, with the idea of leaving some things to the COL stage. And I mean, as you all know, the fact is that is allowed. There's a lot of

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

95

96 important things that are left to the COL stage that are not necessarily resolved at the DC stage. 2 Reasonable people can disagree on where that line should be, what should be in the DC, what should be in the COL. We talk about it all the time. Industry asks about it all the time. But with this particular issue, it's pretty clear that it's not

8 required at the DC stage. I will just mention there's 9 a lot of -- someone mentioned that maybe the Part 52 10 isn't quite meant -- or maybe doesn't fit exactly for evolutionary designs. 11

And I will say that there are some light 12 water SMR designers that are thinking about coming in, 13 14 in the next few years under Part 50 and asking for, first, a construction permit and then an operating 15 16 license. And the level of detail and design that we 17 qet at the construction permit stage is going to be much less than we're seeing now at the DC stage. This 18 19 is going to be an ongoing conversation in terms of, what do we need to make reasonable assurance finding 20 at these various stages of licensing? 21 So that's all I really wanted to say. 22 It was just to point out that this is -- our approach is 23

The Committee can certainly reasonable assurance.

allowed under the regulations. We think we found

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

24

25

1

3

4

5

6

7

	97
1	disagree with that. If you have suggestions on what
2	the staff needs to do within the bounds that it has to
3	address that in your letter, I mean, that would be
4	much appreciated by us. That's all I wanted to say.
5	Thank you for the opportunity.
6	CHAIR SUNSERI: Thank you.
7	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Can I ask a question
8	from Anna?
9	CHAIR SUNSERI: It's really I mean, if
10	it's a question of clarification, I will grant it.
11	But we're not going to debate.
12	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: It's a clarification.
13	It's not a debate.
14	CHAIR SUNSERI: Okay.
15	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Okay. Anna, if,
16	during your review, you had reason to believe that the
17	risk in terms of core damage frequency reported in the
18	FSAR was incorrect and the applicant had not provided
19	any calculation or justification for a number of
20	accidents that are postulated certainly by me and by
21	one of your members, would that rise to the level of
22	high carveout? Because you don't have any reason to
23	believe that the deboration events don't read to
24	significant risk to the core.
25	MS. BRADFORD: So I think this is another
	1

(202) 234-4433

ĺ	98
1	thing that might fall into a gray area that could be
2	discussed. There are some things that are so
3	fundamental to the design that you can't really even
4	carve it out and still approve this, right? I mean,
5	so if we didn't have the, like you were saying, maybe
6	important information about the core or we didn't have
7	the design of the containment or something like that,
8	that's hard to carve out and still approve the design
9	as a whole. So whether
10	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: But this
11	MS. BRADFORD: what you were mentioning
12	falls into that, I don't know. I don't know that we
13	necessarily had those discussions, and it's hard to
14	talk about what if type scenarios like that.
15	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: My concern, and I
16	don't want to get into an argument, is it's not the
17	procedures. It's that there will be operator errors
18	of commission which will start CFDS after the
19	downcomer will deborate. And you decide what the
20	probability of those things are. Those things are not
21	in the risk analysis. You're missing a big chunk.
22	And one member of your staff believes it's seven
23	orders of magnitude larger than what they published on
24	the FSAR.
25	CHAIR SUNSERI: Okay. We understand your
	I contraction of the second

(202) 234-4433

	99
1	point, Jose. We're not going to I think we should
2	save those kind of questions for Committee
3	deliberation, not going back to the staff.
4	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Matt, could I ask a
5	question?
6	CHAIR SUNSERI: Yes.
7	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: This is Pete. So
8	Anna, short of a carve out, is there some other way
9	that we can flag this to make sure that it's
10	considered a very important item that needs to be
11	addressed and make sure it doesn't
12	(Simultaneous speaking.)
13	CHAIR SUNSERI: I understand what you're
14	saying. Yeah, I understand what you're saying, Pete.
15	And maybe some other members may correct me on this,
16	but let me just very high level philosophically
17	discuss what I'm about to say. So clearly, the staff
18	is bound by the regulations and that's their charter
19	to go look at the regulations in depth as they are
20	written and apply that to the application that is
21	before and make the reasonable assurance
22	determination.
23	I'm going to make a broad leap here and
24	just say Congress in its wisdom recognized that maybe
25	all regulations couldn't be written so prescriptively
1	I contract of the second se

(202) 234-4433

that they would always ensure safety. So they created an independent Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards for us to look at the results of the safety evaluation that's being produced by the staff and come to our independent conclusions. We don't write the SER. We don't tell the staff how to do their business.

We review their work and we fill in the 8 9 gaps where we see potential safety issues. We write 10 those up in our letters, and that's how we do it. So it, your point is, yes, we can point out where we 11 think there are safety significant issues that need to 12 be addressed before a final license is granted, or 13 14 maybe even a DCA. But we'll have to figure out what that message is and then we'll it in our letter. 15

16 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: So you're saying our 17 letter in itself is a way to flag it?

18 CHAIR SUNSERI: Our letter goes -- it is19 part of the rule.

20 MEMBER KIRCHNER: It's a crucial part of 21 our function, Pete. And I have had in the last few 22 days input and contact from people I haven't heard 23 from for years. So these proceedings are actually 24 being paid attention to. An ACRS letter does have 25 impact.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

	101
1	CHAIR SUNSERI: I hope that addressed your
2	question, Pete.
3	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: It does.
4	CHAIR SUNSERI: Okay. Thank you. Any
5	other members have anything they want to add at this
6	point?
7	(No audible response.)
8	CHAIR SUNSERI: All right. Thank you,
9	all. And I will now turn the floor over to Walt for
10	a continuation of the report preparation.
11	MEMBER KIRCHNER: So colleagues, what I
12	would like to do is capture your major comments. I
13	was not able to do justice to taking notes and also
14	participate in the meeting. So Sandra is standing by.
15	We had some very good input.
16	What I would like to do in this open forum
17	is just capture any major items that you feel the
18	letter should address, and we can do this in
19	shorthand, perhaps cryptic form. And we will collect
20	those, and then a smaller group will take this
21	information and ensure that we reflect in a draft
22	letter on the topic of boron dilution. So with that,
23	I hesitate to put people on the spot. Dennis, are you
24	there?
25	(No audible response.)

(202) 234-4433

	102
1	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I know we missed him
2	because he had several salient comments. Well, let me
3	just go them through the roster. Ron Ballinger, what,
4	if any, major comments or input do you want to see
5	reflected in this letter?
6	MEMBER BALLINGER: I think the I think
7	other people are going to say the same thing. But I
8	would like to be sure that in the letter, we stress
9	that there needs to be a well identified recovery
10	path. I'm not sure what well means, but you get my
11	point, I think.
12	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Okay. Let's see.
13	MEMBER BALLINGER: That's it.
14	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Go ahead. I'm just
15	I'm doing this from memory, so bear with me while I go
16	through the roster. Dennis, are you on the line?
17	(No audible response.)
18	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Does anyone want to take
19	a stab at Dennis' earlier comments? What I remember
20	
21	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Walt, can I help you?
22	MEMBER KIRCHNER: that the FSAR and the
23	SER were really not clear in identifying this
24	particular issue.
25	CHAIR SUNSERI: Hey, Walt, I think
	I contract of the second s

(202) 234-4433

	103
1	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Walt
2	CHAIR SUNSERI: Joy has some
3	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Go ahead, Joy.
4	VICE CHAIR REMPE: I actually took the
5	notes on that session and put them on Jose's thing
6	because I wanted to make sure we got it. But it was
7	the guidance about
8	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Okay.
9	VICE CHAIR REMPE: not having to
10	identify recovery. The staff is just following the
11	regulations, and it's not required that they have to
12	identify that, right?
13	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yeah, the part I
14	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Is that what you think
15	he said?
16	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: The part I liked
17	about Dennis' talk earlier and I wish he was here.
18	Maybe we should wait for him. He said that for normal
19	reactors, you end up in a safe and stable condition
20	and there's a clear path to get out of it. Here, we
21	don't. And it is a tricky path, especially for some
22	failures, and that's what he said, that
23	(Simultaneous speaking.)
24	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yeah, I think he was
25	getting at suggesting go ahead, Jose. Sorry.
l	1

(202) 234-4433

	104
1	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yeah, this is not the
2	same situation.
3	(Simultaneous speaking.)
4	MEMBER KIRCHNER: He's suggesting the
5	completeness of the Chapter 15 analysis. If you come
6	out of a Chapter 15 analysis to most reactor in the
7	existing fleet and such, when you do those Chapter 15
8	analyses, and all of us have been involved in them in
9	one way or other, usually let me make up something
10	on the spot. You reflood the core. You're done,
11	right? And the event is terminated. You've reached
12	the safe, stable condition.
13	Here what I note was, for example, and the
14	applicant did a good job. They were able to point out
15	that the core was very well borated. So that was one
16	of their, if you will, not only was the core covered,
17	the SAFDLs were not violated. And there was actually
18	a higher concentration of boron than at shut down or
19	when the transient was initiated.
20	But it begs the question, is that set of
21	metrics completed? Because, again, I come back to the
22	staff's presentation yesterday where for the DHRS
23	system performance, they demonstrated that there was
24	significant margin above critical boron concentration
25	in the downcomer at 72 hours after those DHRS event
1	I Contraction of the second

(202) 234-4433

1 paths, both at beginning of core and BOC and -- sorry, beginning of cycle, I misspoke, and middle of cycle 2 3 with good margin. It just begged the question of me 4 that why don't we see that for the post-ECCS of boron 5 dilution because it would suggest that you could 6 analyze the trajectory of the event after ECCS 7 injection and look at the boron dilution of time. 8 And at some point -- and it will vary with 9 the event analyzed. But basically, you'll see that the boron concentration is diluted. 10 And at some point, you're at some level above critical boron 11 concentration for the core inlet. And it suggests at 12 least to me that's a trigger point. 13 You better 14 intervene. 15 But we didn't see that. We only saw it 16 for the successful path that addressed the design 17 changes that were made that included the set points and the holes in the riser, et cetera. So I think 18 19 Dennis was hinting at the fact that --CHAIR SUNSERI: Hey, Walt. Dennis is on 20 the line now, I believe. 21 All right. 22 MEMBER KIRCHNER: Now I'll stop talking. Dennis, I was trying to reconstruct 23 24 your input from this morning about the FSAR and FSER

not having the visibility on this matter. And I think

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

25

(202) 234-4433

105

5 MEMBER BLEY: Yeah, I thought I did more The history of our regulations and how we 6 than hint. 7 address these things really evolve over many years. 8 And I think the staff is over-reading their guidance. 9 I think whatever -- and I haven't looked up the 10 quidance on this point. I think whatever guidance they have that says, you stop once everything is 11 initially stable, is historically based on the fact 12 that at that point, hands off and almost any hands on, 13 14 you're going to take it back to a normal condition.

15 This is an unstable point, at least as far as we know because nobody has done the analysis to 16 prove it's not. And therefore, I don't see that it's 17 -- because it's recovery, it belongs in the next phase 18 19 of licensing. By the way, Part 52, it's this the sixth or seventh exercise of it. If you're on Part 20 50, you wouldn't be putting things off. 21 You'd be selling them on the spot. And I think this one that 22 most of the designers of this process have said, no, 23 24 we aren't there yet. Let's finish this analysis.

CHAIR SUNSERI: So Dennis, what Walt has

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

25

1

2

3

4
	107
1	been doing is we have a white sheet of paper up on the
2	screen there, and Sandra is recording the key points.
3	So do you want to summarize for Walt and Sandra what
4	that message is so she can capture it on this piece of
5	paper?
6	MEMBER BLEY: Okay. Let me try. And this
7	is something I think Walt, Vesna, and I and Jose
8	talked about some weeks ago is that we think I
9	think completion let's go, Sandra completion of
10	the analysis in Chapter 15
11	MS. WALKER: I'm sorry. For some reason,
12	the audio kept breaking up.
13	MEMBER BLEY: Oh, sorry. Completion
14	can you hear me? I'll call in on the phone if this
15	isn't working. It's worked up till now.
16	CHAIR SUNSERI: I can hear you, Dennis.
17	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yeah, you sound good.
18	MEMBER BLEY: Completion of the Chapter 15
19	analysis for events involving long-term deboration of
20	the downcomer should have a path to instead of to,
21	through recovery explained in the DCA, something like
22	that. Anybody is free to fiddle with it.
23	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Good. Thank you,
24	Dennis.
25	MEMBER BLEY: Not only are you free to
	I contract of the second se

(202) 234-4433

108 1 fiddle with it, I don't know if everyone agrees with this point. But it seems clear to me that you don't 2 3 leave yourself tottering on the tip of a cone. 4 CHAIR SUNSERI: Just for clarity, what 5 Walt's trying -- and you were on the first part. Walt's just trying to capture everybody's main points, 6 7 and then we'll go through and get consensus on these 8 things. And they don't have to be perfect because 9 we've got the transcript but just enough information there so we know what it is and not forgetting about 10 it. That's kind of the theme of this exercise we're 11 going through. 12 VICE CHAIR REMPE: So could I note that 13 14 when you try to introduce this point, Dennis, a few 15 minutes ago, you also mentioned that the quidance or 16 the regulation may not be appropriate at this point 17 for this more evolutionary design or something. You're going to have to say it better than me. But I 18 19 think that that's an important point you raised that I think ought to be covered in the letter because 20 Anna, and maybe you missed it, had said it's what the 21 regulations say. Anna Bradford made a comment at the 22 beginning of meeting, and I think you may have missed 23 24 that part too. (Simultaneous speaking.) 25

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

109
MEMBER BLEY: I missed the first minute.
CHAIR SUNSERI: We'll have the transcript.
We can go back and look at his exact words, what he
said. We don't have to capture it all right here.
But if you want, just put a note for what the point is
and then we can do that.
VICE CHAIR REMPE: Guidance or regulation
may need to be modified or something like that, just
something about we understand why the staff did what
they did.
MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: If I may say so, that
last statement should be a third bullet and really the
first and second are the same concept.
MEMBER KIRCHNER: Jose, yeah, we could
just keep them for now.
MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Okay.
MEMBER KIRCHNER: Offline, we can condense
and make sure we capture everything.
CHAIR SUNSERI: So once Dennis is done,
the next member would be Vesna.
MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yeah, Vesna, you had
I know you have something you said perhaps written
down. But if you could just summarize it, we
certainly can collect from all members any input
offline. But for this purpose

(202) 234-4433

	110
1	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Yeah, this will be
2	difficult to dictate. So I'm just going to summarize
3	and then I mean, I have it written on my piece of
4	paper. I will start putting it in the vote, but I'm
5	not finished. So then I will send you the file.
6	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Summarize here and it
7	will
8	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: So main summary here
9	is the Chapter 19 on multiple places, thanks to Jose,
10	we have stated that we cannot make conclusions. And
11	the risk is properly identified and the safety goal is
12	met. And we cannot conclude the design is safe until
13	this boron thing is addressed, right? Everybody
14	remembers that, right?
15	(Simultaneous speaking.)
16	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: So therefore, the
17	question is, how can we close the Chapter 19 if we
18	cannot really after this discussion say, oh, this is
19	not a risk concern? I don't think at this moment we
20	are ready to say this is not a risk concern. The main
21	of these things is because also the same thing, the
22	beginning of this meeting that we're going to clearly
23	identify scenarios leading to this boron power
24	excursion.
25	So I don't think we have succeeded in that
	1 I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I

(202) 234-4433

	111
1	either because those scenarios are not in this moment
2	clearly identified, at least not from my point of view
3	that I can feel comfortable that they don't present
4	significant risk concerns. I don't think that the
5	risk is as high as presented yesterday to us because
6	there is so many assumptions there that may be
7	questionable. The one other thing is the the one
8	important thing is for how long it takes to get in
9	this. What does it mean, prolong? How long is that?
10	And the second thing is, how would
11	operator make this error of commission? Is that
12	sabotage event? Does he have got the wrong
13	indication? Why would an operator when he has
14	successfully since he had decided to start, for
15	example, charging?
16	So then we haven't alternatively addressed
17	or discussed this operator action in order to estimate
18	how likely that action is or not likely. I mean, if
19	he wants to sabotage, he can withdraw the rods. I
20	mean, why would he do it? So then Jose's point is
21	then he tries to go in the different mode of
22	operation, the change the state, that he will be
23	instructed or required to do that. But we don't
24	really have operating procedures how to shut down or
25	in this moment. So we cannot deliberate what he's
l	1 I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

	112
1	doing.
2	So therefore, in this moment, you cannot
3	really estimate how likely is the operator to make
4	this settle for this most likely state. That state,
5	there is so many things in there, and PRA scenarios
6	which have not been addressed. One of those is, for
7	example, if we have a charging break outside of
8	containment. Then the operator will definitely should
9	start.
10	After the ECCS operation and everything
11	goes, operator will start containment flooding and
12	drain system. And that could happen after prolonged
13	ECCS operation. Now I the PRA presentation, it will
14	say that the injection in this case is very low and
15	would not change. But we cannot see any relation of
16	that.
17	Also, this is happening not in ATWS
18	scenario. So this is happening in the all-rods-in
19	scenario. And this is a very important question for
20	me. What is a rod seam because having one rod out is
21	already getting your sequencing where the for rod four
22	orders of magnitude down.
23	So I just want to say that we have not
24	really defined scenarios. Definitely, there is no
25	support. The most the LOCA, I've been very
l	1

(202) 234-4433

impressed with Pete, that it's all defined for small LOCA and rod-out.

And the thing is that I don't think at 3 4 this moment I have enough conclusion to say that Chapter 19 agrees that this is a low risk with a big 5 matching to the safety goals. 6 And then we have 7 identified all risk in sight. And without discovering 8 recovery actions or the actions which can get us into 9 trouble, we cannot even -- in the Chapter 19, the 10 first table says that important risk inside should be identified. And for example, I has a section on human 11 actions. Also, the human actions is important for the 12 risk should be identified. 13

However, in the text of Chapter 19, it clearly says there is no important human actions. There is no action of commission to be considered. We have been complaining about that from the different reasons. But when it comes to this boron, obviously is Chapter 19 acceptable with the statements they make?

So my point is that what we wrote in the Chapter 19 letter, I'm not sure we can close in this moment with the information which we have. And I'm interested what other members think about how do we proceed from now. But I will put a lot of those

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

(202) 234-4433

113

114 1 things in the statement and then we can -- you guys can consider them. 2 So Vesna, 3 MEMBER PETTI: Ι have а 4 question. Are you saying -- you say we, so I'm a 5 little confused. Are you saying that the PRA missed sequences of the kind that we are talking about --6 7 that we've been talking about? 8 MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: No, what I'm saying 9 the sequences in the PRA exist, but they only --10 success criteria is only make up, not the reactivity They just consider are they on time to 11 excursion. cover the core, not the boron and the reactivity 12 They're not considered in any of those 13 insertions. 14 scenarios. MEMBER PETTI: So the phenomenology behind 15 the risk assessment --16 17 MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Yes. MEMBER PETTI: -- is not correct? 18 19 MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: And I don't know if it's correct. If this is -- if boron is not an issue, 20 then it's correct. 21 Right, right. 22 MEMBER PETTI: So it 23 MEMBER KIRCHNER: may not be 24 complete. MEMBER PETTI: Right. And I'm just trying 25

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

	115
1	to figure out how to characterize that in my mind,
2	yeah. Thanks.
3	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: So from that
4	perspective, actually if you control F boron dilution
5	in the Chapter 19, you will only find the very short
6	discussion about the deborated water, some simple
7	things. But no boron not any or no discussion at
8	all about this downcomer boron dilution.
9	MEMBER BLEY: And the things we heard
10	discussed this week aren't documented in the normal
11	place.
12	CHAIR SUNSERI: So Vesna, I have a
13	question.
14	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: We need to capture
15	that.
16	CHAIR SUNSERI: In my mind go ahead.
17	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: No, go ahead, Matt.
18	Finish it. But what I was saying is we need to
19	capture. There were two or three concepts, and we
20	need to capture them in bullets. And then both of
21	them or whatever, we'll write a letter. So I heard
22	there were two concepts. One is the boron dilution
23	topic is not properly captured in the PRA. This
24	dilution issue or topic is not properly captured in
25	the PRA.
1	

(202) 234-4433

116 1 MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Well, Jose, what means properly? I mean, it's not captured. 2 (Simultaneous speaking.) 3 4 MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Okay. 5 MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: What do you mean 6 properly? 7 MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yeah. Sandra, please 8 delete --9 MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Right now, we don't 10 have it properly to capture that. MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Please delete 11 12 properly. MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: And because that's 13 14 a red box in Dave's diagram. So I don't know. Can it 15 be properly? Let me ask you something, Jose, because 16 I wanted to ask you that. Is this -- the prolong ECCS dilution, is this also an issue if all rods are in? 17 I mean --18 19 MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yes, yes. MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: -- the dilution is 20 going to happen, but can you add enough reactivity to 21 qet in trouble? 22 MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yes. What I --23 MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Even if all rods are 24 in? 25

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

	117
1	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Even with all rods
2	are in, you will get critical. What I don't know
3	because a calculation has not been performed is if the
4	power will be high enough to cause damage to the core
5	because the calculation has not been performed. But
6	the reactor will go critical, yes.
7	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Pete has said in his
8	paper that even with one rod out, he will not go
9	critical. So now the question is
10	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: And that's why I said
11	earlier before lunchtime I think he's being misquoted.
12	But we'll talk about that whenever Walt wants to talk
13	about it.
14	MR. LU: Yes, we have his white paper and
15	we can use that as a reference.
16	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yeah, but the white
17	paper is being misunderstood.
18	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Well, he has stated
19	that in his conclusions on Chapter 36, he said that
20	Doppler feedback, blah, blah, blah, that there will
21	not be any damage from the excessive energy
22	disposition.
23	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Okay. I disagree
24	with that statement.
25	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: I know, but this is
	I contraction of the second

(202) 234-4433

	118
1	another assumption that one rod is out, so
2	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Since we're talking
3	about this, Pete has not a single calculation to
4	support what you guys have said.
5	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Well, now let's ask
6	another question. How about the delay ECCS actuation?
7	Is there also, you think, enough criticality can be
8	added, because that's happened in that accident is the
9	all rods are in.
10	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: We can talk offline.
11	I haven't thought about that one. Critical delay ECCS
12	actuation means less deboration. But you have to tell
13	the specific transient.
14	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: I will try to put
15	these things in the you are also aware that I
16	mean, I noticed you discussing this containment flood
17	and drain multiple times. You are aware that there is
18	actually scenario which is assume to lead to success.
19	When we have a break outside containment in charging
20	lines, so charging is not going to be insulated. Is
21	that operator still instructed to start containment
22	flood and drain after some time? That timing is not
23	defined in the PRA or in HRA, but it comes after
24	prolonged ECCS operation in my opinion.
25	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I am willing, ready,
	1

(202) 234-4433

	119
1	and able to have an offline meeting with you. And you
2	ask me what your transient is, and I'll tell you what
3	I think happens. But right now, I haven't thought
4	about that one, so I don't have an answer.
5	MEMBER BLEY: This is Dennis. May I
6	interrupt the process question for Matt?
7	CHAIR SUNSERI: Yes, go ahead, Dennis.
8	MEMBER BLEY: Or Walt, I'm not sure who
9	this goes to. In two weeks, we're going to have
10	another meeting ostensibly to get three letters out.
11	But at least for me, the Dr. Lu paper and Peter
12	Yarsky's paper, I really can't say I've studied those
13	to the point that I'm comfortable drawing any
14	conclusions from them. I'm hoping we're planning at
15	least a half of day meeting back with the staff and
16	the applicant to discuss any issues we have been we
17	try to complete the letter. Is that true?
18	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Well, we haven't asked
19	them to make any formal presentations, Dennis. But
20	should the as a result of this process, if we feel
21	we need to request through Scott of support from the
22	staff and/or the applicant, I think we can do that.
23	So
24	MEMBER BLEY: Well, I just
25	CHAIR SUNSERI: I agree, Walt. What I
	1

(202) 234-4433

	120
1	would suggest here is we get through the list of
2	things and then we identify where we feel like there's
3	holes in our knowledge that would be enhanced or
4	whatever, how you want to say it.
5	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Right, right. For the
6	presentations.
7	CHAIR SUNSERI: And be very specific on
8	what we want from them. I mean, that's where I would
9	go with it.
10	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yes. Is that fair
11	enough, Dennis?
12	MEMBER BLEY: Yes.
13	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yeah, because I just
14	don't want to just say, oh, we want presentations
15	again from the staff and the applicant, without the
16	specificity that Matt's referring to.
17	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Walt, just to wrap
18	it up, I don't think it's my job to make conclusion
19	that this is not a risk I can have more days to try
20	to estimate this. But that shouldn't be my job. The
21	main thing is the PRA made the point.
22	It says, in their opinion, the boron
23	dilution of downcomer is not a risk issue, period. So
24	now the only question is we can at least their
25	conclusions which I was trying to do and then say, do

(202) 234-4433

	121
1	we have enough to conclude that they made the right
2	conclusions? That's it. I mean, they have made
3	conclusions that this is not a risk issue in the
4	Chapter 19. Okay. That's it.
5	CHAIR SUNSERI: So Walt, if I were
6	following alphabetical order, you would be next. But
7	since you're the Chair
8	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I'm going to pass, yeah.
9	CHAIR SUNSERI: you should go last so
10	as to not to unduly influence with the power of the
11	position, huh? How's that sound?
12	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yes. What power of
13	position? Okay. I think Jose is next.
14	CHAIR SUNSERI: We'll go to Jose next,
15	yes.
16	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Okay. Sandra, I
17	apologize. You're going to have to type a lot because
18	I have a five-page document I'm going to try to
19	summarize it in few words. So Sandra, are you ready?
20	Type, the design modifications solved the issue of
21	solve, like in resolve. Okay. Solve the issue of
22	uncontrolled passive cooling and late ECCS actuation.
23	MS. WALKER: I'm sorry, Jose. I missed
24	that.
25	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yeah. So self
1	I construction of the second se

(202) 234-4433

	122
1	control is uncontrolled, U-N controlled, lack of
2	control, uncontrolled, uncontrolled. We know anyway.
3	No. Type where you are. Type, late ECCS actuation.
4	I think we know what we mean.
5	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yeah.
6	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Go to the next one.
7	Next not accusation. Okay. We know what we mean.
8	Okay. Keep typing. Next bullet. The design
9	modifications actuation. Are you ready? The design
10	modifications do not prevent and type upper case DC
11	for downcomer, D-C, deboration. Okay.
12	And can you move backwards? It shouldn't
13	say, do not prevent. Say, do not completely prevent.
14	Next bullet. The applicant and the staff argue that
15	no mechanism exists to drive deborated DC water into
16	the core. Deborated, D-E-B-O-R okay. Unborated,
17	say unborated. Okay. It's good. Deborated water
18	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Jose? Jose?
19	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: into the core.
20	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Jose, I don't think they
21	quite say that. They kind of say
22	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: We'll argue that
23	after I type it, and we will
24	(Simultaneous speaking.)
25	MEMBER KIRCHNER: All right. All right.
	I

(202) 234-4433

	123
1	But I'm just trying to be factual. I'm not trying to
2	debate positions. Okay.
3	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Deborated water into
4	the core and cause damage, period. We believe no,
5	don't put believe. Can you delete that, please? No
6	calculations support this statement. All right.
7	That's good. Let's move to the next. I will skip
8	recovery because we already covered it.
9	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Jose, would you let me
10	just make a suggestion?
11	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yes, sir.
12	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I know where you're
13	going with that previous bullet. They actually do
14	look at it's the latter part of your bullet that's
15	operative here. They don't believe that they would
16	experience any core damage. I don't think they ever
17	said that no deborated water would find
18	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Walt
19	MEMBER KIRCHNER: its way to the core.
20	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: how about if you
21	put the word, significant, before deborated?
22	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yeah, I thought
23	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Would exist to drive
24	
25	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: what I typed
1	I contract of the second se

(202) 234-4433

	124
1	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: significant
2	amounts of deborated water into the core.
3	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yeah.
4	(Simultaneous speaking.)
5	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I mean, in my
6	statement, I was saying that no mechanism exists to
7	inject sufficient deborated water into the core to
8	cause damage.
9	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Yeah, there you go.
10	There you go.
11	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: That's what I was
12	(Simultaneous speaking.)
13	MEMBER KIRCHNER: That's better. That's
14	better because they did look at it. We need to be
15	factual.
16	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: On the next line, can
17	you instead of say, and cause damage, can you say, to
18	cause damage? After core, instead of, and cause
19	damage, say, to cause damage on the last line.
20	MS. WALKER: I'm sorry. On the last line?
21	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yeah. On the fifth
22	one, on the last line, it says, water into the core
23	and cause damage.
24	MS. WALKER: Okay.
25	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: It should say, water
	I contraction of the second

(202) 234-4433

	125
1	into the core to cause damage.
2	MS. WALKER: Okay, sorry.
3	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Hey, take a little
4	break. Can you go into layout and put line numbers?
5	So that way, we can tell you where to go. All right.
6	New paragraph, line 23. No instrumentation exists to
7	measure boron redistribution, period. The existing
8	instrumentation no, no, the same paragraph. The
9	existing instrumentation may not be operable under
10	ECCS conditions, under, under. You know what I'm
11	doing. This is just a reminder.
12	New paragraph. The void reactivity
13	coefficient the void, V-O-I-D, bubbles, bubbles,
14	reactivity coefficient has not been calculated,
15	period. These conditions are an unusual geometry, and
16	the possibility of a positive coefficient the
17	possibility of a positive being greater than zero
18	positive coefficient cannot be discarded without a
19	calculation.
20	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Jose, while this
21	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yes.
22	MEMBER KIRCHNER: being typed, just an
23	observation. I know this is not our final letter.
24	I've learned over the years to not use no, never, or
25	all. Instrumentation does exist, but I'll let this

(202) 234-4433

	126
1	pass for the time being. I know the point you're
2	trying to make.
3	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Boron redistribution
4	will require multiple locations to measure the boron.
5	We only have one
6	MEMBER KIRCHNER: But we're saying
7	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: that one doesn't
8	work.
9	MEMBER KIRCHNER: here no
10	instrumentation exists. And there is only
11	unfortunately, only one-point sample, if it's
12	operable.
13	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yeah, yeah. Sandra,
14	on Line 23, can you say, no effective instrumentation
15	exists on Line 23?
16	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I'm not going to debate
17	these, Jose. I just wanted for the record to make it
18	clear that we're just capturing thoughts here. This
19	is not a final statement or position by the Committee
20	by any means.
21	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: All right. Sandra,
22	final paragraph and you're almost done with me. Yeah,
23	type, Chapter 19 of the SER states that CFDS F-D-S
24	operation is not a risk concern, period. No
25	calculation is provided to support it.
I	

(202) 234-4433

	127
1	Instead of is, can you say, has been on
2	the other line, 29? No calculation has been provided.
3	And I don't know if thank you, Sandra. I'm asking
4	Vesna now. Did you already make the point that they
5	claim that no operator errors of commission can
6	possibly do any damage to the core? And that is on
7	the SER, and I think that's unsupported by
8	calculations.
9	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: They didn't make any
10	claims on the boron event.
11	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: No, no, not boron
12	dilution. On the generic Chapter 19, I believe they
13	say
14	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Yes.
15	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: look at the
16	possible
17	(Simultaneous speaking.)
18	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: No, they say they
19	didn't identify any errors of commission, and we
20	argued that on the crane operation. But no discussion
21	was connected to the boron.
22	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I am concerned of all
23	the operator errors of commission of starting these
24	nonsafety grade systems, especially if incorrect
25	information is provided in the FSAR to the COL. The

(202) 234-4433

	128
1	FSAR states in many places that CFDS can be used as a
2	backup for CVCS, many places. And now they're telling
3	us that to the COL, we will actually do this
4	calculation and find out if we were wrong. But that
5	statement is not supported by calculations. But I'll
6	leave that to you, Vesna. I'm done.
7	MR. MOORE: Jose, this is Scott.
8	(Simultaneous speaking.)
9	MR. MOORE: Yeah, this is Scott. On Line
10	15, Jose, did you want and control to be uncontrolled?
11	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yes, can you yes.
12	And Sandra, can you delete and? And by that, it's the
13	generic DHRS actuation. But most people don't know
14	what DHRS is, so
15	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yeah, and I cautioned
16	everyone that these are not statements from the
17	Committee. We're just gathering input, and we're not
18	going to edit them in real time to make them perfect.
19	This is not a Committee letter. We're just gathering
20	input. So I think
21	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: And for the record,
22	what I mean by uncontrolled, I mean hands off.
23	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yes.
24	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: It's passive. The
25	operator doesn't touch it.

	129
1	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yeah. Okay. Thank you,
2	Jose. On the roster, I think Dave Petti is next.
3	MEMBER PETTI: I'm not exactly sure what
4	to say. I will tell you that I am concerned about a
5	couple of things. The staff made a reasonable
6	assurance finding. Some of these bullets imply they
7	didn't do their job properly because they didn't do a
8	calculation. They did an assessment, an engineering
9	assessment. You could argue whether that's good
10	enough or not. But the implication based on the words
11	is that they were somehow negligent in their
12	MEMBER KIRCHNER: No, so Dave, let's
13	capture this. I don't want to collect a lot of
14	negatives. I want to collect just issues that were of
15	concern. So you're concerned that we're overreacting
16	or overstating the case, let's capture it.
17	MEMBER PETTI: Yes, that's the concern,
18	Sandra, is that the statements are overly negative
19	relative to the staff's reasonable assurance finding
20	and the engineering assessments that support that. I
21	did write some words that you all saw that tried to be
22	more balanced in this regard. But we can take those
23	offline later.
24	In my opinion, what we're down to is
25	differences of opinion between two experts two or

(202) 234-4433

	130
1	three experts, Dr. Yarsky, Jose, and whose name I
2	can't remember, the dissenting opinion.
3	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Dr. Lu.
4	MEMBER PETTI: Dr. Lu. Thank you. So
5	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I cannot run the
6	calculations for them. All I know
7	(Simultaneous speaking.)
8	MEMBER PETTI: But you are dismissing the
9	role of engineering assessment. If you
10	(Simultaneous speaking.)
11	MEMBER PETTI: It would be I don't mind
12	a statement that says, a calculation to confirm or
13	deny the engineering assessment would be very
14	valuable. But when you say, this isn't supported,
15	this isn't supported, this isn't supported, it makes
16	it sound like they didn't do a damn thing for the last
17	four weeks. These guys have been busting their butt
18	to try to get this done, I'm sure working night and
19	day.
20	And that's what I'm concerned about is the
21	tone of the letter, how it can be misinterpreted,
22	because you know people are looking. They've already
23	been looking at our previous letters in the press. We
24	have to be extremely careful with how we craft the
25	picture.
1	I Contraction of the second

(202) 234-4433

ĺ	131
1	I agree with the item on Line 3. We
2	should it'd be nice to have a well identified
3	recovery path. I don't think any of us disagree with
4	that. But there's not enough information to, I think,
5	meat the well identified path at this point.
6	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: The problem, Pete
7	I mean, Dave, is that the argument for saying that
8	CFDS has no risk concern when you go to bottom and
9	I talked to the staff, Pete, and the applicant. And
10	their argument is in their mind, they honestly believe
11	that the core will mix. There will be sufficient
12	turbulence to mix the front, and the front won't
13	exist.
14	That's their bottom line argument because
15	if they're calculation with the front moving through
16	the core unimpeded and clean, not mixed, they cannot
17	support it. So that's their argument. Their argument
18	is it will mix, but they haven't written that
19	anywhere. They don't even make that argument, not
20	even in oral arguments. Well, they do. And how do
21	you calculate that? So their argument
22	MEMBER PETTI: I see them
23	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: of CFDS
24	MEMBER PETTI: make that argument in
25	the white paper.
	1

(202) 234-4433

	132
1	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Yeah, the white paper
2	makes that argument, Jose.
3	CHAIR SUNSERI: Jose, you've made that
4	point. We understand that. We get it. Saying it
5	over and over again is not helping any. It's impeding
6	Dave's ability to get his points on the table. Let
7	Dave get his points on the table. Go ahead, Dave.
8	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Go ahead, Dave.
9	MEMBER PETTI: I think that's the major
10	point beyond what's in the email that you guys have
11	that to get to a well identified recovery path I think
12	is going require analysis of the stuff in the red box
13	that we talked about this morning. That isn't going
14	to happen quickly. We talked about that.
15	MEMBER BALLINGER: This is Ron. I guess
16	I was the one that put the statement on Line No. 3.
17	I think we have to be satisfied in our minds that
18	there's a well defined recovery path. I don't know
19	that they need to write it down and make sure and show
20	it to us. I mean
21	MEMBER PETTI: So a strategy
22	MEMBER BALLINGER: somehow we need to
23	be
24	MEMBER PETTI: perhaps is really
25	MEMBER BALLINGER: Yeah, in other words,

(202) 234-4433

	133
1	we need to be satisfied that down the line when they
2	build one of these things, somebody says, oh, my gosh.
3	We can't recover. So we need to be satisfied, I
4	think, that a recovery path exists. That's what I was
5	trying to get at.
6	MEMBER PETTI: Yeah, and I don't disagree
7	with that. The question is, I mean, and this gets
8	into this legalistic thing, now or before, is it a
9	high COL item?
10	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Dave, any further
11	comments?
12	MEMBER PETTI: No.
13	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Okay. I'm thinking
14	alphanumerically here.
15	CHAIR SUNSERI: Hold on a second. Did we
16	get that? Did we get that?
17	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Did we get what you
18	wanted, Dave?
19	MEMBER PETTI: Yeah, that's fine.
20	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Okay.
21	CHAIR SUNSERI: Okay. Joy would be next.
22	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Joy would be next.
23	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Okay. So rather than
24	start something who I guess I I'll tell you what
25	I'm trying to say. You tell me whether how to best do
1	I Contraction of the second

(202) 234-4433

	134
1	it. In a way, it's kind of building off of your
2	chart, Dave, and some other things that I heard. But
3	if I hadn't seen other people's input, it's difficult
4	to have in my opinion from what I've heard.
5	It's difficult to obtain it may be
6	difficult to have a well justified recovery path
7	because, one, we didn't see a write up that was
8	documented and available for us to review. And in my
9	opinion, it may be difficult to actually detailed
10	codes may not be available that are validated. And we
11	sent an awful lot of time arguing about engineering
12	judgment or expert opinion.
13	And so yeah, you might say it's a COL
14	item. But on the other hand, I'm thinking that we're
15	kind of just touching the tip of what they're going to
16	have to deal with in the future. And you could almost
17	put it as an add on to Ron's point on Line 3 that it
18	may be difficult to resolve with available validated
19	methodologies. Is that going to be offensive to you,
20	Ron, if I add something like that there?
21	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: I'm impossible to
22	offend.
23	VICE CHAIR REMPE: That's good to know.
24	I'll try and use that
25	(Simultaneous speaking.)
	I

	135
1	MEMBER BALLINGER: I've been offended by
2	professionals. You can't do anything.
3	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Ooh, I could try. It's
4	a challenge. On your thing about the existing
5	instrumentation, I know you're talking about boron
6	distribution. And I heard Matt earlier today talking
7	about, well, the operators can infer it from the flux
8	monitors.
9	And if you've got chugging going back and
10	forth, the kicker I'm trying to get to is that they're
11	going to have to infer what's need. And it may be
12	more difficult because not only you may have changes
13	in your boron distribution, but I'd also think you
14	might be having fluctuations in the water itself. And
15	so and that's kind of also talking about a well
16	identified recovery path. It could be also difficult
17	to infer what's needed. And I don't know whether you
18	want to add that to your point, Jose, on 22. Or just
19	it's not only validated (audio interference) but with
20	existing
21	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I see
22	VICE CHAIR REMPE: available plant
23	instrumentation.
24	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I see where you're
25	going. The only possible way out they have without

(202) 234-4433

	136
1	thinking much about it because they have not thought
2	much about it and we're thinking at a COL stage. They
3	say that we can use the period-based trip or not
4	trip. In this case, it would be an alarm to identify
5	criticality and then we would stop.
6	I don't know what the inertia will do.
7	And certainly it raises significant questions about
8	GDC-27, a return to power. And especially from the
9	point of view of HRA, human reliability assessment,
10	that's not a simple operation that you can give ten to
11	the minus four probability that the operator will do
12	right.
13	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Well, if you're
14	(Simultaneous speaking.)
15	VICE CHAIR REMPE: what they're going
16	to do with existing instrumentation for a different
17	application and I can think about what we tried to do
18	with the SPNDs at TMI to understand when the core was
19	relocating or what we're trying to do at Fukushima, a
20	lot of variables. It's not so easy. And so it's
21	going to so you can decide where to put it, but
22	(Simultaneous speaking.)
23	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: It is conceivable
24	that the operator will thread the needle and do it
25	right. But it's not inconceivable that one of those
I	1

(202) 234-4433

	137
1	ten times, he'll do it wrong.
2	(Simultaneous speaking.)
3	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Anyway, so I don't
4	know. Do you want to add it on to yours? I mean
5	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Okay. You do it.
6	VICE CHAIR REMPE: you're talking about
7	boron distribution.
8	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I've been putting in
9	too much stuff.
10	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Okay. Well, maybe
11	we'll just add it on number 3. And Sandra, right now,
12	maybe I have a slow response this time. But I just
13	see validated. So why don't you say, validated
14	analysis codes. Okay? Maybe you're doing it, Sandra,
15	but my computer is not I see something happened.
16	Yeah, there it is.
17	And existing plant instrumentation. And
18	then because we spent so much time arguing about
19	expert opinion or engineering judgement, maybe put in
20	parenthesis there's variability with experts and
21	engineering judgement and you get my point. I mean,
22	bring in a new set of experts and you get a different
23	answer.
24	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Well, that always is
25	true. I don't that's going to find its way into our

(202) 234-4433

	138
1	letter.
2	VICE CHAIR REMPE: I know, but I've
3	listened to many arguments between experts this week.
4	It's just my own frustration. Anyway, go ahead.
5	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Well, what was relevant
6	to that, Joy, again, on a factual level is whether
7	there was an issue about the PERT that was used for
8	the PRA. And that's where there was perhaps something
9	was missed. But generically, I don't think we want to
10	take that topic on.
11	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Well, right now, you're
12	talking about I've heard today about, well, they
13	used engineering judgment. And again, engineering
14	judgment, unless it's just so obvious, undocumented
15	engineering judgment or that we couldn't review is
16	difficult to have confidence. Okay? How about that?
17	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Just be careful you
18	don't undermine the Committee.
19	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Good point.
20	(Simultaneous speaking.)
21	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Maybe that's another
22	point. Anyway, I said enough. Maybe put in
23	parenthesis, engineering judgment, and I'll let the
24	letter writers figure out what to do with that.
25	MEMBER BALLINGER: You know, folks, that's
1	I contract of the second se

(202) 234-4433

	139
1	always our opinion. It's always our engineering
2	judgment.
3	CHAIR SUNSERI: That's why we were chosen
4	hopefully.
5	MEMBER BALLINGER: That's why we were
6	chosen.
7	CHAIR SUNSERI: I'm going to turn from Joy
8	to Matt Sunseri.
9	(Simultaneous speaking.)
10	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Oh, no. Wait a minute.
11	My alphabet is scrambled today. Pete Riccardella?
12	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Yeah, I had
13	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Could you do the Italian
14	pronunciation for us, Pete?
15	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Riccardella. That
16	was the Italian spelling before my ancestors ended up
17	at Ellis Island or wherever it was. Anyway, it's
18	I had a bunch of points, but most of them, I think,
19	have been covered. I'd just maybe add to couple of
20	them in what was Line No. 8. Now it's, I guess, No.
21	9.
22	To me, at the end of that, there's
23	after it says, how much of what we're talking about is
24	required to demonstrate adequate protection at the DCA
25	stage? How much of the analysis in that red box is
	1 I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I

(202) 234-4433

1 really required at this stage I'm asking. And then kind of along the lines of what Joy was talking about, 2 3 all these lines where we talk about no calculations 4 have been done, no calculations have been done. But 5 there has been what I think is a very impressive engineering judgment, a 30-page white paper by an 6 7 expert in the field. And I don't think we should just discount 8 9 there's no calculations, that as, oh, no hard 10 calculations. I read that report and admittedly not an expert in that area, but it was very convincing to 11 So somehow no calculations, but a well documented 12 me. engineering judgment. 13 14 MS. WALKER: What was the last part? 15 MEMBER RICCARDELLA: Engineering judgment. 16 That's all I have. 17 MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Sorry, Pete. But I need to again emphasize that I strongly disagree with 18 19 one of Pete's conclusions. I think he would agree with me if he was informed. He did not say that when 20 you turn CFDS, you won't have a problem if you inject 21 cold unborated water all the way to the top of the 22 What is he said is he believes, engineering 23 core. 24 judgment, that the water will mix and won't cause the 25 problem.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

140

	141
1	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: You know
2	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: But
3	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: his engineering
4	judgment all involves the required calculations in
5	that red box and Dave's charts. And he's made some
6	engineering judgment about that. And I think, Jose,
7	that you and Dr. Lu are kind of ignoring that red box
8	and just saying, well, they haven't done the
9	calculations, so we're just going to assume that it
10	all goes in there. And he's tried to explain, I
11	think, based on his best judgment what will happen in
12	that red box.
13	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Right. But when
14	you're taking credit for mixing because of turbulence
15	in the core, that's a stretch, man. And I'll stop
16	there.
17	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: He's taking credit
18	for that. He's taking credit for negative reactivity
19	coefficients, both Doppler and void coefficients.
20	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Which he doesn't
21	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I would just prefer that
22	nature Jose, nature isn't very kind. If you try
23	and propagate a level front of almost anything in a
24	liquid system, it's only with great difficult. If you
25	had oil and water, might be a little easier. They
I	I contraction of the second

(202) 234-4433

142
tend to separate. Otherwise, Second Law of
Thermodynamics, entropy, things mix.
MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I know it will mix
with what's in the core. But there are 14 times more
core volumes going behind it. Okay. I said enough.
I mean, I agree with Pete. This is likely to be the
answer. I just don't see any justification that it
is.
MEMBER KIRCHNER: Okay. That argument,
we've heard now. I think, Chairman Sunseri, it's your
turn.
CHAIR SUNSERI: Thank you, Walt. And I
think most of what I have to say is covered within
these bullets. But I just want to make sure that we
emphasize or that we at least address a balance
between reasonable assurance and absolute assurance
and that our letter strikes the right tone.
And what I mean by way of an example is I
know we're concerned about the evaporation of the
water out of the core. We know the scenario, right?
It condenses in a downcomer. It dilutes there. And
then we're worried about recovery about that.
I can think back on my experiences with
PWRs advance sequence where you lose natural
circulation cooling during some kind of loss of

(202) 234-4433
1 coolant accident. The steam generate U-tubes uncover and you are in the exact same situation as here. 2 The 3 core is heating up. The water boils. The steam goes 4 up in the steam generator tubes, condenses, falls down 5 the cold leq side of the coolant system, feeds the And that diluted water then starts 6 manometer. 7 migrating back to the core, and we count on that for 8 core cooling in that situation. If we can -- and we can recover from that 9 And I think there's sufficient evidence 10 situation. that we can recover from this situation in the NuScale 11 model. And that's all I want to say at this time, and 12 I'll just leave it at that. 13 14 MEMBER KIRCHNER: Thank you, Chairman. 15 MEMBER PETTI: Walt --16 (Simultaneous speaking.) So I think --17 MEMBER KIRCHNER: MEMBER PETTI: Walt, can we just capture 18 19 one other thing. I mean, I said it, but we were talking fast. 20 MEMBER KIRCHNER: Go ahead, Dave. 21 I just think a statement 22 MEMBER PETTI: about the tremendous amount of work that both the 23 24 staff and applicant have put in. MEMBER KIRCHNER: I'm going to close with 25

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

143

	144
1	that, Dave.
2	MEMBER PETTI: Okay.
3	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Thank you for the
4	prompt.
5	MEMBER PETTI: Thanks.
6	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Okay. So I get to that
7	clean up. I personally and I'm going to do
8	something I never do, but I'm going to do it today.
9	I'll use the never word. I was the reactor design
10	group leader at Los Alamos for quite a few years in
11	the '80s. I just put that on the table because I had
12	the great fortune to look at a lot of different
13	reactor designs.
14	I worked for the NRC on the module HTGR,
15	the PRISM reactor and so on. And we designed heat
16	pipe reactors. We may see them very shortly. There's
17	an application that's been accepted by the Commission.
18	So I have that background. And so I want to say this
19	statement first.
20	In the context of 10 CFR 52, this is as
21	essentially complete design as we're likely to see.
22	We know that some of the applicants coming are going
23	to try and use 10 CFR 52. There is if you pardon
24	me, staff, there's what I would call a loophole that
25	allows novel designs that have enhanced safety
	1

(202) 234-4433

	145
1	features, et cetera, to also apply under 10 CFR 52.
2	But this NuScale design I find pretty sound and
3	essentially complete. That's the words out of 10 CFR
4	52.
5	MEMBER PETTI: Walt, should Sandra capture
6	that point?
7	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Excuse me?
8	MEMBER PETTI: Should Sandra capture that
9	point? The NuScale design
10	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yeah, please, Sandra.
11	MEMBER PETTI: A complete DCA.
12	MEMBER KIRCHNER: This is an essentially
13	complete design in the spirit of 10 CFR 52. Spirit is
14	not the right word. In the context, please, of 10 CFR
15	52, this is an essentially complete design. It has
16	large margins compared to the existing fleet. And
17	with regard to now this may be better part of the
18	final letter, not the boron dilution letter. But let
19	me start with this, and then I'll narrow down my
20	comments.
21	It has large margins compared to the
22	existing fleet. Now don't type anything yet, Sandra,
23	because I haven't condensed this. But I see just this
24	one remaining issue that we've been engaged in this
25	last couple of days and for the last several months.
	I

(202) 234-4433

I think basically maybe you could type now, Sandra. 1 Design changes and set point changes have 2 addressed long-term cooling under DHSR, that's an 3 4 acronym, capital D, capital H, capital R, capital, 5 DHRS conditions. Our remaining concern -- this is 6 more an opinion. But the concern -- yeah, just our 7 remaining concern is boron dilution after ECCS 8 actuation. 9 And now don't type anything, Sandra. I'm 10 just going to make a statement. This is the third time I'm going to say it and the last. 11 The staff presented figures of merit which Ι think 12 are appropriate for this situation and in a way kind of 13 14 address what Dennis was saying about completeness of 15 the Chapter 15 analyses. With regard to the DHRS, they were able to 16 17 demonstrate and confirm the applicant's position that out to 72 hours, there was sufficient margin versus 18 19 critical boron concentration in the downcomer to prevent the potential for a reactivity insertion 20 It just begged from me 21 accident. That was good. personally the question, where's the analysis on the 22 other side of the ledger? 23 24 Like, think about Dave's diagram. So he checked the box, okay, on the left-hand side. 25 Now

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

146

we're on the right-hand side. We're under -- ECCS is actuated. We're under conditions that could lead to long-term boration. Both the applicant and the staff suggest that that could take place within -- going to Vesna's comments. Time frame, Vesna. Time frame is hours. It's not 72 hours.

7 And so in my opinion, there is а successful recovery path. And the path is based on 8 9 conservative analysis to just either -- I would do it 10 in tech-spec space. But hopefully down the road, they'll do it in an operational procedure or EOP space 11 that within X time frame, and this can be estimated 12 marqin, shall, 13 with conservative thou if it's available, start with the preferred option, CVCS if 14 15 it's not injection above the -- in the riser.

16 Second, spray. And third, containment, 17 flood and drain system and intercept this before the conditions come to a situation where your downcomer 18 19 dilution greater than the critical boron is concentration for the core. And then --20 MEMBER PETTI: So Walt --21 MEMBER KIRCHNER: Let me finish. 22 23 MEMBER PETTI: Okay. 24 MEMBER KIRCHNER: I love calculational I was an original member of the team that 25 space.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

developed TRAC which is now TRACE. I'm very pleased that almost 50 years later, it's still in use. I have a lot of confidence in what can be done in computational space.

5 But I would rather - as Dave had 6 eloquently said or someone else, I don't want to be in the red box. All I want to do is avoid getting to 7 this situation. I personally believe it can be done. 8 9 And so again, from my standpoint, an adequate safety 10 determination could be made. And that's the end of my speech. 11

So Walt, to make sure I MEMBER PETTI: 12 understand what you're saying is think about a part of 13 14 the boron concentration in the downcomer after 15 It's decreasing. It's decreasing. actuation. It's 16 decreasing. There's a window where you need to get in 17 there and do the things you suggest so you don't get into --18

MEMBER KIRCHNER: Exactly.

20 MEMBER PETTI: -- below a critical level. 21 MEMBER KIRCHNER: I'm an engineer. I want 22 to prevent this situation. I don't want to try and 23 manage it.

24 MEMBER PETTI: I think we should capture 25 that.

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

19

MEMBER KIRCHNER: There is a window. It doesn't happen instantaneously. You don't have ECCS actuation and then entire boron, as Jose was saying, 14 volumes of the core diluted. That takes time. You have time to react. I have confidence that they can do it.

7 I don't want to get into the detailed procedures. But I do believe that in calculational 8 9 space with conservative assumptions, much like the 10 applicant and the staff used, one can make an estimate of the time window that's available to intervene 11 before you come close to conditions that would 12 threaten the possibility of a reactive insertion 13 14 accident. And then we don't have to argue about 15 whether the wavefront is purely diluted, whether 16 there's mixing in the core, and all these other 17 aspects of the problem which are very complex calculations. 18

MEMBER PETTI: So Walt, can you --MEMBER KIRCHNER: But I don't want to do that.
MEMBER PETTI: Can you dictate a sentence to Sandra so we don't lose it?
MEMBER KIRCHNER: Go ahead, Dave.
MEMBER PETTI: Okay. I'll try. A window

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

1

2

3

4

5

6

	150
1	of time exists following ECCS actuation for operator
2	actions to assure boron dilution does not decrease
3	below critical core concentration.
4	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: It's called the
5	critical boron concentration.
6	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yeah, critical boron
7	concentration is the vernacular.
8	MEMBER PETTI: Right.
9	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Which I remind
10	everybody that it's just a few percent from nominal.
11	I cannot tell you the exact number, but it's not very
12	large. And for this window, it might be minutes. And
13	I would like to ask you guys what power I'm going to
14	use to fix this.
15	MEMBER PETTI: Let me just finish. It's
16	concentration, yeah. Conservative calculations need
17	to be performed. Conservative calculations need to be
18	performed to determine the time window for such
19	recovery actions.
20	MEMBER KIRCHNER: And then finally, as a
21	former operator as well, I would not want to have to
22	rely on the source instrumentation. If we get into a
23	situation where this is feasible, there's inertia and
24	fluid dynamic effects. You, as an operator, will not
25	react fast enough to and you don't have much to
	I Contraction of the second

(202) 234-4433

	151
1	actually, what are you going to do, stop a boron
2	injection? It's a nice theory, but I don't think it
3	will if you just examine it from a few different
4	perspectives, yeah, the source
5	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I agree. It is
6	MEMBER KIRCHNER: centers will tell you
7	went critical. But you know what? It's too late. So
8	you don't want
9	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yeah, it will take at
10	least a minute or two to stop the flow.
11	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yeah, yeah. You've got
12	flow in the pumps. The pumps or you isolate
13	there's still flow in the system. That's not you
14	can't sit there with a delicate balance and then just
15	say, I'm going to look at the source term measurements
16	and control this situation. Trust me. Look into it.
17	Think about it. You'll figure out why
18	VICE CHAIR REMPE: I agree.
19	MEMBER KIRCHNER: it's not feasible.
20	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Absolutely, Walt, what
21	I was trying to get to earlier. You just can't rely
22	on it.
23	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I mean, you can rely
24	if it's the only thing you got. Okay? But that will
25	require throttling the CFDS injection to ten percent
	I

(202) 234-4433

	152
1	or something. There will have to be an analysis and
2	the operator will have to be with the bottom at the
3	stop. I mean, plus, he have all the GDC-27
4	MEMBER KIRCHNER: They're not calibrated
5	for that. They're not it's just not a viable
6	option. Trust me.
7	VICE CHAIR REMPE: And they have voiding
8	to consider as well as boron concentration. So how do
9	you distinguish what's causing it?
10	MEMBER KIRCHNER: It's just not that's
11	not a credible option. I like what the applicant is
12	doing. I mean, prevention is the best cure for any of
13	these kind of events.
14	MEMBER PETTI: Stay out of the box.
15	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Stay out of the box. Do
16	not put yourself into a situation. Now I do not know
17	whether this is tech-spec space or EOP space. I would
18	like to see this is not a wish list thing. It may
19	exist. But I mean, what one can do clearly is
20	calculate very conservatively the deboration rate and
21	whether it's minutes as Jose suggested. It may depend
22	on the scenario that got you there and so on.
23	It may be hours. I think in most events,
24	it will be hours. But I haven't looked at the
25	spectrum of initiating events that you would consider.
	I contract of the second se

(202) 234-4433

	153
1	But it's like going through a spectrum of small-break
2	LOCAs to see what's the limiting
3	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Well, we're not
4	supposed to be deciding the reactor agenda.
5	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I'm trying to solve the
6	problem.
7	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Okay. But the
8	critical boron concentration is just a few percent
9	below the nominal. It is minus, believe me.
10	If you use any conservative analysis, I
11	think you'll see
12	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I don't know, Jose. Let
13	them analyze the problem. Let them tell us what the
14	distribution is in the lower
15	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: That's what I've been
16	screaming at the top of my lungs. I don't know what
17	the answer is.
18	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Okay.
19	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: All I know is nobody
20	else does.
21	MEMBER KIRCHNER: But, well I don't know
22	that. I'm not going to say that.
23	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I know that. Because
24	if they knew, it was an only
25	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yeah. Jose, let's not
	I

```
(202) 234-4433
```

	154
1	use the no, all never. That's an allegation, not a
2	fact.
3	All I can say is, there is a way to
4	determine a path out of this problem. And that's my
5	suggestion.
6	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Let me put a request
7	to all the world that this is really distressing. If
8	you have a calculation that shows that this is not a
9	problem, please let me know.
10	Because I don't have it.
11	MEMBER KIRCHNER: No, no, no. No, Jose,
12	that's not that's not where I'm coming from. I
13	don't want to do the wave front going into the core
14	calculation and argue with you about void fraction
15	feedback and all the rest.
16	I want to avoid that. What I want to say
17	is, there is a pathway to determine when I don't have
18	sufficient boron in the downcomer. And I need to
19	intervene in the situation and take action.
20	And then I'm not going to bother about
21	analyzing the worst case scenarios.
22	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Okay. The most
23	likely reason you have a LOCA is because you have an
24	earthquake, and you don't have power.
25	Okay. I will wait.
l	1 I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I

(202) 234-4433

	155
1	MEMBER KIRCHNER: But let them, let them
2	do that in PRA space.
3	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Why in the PRA
4	space? You know, I just want to say you guys are now
5	discussing details that we don't even have a good big
6	picture.
7	We obviously have a difference in opinion.
8	We don't have all the calculations we need. Now,
9	where do we go from here?
10	That's the big picture.
11	MEMBER KIRCHNER: The big picture, if I
12	could summarize, Vesna, is the concern is post-ECCS
13	actuation for a variety of initiating events can lead
14	to boron dilution of the downcomer.
15	The boron the diluted downcomer
16	introduces the possibility of a reactivity insertion
17	event. Which could potentially lead to core damage.
18	So, the big picture is, how does one
19	prevent that from happening?
20	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Okay. So,
21	MEMBER KIRCHNER: And demonstrate that you
22	can do it.
23	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: All right. So, your
24	proposal is that they address this with the tech specs
25	or we're talking procedures.
1	I contract of the second s

(202) 234-4433

	156
1	When should this happen? Now? Or how do
2	we make I mean, they're not going to write
3	procedures that they have some tech specs, you
4	know, section.
5	And we can
6	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Earlier. We heard
7	earlier from the staff today and yesterday. They seem
8	to be in a position where they believe they can issue
9	an FSER.
10	And that the Applicant has met all the
11	requirements for the DCA. And we, in the course of
12	preparing this letter, can affirm that descent.
13	We can point out whatever deficiencies we
14	see possible. I don't think at this point we're going
15	to see any new design changes.
16	We're not likely to see any new analysis.
17	So, we have what we have. And we can then, as a
18	collegial body, come to a conclusion on this issue.
19	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: But the whole, how
20	do they come to the conclusion, or all of us, how do
21	we come to a conclusion that this is not a risk
22	outlier?
23	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Well, you may convince
24	us that this is a risk outlier. And we put that in
25	the letter.

(202) 234-4433

	157
1	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Well, well, the
2	cla you know, that's what I was sort of on there
3	yesterday. What is our I mean, if you write a
4	letter that this we can, you know, we disagree with
5	ACR conclusions on Chapter 19 for example, or Chapter
6	15.
7	Then where do we go from there? I mean,
8	you know, if that
9	MEMBER KIRCHNER: We document them. And
10	the COL Applicant will likely not ignore an ACRS
11	letter that has anything that has a negative or a
12	conclusion that suggests that further work isn't
13	necessary before the COL application is accepted by
14	the Commission.
15	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: But whatever has to
16	point, when they point that there is a difference of
17	opinion, there is not just difference in opinion
18	between, you know, the staff and us.
19	There is a difference of opinion among the
20	staff. So, I mean, there is so many
21	MEMBER KIRCHNER: But Vesna, Vesna stay
22	out of that. That is something that is dealt with
23	through a formal process.
24	And that's a staff issue. That's not an
25	ACRS issue.

(202) 234-4433

	158
1	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Well, it was
2	presented to us. So, I mean, we don't
3	MEMBER KIRCHNER: It was. We that's
4	our role to hear all positions. And also ask for
5	public input.
6	MEMBER PETTI: But isn't it in fact, your
7	major point Walt, is that we've got to look at
8	prevention here. And think about that.
9	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Well, this is
10	MEMBER PETTI: Which I think there's been
11	enough about that.
12	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I think, you know, if
13	you remember our meetings with the Applicant, I
14	stopped let's see, who was it?
15	It wasn't Paul. It was probably Matthew
16	Presson. Very early in the presentation, the first
17	time they presented after they had made design
18	changes.
19	And I he had, you know, I don't have
20	the view graph in front of me. He talked about
21	prevention and mitigation, I believe. And I may not
22	be quoting the view graph well.
23	But, it was clear that their design
24	changes, their first objective was prevention. And I
25	think to a large part, they succeeded.

(202) 234-4433

	159
1	So, yeah. As Ron pointed out earlier, if
2	you're going to let me back up. Years and years
3	ago, I don't like to do this, but I'm going to do it.
4	Years and years ago, there was something
5	called the Clinch River Breeder Reactor. And this
6	sounds like I'm getting off topic.
7	But
8	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Really, it was just a
9	paper reactor. There never was a reactor, right?
10	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Well, no. There was a
11	pretty solid design actually. And it was derivative
12	of FFDF, which was built and operated.
13	So, we're talking about yes, paper, on
14	paper. But fairly mature design concepts and so on
15	and so forth.
16	And what happened with CRBR among other
17	things was that there were, what should I say, event
18	paths that could lead to and challenge core integrity,
19	probably, oh bad choice in words, likely, with a
20	higher frequency then we would ever see in an LWR in
21	the existing fleet.
22	And so the NRC actually funded Los Alamos
23	to develop a safety analysis code specifically for
24	fast reactors, for liquid metal fast reactors. It was
25	called poor choice of acronyms. Don't ever do this in
	I contraction of the second

(202) 234-4433

	160
1	the future. SIMMER, S-I-M-M-E-R.
2	A tremendous amount of effort went into
3	it. But what was realized was something that Ron was
4	alluding to earlier today.
5	It was going to be a calculational warfare
6	between you know, the applicant, the regulator and the
7	public about, you know whose estimates were better.
8	Much more difficult problems I would suggest.
9	It's like being it's like being in
10	MELCOR space. You don't want to be in MELCOR space
11	because now the uncertainties, the difficulty of the
12	physics, the chemistry, everything gets, you know, so
13	much more complicated.
14	So, my feeling is, Dave, well, pardon the
15	ramble, we don't want to get there. I think there are
16	ways to intervene so that getting into the red box is
17	yes, it's probably worth exploring.
18	But, what's the old maxim? There's
19	something about something about prevention is worth
20	a lot of cure. And I forget the measurement. I don't
21	want to do it in dollars of reactivity.
22	MEMBER BALLINGER: It's a pound of
23	convention is a, of prevention is worth an ounce of
24	cure.
25	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Or whatever it was.
	I

(202) 234-4433

	161
1	Yeah.
2	MEMBER BALLINGER: It's something like
3	that. The corollary is, cut the head off the snake.
4	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yes. That's it. Thank
5	you, Ron. You just don't want to be there.
6	MEMBER RICCARDELLA: An ounce of
7	prevention is worth a pound of cure.
8	MEMBER BALLINGER: Ah, okay. I had it
9	backwards. Okay.
10	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I was tongue-tied.
11	Thank you, Pete. Mr. Chairman, I think I've done
12	I've used too much of my platform as the subcommittee
13	chair.
14	I think where we go from here is we take
15	this. I've already talked to several members. First,
16	I want to say to all members, thank you.
17	And I want to say that please send any
18	further input you have to me and the rest of the
19	Committee. And my proposal is that myself, Member
20	March-Leuba, and Member Petti take it from here.
21	And try and provide the Committee a draft
22	next week. I don't want to pick a day next week, but
23	provide something next week, because we are on a tight
24	time schedule.
25	And our next full Committee meeting is

(202) 234-4433

	162
1	just a short two weeks away. And this lastly, I want
2	to say once again, thank you to the Applicant.
3	And thank you to the staff. We know how
4	hard you've been working. And we appreciate your
5	presentations and your patients with us.
6	And with that, I am going to stop and turn
7	it over to you, Mr. Chairman.
8	CHAIR SUNSERI: Thanks Walt. And thanks
9	for leading that session. Looking ahead, I think we
10	still need to answer the question for the upcoming
11	full Committee week.
12	Do we need any additional presentations
13	from staff or Applicant on any topic to help us with
14	our deliberation?
15	MEMBER BLEY: Well, since I brought that
16	up earlier, I'll take a shot now. I don't see a need
17	for presentations.
18	But, I think each of us, as we go back and
19	review, this week, review the transcript. And for me,
20	especially review the Peter Yarsky paper.
21	There will be questions, and I don't think
22	open-ended discussions of questions is appropriate in
23	a letter writing session. So, I'd like to see us have
24	at least a two hour session which would allow us to
25	raise questions and discuss them in detail with the
	I

(202) 234-4433

	163
1	staff and with NuScale if they participate.
2	And I'd like to hear from others too on
3	that, because, you know, that might not be enough
4	done.
5	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Actually Dennis, maybe
6	four hours on the first day of our meeting for that
7	purpose.
8	MEMBER BLEY: And if we finish early,
9	that's great. But, I just can't see us not having
10	things we really want to pursue with the staff and the
11	Applicant.
12	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Dennis, can we make
13	a commitment as members to think through everything we
14	still need to know, writing down, and send the
15	questions in advance to the staff so that they can
16	prepare a presentation to respond to our specific
17	questions.
18	Instead of go fill me up four hours of
19	entertainment, no. I still need an answer to this
20	particular question. Can you please prepare for it.
21	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yeah. So, we don't
22	MEMBER BLEY: I think the Board makes
23	that.
24	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yeah, we don't send it
25	to the staff. We'll send it to Mike Snodderly.

(202) 234-4433

	164
1	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Sure.
2	MEMBER KIRCHNER: And he'll collate and
3	collect any input.
4	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: But do we have a buy
5	in for all the members that that's what we're going to
6	do?
7	MEMBER BLEY: Well, sure. With the
8	proviso that we may still be working on this the
9	weekend before, and then we have a full week.
10	So there we can't be assured that
11	everybody will get everything written down.
12	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: You can always ask
13	questions on the spot. But, any important question,
14	it would be really nice if we write it out in advance,
15	send it through Mike to the staff. And say hey, I
16	still have doubts on this. Prepare an answer.
17	That would be fantastic that. That would
18	be good.
19	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Mike, when did you
20	say we were going to get out into documentation?
21	MR. SNODDERLY: I'm sorry, Vesna. Could
22	you please repeat that? When are we going to what?
23	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: You said that we
24	were going to get out the documentation late
25	MEMBER KIRCHNER: July 17.
I	I contract of the second se

(202) 234-4433

	165
1	MR. SNODDERLY: The audit summary July 17,
2	next Friday.
3	MEMBER KIRCHNER: July 17.
4	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: That will be just a
5	couple of days before the meeting.
6	MR. SNODDERLY: Yes. But as I said, I
7	don't think you're going to well, I just yes.
8	That's what they've proposed.
9	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: But somebody said
10	there is a four hundred or five hundred pages in that
11	document.
12	MR. SNODDERLY: No. That's if someone
13	from the staff could give us an estimate. But, I
14	think that I don't know where where did you hear
15	that, Vesna?
16	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Well, it was in our
17	discussion somebody say on the I think maybe Dennis
18	estimate that. I'm not sure. Somebody said it and
19	we're not that far.
20	(Simultaneous speaking)
21	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I don't think there was
22	the estimate of the page length to anyone. Let's
23	just, let's just do that.
24	MR. SNODDERLY: Yeah. Maybe they reviewed
25	that many pages. They probably reviewed that many.
1	

(202) 234-4433

	166
1	But, I don't think that that report is anywhere near
2	that.
3	Again, it's a summary. But, I'll follow
4	up on that. But, one thing I would like from the
5	Chairman, so what was the deadline for providing
6	questions for me to then pass onto the staff?
7	Because remember, they need time to
8	prepare.
9	MEMBER KIRCHNER: That's right. Let's
10	see, I have not a calendar in front of me. But I know
11	that we have a two week window.
12	So, I would ask my colleagues, could you
13	do it by the end of next week? The close of business
14	next Friday?
15	Because or even Thursday would be
16	better. Thursday would be better, then Mike and I
17	perhaps on Friday could go over them and consolidate
18	the things that might overlap.
19	And then for that to the staff.
20	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Walt, you keep saying
21	two weeks. It's one week. Okay, we have one free
22	week to work. The next week we'll be in meetings.
23	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Oh, I'm sorry. My
24	mistake. You're right. Okay, hold on. I'll get a
25	calendar.
1	

(202) 234-4433

	167
1	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: Walt, this is why I
2	was bringing this out. Is because we can even have
3	more questions after we look at this outed document.
4	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Well, here's the
5	problem. The problem is now, with the calendar in
6	front of me, we've been told that we'll get the audit
7	document on July 17.
8	That's a week from today. And then we
9	reconvene the following week. Thank you, Jose, for
10	pointing out my oversight.
11	If you have questions, I probably we
12	would have to say Wednesday. And that does not give
13	staff a lot of time.
14	MEMBER BLEY: Anything after that we just
15	bring up in the meeting.
16	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yeah. Just bring up in
17	the meeting. I mean, I'm assuming now we're talking
18	about a really, you know, substantive issue, not a
19	not just clar issues of clarification.
20	Because I think we can bring those up in
21	the meeting.
22	MR. SNODDERLY: I would request Wednesday
23	at lunchtime. That way then Walt, you and I have
24	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Okay. Okay, Mike.
25	Yeah.

(202) 234-4433

	168
1	MR. SNODDERLY: Yes. Can we get it out by
2	Wednesday by close of business to the staff.
3	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Okay. Good point. And
4	that's lunchtime is 12:00 Eastern daylight time.
5	MR. SNODDERLY: So, I just heard from the
6	staff. They estimate the audit report will be about
7	20 pages.
8	So, as I said before, I really think the
9	Committee should stay focused on resolving from this,
10	these interactions between the staff and NuScale.
11	Which was the May 20 submittal, the June 19 submittal,
12	and the May 28 8930 supplement.
13	So, that's the bulk of the documentation.
14	And of course the Yarsky white paper.
15	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Yes. Another
16	housekeeping matter here. Alexandra, would you send
17	what you have on the screen to the members and staff
18	only? ACRS staff only.
19	And I just remind the public, since you
20	have the opportunity to participate, these are not
21	positions of the Committee. These are just topics
22	that we will consider in our letter report.
23	The Committee can only speak through its
24	final letter report. So, we have not made any effort
25	here to edit these in any way to reflect a position of
	1

(202) 234-4433

	169
1	the Committee.
2	Mr. Chairman?
3	CHAIR SUNSERI: Thank you, Walt. So, any
4	other final input from the Committee?
5	MEMBER BLEY: Yes. This Dennis. And I
6	apologize for missing Anna Bradford's opening remarks.
7	I have searched through Part 52, and to
8	some extent searched through the SRM guidance or
9	the SRP guidance on reviewing applications.
10	And I haven't found the guidance or
11	regulation that says, don't consider anything after
12	the initial point of stability.
13	If anybody can point me to something like
14	that, I'd like to, you know, be familiar with it
15	before our next meeting. I'm going to keep looking.
16	CHAIR SUNSERI: Can you state that again?
17	You were a little muffled on my microphone. What are
18	you looking for again?
19	MEMBER BLEY: I am looking for regulation
20	or the guidance that tells the staff anything dealing
21	with recovery, no matter how unstable the position, is
22	not an issue for the design cert.
23	I can't find it. I have I shouldn't
24	say that. I have not yet found it. I'm still
25	looking.
	I contract of the second se

(202) 234-4433

	170
1	CHAIR SUNSERI: Okay. I understand.
2	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yeah. I support
3	Dennis' statement. Is it possible to add an
4	additional paragraph to Sandra's letter?
5	Because a couple of members mentioned that
6	using source range flex monitors to recover from a
7	critical event, is certainly not recommended.
8	(Simultaneous speaking)
9	MEMBER KIRCHNER: If we could capture
10	Dennis' thoughts, because that was the part that I had
11	missed on this morning when I was taking notes.
12	VICE CHAIR REMPE: So, actually, that's
13	already captured. If you'll go to the lower numbers.
14	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Is it? Okay.
15	VICE CHAIR REMPE: And also, the thing
16	about the instrumentation. Please show lower numbers.
17	I'd defy it, but flip on it. Lower numbers, please.
18	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: We don't have to talk
19	
20	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Okay, there. Guidance
21	is number nine. And that's the thought. And then the
22	exist it should be with unvalidated analysis code
23	and existing plan instrumentation.
24	And that's what I'm trying to get to here.
25	Okay, Jose?
I	1

(202) 234-4433

	171
1	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Sorry, what was
2	what was the line number?
3	VICE CHAIR REMPE: On number three
4	four.
5	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: I couldn't see.
6	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Look at line four. It
7	says existing plant instrumentation.
8	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: But, I think we can
9	be, you know, a little stronger than this. Saying
10	that it has been proposed to use a criticality alarm
11	to control boron addition to the core. And we don't
12	think that's wise.
13	VICE CHAIR REMPE: We don't need to write
14	it out. But just put under existing plan
15	instrumentation, put criticality alarm.
16	Right, Jose? We're just trying to put a
17	note to jog your memory as you write this thing,
18	right?
19	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Right. Yeah. I just
20	think that using a criticality alarm to control your
21	boron presentation, it is not advisable.
22	MEMBER KIRCHNER: We discussed that.
23	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Right. And then on the
24	documents and regulations they need to be modified.
25	If Anna is still here, I mean, she made a

(202) 234-4433

	172
1	statement saying that they met the existing
2	regulation. It clarified, I mean, she even said, you
3	guys can think of a way to do this.
4	I mean, with her point about the fact that
5	you can't do a pull out because of the fact that this
6	is so linked integral to the reactor. But, is Anna
7	still on the line?
8	I can't see the whole group.
9	(Simultaneous speaking)
10	MEMBER KIRCHNER: No, Joy. Let's not
11	debate let's not debate our letter writing with the
12	staff.
13	VICE CHAIR REMPE: No. I'm not trying to
14	do that. I want her clarification. Dennis asked a
15	question.
16	If she's here, she knows, I think, the
17	answer to Dennis' question, Walt. Right?
18	MEMBER KIRCHNER: All right.
19	VICE CHAIR REMPE: And I if Anna is on
20	the line, then she is
21	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Why don't we wait,
22	Joy. Sandra needs to know that what she did is okay.
23	And I think it's sufficient.
24	She put criticality along with line four.
25	And that reminds us that what we need. So, that
	•

(202) 234-4433

	173
1	for Sandra, you don't need to do anything for my
2	account.
3	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Okay. If you're going
4	to I thought you were taking care of your stuff.
5	MEMBER KIRCHNER: So, let me just be
6	clear, I wasn't talking about
7	VICE CHAIR REMPE: And after moving the
8	thing, then we're there. But, is Anna still on the
9	line?
10	MEMBER KIRCHNER: No, Joy. Wait a minute.
11	Wait a minute. Let's observe the process. What
12	precisely is the question that you want to pose?
13	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Dennis question that he
14	asked. Is there some guidance that led the staff to
15	believe you don't could not ask for recovery.
16	MEMBER KIRCHNER: Let's do the following.
17	Let's do the following, let's not put the staff in a
18	position of having to respond on the spot.
19	Let's pass that request through Mike
20	Snodderly.
21	VICE CHAIR REMPE: It would be nice if we
22	could hear a little sooner then next week. But, I
23	think yes, if you could point to a section, you
24	know, she had that.
25	But we were told that earlier today. And
	1

(202) 234-4433

	174
1	I wanted to ask at the time. But I didn't it in.
2	MEMBER KIRCHNER: I defer to you, Mr.
3	Chairman.
4	CHAIR SUNSERI: Yes. I agree with letting
5	Snodderly ask the question and let them reflect on it.
6	Because we're talking two different things.
7	They're talking procedures. And Dennis
8	framed it a little differently then procedures. So,
9	let's not put them in a spot by giving a reaction
10	without reflecting on the request.
11	VICE CHAIR REMPE: Okay.
12	CHAIR SUNSERI: And let me just be clear
13	on what I was saying a little earlier. Because people
14	like to take what I say and then change it.
15	But, I'm not talking about using a
16	criticality alarm to approach critical. And I know
17	the accident situation is different and there needs to
18	be some compensation.
19	I get that. I understand. I'm a nuclear
20	engineer. I'm just suggesting that, I've been on
21	several power reactors where we have diluted the
22	criticality using source range instrumentation,
23	plotting count rate, and in doing a very controlled
24	approach to criticality.
25	That's my simple comment. You could
I	1

(202) 234-4433

	175
1	probably turn that around, if you wanted to. And
2	think about an approach to avoiding criticality using
3	those kind of instruments and that approach.
4	And I will also say, there's not that much
5	momentum, fluid momentum. When you turn off that CFDS
6	system, it's going to stop. It's only 100 gallons per
7	minute.
8	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: All I want Matt, is
9	a calculation and an estimate from a risk analysis and
10	HRA specialist of how long it would take for the
11	operator to recognize the problem. Which will be not
12	much, because there's a criticality alarm.
13	And then push the button to stop it. And
14	what is the probability that he will push the wrong
15	button when it's at
16	CHAIR SUNSERI: I'm not arguing all that.
17	I mean, that's the probability and all that stuff. I
18	mean, what so, what's the probability of success is
19	not the question.
20	The question is, is there a success path?
21	Can we contemplate one that would be successful?
22	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Well
23	CHAIR SUNSERI: I'm just saying
24	everybody's imposing their extreme positions. I'm in,
25	you know, I get the right to impose mine as well,
l	I Contraction of the second

(202) 234-4433

	176
1	don't I?
2	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Yes, you are. Yes,
3	you are, Matt. And as an engineer, as a guy that has
4	worked on a plant, you are fully right.
5	But, if risk analysis people need to
6	consider what kind of probability field that something
7	will go wrong. And put that on their PRA.
8	And tell me that it probably something
9	will go wrong is less than 10 to the minus 11.
10	Because if it's more then 10 to minus 11, which is a
11	ridiculously low number, it becomes the critical path
12	for this one.
13	CHAIR SUNSERI: Yes. So, I mean, I don't
14	want to
15	MEMBER DIMITRIJEVIC: It's a nine. It's
16	a nine. You're repeating the minus 11. But there's
17	nothing minus 11. I mean, therefore we have to be
18	even below the 10 to minus nine not to be the, you
19	know, the significant consequences.
20	So, I wouldn't the minus 11, it's never
21	mind.
22	MEMBER MARCH-LEUBA: Nine and 11 among
23	friends. There is a 10 to the minus in front of it is
24	the same thing.
25	CHAIR SUNSERI: So, okay. Any other
I	1

(202) 234-4433

	177
1	comments and input? This is good.
2	(No response)
3	CHAIR SUNSERI: Since this has been a
4	little bit of a modified session then our normal
5	report preparation session, and since this is a public
6	line, I would like to kind of close this session with
7	an opportunity for the public listening in to make any
8	statements or comments.
9	So, Thomas, if we could open the public
10	line, please.
11	THOMAS: The public line is open for
12	comment.
13	CHAIR SUNSERI: Thank you. So, any
14	members of the public that are listening in, if you
15	care to make a statement or a comment, now is the
16	opportunity to state your name and provide your
17	comment, please.
18	MS. FIELDS: Yes. This is Sarah Fields.
19	I didn't expect there's an opportunity to make a
20	comment.
21	I think you are in a very serious and
22	critical situation. I've been following this process
23	with the NRC and with the ACRS for quite a while.
24	I have little or no technical background.
25	But I have had long experience with the Nuclear

(202) 234-4433

	178
1	Regulatory Commission.
2	I was in a town with a one billion dollar
3	
4	(Simultaneous speaking)
5	CHAIR SUNSERI: Could you hold on please?
6	Would everybody that's not speaking, mute their
7	microphone?
8	(Simultaneous speaking)
9	MS. FIELDS: Okay. I'm sorry.
10	CHAIR SUNSERI: No, no. Hold on please.
11	Somebody has got their microphone open and disrupting
12	the flow.
13	Could we please mute our microphones and
14	let the public have their chance to talk. Sarah,
15	please go on.
16	MS. FIELDS: I live in a community with a
17	one billion dollar uranium tailings removal project.
18	I live in an area where there are a number of
19	abandoned uranium mines, permitted mines.
20	And the only operating convention is the
21	uranium mill. I have seen many errors by the Nuclear
22	Regulatory Commission over the years.
23	Most of you have worked in the industry.
24	But probably none of you have lived within 50 miles of
25	a proposed nuclear reactor and attended the emergency
1	

(202) 234-4433
	179
1	planning meetings. Or you probably not lived within
2	10 miles of a reactor that was under construction.
3	So, I because I've experienced many
4	things and been involved in many NRC proceedings and
5	meetings, and what not, I have a different
6	perspective.
7	And I really hope that you will lay out to
8	the NRC staff and to NuScale, and for the benefit of
9	the public, all of your concerns about this design.
10	I am sure if there is any problem in the
11	future that people will look back and say, well, you
12	know, how did this happen?
13	How did we miss this? What did NuScale
14	say? What did the NRC say? What did the ACRS say?
15	So, it's important that you fully express
16	all your concerns about this design. I know, you
17	don't address the PR aspect of this whole thing.
18	You don't make a decision about whether
19	this NuScale design is a carbon free power project.
20	Which, if course, is ridiculous industry in Department
21	of Energy public installations.
22	So, I see many different views from many
23	different aspects. I see the local concern about the
24	cost of this.
25	I see the NuScale and the industry trying

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

	180
1	to save money and reduce the cost by limiting the
2	emergency planning zone. By reducing the number of
3	operators to one in the control room.
4	When you're talking about control room
5	operator action, that maybe just one operator and two
6	senior operators. That's what NuScale would like to
7	have.
8	So, there are a lot of different
9	perspectives that you don't hear about, that you don't
10	know about. But, you need to completely consider and
11	document all the issues. Thank you.
12	CHAIR SUNSERI: Thank you for those
13	remarks. Any other members of the public care to make
14	a comment?
15	MR. DAVIS: This is Ed Davis with the
16	Pegasus Group. I've just got a very simple question.
17	Is the NRC White Paper, 30 page White
18	Paper going to be made available? And if so, where
19	would we find it?
20	CHAIR SUNSERI: I'm going to ask you to
21	contact our Federal Agent, Mike Snodderly for a
22	response to the question.
23	Mr. Snodderly would you make a statement?
24	MR. SNODDERLY: Yes. So, Dr. Yarsky's
25	paper does have a does have an ML number. But I

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

	181
1	don't know if they have a it is a proprietary
2	report.
3	I don't know if they're going to is I
4	would imagine they're going to issue a redacted
5	version.
6	Is there someone from the staff that can
7	verify what I'm saying is correct?
8	MS. BRADFORD: This is Anna Bradford from
9	the Office of Nuclear Reactor Relation. Yes. Our
10	plan was to, as you said, Mike, it's a prop version
11	that you have.
12	But we do plan to make a non proprietary
13	version publically available.
14	MR. SNODDERLY: So Ed, if you contact
15	Mr. Ferguson, if you yeah, my email is
16	Michael.Snodderly@NRC.gov. And I can get you that ML
17	number when the public version is available.
18	But it doesn't exist at this time.
19	MS. DAVIS: Well, thank you very much.
20	Thank you.
21	MR. SNODDERLY: You're welcome.
22	CHAIR SUNSERI: Okay. Any other members
23	of the public care to make a comment?
24	(No response)
25	CHAIR SUNSERI: All right. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

	182
1	Thomas, please close the public line.
2	THOMAS: The public line is closed.
3	CHAIR SUNSERI: Members, any additional
4	business to cover before we close this meeting?
5	(No response)
6	CHAIR SUNSERI: Okay. Well, I just want
7	to extend the appreciation of the ACRS to the NRC
8	staff, and the Applicant who supported us this
9	weekend. And everybody's engaged and active
10	participation.
11	So, I thank you all. And at this point,
12	we are adjourned. Thank you.
13	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
14	off the record at 4:35 p.m.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	



Reactivity Effects: kinetic issues; doppler and void coefficient















