

**From:** Timothy Collins / *WAC*  
**To:** Charles Tinkler, Diane Jackson, Edward Throm, G...  
**Date:** Mon, Aug 21, 2000 9:12 AM  
**Subject:** Re: 3.5 cores for SFP accidents

Ed,

**Thanks, but some clarification please: If only the last two years could be involved in the fire, then I get for Ginna  $2 \times 24 / 121 = 0.4$  cores; and for Millstone:  $2 \times 173 / 580 = 0.6$  cores.**

**Also , you indated that GI-82 "concluded" that only the last 1-2 years of fuel would be involved.... What drove that conclusion?**

Tim

**>>> Edward Throm 08/21 7:57 AM >>>**

Ref: NUREG/CR-4982, Appendix A

The inventories used for GI-82 were based on the actual loadings at Ginna and Millstone 1 when the report was written.

Ginna: 428 assemblies in the pool / 121 assemblies in core: **3.5 core equivalents**

Millstone: 1653 assemblies in the pool / 580 assemblies in core: **2.9 core equivalents**

GI-82 "concluded" that only the last one to two years of discharged fuel would be involved in a zirc-fire.

Ginna discharged 24 assemblies per refuel, and Millstone 173 assemblies per refuel.

**>>> George Hubbard 8/18/2000 1:17:17 PM >>>**

Tim asked the question as to the origin of using 3.5 cores in determing the source term and consequences for spent fuel pool accidents. In particular this is important since Joe says in his appendix that fire propagation is probably limited to less than two cores (Section 1.7 of T/H Appendix, page A1-9, last paragpah of February Report). Does anyone know the answer?

Diane, if we don't know the answer can you do some research to determine why? Note that Ed Throm is out of the office until August 28.

Thanks,

George Hubbard  
2870

**CC:** Glenn Kelly, Joseph Staudenmeier, Mark Rubin, M...

*m/s9*