

**From:** George Hubbard , *NPP*  
**To:** Charles Tinkler, Jason Schaperow, Joseph Stauden...  
**Date:** Wed, Apr 26, 2000 7:38 AM  
**Subject:** Fwd: VB: Comments nr 2. to Draft Final Technical Study SFP Risks at De com NPPs

FYI. More comments.

George Hubbard  
2870

**CC:** Diane Jackson, Glenn Kelly, John Hannon, Mark R...

*m/76*

**From:** Richard Dudley *R. Dudley*  
**To:** David Meyer, George Hubbard  
**Date:** Tue, Apr 25, 2000 10:50 AM  
**Subject:** Fwd: VB: Comments nr 2. to Draft Final Technical Study SFP Risks at De com NPPs

Attached are comments from Sweden (SKI) on the TWG report. I think we should include them in the report with the other comments, but they might need to be addressed first depending on the SKI schedule. I will discuss the schedule with SKI and let you know if they have any special needs.

Dick Dudley  
415-1116; rfd

**CC:** Michael Masnik, William Huffman

**From:** <Richard.Olsson@ski.se>  
**To:** OWFN\_DO.owf4\_po(RFD)  
**Date:** Tue, Apr 25, 2000 10:42 AM  
**Subject:** VB: Comments nr 2. to Draft Final Technical Study SFP Risks at De com NPPs

Dear Mr Dudley,

During our study of the report, we have found a couple more questions/comments and would appreciate if you can comment on them.

Best regards

Richard Olsson

-----Ursprungligt meddelande-----

Från: ferenc@eskonsult.se [mailto:ferenc@eskonsult.se] Skickat: den 25 april 2000 16:07

Till: Richard.Olsson@ski.se; mats@eskonsult.se

Ämne: Comments nr 2. to Draft Final Technical Study SFP Risks at Decom  
NPPs

Bifogar ytterligare comments till NRC

Mvh

Ferenc Muller

Bifogar ytterligare comments till NRC

Mvh

Ferenc Muller

**Memorandum**

Issued by  
Mats Sjöberg/ Ferenc Müller

Reviewed by

Approved by

Date  
2000-04-25

Client

Project

Subject

To

Copy

Page  
1(1)

**Questions/Comments on the NRC "Draft final technical study of spent fuel accidents risk at decommissioning nuclear power plants", 7590-01-P.**

Dear Mr Dudley,

During our study of the report, we have found a couple more questions/comments and would appreciate if you can comment on them.

1. Page A1-7 in the report says:

"When zirconium reaches temperatures where air oxidation is significant, the heat source is dominated by oxidation. The energy of the reaction is 262 kcal per mole of zirconium. In air, the oxidation rate and the energy of the reaction is higher than zirconium-steam oxidation."

We can transfer 262 kcal to other units:  
 $262 \text{ kcal per mol Zr} = 1.1 \text{ MJ per mol Zr}$  ( $1 \text{ mol Zr} = 91.2 \text{ kg Zr}$ ) =  
 $1.1\text{E}+06/91.2 = 1.2\text{E}+04 \text{ J/kg Zr}$ . We can conclude that the air oxidation energi according to the report is  $= 1.2\text{E}+04 \text{ J per kg Zr}$

The corresponding values for Zr-steam reaktion in the Melcor manual =  $6.43\text{E}+06 \text{ J/kg Zr}$   
 (Ref. Bottom Head Package, Reference Manual, Table 3.6. Heats of reaction at 1,700 K)  
 The Maap code uses  $6.18\text{E}+08 \text{ J per mol Zr} = 6.78\text{E}+06 \text{ J/kg Zr}$ , for Zr-steam reaktion i.e. near the same as Melcor.

There is a factor 500 difference in the oxidaton energi and to the wrong direction.

2. Release Fractions, Page A4-5, Table A4-3.

100 % release is assumed for noble gases, iodine and cesium.

We feel that this is too conservative. The latest estimates by the Swedish Radiation Protection Institute for the Tjernobyl case says that 100 % of the noble gases, 50-60 % of the iodine and 20-40% of the cesium were released

ES

*Datum*  
2000-04-05

*Sida*  
2(1)

at the accident.