

EDO Principal Correspondence Control

FROM: DUE: 07/05/12 EDO CONTROL: G20120390
DOC DT: 05/31/12
FINAL REPLY:

Tom Gurdziel

TO:

Chairman Jaczko

FOR SIGNATURE OF : ** GRN ** CRC NO: 12-0268

Leeds, NRR

DESC:

Fukushima Comment - Cool-Down Rate in Accident
Conditions (EDATS: SECY-2012-0292)

ROUTING:

Borchardt
Weber
Johnson
Ash
Mamish
OGC/GC
Merzke, OEDO

DATE: 06/05/12

ASSIGNED TO:

CONTACT:

NRR

Leeds

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS OR REMARKS:

Template: SECY-017

E-RIDS: SECY-01

EDATS Number: SECY-2012-0292

Source: SECY

General Information

Assigned To: NRR

OEDO Due Date: 7/5/2012 11:00 PM

Other Assignees:

SECY Due Date: NONE

Subject: Fukushima Comment - Cool-Down Rate in Accident Conditions

Description:

CC Routing: NONE

ADAMS Accession Numbers - Incoming: NONE

Response/Package: NONE

Other Information

Cross Reference Number: G20120390, LTR-12-0268

Staff Initiated: NO

Related Task:

Recurring Item: NO

File Routing: EDATS

Agency Lesson Learned: NO

OEDO Monthly Report Item: NO

Process Information

Action Type: E-mail

Priority: Medium

Sensitivity: None

Signature Level: No Signature Required

Urgency: NO

Approval Level: No Approval Required

OEDO Concurrence: NO

OCM Concurrence: NO

OCA Concurrence: NO

Special Instructions:

Document Information

Originator Name: Tom Gurdziel

Date of Incoming: 5/31/2012

Originating Organization: Citizens

Document Received by SECY Date: 6/5/2012

Addressee: Chairman Jaczko

Date Response Requested by Originator: NONE

Incoming Task Received: E-mail

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL TICKET

Date Printed: Jun 05, 2012 08:26

PAPER NUMBER: LTR-12-0268

LOGGING DATE: 06/05/2012

ACTION OFFICE: EDO

AUTHOR: Tom Gurdziel

AFFILIATION: NY

ADDRESSEE: Chairman Resource

SUBJECT: Fukushima-related comments for 5-31-2012 - 100 degrees F. per hour

ACTION: Appropriate

DISTRIBUTION:

LETTER DATE: 05/31/2012

ACKNOWLEDGED No

SPECIAL HANDLING:

NOTES:

FILE LOCATION: ADAMS

DATE DUE:

DATE SIGNED:

EDO --G20120390

Joosten, Sandy

From: Tom Gurdziel [tgurdziel@twcny.rr.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2012 8:29 AM
To: CHAIRMAN Resource
Cc: hillsc@INPO.org; Bridget.Frymire@dps.ny.gov; Screnci, Diane; P.Kaiser@iaea.org; jicc@ws.mofa.go.jp; JLD_Public Resource; 'Newal Agnihotri'; 'Tom Henry'; 'Vanags, Uldis'; Bowman, Gregory; ESTRONSKI@aol.com
Subject: Fukushima-related Comments for 5-31-2012

Good morning,

100 degrees F. per hour

Suppose you are an on-duty plant operator. If you knew you had a choice to either cooldown the reactor vessel at 100 degrees F. per hour or prevent the reactor core from melting, I am sure that you would choose to save the core. But suppose that choice was not apparent, as it was not at Fukushima Daiichi Unit 1 on March 11, 2011?

Does it make sense for us to continue to require a cooldown rate of 100 degrees F. per hour (or less) in accident conditions when time is critical, given that this was instrumental in destroying the Unit 1 reactor core?

Yet, after more than a year, I have still not seen any identification that the existing cooldown rate is no longer defensible in accident situations. Or is it?

How about somebody taking a look at the possible (accident) value of a fast cooldown by emergency condensers, (which is a passive system)?

Thank you,

Tom Gurdziel