

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL TICKET

Date Printed: Jul 31, 2012 09:07

PAPER NUMBER: LTR-12-0384

LOGGING DATE: 07/31/2012

ACTION OFFICE: EDO

To: Leeds, NRR

AUTHOR: Tom Gurdziel

AFFILIATION:

ADDRESSEE: Chairman Resource

SUBJECT: Concerns NRC Bulletin 2012-01 - Design Vulnerability in Electric Power System

cys: EDO  
DEDMRT  
DEDR  
DEDCM  
AO  
Mercke, OEDO

ACTION: Appropriate

DISTRIBUTION:

LETTER DATE: 07/30/2012

ACKNOWLEDGED No

SPECIAL HANDLING:

NOTES:

FILE LOCATION: ADAMS

DATE DUE:

DATE SIGNED:

Template: SECY-017

E-RIDS: SECY-01

Joosten, Sandy

---

**From:** Tom Gurdziel [tgurdziel@twcny.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 30, 2012 11:00 PM  
**To:** CHAIRMAN Resource  
**Cc:** hillsc@INPO.org; Bridget.Frymire@dps.ny.gov; 'Vanags, Uldis'; Screnci, Diane; 'Newal Agnihotri'; 'Tom Henry'  
**Subject:** NRC Bulletin 2012-01: Design Vulnerability in Electric Power System

Hello,

I tried to read this bulletin this evening but my electrical background is not sufficient to understand the significance of either a "high impedance ground fault" or how a plant can meet existing electrical requirements and still not know it has no voltage on one phase.

In any event, I want to say that, when I was on an operating shift, it was my understanding that all nuclear plants needed two sources of off site AC power supply and they were NOT to be combined (as was apparently the case at Byron). So maybe, instead of asking everybody to see if they are doing what they had agreed to do many years ago, we should see if they are doing what needs to be done now.

And, let me make this final point. If 2 out of 2 logic does not provide the necessary protection, (and I think I do understand that it did not at Byron), Then, instead of accepting it, why don't we challenge it by asking, wouldn't 1 out of 2 logic be safer?

Thank you,

Tom Gurdziel