

From: PAUL M. BLANCH <PMBLANCH@ix.netcom.com>
To: DIANE SCRENCI <DPS@nrc.gov>
Date: 10/3/96 7:18pm
Subject: CY ECCS

Diane:

This is a good answer but it must have been to some other question. Please review your response to my question I posed to you recently. I don't think I got a direct answer. More specifically I want to know what systems Roger was referring to when he stated there were other systems to cool the core. What specific procedures is Roger referring to? I would like him to cite the procedures by number. Bill Raymond said to me there are other sources of water for the RWST. What are these other systems and how long will it take to restore cooling during a LOCA. Assuming a design basis LOCA, how many gallons are available and how long will these other systems be able to cool the core. Would there be any core damage? What about releases to the environment?
Please give me some real answers to these questions.

I wrote:

>Roger Hannah:

>This morning you informed a member of the public there are other systems capable of cooling the core during a LOCA at CY. Assume the sump is plugged or there is insufficient NPSH for the pumps, please explain to me what pumps would be used and the source of the water for long term cooling. Would this system be available with a loss of offsite power? >What are the radiological consequences of this event assuming insufficient >NPSH for the ECCS?

>With your statement to this person, I would assume your statement is backed by an analysis by either NU or the NRC. Please respond by either e-mail or by phone.

Diane responded:

Subject: your question Sent: 10/1/96 8:32 PM
Received: 10/1/96 4:46 PM
From: Diane Screnci, DPS@nrc.gov
To: PAUL BLANCH, pmb Blanch@ix.netcom.com
Enclosure: blanch

Paul, I'm forwarding to you a response to the questions you posed to Roger Hannah regarding comments he made about the most recent Haddam Neck inspection findings.

Diane

In response to your e-mail message to me:

In response to general questions about the ECCS, I told a member of the public (the person I assume you also talked to) the licensee would in all likelihood use or attempt to use a number of different methods to cool the

core in an accident situation. These methods include actions directed by the emergency operating procedures. These procedures deal with conditions within, as well as, beyond the design basis for the facility and address safety and non-safety equipment.

In my phone conversation, I did not imply that we were unconcerned about the ECCS questions. In fact, two items on page 32 of NRC Inspection Report 50-213/96-08 [available at www.nrc.gov/OPA/reports/hn.htm] directly address the specific concerns you mentioned in your e-mail message: (1) Among the "issues to be resolved before plant restart" is "modifications to address RHR NPSH - eliminate the reliance on containment back pressure, and to upgrade the containment sump." (2) An NRC inspector verified that the mesh openings in the containment sump screen were "larger than used in the operability determination." The plant is currently shut down and the ECCS issues are being seriously reviewed by NU and the NRC prior to restart

Paul M. Blanch
Energy Consultant
135 Hyde Rd.
West Hartford CT 06117
Voice 860-236-0326
Fax 860-232-9350