

(5)

From: <LOFARO@dnenet.nov.dne.bnl.gov>  
To: TWD2.TWP0(ska)  
Date: 12/2/96 2:47pm  
Subject: Jim Gleason's Comments to NUREG/CR-6412

Satish:

In addition to the BNL comments sent to you on October 28, attached are comments from Jim Gleason on Sandia NUREG/CR-6412.

Bob Lofaro

----- Forwarded Message Follows -----

Date: Mon, 02 Dec 1996 00:14:04 -0600  
To: LOFARO@dnenet.nov.dne.bnl.gov  
From: glsinc@Traveller.COM  
Subject: Jim Gleason's Comments to NUREG/CR-6412

The subject NUREG/CR-6412 has several flaws. The most obvious are :

1. The 5 connector "failures" in submerged dielectric testing are an artifact of the test performed by Sandia and are not an indication of an Environmental Qualification problem. The failures are due to a lack of understanding of the connectors' safety related functions, lack of understanding of the different connector categories represented by the test specimens, and a lab induced failure mode. The ten connector types tested actually represent four categories of connectors. All five failures came from one category of connector and would all be susceptible to the same lab induced failure mode.
2. Of the twelve connector types tested, 11 out of 12 passed all of the requirements for environmental qualification. The one that failed is indicative of handling damage and may have been damaged by Sandia.
3. The objectives of the testing were to A) Assess accident performance of electrical connectors aged at lower temperatures and dose rates than typical industry tests and B) Investigate the performance of connectors aged to 60-year life. The testing clearly shows that both objectives have been met and that A) lower temperature and lower dose rate testing do not impact qualification and B) there is no performance degradation in extending the life to 60 years.
4. The results of the terminal block testing demonstrate that the previous issues reported by "Craft (5,6)," have been shown to be non-issues.

I will gladly discuss these results with you at your earliest convenience. Please note that Satish Aggarwal and Paul Schemanski had asked for my input on this NUREG/CR-6412 and would be interested in hearing that the failures at Sandia, in my opinion, were caused by Sandia. I do recommend a review of Sandia's data and a review of their failure analysis to confirm my conclusions.

1/0

*I & P 11 Guides / Manuals*

130010  
9702130102 961202  
PDR NUREG  
CR-6412 C PDR

A061