

From: <pshastings@dukeengineering.com>  
To: TWFN\_DO.twf4\_po(DLM1)  
Date: Fri, Apr 28, 2000 3:36 PM  
Subject: Amendmrent to DCS MOX SRP Comments

RECEIVED  
200 APR 29 AM 5:12  
RULES & REGULATORY DIVISION  
US NRC

Mr. David L. Meyer, Chief  
Rules Review and Directives Branch  
Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards  
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission

65 FR 4856  
2-1-00  
15

Dear Mr. Meyer:

Discussion with Mr. Andrew Persinko (NRC/NMSS) indicated that a previously transmitted message regarding a correction to Duke Cogema Stone & Webster's (DCS's) comments on the draft NUREG-1718 (Standard Review Plan for a MOX facility) may not have reached you. Accordingly, I am retransmitting that correction. Please note this change to our comments appropriately, and let me know if you need any additional information.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,  
Peter Hastings  
Licensing Manager  
Duke Cogema Stone & Webster

cc: Andrew Persinko  
Betty K. Golden

----- Forwarded by Peter S Hastings/Fed/DukeEngineering on  
04/28/2000 03:30 PM -----

Peter S Hastings 03/28/2000 11:01 AM  
(Embedded image moved to file: pic25216.pcx)

To: axp1@nrc.gov  
cc: Mark A Michelsen/Fed/DukeEngineering@DukePower, William P  
Hennessy/Fed/DukeEngineering@DukePower, John M McConaghy  
Jr/Fed/DukeEngineering@DukePower  
Subject: Amendmrent to DCS MOX SRP Comments

Our Comment 194 reads as follows:

"The last two paragraphs on this page, describing the iterative nature of natural phenomena analyses, are confusing. It indicates that maximum-magnitude natural phenomena should be evaluated (i.e., in terms of likelihood and consequence), and if performance is unacceptable, less likely hazards should be evaluated. It is nearly certain that, if a given design fails to perform adequately under a given phenomenon, then it will perform better under a less likely (i.e., higher magnitude) event. Revising the design to reflect performance against the natural phenomenon is not discussed, but if the design is changed, it is not obvious that a less likely event necessarily need be considered."

E-RIDS = ADM-03  
Add: Andrew  
Persinko (AXP1)

Template: ADM013

Obviously the third sentence of the comment should read: "It is nearly certain that, if a given design fails to perform adequately under a given phenomenon, then it will NOT perform better under a less likely (i.e., higher magnitude) event."

I apologize for the error. Please note this change and inform Mr. Meyer appropriately. Thank you.

**CC:** "MOXDOCUMENTUM" <MOXDOCUMENTUM@duke-energy.com>

Received: from igate ([148.184.176.31])  
by smtp (GroupWise SMTP/MIME daemon 4.1 v3)  
; Fri, 28 Apr 00 15:36:16 EDT

Received: from nrc.gov  
by smtp-gateway ESMTPœ id PAA04676;  
Fri, 28 Apr 2000 15:38:44 -0400 (EDT)

From: pshastings@dukeengineering.com

Received: from deinet01.dukepower.com (deinet01.dukepower.com [148.134.58.199])  
by malone.dukepower.com (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id PAA15554;  
Fri, 28 Apr 2000 15:36:57 -0400

Received: by deinet01.dukepower.com(Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.3 (733.2 10-16-1998)) id  
852568CF.006BB671 ; Fri, 28 Apr 2000 15:36:29 -0400

X-Lotus-FromDomain: DUKEPOWER

To: dlm1@nrc.gov

cc: bkg2@nrc.gov, Axp1@nrc.gov,  
"MOXDOCUMENTUM" <MOXDOCUMENTUM@duke-energy.com>

Message-ID: <852568CF.006BB3CA.00@deinet01.dukepower.com>

Date: Fri, 28 Apr 2000 15:36:27 -0400

Subject: Amendmrent to DCS MOX SRP Comments

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed;  
Boundary="0\_\_=O7HvePq0Lzm8RusEnYfY6gDVTqUzXNeP3TAVotSKwldSGezeBff9Ws4g"

Content-Disposition: inline