

FACSIMILE SERVICE REQUEST

DATE: May 4, 1999

MESSAGE TO: Jason H. Schaperow c/o Double Tree Hotel

TELECOPY NUMBER: 9-1-505-247-7025
AUTOMATIC (X) MANUAL ()

VERIFICATION NUMBER: 9-1-505-247-3344

NO. OF PAGES: 1 (EXCLUDING REQUEST SHEET)

RETURN COPIES? YES (X)
()

CITY AND STATE: Albuquerque, New Mexico

MESSAGE FROM: John N. Ridgely

BUILDING: T 10E44 OFFICE PHONE: 415-6555 MAIL STOP: T 10K8
FAX: 415-5062

SPECIAL INSTRUCTION(S):

NOTE TO RECIPIENT: IF THERE
ARE ANY PROBLEMS PLEASE
CALL: (301)

SENDER'S INITIALS ____

SERVICE: IMMEDIATE X OTHER ____

Jason:

Enclosed is a copy of the e-mail that I sent to you and Charlie for your
advanced information. If you have any questions, let me know.

Have Fun!

John N. Ridgely

C/44

Subject: MACCS Calculations re: SFP Fires
Date: Tue, 04 May 1999 07:07:19 -0400
From: "John N. Ridgely" <melcor%res12@nrc.gov>
Organization: U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
To: jhs1@nrc.gov
CC: "Charles G. Tinkler" <CGT@NRC.gov>

NRR (Glenn Kelly, Mike Cheok, Vonna Ordaz, and Jim O'Brien) wanted to talk about your MACCS calculations for postulated SFP fires. I answered the questions as best I could. They identified additional calculations that they wanted performed, as follows:

Consequences:	0 - 50 miles								
	0 - 100 miles								
Consequence Measures:	Early Fatalities								
	Latent Cancers								
	Population Dose (no changes here)								
Warning Time:	5 hours								
Delay Time:	<table border="0"> <tr> <td><u>Hours</u></td> <td><u>Percent Population</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>30</td> </tr> </table>	<u>Hours</u>	<u>Percent Population</u>	1	40	3	30	5	30
<u>Hours</u>	<u>Percent Population</u>								
1	40								
3	30								
5	30								
Population:	Uniform = 100 people/square mile								
Meteorology:	Surry Site (no change)								
Emergency Protective Actions:	1) None (normal activity) 2) "Adhoc EP" (Undefined at this time) 3) "Normal EP" (defined by NRR as 95%/5%)								

They stated that they needed the results of your revised calculations by Tuesday, May 11, 1999. I told them that IF (NOTE THE CONDITIONAL HERE) you could devote full time to this work Monday and Tuesday and Charles could provide you the needed support, you could get the calculations run by Tuesday morning and with Charles' review Tuesday afternoon you could probably provide DRAFT results by cob Tuesday. I said that you two would want to take some time to assure yourselves that the calculations were correct before giving them final results.

I stated that we had reservations about a "no EP" case, but that we would consider such a case.

They did not seem to be concerned that the cases that you ran were not strictly NUREG-1150 PAA. They do, however, want to know the assumptions that you are using. (Note: Julie's comparison of the sample case and NUREG-1150 assumptions is in both of your mail boxes.)

They asked the same question as we did: "Why did the latent cancers increase for the one year case?". I could not remember your answer but stated that we considered all the results to be the essentially the same, i.e., there is no difference in offsite consequences between the cases.

They questioned the validity of your release fractions (too high) and inventories. All I could say was that you took them out of a report.