

**From:** Diane Jackson *Nrk*  
**To:** Glenn Kelly, Joseph Staudenmeier *Nrk*  
**Date:** Wed, Nov 17, 1999 9:32 AM  
**Subject:** Green ticket: Staff response to ACRS letter

We just received a green ticket to respond to the ACRS letter to the Commission (dated 11/12) on our ACRS presentation (11/5). To the extent possible, Gary would like us to respond to the ACRS on the feasibility of their suggestions. Of course, at this late date, we really do not have the luxury of incorporating new items our analyses. But we need to address the ACRS's suggestions.

In the conclusions and recommendations section - please look at the items in your area.

Joe - Items 1 and 2

1) Uncertainties related to oxidation kinetics and heat rejection mechanisms - they suggest conservative choices or additional research - is there anything we can do (look into doing) in these two areas to improve our analysis.

2) uncertainties in analysis for critical temperature for the onset of runaway oxidation - can they be quantified? - conservative choices again or perhaps discuss the dependence on the ability of the code to model oxidation as a factor?

Glenn - Items 3 - 5, plus one

3) I don't see any suggestions that need to be responded to - perhaps we just agree with their statement that PRAs should be as realistic AS POSSIBLE and not OVERLY conservative.

4) Distributions vs point estimates - I think Ed uses distributions (?) - can we say we will/are using distributions where we have sufficient information.

5) Using LERF as frequency

Extra) Respond to the "rationalist approach" comment?

The due date to Sam is 12/8 - subtract 2 days for Brian Sheron (12/6) - 2-3 days for Gary (12/1) - **How about having a draft by Tuesday 23rd?** - (Thursday & Friday are shot with the holiday), then we will have a few days for the section and branch chiefs to look at it (11/24. 11/29- 12/1).

Thanks - Diane

**CC:** Eric Weiss, Gareth Parry, GTH, Jared Wermiel, ...

Q/1119