

**From:** Steven Long  
**To:** James Trapp, Wayne Schmidt  
**Date:** Thu, Aug 24, 2000 10:00 AM  
**Subject:** Re: GOOD JOB!

Wayne and Jim,

I read the risk write-up revision attached to your e-mail. It's well done. I was going to make one suggestion, but eventually came to the conclusion that Jim's way of handling it was probably best.

The sentence I was going to try to "improve" says, "The NRC staff determined that the performance issues identified in this inspection report, changed the SGT failure frequency to 1 failure per year." People may quibble with this by saying that the rupture probability was 0.5 in the analysis. On third thought, that's great, because they would then be acknowledging that they were familiar with the details of the analysis, and we could get into it directly.

Steve

>>> James Trapp 08/23 12:45 PM >>>  
Your briefing sounded good on the phone!

I've attached a Rev. to the report. Like I said, I have no strong feelings if you want to leave it as is. I simply rearranged your paragraphs to put the guidance stuff first and the finding specific issues last. I also changed the draft NUREG reference to the SDP appendix H. I don't think that appendix H was issued at the time Steve did his analysis. I also added a reference NUREG for the .5 assumption, since CE questioned this and I don't believe it's captured in Steve's assessment. Please look at it carefully and see if there is anything you would like to use. I did it quickly and it hasn't been peer reviewed!

①

A1172