From: James Trapp
To: Wayne Schmidt
Date: Fri, Aug 25, 2000 1:18 PM
Subject: Per your Request

I looked at the AIT and copied the first part of the attached. The second (bold, underlined & italiced) part I just dreamed up! In the AIT they wouldn't allow us to put a high, medium or low significance label on it. The political fervor was high so we just stated CCDP facts!

2

A/174

The licensee took the necessary steps to mitigate this event, including shutdown of the reactor, identification and isolation of the faulted SG, and cooldown of the RCS. The Team noted that no radioactivity was measured off-site in excess of normal background levels and determined that the event did not impact the health and safety of the public. Necessary event mitigation systems worked properly. The results of the licensee and independent NRC risk evaluation of this event were similar. The risk estimates are conservative in that the actual SG tube leak rate (maximum about 146 gallons per minute (gpm) at the initial reactor coolant system temperature and pressure) was less than the SG tube leak rate design analysis. This increased the amount of time operators had to complete the necessary event mitigation activities. The increased time to perform the necessary accident mitigation functions would lower the expected operator error rate, and reduce the plant risk below the calculated risk value. The licensee determined that the conditional core damage probability (CCDP) for this event was ~7.7×10^{-5}. A preliminary NRC determination of CCDP for this event was ~1.0×10^{-4}. The CCDP is used to estimate the risk significance of conditions or events. ***A more detailed risk analysis, which incorporated corrections for the actual steam generator leak rate experience during the event, determined that the CCDP of this event was ~2E-6. Events with CCDP in this range would be considered to have low to moderate risk safety significance***.