

From: James Trapp
To: David Lew, Thomas Shedlosky, Wayne Schmidt
Date: Mon, Jul 24, 2000 7:45 AM
Subject: Fwd: IP-2 SGTR-Rev. 1

A/219

②

From: Don Marksberry
To: James Trapp
Date: Fri, Jul 21, 2000 1:36 PM
Subject: IP-2 SGTR--Rev. 1

Jim,

IP-2 assumes a human error probability of $1.2E-3$ for RWST refill (from their IPE). Can you find out what the basis for basis for $1.2E-3$, such as:

- (1) Is the refill operation proceduralized?
- (2) How long would it take them to implement the procedure to start makeup?
- (3) What is the max makeup capacity for RWST refill?
- (4) Was an adequate human reliability analysis performed by the licensee?

It looks like that the RWST refill as a recovery option can reduce the CCDP of a SGTR a lot by extending the time to recovery other dominating problems. However, the risk to the environment/public goes up through the roof.

I'm working on an conditional assessment . The actual event from an initiating event assessment ended up to be $<E-6$ based on the slow nature of the leak which give plenty of time to take action and recover equipment failures. This assumes no makeup to the RWST. We are still looking at this, however.

The conditional assessment will include the probability of a tube leak leading to a rupture (around 400 gpm). The CCDP will be the fraction of the CCDP for a SGTR initiating event. We are working on the conditional probability from the operating experience.

Thanks.

don