

**From:** Lawrence Rossbach  
**To:** Allan.haeger@Exeloncorp.com  
**Date:** 10/1/01 5:03PM  
**Subject:** Seismic information clarifications

The staff would like to clarify a few points that came up in reviewing your Dresden EPU risk information submittals from last week. See attached. We would like to arrange a call on this.

**CC:** Anthony Mendiola; Donald Harrison; Stewart Bailey

*Docket Nos. 50-237, 50-249*

Dresden seismic information that needs to be explained:

1. The earthquake goes up in steps of 0.1g, until it reaches G8 and then this step goes up by 0.2g. From my quick estimate, this will underestimate the CDF values by about 10% for the non-LOCA and 20% for the LOCA event. Why shouldn't G8 cover 0.7 - 0.8 g and a new G9 cover 0.8 - 0.9g and then have a new final step of G10 >0.9g?

2. Could Dresden provide the equation for calculating the seismic non-LOCA, such as:

$$CDF = S * DF * [ICF + HEPI + (CWDTF * CSTF) + (HEPI + CSTF)]$$

S - Seismic Hazard Value

DF - Dam Failure

ICF - Isolation Condenser Fails

HEPi - Early alignment of CWDT or CST

CWDTF - Clean Demin. Water Tank Failure

CSTF - 1A Condensate Storage Tank Failure

HEPI - Later alignment of CST supply to IC

Also, is credit being taken for the 2/3A or 2/3B CSTs?

3. What is the SORV failure probability used in the LOCA case pre- and post-uprate? Also, it is not clear what the numbers represent in the last sentence in the second to last paragraph (i.e., ... 1.9E-6/yr to 2.1E-6/yr with an EPU delta of 4.6E-8/yr.) The base case LOCA (without considering SORV) is 1.9E-6/yr. This base case increases to 2.1E-6/yr when the SORV failure probability is included. When EPU is considered does the base case value with SORV consideration increase by an additional 4.6E-8, which is totally due to the increased probability of an SORV due to the cycling of the valves? In essence, the EPU value would then be 2.146E-6.