

K

From: William Dean *NRK*
To: Adensam, Elinor, Holian, Brian, Milano, Patrick *NRK*
Date: Mon, Nov 13, 2000 6:05 PM
Subject: Re: Fwd: Proposed Red Finding and NOV for Indian Point 2

Please check that we are characterizing red and yellow findings in accordance with program - we use high safety significance for red and substantial safety significance for yellow findings.

Also, on pp. 2 of cover letter, may want a closure sentence on the paragraph relating to the mootness of whether it is yellow or red, which says something to the effect that the level of effort to better define the uncertainties and get a more exact risk characterization is not warranted, given the range of values determined by sensitivity analysis of key uncertainties.

Appeal criteria is in Attachment 3, not supplement 3 of MC 0609 (para 3 of pp. 2)

Final staff risk assessment in attachment, pp 7, 2nd para of Initiating event frequency section, line 3 : delete "that" after the word staff and replace "meager" with "limited"; Also, the last sentence of this para. reads better as "Therefore the probabilities utilized by the staff in its analysis are 0.33 for"

Could use the article "a" before the word tube at end of 1st line of 4th para in this section.

Under section on conditional prob. for tube rupture, could use similar language on the "split" of probabilities, as I noted above.

Otherwise, it reads as good as it is gonna be.

I will be in Region IV the next couple days if you need any more "help"

>>> Brian Holian 11/13 10:25 AM >>>
fyi - I have attached a few edits that Steve Long proposed for attachment to the letter.

RI agrees.

We are looking for rest of concurrences today... In support of getting letter to Sam Collins and hopefully up to Commission.

I am checking on whether 11/16 briefing for Diaz is still on...Joe...?

thanks
Brian

CC: Shea, Joseph

53
 26
 [Signature]