

From: Ellis Merschoff, *ELU*  
To: Brian Sheron; Gary Holahan; Jim Dyer; John Grobe; Jon Johnson; Samuel Collins  
Date: 8/31/02 8:41AM  
Subject: Re: Davis Besse Reactor head Degradation SDP

Gary,

I answered this email once but it seems to have disappeared into the ether. So, if two versions eventually show up, I apologize.

*ELU*  
[REDACTED]

We appreciate the opportunity to review the SDP and contribute our thoughts.

Additionally, a poisson ratio of 0.5 (rubber) was used, vice 0.295 (steel). and a radius was modelled at the point of attachment of the clad to the vessel base metal.

So, we appreciate the opportunity to weigh in. Our interest is to inform the agency's thinking with our best thoughts on the matter as the decision is being considered.

Thanks

Ellis

>>> Gary Holahan 08/30/02 12:44PM >>>

Ellis,  
Jim,

*NEC*  
Brian forwarded a copy of Ellis' s simplified SDP analysis for the Davis Besse performance deficiencies related to the Reactor Vessel Head Degradation. I must confess that I am not a fan of simplified PRA analysis. It's just too easy to miss something important and too hard to defend when challenged. I have done simplified PRAs in the past (single sequence, point estimate vs full distributions, no parameter or model uncertainty analysis ...) and have usually regretted it later.

Since we are near the final stage of the SDP analysis, I suggest that our draft analysis be reviewed by Reg IV in addition to the currently planned NRR, RES and Reg III reviews. In that way we can, hopefully, develop an agency consensus around a single, final version that Jack Grobe can use, with confidence, as part of the 0350 process. I expect the draft SDP analysis to be available for review by next week.

Gary

CC: Bill Bateman; Bruce Boger; Cynthia Carpenter; Elmo Collins; F. Mark Reinhart; Mark

information in this record was deleted  
in accordance with the Freedom of Information  
Act, exemptions 3  
FOIA- 2003-0018

634