

>>> "Steve Long" [REDACTED] 05/24/02 03:56PM >>>
To all,

E + B

I'm not sure I got my position across well enough in the phone call, so I am writing it down to be sure.

Since the modelling uncertainty will dominate the estimation process for the probabilities that the as-found cavity would have failed if exposed to the various pressure levels below 2500 psi, I am saying that I will be counting on RES and its contractors to come up with a rationally defensible basis for the values that I am requesting. I am further requesting that the basis not be dependent on what the licensee has submitted. That is, the credibility of their position, or the probability that they are right, or however you want to think of it, should be independent of the fact that it is what the licensee submitted. "Our" probabilities should depend on "our" estimates of how probably things can differ from "our" best guess. And, those probabilities need to be defended on that basis. A process that automatically gives a licensee's subjective estimate equal weight with a staff/staff contractor's subjective estimate would be a regulatory problem, because that would allow a licensee to arbitrarily influence the agency's regulatory response to a problem at a plant. So, all I was trying to say is that the basis for our estimate should be independent of the fact that the licensee has taken a specific position. I hope this helps clarify my point.

Note that this e-mail is from my home address. If you want me to see the reply when I get back to the office, send it to sml@nrc.gov

Steve

J-5