

**From:** Mark Kirk / *RES*  
**To:** Gary Demoss; Steven Long  
**Date:** 10/7/02 10:41AM  
**Subject:** davis besse reports and letter

Gary & Steve -

Per our recent conversation, here are the office letter & reports that will soon be issued on DB. I would strongly suggest - and greatly appreciate - your reading of the "cover" report (i.e. kirk db rpt 1.pdf) - this summarizes the other 2 reports (by ORNL) and furthermore states explicitly all of the assumptions made in those analyses. Certainly our non-inclusion of cracks in these analyses has gotten considerable air time of recent. However i think that a factor that is often overlooked in those discussions is that we have been intentionally conservative in another of areas. After writing the cover report i came away with the clear impression that unless something VERY surprising is revealed by the destructive evaluation of the davis besse "crack" (i.e. finding that it actually was a pre-existing flaw that was very deep (say half way through the cladding) ) then i strongly suspect that any errors of omission (like omitting cracks) we have made in the current analysis have been MORE than compensated for by errors of commission we have also made (like modeling the cavity to be at least 1/3 bigger than it really is. Thus ... i suspect (i guess) that our burst pressure estimates are still - in the end - conservative.

Would be interested to receive any questions or comments you would like to share.

Mark

**CC:** . Deborah Jackson; Nilesh Chokshi; William Cullen

H-10