From: "Kozyra, Jan" <jan.kozyra@pgnmail.com>
To: "Robert Palla" <RLP3@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, May 5, 2005 1:32 PM
Subject: RE: RAI *

Thanks. I'll look into the problem of the list, but no further calcs. were done. I presume you will need this in a letter.

-----Original Message-----
From: Robert Palla [mailto:RLP3@nrc.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2005 1:23 PM
To: Kozyra, Jan
Cc: kim@islinc.com; Cristina Guerrero; Richard Emch
Subject: Re: RAI *

Jan - I think we can work with what you sent to address the potentially cost beneficial (CB) SAMAs when uncertainties are considered. In checking the SAMA numbers in the second paragraph, however, I notice that you identify several SAMAs that we would not expect to be CB even when uncertainties are considered (11, 13, and 21), and you do not identify several SAMAs that we expect may be CB when uncertainties are considered (17 and 34).

Our logic is as follows:

The following SAMAs appear CB when uncertainties are considered: 1, 6, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36. This can be seen from the table on p. 36 of 65 of the RAI response. (We did some separate calcs based on 7%, single unit replacement power costs, and a multiplier of 2.0 and come up with the same set.)

In the first paragraph of your e-mail discussing the impacts of implementing SAMA 1, you indicate that SAMAs 15, 25, and 29 would remain CB in the baseline case after implementing SAMA 1 and will be assessed as part of the further evaluation. Based on this, SAMAs 1, 15, 25, and 29 can be dropped from the above list.

Based on the information provided in the table on p. 39 of 65 (showing the benefits of some of the remaining SAMAs after implementation of SAMA 1), the averted-cost-risk and the net values associated with the 95%ile CDF can be computed for the 8 SAMAs listed. (We applied a multiplier of 0.85 x 2.0 = 1.7 to the column 5 values to reflect a 15% reduction for single unit replacement power costs and a multiplier of 2.0 for uncertainties.) These calcs show that SAMAs 13, 19, and 36 would not be CB after implementing SAMA 1, even when uncertainties are considered. Based on this, SAMAs 13, 19, and 36 can be dropped from the above list. The rest of the SAMAs listed on p. 39 of 65 appear CB at the upper uncertainty bound after implementation of SAMA 1 (SAMAs 15, 16, 17, 25, and 29). For the other remaining SAMAs not listed on p. 39 of 65 (SAMAs 6, 18, 30, 31, 32, and 34) we don't know their value after implementation of SAMA 1 - so these should be considered potentially CB.

In recognition of the above, the SAMAs listed in the second paragraph should be: 6, 16, 17, 18, 30, 31, 32, 34.

Did PEC staff do some additional calculations to arrive at your list? Either some further discussion or some corrections are needed to reconcile these lists.

Bob Palla
301-415-1095

>>> "Kozyra, Jan" <jan.kozyra@pgnmail.com> 05/04/05 03:42PM >>>

CC: "Richard Emch" <RLE@nrc.gov>

Mail Envelope Properties (427A588A.C23 : 4 : 19491)

Subject: RE: RAI *
Creation Date: Thu, May 5, 2005 1:31 PM
From: "Kozyra, Jan" <jan.kozyra@pgnmail.com>

Created By: jan.kozyra@pgnmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
OWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
RLE CC (Richard Emch)

nrc.gov
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
RLP3 (Robert Palla)

Post Office	Route
OWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2784	Thursday, May 5, 2005 1:31 PM
Mime.822	1	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard