

23-RFS

From: David Loveless
To: Don Marksberry
Date: Wed, Jun 30, 2004 8:16 AM
Subject: Re: Report Input

Don,

Attached is the revision, please note all of the following:

I believe that I fixed your concern with Item 1, please ensure.

Comment 2 incorporated.

Comment 3 and 5 are really the same. Unfortunately, at this point, my requirements are to complete the analysis and get it in the report. This is an age old question, I doubt you and I will resolve this. I don't have a problem moving forward. However, at this point, the report will not be documenting an ASP evaluation. . . and I don't want to set precedent when RASP hasn't spoken yet.

Comment 4, incorporated. I thought I'd said that, but understand now how I could be misread. Thanks.

Comment 6. We normally don't discuss uncertainty in the inspection report. If this wasn't an AIT, we wouldn't have put in the details that I have. . . I'm really stretching using the mean as opposed to the best estimate value (what we normally use). I only did that, cause I know that is what you guys use, and want to be as close as we can on this one.

I'm here today and tomorrow, but will be on vacation most of July. I will be working on the more detailed writeup on the days that I am here. If you guys want to send me something that discusses your normal approach to uncertainty, that would help.

Thanks,

David

>>> Don Marksberry 06/30/04 07:46AM >>>
Looks good. Some comments:

1. 4th assumption concerning recovery of vital power---recovery includes GTG and offsite power; offsite power was available within 1 hour.
2. Offsite power recovery is the most important assumption. You may want to add the basis that supports the 1 hr recovery, such as east bus was actually recovered at 32 minutes, power from East bus can be lined up to first vital bus within 30 minutes (and the team supports this), and grid was determined by the operators to be stable at 49 minutes. Also, both GTGs were started and loaded into its bus at 29 minutes.
3. I'm checking with INEEL HRA experts about the high vs. extreme stress issue. My only concern here is that the August 14 grid LOOP analyses assumed extreme and most peer reviewers agreed. The grid instability here is some what similar with the grid LOOPS---but slightly different because the availability of the Dever line. I'm checking this so we can head off conflicts with Regions 1 and 3.
4. SPAR was not modified to include updated LOOP curves, given that we replaced the industry average non-recovery probabilities with the HRA values that reflected the actual event and dominate sequences.
5. The ASP analysis (which will be the same as this one) may be sent out for external peer review in accordance with current ASP Program procedure. This means that SPSB, IIPB, and the licensee will be

4/22
K

given a change to comment on the analysis. This may result in a change in results. This is a RASP issue that we plan to address. You may want to indicate that these results are preliminary and will become final after the peer review.

6. Do you want to add uncertainty results?

Good job!

>>> David Loveless 06/29/04 04:08PM >>>

Hey,

Attached is the report feeder. Look for accuracy. Obviously, the 3 numbers at the end of the first paragraph will change. I'm looking to make sure we have agreement and understanding on the assumptions and approach.

Thanks,

David

