

Schaperow, Jason

From: Schaperow, Jason
Sent: Tuesday, January 04, 2011 5:10 PM
To: Chang, Richard
Cc: Tinkler, Charles
Subject: FW: Paragraph to Steering Committee (B.5.b)
Attachments: Doc2.docx

Hi Richard,

Suggest you first take another cut at it based on Charlie's comments during our discussion this afternoon.

Thanks,
Jason

From: Chang, Richard
Sent: Tuesday, January 04, 2011 1:20 PM
To: Tinkler, Charles; Schaperow, Jason
Subject: Paragraph to Steering Committee (B.5.b)

Charlie and Jason,

I took a first whack at writing a paragraph to the steering committee on the issue Jennifer wanted us to raise on couching B.5.b as the best estimate analysis.

Could you take a look at it and tell me your thoughts? One of the SRAs called me up and I may want to gain his insights into this as well.- I'll swing by to chat with you guys before I send it to anyone else.

Thanks,
Richard

Certain NRC staff advocates characterizing the B.5.b mitigated scenarios as the SOARCA "best estimate" calculations and the associated unmitigated scenarios as sensitivity studies. Neglecting the possibility of mitigation through B.5.b procedures and equipment would certainly be excessively conservative. Other members of the SOARCA team as well as NRC's regional senior reactor analysts hold the position that ignoring B.5.b mitigation is excessively conservative but, in the absence of a full PRA/HRA analysis of the B.5.b procedures and equipment, characterizing the B.5.b mitigated scenarios as "best estimate" would leave the SOARCA project and NRC staff open to cross examination. The staff is seeking guidance from NRC's SOARCA Steering Committee to resolve this disagreement amongst staff. Currently the draft SOARCA NUREG characterizes the B.5.b mitigated scenarios as the best estimate analysis.