

From: [Bob Budnitz](#)
To: [KEITHLINE, Kimberly](#); [Gratton, Christopher](#)
Cc: [Regner, Lisa](#); [Chokshi, Niles](#); [Munson, Clifford](#); [Kammerer, Annie](#); [Ravi Ravindra home](#); [Lewis, Stuart](#); [Robert P. Kassawara](#); [Robert P. Kennedy](#)
Subject: SPID Table 6-6, BUDNITZ IMPORTANT CORRECTION
Date: Friday, November 09, 2012 1:10:18 AM
Attachments: [Addendum B, SPR-B8 \(very small LOCAs\), final version \(from Bob Budnitz\).doc](#)

TO: Kimberly Keithline
FROM: Bob Budnitz
COPY TO: N. Chokshi, C. Munson, A. Kammerer, L. Regner, C. Gratton
COPY TO: MK Ravindra, S. Little, R. Kassawara, R. Kennedy

In studying the TABLE 6-6 material this evening, I noticed that an error has been made for Supporting Requirement SPR-B8, the one covering very small LOCAs. I am acutely aware of this issue because I have probably spent a hundred thousand hours (of volunteer time!) going back to the end of the last millennium (namely, 1999) adjudicating different views on it since I wrote the original requirement in the ANS 58.21 version back then.

[Note that in Addendum A the corresponding requirement had a different number, SPR-B10. It is now SPR-B8 in Addendum B.]

The final version that was balloted for Addendum B is in the attached file. Please notice that the final version, for Capability Category II, has a significantly different text and a significantly different idea than the version quoted in Table 6-6, which is from an earlier version. The revised version that was balloted was changed in response to extensive comments from various SPRA experts.

The crucial idea in the latest (balloted) version is that the analyst must assume a very small LOCA unless as follows: "...unless it is demonstrated that such a LOCA can be excluded, based on a walkdown or on another examination of the possible sources of such a LOCA." The "unless" clause had been absent in the earlier Addendum A version. It was added, as I just said, in response to several persuasive comments. It is a very useful addition in my personal view. The first paragraph of the NOTE was also modified to incorporate and support this idea.

I hope and expect that the final SPID will take an affirmative position on this requirement, accepting it essentially "as is." I would be happy (nay, eager) to discuss this issue in the Webinar meeting tomorrow (Monday) if appropriate.

BOB BUDNITZ

++++
On 11/8/2012 1:09 PM, KEITHLINE, Kimberly wrote:

Here's Table 6-6 for discussion tomorrow. Robin McGuire is working on Table 6-4, which we aim to have ready by the webinar tomorrow.

Kimberly A. Keithline
Senior Project Manager

Nuclear Energy Institute
1776 I St. N.W., Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006
www.nei.org
P: 202-739-8121
F: 202-533-0143
E: kak@nei.org