



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

APR 20 1979

S. Hanau.

P-822

(A9)

Handwritten notes: "Sub in P6 handle", "Search for Hanau Cherry", "A: h: k"

NOTE TO: Thomas H. Novak, Chief, Reactor Systems Branch, DSS  
FROM: B. J. Youngblood, Chief, Cost-Benefit Analysis Branch, DSE  
SUBJECT: ATWS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT APPRAISAL

In order to complete our evaluation of alternatives with respect to an environmental impact statement for an ATWS rule, we need responses to the enclosed questions. A. Thadani has been given a copy and we would like to discuss them at his earliest convenience.

*B. J. Youngblood*  
E. J. Youngblood, Chief  
Cost-Benefit Analysis Branch  
Division of Site Safety and  
Environmental Analysis

Enclosure:  
As stated

- cc: R. DeYoung
- R. Matson
- M. Ernst
- R. Tedesco
- A. Thadani
- S. Coplan

Ashok/Frauh

Q1 needs early discussion.

*Steve 6/22*

*cy SHH file  
ma*

1736 069

1. What is the shape of the proposed rule - i.e., specified hardware, criteria for hardware, what?
2. How would the resulting hardware and degree of protection differ from making ATWS a DBA not to exceed Part 100 guidelines?
3. The thrust of this question is, would the proposed rule make ATWS an incredible event - specifically: is the  $10^{-6}$  per RY estimate of probability conservative as opposed to realistic?
4. How do the probabilities in Appendix F apply to:
  - a. operating plants before Dresden 2 (Class 1)?
  - b. CP's before January 1, 1978 (Classes 2 and some 3)?