

INFORMAL TECHNICAL COMMUNICATION

Date July 7, 1982

TO: Al Spano
United States Nuclear Regulation Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

FROM: B. Johnson *BJ*
Science Applications, Inc.
1710 Goodridge Drive
McLean, VA 22102

Attention: _____

Reference: SAI Project 1-186-03-020-XX
NRC Contract NRC-03-82-096
NRC TAC No. _____ SAI Task Assignment 6, Task 3
1-186-03-342-03

Title: _____

Attachment: Comments on PRA Plan of June 18, 1982

Message: In accordance with Task 3 of assignment 6 (Clinch River PRA Review)
which requires participation in the planning of the PRA review, we hereby
transmit our comments on the applicant's proposed PRA plan.

NRC cc: H. Silver
A. Thadani
J. Swift

SAI cc: B. Johnson
D. Findley (form only)
R. Liner
E. Rumble
Task File

Review of PRA Program Plan of June 18, 1982
(Submitted to CRBR Program Officer, Mr. Paul S. Check in a Letter
Dated June 21, 1982 from John R. Longenecker)

Science Applications, Inc. (SAI) has reviewed the above plan and has the following comments relative to content as well as format. (Our comments are concerned not only with content of the plan but with the effectiveness with which it can be reviewed on an interactive basis.)

Content

The overall subject matter suggested is reasonable. With appropriate resource allocation to each topic, SAI regards the plan to be complete.

Resource Allocation

The plan as presented contains no indication of the relative resource allocation, i.e. what fraction of the total effort is to be devoted to each subtopic. SAI feels that this type of information is important for an interactive review. With this information we can ascertain that appropriate priorities have been established for the various subtasks. This information should constitute an overall "strategy" for performance of the work. We would like an indication of the depth and breadth of effort planned for the subtasks.

Details of Plan

The plan is lacking in sufficient detail to permit the evolution of a meaningful review plan. The schedule of figure 4 is too broad to allow us to allocate resources for a review. For example, we need to know details of when various types and quantities of event trees or fault trees will be available for our review. There is no review (i.e. no preliminary draft) indicated for health efforts or study applications. According to the plan of Figure 4, some draft initiating events, event trees, and fault trees should have already been available for review.

It is planned that all event trees and all fault trees will be presented at the same time for our review? A staged submittal would be preferable for our purposes.

Also, it would be helpful to indicate (as on Figure 4) how the external event evaluation will interface with the remainder of the program.

Phenomenological Tasks

There is currently inadequate information on the phenomenological tasks. We need to know the codes (or other analytical means) and data which are to be used to develop event trees in order to perform a meaningful review.

In this regard, we question the use of the code, CACECO. We feel CONTAIN is a better code.