APR 2 6 1988

MEMORANDUM	FOR:	Karl Kniel,	Chief	
		Reactor and	Plant Safety Issues Branch	
		Division of	Reactor and Plant Systems, RE	S

FROM: Reactor and Plant Safety Issues Branch Division of Reactor and Plant Systems, RES

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MARCH 31, 1988 MEETING TO DISCUSS REANALYSIS OF DWR RISK AT POINT BEACH, WITH FOLLOWUP CORRESPONDENCE

The meeting was held as described in the Meeting Notice (Attachment A).

In attendance were representatives from the NRC Staff, Sandia National Laboratory, NUMARC, EPRI, SAIC, Wisconsin Electric Power, Westinghouse, Southern Co. Services, CFA, Inc., and ERC International, as indicated on the attached Attendance sheet (Attachment B).

A package of material was distributed at the meeting (Attachment C) consisting of: (1) the subject EPRI/WOG/NUMARC analysis ("EPRI/WOG Analysis of Decay Heat Removal Risk at Point Beach," NSAC/113, March, 1988); (2) a package of slides that were presented at the meeting ("Differences between Sandia and NUMARC Analysis of Decay Heat Removal Related Risk for Point Beach," 31 March 1988, White Flint, Md.); (3) a cover letter with attachment to be discussed at the meeting (letter to Ms. Elaine Gorham-Bergeron, SNL, from Mr. John J. Haugh, NSAC, March 31, 1988, with attached ENCLOSURE, "Responses to SNL Questions on EPRI/WOG Analysis of DHR at Point Beach," March 30, 1988); (4) a set of three slides consisting of one map and two handwritten sheets regarding seismic hazards at various sites; and (5) a Sandia submittal for discussion at the meeting ("Supplemental Analyses and Comments/Responses to EPRI/WOG Analysis of Decay Heat Removal Risk at Point Beach," by David M. Ericson, Jr., ERC International for Sandia National Lab., Final Draft dated March 30, 1988).

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss differences between the subject industry-sponsored analysis of Point Beach, and an earlier analysis of the same plant which was sponsored by the NRC staff and performed by SNL as part of the resolution of Unresolved Safety Issue (USI) A-45, "Decay Heat Removal Requirements." The objective of the meeting was to provide the NRC Staff with sufficient information to allow completion of a preliminary staff evaluation of the industry-sponsored analysis. An earlier meeting had been held, during which NRC Staff representatives had outlined the subjects (to be discussed at this meeting) where more information was needed from industry representatives as bases for the industry sponsored study (Memorandum to Karl Kniel, NRC, from Roy Woods, NRC, "Minutes of Feb. 23, 1988 Meeting with Sandia and NUMARC Regarding EPRI/WOG/NUMARC Analysis of One USI A-45 Plant," March 3, 1988).

8805250187 880426 PDR ADOCK 05000266 PDR PDR

Discussions concentrated on exploring core melt frequency differences, with a minor portion of the meeting devoted to cost and consequence differences as time permitted.

The package distributed at the meeting (Attachment C) presents the subjects discussed at this meeting in some detail. That level of detail will therefore not be re-iterated in this Summary.

In summary, it was considered reasonable by the NRC Staff and Sandia representatives to allow more credit for lower frequency of the SBLOCA. presence of the new batteries, and lack of dependence of the SI pumps upon availability of the CCW system (the SBLOCA frequency change is the dominant one) as proposed in the EPRI/WOG study. It was not considered prudent by NRC/SNL to allow more credit for many of the operator recovery actions proposed in the EPRI/WOG study.

The NRC staff believes that the approximate core damage frequency that would result from use of these agreements in a "revised" NRC staff sponsored analysis would be about 9E-05 per reactor year. This is below the NRC/SNL case study calculated value of 3E-04 per reactor year, and above the industry-sponsored study calculated result of 1E-05 per reactor year.

Additional details concerning differences between the two analyses are documented in Enclosure D. The material in this Enclosure was not presented at the meeting. Rather, it was produced as a result of the meeting and in fulfillment of the above stated objective of the meeting, to enable the NRC Staff to write a preliminary evaluation of the industry sponsored Point Beach Analysis. The material is presented with these minutes in order to provide a more complete, coherent record in one place for later reference. Enclosure D consists of the following: (1) Appendix D: Insights Gained From Industry-Sponsored Study of Point Beach, from the NRC Staff's Regulatory and Backfit Analysis: Unresolved Safety Issue A-45, Shutdown Decay Heat Removal Requirements, NUREG-1289 (Draft), April, 1988; (2) Letter from E. Bergeron (SNL) to R. Woods (NRC) April 27, 1988, with attached "Supplemental Analyses and Comments/Responses to EPRI/WOG Analysis of Decay Heat Removal Risk a Point Beach" by D. Ericson, Jr., ERC International, April 25, 1988.

> Roy Woods, Senior Task Manager Reactor and Plant Safety Issues Branch Division of Reactor and Plant Systems, RES

> > FCoffman

RWoods DISTRIBUTION: RPSIB R/F PDR Ofc. of the Secy of the Commission BSheron MCunningham WMinners Meeting Attendees JMurphy ARubin GMazetis RPSIB/DRPS * OFC:

NAME : Rwoods:sd 4/ /88 DATE:

RPSIE/DRPS * GMazetis 4/ /88

*See previous concurrences

Discussions concentrated on exploring core melt frequency differences, with a minor portion of the meeting devoted to cost and consequence differences as time permitted.

The package distributed at the meeting (Attachment C) presents the subjects discussed at this meeting in some detail. That level of detail will therefore not be re-iterated in this Summary.

In summary, it was considered reasonable by the NRC Staff and Sandia representatives to allow more credit for lower frequency of the SBLOCA, presence of the new batteries, and lack of dependence of the SI pumps upon availability of the CCW system (the SBLOCA frequency change is the dominant one) as proposed in the EPRI/WOG study. It was not considered prudent by NRC/SNL to allow more credit for many of the operator recovery actions proposed in the EPRI/WOG study.

The NRC staff believes that the approximate core damage frequency that would result from use of these agreements in a "revised" NRC staff sponsored analysis would be about 9E-05 per reactor year. This is below the NRC/SNL case study calculated value of 3E-04 per reactor year, and above the industry-sponsored study calculated result of 1E-05 per reactor year.

Additional details concerning differences between the two analyses are documented in Enclosure D. The material in this Enclosure was not presented at the meeting. Rather, it was produced as a result of the meeting and in fulfillment of the above stated objective of the meeting, to enable the NRC Staff to write a preliminary evaluation of the industry sponsored Point Beach Analysis. The material is presented with these minutes in order to provide a more complete, coherent record in one place for later reference. Enclosure D consists of the following: (1) Appendix D: Insights Gained From Industry-Sponsored Study of Point Beach, from the NRC Staff's Regulatory and Backfit Analysis: Unresolved Safety Issue A-45, Shutdown Decay Heat Removal Requirements, NUREG-1289 (Draft), April, 1988; (2) Letter from D. Erickson, ERC International, to R. Woods, NRC Staff, with attached additional comments regarding the EPRI/WOG analysis, April 26, 1988.

> Roy Woods, Senior Task Manager Reactor and Plant Safety Issues Branch Division of Reactor and Plant Systems, RES

DISTRIBUTION: RPSIB R/F BSheron WMinners Meeting Attendees GMazetis RWoods OFC: RPSIB/DRPS NAME: RWoods:sd DATE: 4/26/88

PDR Office of the Secretary of the Commission MCunningham JMurphy ARabin FCofiman RESED DRPS Gnazetis 4/10/88

Attachment B ATENDANCE (3/31/88)

MAME

ORGANIZATION

Jerry Mazetis Roy Woods Claire Bergeron Roger Newton Harv Hanneman Don Face leford

SID FELD BRIAN RICHTER

LUAPPEL M AUDALLE



Harold VanderMoren ESCHELLIBLE

Bill Parkinson

Ed Daylard FAUL EVEHNERT

Kens ADAMS DAVID M. ELICSON, de David W. Pyätt GARY VINE JACK HAUGH GERALD H NEILS T. Ryon (atternon) Guild Staff

NRC RES RPSIB

Sandia Laboratories Wisconsin Electric Power Wisconsin Electric Power Westinghouse Electric NRC/RES/RDB NRC/RES/RDB SOUTHERN CO. SERVICES

CFA, INC NUMARC NRC/RES/PRAB NRE/RES/PRAG SAIC SAIC MRC/ACRS Saula Lobs ERE INTERNATIONAL (SUL CONTR) Sandle hal's Lets NRC/RES/DRAA GRU REP TO NUMARC EPRI. NSP/NUMARC WKG GROOP NRC/ EPRI

(301) 492-3535 (201) Y92-3500 505 844 - 3151 (414) 221-2002 (414) 221-2009 (412)-374-5572 (301) 492 3748 (301) 492-3763 (205) 877. 7874 (301)963-9457 (202) 872-1280 (301) 492- 3460 (300 492-3948 415-860-5919 615-482-6743 202/634-3247 505 844-2758 505/265-5542 525 846-4927 301 492-3979 202-872-1280 415-855-2768 612-337-2003 (301) 497 - 3550

PHONE