

From: "John N. Ridgely" <melcor%res12@nrc.gov>
To: TWEN_DO.twf5_po(JHS1)
Date: Tue, May 4, 1999 7:07 AM
Subject: MACCS Calculations re: SFP Fires

NRR (Glenn Kelly, Mike Cheek, Vonna Ordaz, and Jim O'Brien) wanted to talk about your MACCS calculations for postulated SFP fires. I answered the questions as best I could. They identified additional calculations that they wanted performed, as follows:

Consequences: 0 - 50 miles
 0 - 100 miles
 Consequence Measures: Early Fatalities
 Latent Cancers
 Population Dose (no changes here)
 Warning Time: 5 hours
 Delay Time: Hours Percent Population

 1 40
 3 30
 5 30
 Population: Uniform = 100 people/square mile
 Meteorology: Surry Site (no change)
 Emergency Protective Actions:
 1) None (normal activity)
 2) "Adhoc EP" (Undefined at this time)
 3) "Normal EP" (defined by NRR as 95%/5%)

They stated that they needed the results of your revised calculations by Tuesday, May 11, 1999. I told them that IF (NOTE THE CONDITIONAL HERE) you could devote full time to this work Monday and Tuesday and Charles could provide you the needed support, you could get the calculations run by Tuesday morning and with Charles' review Tuesday afternoon you could probably provide DRAFT results by cob Tuesday. I said that you two would want to take some time to assure yourselves that the calculations were correct before giving them final results.

I stated that we had reservations about a "no EP" case, but that we would consider such a case.

They did not seem to be concerned that the cases that you ran were not strictly NUREG-1150 PAA. They do, however, want to know the assumptions that you are using. (Note: Julie's comparison of the sample case and NUREG-1150 assumptions is in both of your mail boxes.)

They asked the same question as we did: "Why did the latent cancers increase for the one year case?". I could not remember your answer but stated that we considered all the results to be the essentially the same, i.e., there is no difference in offsite consequences between the cases.

They questioned the validity of your release fractions (too high) and inventories. All I could say was that you took them out of a report.

That is about all that we discussed.

c/45

Have fun!

Thank you,

John N. Ridgely

John N. Ridgely
E-mail: melcor%res12@NRC.gov
Telephone: (301)415 6555
FAX: (301)415 5062

CC: "Charles G. Tinkler" <CGT@nrc.gov>