

Comments on the final draft SFP report:

1. Section 4.1.2.3, Hardware Failure Probabilities, reference to "reference 11" should probably be reference 12.
2. Table 5.1, Should second column be called "Spent Fuel" viz "Core" Uncovery? Also I get a total of 2.2×10^{-7} viz 2.3×10^{-7} (actual 2.221×10^{-7}). Or should column heading be "Frequency of Fuel Uncovery" to be consistent with Table 3.1?
3. SPAR tables: uses values like $10E-2$ and $10E-3$. Could this be confusing, for example is $10E-2$ a value for $10 \times 1E-2$ or 0.1, or is it 0.01?
4. Inconsistent use of the mean repair time $f = \exp(-\lambda t)$ calculations:

Section 4.1.5.3, HEP-FW-REP-DEPEN, says $\exp(-(1/10)*72) = 1.E-3$. Actually the value is $7.5E-4$. Using $1.E-3$ might need the qualify that it includes uncertainty in the mean repair time (estimated to be 10 hours), or not equal but rather estimated to be about $1E-3$. (Same for HEP-FW-REP-NODEP, Section 4.3.4.3.)

Section 4.4.4.3, $\exp(-(1/10)*40) = 2.5E-2$, really $1.8E-2$.

Section 4.5.7.3, HEP-FW-REP-NODS and HEP-FW-REP-NODLG are real values from the $\exp(-\lambda t)$ calculations ($\exp(-(1/10)*49) = 7.5E-3$ and $\exp(-(1/10)*24) = 9.0E-2$, respectively).

5. Equation 3, App 5b "The Craig Memo" should read $P_F = 0.05 H_{HCLPF}$.
6. Appendix 7, item 6 ("Other Seismic Stakeholders Interactions") is shown as 1.06.
7. Section 4.3.1, Emergency Preparedness, near end of 6-th ¶, there is an extra comma "This study, indicates ..." should be "This study indicates ...".

B/47