

From: Steven Long *NRL*
To: Peter Wilson *NRL*
Date: 3/26/01 4:42PM
Subject: ASP Analysis of IP2 SGTF Event

Pete,

I reviewed the draft ASP analysis provided with Baranowsky's March 2st memo.

I don't see any need to make formal comments to RES on the analysis.

It is interesting that they chose to look at how large the flow rate through the tube could have been, as well as the flow rate that actually occurred. Their result would have been only $3E-6$ if they had only considered the actual flow rate. So, in effect, they considered the condition of the plant and it's operation, not just the event as it happened. The ASP Program does have a process for dealing with conditions, but that process wasn't used for this event.

So, this analysis seems to be a strange sort of thing, somewhere between the "event" CCDPs that we expect from ASP and the ASP evaluation of a plant "condition," which provides a delta-CDF-times-duration result (that they feel compelled to point out isn't REALLY a CCDP).

I don't think it's constructive to pick nits on what the analysis is supposed to be, conceptually. They state what they did, and I don't have any problem with their results. They provide a risk insight that can be used for whatever it is worth to any specific purpose, based on their description of what that analysis is. That's really all we can ask. There is no single risk insight that can provide all information for all potential considerations. So, let's just say "thank you" and not point out what their analysis isn't.

Steve

J/68