

From: "Jeff R. Gabor" <JRGabor@erineng.com>
To: <RLP3@nrc.gov>
Date: 9/26/05 9:46AM
Subject: NEI Guidance Document Comments

Bob,

Attached is a spreadsheet that provides our responses to your comments on the SAMA Guidance Document. As we discussed last week, I would like to schedule a phone call with you later this week to review these. Let me know if Thursday or Friday is good for a call and please indicate a preferred time. Thanks

Jeff

Jeff R. Gabor
ERIN Engineering & Research, Inc.
1210 Ward Avenue, Suite 100
West Chester, PA 19380
(610) 431-8260
(610) 431-8270 fax

CC: <LPOTT90@entergy.com>, <jr@nei.org>

Mail Envelope Properties (4337FBC2.385 : 15 : 50053)

Subject: NEI Guidance Document Comments
Creation Date: 9/26/05 9:42AM
From: "Jeff R. Gabor" <JRGabor@erineng.com>

Created By: jrgabor@erineng.com

Recipients

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
RLP3 (Robert Palla)

nei.org

jr CC

entergy.com

LPOTT90 CC

Post Office

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov

nei.org

entergy.com

Files

MESSAGE

TEXT.htm

NEI 05-01 NRC Comment Resolution.xls

Mime.822

Size

471

4340

105336

Date & Time

09/26/05 09:42AM

71680

Options

Expiration Date:

None

Priority:

Standard

Reply Requested:

No

Return Notification:

None

Concealed Subject:

No

Security:

Standard

Resolution of NRC Comments on NEI 05-01 (Rev. A)

| Comment # | Location | Comment | Resolution |
|------------------|--|--|--|
| 1 | Page 1, Section 1 (also Page 16, Section 4, 1st paragraph) | Correct the cited NUREG to read NUREG/BR-0184. Suggest adding a reference to NUREG/BR-0058, Revision 4, which contains guidance on discount rates that should be used in a cost-benefit analysis. | 1) Agree to fix typos. 2) Need to resolve comment 36 before adding NUREG/BR-0058. |
| 2 | Page 1, Section 1 | Clarify whether the method also incorporates insights gained from review of NRC SAMA evaluations. | Agree to change wording to, "method ... incorporates insights gained from review of NRC evaluations of SAMA analyses and associated RAIs." |
| 3 | Page 1, Section 1.1 (also Page 24, Section 5) | Add a discussion of the scope of SAMAs to be considered, i.e., SAMAs that improve core damage prevention or containment performance, hardware changes, procedure changes, and enhancements to licensee programs, including training and surveillance programs. | Agree to add discussion of scope of SAMAs to Section 5 along with clarification suggested in comment 38. Not necessary to also include in Section 1.1. |
| 4 | Page 2, Section 2, SAMA Identification | Add a statement that importance analyses should be used to identify both SAMAs that prevent core damage and SAMAs that prevent significant releases from containment. | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 5 | Page 2, Section 2, Final Screening | Suggest better wording for "reduction in cost of severe accident risk." | Agree to change to "benefit of severe accident risk reduction." |
| 6 | Page 3, Section 2, Sensitivity Analysis | Add "and analysis uncertainties" after "assumptions." | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 7 | Page 4, Section 3 | Add the following to the list of items to be provided: (1) describe the evolution of the plant-specific risk model subsequent to the individual plant examination (IPE) and individual plant examination of external events (IPEEE), and subsequent to any peer reviews, and (2) for multi-unit sites, provide either separate results for each unit or results for a single unit with rationale for why the single analysis is representative or bounding for the other unit(s). | (1) The requested information is provided in subsequent sections. See Sections 3.1.1.2, 3.1.2.1.1, 3.1.2.2.1, and 3.3. Our intent was not to needlessly duplicate detail in multiple sections. (2) OK - consistent with our intent. |
| 8 | Page 4, Section 3.1.1.1 (also Page 11, Section 3.2.1) | Section title and discussion assume that the current probabilistic safety assessment (PSA) model is the same version as used for the SAMA analysis. This may not always be the case, e.g., if the PSA was revised subsequent to completion of the SAMA analysis. Also, different PSA versions might be used for identifying SAMAs (importance analysis) and for quantifying the risk reductions for the SAMAs. The section should be revised to focus on the version(s) of the PSA used to support the SAMA analysis. If applicable, a description should be provided of any PSA versions more recent than the version used for the SAMA analysis and how use of the later version would impact the risk profile and the identification and dispositioning of SAMAs. If different PSA versions are used for different portions of the SAMA analysis, e.g., for identifying SAMAs and for quantifying risk reductions, the impact of using the later version should be similarly described. | Agree to change "current" model to model "used for SAMA analysis." Agree to state that impact of using of a later version for Phase II should be described, if applicable. Disagree that a description should be provided of PSA versions more recent than the version used for the SAMA analysis and how use of the later version would impact the risk profile, and the identification and dispositioning of SAMAs. We assume you mean PSA revisions between the SAMA analysis and LRA submittal. However, the analysis is a snapshot in time. [If a plant did a SAMA analysis for initial licensing it isn't even required for license renewal.] Also, Sections 3.1.1.2 and 3.2.2 include assessment of major plant changes that are planned or have occurred since the model freeze date. |
| 9 | Page 4, Section 3.1.1.1 | Specify that the contribution to core damage frequency (CDF) from station blackout (single unit and dual unit) and anticipated transient without scram events be included since these events are typically of interest for SAMA. | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |

Resolution of NRC Comments on NEI 05-01 (Rev. A)

| Comment # | Location | Comment | Resolution |
|------------------|--|--|---|
| 10 | Page 4, Section 3.1.1.1 | Rather than specifying that only "internal events importance measures" be provided, suggest less restrictive wording, such as "importance measures for internal events, and external events if included within the PSA model." | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 11 | Page 4, Section 3.1.1.2 | Add a statement that PSA revisions/model changes since the PSA peer review should be included within the discussion of the PSA evolution. | The requested information is provided in subsequent sections. See Section 3.3. Our intent was not to needlessly duplicate detail in multiple sections. |
| 12 | Page 5, Section 3.1.2, 2nd paragraph | The statement that "quantified external events should not be compared directly with the results of the best-estimate internal events analysis" is unrealistic and fails to recognize that such comparisons will be made by the public and are in fact made in the SAMA methodology itself when deriving an external events multiplier. | Disagree - It's not unrealistic, it's true - they <u>should</u> not be compared <u>directly</u> . Using a multiplier prevents direct comparison of the values. Use of a ratio of external to internal values would be a direct comparison. If acceptable to the NRC reviewer, we could change the words from "quantified external events should not be compared directly with the results of the best-estimate internal events analysis" to "care should be taken when comparing quantified external events with the results of the best-estimate internal events analysis." |
| 13 | Page 5, Section 3.1.2, last paragraph, 3rd sentence | Add "and outliers that have not been addressed" after "implemented." | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 14 | Page 7, Section 3.1.2.1.1, last sentence | Add a statement that further enhancements to address dominant contributors should also be considered, and if potentially cost-beneficial, included in the list of Phase I SAMA candidates. | Agree to change the wording to, "Potential improvements from the internal fire portion of the IPEEE, or subsequent fire evaluations, should be included in the list of Phase I SAMA candidates." Part of the IPEEE fire evaluation (and subsequent revisions) was to implement enhancements to address dominant contributors. Guidance states that potential enhancements that were identified but not implemented should be included in the list of SAMA candidates. |
| 15 | Page 7, Section 3.1.2.2.1, Recommended Improvements | Specify that a discussion be included on A-46 resolution and whether all identified outliers have been addressed. Modify the last sentence to read "Unresolved outliers and potential improvements ..." | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 16 | Page 8, Section 3.1.2.4, Fire-Induced Vulnerability Evaluation (FIVE) and seismic margins analysis (SMA) Methods | Add a statement that although the SMA method does not provide a quantitative CDF, an approximate estimate of the seismic CDF could be developed by other means, e.g., based on high confidence in low probability of failure (HCLRF) values for limiting systems, structures and components in conjunction with site-specific seismic hazard curves. | Disagree - While it's true that an approximate estimate of the seismic CDF could be developed by other means for use in the SAMA analysis, we do not want to include this option. In the interest of streamlining the review process, we feel that this option should not be pursued. It just results in another external CDF estimated value that should not be compared with internal events values. |

Resolution of NRC Comments on NEI 05-01 (Rev. A)

| Comment # | Location | Comment | Resolution |
|-----------|--|--|---|
| 17 | Page 8, Section 3.1.2.4, FIVE and SMA Methods (also Page 9, Fire PSA and SMA Method) | The statement that "the FIVE results may be considered representative of total (external) events risk is site specific and not generally applicable. The contribution to risk from seismic events (and the potential for seismic-related SAMAs) would need to be considered unless the contribution is estimated to be much lower than internal events, and all seismic outliers have been addressed." | Disagree - This statement is generally applicable to plants who used the SMA method. The premise of the SMA method is that if a plant's analysis results in no outliers, seismic risk is low. Therefore, use of the method, followed by modifications to address seismic outliers, assures that seismic risk is low. Since resolution of USI A-46 requires that seismic outliers be addressed, we can assume that they have already been or will be addressed, assuring that seismic risk is low. |
| 18 | Page 9, Section 3.1.2.4, Fire PSA and SMA Method (also Page 9, FIVE Method and Seismic PSA, and Page 10, Fire PSA and Seismic PSA) | The document states that if the PSA analysis contains numerous conservatisms a more realistic assessment could result in a substantially lower CDF, and that engineering judgement should be used to determine a reduction factor to obtain a more realistic fire (and seismic) CDF. In concept, fire and seismic PSAs will have removed many of the conservatisms existing in margins-type analyses such as FIVE. Hence, in general, the CDF from the PSAs should not be further adjusted, especially based on only engineering judgement. Factor of four changes to PSA-based CDF estimates (as implied on Page 10) would be difficult to defend. If changes of this magnitude are believed to exist, the external event analysis should be formally updated to incorporate the more realistic models/assumptions. | Disagree - Fire and seismic PSAs created for the IPEEE contain numerous conservatisms, as did internal events PSA models created for the IRE. While plants have updated and refined their internal events PSA models to be able to use them for risk assessments, the same has not always occurred for the models created for the IPEEE. [The generic letter for the IPEEE did not intended that these models be "living" - it was to be a one-time analysis.] Therefore, factor of four changes to PSA-based external events CDF estimates may be defended. While it is true that these models should be updated, and many plants do have plans to update them, the fact remains that they are not necessarily available for use in the SAMA analysis. Therefore, the existing wording is still appropriate. |
| 19 | Page 9, Section 3.1.2.4, FIVE Method and Seismic PSA | The statement that NRC has accepted that a more realistic fire CDF may be a factor of three less than the screening value obtained from a FIVE analysis, should be appended with the statement "if sufficient technical justification is provided to show that certain aspects of the analysis have been addressed in a conservative fashion." | Need more information - Please define "certain aspects." If words are appended, the first word should be changed from "if" to "when." |
| 20 | Page 11, Section 3.2.1 | Add the following to the list of items to be provided: (1) a table or matrix describing the mapping of Level 1 accident sequences into Level 2 release categories; (2) a description of how the sequences selected to represent each release category were chosen; and (3) a description of any Level 2 PSA versions more recent than the version used for the SAMA analysis and how the use of the later version would impact the risk profile, and the identification and dispositioning of SAMAs. | (1) and (2) Agree - Information to describe the link between the Level 1 and the Level 2 can also be provided along with a summary of the representative release sequences. (3) Disagree that a description should be provided of PSA versions more recent than the version used for the SAMA analysis and how use of the later version would impact the risk profile, and the identification and dispositioning of SAMAs. We assume you mean PSA revisions between the SAMA analysis and LRA submittal. However, the analysis is a snapshot in time. (If a plant did a SAMA analysis for initial licensing it isn't even required for license renewal.) Also, Sections 3.1.1.2 and 3.2.2 include assessment of major plant changes that are planned or have occurred since the model freeze date. |

Resolution of NRC Comments on NEI 05-01 (Rev. A)

| Comment # | Location | Comment | Resolution |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| 21 | Page 11, Section 3.2.1 | Specify that "fission product release characteristics (release fractions, timing, and energy)" be provided, rather than "fission product release fractions (source terms)." | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 22 | Page 11, Section 3.2.1 | Clarify that the Level 2 importance measures to be provided should not be based on consideration of only large early release frequency contributors, but should include the consideration of other release categories that are major contributors to population dose, such as medium magnitude-early releases, and large magnitude-late releases. | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 23 | Page 11, Section 3.2.2 | Add the following to the list of items to be provided: Clarify whether accident progression/source term calculations were updated since the IPE. | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 24 | Page 11, Section 3.2.2 | Add a statement that PSA revisions/model changes since the PSA peer review should be included within the discussion of the PSA evolution. | The requested information is provided in subsequent sections. See Section 3.3. Our intent was not to needlessly duplicate detail in multiple sections. |
| 25 | Page 12, Section 3.3, last paragraph | Insert the words "at least" before "a qualitative discussion." | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 26 | Page 12, Section 3.3 | Add the following to the list of items to be provided: (1) provide a quantitative assessment of the impacts of any unresolved, significant peer review findings if the impacts are able to be readily quantified; e.g., if the probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) version used for the SAMA analysis was subsequently updated to address the peer review finding; and (2) identify the types of sequences for which the CDF or release frequency could be increased by resolution of the peer review finding, and the candidate SAMAs related to those sequences. Discuss whether resolution of the finding could result in identification or retention of additional SAMAs. | Disagree - (1) During a SAMA analysis subsequent revisions cannot already exist. The guideline requests a qualitative assessment of the impact and suggests performing a quantitative sensitivity analysis. This should be sufficient. (2) The sensitivity analysis described in Section 8.3 addresses these concerns. |
| 27 | Page 13, Section 3.4.1 | The statement that extrapolation to a later date adds conservatism to the analysis is true in general, however, at some sites a population reduction is actually projected, in which case extrapolation to an earlier date (e.g., the mid-point of the extended period of operation) would be more reasonable. | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 28 | Page 14, Section 3.4.2 | Rather than "Provide the following economic estimates," suggest "Describe the values and bases for the following economic estimates." | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 29 | Page 14, Section 3.4.3 | Add a discussion to the effect: "However, consideration should be given to the applicability of the MELCOR Accident Consequence Code System 2 (MACCS2) data. MACCS2 inventories are based on a 3-year fuel cycle (12-month reload) with an average power density for the assembly groups ranging from 24 to 30 MW/MTU. Current fuel management practices may use longer fuel cycles and result in significantly higher burnups. As such, use of the MACCS2 data (scaled by the ratio of power level) could substantially underestimate the inventory of long-lived radio nuclides, and the benefits of certain SAMAs. Use of a plant-specific core inventory representative of that expected during the period of extended operation is recommended. If power scaling is used, the impact of potentially higher radio nuclide inventories on the SAMA identification and screening should be addressed." | Agree to add to the end of second paragraph, "Additional adjustment of the core inventory values may be necessary to account for differences between fuel cycles expected during the period of extended operation and the fuel cycle upon which the MACCS2 default core inventory values are based." |

Resolution of NRC Comments on NEI 05-01 (Rev. A)

| Comment # | Location | Comment | Resolution |
|------------------|--|---|--|
| 30 | Page 14, Section 3.4.4 | Replace "site-specific emergency evacuation plan" with "site-specific emergency action levels and emergency evacuation plan, and onsite-specific evacuation time estimates, where available." | Agree to replace "information from the site-specific emergency evacuation plan" with "site-specific information." |
| 31 | Page 14, Section 3.4.4 | Replace "conservative" with "reasonable." | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 32 | Page 15, Section 3.4.4 | Suggest identifying the specific table in Reference 3 to which this discussion is referring (Table 3.28?). | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 33 | Page 15, Section 3.4.5 | The example discussion is adequate as a general explanation, but does not indicate why data for a specific year might have been selected as representative. Expand the example to include such rationale, e.g., "Population doses were evaluated based on three different years (1999, 2000, and 2001). Data from year 2001 was selected because ..." | Agree - example changed to the following. Annual meteorology data sets from 1998 through 2000 were investigated for use in MACCS2. The 1998 data set was found to result in the largest doses and was subsequently used to create the one-year sequential hourly data set used in MACCS2. The conditional dose from each of the other years was within 10 percent of the chosen year. |
| 34 | Page 15, Section 3.5 | Add the following to the list of items to be provided: (1) provide a breakdown of the annual population dose risk (person-rem per year) by containment release mode, and (2) report results for all release categories, including those with normal containment leakage/intact containment. Add a note that the sum of release frequencies should equal the total CDF, and that any differences should be explained. | 1) and 2) Agree - consistent with our intentions. Note about sum of release frequencies should be added to Section 3.2.1, on page 11, rather than here. |
| 35 | Page 16, Section 4, 2nd, and 3rd paragraphs (also Page 32, Section 8.6) | A sensitivity analysis (or baseline analysis) using the period from the time of the SAMA analysis to the end of the period of extended operation is unnecessary. The impacts of the longer time period would also be bounded by the 3% discount rate case. | Need more information - We would be happy to eliminate this. However, is this acceptable if we don't change to a 3% discount rate in comment 36? |
| 36 | Page 16, Section 4, 4th paragraph (also Page 31, Section 8.5, 1st paragraph) | The discussion on calculations using alternative discount rates misses an important point. Use of both 7% and 3% real discount rates in regulatory analyses is specified in Office of Management Budget guidance (Circular A-4, September 17, 2003) and NUREG/BR-0058, Revision 4. The two discount rates represent the differences in whether a decision to undertake a project requiring investment is viewed as displacing either private investment or private consumption. A rate of 7% should be used as a baseline for regulatory analyses and represents an estimate of the average before-tax rate of return on an average investment in the private sector in recent years. A rate of 3% should also be used and represents an estimate of the "consumption rate of interest," i.e., the real, after-tax rate of return on widely available savings instruments or investment opportunities. An analysis using a 5% discount rate will not meet the intent of the latter calculation. | Need more information - 1. What is the important point? 2. What is the "intent" of the calculation using 3% discount rate? 3. Why would the 5% discount rate analysis not meet that intent? |

Resolution of NRC Comments on NEI 05-01 (Rev. A)

| Comment # | Location | Comment | Resolution |
|------------------|---|--|---|
| 37 | Page 23, Section 4.5, last paragraph | Rather than using a "maximum attainable benefit (MAB)" that does not account for uncertainties for the Initial Phase I screening, and re-screening later using a "modified MAB" that includes uncertainties, should present the option of performing the Initial screening using the modified MAB. | Disagree - We decided not to present this option because we did not want to place undue emphasis on uncertainties. Since this is suggested as an option, there should be no objection if we don't list it. Of course, a plant may choose to include uncertainties in the original analysis as that would be more than the guideline recommends. |
| 38 | Page 24, Section 5 | Clarify that hardware changes considered should not be limited to permanent changes involving addition of new, safety-grade equipment, but should also include lower cost alternatives, such as temporary connections using commercial grade equipment (e.g., portable generators and temporary cross-ties). | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 39 | Page 24, Section 5, 1st sentence | Replace "contributors to CDF" with "contributors to CDF and population dose based on the plant-specific risk assessment." Insert the following words at the end of the sentence: "and the SAMAs found to be potentially cost beneficial in the SAMA analyses for similar plants." | Agree to replace "contributors to CDF" with "contributors to CDF and population dose based on the plant-specific risk assessment." Instead of the second change, suggest adding the following words in Section 5.1: "Previous SAMA analyses for similar plants are a prime source for identifying potential low-cost alternatives to address similar risk contributors." Focusing on plant-specific risk insights will allow us to identify important modifications without the need to individually address other SAMA submittals. |
| 40 | Page 24, Section 5.1, 1st paragraph | Add a statement that contributors to both CDF and population-dose should be considered. | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 41 | Page 24, Section 5.1, 2nd, and 3rd paragraphs | Add a statement that the rationale for the cutoff values should be provided. | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 42 | Page 25, Section 5.3 | Clarify this statement to indicate that potential improvements and/or outliers from the IPEEE should be identified, and their implementation status should be discussed. Those improvements/outliers that have not been implemented or resolved should be included in the list of Phase I SAMA candidates. | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 43 | Page 25, Section 5.3 | Add the following guidance: "In addition to any potential improvements specifically identified in the IPEEE, the dominant contributors to external event CDF and release frequency should be systematically assessed to determine whether any additional improvements might be justified, e.g., improvements to fire detection or suppression, equipment separation, or heat shielding in dominant fire areas; improvements to the seismic capacity of components with limiting HCLPF values; improvements to flood barriers/doors. (This might also be addressed in Sections 3.1.2.1.1 and 3.1.2.2.1.)" | Agree to change the words to, "Potential improvements from the IPEEE, or subsequent fire and seismic evaluations, should be included in the list of Phase I SAMA candidates." See response to comment 14. |
| 44 | Page 25, Section 5.4 | Add a statement that SAMAs that were found to be potentially cost beneficial in SAMA analyses for similar plants should also be included in the list of Phase I SAMAs. | Disagree - See comment 39. |

Resolution of NRC Comments on NEI 05-01 (Rev. A)

| Comment # | Location | Comment | Resolution |
|------------------|--|---|--|
| 45 | Page 26, Section 6, Bullet 4 | Add the following guidance: "In screening SAMAs based on excessive implementation costs, consideration should be given to whether low cost alternatives (e.g., use of portable rather than permanently installed equipment, or procedure and training enhancements rather than hardware changes) could offer much of the potential risk reduction at a fraction of the cost." | Agree to add, "Consideration should be given to lower cost alternatives, such as temporary connections using commercial grade equipment (e.g., portable generators and temporary cross-ties), procedure enhancements, and training enhancements that could offer much of the potential risk reduction at a fraction of the cost of safety-related modifications." |
| 46 | Page 26, Section 6, last paragraph | Add the following guidance: "Provide a description of the screening process and its results, in sufficient detail that a reader can understand how the initial set of Phase I SAMAs was reduced to the more limited set of Phase II SAMAs, e.g., an accounting of the SAMAs eliminated by each criterion." | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 47 | Page 27, Section 7 | Add the following guidance: "For multi-unit sites, assure that the benefits and implementation costs are provided on a consistent basis, e.g., all benefit and all cost estimates are on a per-site basis. If benefit and cost estimates are provided on a per-unit basis, the impact (and efficiencies) associated with implementation of the SAMA at multiple units should be reflected in the estimated implementation costs." | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 48 | Page 27, Section 7.1.1 | Add the following guidance: "For SAMAs specifically related to external events, estimate the approximate benefits through use of: (1) the external events PRA, if available, or (2) bounding-type analysis, e.g., estimating the benefit of completely or partially eliminating the external event risk." | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 49 | Page 28, Section 7.1.2 | Add the following to the list of items to be provided: "(1) discuss when external event multipliers might not apply (for example, SAMAs that relate to specific internal event initiators (e.g., guard pipes for main streamline break events) and external event SAMAs that would not impact internal events (e.g., enhanced fire detection); and (2) discuss when larger multipliers might be appropriate." | (1) Agree - consistent with our intentions. (2) Disagree - Larger multipliers are not appropriate. In some cases, when we know that external events are not contributors to a scenario, conservatism may be reduced by not applying the multiplier. However, the multiplier provides an appropriate accounting for external events and thus, does not need to be adjusted when it is applied. |
| 50 | Page 30, Section 8 | Consider adding a subsection addressing the impact of PRA modifications subsequent to the SAMA analysis. The guidance would indicate that if the PRA has been modified subsequent to the SAMA analysis, the impact of the changes on the identification and dispositioning of candidate SAMAs should be addressed. | Disagree - See comment 8. |
| 51 | Page 30, Section 8.1, 2nd paragraph (also Page 31, Section 8.3, 2nd paragraph; Page 31, Section 8.5, 2nd paragraph; and Page 32, Section 8.6, 3rd paragraph) | Add the words "Assure that" before the words "Sufficient margin." | Disagree - We are stating that, if the maximum benefit estimation is performed as described in this guideline, sufficient margin does exist such that the Phase I screening does not have to be repeated in sensitivity analyses. |

Resolution of NRC Comments on NEI 05-01 (Rev. A)

| Comment # | Location | Comment | Resolution |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| 52 | Page 30, Section 8.2, 1st paragraph | The discussion places too much emphasis on the ratio of the 95th percentile to the mean CDF value, and not enough emphasis on the objective of the uncertainty assessment, i.e., whether/how the results of the SAMA identification and screening might be impacted by uncertainties in various aspects of the analysis. The rationale for performing this assessment should be further explained. The statement that "a discussion of CDF uncertainty and conservatism in the SAMA analysis that offset uncertainty should be included" is important and might also be expanded. | Need more information - Agree to move the first two sentences to the end of the first paragraph. I don't see that we have placed undue emphasis on the 95th percentile. We mention it and then discuss the objective of the uncertainty assessment. Does the last sentence mean that examples of conservatism should be provided? |
| 53 | Page 31, Section 8.4, 1st paragraph | The statement that population dose is highly dependent on radial evacuation speed should be reconsidered. Evacuation-related sensitivity calculations provided in previous SAMA analyses show only a minor impact. Note that, although evacuation-related sensitivity calculations typically don't show much impact on results, they may be important for sites with emergency preparedness issues or concerns. | Agree to change "highly dependent" to, "may be significantly affected by." |
| 54 | Page 31, Section 8.4, 1st paragraph | Rather than using the sensitivity analysis to show that the evacuation speed is conservative, it might be used to show that variations in this parameter would not impact the results of the analysis. | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 55 | Page 32, Section 8.6, 2nd paragraph | If this section is retained, the discussion regarding plant obligations and commitments should be removed (2nd through 4th sentences). | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 56 | Page 33, Section 9 | Add the following guidance: (1) In instances where multiple SAMAs appear to be potentially cost beneficial, consider further analyses to identify an optimum subset of these SAMAs, i.e., that provides a majority of the risk reduction with a minimum impact/cost. Such an analysis could lead to a recommended set of SAMAs that can be further evaluated for implementation by the licensee as part of its normal corrective actions programs; and (2) Include a discussion of licensee plans for implementation or further evaluation of potentially cost-beneficial SAMAs. | Disagree - This is beyond the scope of the analysis and is trying to make applicants commit to something, even though the potentially beneficial SAMAs have nothing to do with aging. |
| 57 | Page 38, Table 5 | The sample MACCS2 economic costs provided in the table represent an increase of approximately 60% over the corresponding values used in Sample Problem A of NUREG/CR-6613, Volume 1, Appendix C (1998). In the most recent NRC-sponsored MACCS2 calculations, these economic costs have been increased even further (by a factor of 1.4 to 3.2 over the values in Sample Problem A). Further discussion is needed on the appropriate economic cost values to be used in the MACCS2 calculations. | Need more information - These values are dependent on the region of the country in which the plant resides. Section 3.4.2 states that economic data from publicly available data should be provided. It was not intended that examples in MACCS2 calculations or in Table 5 would be used. Propose adding "(e.g. from the US Census Bureau, US Department of Agriculture, and state Tax Office)" to the statement about publicly available data in Section 3.4.2. |
| 58 | Page 40, Table 8 | Results should be reported for all release categories, including Intact containment, in order to provide a complete accounting of all core damage events/frequency. In the case of this example, the results for release category E-E should also be reported. | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |

Resolution of NRC Comments on NEI 05-01 (Rev. A)

| Comment # | Location | Comment | Resolution |
|-----------|---|--|--|
| 59 | Page 41, Table 9 | To be more representative, the first column of this table should list basic events from either CDF or population-dose importance calculations. | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 60 | Page 41, Table 9 | All relevant Phase I SAMAs should be identified in the third column, whether they were implemented or not. If the Phase I SAMA survived the screening, the corresponding Phase II SAMA number should also be listed. | Disagree - Relevant Phase I SAMAs that have been implemented are the only ones that should be listed because (see page 26): • Phase I SAMAs that are <u>not applicable</u> are not relevant. • Phase I SAMAs that are <u>already implemented</u> are described as in the example table 9. • Phase I SAMAs that are <u>combined</u> are evaluated in Phase II. • Phase I SAMAs that have <u>excessive implementation cost</u> are not relevant. • Phase I SAMAs that have <u>very low benefit</u> do not address events in this table of important basic events, by definition. If the Phase I SAMA survived the screening, the Phase II SAMA number should be listed as in the examples in Table 9. Propose rewording the 2nd sentence of the 4th paragraph of Section 5.1 (page 24) to state, "For each dominant contributor describe relevant Phase I SAMAs that have been implemented and list the Phase II SAMAs that address that contributor." |
| 61 | Page 42, Table 10 | It would be helpful to illustrate (within the sample list) some low cost alternatives to major plant modifications, e.g., "Add a portable generator ..." Also, suggest adding "Phase I" to the heading of column 1. | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 62 | Page 43, Table 11 | Suggest adding "Phase II" to the heading of column 1, and numbering the SAMAs in this table so that they don't conflict with the SAMA numbers in Table 10. | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 63 | Page 45, Table 13 and Page 57, Table 14 | The boiling-water reactor table is titled "Sample List" and the pressurized-water reactor table is titled "Standard List." Suggest using consistent wording. | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |
| 64 | Page 70, Figure 1 | The screening criteria depicted in the figure do not completely match the screening criteria described on Page 26. The figure and text should be made consistent. | Agree - consistent with our intentions. |