From: Goutam Bagchi INRR
To: Glenn Kelly
Date: Wednesday, July 12, 2000 10:12 AM
Subject: Re: Revision:Seismic Risk: Spent Fuel Pool Failures at 69 Sites

We know that for 51 % of the plants the seismic risk is greater than 1XE-6. We know that seismic risk is high for about 15 sites. The latest twist from TH consideration needs to examined carefully. Spent fuel buildings that might collapse are supposed to be screened to preclude impact on stored fuel at 0.5g HCLPF value. Why are we assuming that seismic failure is going to reduce natural air flow? Some body needs to explain these assumptions going into the TH calculations. Please help!!

Thank you,
Goutam
301-415-3305

>>> Glenn Kelly 07/12 9:56 AM >>>
What we will need the information for us to see if we can characterize the seismic risk for all the plants, not just the top 50% that are over 1E-6 per year. How we end up dealing with thermal hydraulic issues may hinge on whether the seismic risk is clustered around 1E-6 as I suspect, or if we have lots of plants down near the 1E-7 per year range. Right now, the risk from non-seismic events (at an absolute value) is acceptable. The seismic risk is sufficiently high for some (most?) sites that it cannot be dismissed, especially with potentially less than 10 hours of time to evacuate.

CC: Joseph Staudenmeier

4/203