

From: John Hannon / *NRA*
To: Bagchi, Goutam, Chokshi, Nilesch, Hubbard, George
Date: Fri, Aug 11, 2000 3:52 PM
Subject: Re: Spent Fuel Pool Decommissioning: Seismic Screening

I just read the white paper from a layperson's perspective to see if I could understand what was being said, and I offer the following comments for your consideration:

1. It isn't immediately obvious to me why we would want to argue that the two different estimates are "equally valid" or "equally credible". If ground motion modeling is the major source of uncertainty, then which of the two estimates provides the best model of ground motion (the one we think is more realistic and represents more closely what would really happen)? Isn't that the one we should be using in a risk informed approach?
2. I don't understand key assumptions 1 and 3 the way they are currently written. If they are key to understanding our analysis, we need to state them more clearly so they can be understood by our stakeholders.
3. Same comment as above for Source of Conservatism # 2.
4. I am concluding (perhaps incorrectly) that the checklist is important to establish HCLPF, but that our risk analysts can now use 1 E -6 return frequency for seismic, and it does not need to be considered the dominant risk contributor except at a few plants.

>>> Nilesch Chokshi 08/11 1:34 PM >>>
Goutam/George,

I am attaching a file with my comments (strikeout and redline) on Goutam's draft. In few places I have embedded questions we need to discuss. I think we will need one more iteration. I would like to have Bob Kennedy look at it also before we finalize it. We are working on Bob's contract so that he can review this and attend August 23rd meeting. It would be very useful if we can include figures and data to enhance our discussion on uncertainties.

Nilesch

CC: Bahadur, Sher, Barrett, Richard, Diec, David, J...

4250