

**From:** Tanya Eaton, *NRC*  
**To:** Diane Jackson, George Hubbard, John Lehning  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 05, 2000 04:42 PM  
**Subject:** My comments on Goutam's Insert

I have read Goutam's insert and have a few questions that may need to be forwarded to him. I thought I'd see if anybody else had questions, before I forward mine, so that we can send them together.

(1) From NEW Insert: It states that since the conservatisms blur the distinction between the  $3 \times 10^{-6}$  and  $4.5 \times 10^{-6}$  frequencies, that it should not be used as a sole criterion. "Therefore, the staff recommends that only those plants which significantly exceed  $3 \times 10^{-6}$  values should be required to conduct plant-specific analysis beyond the confirmation of the checklist".

**Exactly what would we consider "significant" and should that be stated in the final report? Is it possible that a decomm. plant right over the border of  $3 \times 10^{-6}$  may need to know what we consider as "significantly exceed"?**

(2) From NEW Insert: Staff recommendation #2 states that those sites that cannot demonstrate a seismic HCLPF value exists, may either take some form of remedial action or conduct site specific seismic risk assessment. **What would the NRC staff consider as remedial actions which are acceptable (or not acceptable) and should this be stated in the final report?**

4/193