

From: Goutam Bagchi *INRR*
To: George Hubbard
Date: Tue, Jul 25, 2000 8:11 AM
Subject: Re: Items from Last Week's Meetings on TWG Report

George,

There are several things that appear to be contrary to my understanding:

- 1) Barrett's writeup should use 0.5 g peak ground acceleration value not 3XSSE.
- 2) Passing the seismic check list using 0.5 g would ensure that the building will not collapse or overhead super structure will not generate missiles that can damage the fuel. This does not mean that the forced ventilation equipment will remain functional. There are too many questions regarding ventilation fans, motors, electric power etc. I think that John Hannon's argument is compelling - there will be a chimney effect and air will flow through cracks etc. This issue needs to be straightened out.
- 3) Please remember that we are now reducing the seismic conservatism and using 0.5 g as a screening level. Now the highest probability of spent fuel pool failure in the Eastern US is 4.5×10^{-6} per year. The marked up copy that I had left with you has the changes you need for the seismic writeup. I suggest that we get Dr. Kennedy's review (with RES help) of our report after you have incorporated the changes.

Thank you,
Goutam
301-415-3305

>>> George Hubbard 07/24 7:16 AM >>>

Please review the attached file on my understanding of actions we need to take based on last weeks meetings and give me your feedback.

Thanks,

George Hubbard
2870

CC: Jack Strosnider, John Hannon, Nilesh Chokshi, R...

4226