

**From:** Edward Throm *JNR*  
**To:** George Hubbard  
**Date:** Wed, Sep 13, 2000 1:49 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Fwd: DOCUMENT REQUESTS FOR HARRIS DISCOVERY

For a plant meeting the design basis, the probability is likely no greater than the NUREG-1353 estimate (however, it should be noted that the seismic part is plant specific - leading to a few plants being in the  $3 \times 10^{-6}$  range (TWG report) as compared to  $2 \times 10^{-6}$  (1353), but Harris is a relatively new plant designed after 1973 and is likely to be bounded by the NUREG-1353 value).

>>> George Hubbard 9/13/2000 1:33:11 PM >>>  
Please take a look at request Number #6 and give me your thoughts.

REQUEST NO. 6. All documents in your possession, custody or control that contain any information responsive to the concerns and questions raised in paragraph 2 (copied below) on page 17 of the Licensing Board's Memorandum and Order of August 7, 2000.

Paragraph 2. The parties should take careful note of any recent developments in the estimation of the probabilities of the individual events in the sequence at issue. In particular, have new data or models suggested any modification of the estimate of  $2 \times 10^{-6}$  per year set forth in the executive summary of NUREG-1353, Regulatory Analysis for the Resolution of Generic Issue 82, Beyond Design Basis Accidents in Spent Fuel Pools (1989)? Further, do any of the concerns expressed in the ACRS's April 13, 2000 letter suggest that the probabilities of individual elements of the sequence are greater than those previously analyzed (e.g., is the chance of occurrence of sequence element seven, an exothermic reaction, greater than was assumed in the decade-old NUREG-1353)?

Are there any documents associated with the TWG study that are responsive to this document request?

Thanks,

George Hubbard  
2870

CC: Glenn Kelly, Mark Rubin

4311