

From: William Huffman, *NLL*
To: Charlotte Collins, George Hubbard, Goutam Bagchi... *NLL*
Date: Wed, Aug 16, 2000 4:30 PM
Subject: Fwd: Draft AGENDA for meeting to evaluate bases and uses of seismic risk

Attached is an e-mail from NEI with their proposed agenda for next week's meeting on seismic issues associated with the decommissioning spent fuel pool risk study.

Please let me know any additions or changes you wish to make to this agenda.....Bill

CC: David Wrona, Duke Wheeler, Michael Masnik, Phil...

0/249

From: "HENDRICKS, Lynnette" <lxh@nei.org> *MEI*
To: "wch@nrc.gov" <wch@nrc.gov> *(W. Huffman) NER*
Date: Wed, Aug 16, 2000 3:04 PM
Subject: Draft AGENDA for meeting to evaluate bases and uses of seismic risk

Bill,
Here's a draft agenda for the meeting on the 23rd which I understand is from
9:30 to 12:00 at your place?
Lynnette
<<AGENDA seismic D&D 8 00.doc>>

AGENDA

Meeting to Discuss Risk Informed Approaches to Decommissioning Regulations

I. Examine deterministic bases for evaluating seismic risk:

1. Is there general agreement that spent fuel pools that satisfy the requirements of the seismic checklist, have HCLPFs of 0.5g or greater (i.e., in no CEUS licensing proceeding has there been compelling data to require design to an earthquake of a magnitude which would challenge the seismic capacity of an SFP that satisfies the seismic checklist.)?
Is there general agreement that seismic risk at sites that satisfy the checklist is zero? (Only extremely large earthquakes can generate ground motions of the amplitude, frequency content, and duration to challenge the seismic capacity of spent fuel pools that satisfy the seismic checklist i.e., Charleston like earthquakes of magnitude 7 or greater).

II. Examine probabilistic bases for evaluating seismic risk:

1. Using Kennedy's simplified methodology, a SFP HCLPF of 0.5g, and the EPRI seismic hazard results, is there general agreement that the highest SFP failure frequency was slightly greater than 10^{-6} per year, while the preponderance of the SFP failure frequencies were well below 10^{-6} per year?
Using Kennedy's simplified methodology, a SFP HCLPF of 0.5g, is there general agreement that the LLNL seismic hazard results show the preponderance of the SFP failure frequencies on the order of 10^{-6} per year or below?
Is there agreement that use of the screening level capacity in the calculation SFP failure frequency (using simplified Kennedy method) are upper bound seismic risk estimates?
How valid are LLNL results at low probability levels?

III. Use of probabilistic and deterministic bases to risk inform decommissioning regulations.