

From: Goutam Bagchi, *NRN*
To: Glenn Kelly, Robert Rothman
Date: Thursday, March 02, 2000 10:57 AM
Subject: Re: documentation of 8 sites with SSEs that may require plant-specific analyses

Glenn,

That set of sites above the line in Table 2 in Kennedy's report. I have no documentation that would allow me to be certain as to which ones they are. We have concluded in Page A2b4 that because of conservative assumptions in the hazard curves from the LLNL 93 study (remember that EPRI hazard curves did not identify any sites with risk above $10E-6$), the seismic risks for those 8 sites are bounded by $3X10E-6$ per year. The 93 LLNL curves correlate well with the EPRI curves at the levels of SSE ground motion, but at very low frequency of occurrence, the curves were not examined/scrutinized as a part of the project. To the best of my knowledge, no attempts were made to compare the two sets of results for very high levels of ground motion. At $3XSSE$ or $2XSSE$, as appropriate for the region of the country, we reach the threshold of credible ground motion and determination of HCLPF at those levels using the seismic check list is more than adequate. We would need to consider public comments on this matter, but I do not believe that we need to pursue what you have asked for at this time. Thanks,
Goutam

>>> Glenn Kelly 03/02 9:54 AM >>>
Goutam,

In our work on decommissioning reactor risk, Bob Kennedy, Bob Rothman, and you indicated that there were eight sites where the site hazard and plant SSEs were such that plant-specific seismic analyses were justified. We did not identify those sites in the draft final report. I believe that it is important to at least have an internal document that lists these sites so future reviewers after were long gone will know which sites were referred to.

Please send me an email or a note documenting these sites.

Thanks,

Glenn

CC: Mark Rubin, Niles Chokshi, Phyllis Sobel, Rich...

4/1/40