From: Stephen Salomon
To: INTERNET:jake.jacobi@state.co.us
Date: 10/24/96 3:32pm
Subject: Note for Chuck Mattson re draft Part 19

Jake,

Hi!

Please pass on to Chuck Mattson. I am sending again with another point that I omitted on the first round.

Chuck,

Steve McGuire, the author of Part 36, who just returned, responded to your question re 10 CFR 36.23(c) The last sentence which reads: "The monitor may be located in the entrance (normally referred to as the maze) but not in the direct radiation beam."

McGuire's response: If the monitor is in the direct beam, it will soon burn out and give a false indication that there is no radiation. There is no need for the monitor to be in the direct beam because there is plenty of scattered radiation in the maze that is easily detected.

Hope this answer's your question.

In 10 CFR 36.2 Definitions, For seismic areas, why is "in 250 years" used?

Response: There is a little more discussion of seismic areas on the bottom of page 17 and the top of page 18 of Reg Guide DG-0003. 250 years is one of the time periods for which the USGS gives probabilities of acceleration. The selection of 250 years was a judgment. Since the lifetime of an irradiator is considerably less than 250 years, the value is unlikely to be exceeded during the life of the irradiator and even if exceeded it is unlikely to be exceeded by much.

Hope this is helpful.

Please acknowlege receipt.

Thanks.

Steve