

From: John Linehan *WJL 3/22/01*
To: Claudia Seelig
Date: 3/22/01 3:40PM
Subject: Fwd: Planning for PBMR and Efficiency Chart

See attached. Item 1 appears to take care of Pebble Bed issue, unless you see a problem. Need your reaction to Item2. Based on my review of BP/IT with Elise, I would agree with Mike.

K/4

From: Michael Weber
To: Donald Cool; E. William Brach; John Greeves; John Linehan; Margaret Federline; Martin Virgilio
Date: 3/22/01 2:13PM
Subject: Fwd: Planning for PBMR and Efficiency Chart

Two issues:

1. Planning Wedge on Pebble Bed Infrastructure Review

We have removed the resources for NMSS activities on Pebble Bed to be consistent with the NRR and RES approaches on this topic. Consistent with our discussion with Carl prior to the PRC briefing, there is good reason to question the ability of industry to deliver on the applications needed to support the accelerated schedule to license a pebble bed reactor, let alone the infrastructure necessary to support its operation (transportation packages for 8% enriched fuel, spent fuel transportation casks, spent fuel storage casks, fuel fabrication facilities). Consequently, I question whether these resources will be needed. The approach to deal with this as a planning wedge, rather than a clear add, is clearly appropriate because it means we do not have to shed other high priority work for something that is highly speculative at this point. Note the attached resource estimates have been supplemented to reflect work in SFPO (container/cask reviews), FCSS (fuel facility licensing, criticality code validation (necessary at 8%)), and DWM (EIS support for fuel facility licensing).

2. Efficiency Chart (Attachment 6 in the budget package)

It appears that the utility of Attachment 6 has been overtaken by events and it is of questionable value. It is unclear whether this chart is used by anyone. In addition, considerable effort may be required to reconcile this chart with our priorities matrix and adds/sheds/efficiencies list that we developed before the PRC briefing. Consequently, this may be something that we may want to shed because the effort required to prepare the chart may greatly exceed the value of developing it in the first place. Instead of delivering the chart in the format required by OCFO, it would make better sense to provide the information that we have already compiled on efficiencies in FY00/01 and the Sheds/Efficiencies list.

CC: Aby Mohseni; B. Jennifer Davis; Elizabeth Suarez; Jack Davis; Robert Pierson