

From: "Sorenson, Ken B" <kbsoren@sandia.gov>
To: "Bernard White" <BHW@nrc.gov>
Date: 2/14/03 11:32AM
Subject: RE: Our HI-Storm large Plane Discussion yesterday....

Thanks for the reply, Bernie. We will get you the answers to your questions 1-6 on the HI-STORM evaluation next week. Right, now we are focused on getting you the Executive Summary:

With regard to your questions below, not related to the HI-STORM work:

Question 4:

Jeff Smith will send you a written discussion on the approaches we are using for the other packages next week. You may have seen a brief discussion of this in Jeremy's weekly up-dates. We are moving forward on the other packages and will have preliminary results on the NuHOMS shortly.

Question 5:

Jeremy has been in contact with you on this one. If you need a written justification on this (e.g., a white paper), we will get you one. In short, based on what we have learned in the airplane studies, if a impact travelling at doesn't breach these casks, a small airplane impact at a lower speed won't come close. Therefore, it is reasonable look at the damage due to the, without consideration of the airplane impact. Similar arguments can be made for the barge or any other conveyance.

With regard to the day-to-day communications, I think your idea is a good one. We do need to be careful that yourself and your team, myself and my team, are all kept in tune with decisions/guidance that is being provided so that we are all under the same understanding in terms of what is being done. From our side, Jeff is the team lead for the spent fuel groups for structural, and Carlos is the lead for the thermal work. Richard is the lead for the work under the aegis of the Expert Panel and Jeremy is the technical lead and integrator for the entire program.

With regard to the deliverables. The draft report on the 28th will not have gone through a tech editor. We can do that in a matter of a few days. We would like to get your comments prior to going through a tech editor.

We will look at the classification issues. However, we will be hard pressed to lighten up on the classification that was assigned to the first draft. Once the 28th draft is complete, we will go to our Sandia classifier and see if he can reduce some of the classification.

Regards,

Ken

-----Original Message-----

From: Bernard White [mailto:BHW@nrc.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 12, 2003 8:31 AM
To: jlsprun@sandia.gov; kbsoren@sandia.gov
Cc: Antonio Dias; Adelaide Giantelli; Christopher Bajwa; Daniel Huang;

Portions Ex 2

E/102

Elaine Keegan; Earl Easton; Jesse Arildsen; Jack Guttman; Mahendra Shah; Robert Shewmaker; Ron Parkhill; Stephanie Bush-Goddard
 Subject: Our HI-Storm large Plane Discussion yesterday....

Our discussion regarding the large plane and HI-STORM evaluation went well yesterday.

We, like you, are comfortable with the resolution that was proposed in Ken's email and phone call to me. Although we have several questions we would like to put forth regarding the conclusion of the calculation.

1. Is the evaluation of the landing gear into the cask and the still crashing? If you can not get it to run prior to finishing the report, what will you report about the case?
2. We agree that the 11-foot impact (cask on cask across a diagonal of the pad) is since a cask.....
3. Instead of stating that you performed bounding analyses, consider stating that you performed
4. Mahendra sent an email to Jeff and cc'ed you and Ken regarding his thoughts on how to include the rest of the airplane momentum after the plane and two casks have interacted. Do you have any comments on the approach? Will you use it to determine the rotational (slapdown) velocity of the second cask when evaluating the MPC impacting the overpack lid?
5. It seems to us that the first figure on Page 10 (document Jeff sent to me on Feb 11) under How do you think that this can occur? It is determined that it is
6. How will you determine the velocity of the MPC impacting the rigid target for the last evaluation shown on Page 10 (document Jeff sent to me on Feb 11) for the last velocity that is shown with a question marks?

On other topics, not related to the HI-STORM

4. Are you planing on giving us anything in writing on the evaluation methodology for the other casks?
5. I have said this over and over, provide us a justification for stating that the mode of delivery for the doesn't matter.

Jerry, I would like to propose that the Team leaders, Bob Shewmaker for spent fuel storage, Ron Parkhill for spent fuel transport and myself for non-spent fuel transport start interacting more and providing you and I summaries of what happens, as far as the day-to-day operations go on the contract. Should we still assume that Jeff smith is the team leader for both spent fuel groups and Richard is the team leader for the non-spent fuel group?

Portions Ex 2

I proposed to Wayne, Earl and Jack, the date of February 28th for you to submit a completed draft and they were fine with that. I also like the idea of an executive summary coming at the end of this week for us to look at. Will the report on the 28th have gone through a Tech Editor? Also, Please work with your classifier well before the 28th to have as much of the report be non-classified as possible.

CC: "Smith, Jeffrey" <jasmith@sandia.gov>, "Sprung, Jeremy L" <jlsprun@sandia.gov>, "Yoshimura, Richard H" <rhyoshi@sandia.gov>, "Guth, John R" <jrguth@sandia.gov>