

From: Mahendra Shah
To: Bernard White; Daniel Huang; Robert Shewmaker; Ron Parkhill
Date: 2/20/03 8:28AM
Subject: Re: small plane evaluation for Vulnerability Analyses.

Bernie:

I agree with the statement. Sandia needs to provide the basis for the conclusion that the cask damage due to plane hard components effects. I hanks.

Ex 2

Mahendra

>>> Bernard White 02/20/03 08:15AM >>>

I received the a comment from Ron regarding the evaluation of the small plane for the spent fuel transport study, which I have discussed with him and modified a bit. Any comments? Do we all agree with this statement

Task 1.5 and possibly Task 1.2 - A small plane evaluation needs to be completed in accordance with the existing contract provisions, including the NAC NLI 1/2 which has not been evaluated for the large plane impact. A small plane analysis for impacting the NAC UMS SF transportation cask does not need to be performed because it has been bounded by the large plane analysis. Further SNL keeps proclaiming that the small plane is bounded by the but has yet to be substantiated. Additionally, the proclamation appears to ignore the possibly of the hard object impacts which may be. This scenario should be evaluated either with Pronto (as was done in the large plane analysis), hand calculations or reasoned arguments that the NRC agrees with. However, just because one threat appears to bound another does not necessarily mean we don't want to perform and engineering evaluation on that threat from a public confidence standpoint. The small plane scenario needs to be completed for the small SF transportation cask principally because the public is aware of the plane threat and we need to specifically address it.

Ex 2

Ex 2 portions

Elion