HLWYM NPEmails

From: Sheena Whaley
Sent: Wednesday, May 23, 2007 1:01 PM
To: Oleg Povetko; Fernando Ferrante; Tina Ghosh; Christopher Ryder
Cc: George Adams; susanecooper@comcast.net; Susan Cooper; Rosemary Reeves; Albert Wong
Subject: Re: PCSA Exercise - Questions for 2.4 Scenario

1. If use, they will probably use ANS/HPS 56.8 or like criteria. Also see Reg Guides 8.8 and 8.25..

4-9 are operational Qs that we don't necessarily have the details on - best bet is to review other like operational procedures.

>>> Tina Ghosh 5/23/2007 11:29 AM >>>
Dear all,

In the first attachment, please find my notes on what I gathered from Oleg's description of what the scenario is assumed to be. This is the starting point Susan and I used this morning. Please correct any mistakes and add critical elements that I did not capture. Thank you!

Fernando, Oleg, and Chris,

Susan had a number of questions regarding the assumptions that the team is making (or going to make). A common understanding on these issues will help flesh out the HRA contribution. Since I do not have a good handle on the details of the layout, dimensions, and likely operation specifics in the WHF (I did not attend the OR visit where DOE discussed this in more detail and unfortunately missed the post-trip team brief), your expertise and memory of discussions with DOE is much appreciated. It would be helpful if we could come to common answers on the following questions by tomorrow, since Susan may have time to work on this tomorrow (and our schedule is tight). If the answer is contained in a reference document, please point me to it. If we don't know the answer, let's discuss approach (e.g., element for sensitivity analysis?). Please indulge if I am asking a question you already answered - I am having trouble keeping track of everything. Please let me know if you need clarification on any of these questions, or if you want to discuss on phone - I'll be in my office today until the OpE meeting at 2:30pm ET.
(1) Are we assuming one air monitor/detector in room? If not, how many? What about assumptions about the location(s) of the monitor?
(2) Why is tritium being considered for gaseous release?
(3) If there were a gaseous release in the WHF, why do we assume that we want to vent it to the atmosphere as quickly as possible? Might a different approach be to contain the release within the building once personnel are evacuated? In that case, we would be looking at different actions - perhaps instead of ensuring HVAC is working (my understanding from Monday's discussion is HVAC can't capture noble gases anyway), might the goal be to ensure confinement of some kind?
(4) How does the HVAC vent to the atmosphere? Is there a stack?
(5) Do we assume that there will be someone on the floor giving hand (or other) signals to the crane operator? Where is the crane operator located, e.g., in the adjacent control room?
(6) Might it be possible to have someone's foot caught under the dropped cask? (i.e., where will personnel be in relation to the cask while it's being moved?)
(7) Will there be any diagonal movement of casks? (From the slides from CD-1 TE, can't tell. There is a diagonal line from pool to prep. area, but that's probably just to show process flow, not actual physical movement?) Will crane only do C-shaped orthogonal movement along pre-set tracks, or something else?
(8) How many cranes will there be?
(9) Remind me, how will the load be attached to crane? (i.e., we heard "no rigging" from DOE - will it be rigid bars on cask lip or something?) Thank you for your insights!

Fernando and Chris,

From talking to Susan, and as we had discussed previously, what is probably possible for the HRA part is qualitative discussion of what is likely to influence human performance in the event sequence. The quantification, for example a distribution of evacuation times, can not really be done. We'll have to discuss approach to use in the sequence - I imagine some crude approximation with extensive caveat discussion. Also Fernando - we didn't talk about the HVAC this morning, hopefully Susan will look at that later. Immediate focus is on HP-influence on cask drop probability and worker evacuation time (I think those will be the more risk-significant human-performance related aspects of the sequence, but I could be wrong...). Please call or e-mail if you want to discuss anything.

Thank you,
Tina

301-415-5000

Hearing Identifier: HLW_YM_NonPublic_EX
Email Number: 44

Mail Envelope Properties (Sheena.Whaley@nrc.gov20070523130042)

Subject: Re: PCSA Exercise - Questions for 2.4 Scenario
Sent Date: 5/23/2007 1:00:42 PM
Received Date: 5/23/2007 1:00:42 PM
From: Sheena Whaley

Created By: Sheena.Whaley@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"George Adams" <gadams@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"susanecooper@comcast.net" <susanecooper@comcast.net>
Tracking Status: None
"Susan Cooper" <Susan.Cooper@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Rosemary Reeves" <Rosemary.Reeves@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Albert Wong" <Albert.Wong@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Oleg Povetko" <opovetko@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Fernando Ferrante" <fferrante@cnwra.swri.edu>
Tracking Status: None
"Tina Ghosh" <Tina.Ghosh@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Christopher Ryder" <Christopher.Ryder@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	4211	5/23/2007 1:00:42 PM

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received: