

5/15

SOARCA Staff Comments					
No.	Name	Document	Location	Comment	Supporting Basis
1	J. Commenter	App. A - Peach Bottom	Page 38, Section 4.7.2	end of 2nd para, need to add sentence that a seismic analysis and a delayed public notification case were also performed. May be appropriate to make up a reason why we did those.	
2	R Sullivan	App. A - Peach Bottom	95 sec 6.0	This para is almost unreadable and may be in error.	description of analyses is incomplete Just read it. We have to review this with the modelers at SNL.
3	R Sullivan	App. A - Peach Bottom	103 sec 6.2.6	one says the non-evacuating pop shelters and the other says normal activity	in consistent statements, which is it?
4	R Sullivan	App. A - Peach Bottom	114, sec 6.4 and 6.4.1	section does not sufficiently describe PA volunteer emergency response and the assistance that would be available from other locals that do suffer significant damage	comment/concern voiced by ACRS and licensee fact check
	R Sullivan	App. A - Peach Bottom	126, 6.5.4	states the cohort leaves when sirens sound, sirens do not sound due to loss of A/C	misstatement for the case
	R Sullivan	App. A - Peach Bottom	130, 6.5.5 cohort 1	as pointed out, the reactor building can not be flooded above the core melt and this section will have to be rewritten	
	R Sullivan	App. A - Peach Bottom	132, 6.6		licensee fact check this is not true, they are inspected by FEMA and NRC regularly, but exercise participation is less frequent
	R Sullivan	App. A - Peach Bottom	132, 4th paragraph	states that licensees exercise with federal agencies regularly,	
	R Sullivan	App. A - Peach Bottom	137, 6.6.3	the 24 hours after release statement is not correct, T~about 32 hours at that point, not 44	just arithmetic 1 or 2 E-4 is the difference and is small, surely within the error of this analysis
		App. A - Peach Bottom	154, 7.3.3 below fig 88	not sure the word significant should be used, dramitizes a very small difference	We did not examine the plant damage state leading to the GE declaration and just assumed LTSBO timing, this is probably the wrong assumption and STSBO timing is more likely correct.
		App. A - Peach Bottom	155, 7.3.4	do not know how I missed this before, but it is very likely that the GE would be declared earlier than 1.5 hours due to plant conditions that result in the SST1	
		App. A - Peach Bottom	157 below table 32	Are these doses for normal activity? And does this not beg the question what the SOARCA doses are? Are these a necessary item to include?	unclear what the doses are for (fencepost, sheltered, evacuating person?)
		Summary	pg 11 sec 1/8 last sentence	this statement is not true for the EP related parameters, they too will be chosen based on expert judgement	There are no studies on this subject
		summary	pg 53 sec 5.3.2	The sensitivity for 30 minute delay is not characterized quite right... the delay could be due to a notification delay or the public delaying evacuation	the statement is too narrow
		summary	pg 61, sec 6.1 and page 67 first para	PB pointed out that a reactor building can not be flooded, the last sentence of first para, needs to be changed to say something else, like spraying and flooding	Factual error

	pg 67 first para sec. 6.2	why do we specify that only 50.54(hh) mitigative measures fail, there are other measures, SAMGS, ad hoc, etc that also fail?	unnecessarily limiting
App B Surry	191, 6.2.3	Recent news item said Va was cancelling their KI program, am trying to verify... further the assumption we use for KI has little basis.	We may need to do a sensitivity analysis to show KI does not matter in our results, and that assumption is not important
App B Surry	193, 6.2.5	statement that public travels 8.75 miles is only true for those at the plant (none)	arithmetic same comment on PB
App B Surry	193, 6.2.6	unreadable, SNL offering explanation and justification	read it
App B Surry	195, 6.3.1 and elsewhere	In Pa, it is the county, not the state that contacts schools, we need to check on Va	PB fact check
App B Surry	6.6, 226	same as PB, licensees do not often exercise with the list of agencies provided.	just a fact
App B Surry	7.3, 239	mentions the use of economic data	we did not use economic data
		uses emergency phase, think he meant early phase or perhaps if intended, define emergency phase	
App B Surry	7.3, 241	states there is benifet to expanding the EPZ, please this judgemental statement is based on a difference in risk that is probably within the error of this analysis	misstatement for the case
App B Surry	7.3.6, 255 sensitivity 3		let us not opine on policy such as size of the EPZ, which the Comm has stated is adequate
App B Surry	7.3.8	SST1, the GE would probably have been declared earlier for this type of event	Although we do not know the accident sequence, potential loss of containment is a GE and would have resulted in earlier evacuation of the public