

**Newell, Brian**

---

**From:** Turk, Sherwin  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 19, 2011 1:44 PM  
**To:** Newell, Brian  
**Subject:** FW: Action on New York State's motion to compel  
**Attachments:** Analysis.zip

---

**From:** Bixler, Nathan E [<mailto:nbixler@sandia.gov>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 27, 2011 5:20 PM  
**To:** Turk, Sherwin  
**Cc:** Jones, Joe A  
**Subject:** RE: Action on New York State's motion to compel

Sherwin,

I looked back at my files and discovered that I had run a WinMACCS calculation for Indian Point. The results of this calculation lead to the discovery of the problem with the wind rose, just as you suggested during our phone conversation. I believe that my intention was simply to reproduce the analysis done by the applicant, but using WinMACCS rather than the older version of MACCS2 that the applicant was using. As a result of this, I did generate a WinMACCS project and two new output files, one text and one binary. The new output text file should be similar, but not identical, to the one generated by the applicant. Even though the input values should match, the results contained in this file should not be identical to the ones produced by the applicant because the code versions are different. The binary file mainly contains the same information as the text file, but does include additional information not in the text file. However, the binary file is difficult to read without WinMACCS.

I'm attaching a zipped copy of the WinMACCS project that I generated, including the text output file, which is named Model1.out. The binary output file, Model1.bin, is also included in the zipped file.

There is one additional report that Joe generated and that may be of interest. Joe thinks it was already transmitted to Bob Palla and therefore should be in your archives, but Joe will double check on that tomorrow. Otherwise, we believe that you should already have all of the files that we generated.

Nate

---

**From:** Turk, Sherwin [<mailto:Sherwin.Turk@nrc.gov>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 27, 2011 12:59 PM  
**To:** Jones, Joe A; Bixler, Nathan E  
**Cc:** Harris, Brian; Wrona, David; Ghosh, Tina; Harrison, Donnie; Stuyvenberg, Andrew  
**Subject:** Action on New York State's motion to compel

Nate and Joe –

Attached is a motion to compel the production of documents that we received from New York State (without the attachments). It is very wordy, but their point is: There must be some documents regarding your review of SAMA issues in the Indian Point proceeding, beyond the documents that we produced to date or identified as privileged.

I know that you searched your files previously, and that you've sent us various documents already. Still, in response to this motion, I need you to review all documents in your possession, including any computer runs, output results, input tabulations, internal memos, etc., to be sure that we have captured everything already. If

there is something that we have not produced or identified yet, please send me a copy, by E-mail or express mail.

Thanks very much.  
Sincerely,  
Sherwin

*Sherwin E. Turk  
Special Counsel for Litigation  
Office of the General Counsel  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
11555 Rockville Pike  
Mail Stop O15-D21  
Rockville, MD 20852  
(301) 415-1533*