

Greenwood, Carol

From: Gibson, Kathy - RES
Sent: Wednesday, June 16, 2010 10:14 PM
To: Nosek, Andrew; Uhle, Jennifer
Subject: Re: SOARCA

Keep at it, AJ, the public depends on it! And we (Jennifer and I) want to hear all views. It may take me a few times to catch on, and I might not always agree, but good science and public safety depend on a full consideration and vetting of opposing views. Otherwise the sun would still be revolving around a flat earth!

From: Nosek, Andrew
To: Uhle, Jennifer
Cc: Gibson, Kathy
Sent: Wed Jun 16 17:15:28 2010
Subject: SOARCA

Thanks Jennifer. I appreciate it. I have lots more comments, but they don't seem to ever get any traction, at least until you or Kathy are in the room. I feel I have to keep giving these comments until I get some feedback, which is rare. Instead, I am usually given direction to not work on any review activities unless I am specifically asked to. I try to deal with these situations as best I can.

I worry about the Executive Summary (ES). From what I can tell, except for the edits Charlie or Jason added, it has basically remained unchanged since almost a year ago. I have proposed using a short, 4-page version (that Jocelyn and Scott Burnell have reviewed). The current ES is still needed (perhaps as a "project overview", or by some other name), as there are things discussed there that do not exist elsewhere in the report. I submitted a (heavily) marked-up version of the ES back in January, and I have not received any feedback on either of these, yet. Sandia has both of these.

I also worry about the brochure, which has a few problems. But I thought yesterday we made good progress. Also, the website is looking decent, and I believe if we use these new tables, we may actually be starting to tell a complete story. We have a lot of work, but we might get a concurrable document after all.

AJ Nosek
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Systems Analysis
(301)251-7476

From: Uhle, Jennifer
Sent: Tuesday, June 15, 2010 6:55 PM
To: Nosek, Andrew
Subject: Re: Consequence Tables

Kathy and I agreed that you had great comments today. Thanks. J

From: Nosek, Andrew
To: Nosek, Andrew; Barr, Jonathan
Cc: Yerokun, Jimi; Gibson, Kathy; Uhle, Jennifer; Stutzke, Martin
Sent: Tue Jun 15 18:41:09 2010
Subject: RE: Consequence Tables

Jon,

I forgot to include a column to show the delta LCF risk due to mitigation, as Jennifer/Kathy requested. Let's talk about how we can expand the table tomorrow.

AJ Nosek
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Systems Analysis
(301)251-7476

From: Nosek, Andrew
Sent: Tuesday, June 15, 2010 6:37 PM
To: Barr, Jonathan; Stutzke, Martin
Cc: Yerokun, Jimi; Gibson, Kathy; Uhle, Jennifer
Subject: Consequence Tables

Jon,

Per our meeting today, here are the updated consequence tables for consideration at the ACRS briefing. They are essentially the tables included in my edits to the executive summary. Also, should we consider adding Spontaneous SGTR and Bus E-12 failure scenarios? How about the variation of unmitigated STSBO (i.e. RCIC blackstart/blackrun)?

Marty,

I tweaked the tables so that it denotes that these are the CDFs from the SPAR models, which do not consider mitigation measures. Do you like this solution? Let's talk.

AJ Nosek
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Systems Analysis
(301)251-7476