

Greenwood, Carol

From: Gibson, Kathy — RES
Sent: Saturday, August 28, 2010 12:49 AM
To: Valentin, Andrea
Subject: Fw: SOARCA schedules

Sorry I left you with this and Brian/foreign travel to deal with. Charlie should have raised this before we briefed Brian! Please make sure Jimi is aware of these concerns and that Charlie is aware that we are hiring 2 very good people to work on SOARCA. Part of the problem is that Charlie thinks he has to be involved in all aspects of SOARCA and I'm not sure that's the case. We have other very competent staff here and at Sandia working their butts off on the project. Maybe a Gantt chart is needed and maybe the person Jimi hired to take PM duties from Jon will choose to manage the project that way.

We can discuss the work and schedule with Jimi when I get back and see where to go from here. We'd have to have a really good story before I'd want to go back to Brian with yet another schedule revision but we've got to be confident in what we tell the CAs.

From: Tinkler, Charles
To: Gibson, Kathy; Uhle, Jennifer
Sent: Fri Aug 27 09:27:02 2010
Subject: SOARCA schedule

It has been my view that the proposed schedule that we are proposing in the upcoming briefings is not feasible and reflects a continued lack of project planning. The situation has been greatly and primarily aggravated by the enormous time consumed generating and reviewing internal staff comments (a process that was advertised as efficient but has been anything but). One particular example of the "process efficiency" - project management has had all staff comments on the Summary volume since July 8 approx. We were told that management had dispositioned 2/3 of the approx. 400 comments received on the Summary report (accepted or rejected). The remaining 1/3 were identified as needing further review - the staff was asked to review the 1/3 needing further review and provide text changes as appropriate. The staff completed that in a little over 1 week. It was revealed yesterday that project management has done nothing to address the comments it "dispositioned" even though those comments have been available for 7 weeks.

Not to mention we have accomplished very little in addressing peer review comments or fact check comments.

It has been suggested repeatedly that a detailed work plan is needed to assure all necessary tasks are accomplished. This suggestion is dismissed and instead the project is managed by a bottom line due date. This has not worked and cannot work since project management has limited technical understanding of the work.

Yesterday we briefed Jimi on the extent of new issues raised by the Surry fact check and plant trip. It was clear that he had no idea of the magnitude of the issues (he did not seek earlier to learn of the issues) - instead he has solely focused on internal staff comments .

We are in the process of performing some new analyses of the Surry ISLOCA, LTSBO and STSBO. The idea that we can do this and simultaneously update these reports by October is not realistic. I pointed out that if we end up with new analyses for scenarios we will have to go back to the peer review (ACRS subcommittee). That is not scheduled.

I advised (again) yesterday that we should set aside Appendices A&B and focus on the Summary report, in the short term. Since Sandia has some 700 more comments to address on the appendices project management may agree to focus on the Summary report.

Meanwhile we are supposed to start on the uncertainty analysis in September.

The briefing should be revised dramatically to focus on what new things we have learned (good and bad), why we need to do some new best estimate work, the 2 months spent on staff comments so far, etc. We should drop/soften the direct linkage of the uncertainty analysis (postpone all uncertainty work until after completion of new best estimate analysis). We should not propose a hard schedule yet, suggest a February – March date, without the uncertainty report. (maybe we will have some preliminary calcs by then)

Charles Tinkler

Charles.Tinkler@nrc.gov