

Greenwood, Carol

From: Gibson, Kathy - RES
Sent: Tuesday, October 26, 2010 2:48 PM
To: Uhle, Jennifer
Subject: Fw: draft Commission Paper for concurrence

I didn't look at this paper myself, but Charlie, John, and Steve B did. Charlie's comments are below and John/Steve had no comments. So we can concur if you agree.

From: Tinkler, Charles
To: Gibson, Kathy
Cc: Uhle, Jennifer
Sent: Mon Oct 25 14:29:04 2010
Subject: RE: draft Commission Paper for concurrence

Kathy-

I took a quick look through the paper. It has a very short section discussing the reexamination of success criteria in SPAR using MELCOR and SOARCA input decks. It is not objectionable though it does, in my mind, slightly downplay the benefits. It has language that says in some cases existing basis was confirmed; in other cases the MELCOR calcs support modification to enhance realism. What it does not say is that the calcs done which confirm existing basis also provided a technical basis for greater realism in another respect. If we had been given more time I might have pursued better language but it is not incorrect as written.

More important to me is the issue of other SOARCA insights and their factoring into level 2 and level 3 PRA activities. But this paper is directed towards level 1 PRA activities (as is most of NRC efforts – in my opinion)

From: Gibson, Kathy
Sent: Monday, October 25, 2010 11:52 AM
To: Bajorek, Stephen; Voglewede, John; Tinkler, Charles
Cc: Uhle, Jennifer
Subject: Fw: draft Commission Paper for concurrence

Can you guys look at this paper today and advise J and I on any issues and concurrence? Thx

From: Coe, Doug
To: Case, Michael; Uhle, Jennifer
Cc: Richards, Stuart; Gibson, Kathy; Lui, Christiana; Demoss, Gary; Hunter, Christopher; Wagner, Brian; Hudson, Daniel
Sent: Mon Oct 25 09:11:56 2010
Subject: draft Commission Paper for concurrence

Mike/Jennifer,

On Friday we sent to you the subject draft Commission paper on the annual update of Risk-Informed Performance-Based agency initiatives.

The paper is due to Brian tomorrow and we apologize for our administrative error that did not forward this draft paper to you when it went out for parallel concurrence on 10/20 to NRR, NRO, NMSS, FSME, and NSIR.

Items of interest for DSA and DE may include NRR's input on 50.46a rulemaking and NMSS's input on extended storage and transport of spent fuel.

Your consideration of this very short-fused request is really appreciated.

Let me know if we can provide any assistance.

Thanks,

Doug