

**Weber, Michael**

---

**ED** **From:** Weber, Michael **ED**  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 25, 2011 6:13 PM  
**To:** Sheron, Brian  
**Subject:** RESPONSE - Periodic with Commissioner Apostolakis

Thanks. We should discuss so I understand the basis for the delay. What does this do to the Level III PRA paper? Would we still deliver that on schedule in July? Delay in these areas may make sense if the Commission is about to launch a task force on risk informing nuclear regulation – where do we go from here.

**RES** **From:** Sheron, Brian  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 25, 2011 5:33 PM  
**To:** Weber, Michael  
**Subject:** RE: RESPONSE - Periodic with Commissioner Apostolakis

Couple of things. Right before I went on AL last week, I discussed with staff, and conclusion was that results (prompt fatalities, etc.) were very integrally entwined within methodology write up, so issuing methodology only for early public review was not practical. Also, I had a periodic with Chairman the day before going on AL and mentioned SOARCA issue. Chairman was not in rush for SOARCA and said we should make corrections before releasing it publicly. I was unaware that staff was going to send up extension request before I got back from AL and had an opportunity to discuss with you. Jennifer said that this was discussed at Chairman budget briefing last week, so she thought you were aware. I apologize if we didn't communicate this to you.

While staff asked for about a 4 ½ month delay (July 31<sup>st</sup> to December 15<sup>th</sup>), we are trying to finish up earlier.

**ED** **From:** Weber, Michael  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 25, 2011 5:01 PM  
**To:** Sheron, Brian  
**Subject:** RESPONSE - Periodic with Commissioner Apostolakis

I thought we discussed not seeking a delay to the SOARCA completion date and several alternatives that could address the concern identified by our staff while allowing the draft report to be circulated for public/stakeholder comment. What is going on?

**RES** **From:** Sheron, Brian  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 25, 2011 1:01 PM  
**To:** Borchardt, Bill; Weber, Michael; Virgilio, Martin; Ash, Darren; Johnson, Michael; Wiggins, Jim; Miller, Charles; Haney, Catherine; Leeds, Eric; Dean, Bill; Satorius, Mark; Collins, Elmo; McCree, Victor; Howard, Patrick; Boyce, Thomas (OIS); Greene, Kathryn  
**Subject:** Periodic with Commissioner Apostolakis

On Tuesday, January 25<sup>th</sup>, I had a periodic with Commissioner Apostolakis.

- 1.) I told him that we were requesting a delay in the SOARCA completion date. I said that when the licensee did a fact check on the design data we used, they pointed out that a raceway between the reactor and aux building that we assumed was open was actually filled with fire barrier foam. The SOARCA assumed that during an intersystem LOCA, fission products would leave the reactor building via the raceway and enter the aux building, where plate-out could occur. If the raceway was filled with fire barrier foam, this was no longer an egress pathway. The current result was therefore non-conservative, and we felt we needed to reanalyze it before releasing the results to the public. The Commission agreed.

T/6

- 2.) The Commissioner mentioned is COMSECY that a task force be created to look at how the agency should use risk-informed regulatory approaches in the long term (~10 years). His basic concern is that he does not see risk-informed regulation and regulation using part 50 as compatible. I pointed out that we developed a technology-neutral, risk-informed approach a while ago, and the Commission directed us to pilot it on the NNGP application. He said that he had a drop in with some utility VPs just before meeting with me, and he was amazed that they were completely unfamiliar with risk-informed regulatory approaches. I pointed out that many utilities still do not have sufficient staff with PRA skills to effectively implement risk-informed regulatory initiatives.
  
- 3.) I mentioned that I found the briefing by the National Academy of Sciences on risk-informing security for the DOE weapons complex interesting, especially since they were not recommending using a risk-informed approach. The Commissioner said he did not think that the NAS was meeting the intent of the congressional direction. I told him we had sent the Sandia workshop results on risk-informing security to NSIR, and we were working with them to develop what the next steps should be.