

(6)

Cool, Donald

From: Cynthia Jones *MS12*
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2008 9:48 AM
To: Dennis Damon; Matthew Bartlett; Timothy McCartin; Farouk Eltawila; Donald Cool; Jean-Claude Dehmelt; Vincent Holahan; Patricia Holahan; Jocelyn Mitchell; Patricia Milligan; Sami Sherbini; Roger Pedersen
Cc: Sher Bahadur; Michael Johnson; Jimi Yerokun
Subject: Re: SOARCA SECY PAPER

NSIR

Farouk-

Rather than repeat the comments provided this week, I will provide you info on the comments I support:

1. Trish's Comment #1 (regarding discussions of "comparison", "direct comparison" with previous offsite consequence analyses in both the pro and con options). I agree that it is not correct to state that there can be "direct" comparisons between SOARCA and the 1982 study.

Trish's Comment #2 (regarding "Assessment of Latent Health Effects Attributable to Ionizing Radiation and Public Communication of Offsite Consequences")

Trish's Comment #3 (regarding many organizations ...)

Trish's Comment #5. (regarding suggested rewording this section like...."several experts described this alternative as potentially more challenging to communicate...")

2. Roger's comment on Option 6. Currently as written, it is still unclear that the "average probability of an average individual" will be calculated as a function of distance from the plant. I agree that if we are targeting and calculating an average risk of, and individual within "X" miles, even those individuals with little to no risk could be averaged in.

3. Don's comments on revisions to the current paper to more accurately reflect the newest option. We should be clear on the fact that the experts and steering group saw this as having an advantage to not depend on aggregating small doses at all. This is supported by the ICRP that collective dose should not be used to calculate a total integral health effect, and the staff's revise option avoids this pitfall (but as yet is not articulated).

I would also agree that there needs to be a revised statement on resource implications given that we are recommending that an external peer review be conducted.

Cyndi

>>> Roger Pedersen 01/30/2008 9:05 AM >>>

Sorry for the late response, I was on travel the last two days.

NLR

I think option 6 needs more development in the paper. It is not clear that the "average probability of an average individual" will be calculated as a function of distance from the plant. Also, I don't see the need for using a 10 mrem (0.1 mSv) truncation in this calculation. If we are truly calculating an average risk of and individual within "X" miles, even those individuals with trivial-to-no risk should be averaged in. This option limits the population considered by limiting the distance considered, thus avoiding the problem of summing trivial doses to very large populations.

>>> Farouk Eltawila 01/28/2008 2:57 PM >>>

All:

RES

As you might be aware, Vince Holahan is in Vienna this week. In his absence, I appreciate your review of this paper and provide your comments to Jimi, Vince, Sher, and I. As you can see, it takes 3 people to fill vince's shoes. Except for some changes that will be articulated later in this e-mail, this version reflects the excellent inputs we received from you. I thank you for your support and look forward to getting this version of the paper

T/70

concurrent on by you Office. The EDO wants the paper no later than 2/2/12/08 , so we have a very short time to get all the concurrences; hopefully with minimal comments.

The paper now is a notation paper, and we moved many of the background information into the enclosure. The pros and Cons of the different options, provided by you, have not been changed. Some of the information, suggested by Mike Johnson and I are inserted to provide a summary of the SOARCA results, so as to put the dose truncation criteria in proper perspectives. The staff recommended option is using the mean probability of an average person dying from cancer conditioned on the occurrence of severe reactor accident. We are asking the Commission to approve the staff recommendation to use this option to calculate the SOARCA consequences. We are also asking the Commission to approve the staff plan to peer review the whole SOARCA methodology, assumptions and results.

To meet the deadline stated above, I would like to get any high level comments by cob tomorrow, 1/29/08 . Please do not be concerned with tech editing, the document is currently being tech edited.