

Cool, Donald

From: Jocelyn Mitchell *RES*
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 2008 4:15 PM
To: Donald Cool
Subject: FW: POC Comments

Jocelyn Mitchell
Senior Level Technical Advisor
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

301-415-5289
jocelyn.mitchell@nrc.gov

From: Jocelyn Mitchell
Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2008 3:59 PM
To: Farouk Eltawila; Jimi Yerokun; Terry Brock; Charles Tinkler; Jason Schaperow
Subject: RE: POC Comments *RES*

I spoke to Scott Morris (acting for Trish Holahan), Bob Dexter, and Robert Caldwell. The report from SNL does not have any new science. Their contractor at SNL used many existing reviews and reports to put together normalized consequence results, that is how much material would be necessary to exceed the limiting consequence criterion of 2 rem dose over a 1 square km area. They used 5 criteria, three of which sound like the ones that were considered in the NRC/DOE report on dangerous sources. The other two in the present study are more subjective. NSIR does not have a code under development that would include calculation of economic consequences, however, as a follow-on effort they hope to have a "footprint" produced by a given mass of material from which economic impacts could be derived. They have asked that I look at the report that they have so far.

Jocelyn Mitchell
Senior Level Technical Advisor
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

301-415-5289
jocelyn.mitchell@nrc.gov

From: Farouk Eltawila
Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2008 11:44 AM
To: Jimi Yerokun; Terry Brock; Jocelyn Mitchell; Charles Tinkler; Jason Schaperow
Subject: FW: POC Comments
Importance: High

Jimi:

Please check with NSIR so we can incorporate your finding in our POC meeting on SOARCA. If anyone else have relevant information on the subject, please provide to Jimi.

RES
4/22

From: Brian Sheron
Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2008 11:41 AM
To: Farouk Eltawila
Cc: James Lyons
Subject: FW: POC Comments

RES

Farouk, see below. Pls check and find out what NSIR is doing. The last thing we need is two models that do land contamination and economic consequences.

From: Martin Virgilio
Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2008 10:48 AM
To: Brian Sheron
Cc: Mark Shaffer; Rickie Seltzer; John Adams
Subject: RE: POC Comments

DEDO

Brian

Outside of Scope

outside of scope

From: Brian Sheron
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2008 5:12 PM
To: Martin Virgilio
Subject: POC Comments

RES

Marty, we received POC comments on the RES package "Chairman Approval of Modifications for 'State-of-the-Art Reactor Consequence Analyses,' and 'Faster-Than-Real-Time Decision-Making Tool.'" I have two concerns:

1.) The second paragraph says "Where/how are we going to address the Commission's interest in having one methodology for assessing consequences for reactor and material events including security (RDD) events in a manner that includes land use denial and economic impacts?"

We (RES) have not received any direction to develop a single methodology for assessing consequences that address land use denial and economic impacts. In fact, as far as I can tell, the Commission is still split on this issue, with Commissioners Lyons and Jaczko asking for this methodology request to be included in the SOARCA SRM and Commissioner Svinicki and Chairman Klein against asking for it. Thus, I do not think this is an appropriate question for us to have to address as part of the POC review of our package.

2.) There is a comment regarding page 2 which says some language should be added that addresses the relationship of this work with the direction of the current Commission draft SRMs on SOARCA and the Reactor Consequence Analysis.

I don't think it appropriate that we should be expected to address how this work relates to a draft SRM that may or may not materialize. The draft I saw talks about including economic and land use denial. However, this is simply the language proposed by two of the Commissioners. The other two disagree with the language. I could argue that an equally valid draft SRM could have been crafted that would be silent on the issue of economic impact and land use denial, and two Commissioners would approve it, and the other two wouldn't.

Regardless, it is my recollection that the MACCs code contract includes improving the economic and land use denial models in MACCs.