

## Schaperow, Jason

---

**From:** Schaperow, Jason  
**Sent:** Monday, January 03, 2011 2:11 PM  
**To:** Santiago, Patricia  
**Subject:** RE: SOARCA RIC Description

Thanks for the email. I continue to believe that we should cancel the SOARCA session of the RIC. Also, I just checked the NRC public web site for the RIC and there is no program given there and no mention of SOARCA.

I look forward to speaking with you tomorrow.

---

**From:** Santiago, Patricia  
**Sent:** Monday, January 03, 2011 1:59 PM  
**To:** Schaperow, Jason  
**Subject:** RE: SOARCA RIC Description

Jason,

Let's chat more....I define consensus as broad unanimity: general or widespread agreement among all the members of a group. We had several aspects we considered and as a team we came up with the most reasonable approach to deal with as many issues as we could and we recognize that we may not capture all but we move forward.

Can we also quickly talk tomorrow about team morale, efficiency, effectiveness and what else as senior staff we can do to ensure a good team approach (consensus as I use it) on issues we discuss. I want you to help lead this effort so that we can move forward with team approaches.

For the RIC, we can consider what Richard's note has described for the session along with what we have already prepared for other briefs and Charlie's views re uncertainty. If we don't present for part of the session, I am sure the peer review group would happily use the entire time ....thus, I think we should do our part as efficiently as possible.

Thanks again!

Pat

---

**From:** Schaperow, Jason  
**Sent:** Monday, January 03, 2011 12:52 PM  
**To:** Santiago, Patricia  
**Subject:** RE: SOARCA RIC Description

Hi Pat,

What do you mean by "consensus?" Do you mean:

- 1) All 4 people at our meeting this morning?
- or
- 2) 3 out of 4 people at our meeting this morning?

The reason I am asking is that, when I say consensus, I mean unanimity.

Thanks,  
Jason

---

**From:** Santiago, Patricia  
**Sent:** Monday, January 03, 2011 12:09 PM  
**To:** Tinkler, Charles; Schaperow, Jason  
**Cc:** Chang, Richard; Ghosh, Tina  
**Subject:** RE: SOARCA RIC Description

Thanks Charlie, that was our concensus too that we needed to have the session. It could however hopefully include new info from App A and anything else that we can brief the DEDO Feb 28<sup>th</sup> etc. Shifting focus to uncertainty we need to all talk about.  
Thanks!

---

**From:** Tinkler, Charles  
**Sent:** Monday, January 03, 2011 12:00 PM  
**To:** Schaperow, Jason; Santiago, Patricia  
**Cc:** Chang, Richard; Ghosh, Tina  
**Subject:** RE: SOARCA RIC Description

I checked with Jennifer late last week. She said she had talked to Brian about the SOARCA RIC and that Brian wanted us to go ahead with the session. I told her again, that it would be very difficult to have a session that presents progress on the best estimate study, her reaction was to present the same old , same old (my words not hers). In my view this is not looking promising. Perhaps we should shift focus to a new area, i.e., Uncertainty Analysis.

---

**From:** Schaperow, Jason  
**Sent:** Monday, January 03, 2011 11:25 AM  
**To:** Santiago, Patricia  
**Cc:** Chang, Richard; Ghosh, Tina; Tinkler, Charles  
**Subject:** RE: SOARCA RIC Description

Hi Pat,

During a telecom with Jennifer during the week of December 20, she said she would give us feedback on 1) whether we could cancel the SOARCA RIC session and 2) if we proceed with having a SOARCA RIC session, what the process would be for internal review of slides containing consequence results. Suggest we follow-up with Jennifer on this issue either during our Thursday morning SOARCA meeting (Jan 6) or perhaps earlier.

Thanks,  
Jason

---

**From:** Chang, Richard  
**Sent:** Monday, January 03, 2011 11:02 AM  
**To:** Ghosh, Tina; Santiago, Patricia; Schaperow, Jason  
**Subject:** SOARCA RIC Description

All,

Please see attached for the SOARCA session description.

The NRC's State-of-the-Art Reactor Consequence Analyses (SOARCA) research project is designed to estimate the realistic outcomes of severe accident scenarios at nuclear power plants. The project also studied and improved methods

and models for realistically evaluating plant responses during severe accidents, including protective actions for the public (such as evacuation and sheltering), and the potential public health risk. The NRC performed this study, in part, to develop information about the effectiveness of methods for mitigating severe accidents at nuclear power plants to prevent or minimize harm to the public. The SOARCA study seeks to produce more realistic estimates of plant behavior during severe accidents, thereby improving understanding of the consequences of a potential accident. The NRC staff has completed its initial analyses and is addressing issues identified by the SOARCA External Peer Review Committee, as well as feedback from a fact check with the power plants included in the study. Part of this session will include a perspective of the SOARCA peer review. Finally, the NRC will discuss the uncertainty study for SOARCA that it began within the past year.

Thanks,

Richard Chang  
Program Manager  
RES/DSA/SPB  
301-251-7980