

Chang, Richard

From: Chang, Richard
Sent: Wednesday, December 01, 2010 10:54 AM
To: Kahler, Robert
Cc: Sullivan, Randy
Subject: FW: SOARCA small evacuation

Bob,

Since Randy is out of the office today, I was wondering if I put together a meeting, who from NSIR should I invite?

Thanks,
Richard

From: Chang, Richard
Sent: Wednesday, December 01, 2010 9:19 AM
To: Sullivan, Randy
Subject: RE: SOARCA small evacuation

Randy,

I can pull together a meeting...who should I invite from NSIR?

Thanks,
Richard

From: Sullivan, Randy
Sent: Tuesday, November 30, 2010 4:09 PM
To: Yerokun, Jimi; Chang, Richard
Cc: Schaperow, Jason; Tinkler, Charles; McDermott, Brian
Subject: RE: SOARCA small evacuation

I have discussed this issue with my management.

We would like to discuss this with you further as we do not understand your reasons RE: removal of the 16 & 20 mile analyses. They both show the strength and appropriateness of the current EPZ. We also do not understand your resistance to acquiring additional data that is also likely to show the appropriateness of the EPZ (i.e., the 5 mile analysis). Perhaps there are resource concerns? But we do not understand the "multiple reasons" noted below as you have not shared them with us.

Thank you

Randolph Sullivan, CHP

From: Yerokun, Jimi
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2010 8:36 AM
To: Chang, Richard; Sullivan, Randy
Cc: Schaperow, Jason; Tinkler, Charles
Subject: RE: SOARCA small evacuation

Randy – Lets discuss a strategy for potentially doing the 5-mile case study. Since we have done a bigger EPZ study (16 and 20-mile) the study of a smaller EPZ sounds logical. The issue is if the studies need to be in the

SOARCA document or ought to be captured separately. I understand that the 16/20-mile study was done at the request of NSIR. For multiple reasons including the one given below, the thought is to document the studies separately.

Jimi T. Yerokun

From: Chang, Richard
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2010 7:53 AM
To: Sullivan, Randy
Cc: Schaperow, Jason; Tinkler, Charles; Yerokun, Jimi
Subject: RE: SOARCA small evacuation

Randy,

I talked to my management about this...and I think the direction that they are leaning towards is the pulling of the sensitivity analysis of 16 and 20 miles from the report (so that a 5 mile study does not need to be done). One of the primary reasons for this is that my management did not like Sandia's time estimate for the completion of this work. Please let me know what your/NSIR's thoughts on this are.

Regards,
Richard

From: Sullivan, Randy
Sent: Friday, November 19, 2010 9:53 AM
To: Schaperow, Jason; Tinkler, Charles
Cc: Chang, Richard
Subject: FW: SOARCA small evacuation

This is the scope and schedule for completing a case study to determine the effectiveness of a smaller EPZ.

Charlie suggested we pursue this and I agree it would be interesting information. I do not know, however, how this fits into our schedule, of course I do not understand our schedule either, so perhaps all is well.

I also do not know how this gets formally communicated to SNL, but I will leave that up to the PM, if we are going to go forward.

Randolph Sullivan, CHP

From: Jones, Joe A [<mailto:jojones@sandia.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 03, 2010 8:47 AM
To: Sullivan, Randy
Cc: Burns, Shawn
Subject: SOARCA small evacuation

Randy,

Attached is a breakdown of the level of effort we would need to model a sensitivity analysis for one scenario for Peach Bottom and one for Surry. I'm assuming it would be the same accident sequence we ran for the other sensitivity studies. This has been reviewed by Nate and Shawn, and Shawn agreed that having you route it up the NRC chain was a reasonable approach.

We are available to start as soon as a change is processed and funding is available. Please let me know if you have any questions or need any additional information regarding this effort.

Thanks
Joe