

## Chang, Richard

---

**From:** Chang, Richard  
**Sent:** Monday, December 06, 2010 7:29 AM  
**To:** Schaperow, Jason  
**Subject:** FW: SOARCA core dump

FYI.

---

**From:** Burns, Shawn [mailto:spburns@sandia.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, December 03, 2010 4:19 PM  
**To:** Chang, Richard  
**Cc:** Gauntt, Randall O; Ross, Kyle Wayne  
**Subject:** SOARCA core dump

Richard,

I have a number of related SOARCA issues rattling around in my head so I apologize in advancc but I plan to just dump them all out at once.

Kyle Ross Availability  
=====

Randy and I spoke this morning and we dicided the best route is to identify alternate junior staff to handle Kyle's other responsibilities (SNAP etc.) as needed so that Kyle can focus his principal energies on SOARCA for the spring. Kyle will still provide mentoring and review to the other MELCOR drivers but this should allow us to reduce the time required to build the new safeguards building model from 6 calendar weeks to 4 calendar weeks. This relates to my feedback on your moset recent Surry/ISLOCA options listing for NRC management.

Surry safeguards building drawings  
=====

Kyle tells me that the drawings we have for the Surry safegurads buidling are sufficient to get a general understanding of how the safegurds building looks like but are not detailed enough to build a model from. We will need to request additional information from Surry. This relates to my feedback on your moset recent Surry/ISLOCA options listing for NRC management.

dycoda contract  
=====

I have discussed setting up a new contract with dycoda with our financial staff. I have also asked Mark Leonard about KC's ongoing availability to support the SOARCA project but he won't be able to get back to me until Monday. The optimal mix in my view will be to have Kyle take the lead on ongoing calculations and have KC available for consultation to minimize "spin-up" time on Kyle's part. I know that Jason would like to have KC available for a site visit but I do not know if that will be possible yet. I am also not sure that it is really necessary since Kyle will be doing the heavy lifting for the model development and analysis.

PB whitepaper  
=====

I pulsed Mark about the PB whitepaper and he said that he had promised Jason to have it in his in-box as of Monday morning.

Surry ISLOCA Options for NRC management (feedback)  
=====

1) The earliest start time for option 1 and 2 would be January.

2) We need to get more detailed drawings on the safeguards building for Surry (see above) so both Option 1 and Option 2 need to account for the time required to obtain this information (2 weeks was the original estimate). Kyle will need some time to review the new drawings before the site visit. Perhaps the request can be made now so that the drawings are available before the winter shutdown.

3) Although Kyle is more available than I originally anticipated (see above) allowing 3 weeks for BOTH model development and a site visit is unrealistic. I believe this combined effort will require 5 weeks since you must also account for the delay that results from finding a time that works for all the principals involved.

4) I also think that 2 weeks is unrealistic for NRC/SNL review of the results. I am sometimes suspicious that we can all come to agreement on the color of the sky in 2 weeks ;-). I would feel better with 4 weeks allotted to this effort but would be willing to live with 3 weeks.

5) Similarly, updating the documentation implies NRC staff review which cannot realistically be completed in one week. I believe allowing 2 weeks to documentation update would still be tight. It is reasonable to overlap the documentation effort and the review tasks by a week so that together they would add up to 4 weeks.

6) Keep in mind that these efforts reflect my estimate of the calendar time involved and not necessarily the staff time. We have cut out much of the difference between the two by decreasing the model development time but some slack will inevitably creep into the schedule even with full staff commitment at SNL and NRC.

With these points in mind I think better schedules would look like this:

Option 1

Task	duration	dates
Obtain safeguards building drawings from Surry	2 weeks	12/13 - 1/3
Review drawings and preliminary model setup	1 week	1/3 - 1/7
Arrange and complete site visit	2 weeks	1/10 - 1/21
Complete model model development and testing	2 weeks	1/24 - 2/4
Run Melcor Model	5 weeks	2/7 - 3/11
Run MACCS Model	1 week	3/14 - 3/18
NRC/SNL review of results and documentation	4 weeks	3/21 - 4/15

Option 2

Task	duration	dates
Obtain safeguards building drawings from Surry	2 weeks	12/13 - 1/3
Review drawings and preliminary model setup	1 week	1/3 - 1/7
Arrange and complete site visit	2 weeks	1/10 - 1/21
Complete model model development and testing	2 weeks	1/24 - 2/4
Run MELCOR Model	2 weeks	2/7 - 2/18
Run MACCS Model	1 week	2/21 - 2/25
NRC/SNL review of results and documentation	4 weeks	2/28 - 3/25

Let me know what you think.

Best regards,

Shawn