

Chang, Richard

From: Chang, Richard
Sent: Tuesday, November 30, 2010 7:31 AM
To: Schaperow, Jason
Cc: Yerokun, Jimi
Subject: RE: Surry

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Jason,

Let's talk about this when you have the chance. I am wondering if this is considered a substitution of key personnel per the contract...

Regards,
Richard

From: Burns, Shawn [<mailto:spburns@sandia.gov>]
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2010 6:06 PM
To: Gauntt, Randall O; Schaperow, Jason
Cc: Chang, Richard
Subject: RE: Surry

All,

Randy is correct. We will need to place a new contract with dycoda if KC is to continue working on SOARCA. That of course will also require Mark Leonard's approval. Right now there should be approximately 1 month of funding left on the current contract which Mark Leonard will need to complete the work on Peach Bottom. We have already made as many contract extensions and modifications as we are allowed to make under the current contract so we would also need a new contract if we need to depend on Marks support longer than 1 month.

Right now my plan is to have Kyle Ross pick up the work on the Surry plant.

Best regards,

Shawn

From: Gauntt, Randall O
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2010 4:01 PM
To: 'Schaperow, Jason'; Burns, Shawn
Cc: 'Chang, Richard'
Subject: RE: Surry

Randy here --

I kind of support the approach to use the sources from the full calculation to evaluate the re-configured buildings. This could save a lot of time.

KC just landed at dycoda and I understand the contract with dycoda needs revisiting (a new one I think Shawn told me). I don't know what Mark's funding balance is (not that I would mind you). I guess the worst case scenario is that we need a new contract and need to name KC on that contract.

Information in this record was deleted
in accordance with the Freedom of Information
Act, exemptions Ex 6
FOIA- 2011-0083

725

FF/5

Randy

From: Schaperow, Jason [<mailto:Jason.Schaperow@nrc.gov>]
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2010 3:43 PM
To: Burns, Shawn
Cc: Chang, Richard; Gauntt, Randall O
Subject: FW: Surry

Hi Shawn,

Regarding the ISLOCA, we need to, as a minimum, understand where the liquids, gasses, and aerosols will go following the pipe break. We need to find our drawings for the Safeguards Building and develop simplified drawings of the Safeguards and Auxiliary buildings showing where the liquids, gases, and aerosols will go. This will likely involve a visit to the Surry site. Then, we need to rerun our MELCOR model with the correct pathways modeled.

Based on my conversation with KC this afternoon, it sounds like he is not funded to work on SOARCA. Please confirm whether KC is working on SOARCA. The reanalysis of the Surry ISLOCA is currently critical path.

Thanks,
Jason

From: Casey Wagner (b)(6)
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2010 5:22 PM
To: Ross, Kyle Wayne
Cc: Schaperow, Jason
Subject: Surry

1

Hi Kyle,

Jason is wondering what is the best way to get ready for a trip to Surry to pursue the ISLOCA and modeling of the Safeguards Bldg. I suggested that you might be the best contact for that question. My previous research indicates that a model was started (i.e., evidenced by James Madrid's Autocad pictures and Pat's memory). Pat could not find the model. I have never seen a Safeguards Bldg model (i.e., I started from Scott's Surry files). You might check \\beegees\sga. I thought there might have been a Spreadsheet with some general information but certainly not enough for a MELCOR model. I do not know where the drawings might be. Tim Wheeler (manager of the Vulnerability study) or Pat would be the best resources to check.

Jason was wondering what would be the best way to prepare for a plant visit and would like a call to discuss. Call me or tie me with Jason if I could provide some historical information.

KC