

Chang, Richard

From: Chang, Richard
Sent: Friday, November 19, 2010 7:37 AM
To: Burns, Shawn
Cc: Gauntt, Randall O
Subject: RE: SOARCA schedule feedback

Shawn,

Thank you... feedback like this is EXACTLY what I need. I am working with Jason and will be in touch with you to try to clearly define the work moving forward and to come up with when you need NRC input. My goal is to have a clear definition of what work is needed moving forward and to not deviate from that. Any additional items after we come up with our agreed upon list will automatically be deferred to a future study.

Regards,
Richard

From: Burns, Shawn [<mailto:spburns@sandia.gov>]
Sent: Friday, November 19, 2010 5:19 AM
To: Chang, Richard
Cc: Gauntt, Randall O
Subject: SOARCA schedule feedback

Richard,

Here is the feedback on your proposed schedule which I promised:

1. The biggest challenge is justifying the substantial increase in the Surry effort to Jennifer. Primarily this relates to resolution of the site fact check comments since I believe Jason is happy with KCs resolution of the peer review comments for Surry. I have asked Kyle to champion a review of the technical effort required to put Surry to bed. I hope he will be able to make some progress in this area while I am away but I plan to have a team teleconference similar to our recent Peach Bottom call soon after I get back to the office.
2. The uncertainty quantification effort should be split into three phases. A lower effort near term phase where we finalize the parameters and distributions, a high effort phase where we complete the production calculations, and a lower effort long term phase where we socialize the results with NRC staff. The medium term phase will be essentially what we had planned to do under the current plan but it should be deferred until the Peach Bottom calculations are complete. I will send you Patrick Mattie's detailed comments along these lines separately.

On another issue, I spoke to Nate Bixler regarding your recent teleconference regarding the Sandia Siting Study comparison. Frankly I am concerned that this additional effort is being undertaken now after the Sandia Siting Study calculation has been set for so long. Although it will only take Nate a couple days to do the calculation, time and coordination will also be needed to update the documentation. In addition, this work will distract Nate from other work associated with the Peach Bottom SRV issue resolution, support for the uncertainty analysis, and development of the MACCS best practices document. I have told Nate to go ahead and execute the analysis but it is not clear to me that the difference between using the STSBO and LTSBO for the Siting Study comparison is more than a nuance given other substantial ambiguities in that comparison. I am also not confident that I could defend this effort to Jennifer in terms of her "needed" versus "wanted" metric for additional analysis.

Best regards,

Shawn

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

761

FF/8

~~~~~  
Shawn P. Burns, Ph.D., P.E.  
Manager, Risk and Reliability Analysis  
Department 6761

Sandia National Laboratories  
P.O. Box 5800  
Albuquerque, NM 87185-0748

Phone: (505)844-6200

Mobile: (b)(6)

Fax: (505)844-2829

e-mail: [spburns@sandia.gov](mailto:spburns@sandia.gov)

Web: <http://www.sandia.gov/ERN/nuclear-energy/index.html>