

Chang, Richard

From: Chang, Richard
Sent: Tuesday, February 08, 2011 4:33 PM
To: Ghosh, Tina
Subject: RE: SOARCA RIC slides -- comments and questions

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Tina,

Please see below:

Want to chat about my responses tomorrow?

Thanks,
Richard

From: Ghosh, Tina
Sent: Monday, February 07, 2011 12:51 PM
To: Chang, Richard
Subject: SOARCA RIC slides -- comments and questions

Comments/question:

- Spell out acronyms (No problem)
- On slide 4, how does "additional mitigation measures" in last bullet differ from the 2nd sub-bullet above that says includes SAMGs/10CFR50.54(hh)? And did we really take credit for the SAMGs in the baseline analysis (unmitigated and/or mitigated) or just B.5.b measures? For the mitigated analyses we did take credit for the SAMGs. The additional mitigation measures were based on tabletop exercises with the licensee staff.
- On slide 6, 2nd sub-bullet of 2nd bullet, insert "containment" in front of "bypass" Ok
- Slide 6, explain who IRSN, PSI, and NUPEC are. Ok

Questions that might come up at the RIC session:

- Will the SOARCA results be used in NRC regulatory programs, and if so, how? Similarly, if license applicants come in with applications relying on SOARCA information, will NRC accept it as an adequate technical bases? The Commission specifically directed the staff not to consider Policy implications until after the analyses are complete. We are currently rerunning some scenarios.
- Slide 2 – what security assessments, and are they publicly available? These are security assessments implemented after September 11, 2001.
- Slide 6 talks about focus on 'important' scenarios, including 10-7 for (containment) bypass. What about LERF scenarios (not just bypass)? NUREG 1150/ (Predecisional) For scenarios that met our threshold, there were no LERF.
- Slide 6 same bullet says focus on 'important' scenarios only. Do we know the incompleteness in what we modeled? What is the aggregate risk of the scenarios that we left out of the analysis? (i.e., compare to total CDF and LERF for Surry and Peach Bottom). We focused on scenarios where
- Slide 6, 3rd sub-bullet of 2nd bullet says this study has adopted new approaches in many areas, including "integrated, self consistent analyses." Were NRC's past analyses not self-consistent? I will check.
- Slide 6 last bullet – is NRC now considering non LNT cancer modeling in regulatory programs too? Nope...just SOARCA

This is all I have for now – I'm sure our management will have comments/revisions.
Let me know if you want to discuss.