

## Penelope Kinney

---

**From:** Glenny, Jessica  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 09, 2009 3:20 PM  
**To:** Kinney, Penelope  
**Subject:** Chairman Memo  
**Attachments:** J5546ChairmanNotificationGlenny.doc

Hi Penny,

Hope you enjoyed your weekend. Weather was nice.

I've addressed most of Rickie's comments. The only one left to address is whether or not external sources will use this NUREG. I asked John Cook for his help addressing that one. My guess is that stakeholders may reference the findings in the NUREG to support any actions needing NRC approval, but I'm not quite sure.

I've included comments/questions in the margins. Anything you have to offer is greatly appreciated as always.

Jessica

MEMORANDUM TO: Chairman Jackzo  
FROM: R. W. Borchardt  
Executive Director for Operations  
SUBJECT: NOTIFICATION OF A SIGNIFICANT INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT CHANGE - JOB CODE J5546, "SPENT FUEL TRANSPORT RISK ASSESSMENT"

original ceiling was \$286,000 not \$254,430 with a POP of 6/23/05 - 11/15/06

In accordance with the delegation of contractual authority memorandum dated January 24, 2005, this memorandum provides notification of a significant change to the Spent Fuel Transport Risk Assessment laboratory agreement that the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS) entered into with the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), on June 23, 2005. The initial agreement was awarded for \$254,430, with a performance period beginning on the execution of the agreement and ending November 2006. On May 5, 2006, the Chairman granted authorization to increase the ceiling of this agreement to \$1,476,000. NMSS now intends to issue a modification which will increase the ceiling of the agreement by \$335,300. This increase results in a cost variance exceeding the 20 percent threshold and requires notification to the Chairman. The ceiling of this agreement will be increased from \$1,476,000 to \$1,810,300 and the period of performance will be extended from June 10, 2010 to April 30, 2011. NMSS has budgeted \$350,000 for this effort in FY 2009, of which \$114,700 will fully fund the current agreement up to the cost ceiling. Contract support of \$25,000 is included in the FY 2010 budget, and \$75,000 is included in the base budget request for FY 2011, as part of the Planning, Budgeting, and Performance management process. FY 2010 resource requirements decrease to reflect the completion of the SFTRA, and issuance of the draft NUREG for public comment. Efforts under this agreement during FY 2010 will principally be to support a separate peer review of the SFTRA. FY 2011 resource requirements increase to reflect incorporation of the peer review comments and issuance of the final NUREG report.

86,000

from June 23, 2005 to November 15, 2006

Comment [J1]: Per memo dated 4/7/2006 to Chairman Diaz, the original agreement was awarded for \$254,430, June 23, 2005. The 4/7/2006 memo requested an additional \$975,570, which brings the total for the agreement to \$1,230K (plus 20% is \$1,476K).

\$1,230,000.

Budgeted \$335,300 = FY09 + FY10

All prior-year funds were expended by January 2009. FY 2009 budgeted funds are needed for completion of the original effort, and the expansion discussed in this paper. The FY 2009 budgeted funds are planned for obligation in August, but most of these funds will be carried over into FY 2010, for the reasons outlined below. These funds will provide for contractor support from September (estimated to be \$38,000) through the issuance of the draft NUREG in early January 2010 (estimated to be an additional \$127,000). Also, approximately \$65,000 will be carried over from FY 2009 into FY 2010, to allow continuation of contractor efforts from January through July 2010, to support the separate peer review. These efforts were originally anticipated and budgeted to occur during FY 2009, but are now deferred to FY 2010, to complete the Chairman Review process.

Comment [J2]: This was taken verbatim from the previous version of the Chairman memo. It's very detailed. I included it all so that you can help me pick out the details that we should omit.

Under the agreement, Sandia National Laboratory (SNL) is responsible for preparing a NUREG document that summarizes spent fuel transportation safety. It will be used by NMSS staff in the review of environmental assessments and impact statements related to interim spent fuel storage facilities. Analyses of spent fuel risk estimates and the modeling of spent fuel canisters and package impact limiters is more complex than initially estimated. The interaction between the complexity of the structure being modeled and the added analysis code precision was not

statement could be misinterpreted to possibly lead to ?'s regarding SNL's capability.

On July 18, 2008, a modification to increase the ceiling to \$1,475,000 was executed to obtain . . . . and the period of performance was extended to June 30, 2010.

can this be removed?

clearly understood by either the analysts or the code developers at SNL, and required substantial unplanned effort to adjust the cask model code to achieve analysis success. As a result, SNL will require additional time and effort to complete the NUREG and to resolve peer and public comments on the document.

Comment [13]: This blurb is meant to address Rickie's comments as to why the analyses are more complex. I think this blurb may be to high level. I have a note somewhere which answers the question in plain language.

CONTACTS: John Cook, NMSS/SFST  
(301) 492-3318

Penelope Kinney, NMSS/PBPA  
(301) 492-3248

~~Official Use Only - Sensitive Internal Information~~