

From: Debra Damiano
To: Baggett, Steven; Barto, Julia; Cook, John; Funches, Jesse; Heumann, Elise; Hodges, M Wayne; Holonich, Joseph; Itzkowitz, Marvin; Lewis, Robert; RidsEdoMailCenter; RidsNmssOd; RidsNmssSfpoSlid; Scott, Mary Lynn; Wong, Melanie
Date: 4/17/06 2:00PM
Subject: 04/07/06 Memo Chm Diaz, Chairman Review of an Acquisition for Job Code J5546 "Spent Fuel Transport Risk Assessment"
Place: RidsEdoMailCenter

04/07/06 Memo Chm Diaz, Chairman Review of an Acquisition for Job Code J5546 "Spent Fuel Transport Risk Assessment"

ML053320276

Original dtd & dispatched by OEDO 4/7/06
w/ cc to Commissioners, SECY, OGC, OCA, OPA, & CFO

Debra Damiano (dmd1@nrc.gov)
301-415-8500

CC: Damiano, Debra; Greene, Alexandra; Perez-Ortiz, Aracelis; Walker, Sandra; Webb, Susan

From: Robert McOsker
To: Cook, John; Olive, Karen; Scott, Mary Lynn
Date: 4/25/06 11:10AM
Subject: Spent Fuel Transport Acquisition

I have a couple of questions on this one:

1. The modification costs 3+ times as much as the original contract, which seemed to be mostly about public outreach in its original form (June 2005). I am not exactly sure why public outreach is a strength of Sandia, so I am not clear on why the original contract was placed with them. Can you explain?
2. What has happened since June 2005, when the contract was originally placed, that leads to a reevaluation of the prior NUREG? The paper cites new models and security assessments. When did we know that we would need to reevaluate the previously performed NUREG? What exactly changed after June 2005 that drives this modification?
3. I can understand why Sandia would be selected to update the NUREG, but I am not clear why we would add that on to a contract about public outreach. Did we need to keep the Sandia researchers together long enough to conduct this updated study?
4. What is the relationship of the contract as modified with the Package Performance Study?

CC: Castleman, Patrick

From: Karen Olive
To: Beverly Anker
Date: 4/25/06 11:18AM
Subject: Re: NMSS paper status

FYI, the attached questions from the Chairman's staff "stop the clock." They were sent directly to John Cook.

Karen, x2276

>>> Beverly Anker 04/24/06 12:08 PM >>>

Karen,

I am covering for Joyce Fields who is out this week.

I received a call from Elise Heumann, NMSS, regarding their review paper, Spent Fuel Transport Risk Assessment, J5546. It was signed out by Kane for Reyes on April 7. The standard text of the memo states that if NMSS does not hear differently within 15 days, (Friday, April 28), they will go forward with the project.

Elise asked that I check to determine if they will hear something by Friday or if action should be held until after the 25th.

Thanks for your help.

Bev

CC: Elise Heumann; Georgette Price; Susan Bellosi

SFPO response to McOsker questions:

1. The modification costs 3+ times as much as the original contract, which seemed to be mostly about public outreach in its original form (June 2005). I am not exactly sure why public outreach is a strength of Sandia, so I am not clear on why the original contract was placed with them. Can you explain?

The original June 2005 contract had both a public outreach task (prepare visuals to help explain spent nuclear fuel (SNF) transport safety concepts to the public) and a technical task (prepare a letter report assessing the impact of using generic inner canisters on SNF transport risk assessments). Sandia was a clear choice for the technical task because of their internationally recognized transportation expertise, and their previous work for us in this area.

For the public outreach task, the nature of the effort (develop transport safety visuals) requires a thorough understanding of the technical underpinnings of SNF package performance under NRC's hypothetical accident conditions specified in 10 CFR Part 71. For example, a visual might be prepared on the equivalent impact velocities for packages impacting unyielding surfaces (regulatory conditions) vs. yielding surfaces (real world conditions). Also, NRC public messages on SNF transport safety receive considerable scrutiny from those opposed to such shipments. We are unaware of any sources that excel at public outreach, and also possess the requisite technical knowledge and credibility to prepare visuals on these topics. We went with Sandia as the best overall choice, given the need for technical expertise for both the technical and public outreach tasks.

Lastly, note that the increase in cost derives primarily from replacing the original technical task with another that is much larger in scope, as further explained in the response to question 2.

2. What has happened since June 2005, when the contract was originally placed, that leads to a reevaluation of the prior NUREG? The paper cites new models and security assessments. When did we know that we would need to reevaluate the previously performed NUREG? What exactly changed after June 2005 that drives this modification?

We believe the modification builds on the technical assessment contained in NUREG/CR-6672 by adding assessment of specific, rather than generic, inner canisters for SNF casks, modeling impact limiter performance, improving thermal analysis, and other aspects. These additional assessments are intended to address issues identified in reviews conducted after NUREG/CR-6672 was published, including the public screening process used in the early phase of the Package Performance Study. Also note that NUREG/CR-6672 was a Contractor Report, and was not published for public comment. Some western states and local groups objected to this process, and in our replies to them, we committed to addressing public comments in Package Performance Study.

What changed after June 2005 was the recognition that replacing the generic canister assessment and letter report task with a much broader task that included specific canister assessment and other analyses, and then using a public comment and peer review process to finalize and publish a new NUREG (not a Contractor Report) on SNF

transport safety, was an opportunity to be responsive to earlier stakeholder comments and obtain public recognition and support for the NRC's spent fuel shipment safety assessment techniques and outcomes. This objective and desired outcome is what drives this modification.

3. I can understand why Sandia would be selected to update the NUREG, but I am not clear why we would add that on to a contract about public outreach. Did we need to keep the Sandia researchers together long enough to conduct this updated study?

We agree that Sandia is the choice to support NRC in issuing a new NUREG on SNF transport safety. Recall that the original contract was about equally divided between public outreach and technical tasks. The modification adds to (replaces really) the technical task in the original contract (see response to question 1) with a much broader technical effort. The original public outreach task remains, but now constitutes a lesser portion of the modified overall effort. We have kept the Sandia researchers at a low level of effort while we have pursued this modification.

4. What is the relationship of the contract as modified with the Package Performance Study?

The Package Performance Study (PPS) began with a public review process that identified SNF transport safety issues that warranted further assessment (see response to question 2). The nature of the Package Performance Study has since been refocused on physical demonstration testing of SNF packaging such that the identified technical issues not related to package testing are no longer integral to the PPS. These non-testing related issues are still outstanding however, and the modified contract provides the vehicle to address many of them. Note that the modified contract does not involve any SNF full-scale package testing, so the modified contract will not interfere with the PPS, but actually complements the PPS testing and analysis.

From: John Cook
To: Beverly Anker
Date: 4/27/06 10:31AM
Subject: Fwd: Re: NMSS paper status

Beverly-

Please find attached SFPO response to the questions posed by Bob McOsker, and understand that you will forward to Karen Olive. Please call if you have any questions. Thanks.

-John

>>> Beverly Anker 04/25/2006 2:27 PM >>>

John,

Once you have prepared a response for Bob McOsker, please e mail it to me so that I can respond to Karen Olive.

Thank you,

Beverly Anker

Acting for Joyce Fields

Procurement Oversight Branch

Division of Contracts, ADM

CC: E William Brach; Elise Heumann; exe; mcw; Penelope Kinney; slb; whr

SFPO response to McOsker questions:

1. The modification costs 3+ times as much as the original contract, which seemed to be mostly about public outreach in its original form (June 2005). I am not exactly sure why public outreach is a strength of Sandia, so I am not clear on why the original contract was placed with them. Can you explain?

The original June 2005 contract had both a public outreach task (prepare visuals to help explain spent nuclear fuel (SNF) transport safety concepts to the public) and a technical task (prepare a letter report assessing the impact of using generic inner canisters on SNF transport risk assessments). Sandia was a clear choice for the technical task because of their internationally recognized transportation expertise, and their previous work for us in this area.

For the public outreach task, the nature of the effort (develop transport safety visuals) requires a thorough understanding of the technical underpinnings of SNF package performance under NRC's hypothetical accident conditions specified in 10 CFR Part 71. For example, a visual might be prepared on the equivalent impact velocities for packages impacting unyielding surfaces (regulatory conditions) vs. yielding surfaces (real world conditions). Also, NRC public messages on SNF transport safety receive considerable scrutiny from those opposed to such shipments. We are unaware of any sources that excel at public outreach, and also possess the requisite technical knowledge and credibility to prepare visuals on these topics. We went with Sandia as the best overall choice, given the need for technical expertise for both the technical and public outreach tasks.

Lastly, note that the increase in cost derives primarily from replacing the original technical task with another that is much larger in scope, as further explained in the response to question 2.

2. What has happened since June 2005, when the contract was originally placed; that leads to a reevaluation of the prior NUREG? The paper cites new models and security assessments. When did we know that we would need to reevaluate the previously performed NUREG? What exactly changed after June 2005 that drives this modification?

We believe the modification builds on the technical assessment contained in NUREG/CR-6672 by adding assessment of specific, rather than generic, inner canisters for SNF casks, modeling impact limiter performance, improving thermal analysis, and other aspects. These additional assessments are intended to address issues identified in reviews conducted after NUREG/CR-6672 was published, including the public screening process used in the early phase of the Package Performance Study. Also note that NUREG/CR-6672 was a Contractor Report, and was not published for public comment. Some western states and local groups objected to this process, and in our replies to them, we committed to addressing public comments in Package Performance Study.

What changed after June 2005 was the recognition that replacing the generic canister assessment and letter report task with a much broader task that included specific canister assessment and other analyses, and then using a public comment and peer review process to finalize and publish a new NUREG (not a Contractor Report) on SNF

transport safety, was an opportunity to be responsive to earlier stakeholder comments and obtain public recognition and support for the NRC's spent fuel shipment safety assessment techniques and outcomes. This objective and desired outcome is what drives this modification.

3. I can understand why Sandia would be selected to update the NUREG, but I am not clear why we would add that on to a contract about public outreach. Did we need to keep the Sandia researchers together long enough to conduct this updated study?

We agree that Sandia is the choice to support NRC in issuing a new NUREG on SNF transport safety. Recall that the original contract was about equally divided between public outreach and technical tasks. The modification adds to (replaces really) the technical task in the original contract (see response to question 1) with a much broader technical effort. The original public outreach task remains, but now constitutes a lesser portion of the modified overall effort. We have kept the Sandia researchers at a low level of effort while we have pursued this modification.

4. What is the relationship of the contract as modified with the Package Performance Study?

The Package Performance Study (PPS) began with a public review process that identified SNF transport safety issues that warranted further assessment (see response to question 2). The nature of the Package Performance Study has since been refocused on physical demonstration testing of SNF packaging such that the identified technical issues not related to package testing are no longer integral to the PPS. These non-testing related issues are still outstanding however, and the modified contract provides the vehicle to address many of them. Note that the modified contract does not involve any SNF full-scale package testing, so the modified contract will not interfere with the PPS, but actually complements the PPS testing and analysis.