

**Weber, Michael**

**From:** Weber, Michael - EDO  
**Sent:** Monday, January 31, 2011 4:27 PM  
**To:** Sheron, Brian  
**Subject:** RESPONSE - Periodic with Commissioner Magwood

Thanks, Brian.

**From:** Sheron, Brian  
**Sent:** Monday, January 31, 2011 3:03 PM  
**To:** Borchardt, Bill; Weber, Michael; Virgilio, Martin; Ash, Darren; Wiggins, Jim; Leeds, Eric; Johnson, Michael; Miller, Charles; Haney, Catherine; Dean, Bill; Reyes, Luis; Satorius, Mark; Collins, Elmo; Boyce, Thomas (OIS); Howard, Patrick; Greene, Kathryn  
**Subject:** Periodic with Commissioner Magwood

On Monday, January 31, I had a periodic with Commissioner Magwood.

The Commissioner asked about the committee chosen by the National Academy for the cancer study. I told him that they advertised and it was my understanding that they had some 200 applicants, from which they selected 17. I said that the Committee is called a provisional committee right now because the National Academy puts the proposed names out for public comment. I said the plan was for the committee to start phase one of the study this Spring and finish up in about a year. The committee would make a recommendation to the NRC regarding if and how to conduct the phase 2 portion of the study, and we would ultimately bring that to the Commission.

1.) The Commissioner asked how we were with the current budget. I said that the \$4M restored in the passback helped, but that we still had to take a \$6M cut in NGNP, with RES taking about \$4.5M of the cut. I said we were deciding to what extent we should take it in FTE versus contract money.

2.) The Commissioner asked about the SOARCA study. I said that we were proposing a delay because during the Surry licensee's design fact check they found a release path in the analysis that was incorrect. A cable raceway between the reactor and aux buildings had been assumed to be open, thus allowing fission products from a reactor building intersystem LOCA to exit the reactor building via the raceway and aux building. The aux building was assumed to allow significant plateout of fission products and reduce the source term for that scenario. The licensee informed us that the raceway had been filled with fire barrier foam for both fire and security purposes, so that release path was no longer available. Release from the reactor building resulted in less plateout and a higher radiological release. The staff did not want to release a draft of the report with non-conservative results. I said that the proposed delay was until December 15<sup>th</sup>, although we were trying to beat that date.

3.) The Commissioner asked how the effort was going to compare ISAs to PRAs. I said that I had not been briefed on the subject, but it was my understanding that the staff found the ISAs consistent with the PRAs. The Commissioner asked if it was possible to make the ISAs more quantitative.

4.) The Commissioner asked how things were going with my new deputy (Jennifer Uhle). I said Jennifer was doing well. The Commissioner said he'd like to meet her so I said I would have her set up an appointment to meet with him.

5.) The last item we discussed was interactions with DOE. The Commissioner asked if we were coordinating with DOE and mentioned a research meeting DOE was sponsoring in Gaithersburg next week. I said that we had staff that was planning to attend. I told him we had been invited to a meeting on DOE research at EPRI in Charlotte, NC and were planning to attend that as well. Finally, I mentioned that we meet with EPRI and DOE at least twice a year to coordinate on research.

T/19