

ACTION: SOARCA-SECY CONCURRENCE BY 3/5/09

Randy Sullivan

NSIR has provided comments to RES hand written

Areas of concern are as follows:

SECY: Wording changes to reflect Bill Dean's comments

Exec Summ: pg 7 para 3 delete, does not reflect calculations done to date

Comm Plan: disagree with wording of many issues and strongly suggest that a key message should be that the staff believes these accidents are all mitigated and the calculations performed are sensitivity analyses to show the benefit of mitigative actions

Risk Comm Doc: love it, but had many comments to improve message: health effects, EP and regulations were misstated in areas. Will work with author to improve (this doc does not get issued until 2010 or so)

Frederick Brown

I focused on the pamphlet (I think that the policy implications for the other documents have been fully vetted and are water under the bridge at this point).

Overall, I think that pamphlet **serves the intended purpose** of conveying that this was a serious effort to come to what we believe to be scientifically sound results.

In order to achieve the result, a lot of terminology is used that the general public will not understand, but that may well be the intent.

actionable comments:

On page 49, the reference to "cost-based decision to decontaminate" is accurate but deserves some discussion if it is to be included.

I would strongly suggest removing the picture of the thyroid patient on page 50 - this is a very unfortunate photo selection (a women who's throat appears to have been cut) when our intent is to convey that you can live through thyroid cancer.

I'd also use either "accidents per year" (pages 53 and 54), or "accidents per reactor year" (page 24), but not both - it creates the impression that we are using sleight of hand in our statistics. Note - if it is really per reactor year in both cases, than we need to be correct and say so.

In the results graphs on pages 53 and 54, it would be good if we could offer examples of every-day activities with comparable risks - just citing a Commission goal without context is not that strong a message.

Do we know who is in the picture on Page 56 with Joe? It would be unfortunate if this is someone from the new reactor industry on the page that we talk about NRC's independent regulatory role.

Timothy Collins

Attached are my suggested markups to the SECY, the EXEC summary, and the Commuciations plan. I think these 3 documents all need a similar type of tone scrubbing. I believe that they are all too promotional, and should simply present the facts without a lot a adjectives. I've tried to do that in my markups.

I don't think that the info brochure can be marked up. It is far too promotional. Half the time it spoon feeds the reader and half the time it uses technical jargon that would be mystery to most any layman. I would recommend a rethinking of the whole approach. SOARCA is a very complex study and trying to reduce it to "man on the street" terms will take a ton of effort and iteration.

Mark Cunningham

- The document should be revised to provide a more "scientific" tone. For example,
 - The results should be characterized as "preliminary," pending peer review and uncertainty analyses.
 - Language such as "clearly demonstrated" and "dramatically" should be removed.
 - Use of the term "worst case" should be avoided.
- The document intermixes plant design and operational improvements with knowledge improvements in its characterization of how plants are now "safer." Given the scope of SOARCA, it may be appropriate only to discuss knowledge improvements, or the individual safety gains from each type of improvement should be provided.

- The Communications Plan should include questions (and answers) that relate to issues previously raised by the public on accident consequences. The plan should include, for example:
 - For the same accident scenario, what is the number of latent cancer fatalities estimated today vs. the numbers estimated in the 1982 study?
- The target audience of the Informational Booklet should be better described. Its current length and extensive use of technical jargon may reduce the level of external interest.
- The photograph of the person with the thyroid cancer scar should be removed from the Informational Booklet.

Jim Vail

Pamphlet comments:

Page 22 The TMI summary has inaccuracies:

"..., operators opened a valve that stuck open." should read "..., a relief valve opened and stuck open."

"..., the vessel did not melt," should read "..., the vessel did not fail."

"... resulted in a ultimately harmless radiation release, ..." should read "... resulted in a small radiation release, ..."

Page 23 The Chernobyl summary has inaccuracies:

"More than a dozen emergency workers died, and several fatal cases of thyroid cancer were later attributed to the accident." should read "More than a dozen plant staff fire brigade workers died as a result of radiation, and several fatal cases of thyroid cancer were later attributed to the accident."

Page 41 I thought we modeled evacuation with an Oak Ridge code, not MACCS2.

Page 50 The thyroid scar photo has got to go.