

June 5, 2017

To: 
A. S. Chambers, Manager, US DOE Nuclear Criticality Safety Program (NCSP)

From: D. G. Erickson, Chair, US DOE NCSP Criticality Safety Support Group (CSSG)

Subject: CSSG Tasking 2017-02 Response

In Tasking 2017-02 the CSSG was directed to provide a review of all 2018 NCSP Proposals. All proposals, including all current and future projects, were included in the review scope. The entire CSSG participated in the review. The primary effort occurred during the CSSG meeting held in conjunction with the annual Technical Program Review in March.

A copy of the CSSG revised spreadsheet is included as an attachment. Columns K and Q through V were added to document the CSSG position. Some dollar amounts were adjusted per CSSG discussion and are identified by different colored cells in Column K. Cell K153 shows the subtotal based on the CSSG adjustments, and Cell K156 shows that remaining for NCSP use.

Summary by Program Element

Technical Support:

No changes to the identified TS tasks.

Analytical Methods:

Rows 35-37: only funded the Arizona piece of the work, but bumped it \$10K to provide minimal needed lab support.

Rows 38-40: No funding due to low priority.

Integral Experiments:

Overall comment: All experiments should be prioritized via the CEDT/IER process rather than coming through the budget process.

Rows 73&74 (Np and Jezebel) - these were cut way down as this needs to fold into the IER process along with all of the others and the need/priority needs to be considered. (The reason for the reduction was recognition that this would not move forward without line item funding – this money, left in FY18 was to support the efforts leading up to a line item decision and to keep the ball rolling towards a decision on line item. Beyond that point effort would need to be covered by the line item itself.)

Rows 77, 79, 82-84, & 86-88: No funding due to low priority.

Information Preservation and Dissemination:

Noted that there is an SRS-IPD1 and SRS-IPD2. These are the same task, but the IPD2 has the correct funding. Therefore it is recommended, for consistency with prior years, that the IPD2 funds be entered for the IPD1 task, then IPD2 removed. This should free up 'another' \$50K.

Nuclear Data:

No changes to the identified ND tasks.

Training and Education:

Row 144: No funding due to low priority.

CSSG Recommendations

Based on the priorities chosen by the CSSG and including the funds for priorities High and Medium (and adjusting the SRS-IPD tasks [not shown in the spreadsheet]), the FY18 subtotal is \$27,529K, leaving ~\$94K for NCSP discretion.

The attached spreadsheet was reviewed by the entire CSSG and all relevant comments to the CSSG observations were addressed and incorporated into the final report.

The CSSG is available to answer any questions that may arise in working with the provided results.

cc: CSSG Members
D. G. Bowen
L. Scott

Attachment (as a separate file): Spreadsheet with CSSG results: CSSG Ranking of FY18 Proposed Tasks 02JUN2017.xlsx