

NOvA Miscellaneous Topics

L Edward Temple Jr

Friday, July 31, 2007

Evolving Character of Lehman Reviews

- A trend of more emphasis on form
- At possible expense of substance
- Don't be fooled, evidently not; still wants substance:
 - 12 GeV Upgrade CD-2/3a Review outcome not clear with regard to adequacy of contingency
 - LCLS did not make “acceptable” revised baseline proposal
 - ~30 days to rework and make new proposal
- But wants 16 LOI addressed – MP email

PSF EIR Design Review Documents

- PSF (Physical Sciences Facility) at PNNL contains a Nuclear Facility. Partly because of this they have a more formal approach on Design Review
 - Specific Design Development Document
 - Documents a Review and Comments by ~7 subject matter experts (SME) on Safety Aspects of the PSF project
 - PSF Specific ISM Plan/Document

12 GeV Design Review

- 12 GeV approach to the Design Review requirement was to compile comments and recommendations from prior reviews: including reviews like Systems Reviews, Director's Reviews, and prior Lehman Reviews
- Did not have a specific Design Review document like PSF
- Nancy notes NOvA needs to **document!**

12 GeV Design Review

- ~2,400 drawing available at their review!
- 4 DOE Project Reviews from which 73 of 75 recommendations have been closed
- 10 JLab-convened Project System Design and Safety Reviews
- 15 JLab initiated subsystem reviews
- **STATEMENT:** Recommendations have been evaluated & incorporated in Prel Des

NSLS II Design Review

- Jim Yeck, NSLS II Project Manager has chartered an NSLS II Design Review
 - Greg Bock is Chair
 - Quote from “charge”

NSLS II Design Review Charge Quote

The objective of the NSLS-II Comprehensive Design Review is to assess the adequacy of the overall NSLS-II preliminary design effort. The NSLS-II preliminary design is expected to provide the depth and detail required to convert concepts to a design appropriate for establishing the NSLS-II Performance Baseline. Design completion is expected to be roughly 20 - 35 percent of the total design effort and depends on the specific area of the project with accelerator and conventional facilities designs more advanced than the beamlines. The specific elements of the charge are as follows:

- evaluate the technical adequacy and risk resolution (on technical cost, and schedule basis) of the selected design approach;
- ensure that all contributory factors were considered;
- assess whether the design can be constructed, inspected, tested, installed, operated and maintained in a satisfactory way;
- determine whether the design meets the requirements;
- determine whether there is adequate supporting documentation to detail the design.

SLAC Saga Continues - 1

- SLAC safety incidents over last two years
- ~Feb 2007 OE (Office of Enforcement, Podomsky[?]) Review evidently found “need for improvement”
- SSO/SLAC implementation of 10 CFR 851 more restrictive than Fermilab ES&H’s
 - eg requires contractors over small number of employees have Occupational Medicine Plan
 - cf Mary says DOE still must address this

SLAC Saga Continues - 2

- Fortunate with FSO/Fermilab Relations
- Extremely restricted SLAC procurement authority > \$100K requires DOE review and approval
- SLAC striving to improve “administrative” capability and reputation
 - SLAC Today articles: “Safety 2007” Initiative
 - McCallum Turner Management Consultants

NOvA “pre-EIR” #1

- Temple Describe the EIR process from request through response to CAP prior to CD-2 ESAAB
- NOvA PM explain how the LOI are met
- Lessons Learned: people with prior experience
 - Greg Bock, Fermilab/NuMI
 - Bill Freeman, Fermilab/DZero
 - Mark Reichanadter, SLAC/LCLS
 - Craig Whitely, PNNL/PSF

NOvA “pre-EIR” #2

- ~40 minutes with L2 Managers
- When – Prior to CD-2 Review
- Venue / Date
 - WGM August 7 or 14
 - Technical Board Meeting / August 9 or 16