

195

Boyle, Patrick

From: Khanna, Meena
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2011 9:25 PM
To: Boyle, Patrick; Martin, Robert
Subject: FW: North Anna Seismic Issue - Path Forward for Restart

From: Casto, Greg *RCV*
Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2011 11:22 AM
To: Khanna, Meena
Subject: RE: North Anna Seismic Issue - Path Forward for Restart

SBPB believes that given that North Anna reported that the plant has exceeded their design bases earthquake limits, then they should follow the EPRI guidelines for inspections of SSCs in accordance with that guidance. We do not find any additional issues or concerns that should be addressed beyond the EPRI guidance.

Please call me if questions. tx greg

From: Khanna, Meena *MR*
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2011 11:09 AM
To: Ulses, Anthony; McMurtray, Anthony; Dennig, Robert; Mendiola, Anthony; Pelton, David; Fairbanks, Carolyn; Lupold, Timothy; Mitchell, Matthew; Pham, Bo; Murphy, Martin; Casto, Greg
Cc: Kulesa, Gloria; Martin, Robert; Wood, Kent; Clifford, Paul; Bedi, Gurjendra; Cheruvenki, Ganesh; Manoly, Kamal; Wilson, George; McCoy, Gerald; Franke, Mark; Holian, Brian; Giitter, Joseph; Galloway, Melanie; Evans, Michele; Lubinski, John; Howe, Allen; Lund, Louise; Ruland, William; Bahadur, Sher
Subject: North Anna Seismic Issue - Path Forward for Restart
Importance: High

Based on Bob's email that was sent to several folks, as provided below, I'd like to share a few things that may be helpful in coming up with the list that Bob has requested. First of all, there is a link attached that includes the KK report (see pages 42 and on) that provides some useful insights that may be helpful to us in addition to the EPRI guidelines. I've also attached George Wilson's initial thoughts on what needs to be addressed in accordance with the EPRI guidelines as well as lists that he came up with as a result of speaking to several of the NRR BCs. Bob has requested that we each provide a list of questions that you need responses to from the licensee in support of the restart effort (short term and long term) by the 13th.

Bob plans to set up a meeting early next week to address this initiative. Thanks for all of the support.

Here are the tac nos:

TACS ME7050, ME7051 are for North Anna seismic issue.

Thanks,
Meena

From: Martin, Robert *MR*
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2011 10:28 AM
To: Khanna, Meena
Subject: KK report link

D/169

Following today's meeting with Dominion Resources, I propose a process for the forthcoming review of the licensee's basis for restarting the two North Anna units. The discussions today indicate that many staff have given thought to the issue and currently have questions that will require an answer to support the restart review.

I propose that we ask every branch in DSS, DCI, DE, DRA and the appropriate branch in DLR to forward any questions they have that are related to restart to DORL by September 13, cob. Many of these questions appear to be already written up or could be shortly. We would issue them to the licensee and then conduct meetings with the licensee, resolve issues in the meetings, followed by licensee documentation of the resolution. We would meet with the licensee each Thursday for example, and resolve issues as rapidly as licensee resources would support.

We may need management support in getting a dedicated 33 person conference room each Thursday, for example. It can take hours and hours of effort to get a large conference room. The process used for today's meeting is too expensive for a series of multiple meetings. Just the administrative support costs about 3 PM days of time.

Holding meetings at the site may not be practical or productive unless there is a site-specific issue to be addressed. It's said that there is a scarcity of motels near the site. Dominion's engineers are near Richmond. It may be useful to hold one meeting in the vicinity of the site at the conclusion of the series of meetings noted above.