

**Cox, Mark**

**From:** Schwartz, Geoffrey  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 15, 2005 2:08 PM  
**To:** Mayer, Don; Cox, Mark; Hipschman, Thomas  
**Subject:** FW: Call from Sr. NRC management

FYI

**From:** Schwartz, Geoffrey  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 15, 2005 2:04 PM  
**To:** Dacimo, Fred; Comlotes, Jim; Conroy, Pat  
**Cc:** Ventosa, John; Rubin, Paul  
**Subject:** Call from Sr. NRC management

I was called this morning by John White and Don Jackson, requesting a status of the pool issue and our plans going forward. I gave them a summary of our findings thus far and told them we are working on putting together summary conclusions and recommendations regarding the source of the moisture, structural impact on the wall, environmental impact, and further actions. I was asked what I thought about the potential source the at this point in the investigation, recognizing that the investigation is not complete, and I said we have basically confirmed that the water is from the pool (but we're not sure of time-frame) and that fact along with the conditions found in the northwest corner of the loading bay and southwest area of the pipe pen could be indicative of a pinhole in the loading pit liner. I was asked what recommendations in terms of physical actions we might come up with and said that we need to complete our analysis, but we recognize within the full spectrum of possibilities that a loading pit liner inspection and that some type of ongoing monitoring (such as test wells) adjacent to the pool walls could be found appropriate. With regard to the wall structure, I discussed the calculation from the 1990-92 leak, which is reasonable to assume to be bounding for the current situation and that the rebar margin of strength is still high, but that I am having a calculation done now to characterize seepage rate through [redacted] concrete from a pinhole at various depths, which we'll then assess to characterize potential corrosion rates. Regarding environmental impact I indicated that the H-3 results from soil testing indicate a very small plume, i.e. the level of H-3 drops off markedly a short distance from the south wall, and that along with our core-bore results into the soil outside the FSB in 2003, we have some preliminary assurance that we are probably not dealing with an issue on the order of magnitude of what occurred at Surry. At the end of the call I was told they felt comfortable that we are taking the issue seriously and proceeding methodically, and that their major interests are (1) environmental implications, (2) structural implications, (3) security implications, and (4) external stakeholder communication. I was also told that they understood we are mid-investigation and nothing in our discussion was a commitment.

Geoff Schwartz  
Manager, Spent Fuel Dry Storage

Information in this record was deleted  
in accordance with the Freedom of Information  
Act, exemptions 4 & 6  
FOIA 2005-0369

C-3

Entergy Nuclear Northeast, Indian Point Energy Center  
450 Broadway, Buchanan, NY 10511  
Office (914) 734-6684 Fax (914) 271-7191  
Page                      Cell

Ex. 6

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** This electronic mail transmission is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential information belonging to the sender which is protected by Entergy or the attorney-client privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail and delete the original message.

Does this  
disclose  
whole  
section 2