

Original Due Date: 02/16/2007

Ticket Number: 020070015

Document Date: 01/17/2007

NRR Received Date: 01/24/2007

From:

Roy Fuhrmeister

TACs:

MD4081

To:

Ed Miller

*** YELLOW ***

For Signature of:

C. Haney

Routing:

Dyer
Weber
Mitchell
Grobe
Boger
NRR Mailroom

Description:

Confirmation of telephone Conversation Between Rutgers Environmental Law
Clinic and Region I

Assigned To:

DORL

Contact:

HANEY, CATHERINE

Special Instructions:

Called DORL (Linda) on 1/24 at 4:18 p.m. for pick up

From: Roy Fuhrmeister
To: Miller, Ed
Date: 01/17/2007 4:35:11 PM
Subject: Fwd: Confirmation of telephone conversation

Ed,

Here is Mr. Webster's e-mail confirming our conversation. My original e-mail documenting the call went out about 4:00 pm on the afternoon of 9 November.

Roy L. Fuhrmeister

>>> "Richard Webster" <rwebster@kinoy.rutgers.edu> 11/09/2006 4:41 PM >>>
Mr. Fuhrmeister,

Thank you for taking my call. I wish to confirm that I believe the preliminary notification that bears your name is inadequate to assess whether the Oyster Creek Nuclear Power Plant has sufficient justification to restart, in part because it fails to assess what area of the drywell shell in each bay in the sand bed region is thinner than 0.736 inches. As I explained, the one square foot acceptance criterion derives from modeling conducted by GE, which showed that the drywell would meet code if the shell had a uniform thickness of 0.736 inches with one square foot of area in each bay at thickness 0.536 inches.

In order to show that the stresses in the drywell are bounded by the GE modeling, the applicant must at least show that the total area per bay that is thinner than 0.736 inches is less than 1 square foot in area. Amergen tried to show this in its response to AMP-210, but we believe that it underestimated the area considerably. As we discussed, at the ACRS meeting, NRC staff took the position that the total area per bay thinner than 0.736 inches was less than 4 square feet. My questions now are:

- i) what is NRC's current assessment of the area in each bay that is thinner than 0.736 inches?
- ii) how was that assessment derived and what is the uncertainty in the assessment? and
- iii) does the NRC accept that the GE modeling cannot be relied upon to establish compliance with the code because it failed to look at sensitivity to the vessel being non-spherical, it could not take account of asymmetric buckling, and it did not model actual situation, which is that multiple areas in each bay of varying shapes are thinner than 0.736 inches?

I look forward to your urgent response. Thank you once again for your thoughtful response to my call.

Richard Webster
Staff Attorney
Rutgers Environmental Law Clinic
123 Washington Street
Newark, NJ 07102
Phone: 973-353-5695
Fax: 973-353-5537

CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL COMMUNICATION/WORK PRODUCT

This e-mail may contain privileged and confidential attorney-client communications and/or attorney work product. If you receive this e-mail

inadvertently, please reply to the sender and delete all versions on your system.

Thank you.

Mail Envelope Properties (45AE9681.529 : 23 : 27281)

Subject: Fwd: Confirmation of telephone conversation
Creation Date 01/17/2007 4:34:57 PM
From: Roy Fuhrmeister

Created By: RLF1@nrc.gov

Recipients

nrc.gov
TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
GXM (Ed Miller)

Post Office

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4197	01/17/2007 4:34:57 PM

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
ReplyRequested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results

Message is not eligible for Junk Mail handling
Message is from an internal sender

Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered

Junk Mail handling disabled by User
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator
Junk List is not enabled
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled
Block List is not enabled