

From: Bruce Burgess *CB*
To: Scott Burnell
Date: Thu, Jun 7, 2007 9:06 AM
Subject: Fwd: Exponent Report

The answer for the Cleveland Plain Dealer reporter (John Mangels) questions regarding how we identified that another report (the Mattson report) existed based on a page count of the Exponent Report.

F-241

Mail Envelope Properties (466810F9.3CA : 23 : 3652)

Subject: Fwd: Exponent Report
Creation Date Thu, Jun 7, 2007 9:06 AM
From: Bruce Burgess

Created By: BLB@nrc.gov

Recipients	Action	Date & Time
nrc.gov		
OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01	Delivered	06/07/07 9:07 AM
SRB3 (Scott Burnell)	Opened	06/07/07 9:07 AM

Post Office	Delivered	Route
OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01	06/07/07 9:07 AM	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	505	Thursday, June 7, 2007 9:06 AM
Mail		

Options

Auto Delete:	No
Expiration Date:	None
Notify Recipients:	Yes
Priority:	Standard
ReplyRequested:	No
Return Notification:	None

Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

To Be Delivered:	Immediate
Status Tracking:	Delivered & Opened

From: Eric Duncan
To: Bruce Burgess
Date: Tue, Jun 5, 2007 2:20 PM
Subject: Fwd: Exponent Report

The below e-mail sent by Jim Gavula on 4/25 gave us our earliest indication that another document may exist.

This document turned out to be the Mattson Report.

>>> James Gavula 04/25/2007 9:31:04 AM >>>
Eric,

Just to ensure completeness and accuracy, I need to get some additional clarification from you.

On April 16, 2007, you issued a memo to the RA that in two places specifically noted the Exponent Report was 757 pages long (ADAMS Accession No. ML071100234). My search of ADAMS only shows 661 pages associated with the Exponent Report.

Are there 94 pages missing, and if so, can I get a copy?

Additional comment regarding ADAMS: While the letter transmitting the Exponent's Head Wastage Report from FENOC to the NRC was dated 3/20/07, one section of the report was entered with a date of 12/15/06 (the date on the cover sheet of the report), and the other 18 sections of the report were entered with a date of 3/15/07 (I don't know how this date was determined). This makes it difficult to find the report. As a minimum, can all of the report sections have the same date?

Another observation, the CD from FENOC contained an additional file with a single page numbered 8-32A, which shows Figure 8.13. This figure is referenced in the report on page 8-18, but apparently was excluded by mistake. This may need to be added to ADAMS for completeness.

Jim G.