

PMNorthAnna3COLPEmails Resource

From: Jessie, Janelle
Sent: Tuesday, April 06, 2010 11:55 AM
To: Johnson, Judy; Huyck, Doug; Patel, Chandu; Wanda D Craft
Subject: Summary of 3/29/10 Call with Dominion (North Anna) on RAI clarification and PSP Review Schedule Impact

Summary of Call

On Monday, March 29, 2010, NRC staff had a conference call with Dominion to clarify a few RAIs and discuss schedule impacts. During the call, Dominion sought clarification from the NRC on whether or not NRC staff was considering Dominion's use of the terms Armed Security Officer and Armed Responder to be interchangeable when reviewing their plan. Dominion noted that these were two separate posts.

According to Dominion, an armed responder can handle all contingent events (T/Q Matrix-20, 27, 28). An armed security officer is not an armed responder, but simply a security officer who is armed with a handgun and can be utilized to do other tasks such as: escorting vehicles transporting hazardous material, conducting comp patrols, and opening gates, etc. In the security plan, when these posts are discussed, it says that there are X number of Armed responders and Y Number of Armed security officers. It is understood that the number of armed security officers has to be armed responder qualified in order to respond to security events.

After hearing Dominion's question about the clarification, the staff inquired as to why clarification was being sought on RAIs for which responses had already been submitted. Dominion shared with the staff that they were seeking clarification b/c they would like to change their response to RAIs 13.06-1 thru 4, 13.06-01-4-14 and 13.06-01-4-16 to ensure that their fleet security plan is in compliance with the new rule. According to Dominion, their plan would change to reflect what was submitted in rev 1 of their submittal and would not be updated in keeping with the RAI responses that have already been submitted (for the RAIs previously mentioned). To ensure that this was done smoothly, Dominion decided to seek clarification from the staff to ensure that the staff was clear on their use of the two posts so that everyone had the same understanding going forward of what will be reflected in the next revision of their plan.

Upon hearing this information, the staff reminded Dominion of the impact that these changes in RAI responses will have on the review schedule for their PSP. If resubmitted, the staff will need time to reassess Dominion's response to the RAIs to ensure that they meet the requirements set forth in the regs and are acceptable for the staff to make a high assurance finding on the information submitted in the applicant's security plan.

Further discussion is ongoing by both parties.....

Hearing Identifier: NorthAnna3_Public_EX
Email Number: 865

Mail Envelope Properties (65FB43187ED87C46B3F00CB97D081E60D53DDEEA)

Subject: Summary of 3/29/10 Call with Dominion (North Anna) on RAI clarification and
PSP Review Schedule Impact
Sent Date: 4/6/2010 11:55:10 AM
Received Date: 4/6/2010 11:55:29 AM
From: Jessie, Janelle

Created By: Janelle.Jessie@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Johnson, Judy" <Judy.Johnson@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Huyck, Doug" <Doug.Huyck@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Patel, Chandu" <Chandu.Patel@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Wanda D Craft" <wanda.d.craft@dom.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2562	4/6/2010 11:55:29 AM

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received: