

Franke, Mark

From: Collins, Brendan *RB*
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2009 10:40 AM
To: Sykes, Marvin
Cc: Franke, Mark
Subject: Thought on the containment at Crystal River

Marvin,

Typically, I think when people mention Part 21, the mental image that comes with it is some small part or component (bolts, pumps, breakers, etc.) that's been provided from a vendor, so I doubt anyone would think "Crack in containment...Part 21." That said, here's my thought:

If they're going to do a root cause, hopefully that will flush out whether this was a process issue or a design issue. Did they pour the concrete wrong, or was the design inadequate in some way? Obviously there aren't really Part 21 implications for a concrete pour, but what I was thinking was that if the *design* is wrong, it's possible that same design was used at other plants. Maybe just Progress fleet, or maybe even broader than that. With 104 units, I'd think that at least a couple were of the same design.

Chances are, it's not an issue, and even if it was, maybe they deal with it through OE rather than Part 21. Since I don't know how a concrete bio-shield fits into safety-related space, I'm not sure which would be more appropriate, but I thought I'd at least bring up the potential extent of a design issue from that perspective. I know they're not there yet, but just something for all of us to keep in mind (since EB3 will continue to be involved, I say "us").

Brendan

C-6