Davis-BesseNPEm Resource

From:	CuadradoDeJesus, Samuel
Sent:	Wednesday, October 05, 2011 5:44 PM
То:	custerc@firstenergycorp.com; dorts@firstenergycorp.com
Cc:	Davis-BesseHearingFile Resource
Subject:	FW: Davis-Besse Embankment RAI
Attachments:	DB Structural Follow-up RAIs - Lehman 9-23-11.docx

Cliff:

Attached is a draft of the follow-up to RAI 4.1-2.

Hearing Identifier: Email Number:	Davis_BesseLicenseRenewal_Saf_NonPublic 1808		
Mail Envelope Prope	rties (377CB97DD54F0F4FAA	C7E9FD88BCA6D0806D2307E9)	
Subject: Sent Date: Received Date: From:	FW: Davis-Besse Embankment RAI 10/5/2011 5:44:25 PM 10/5/2011 5:45:01 PM CuadradoDeJesus, Samuel		
Created By:	Samuel.CuadradoDeJesus@nro	c.gov	
Recipients: "Davis-BesseHearingFile Resource" <davis-bessehearingfile.resource@nrc.gov> Tracking Status: None "custerc@firstenergycorp.com" <custerc@firstenergycorp.com> Tracking Status: None "dorts@firstenergycorp.com" <dorts@firstenergycorp.com> Tracking Status: None</dorts@firstenergycorp.com></custerc@firstenergycorp.com></davis-bessehearingfile.resource@nrc.gov>			
Post Office:	HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov		
Files MESSAGE DB Structural Follow-u	Size 80 ıp RAIs - Lehman 9-23-11.docx	Date & Time 10/5/2011 5:45:01 PM 35859	
Ontions			

OptionsPriority:StandardReturn Notification:NoReply Requested:NoSensitivity:NormalExpiration Date:Recipients Received:

Davis-Besse Structures Monitoring (SMP) Follow-up RAIs

Draft RAI B.2.40-3 (Follow-Up to RAI B.2.40-2)

Background:

By letter dated August 17, 2011, the applicant responded to a staff RAI regarding operating experience with degradation of the north embankment of the safety-related portion of the intake canal. In the response the applicant committed to ensure that an investigation of the embankment degradation would be completed prior to the period of extended operation. The further committed to evaluate the results and complete needed repairs or modifications of the embankment prior to the period of extended operation.

Issue:

Although the applicant committed to completing long-term evaluation plans, no information was provided about the plan, such as schedule, scope, or acceptance criteria.

Request:

Provide details about the embankment investigation. The response should include scheduling information, activities planned and completed to date, and probable corrective actions. The response should provide technical justification for the timeliness of the corrective actions, including an explanation why prior to the period of extended operation is an acceptable deadline for repairs.