

32

Weber, Michael

From: Weber, Michael - EDO
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2010 4:52 PM
To: Sheron, Brian
Subject: RESPONSE - Periodic with Commissioner Svinicki

Thanks, Brian. Enjoy your weekend!

From: Sheron, Brian
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2010 4:36 PM
To: Borchardt, Bill; Virgilio, Martin; Mallett, Bruce; Ash, Darren; Boyce, Thomas (OIS); Howard, Patrick; Greene, Kathryn; Miller, Charles; Leeds, Eric; Johnson, Michael; Weber, Michael; Wiggins, Jim; Collins, Sam; Reyes, Luis; Satorius, Mark; Collins, Elmo
Subject: Periodic with Commissioner Svinicki

1.) I updated the Commissioner on the status of SOARCA and the Cancer study. These were essentially the same as my updates to the Chairman as described in my periodic notes from that meeting last Wednesday, so I won't repeat them.

2.) I told the Commissioner that we were still doing scoping work on what it would take to do a new level 3 PRA. I reminded her that the last level 3 PRA we did was NUREG-1150, which was published more than 20 years ago in 1989. She was not familiar with NUREG-1150 and asked if it was in ADAMS. I said I thought it was but that it was a multi-volume report and not a quick read. I said that I thought there might be an executive summary available and would check and get back to her.

2.) The Commissioner asked about the AP-1000 shield wall issue. She said when she saw some of the material Westinghouse was submitting, much of it looked like a description of research being done to support their design. She asked whether we were involved with the review, since she saw stuff like placement of strain gauges, etc. I told he we were supporting NRR with their review of the issue and were actively involved.

3.) The Commissioner raised the same concern she had about seismic generic issues that she raised at the NRR program briefing. Her concern was that if USGS updates seismic hazards every 5 years, as she said Jack Grobe mentioned at the briefing, then she was concerned we would have a continuously open generic issue on the subject.

I told her that was not the case. I said that we constantly monitor new information as it becomes available, including USGS seismic updates. However, I said that if the new information doesn't call into question any of our previous decisions, then there is no new issue. It was only when the new information raised questions about the adequacy of our regulations or the capability of operating plants did we do a more generic analysis. I also told her that it takes a while to resolve the issues because of a number of factors, including assessing whether the issue affected all of the plants, a certain class of plants, etc. We then would have to interact with the industry to see what information was already available, and what additional information was needed. She thanked me and said she was comfortable that seismic issues were not a continuously open GI.

T/18