

DE FOIA Resource

From: Manoly, Kamal *MRK*
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 11:25 AM
To: Munson, Clifford; Stutzke, Martin
Cc: Khanna, Meena; Laur, Steven; Li, Yong; Wilson, George; Hiland, Patrick; Laur, Steven
Subject: RE: briefing slides for Comm GI 199 and North Anna

Cliff,
 You are saying the same thing. We use it as a basis for decision threshold.

R

From: Munson, Clifford *MRK*
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 11:04 AM
To: Manoly, Kamal; Stutzke, Martin
Cc: Khanna, Meena; Laur, Steven; Li, Yong; Wilson, George; Hiland, Patrick; Laur, Steven
Subject: RE: briefing slides for Comm GI 199 and North Anna

Kamal,

We cannot use delta SCDF as a barometer because we don't have a reliable baseline for comparison. IPEEE does not provide reliable SCDF values except for perhaps a few plants. In the generic letter we use 10-5 as the value for comparison.

Cliff

From: Manoly, Kamal *MRK*
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 10:55 AM
To: Stutzke, Martin
Cc: Khanna, Meena; Laur, Steven; Munson, Clifford; Li, Yong; Wilson, George; Hiland, Patrick; Laur, Steven
Subject: RE: briefing slides for Comm GI 199 and North Anna

Marty,

I indicated the intent with respect to asking licensees to evaluate plants' seismic risk using current guidance in RG 1.208 and the notion of using delta SCDF as a barometer for potential future regulatory action. None of that stuff is in their licensing basis.

R

From: Stutzke, Martin *MRK*
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 10:47 AM
To: Wilson, George
Cc: Khanna, Meena; Laur, Steven; Munson, Clifford; Manoly, Kamal; Li, Yong
Subject: RE: briefing slides for Comm GI 199 and North Anna
Importance: High

I've got a drug test at 11:30. I'll come to the pre-briefing as soon as I'm done or otherwise catch up with you in Commissioner Magwood's office.

I don't necessarily agree that the proposed GL meets the intent of the NTTF recommendations for several reasons:

1. An order is not a GL (which is request).
2. If we require plants to update their seismic design bases to meet current NRC requirements and guidance (e.g., RG 1.208), then there's no need to do any seismic risk evaluation (SPRA or SMA).

E/16

The purpose of the SPRA/SMA approach used in the GL is to help identify cost justified backfits; however, the issuance of an order implies we are re-defining adequate protection (costs become irrelevant).

Marty

From: Wilson, George *mw*
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 10:01 AM
To: Croteau, Rick; Gitter, Joseph; Hiland, Patrick; Skeen, David; Manoly, Kamal; Munson, Clifford; Laur, Steven; Stutzke, Martin; Howe, Allen; Lund, Louise; Boger, Bruce; Grobe, Jack; Leeds, Eric; McHale, John; Bowman, Gregory; Dean, Bill
Cc: Martin, Robert; Kulesa, Gloria
Subject: briefing slides for Comm GI 199 and North Anna

See attached, Greg please remove the talking points prior to giving to commission offices

George Wilson
USNRC
EICB Branch Chief, Division of Engineering
Mail Stop O12H2
301-415-1711

R