

24

**Kulesa, Gloria**

**From:** Martin, Robert  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 13, 2011 3:27 PM  
**To:** McCoy, Gerald  
**Cc:** Hiland, Patrick; Khanna, Meena; Giitter, Joseph; Howe, Allen; Kulesa, Gloria; Boyle, Patrick; Jones, William; Franke, Mark; Kolcum, Gregory  
**Subject:** RE: Reactor Systems North Anna Questions

I agree with your perspective. I think it represents an NRR-Region II coordinated approach that recognizes that both organizations are interested in many of the same-titled issues, but from somewhat different perspectives. And I think we will do our best to handle the coordination issue with constant continued communication.

R

**From:** McCoy, Gerald  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 13, 2011 3:11 PM  
**To:** Martin, Robert; Kulesa, Gloria; Jones, William  
**Cc:** Franke, Mark; Kolcum, Gregory  
**Subject:** RE: Reactor Systems North Anna Questions

From my perspective, Dominion, NRR and Region 2 have different functions in this process. Dominion has the responsibility to provide sufficient information to provide adequate the plant is safe to operate. NRR has the engineering expertise to determine if the plan is acceptable. Region 2's responsibility is to provide information on the adequacy of the licensee's inspections by inspecting a sample of the inspections, either through witnessing the inspection or reviewing completion data. If NRR has an issue with Dominion's proposed evaluation of a system, I think that they should address it directly to Dominion.

For the issues raised here:

1. How has the licensee evaluated, inspected, or analyzed the steam generators to ensure SG tube integrity? What further work is planned in this area?

The licensee should describe the process they used to ensure the SG tube integrity. Region 2 has plans to witness some of the SG ISI inspections that the licensee has planned.

2. What assurances does the licensee have that system pressure relief capabilities are maintained?

Again, the licensee should describe the process. Once we hear about how they intend to test the reliefs, we will see if there is anything that can be inspected.

3. How will licensee ensure overall RCS pressure boundary integrity? What have the licensee's observations been so far?

Licensee should describe what testing (if any) they have planned. NRR decides if that is acceptable, Region 2 will see what is available for review.

4. How has the licensee inspected, examined, and evaluated the ECCS? How does the licensee know it will still perform as intended? Can it continue to perform its ECCS functions under simultaneous design basis earthquake loading per the ECCS design basis seismic requirements?

Again, the process should be described in the licensee's submittal. NRR needs to judge whether the plan is acceptable. Region 2 currently plans to observe selected surveillance tests when we know about them.

5. Were there any complications in residual heat removal following the earthquake? Did all RHR equipment perform as intended?

Information in this record was deleted  
 in accordance with the Freedom of Information  
 Act, exemptions 6  
 FOIA- 2011-0355

F/20

There have been no issues reported with the RHR system. The RHR system was not put into service until several days after the earthquake.

6. How has the licensee assessed the reactor trip system, including its actuation circuitry and its mechanical components? How will the licensee ensure the RCCAs and the guide tubes retain their required functionality?

The licensee needs to describe how they will assess the RPS (reactor protective system). NRR needs to determine whether the proposed plan is acceptable. Region 2 plans on observing selected tests.

We are planning to observe tests that we know about as they occur. Once we see Dominion's submittal, we will see what else we need to inspect.

Do you agree with my perspective on this process?

## Gerald J. McCoy

Chief, Reactor Projects Branch 5  
Division of Reactor Projects, Region 2  
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Office: 404-997-4551  
Cell: (b)(6)

**From:** Martin, Robert  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 13, 2011 7:59 AM  
**To:** McCoy, Gerald; Kolcum, Gregory; Franke, Mark  
**Cc:** Kulesa, Gloria; Boyle, Patrick; Ulses, Anthony; Parks, Benjamin; Khanna, Meena  
**Subject:** Reactor Systems North Anna Questions

We are preparing questions to send to Dominion. Which of the following Reactor Systems branch questions do you regard as being within Region II's scope – either as covered by the AIT or other Regional actions?

Even if within the Region's scope and NRR/Reactor Systems has the Q, how should we proceed with getting the answer? Region II to provide the answer or should we ask it of Dominion anyway?

---

**From:** Mendiola, Anthony  
**Sent:** Monday, September 12, 2011 3:18 PM  
**To:** Martin, Robert  
**Subject:** FW: North Anna Questions

Fyi...

**From:** Parks, Benjamin  
**Sent:** Monday, September 12, 2011 12:56 PM  
**To:** Mendiola, Anthony; Miranda, Samuel  
**Subject:** FW: North Anna Questions

These were sent for Tony's consideration. --bp

7. How has the licensee evaluated, inspected, or analyzed the steam generators to ensure SG tube integrity? What further work is planned in this area?
8. What assurances does the licensee have that system pressure relief capabilities are maintained?

9. How will licensee ensure overall RCS pressure boundary integrity? What have the licensee's observations been so far?
10. How has the licensee inspected, examined, and evaluated the ECCS? How does the licensee know it will still perform as intended? Can it continue to perform its ECCS functions under simultaneous design basis earthquake loading per the ECCS design basis seismic requirements?
11. Were there any complications in residual heat removal following the earthquake? Did all RHR equipment perform as intended?
12. How has the licensee assessed the reactor trip system, including its actuation circuitry and its mechanical components? How will the licensee ensure the RCCAs and the guide tubes retain their required functionality?

**Benjamin T. Parks**

Reactor Systems Branch, NRR

O10-D2 415-6472

