

Boyle, Patrick

From: Martin, Robert *MR*
Sent: Saturday, September 17, 2011 7:26 PM
To: Khanna, Meena; Howe, Allen
Cc: Karwoski, Kenneth; Manoly, Kamal; Li, Yong; Hiland, Patrick; Giitter, Joseph; Boyle, Patrick
Subject: RE: interview request

I am opposed to answering all such questions as this at this time for two reasons (1) we haven't really even begun to start the review yet. What we discover in the review may result in a need to revise anything we would say today. (2) Not necessarily the least important, is that diverting the resources to answer all these questions will only prolong the schedule for doing the core review work that we have before us.

We should develop a generic answer which basically says, we have begun to evaluate the issue, we expect it will take considerable time, (3) all of our non- SUNSI communications with the licensee will be in the public domain as they take place, (4) we will respond to your question when we have a more developed basis to do so.

-----Original Message-----

From: Khanna, Meena *MR*
Sent: Friday, September 16, 2011 4:28 PM
To: Howe, Allen
Cc: Karwoski, Kenneth; Manoly, Kamal; Li, Yong; Hiland, Patrick; Giitter, Joseph; Boyle, Patrick; Martin, Robert
Subject: RE: interview request

Allen, here are the responses to Mr. Wingfield's questions:

1. Is the NRC satisfied that Dominion's inspections so far are sufficient? Is NRC concerned that Dominion is doing too many visual inspections, particularly regarding spent fuel? How does NRC guarantee that Dominion's inspections are satisfactory?

Response: The NRC staff is currently assessing the acceptability of the licensee's actions following the earthquake. Immediately after the event, an Augmented Inspection Team was sent to the site in order to assess the circumstances surrounding the loss of offsite power, the reactor trips, and the emergency diesel generator failure. Prior to resuming operations Dominion will submit information to the NRC to demonstrate that no functional damage has occurred to those features necessary for continued operation without undue risk to the health and safety of the public. The basis for determining the acceptability of Dominion's inspections will be documented in the staff's publically available evaluation of the information provided by Dominion. At this time, the staff has not made its determination regarding the acceptability of the licensee's actions for supporting plant restart.

2. Dominion says it will have Unit 1 "physically" ready for re-start by Sept. 22? Is that too ambitious? What is a likely re-start timeframe? (Even a ballpark estimate is OK.)

Response: The staff's responsibility is to assess the licensee's determination regarding its acceptability to restart the plants. At this time, it is premature to estimate the timeframe to conduct this review. The staff will take an appropriate amount of time to ensure that there is reasonable assurance that public health and safety will be maintained.

3. From NRC's perspective, what happens in the process after Dominion says the plant is ready to re-start? (I.e. what needs to happen from a regulatory perspective?)

F/38

Response: The NRC will review the information provide by Dominion. If additional information is needed for the staff to conclude that there is reasonable assurance that public health and safety will be maintained, then additional information will be requested of the licensee. On-site inspections will be conducted to provide a measure of the completeness and effectiveness of the licensee's on-site inspections. Once sufficient information is available, the staff will document its basis for its conclusion.

4. Dominion has said North Anna is the "test case" for GI-199. Do you agree? How important is the North Anna review to the entire GI-199 process? Could the GI-199 process delay re-start for North Anna?

Response: We cannot precisely interpret Dominion's intent in using the term "test case." However, there is an obvious correlation between the latest event and the focus of GI-199 since the recorded ground motions, thus far, appear to validate the NRC's current seismic hazard assessment approaches and the basis for the draft Generic Letter on GI-199.

The staff's review related to the restart of North Anna will depend solely on the adequacy of the scope of licensee's inspections, testing and analysis to demonstrate no functional damage and operability of safety related SSCs needed for safe shutdown. GI-199 Generic Letter request for information relies on hazard estimates that are not yet well defined to finalize the GL and start the review process. The staff has not connected the GI-199 GL future reviews to the restart of North Anna.

5. It may take a year or more--please correct me if I'm wrong here--to update seismic risks at nuclear plants as part of the GI-199 process. If that's the case, how does NRC know the seismic analysis at North Anna, which is now ongoing, is going to be sufficient?

Response: The purpose of the GI-199 GL is to conduct systematic evaluations of seismic risk based on the updated seismic hazard estimates that will be available by the end of this calendar year. The staff's evaluation in the safety assessment report of GI-199 indicates that North Anna is among a subset of plants in the Central Eastern United States that were estimated to have a delta core damage frequency between $10 E-4$ and $10 E-5$, which the staff considers acceptable to ensure seismic safety margin consistent with continued operation. Even if some equipment exceeds its design basis limits, this will not preclude inoperability because of the significant margin included in the design and acceptance limits. In that regard, the staff will require the licensee, prior to restart, to confirm functionality of SSCs that may have exceeded its design basis via walkdowns, analysis, and testing, as discussed in response to item 4 above.

From: BRIAN WINGFIELD, BLOOMBERG/ NEWSROOM: [bwingfield3@bloomberg.net]
Sent: Friday, September 16, 2011 2:56 PM
To: Burnell, Scott
Subject: RE: interview request

just checking in. any luck?

----- Original Message -----

From: Scott Burnell <Scott.Burnell@nrc.gov>
To: BRIAN WINGFIELD (BLOOMBERG/ NEWSROOM:)
At: 9/16 12:00:55

OK, I'll see what I can get today. Thanks.

From: BRIAN WINGFIELD, BLOOMBERG/ NEWSROOM: [bwingfield3@bloomberg.net]
Sent: Friday, September 16, 2011 11:58 AM
To: Burnell, Scott
Subject: RE: interview request

Just trying to close it out today, so about 5:00PM

----- Original Message -----

From: Scott Burnell <Scott.Burnell@nrc.gov>
To: BRIAN WINGFIELD (BLOOMBERG/ NEWSROOM:)
At: 9/16 11:57:17

Brian;

Having trouble tracking down the latest -- what's your deadline? Thanks.

Scott

From: BRIAN WINGFIELD, BLOOMBERG/ NEWSROOM: [bwingfield3@bloomberg.net]
Sent: Friday, September 16, 2011 9:23 AM
To: Burnell, Scott; Ledford, Joey; Hannah, Roger
Subject: RE: interview request

Sure. A few of my questions:

1. Is the NRC satisfied that Dominion's inspections so far are sufficient? Is NRC concerned that Dominion is doing too many visual inspections, particularly regarding spent fuel? How does NRC guarantee that Dominion's inspections are satisfactory?
2. Dominion says it will have Unit 1 "physically" ready for re-start by Sept. 22? Is that too ambitious? What is a likely re-start timeframe? (Even a ballpark estimate is OK.)
3. From NRC's perspective, what happens in the process after Dominion says the plant is ready to re-start? (I.e. what needs to happen from a regulatory perspective?)
4. Dominion has said North Anna is the "test case" for GI-199. Do you agree? How important is the North Anna review to the entire GI-199 process? Could the GI-199 process delay re-start for North Anna?
5. It may take a year or more--please correct me if I'm wrong here--to update seismic risks at nuclear plants as part of the GI-199 process. If that's the case, how does NRC know the seismic analysis at North Anna, which is now ongoing, is going to be sufficient?

thanks,
Brian

----- Original Message -----

From: Scott Burnell <Scott.Burnell@nrc.gov> |
To: Joey.Ledford@nrc.gov, Roger.Hannah@nrc.gov, BRIAN WINGFIELD (BLOOMBERG/ NEWSROOM:)
At: 9/16 8:24:20

Brian;

Can you give us a better idea of what you'd like to cover? That'll help us figure out who's best-equipped to answer. Thanks.

Scott

-----Original Message-----

From: BRIAN WINGFIELD, BLOOMBERG/ NEWSROOM: [mailto:bwingfield3@bloomberg.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2011 4:49 PM

To: Burnell, Scott; Ledford, Joey; Hannah, Roger
Subject: Re: interview request

Thanks.

Roger/Joey: If you can help out at all, I'd be grateful.

best,
Brian

----- Original Message -----

From: Scott Burnell <Scott.Burnell@nrc.gov>

To: Joey.Ledford@nrc.gov, Roger.Hannah@nrc.gov, BRIAN WINGFIELD (BLOOMBERG/ NEWSROOM:)

At: 9/15 16:48:23

Hi Brian;

I've asked Eric and Jack for their availability, but perhaps the folks in Atlanta who are running the North Anna inspection might be a decent alternative? Roger and Joey would be able to help you there. Thanks.

Scott

Sent from an NRC Blackberry

Scott Burnell

(b)(6)

----- Original Message -----

From: BRIAN WINGFIELD, BLOOMBERG/ NEWSROOM: <bwingfield3@bloomberg.net>

To: Burnell, Scott

Sent: Thu Sep 15 16:43:38 2011

Subject: interview request

Scott,

Would Eric Leeds or Jack Grobe be available for a phone interview tomorrow to talk about NRC review of North Anna and GI-199? I'm planning a story for next week and would like to get fresh comment from NRC staff if possible.

My schedule is open tomorrow.

Thanks,
Brian

Brian Wingfield
Bloomberg News
1399 New York Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
202-654-7318 office

(b)(6)

cell

9/15

EX-6