

**Lew, David**

---

**From:** Dean, Bill *-p*  
**Sent:** Friday, January 20, 2012 1:07 PM  
**To:** Conte, Richard; Miller, Chris; Lew, David  
**Cc:** Wilson, Peter  
**Subject:** Re: Seabrook ASR exit

Excellent. Thanks.  
Bill Dean  
Regional Administrator  
Region I, USNRC  
Sent from NRC BlackBerry

---

**From:** Conte, Richard  
**To:** Dean, Bill; Miller, Chris; Lew, David  
**Cc:** Wilson, Peter  
**Sent:** Fri Jan 20 13:04:35 2012  
**Subject:** RE: Seabrook ASR exit

We got that covered too, Bill. The NRR tech reviewers are listed as accompanying our inspectors and assisted in the development of weak areas for the PODs. The question about assumptions originated from them.

---

**From:** Dean, Bill  
**Sent:** Friday, January 20, 2012 1:02 PM  
**To:** Conte, Richard; Miller, Chris; Lew, David  
**Cc:** Wilson, Peter  
**Subject:** Re: Seabrook ASR exit

Thanks Rich-sounds like we are establishing a good foundation. My only qualm is the referencing of the TIA in the inspection report even though it was not part of the inspection. We will have to be careful how we word that part of the letter to the licensee so that it is oriented more around the things we expect to see addressed in licensee's plan vice basis for inspection findings.  
Bill Dean  
Regional Administrator  
Region I, USNRC  
Sent from NRC BlackBerry

---

**From:** Conte, Richard  
**To:** Dean, Bill; Miller, Chris; Lew, David  
**Cc:** Wilson, Peter  
**Sent:** Fri Jan 20 12:54:06 2012  
**Subject:** RE: Seabrook ASR exit

We will ask for the response in the cover letter of the standalone inspection report as a voluntary response.

The NRR response to the TIA will be timed in ADAMS to the report and the report will reference the TIA ML number so all will see the bases for the issues to be addressed by the response to the cover letter to report.

Again the report is focused on the unwritten assumptions in the operability determination. The answers in the TIA will be broader, like how to evaluate the problem, short and long term (like a branch technical position)

*B*  
*5*

They will have 15 days to review both documents and give us a verbal on their ability to comply with our request. Part of that will be a request for a management if they think they need it. The letter will also state that either a response or management meeting is to be complete in 30 days, all on a voluntary basis.

As you recall, this is the start of a firmer regulatory footprint.

---

**From:** Dean, Bill  
**Sent:** Friday, January 20, 2012 12:32 PM  
**To:** Miller, Chris; Lew, David  
**Cc:** Wilson, Peter; Conte, Richard  
**Subject:** Re: Seabrook ASR exit

Sounds like a positive interaction. How do we intend to ask for their plan? Like we did in OMA letter?  
Bill Dean  
Regional Administrator  
Region I, USNRC  
Sent from NRC BlackBerry

---

**From:** Miller, Chris  
**To:** Lew, David; Dean, Bill  
**Cc:** Wilson, Peter; Conte, Richard  
**Sent:** Fri Jan 20 11:17:57 2012  
**Subject:** Seabrook ASR exit

The exit meeting went well. Rich did a great job covering the characterization of the findings and the additional questions that would be asked of them related to the TIA, with support from NRR (DE and DLR were on the line). At the end I made sure that Paul Freeman understood the issues and the reasons that from a safety perspective we needed to understand their plan for addressing the operability issues that to date have mainly been covered in a qualitative way. There is a lot of work to be done to ensure the assumptions for their operability determinations remain valid, including work to ensure that water intrusion does not continue to adversely affect the problem. Paul indicated understanding of the issues and their importance, and he understood the request that would be made for additional information in the report.

Christopher Miller  
USNRC Region I  
Director  
Division of Reactor Safety  
610-337-5128