

44

Valentine, Nicholee

From: Cruz, Holly *NRC*
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2012 2:01 PM
To: Jolicoeur, John
Subject: FW: NRC Exit Meeting - ASR PI&R Sample Inspection
Attachments: Report Bolded for Key Points to be Made in Exit Tomorrow; FW: NRC Exit Meeting - ASR PI&R Sample Inspection

FYI only, as it looks like you were not on cc. More info/pressure to get the TIA out ASAP (see highlight below).

Thanks,

Holly

From: Conte, Richard *RC*
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2012 9:57 PM
To: Conte, Richard; Galloway, Melanie; Murphy, Martin; Thomas, George; Sheikh, Abdul; Auluck, Rajender
Cc: Burritt, Arthur; Miller, Chris; Wilson, Peter; Lund, Louise; Khanna, Meena; Raymond, William; Modes, Michael; Chaudhary, Suresh; Cruz, Holly
Subject: RE: NRC Exit Meeting - ASR PI&R Sample Inspection

TO BE SURE

Here is the Seabrook report

From: Conte, Richard *RC*
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2012 9:56 PM
To: Galloway, Melanie; Murphy, Martin; Thomas, George; Sheikh, Abdul; Auluck, Rajender
Cc: Burritt, Arthur; Miller, Chris; Wilson, Peter; Lund, Louise; Khanna, Meena; Raymond, William; Modes, Michael; Chaudhary, Suresh; Cruz, Holly
Subject: FW: NRC Exit Meeting - ASR PI&R Sample Inspection

My apologies Melanie, we scheduled the NRC exit for tomorrow at 930 for the Seabrook ASR Standalone report – pass code is in the iCalendar. The very draft report is also attached – be careful to not respond to all by assuring not licensee staff are on distribution. This is why I used the iCalendar.

It is very draft and the next step is to revise and send it to the inspectors and technical reviewers involved in the review. I hope to do that by late tomorrow with the need to respond by mid week next week.

It appears that it will be difficult to get the TIA out by Jan 31 but we clearly need the report and TIA timed for the same day – my target now is Feb. 6 to 10, no later.

At the prebrief today we decided that we did not what to state there was a SCAQ therefore send in the root cause and comprehensive corrective action plan. We want them to address the key elements that effect the assumptions of the PODs – a point well made by our technical reviewers involved in the TIA response.

Accordingly the summary of the issue will be:

Your PODs state that there are no assumptions.

We know that the design basis code is based on empirical data for determining certain parameters that are a part of the design bases. Poison's ratio on concrete cores are not being tested or evaluated and this ratio is in the CLB – UFSAR.

The assumption of this empirical data is that the relationships are ASR free.

Based on a review of the implementation schedule from contractor-submitted plans that do not have NextEra approval as of Nov. 29th, the inspectors noted that the plans fail to address the following which are directly related to addressing the unwritten assumptions being made in the PODs:

1. Do not appear to test concrete cores for the following key design parameters from the design basis code ACI 318-1971, as for tensile and shear strength, rebar bond strength and Poisson's ratio
2. Do not appear to address nondestructive testing to assess the current progression of the ASR expansion rate before the destructive tests of the concrete cores
3. Appear to lack a clear framework for concrete core sampling in the buildings to ensure how representative the core sampling is vs. what is the worst case and doing a bounding calculation.
4. Appears to lack a plan to address potential effects of other degradations from an aggressive groundwater environment along with the presence of ASR.

Accordingly we will be asking you to address in response to the cover letter for your assessment of how your comprehensive evaluation and testing plans address the above with respect to the unstated assumptions in your PODs.

The plan should provide information related to:

1. Condition assessment (extent and characterization)
2. Cause of the ASR as it impacts current degradation and operability
3. Estimate of expansion to date and current expansion rate.
4. Interim structural assessment as it impacts current operability vs. longer term structural assessment.
5. Longer term monitoring ensure operability in the near future vs. longer term of the duration of the license (1-2 years vs. longer).
6. Short term mitigation or needed remedial actions

If your root cause evaluation scheduled for Feb. 2012 and the associate corrective action plan for this SCAQ, address the above, please use them to respond to our letter in the interest of efficiency.

Is it reasonable to review the report and TIA in 15 days from the date of our letter and get back to us with you intentions to voluntarily respond.

We anticipate a response to our request in 30 days or a management meeting, if you deem it necessary, no later than 30 days from the date of our inspection report letter.

Should a management meeting occur, we will negotiate the response date as a result of the issues discussed at the management meeting.

RECORD AGREEMENTS