

17

Sakai, Stacie

From: Conte, Richard -121
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 3:38 PM
To: Burritt, Arthur; Morey, Dennis; Murphy, Martin; Sakai, Stacie; Chernoff, Harold
Cc: Chaudhary, Suresh; Cline, Leonard; Ferrer, Nathaniel; Lehman, Bryce; Manoly, Kamal; Miller, Barry; Miller, Ed; Thomas, George; Sheikh, Abdul; Raymond, William; Plasse, Richard; Khanna, Meena; Auluck, Rajender; Modes, Michael
Subject: Counterproposal From Seabrook on ASR Meeting
Attachments: Status Call 11-16-2011 Seabrook ASR.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Last night I asked Mike Collins to explore NextEra's voluntary willingness to hand over the 5 concrete cores that were destined to be tensile strength testing but held back based on a new direction they were heading. The new direction is being motivated by a Uni. Of Texas proposal to do some kind of testing that will address as-found mechanical properties of tensile strength, Poisson's Ratio, Modulus of Elasticity in addition to compressive strength. In case you were not following, the learning this week was that 15 cores in a lab in Illinois was only being tested to compressive strength only.

(b)(5)

2.5

Mike Collins and Michael O'Keefe got back to me by cell today. They said they need more time along with higher ups to make the decision on giving the cores to NRC but came in with a counterproposal. I asked what they intend to do with the cores and they could not respond. They would like to come down for a management meeting in Headquarter (open or not is not relevant to them, but a level I subject to public observation only) in order to discuss in detail the Uni. Of Texas approach along with a summary of the literature research they have conducted. The week of Dec 19 is proposed to give them time to prepare but the would prefer the first or second week in January 2012. Once the methods or deltas are addressed they are also agreeable to an open meeting local to Seabrook for each party (NextEra and NRC to present how we are all proceeding. They were hoping a mutual agreeable path or paths could be reached at the headquarters meeting.

So you all can give me you alternate views but I would like only one vote per cognizant branch chief (Addressees above) – 3 projects and 3 technical. Hopefully you will brief your cognizant executive as those executives would have a great opportunity to participant and learn the issues so that reasonable decisions can be made. The decision on cores to the NRC would be at the headquarters meeting. Please respond before Nov. 23 so I can deliberate with management Monday Nov. 28. I am agreeable to an executive brief about a week before xmas either way whether the meeting is voted in or not and it is before or after Xmas.

Meeting in Headquarters (Yes/No)

Open or Not Preferred week 12/19/11 or 1/2/12 and day like Wednesday of the week

Meeting Locally to discuss agreed upon paths in an open public forum (q&a's) at the end (Yes/No/Defer to the License Renewal safety review meeting later in the year)

If you need a briefing sheet for latest development, see attached.

Information in this record was deleted
 in accordance with the Freedom of Information
 Act, exemptions 5
 FOIA 2012-0119

G
 /
 9

– Results of Telecon with NextEra on Seabrook ASR Issue – Nov. 16, 2010

Guiding principles obtained from various emails attached

Facts Established/Licensee Next Steps

1. Licensee has agreed that there were inconsistencies between their implementation schedule and 2 of 4 planning documents submitted by their lead contractor, MPR.

They will be established in 2-3 weeks a Corrective Action Plan that will clearly identify the activities and testing to be done with controls established by the Operational Quality Assurance Plan.

2. On a consistency note, the implementation schedule and plan indicated that tensile strength testing would be completed this week in Illinois, BUT fifteen concrete cores were sent out to the lab, five were held back in light of a recent decision to NOT do tensile strength testing.

Licensee to discuss further with NRC in two weeks on need for this testing on properties related to shear capacity (tensile strength along with modulus of elasticity and poisson's ratio, and stiffness damage testing) in distinction to load bearing strength, compressive strength. They are in agreement these key parameters need to be addressed, how is the question and what is the method acceptable to the NRC staff?

Strength and mechanical properties relationships in the ACI-318 code (building design code) expressed as a function of the concrete compressive strength f_c' , which are empirical based on non-degraded concrete.

3. University of Texas, a relatively new player in the problem is doing testing to prototype the Seabrook concrete aged to 20 years of ASR.

A lot research right now is based on unreinforced concrete. With reinforcement, building capacity and response is expected to be better.

It has been established in literature that ASR reduces the tensile strength of concrete more rapidly than it reduces compressive strength.

University's role and testing plans must be addressed in their new plan.

4. Others ??

NRC Considerations/Next Steps

(b)(5)

EX-5

(b)(5)

24
5

Attachment – Guiding Principles for ASR Review

(b)(4)

*R₁₀
5*

(b)(5)

R-45

(b)(5)

Bx5

8. More ???

(b)(5)

Bx5

6. More???