

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Official Hearing Exhibit

In the Matter of: Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.
(Indian Point Nuclear Generating Units 2 and 3)



ASLBP #: 07-858-03-LR-BD01
Docket #: 05000247 | 05000286
Exhibit #: NYS000197-00-BD01
Admitted: 10/15/2012
Rejected:
Other:
Identified: 10/15/2012
Withdrawn:
Stricken:

NYS000197

Submitted: December 16, 2011

From: Burroni, Richard J
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2008 5:40 PM
To: Lee, Robert C <RLee7@entergy.com>; Azevedo, Nelson F <nazeved@entergy.com>; Orlando, Thomas <TOrland@entergy.com>
Cc: Caputo, Charles <ccapu90@entergy.com>; Mayer, Donald M <dmayer1@entergy.com>
Subject: RE: J Pollock review Friday-ISE R-7 Recommendation

After reading Bob's latest trip report (EPRI Buried Pipe Issues Group (BPIG) meeting Jacksonville, FL. July 22-23, 2008), its clear to me that we have no existing technology that could determine the "health" of our buried piping without the use of excavation. We need to get started on this, especially if we want some data by years end.

RB

From: Lee, Robert C
Sent: Friday, August 08, 2008 2:17 PM
To: Azevedo, Nelson F; Burroni, Richard J; Orlando, Thomas
Subject: FW: J Pollock review Friday-ISE R-7 Recommendation

FYI - See attached EXCEL doc for what Charlie Caputo and I put together for buried pipe for Don Mayer to review with Joe Pollock.
Also, Charlie Caputo is co-ordinating meeting next week with the lawyer(s) for preliminary meeting regards ISE Report response.
Buried pipe is to be discussed on Wed.

Bob

From: Caputo, Charles
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2008 3:48 PM
To: Mayer, Donald M
Cc: Lee, Robert C; Curry, John J
Subject: FW: J Pollock review Friday-ISE R-7 Recommendation

Don, see attached.

PS John Curry may have some other comments

From: Caputo, Charles
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2008 3:47 PM
To: Curry, John J
Subject: RE: J Pollock review Friday-ISE R-7 Recommendation

See attached

From: Curry, John J
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2008 3:35 PM
To: Caputo, Charles
Subject: FW: J Pollock review Friday-ISE

IPEC00091093

IPEC00091093

We are listed for Buried Piping.??

From: Mayer, Donald M
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2008 2:18 PM
To: Runion, William (Mark); Gagnon, Daniel W; Marcussen, Fred; Sullivan, Brian A; Curry, John J; Elliott, Kevin P
Cc: Walpole, Robert W
Subject: RE: J Pollock review Friday-ISE

The excel file is attached (as discussed below. Unfortunately IT can not set up a share service for shared edits quickly. So each person edit and save the file and send it back to me. I will print out your sections for the meeting with Joe and then I'll have clerical help pull all the info into one file.

From: Mayer, Donald M
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2008 9:55 AM
To: Runion, William (Mark); Gagnon, Daniel W; Marcussen, Fred; Sullivan, Brian A; Curry, John J; Elliott, Kevin P
Cc: Walpole, Robert W
Subject: J Pollock review Friday-ISE

Guys-

I will be reviewing your work products with Joe Pollock on Friday 8/8. Bob Waloppe is assembling a spreadsheet that has each individual recommendation listed with its page reference etc. Bob will be sending that to you early this afternoon and the output of your summary papers needs to be placed in the spreadsheet. Simply add rows for each option related to each recommendation you will provide data on. See below. A quick triage of what we can provide Joe is worthwhile. **NOTE:** I still expect to get your one page summaries for review with Joe as part of the matrix review.

Fred Marcussen – in discussion with Dan G, the current asset management planning for security address much but NOT all of the ISE security recs. So we need to be clear and the cost est needs to reflect cost +TBD or cost+est if you have one.

Mark – it is of course obvious that for many items we will not even have a conceptual cost available, but I know in some case we do (eg AMP). Depending on Joes thoughts on the response and that of Corp Execs we will likely need the assistance of an estimator to meet with small groups and get an idea of potential solutions and help develop initial conceptals (+/- 50% or more). Please give some thought to expertise you may be able to bring in to assist as a consultant.

For example: Rehab Putnam building/real estate is ~xxx\$/sq/ft, IT infrastructure is y\$ (from IT), new midas software and training for site and counties is z\$

Option 1 Rehabilitate new EOF	x million 6moths after AE publishes plans	Basis – this has been evaluated in 2005\$ as an option at that time		
Option 2 Rehab facility in Putnam or Dutchess County outside 2 mile EPZ	1.5 million and 1year	Basis		

Option 3 Build a new EOF with a throne for Brian Sullivan	18 months 3.5 million	basis		
---	--------------------------	-------	--	--

From: Mayer, Donald M

Sent: Monday, August 04, 2008 5:04 PM

To: Runion, William (Mark); Gagnon, Daniel W; Marcussen, Fred; Sullivan Weaver, Daria; Curry, John J; Elliott, Kevin P; Caputo, Charles

Subject: FW: ISE Summary

Guys-

I want to give you more time to develop your responses to my request of today. To that end :

1. by Thursday 8/7 give me your initial/preliminary assessment as follows
 - a. Rec # and Page # and Rec Title (*the attached word document lists recommendation #s and page #s and titles for most, the email below explains the codes used*)
 - b. Your best understanding of the scope of the solution – this should be concise but with enough detail so it is clear what we would expect as a final deliverable for each recommendation..
 - c. What you recommend as an answer to the recommendation – ie how to implement a solution, **including options** as appropriate
 - i. *For example for EOF facility 3* example options are : 1. improve existing facility, 2. build new facility from ground up, 3. purchase a commercial building and modify to suit. Cost and schedule estimates for each.
 - d. Your best estimate of a duration to accomplish each rec assuming funding is in place e.g. 1 month, 3 months, 6 Months, 1 year or 2 years or 2+
 - e. Conceptual cost estimate, for example we have a 2006 estimate to paint the VC stacks of x\$Million, conceptual only – risk factors include etc
 - i. Note – it is critical that you each provide the basis for your cost estimates (ie prior conceptual, industry benchmark, presently in the asset mngt plan, industry experience etc)
2. by Wednesday 8/13 of the following week formalize your draft and provide it via email.
3. You guys will be designated as “SMEs” providing input – these are conceptual – first cut numbers only and further scope definition and refinement will be necessary as we move forward. Certainly do not low ball the estimates (\$, scope or time).

From: Walpole, Robert W

Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2008 5:14 PM

To: Pollock, Joseph E; Vitale, Anthony J.; Mayer, Donald M; Orlando, Thomas

Cc: Donnelly, John M; Sullivan, Brian A; Gagnon, Daniel W

Subject: ISE Summary

Attached please find a summary document of the ISE report.

The first part of the attached report repeats the 42 recommendations and 16 observations that the ISE had in their report.

The second part of the report is a summary by section which attempts to identify Actions that we need to take,

IPEC00091095

IPEC00091095

Inaccuracies in the report, or items that may be inflammatory when they are read or quoted.

The following is a key to the attached report:

R – Recommendation taken from the ISE report

O – Observation taken from the ISE report

P – Potential Inflammatory statement

I – Inaccurate

A – Action required to be performed.

We have included a page number so that you can refer back to the report to see where the statement was extracted.

If you need specific details or data to address a particular issue, please let me know.

Bob Walpole
Manager, Licensing - IPEC
(914) 734 - 6710 (work)
(914) 760 - 2019 (cell)