

From: [RILEY, Jim](#)
To: [Cook, Christopher](#)
Cc: [Miller, Ed](#); [Attarian, George](#); [Bell, Roderick](#); [bolognar@firstenergycorp.com](#); [Brunette, Pat](#); [Buman, Dan](#); [Burriss, Ken](#); [Carrie L. Stokes \(carrie.stokes@bwsc.net\)](#); [Colin Keller](#); [Dave Bucheit](#); [Dean Hubbard \(dmhubbard@duke-energy.com\)](#); [Don Bentley \(DBENTLE@entergy.com\)](#); ["Faller, Carl"](#); [Gambriell, David](#); [GASPER, JOSEPH K](#); [Giddens, John](#); [Glen D Ohlemacher \(ohlemacher@dteenergy.com\)](#); [Hackerott, Alan](#); [Hammons, Mark A.](#); [Heather Smith Sawyer \(heather.sawyer@bwsc.net\)](#); [Heerman, John](#); [Horstman, William R](#); ["Huffman, Ken"](#); [HYDE, KEVIN C](#); [Jeff Brown \(jeffrey.brown@aps.com\)](#); [Jim Breunig \(james.breunig@cengllc.com\)](#); [Joe Bellini \(joe.bellini@amec.com\)](#); [John Lee \(John.Lee@dom.com\)](#); [Kit Ng \(kyng@bechtel.com\)](#); [LaBorde, Jamie](#); [Larry Shorey \(ShoreyLE@Inpo.org\)](#); [Lorin.Young@CH2M.com](#); [Maddox Jim \(maddoxje@inpo.org\)](#); [Mannai, David J](#); [manolerasm@firstenergycorp.com](#); [Matt Nienaber \(mbniena@nppd.com\)](#); [Maze, Scott](#); [Michael Proctor \(michael.proctor@urs.com\)](#); [MICHAEL J.MILLER@sargentlundy.com](#); [Mike Annon - Home \(ICENG2008@AOL.COM\)](#); [Mike Annon \(annonm@dteenergy.com\)](#); [Miller, Andrew](#); [Murray, Mike](#); [Parker, Thomas M.](#); [Ray Schneider \(schneire@westinghouse.com\)](#); [RILEY, Jim](#); [Robinson, Mike](#); [Rogers, James G](#); [Rudy Gil](#); [Scarola, Jim](#); [Selman, Penny](#); [Shumaker, Dennis](#); [Snyder, Kirk](#); [Stapleton, Dan](#); [Stone, Jeff](#); [Terry Grebel \(tlg1@pge.com\)](#); [Thayer, Jay](#); [Vinod Aggarwal \(Vinod.aggarwal@exeloncorp.com\)](#); [Wrobel, George](#); [Yale, Bob](#)
Subject: Materials and Requested Agenda Items for January 16th and 17th Webinar
Date: Tuesday, January 08, 2013 6:20:46 PM
Attachments: [FAQ 008 - IA Lite Submittal Timing Rev 1.doc](#)
[FAQ 009 - IA Lite Peer Review, Rev 0.doc](#)

Chris, Ed;

I would like to suggest the following items for our webinar next week:

- FAQs 008 and 009 on the Integrated Assessment trigger letter. These are the items we discussed at our last meeting. The documents are attached.
- Expected content of the flooding reevaluation report. First year sites are starting to prepare these reports and we would like to establish some guidance.
- IA ISG example for evaluating scenario based mitigation – we will have the latest version of the example to you by the end of this week
- Dam failure white paper – I sent you one section that was changed to focus on attributes. We will have more sections to you by next Monday.
- Dates and game plan for our February meeting. We want to set up a schedule that coordinates with Duke meetings on the Oconee IA lead plant effort. We are thinking of the following schedule for the second full week of each month:
 - Tuesday pm – Duke meeting with the NRC with FFTF representatives in attendance
 - Wednesday all day – FFTF internal meeting to prepare for the NRC meeting in general and also develop thoughts on any questions raised by the Duke meeting.
 - Thursday all day or as necessary – FFTF / NRC meeting on defined agenda items

One of the items we will want to talk about in February is the operability and reportability considerations associated with reevaluation results. We are working on a white paper to address this subject and will want to discuss the white paper during our February meeting. We should have the appropriate people at this meeting to ensure everyone is on the same page on this subject.

Talk to you tomorrow at our regular weekly phone call (invitation coming). Thanks.

Jim Riley

NEI

(o) 202-739-8137

(c) 202-439-2459



FOLLOW US ON



This electronic message transmission contains information from the Nuclear Energy Institute, Inc. The information is intended solely for the use of the addressee and its use by any other person is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient, you have received this communication in error, and any review, use, disclosure, copying or distribution of the contents of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone or by electronic mail and permanently delete the original message. IRS Circular 230 disclosure: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS and other taxing authorities, we inform you that any tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties that may be imposed on any taxpayer or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

Sent through mail.messaging.microsoft.com

Inquiry Form – Industry Approval

A. TOPIC:	Peer Review of Simple Integrated Assessments
Source document:	<u>NRC Integrated Assessment Trigger Letter</u> Section: <u>NA</u>
B. DESCRIPTION:	
<p>The NRC Letter dated 12/3/12 on the subject of trigger conditions for performing an integrated assessment identified two scenarios for which a full integrated assessment (IA) is not required. Scenario 2 requires application of Appendix A of the IA and NUREG-0800. Scenario 3 requires application of Section 6 and Appendix A of the IA. Accordingly, other sections of the IA ISG, and specifically the requirements for peer reviews, are not required for evaluation of these scenarios. This approach appears reasonable, since the scenarios are not complex and normal reviews associated with submittals under 50.54(f) will ensure the accuracy of the evaluations. Please confirm this interpretation.</p>	
C. Initiator:	
Name:	<u>R Gil</u> Phone: _____
Date:	<u>12/14/12</u> E-Mail: <u>rudyl_gil@fpl.com</u>
D. RESOLUTION: (Include additional pages if necessary. Total pages: <u>1</u>)	
Inquiry number:	<u>009</u> Priority: <u>M</u>
<p>It is not necessary to perform the peer reviews described in section 4 and Appendix B of JLD-ISG-2012-05 for simple Integrated Assessments such as those described in scenarios 2 and 3 of the December 3, 2012 NRC letter to NEI.</p>	
Revision: <u>0</u>	Date: <u>12/18/12</u>
E. NRC Review:	
Not Necessary _____	Necessary <u>X</u>
Explanation: _____	
F. Industry Approval:	
Documentation Method: _____	Date: _____