

NRR-PMDAPEm Resource

From: Banic, Merrilee
Sent: Wednesday, July 05, 2017 2:15 PM
To: Paul Gunter
Cc: Kim, James
Subject: PRB's initial recommendation on your petition dated January. 24, 2017 on Areva Forgings
Attachments: Petition Review Board's (PRB's) initial recommendation regarding your petition dated January 24, 2017, on Areva forgings.

Dear Mr. Gunter:

This is to follow up on our phone call of June 27, 2017. To summarize, you were informed that we had received your supplements and were asked whether you desired a second meeting with the PRB. The purpose of the meeting is to comment on the PRB's recommendation, and since we are accepting the requested actions in your petition for review, and referring part of the petition to another process, the meeting is not necessary, and we want to treat the petition in a timely manner. You stated that the email on our initial recommendation was not specific enough about which enforcement actions we were accepting. Once you had the specifics, you could respond regarding the public meeting. The specifics are provided below.

The email transmitting the PRB's initial recommendation (attached) stated:

The PRB has made an initial recommendation to accept the requested actions in your petition for review, but has referred a portion of the petition to another NRC process for appropriate action. The PRB's understanding is that the basis for the requested action was potentially defective safety-related components and potentially falsified quality assurance documentation. Your concern of potentially falsified quality assurance documentation has been referred to the NRC's allegation process for review and consideration of appropriate action. Because the allegation process provides an opportunity for the petitioner to address these concerns, the issue of potentially falsified quality assurance documentation will not be reviewed as part of this 2.206 petition.

Specifically, the requests, as stated in your petition, and that were accepted for review are as follows:

1) suspend power operations of U.S. nuclear power plants relying upon Le Creusot Forge components and Le Creusot subcontractors pending both full inspection (including Non- Destructive Examination by ultrasonic testing) and material testing. With the finding of carbon anomalies ("carbon segregation" or "carbon macrosegregation") in excess of the design basis specifications for at-risk component parts:

A) replace the degraded at-risk component(s) with quality certified components or;

B) for those at-risk degraded components that a licensee seeks to allow to remain inservice the licensee shall make application through the License Amendment Request process to demonstrate that a revised design-basis is achievable and will not render the in-service component unacceptably vulnerable to fast fracture failure at any time, and in any credible service condition, throughout the current license of the power reactor.

2) should the NRC decline the Petitioners' request for the immediate suspension of reactor operations pending inspections and material testing of at-risk components, the NRC alternatively modify the operating licenses to require the affected operators to perform the requested emergency enforcement actions at the next scheduled outage;

3) given that the agency is reliant upon its licensees to oversee their own quality control, the agency “take other action as may be proper” by issuing a letter to all U.S. light water reactor operators pursuant to 10 CFR 50.54(f) requiring licensees to provide the NRC with information under oath and affirmation specifically as to how U.S. operators are reliably monitoring contractors and subcontractors for the potential carbon segmentation anomaly in the supply chain and the reliability of the quality assurance certification of those components. The Petitioners request that the industry responses to the requested 50.54(f) letters then be publicly released into the NRC Agency-wide Document Access and Management System (ADAMS).

Your supplements are being handled according to the guidance in MD 8.11 excerpted below:

The petition manager will also ensure the supplement receives the same distribution as the petition and will forward a copy of the supplement to the PRB members. The PRB members will review the supplement and determine whether they need to meet formally to discuss it and, if so, whether or not to offer the petitioner an opportunity to discuss the supplement with the PRB members before the board reviews the supplement. *[NOTE: this meeting is different than the meeting the petitioner may have with the PRB before the PRB issues an acknowledgement letter.]* In deciding whether a formal PRB meeting is needed, the PRB members will consider the safety significance and complexity of the information in the supplement. Clarifications of previous information will generally not require a new PRB meeting. If a new PRB meeting is not convened, the petition manager will include the supplement in the ongoing petition review and no further action is necessary.

Please respond within one week of this email whether you wish to address the PRB a second time. If we do not hear from you in that time, we will proceed with issuing an acknowledgement letter.

Hearing Identifier: NRR_PMDA
Email Number: 3595

Mail Envelope Properties (Merrilee.Banic@nrc.gov20170705141400)

Subject: PRB's initial recommendation on your petition dated January. 24, 2017 on Areva Forgings
Sent Date: 7/5/2017 2:14:35 PM
Received Date: 7/5/2017 2:14:00 PM
From: Banic, Merrilee

Created By: Merrilee.Banic@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Kim, James" <James.Kim@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Paul Gunter" <paul@beyondnuclear.org>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4980	7/5/2017 2:14:00 PM
Petition Review Board's (PRB's) initial recommendation regarding your petition dated January 24, 2017, on Areva forgings.		
	14355	

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received: