| From: | McCree, Victor |
|----------|---|
| Sent: | Friday, September 16, 2016 5:34 AM |
| То: | Baggett, Steven; Castelveter, David |
| Cc: | Zorn, Jason; Harrington, Holly; Burnell, Scott; Dacus, Eugene; Colgary, James; Holahan, |
| | Gary; Clark, Theresa |
| Subject: | Re: Current blog draft and Q&A |

Thanks Steve. This looks fine and, given yesterday's decision and public availability of all related documents today, I support approval and issued today (as is).

That said, I read this on my iPhone, so the pagination opportunities I see may be due to conformance with a Maas 360 format.

Have a great day!

Vic

On: 16 September 2016 04:30, "Baggett, Steven" <Steven.Baggett@nrc.gov> wrote: Good morning gentleman.

(b)(5)

From: Castelveter, David
Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2016 2:05 PM
To: McCree, Victor <Victor.McCree@nrc.gov>
Cc: Zorn, Jason <Jason.Zorn@nrc.gov>; Harrington, Holly <Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov>; Burnell, Scott
<Scott.Burnell@nrc.gov>; Dacus, Eugene <Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov>; Colgary, James <James.Colgary@nrc.gov>; Baggett, Steven <Steven.Baggett@nrc.gov>
Subject: Current blog draft and Q&A

Mr. McCree, I hope that the day is treating you well.

In follow up, and pursuant to our conversations, attached are two documents that we plan to use in response to the pending backfit decision.

As discussed, there was a consensus that issuing a press release on the decision was not the preferred choice at this time. With that said, we will prepare a brief shovel-ready press release to be used in the event that we need to issue one.

Our plan is to post publicly a blog (attached). If needed, we will aggressively push it to the usual media beat reporters.

I also have attached a Q&A which would be used only in response to query (RTQ). We also are discussing whether to post the Q&A on the web site hyperlinked from the blog to provide the necessary resources for reporters to write with accuracy. We, supported by the Chairman's office, agreed that if we felt the need for a more in-depth discussion with media, you would be the ideal choice, naturally, staffed by OPA and whomever in your shop you feel comfortable to provide the necessary support.

With your help, we did our absolute best to prepare these documents in plain language, conscious of the importance of not ignoring important facts or distorting context, yet eliminating any ambiguity associated with NRC-centric terminology.

Once you and your team have reviewed, the blog and the Q&A will be shared with the Chairman for his review and comment.

Thanks sir, for understanding our position on this matter. We opted to err on the side of caution in the preparation and distribution of messaging. We will await confirmation of the decision and the timing of the post.

Note: These documents were prepared by OPA's Scott Burnell and reviewed by both Holly Harrington and me. Holly and I discussed this strategy at length and feel comfortable that this is the correct strategy. I have copied Messrs. Dacus and Colgary for awareness.

Best regards,

David A. Castelveter Office Director U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office of Public Affairs (Mail Stop O-16D3) 11555 Rockville Pike, MD 20852

301-415-8200 (O) (b)(6) (C) david.castelveter@nrc.gov www.nrc.gov From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments: McCree, Victor Friday, September 16, 2016 5:34 AM Clark, Theresa; Holahan, Gary Fwd: Current blog draft and Q&A Byron_Braid_backfit_McCree - Additional Edits.docx

FYI

From: "Baggett, Steven" <Steven.Baggett@nrc.gov> Subject: RE: Current blog draft and Q&A Date: 16 September 2016 04:30 To: "Castelveter, David" <David.Castelveter@nrc.gov>, "McCree, Victor" <Victor.McCree@nrc.gov> Cc: "Zorn, Jason" <Jason.Zorn@nrc.gov>, "Harrington, Holly" <Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov>, "Burnell, Scott" <Scott.Burnell@nrc.gov>, "Dacus, Eugene" <Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov>, "Colgary, James" <James.Colgary@nrc.gov> Good morning gentleman.

(b)(5)

From: Castelveter, David Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2016 2:05 PM To: McCree, Victor <Victor.McCree@nrc.gov> Cc: Zorn, Jason <Jason.Zorn@nrc.gov>; Harrington, Holly <Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov>; Burnell, Scott <Scott.Burnell@nrc.gov>; Dacus, Eugene <Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov>; Colgary, James <James.Colgary@nrc.gov>; Baggett, Steven <Steven.Baggett@nrc.gov> Subject: Current blog draft and Q&A

Mr. McCree, I hope that the day is treating you well.

In follow up, and pursuant to our conversations, attached are two documents that we plan to use in response to the pending backfit decision.

As discussed, there was a consensus that issuing a press release on the decision was not the preferred choice at this time. With that said, we will prepare a brief shovel-ready press release to be used in the event that we need to issue one.

Our plan is to post publicly a blog (attached). If needed, we will aggressively push it to the usual media beat reporters.

I also have attached a Q&A which would be used only in response to query (RTQ). We also are discussing whether to post the Q&A on the web site hyperlinked from the blog to provide the necessary resources for reporters to write with accuracy. We, supported by the Chairman's office, agreed that if we felt the need for a more in-depth discussion with media, you would be the ideal choice, naturally, staffed by OPA and whomever in your shop you feel comfortable to provide the necessary support.

With your help, we did our absolute best to prepare these documents in plain language, conscious of the importance of not ignoring important facts or distorting context, yet eliminating any ambiguity associated with NRC-centric terminology.

Once you and your team have reviewed, the blog and the Q&A will be shared with the Chairman for his review and comment.

Thanks sir, for understanding our position on this matter. We opted to err on the side of caution in the preparation and distribution of messaging. We will await confirmation of the decision and the timing of the post.

Note: These documents were prepared by OPA's Scott Burnell and reviewed by both Holly Harrington and me. Holly and I discussed this strategy at length and feel comfortable that this is the correct strategy. I have copied Messrs. Dacus and Colgary for awareness.

Best regards,

David A. Castelveter Office Director U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office of Public Affairs (Mail Stop O-16D3) 11555 Rockville Pike, MD 20852

301-415-8200 (O) (b)(6) (C) <u>david.castelveter@nrc.gov</u> <u>www.nrc.gov</u> From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject: Attachments: Clark, Theresa Wednesday, September 07, 2016 12:06 PM Miller, Ed Rankin, Jennivine; Schmitt, Ronald ETA REVIEW: Exelon briefing package OEDO-16-00547 9-14-16 Exelon drop-in.docx

The attached briefing package is publicly available in ADAMS as ML16244A234.

Ed,

As I mentioned to you earlier today, I reviewed the briefing package. The content was quite good—thanks. I made some formatting changes and rearranged/shortened some of the information, especially where I know people just received additional background via hearing 1-pagers and such. I accepted the formatting changes in the attached but tracked the others. Can you please check them over for me quickly? I need to get the package to the Commission offices today if possible.

Once it is good with you, please update in ADAMS (or loop back with me if any major issues). Typically the office also makes copies (8 double-sided and 2 single-sided would be good) of just the package part, not the memo on top.

Ron—here's the draft we discussed over the phone. It's almost done, and the DIRS pieces look good to me (not sure if DORL worked with Jo or not).

Thanks again for the great work on this.

Theresa Valentine Clark Executive Technical Assistant (Reactors) U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Theresa.Clark@nrc.gov | 301-415-4048 | O-16E22

| From: Sent: | Holahan, Gary Tuesday, September 13, 2016 12:14 PM | |
|------------------------|---|--|
| To: Cc: Subject: | McCree, Victor; Clark, Theresa Burnell, Scott; Castelveter, David Exelon Backfit Appeal decision - (b)(5) | |

(b)(5)

1

.

From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject: Holahan, Gary Thursday, September 15, 2016 12:42 PM Burnell, Scott; Clark, Theresa Harrington, Holly; Castelveter, David RE: FYI FW: Current blog draft and Q&A

I believe you may get additional comments from Theresa or Vic.

Gary

From: Burnell, Scott Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2016 9:57 AM To: Holahan, Gary <Gary.Holahan@nrc.gov>; Clark, Theresa <Theresa.Clark@nrc.gov> Cc: Harrington, Holly <Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov>; Castelveter, David <David.Castelveter@nrc.gov> Subject: RE: FYI FW: Current blog draft and Q&A Importance: High

Gary;

Just double-checking - are you signing off for the EDO's office as a whole?

Also, we've realized there should be another Q&A about how much the original backfit analysis and both appeals cost in billable staff hours and who it was billed to -- what's the best way to figure that out? Thanks.

Scott

From: Holahan, Gary Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2016 9:18 AM To: Baggett, Steven <<u>Steven.Baggett@nrc.gov</u>>; Zorn, Jason <<u>Jason.Zorn@nrc.gov</u>>; Harrington, Holly <<u>Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov</u>>; Burnell, Scott <<u>Scott.Burnell@nrc.gov</u>>; Dacus, Eugene <<u>Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov</u>>; Colgary, James <<u>James.Colgary@nrc.gov</u>>; McCree, Victor <<u>Victor.McCree@nrc.gov</u>>; Clark, Theresa <<u>Theresa.Clark@nrc.gov</u>> Subject: RE: FYI FW: Current blog draft and Q&A

(b)(5)

From: Baggett, Steven Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2016 2:59 PM To: Holahan, Gary <<u>Gary.Holahan@nrc.gov</u>> Subject: FYI FW: Current blog draft and Q&A

(b)(5)

From: Castelveter, David Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2016 2:05 PM To: McCree, Victor <<u>Victor.McCree@nrc.gov</u>> Cc: Zorn, Jason <<u>Jason.Zorn@nrc.gov</u>>; Harrington, Holly <<u>Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov</u>>; Burnell, Scott <<u>Scott.Burnell@nrc.gov</u>>; Dacus, Eugene <<u>Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov</u>>; Colgary, James <<u>James.Colgary@nrc.gov</u>>; Baggett, Steven <<u>Steven.Baggett@nrc.gov</u>> Subject: Current blog draft and Q&A

Mr. McCree, I hope that the day is treating you well.

In follow up, and pursuant to our conversations, attached are two documents that we plan to use in response to the pending backfit decision.

As discussed, there was a consensus that issuing a press release on the decision was not the preferred choice at this time. With that said, we will prepare a brief shovel-ready press release to be used in the event that we need to issue one.

Our plan is to post publicly a blog (attached). If needed, we will aggressively push it to the usual media beat reporters.

I also have attached a Q&A which would be used only in response to query (RTQ). We also are discussing whether to post the Q&A on the web site hyperlinked from the blog to provide the necessary resources for reporters to write with accuracy. We, supported by the Chairman's office, agreed that if we felt the need for a more in-depth discussion with media, you would be the ideal choice, naturally, staffed by OPA and whomever in your shop you feel comfortable to provide the necessary support.

With your help, we did our absolute best to prepare these documents in plain language, conscious of the importance of not ignoring important facts or distorting context, yet eliminating any ambiguity associated with NRC-centric terminology.

Once you and your team have reviewed, the blog and the Q&A will be shared with the Chairman for his review and comment.

Thanks sir, for understanding our position on this matter. We opted to err on the side of caution in the preparation and distribution of messaging. We will await confirmation of the decision and the timing of the post.

Note: These documents were prepared by OPA's Scott Burnell and reviewed by both Holly Harrington and me. Holly and I discussed this strategy at length and feel comfortable that this is the correct strategy. I have copied Messrs. Dacus and Colgary for awareness.

Best regards,

David A. Castelveter Office Director U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office of Public Affairs (Mail Stop O-16D3) 11555 Rockville Pike, MD 20852

301-415-8200 (O) (b)(6) (C) david.castelveter@nrc.gov www.nrc.gov