

63

**Boyle, Patrick**

**From:** Mizuno, Geary *OG*  
**Sent:** Monday, September 19, 2011 9:05 AM  
**To:** Karwoski, Kenneth; Scott, Catherine; Lemoncelli, Mauri  
**Cc:** Khanna, Meena; Boyle, Patrick; Martin, Robert; Benowitz, Howard  
**Subject:** RE: North Anna Restart

Colleagues:

(b)(5)

*5/11*

Geary

**From:** Karwoski, Kenneth *me*  
**Sent:** Monday, September 19, 2011 8:29 AM  
**To:** Scott, Catherine; Mizuno, Geary; Lemoncelli, Mauri  
**Cc:** Khanna, Meena; Boyle, Patrick; Martin, Robert  
**Subject:** North Anna Restart

As you know, North Anna experienced an earthquake that was larger than their design basis earthquake. We would like to discuss with you (today, if possible) what is required for the plant to restart. This is needed so that we can guide the staff in their review of the licensee's submittal.

The main issue we would like to discuss is whether the licensee is required to (a) demonstrate that any damage that did occur as a result of the earthquake did not impair the functionality of any structures, systems, or components (SSCs) with the acceptance criteria being the SSCs will function under the current licensing basis, or (b) establish a new design basis earthquake and re-analyze the plant to ensure all SSCs are capable of withstanding this new design basis earthquake.

The licensee has submitted a document that is more in line with "option (a)" with the actions of "option (b)" being a longer term effort (i.e., after restart).

Thanks,

Ken  
415-2752