

9

Murphy, Martin

From: Murphy, Martin
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 9:23 PM
To: Murphy, Martin
Subject: FW: Status on the ASR Project at Seabrook

What is the product that we are developing and what is the time table?

Level of effort?

From: Conte, Richard
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:13 AM
To: Auluck, Rajender; Burritt, Arthur; Chernoff, Harold; Morey, Dennis; Murphy, Martin
Cc: Raymond, William; Modes, Michael; Chaudhary, Suresh; Thomas, George; Sheikh, Abdul; Lehman, Bryce; Cline, Leonard; Ferrer, Nathaniel; Khanna, Meena; Manoly, Kamal; Lehman, Bryce; Miller, Ed; Plasse, Richard; Sheikh, Abdul; Skeen, David; Thomas, George; Erickson, Alice
Subject: Status on the ASR Project at Seabrook

Branch Chiefs it may be time for another internal discussion on the Seabrook ASR. Developments to date include:

1. Revised PODs to address weaknesses identified during the week of 9/26/11, available on Certrex
2. Revised implementation schedule that appears to be the controlling document or view from NextEra on what type sampling and testing they will be doing (available on Certrex).
3. NRC conducted another seminar on ASR Oct 20 – we need to understand what we took away from it – see the below list of issues summarized by Bill Raymond – general question is what standards are we regulating to, do we need a ISG or BTP – fundamental question is do they need to do Triaxial Testing on the sampling – what would be the ACRS view.
4. George Thomas and Bill Raymond communicated some fundamental questions to them, not sure when response will come in.
5. Inquiry from C-10 to DLR on ASR issue – what were the discussion points, new actions?
6. Some limited discussion between DRS and DRP on the disposition of the apparent inadequate PODs as of the beginning of the week of 9/26/11.
7. Suresh is to do a PIR sample the week of 11/28/11 related to the MR scoping apparent cause; that week is also to look at how NextEra is controlling their contractors. He may also need to find out the answers to questions noted herein.

We need to exit for the standalone report that we started the week of 9/26/11. I think we can go that if our experts are ok with the revised PODs, Suresh, George and Abdul.

We should get a status from the licensee but also exit and give them or view on the PODs

If we meet internally 11/9/11 and collect information for the licensee to answer we might be able to exit and get status on Wednesday Nov. 16, 2011. Conference call times would be both at 1030am and maybe go to noon (call number later):

Tentative list below, if you have add on's let me know.

Agenda for Internal 11/9/11:

1. Adequacy of revised PODs to address weaknesses identified during the week of 9/26/11, available on Certrex

D/5

2. Adequacy of revised implementation schedule that appears to be the controlling document or view from NextEra on what type sampling and testing they will be doing – Action Plans remains contractor recommendation – What is important that they are not doing that they should be going and regulatory basis.
3. NRC conducted another seminar on ASR Oct 20 – we need to understand what we took away from it – see the below list of issues summarized by Bill Raymond – general question is what standards are we regulating to, do we need a ISG or BTP – fundamental question is do they need to do Triaxial Testing on the sampling.
4. Any answers yet to George Thomas and Bill Raymond question communicated for TIA response – TIA response due 12/30/11
5. Inquiry from C-10 to DLR on ASR issue – what were the discussion points, new actions?
6. Some limited discussion between DRS and DRP on the disposition of the apparent inadequate PODs as of the beginning of the week of 9/26/11.
7. Suresh is to do a PIR sample the week of 11/28/11 related to the MR scoping apparent cause; that week is also to look at how NextEra is controlling their contractors. He may also need to find out the answers to questions noted herein.
8. Are we ready to Exit on the updated but open URI pending the engineering evaluation of March 2012 – Any violations from the inadequate POD.
9. DRP Input on URI for 50.59 screening issue, the design change was rescinded

Agenda for Conference with NextEra 11/16/11;

1. Exit and matters to discuss
2. Their status of accomplishments since Oct. 1
3. Open issues from 1 to 9 above.

From: Raymond, William *WR*

Sent: Friday, October 21, 2011 8:07 AM

To: Conte, Richard; Modes, Michael; Chaudhary, Suresh; Thomas, George; Sheikh, Abdul; Auluck, Rajender; Lehman, Bryce

Subject: RE: Items identified in Today's Meeting Relevant to Seabrook

I agree Rich, good perspectives. Before they launch into a FM analysis, we should articulate

- what is wrong with the static analysis;
- why the methods of the ACI-318 building code are no longer sufficient;
- what additional information is needed from the FM analysis and why;
- what physical data from the structures is needed to validate the FM analysis;
- how the FM analysis would be combined with the ACI-318 analytical methods;
- what criteria do we want them to meet;
- What are we looking for – more margin? Less uncertainty?
- Does the FM analysis with parametric study address scatter in the concrete material properties and “guide” the selection of core sample size & location?
- Which structures need the FM analysis – all? those most ASR-impacted? Those with smallest margin? and,
- What information is needed in short term for assurance of safe operation and what is needed for long term assurance the licensing basis will be met;

NRC should construct a regulatory framework based on a comprehensive technical basis rather than approach the issue piecemeal.

Shouldn't these matters be captured in the NextEra ASR Plan and addressed in the final OD?

Bill *R*

From: Conte, Richard

Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2011 5:20 PM

To: Sheikh, Abdul; Raymond, William


Cc: Auluck, Rajender; Lehman, Bryce; Modes, Michael; Chaudhary, Suresh; Thomas, George
Subject: RE: Items identified in Today's Meeting Relevant to Seabrook

What is the regulatory basis for a Canadian Standard.

Why don't we come up with our own standard like a branch technical position or interim staff guidance.

I would hold on telling the licensee anything before we march them on a worldwide research for any and all applicable standards

Sounds like we need a branch chief meeting to assess what we got from the Seminar.

From: Sheikh, Abdul 
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2011 5:01 PM
To: Raymond, William

Cc: Auluck, Rajender; Lehman, Bryce; Conte, Richard; Modes, Michael; Chaudhary, Suresh; Thomas, George
Subject: Items identified in Today's Meeting Relevant to Seabrook

- a. Mr. Katayama from Japan stated that:
 - 1. ASTM C289, C227, and C295 tests for aggregates cannot identify ASR reactivity for slow expansive aggregates.
 - 2. ASTM C1260, that is an improvement from the previous standard, cannot also effectively identify ASR reactivity in granite aggregates.
 - 3. Tests specified in Canadian standard CSA A.2.23.2-14.A can identify ASR reactivity in granite aggregates.

If Seabrook has granite aggregates, it is better to test them in accordance with CSA A.2.23.2-14.A.

- b. Professor Sauoma stated that to determine the structural integrity of ASR affected concrete structures, it is better to perform non-linear analysis to capture the effect of cracking in concrete.

It may be useful to pass this message to the applicant.

Abdul



From: Raymond, William
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2011 3:32 PM
To: Sheikh, Abdul
Subject: RE: ASR

OK, thanks.
Too bad.
Bill

From: Sheikh, Abdul
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2011 3:30 PM
To: Raymond, William
Subject: RE: ASR

No

From: Raymond, William
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2011 10:44 AM

To: Erickson, Alice
Cc: Sheikh, Abdul
Subject: RE: ASR

Alice,
Will these slides be put into Adams to be available publically?
There is information here that might be useful to the licensee's.
Bill

Q/S

From: Erickson, Alice
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2011 8:42 AM
To: Raymond, William
Subject: ASR

Bill,

Let me know if you can get to them through this zip file. Meanwhile, I will try to fix the SharePoint issue.