

Mitman, Jeffrey

From: Mitman, Jeffrey *NR*
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2010 11:30 AM
To: Ferrante, Fernando
Subject: FW: MG Briefing

From: Jeffrey Mitman
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 2009 3:34 PM
To: Antonios Zoulis *NR*
Subject: MG Briefing

I'll incorporate your comments and copy you on the email. I plan to be here early tomorrow morning with the expectation to get Melanie up to speed early. Feel free to join in if you want.

From: Antonios Zoulis *NR*
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 2009 3:31 PM
To: Jeffrey Mitman
Subject: RE: Different Assumptions?

That is good enough. Also tell her about the lawyer situation, the generic issue and that Fernando is working on the issue but it seems a generic issue is out of the scope of the group. We can support the PRA but for us to be the lead would not be appropriate. It probably entails issuing a generic letter to gather information on sites proximity to dams and how they addressed those vulnerabilities. Based on their response we would need to determine if a reevaluation is necessary i.e. generic backfit.

JCO comments are in but we have very differing views with DORL. Mention the issuance of the meeting minutes without DRA concurrence. Geary Mizuno (Adequate Protection) does not want to send a memorandum from OGC to us. He sent an email to Melanie to that effect. We are planning to draft a memo and send it from DRA to OGC. JAC has incorporated her comments. Work on the FAQs is ongoing but low priority.

From: Jeffrey Mitman
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 2009 3:23 PM
To: Antonios Zoulis
Subject: RE: Different Assumptions?

I'm preparing a status memo for MG. Do we want to say anything about the IN meeting other than we had it and are working to resolve Dave's comments?

From: Antonios Zoulis
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 2009 3:21 PM
To: Jeffrey Mitman
Subject: RE: Different Assumptions?

ok

From: Jeffrey Mitman
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 2009 3:21 PM
To: Antonios Zoulis
Subject: RE: Different Assumptions?

Not today.

From: Antonios Zoulis
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 2009 3:09 PM
To: Jeffrey Mitman
Subject: FW: Different Assumptions?

Can you follow up on this?

From: David Beaulieu *in R*
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2009 5:20 PM
To: James Vail
Cc: Antonios Zoulis
Subject: Different Assumptions?

Jim,

The Excel file you provided states

Jocassee Dam Failure

Calculation results from Oconee IPEEE Rev 2 Section B.4.3, "Frequency of Dam failure":

Failures since 1940 to 1993 of >50 foot rockfill dams > 5 years old = 2

Dam years of operation since 1940 to 1993 of >50 foot rockfill dams = 154380

Result = 1.3E-05 failures per dam year for the Jocassee dam

The dam years of operation since 1940 to 1993 appear to be about 1 decade too high.

This information appears to differ from the licensees IPEEE which states on page 5-21 "The date bases covered the period of dam construction from 1940 to 1987 [rather than 1993]. During this period, U.S. dams in operation 6 [rather than 5] or more years at the time of failure and 45 [rather than 50] feet or more in height were considered. The dams of three types -- earth, earth-rockfill, or rockfill [rather than rockfill only] -- and only catastrophic failures [rather than including non-catastrophic failures] were included."

Would these differences explain the different results?

DAVID BEAULIEU PROJECT MANAGER, NRR/DPR/PGCB (bowl-yer) 301-415-3243 O12C12 David.Beaulieu@nrc.gov
--

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
