

✓  
**Mitman, Jeffrey**

---

**From:** Rodriguez, Veronica *inrr*  
**Sent:** Monday, November 22, 2010 4:27 PM  
**To:** Mitman, Jeffrey  
**Cc:** Wong, See-Meng  
**Subject:** RE: draft letter to FERC

Jeff ... the letter looks ok to me.

The term "absolute assurance" is odd to me though. Are you ok w/this term?

---

**From:** Mitman, Jeffrey *inrr*  
**Sent:** Monday, November 22, 2010 11:14 AM  
**To:** Rodriguez, Veronica  
**Cc:** Wong, See-Meng  
**Subject:** RE: draft letter to FERC

My comments to the attached draft letter are incorporated via Word revision marks. Is it OK to send this back to DE?

Jeff Mitman

---

**From:** Wilson, George *inrr*  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 17, 2010 7:09 AM  
**To:** Mitman, Jeffrey; Coleman, Neil; Wescott, Rex; Stang, John; Persinko, Andrew; Scott, Catherine; Khanna, Meena; Sexton, Kimberly; Simon, Marcia  
**Cc:** Hiland, Patrick; Cunningham, Mark  
**Subject:** draft letter to FERC

Please look at the draft letter and provide comments

George Wilson  
USNRC  
Acting Deputy Director, Division of Engineering  
Mail Stop O12H2  
301-415-1711

**Mitman, Jeffrey**

---

**From:** Mitman, Jeffrey *NR*  
**Sent:** Monday, November 22, 2010 11:43 AM  
**To:** Wong, See-Meng; Rodriguez, Veronica  
**Subject:** RE: draft letter to FERC

See Meng, we can but it is not necessary. The sender and receiver of the email will clearly understand the meaning and its significance. Adding an appropriate definition will take significant verbiage that is unwarranted.

Jeff

---

**From:** Wong, See-Meng *NR*  
**Sent:** Monday, November 22, 2010 11:35 AM  
**To:** Mitman, Jeffrey; Rodriguez, Veronica  
**Subject:** RE: draft letter to FERC

Jeff,

Can we provide a short phrase (in parentheses) to say what a "sunny day" failure is, or there is no plain language definition available?

See Meng.

---

**From:** Mitman, Jeffrey  
**Sent:** Monday, November 22, 2010 11:14 AM  
**To:** Rodriguez, Veronica  
**Cc:** Wong, See-Meng  
**Subject:** RE: draft letter to FERC

My comments to the attached draft letter are incorporated via Word revision marks. Is it OK to send this back to DE?

Jeff Mitman

---

**From:** Wilson, George  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 17, 2010 7:09 AM  
**To:** Mitman, Jeffrey; Coleman, Neil; Wescott, Rex; Stang, John; Persinko, Andrew; Scott, Catherine; Khanna, Meena; Sexton, Kimberly; Simon, Marcia  
**Cc:** Hiland, Patrick; Cunningham, Mark  
**Subject:** draft letter to FERC

Please look at the draft letter and provide comments

George Wilson  
USNRC  
Acting Deputy Director, Division of Engineering  
Mail Stop O12H2  
301-415-1711

~~OFFICIAL USE ONLY/SECURITY-RELATED INFORMATION~~

Mr. Daniel J. Mahoney, Director  
Division of Dam Safety and Inspections  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Office of Energy Projects

SUBJECT: Oconee Intake Dike - External Flood Diversion Barrier

Dear Mr. Mahoney:

By letter dated, September 13, 2010, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) requested that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), confirm that the temporary structure on the Oconee Intake Dike, is a beneficial or prudent feature of the Oconee Nuclear Station (ONS) Safe Shutdown Facility (SSF) protection project that adds to the interim flood protection of the SSF.

Duke provided the NRC staff with 2D modeling runs of the flooding inundation caused by a "sunny day" failure of the Jocassee Dam study utilizing the existing temporary intake dike wall. Those model runs showed that there would be a reduction in the water level from approximately 19 ft. to 5.5 ft. at the SSF on the ONS site. It is noted that the SSF is currently protected by a 7.5 ft. wall; therefore, the current wall provides protection for the SSF, in the above scenario. The SSF provides equipment for additional accident mitigation at the site. The present intake dike wall structure is not designed to be water tight and does not meet FERC's design criteria. There is no positive upstream cutoff water barrier and uplift was not analyzed in the stability analysis. Based on this information, there is not an absolute assurance that the intake dike wall structure will perform in a manner that the analysis predicts; however there is a good likelihood that the intake dike wall act as a flood diversion barrier as depicted in the 2D modeling runanalysis. The NRC staff agrees that if the intake dike wall performs the function of a flood diversion barrier then it is beneficial for an interim flood protection measure at the ONS.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (301)415-1711.

Sincerely,

George Wilson, Dam Safety Officer  
Division of Engineering  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
US NRC

cc: Charles Wagner, FERC

~~OFFICIAL USE ONLY/SECURITY-RELATED INFORMATION~~

November 30, 2010

Mr. Daniel J. Mahoney, Director  
Division of Dam Safety and Inspections  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Room 6N-01  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

SUBJECT: OCONEE INTAKE DIKE - EXTERNAL FLOOD DIVERSION BARRIER

Dear Mr. Mahoney:

In your letter to Duke Energy (Duke) dated September 13, 2010, you indicated that, in order to authorize Duke to complete construction of the temporary structure (wall) on the Oconee Intake DiKE, you would need the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to confirm that the temporary structure is a beneficial or prudent feature of the Oconee Nuclear Station (ONS) Safe Shutdown Facility (SSF) protection project that adds to the interim flood protection of the SSF. In subsequent telephone conversations between the NRC and you and your staff, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) requested that the NRC provide this confirmation. This letter addresses that request.

Duke provided the NRC staff with 2D modeling runs of the flooding inundation study, utilizing the existing temporary intake dike wall. Those model runs showed that there would be a reduction in the water level from approximately 19 ft. to 5.5 ft. at the SSF on the ONS site with the intake dike wall in place. It is noted that the SSF is currently protected by a 7.5 ft. wall; therefore, the current wall protecting the SSF would be adequate in the above scenario. The SSF provides equipment for additional accident mitigation at the site. The NRC staff agrees that if the intake dike wall performs the function of a flood diversion barrier, then it is beneficial as an interim flood protection measure at the ONS.

The NRC staff greatly appreciates all the help and support that has been provided by you and your staff on this issue. We also look forward to hearing from you and your staff on your evaluation of the proposed permanent mitigating structures proposed by Duke on the site.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-1711.

Sincerely,

/RA/ M.Khanna for

George A. Wilson, Dam Safety Officer  
Division of Engineering  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

November 30, 2010

Mr. Daniel J. Mahoney, Director  
Division of Dam Safety and Inspections  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Room 6N-01  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20426

SUBJECT: OCONEE INTAKE DIKE - EXTERNAL FLOOD DIVERSION BARRIER

Dear Mr. Mahoney:

In your letter to Duke Energy (Duke) dated September 13, 2010, you indicated that, in order to authorize Duke to complete construction of the temporary structure (wall) on the Oconee Intake DiKE, you would need the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to confirm that the temporary structure is a beneficial or prudent feature of the Oconee Nuclear Station (ONS) Safe Shutdown Facility (SSF) protection project that adds to the interim flood protection of the SSF. In subsequent telephone conversations between the NRC and you and your staff, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) requested that the NRC provide this confirmation. This letter addresses that request.

Duke provided the NRC staff with 2D modeling runs of the flooding inundation study, utilizing the existing temporary intake dike wall. Those model runs showed that there would be a reduction in the water level from approximately 19 ft. to 5.5 ft. at the SSF on the ONS site with the intake dike wall in place. It is noted that the SSF is currently protected by a 7.5 ft. wall; therefore, the current wall protecting the SSF would be adequate in the above scenario. The SSF provides equipment for additional accident mitigation at the site. The NRC staff agrees that if the intake dike wall performs the function of a flood diversion barrier, then it is beneficial as an interim flood protection measure at the ONS.

The NRC staff greatly appreciates all the help and support that has been provided by you and your staff on this issue. We also look forward to hearing from you and your staff on your evaluation of the proposed permanent mitigating structures proposed by Duke on the site.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-1711.

Sincerely,

/RA/ M.Khanna for

George A. Wilson, Dam Safety Officer  
Division of Engineering  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

DISTRIBUTION: CWagner RidsNrrDorl RidsNrrDRA RidsNrrOd

**ADAMS ACCESSION NO.: ML103280287**

|        |              |              |              |
|--------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| OFFICE | NRR/DE/EMCB  | NRR/DE       | NRR/DE       |
| NAME   | MKhanna      | PHiland      | GWilson      |
| DATE   | 11 / 30 / 10 | 11 / 30 / 10 | 11 / 30 / 10 |

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY