

22

Hardies, Robert

From: Kirk, Mark *RES*
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2012 12:24 PM
To: Hardies, Robert
Subject: RE: Doel 3 plans and proposed actions

OK. I'll pass you something back later today

From: Hardies, Robert *RL*
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2012 12:23 PM
To: Kirk, Mark
Subject: RE: Doel 3 plans and proposed actions

I accept you offer to help with 1, 4 and 5. Carolyn is the PM and she will help.

Bob Davis will be the NRO rep. I included him on the email.

The public meeting is March 5.

Robert Hardies
Senior Level Advisor for Materials Engineering
Division of Engineering
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Office Phone 301 415-5802

Cell (b)(6)

From: Kirk, Mark
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2012 9:30 AM
To: Hardies, Robert
Subject: RE: Doel 3 plans and proposed actions

Dear Bob -

Congratulations, and thanks. I think that this e-mail is an excellent start to help the repair of certain frayed emotions, and to help build bridges. Particularly important is your proposal for a group meeting. I think that if such a meeting could include the following elements it would be most beneficial:

1. An agenda (real one) circulated before hand.
2. Said agenda should state explicitly that the aim of the meeting is to develop a consolidated consensus plan that is agreeable to all participating NRC offices.
3. Time for all to present their views in whatever mode they choose (presentation, talking points, etc).
4. Actions from the meeting that are tracked.
5. Follow-up meetings scheduled.

If you need help I volunteer to develop #1 for your review, and to take the lead on #4 & #5.

What do you think?

Also, 2 questions:

- A. Who is the NRO rep?
- B. When is the public meeting.

E/59

GOOD JOB

Best

mark

From: Hardies, Robert

Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2012 8:48 AM

To: Fairbanks, Carolyn; Rosenberg, Stacey; Kirk, Mark; Stevens, Gary; Nove, Carol; Csontos, Aladar; Poehler, Jeffrey; Davis, Robert

Subject: Doel 3 plans and proposed actions

Just to bring everyone up to date:

Recent events:

- Electrobelt published their safety case and associated documents; we have reviewed it.
- Mark Kirk participated in expert review panel
- ASN visited NRC to discuss materials issues
- Gary and Jeff provided feedback to FANC for their prospective working groups. The feedback was positive.

(b)(4).(b)(7)(D)

Future actions that are planned

- NRO may intervene in receipt inspection of new vessels to see if they are affected.
- Carolyn will update the Comm plan to reflect the possible or probable permanent shut down of Doel and Tihange (be prepared for questions from stakeholders)
- Carolyn will finish the draft information notice
- Mark and I will travel to FANC for the Jan 7-8 closeout/summary meeting
- Stacey and I will attempt to get on the LT schedule before Jan 15 to indicate that FANC is likely not to approve restart and to propose a contingency for generic communications to require plants to review records (one complication is that it will not be possible to get on the calendar since there are no LT meetings between the FANC review meeting and the 15th).
- FANC will announce decision (expected January 15)
- Industry will discuss the activity to perform a PFM analysis on the January 15 materials industry exec/NRC management phone call

- FANC will publically release the Electrobelt analyses, reports and findings, and the recommendations of the internal, external, international and expert review groups in mid-late January, we expect.
- We have scheduled a public meeting with industry (to permit all of our stakeholders the opportunity to learn) to discuss industry and NRC proposed actions.
- Farther out, we will receive the industry analysis for review
- We will review the industry analysis

Other things we need to do:

- We need to get together and strategize what our short, intermediate and long term activities should be. With holidays and travel, the only dates that seem to be available where most of us are here are Jan 11 and Jan 14. I will send out a scheduler.
- Our current primary approach is to rely on the excellent technical evaluation of Doel and Tihange, and our prior engineering understanding of laminar flaws and our acceptance of the ASME Code to provide us reasonable assurance that U.S. plants do not have a safety issue. As an added tangible activity, industry is performing an analysis, we are holding a public meeting, and we are issuing an information notice. We may also want to have plants review their original records and/or perform a zero degree exam on their forgings.

Robert Hardies
Senior Level Advisor for Materials Engineering
Division of Engineering
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Office Phone 301 415-5802

Cell

(b)(6)