

25

Hardies, Robert

From: Kirk, Mark *RES*
Sent: Thursday, January 03, 2013 12:21 PM
To: Hardies, Robert
Subject: RE: Suggested agenda for NRC Staff meeting on Doel, 11 or 14 January

Request approval to create a plan ?!?!?!?!? Never mind, I don't want to know. Instead I shall just say: GREAT!

Is there a date for such a meeting?

1st Kwak is on me.

From: Hardies, Robert *MR*
Sent: Thursday, January 03, 2013 12:20 PM
To: Kirk, Mark
Subject: RE: Suggested agenda for NRC Staff meeting on Doel, 11 or 14 January

Yes, thanks. The meeting will be fun. I had Carolyn get a spot on the LT calendar to request permission to create an action plan (LT approval is bureaucratically required). This meeting would feed into an eventual action plan, if we go that way.

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)

R

From: Kirk, Mark
Sent: Thursday, January 03, 2013 8:45 AM
To: Hardies, Robert
Subject: RE: Suggested agenda for NRC Staff meeting on Doel, 11 or 14 January

That is why Beer is needed ... so I will be ready for the evening.

I'll put the agenda in the scheduler, OK?

From: Hardies, Robert
Sent: Thursday, January 03, 2013 8:44 AM
To: Kirk, Mark
Subject: RE: Suggested agenda for NRC Staff meeting on Doel, 11 or 14 January

By all means, please send out a scheduler. The agenda looks good and the exercise will be useful.

Beer is good. You are brave to fly one night, then meet the same day you arrive.

Robert Hardies
Senior Level Advisor for Materials Engineering

E/68

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, January 03, 2013 8:40 AM
To: Hardies, Robert
Subject: Suggested agenda for NRC Staff meeting on Doel, 11 or 14 January

Bob –

I trust you have had a restful & enjoyable holiday. Per my previous commitment, below please find my suggestion for an objective and an agenda. You said you would send out a scheduler ... if you do not have time to do so I can take care of that for you today ... just let me know.

Objective of Meeting: Develop NRC Staff consensus approach to ensuring the continued operating integrity of USA RPVs in view of recent discoveries at Doel 3 and Tihange 2 in Belgium.

Agenda:

1. **Synopsis of January 2013 Belgium meeting.** Bob, Mark, Carol (5 minutes each)
2. **Proposals for Path Forward for USA plants.** Everyone who wants to weigh in should be afforded the opportunity. To do so they should provide a written synopsis, in advance, of 1 page or less, and they get 10 minutes of air time to present their case to the group.
3. **Group discussion / negotiation of the objective and elements of a consensus plan.** 1 hour
4. **Summary of consensus plan and actions moving forward.** 30 minutes

This could well take several hours, but I personally believe it would be a wise investment of time. It would help to mend some frayed nerves, and it would also go a long way to prevent organizational brinksmanship that is now brewing, which could well waste FAR MORE than the time we would invest in this meeting.

I have late afternoon / evening meetings with my review board on Monday in Belgium, but if you would be interested in sampling the local brew before that time I would be more than pleased for your company.

Best

Mark

From: Hardies, Robert
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.

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:

- Electobel 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 permaner 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 tha 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 Electobel 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 Hardles
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)