From: Christian Araguas
To: <JTDAVIS@southernco.com>
Date: 6/25/2007 3:40:21 PM
Subject: Site Visit Proposed for July 19, 2007
cc: "Thomas Cheng" <TMC@nrc.gov>

Jim,

Attached is the proposed agenda for the site visit. A lot of the requests I am sure you will discuss during the July 11 public meeting and therefore I would just highlight those areas and let us know that they are on the July 11 agenda. This should reduce the scope of the site visit. We can talk further on the agenda later this week. In the short term just let me know if July 19th is a date you can support for a 1 day visit.

Christian

Hearing Identifier: Vogtle_Public
Email Number: 414

Mail Envelope Properties (468A2CBF.HQGWDO01.TWGWPO04.200.2000007.1.9ECD8.1)

Subject: Site Visit Proposed for July 19, 2007
Creation Date: 6/25/2007 3:40:21 PM
From: Christian Araguas

Created By: CJA2@nrc.gov

Recipients "Thomas Cheng" <TMC@nrc.gov>
<JTDAVIS@southernco.com>

Post Office	**Route**
TWGWPO04.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	455	6/25/2007 3:40:21 PM
Vogtle - Review Scope for ESP Geotechnical Site Visit.wpd	4788	7/3/2007 11:02:23 AM

Options
Priority: Standard
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None
None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

Scope for Vogtle ESP Geotechnical Site Visit

1. General walk around the site to inspect boring/cone penetrometer locations and review details of the sampling program.

2. Visual inspection of some typical samples (touch the dirt) from the primary soil layers.

3. Determine the relation of the site configuration at Vogtle with the SRS site across the river since the Vogtle site response calculations reference the SRS resonant column/torsion shear test results.

4. Review the details of any proposed backfill criteria and conmpaction control program proposed to qualify the site. Discuss the extent of backfill and potential impact on 2D site response issues.

5. Discuss the criteria to be used by the COL applicant to certify that the site prtovides adequate "{bearing capacity" to satisfy the Tier 1 descriptions of the AP1000 DCD.

6. Discuss the details of the site response calculations to ensure that the effect of excavated overburden was included in the UHS calculation for the top of the blue bluff marl.

7. Discuss any issues of soft zones that may exist below the plant as is oftent encountered at the SRS across the river.

8. Evaluate location and construction of any retaining walls that will need to be evaluated as part of the review.

9 Review current concept of how the excavation is to be performed and backfill is to be placed and review whether this will be appropriate for the construction description (soil nailing) provided in the AP1000 DCD. The issue of qualifying backfill from ground surface down (minimum of 1,000 fps velocity) needs to be clarified. Comparison of resulting site-specific profile with set of site conditions used by Westinghouse during the design needs to be evaluated.