

**From:** "Timothy Rice" <tbrice@gw.dec.state.ny.us>  
**To:** "Gary H Hinrichs" <ghinric@entergy.com>  
**Date:** 08/01/2007 8:11:16 AM  
**Subject:** Re: GZA Report

Gary,

I spoke with John White yesterday and both the State and the NRC are in concurrence that we need to stick with the agreed upon process of Entergy sharing the draft document with the State and NRC for review and comment. We don't anticipate the need for an extended review period. Given the generally satisfactory outcome of the recent USGS sparked conference call between our respective hydrologists about GZA's work we anticipate being able to review and comment on the draft within two weeks time. Not only will this review of the draft help to ensure that Entergy produces a final report that satisfies everyone's expectations, but it also ensures that Entergy honors the commitment made to the stakeholders for such an agency review.

If there are any questions on the expectations for this review, please feel free to give me a call to discuss them.

Thank you,

Tim Rice  
NYSDEC  
Env Radiation Specialist II  
625 Broadway, 9th floor  
Albany, NY12233-7255  
Phone (518)402-8574  
fax, hard copy (518)402-8646

>>> "Hinrichs, Gary H" <ghinric@entergy.com> 7/30/07 4:37 PM >>>  
As we discussed this morning, what do you think the correct protocol should be for reviewing the report? I see we have 2 options, one is to let us accept GZA's report and present to the NRC and State. If comments are generated, we would respond and add it to the report as an appendage. The second option is to take the comments and have GZA revise the report. Each approach has its pros and cons.

We are still a few weeks away from the decision point. I believe all the groups are in general agreement with the investigation, so there should not be many conflicts with the report.

**CC:** "Barbara Youngberg" <bayoungb@gw.dec.state.ny.us>, "Denise Radtke" <dmsradtke@gw.dec.state.ny.us>, "John White" <JRW1@nrc.gov>

B-75