

PMGrandGulfColpem Resource

From: Tamsen Dozier
Sent: Sunday, May 25, 2008 1:52 PM
To: GrandGulf Resource
Subject: FW: question on your response to M Tonacci on rad waste and effluent release

From: Tamsen Dozier
Sent: Sunday, May 11, 2008 3:51 PM
To: Katherine Streit; Richard Clement; Charles Hinson; Jean-Claude Dehmel
Cc: Stapp, Darby C; Terri.Miley@pnl.gov; Richard.Trab@pnl.gov; Jessie Muir; Paul Michalak; Richard Emch
Subject: FW: question on your response to M Tonacci on rad waste and effluent release

To Rad Health Reviewers for Grand Gulf:

I am forwarding discussions concerning safety review aspects of which revision of DCD gets referenced in new applications. (see below) Grand Gulf review possibly not affected, but ????

Just making sure you were aware of a potential item.

I am also using this message as an excuse to touch base with you guys since I haven't been in contact with some of you. For internal folks - I will be sending the updated schedule for Grand Gulf review in a day or so. There have been many changes due to it being a COL referencing an ESP. Also, since I am pretty certain internal reviewers will not be attending site audit (week of June 16-20), please let Rick Traub know of anything you feel might deserve some attention while he is there that week. (example - construction worker dose - making sure Rick is aware of the analysis done in the COLA FSAR that doesn't match the analysis from the ESP - which is what is being carried forward to the COLA ER. Probably "new but not significant" ? I think we mentioned to Eva, but just want to make sure Rick got that info.)

Thanks.
Tami Dozier
Env PM for GG Environ Review

From: Timothy Frye
Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2008 11:08 AM
To: Tamsen Dozier
Cc: Eric Oesterle; Mark Tonacci; Richard Raione; Paul Michalak; Stephen Lemont; William Burton
Subject: RE: question on your response to M Tonacci on rad waste and effluent release

I would expect that it has some impact on the Environmental reviews since these changes can affect concentrations of radionuclides released, how they are dispersed to the environment, and the resulting dose to the public

From: Tamsen Dozier
Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2008 9:27 AM
To: Timothy Frye
Cc: Eric Oesterle; Mark Tonacci; Richard Raione; Paul Michalak; Stephen Lemont; William Burton
Subject: question on your response to M Tonacci on rad waste and effluent release

Tim:

does this have an effect on Environmental Reviews?

Tami Dozier

From: Timothy Frye

Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2008 9:01 AM

To: Mark Tonacci; Paul Michalak; Tamsen Dozier; John Nakoski; Michael Junge; Michael Marshall; Steven Bloom; Joseph Donoghue; Peter Wilson; John Segala; Michael Snodderly; Robert Radlinski; Hossein Hamzehee; Sujit Samaddar; Kimberly Gruss; Ian Jung; Jennifer Dixon-Herrity; David Curtis; William Reckley; William Burton; Richard Raione

Cc: Thomas Bergman; Mohammed Shuaibi; Belkys Sosa; Jeffrey Cruz; Thomas Kevern; Chandu Patel; Eric Oesterle; Amy Cabbage

Subject: RE:

Mark

ESBWR DCD Rev 5 and North Anna RCOL Rev 1 will have a significant impact on radwaste processing and rad effluent release control and monitoring per chapter 11. Due to the scope and significance of these changes, I won't do any ESBWR chapter 11 work that is impacted by these upcoming changes until applications are revised to reflect DCD rev 5.

I don't know right now if I would consider a chapter 11 technically sufficient from the three applicants you mentioned below if they are not reflective of DCD rev 5 and North Anna Rev 1. But right now, I would lean towards saying ch 11 was not technically sufficient during the acceptance review. The deviation letter you described for the Victoria initial submittal may be sufficient for AR purposes, but we would need to see it's content to be sure.

From: Mark Tonacci

Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2008 7:38 AM

To: Paul Michalak; Tamsen Dozier; John Nakoski; Michael Junge; Michael Marshall; Steven Bloom; Timothy Frye; Joseph Donoghue; Peter Wilson; John Segala; Michael Snodderly; Robert Radlinski; Hossein Hamzehee; Sujit Samaddar; Kimberly Gruss; Ian Jung; Jennifer Dixon-Herrity; David Curtis; William Reckley; William Burton; Richard Raione

Cc: Thomas Bergman; Mohammed Shuaibi; Belkys Sosa; Jeffrey Cruz; Thomas Kevern; Chandu Patel; Eric Oesterle; Amy Cabbage

Subject:

Branch Chiefs,

I am soliciting your input regarding impact of Victoria, Fermi, and River Bend submitting their COLAs in September '08 based on ESBWR DCD R4 and NA R0. This is their business decision. I need to understand the impact of their decision and tell them. I do not think there will be a technical reason for not accepting the application if it is based on NA R0 because we accepted NA and GG both based on ESBWR R4. However, I am unsure if this in any way impacts the 60d acceptance review time, or your ability to provide schedule inputs to me so I can send them the letter defining the milestone schedule a month later. This issue is will be a topic of a telephone call between us and them in the next day or so. Both the applicants and I do not want to wait till the 5/13 public meeting to discuss this.

Here are the details as I know it, primarily from Victoria. They will send us the COLA 9/1 based on ESBWR DCD R4. With the Victoria initial submittal, they will include a letter telling us anywhere they are deviating from the NA R1 COLA. Sixty days later Victoria will send us a revision based on ESBWR DCD R5 (due 5/31) and NA R1 (due around 7/31) so we will have it for the start of our safety review.

Please send me your input on the impacts for acceptance review, schedule development or any other aspects that I may have missed either by email or at today's 1PM BC meeting. Thank you for your help on this short turnaround issue.

Mark Tonacci
Senior Project Manager
NRO/DNRL
Office Telephone: 301-415-4045

Hearing Identifier: Grand_Gulf_3_COL_Public
Email Number: 17

Mail Envelope Properties (01BD2A1885C88F45A12CB413DEF034104330738D4F)

Subject: FW: question on your response to M Tonacci on rad waste and effluent release
Sent Date: 5/25/2008 1:51:58 PM
Received Date: 5/25/2008 1:52:14 PM
From: Tamsen Dozier

Created By: Tamsen.Dozier@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"GrandGulf Resource" <GrandGulf.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5917	5/25/2008 1:52:14 PM

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received: