

## CCNPP3COLA NPEmails

---

**From:** Cook, Rodney [rodney.cook@unistarnuclear.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 26, 2008 3:44 PM  
**To:** John Rycyna  
**Cc:** Wrobel, George; Gibson, Gregory T  
**Subject:** Geology Acceptance Review Questions - Need for some discussion

John

In preparing responses to the Geology issues from the acceptance review questions in April, the following has been determined that I think would be prudent to discuss over the phone with the staff before we docket our response. The following summarizes those issues:

1. In response to the request to provide a more definitive conclusion of whether the CCNPP3 site is over a Triassic Basin
  - A definitive conclusion still cannot be made from the data that is available. As related to me by Bechtel, "We believe that available information is insufficient for definitively defending either interpretation"
  - The uncertainty of this conclusion has been incorporated into the seismic hazard analysis. As further related to me by Bechtel, "The EPRI (1986) source model incorporates this uncertainty with three of the six teams showing Mesozoic basins below or within 5 miles of the CCNPP, Unit 3 site. The probabilistic seismic hazard analysis presented in [FSAR] Section 2.5.2.4 incorporates the uncertainties regarding these two alternate models."

So as you see, a definitive conclusion still cannot be made, though the uncertainty of the conclusion has been considered in the seismic hazard analysis.

This is something that we should discuss further with the staff prior to our response submittal since we still can't answer the specific request.

2. Several of the figures that have been cited as "too tiny" or "illegible" can be enlarged electronically (via computer screen) to provide the resolution and legibility needed, or information that is cited as not being on figures is in actuality on the figures in some form. If the issue is that the reviewers are reviewing the COLA in hard copy, we can provide informational large size hard copy figures to be used in their review. Also, it may be that more than one figure is needed and is already available to provide the figure information requested. Please do not interpret this to say that there are not other issues with other figures; there are others that were cited with resolution or informational issues that required enhancement for viewing and/or revision to incorporate corrections or additional information, and these have been appropriately revised and prepared for electronic submittal.

Please let me know of a time when we can have the affected parties on the phone to discuss these items.

Thanks in advance

**Rod Cook**

(410) 470-3555 (Office)  
(901) 830-1956 (cell)  
[rodney.cook@unistarnuclear.com](mailto:rodney.cook@unistarnuclear.com)  
[rodmcook@msn.com](mailto:rodmcook@msn.com)

>>> This e-mail and any attachments are confidential, may contain legal, professional or other privileged information, and are intended solely for the

addressee. If you are not the intended recipient, do not use the information in this e-mail in any way, delete this e-mail and notify the sender. CEG-IP2

**Hearing Identifier:** CalvertCliffs\_Unit3Cola\_NonPublic\_EX  
**Email Number:** 368

**Mail Envelope Properties** (14237DA1B6A50E44A6C0D80FBBB96F1703822AF2)

**Subject:** Geology Acceptance Review Questions - Need for some discussion  
**Sent Date:** 9/26/2008 3:43:46 PM  
**Received Date:** 9/26/2008 3:43:48 PM  
**From:** Cook, Rodney

**Created By:** rodney.cook@unistarnuclear.com

**Recipients:**

"Wrobel, George" <George.Wrobel@unistarnuclear.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Gibson, Gregory T" <greg.gibson@unistarnuclear.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"John Rycyna" <John.Rycyna@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** EXM-OMF-11.Ceg.Corp.Net

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	2998	9/26/2008 3:43:48 PM

**Options**

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