

PMFermiCOLPEm Resource

From: Rivera-Varona, Aida
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2009 3:48 PM
To: Tonacci, Mark; Hale, Jerry; Lipscomb, George
Cc: FermiCOL Resource; Nakoski, John
Subject: RE: Fermi 3 QA

Hi Mark,

Sorry, I got your message today, and I have been in meetings all day.

Please let's get together and discuss this further.

We still need to have this meeting. Based on our availability to support it, it must this month.

Let me know when you have time to meet with us.

Also, George will be issuing a memo from John to Jeff to document the issue and the need for the meeting.

Thanks!
Aida

-----Original Message-----

From: Tonacci, Mark
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2009 8:18 AM
To: Rivera-Varona, Aida; Hale, Jerry; Lipscomb, George
Cc: FermiCOL Resource
Subject: RE: Fermi 3 QA

Aida,

Tried to call you on this yesterday. They do not have a Fermi QA program for design - that is why they did not send it to you. They decide if the work is safety related and if it is send it to Black and Veatch and use the B&V program. The actual mechanics I believe have changed several times over the past 2 yrs via different contracts they had in place that invoke proposals with cost information embedded in them.

It does seem like going there will work better just because I believe that sooner or later, what you need to see will be in their contract that have sensitive pricing information. By the way, B&V was used by River Bend to do the geotech work and Entergy (not DTE) did some audits of B&V.

My cell has died today. When I get back this afternoon, time permitting, I will call you and we can discuss. I think this still needs careful looking into.

Mark

From: Rivera-Varona, Aida
Sent: Monday, June 08, 2009 3:30 PM
To: Hale, Jerry; Lipscomb, George
Cc: Tonacci, Mark
Subject: RE: Fermi 3 QA

Jerry,

I can see why they might think that some of the documents might get into the public, but they need to be clear that based on the regulation they need to provide in the docket QA programs for design, fabrication and construction activities. We are not talking about the contract documents, and we don't want or we are not expecting to see them as part of the meeting. The only thing that we need them to come and explain is the quality program that they are implementing. Also, it might be beneficial to mention them that we are thinking on performing an inspection later where we will take a look at the contract documents in detail (and where the documents will not need to be made public).

The message that we want to give them is that:

- They need to explain us (they not need to show us documents on how they are doing it at this time) how they are meeting the requirement of 52.79(a)(25). They need to explain which DTE program was used for all design activities performed in support of the FSAR (e.g., sitting, geotechnical, departures from the DCD). The application is not providing an applicant's QA program for design activities in support of the application as required by 52.79(a)(25).
- This issue puts into question the quality of the overall application.

Let me know if you have any other question.

Thanks!
Aida

From: Hale, Jerry
Sent: Monday, June 08, 2009 3:08 PM
To: Rivera-Varona, Aida; Lipscomb, George
Cc: Tonacci, Mark
Subject: Fermi 3 QA

Aida / George,

Just a heads up. Just got off the phone with Peter Smith, DTE regarding QA public meeting. Peter has some concerns about having a public meeting and some of their contract documents potentially getting into the public. Mark with meet with Peter Tuesday at Fermi during the Hydrology Audit to discuss Peter's concerns in more detail.

Jerry Hale
Project Manager
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of New Reactors
ESBWR/ABWR Branch 1
(301) 415-8148

Hearing Identifier: Fermi_COL_Public
Email Number: 405

Mail Envelope Properties (1D658D167B82F54585A33C1A31821B68295CCD4B1A)

Subject: RE: Fermi 3 QA
Sent Date: 6/10/2009 3:47:55 PM
Received Date: 6/10/2009 3:47:56 PM
From: Rivera-Varona, Aida

Created By: Aida.Rivera-Varona@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"FermiCOL Resource" <FermiCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Nakoski, John" <John.Nakoski@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Tonacci, Mark" <Mark.Tonacci@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Hale, Jerry" <Jerry.Hale@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Lipscomb, George" <George.Lipscomb@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3698	6/10/2009 3:47:56 PM

Options

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