

CCNPP3COLA NPEmails

From: Biggins, James
Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2009 12:22 PM
To: Quinn, Laura
Subject: FW: Conference call follow-up

From: William Johnston [mailto:wj3@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, September 11, 2009 5:12 PM
To: Biggins, James
Cc: Peter Vogt; Bruce Gordon; James Mason; Tom Deming; Paul Gunter
Subject: Conference call follow-up

James,

This follows our conference call Wed. Sept. 9 with Laura Quinn, the new manager of the eis for CCNPP3 and her supervisor Robert Schaaf (do I have his name right?) and my email later that day to others but copying you.

During that call I was relieved to learn that the Jan. 2008 copy of Scientific American that I surrendered at the March 2008 scoping meeting in Lusby was indeed in the record, if that is the right term to use here since there appears to be no reference to any particular part of that magazine in the official transcript of my comments, as I stated on the phone with you three, even though I expressly referred to it during my comments at the scoping meeting when I held it over my head and asked "What's wrong with this?" in reference to the article on the Grand Solar Plan.

Mr. Schaaf agreed in our phone call to check the transcript and get back to me on that point. Do I understand this correctly, that he will be getting back to me on this? Later in the phone call you asked that I communicate with you on these matters, i.e., not through them. So should I be expecting this info from Mr. Schaaf to come through you?

In the phone conference I mentioned I had responded to an email sometime after that March 2008 scoping meeting informing us commenters that the transcript was available on contacting some person which I did and eventually got a link from them and did finally succeed in seeing the transcript of my testimony. At the time I was very disappointed with the transcript, since many of my points were garbled by the poor quality of the transcription, with many important words substituted with other words so that meaning was significantly compromised. I prepared comments and corrections, and submitted them as part of a reply to I believe the email address that initially notified me of the availability of the transcript, but I never heard anything more. I remember thinking, why do they send us stuff from an email address you cannot reply to. Then my computer crashed, and I lost all that.

I could go on a rant about how unhelpful the transcript and your other materials and procedures are for public participation in these matters, but no time now. Suffice it to say for now that I'm confident the law and regs require more.

I will be submitting next week at least one issue within the narrow category of comment you said "might" receive consideration at this time, namely involving an environmental impact related to the new information required from applicants that caused the delay, if I understand correctly. I will also be presenting the broader issue, that a new scoping meeting is required in view of the passage of time and the rapid developments in areas basic to a fair eis evaluation. The eis cannot be allowed to be potentially handicapped by being based on an out-of-date scoping input. Of course the nukers would like to proceed without any update, but there is also the interest of the public for a viable and effective eis, particularly in this matter at this juncture in the nation's energy and environmental course. Who knows, maybe a letter to the group that oversees eis matters would be in order, the Council on Environmental Quality I believe it is called, with offices in the White House? Or maybe we need to quickly define issues and proceed to court ASAP? Dr. Peter Vogt and Bruce Gordon will join me in this effort, as they have in Maryland PSC case #9127.

Thank you for the conference call, I believe it has substantially helped us to move ahead with this matter. The email I copied you on later that Wed. has some significant attachments, including the coupling of mid-west wind and compressed air energy storage (CAES) alternative just reported by Dr. James Mason. Again, that needs to be one of the alternatives addressed in the eis.

Any comment is appreciated. Bill Johnston

Hearing Identifier: CalvertCliffs_Unit3Cola_NonPublic_EX
Email Number: 2532

Mail Envelope Properties (BB882299B277DB4C9C9A613B507A6F601DDC6983C9)

Subject: FW: Conference call follow-up
Sent Date: 9/16/2009 12:21:44 PM
Received Date: 9/16/2009 12:21:46 PM
From: Biggins, James

Created By: James.Biggins@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Quinn, Laura" <Laura.Quinn@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4190	9/16/2009 12:21:46 PM

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