

## CCNPP3COLA PEmails

---

**From:** Quinn, Laura  
**Sent:** Monday, June 28, 2010 8:38 AM  
**To:** William Johnston  
**Cc:** June Sevilla; Paul Gunter Gunter; Michael Marriott; CCNPP3COL Resource; Biggins, James; Vrahoretis, Susan  
**Subject:** RE: CCNPP3 dEIS comment

Mr. Johnston,

I am sorry to hear you have not been feeling well and I hope you get better soon. Regarding the "generic EIS for all the new EPR nukes proposed across the US", there are no EISs issued for any other EPR that is being proposed currently. The NRC will issue an EIS for all COL applications whether it is for an EPR or any other design. All the other EPR applications were submitted to NRC a year or more after Calvert's applications and therefore are several months away from being published, if not longer. I hope this helps.

Thanks  
Laura

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

From: William Johnston [mailto:wj3@comcast.net]  
Sent: Friday, June 18, 2010 10:55 AM  
To: Quinn, Laura  
Cc: June Sevilla; Paul Gunter Gunter; Michael Marriott  
Subject: CCNPP3 dEIS comment

Hi Laura,

Thanks again, this time for printed copy of the generic EIS for nuke license renewals, and the undated page apparently concerning correction of the transcript of my statement at the March 2008 scoping meeting, which I could check out online if concerned. June Sevilla made a comment indicating she had seen such correction there.

A bit of bad news re my health preceded the May 25 meetings in Lusby for dEIS comments, and way too much time is being spent with doctors (MDS, a bone marrow/blood disorder that got Carl Sagan). There are also unfinished projects here, besides everyday maintenance. So have been distracted but still hope to prepare written comment by July 9, we'll see.

I think you already told me once, but please verify, that there was no generic EIS for all the new EPR nukes proposed across the US, like the one proposed for Calvert Cliffs, or for any other design. I guess the answer is obviously NO, since I think all such new designs are still under NRC consideration. I just want to make certain the only evaluation of clean energy alternatives is what little there is in the CCNPP3 dEIS, which was so poor as to be a joke, as Mike Marriotte of NIRS pointed out. Allowing the definition of ROI (region of interest) to be the state avoids comparison with regional and national energy solutions. It seems contrary to the spirit if not also the letter of NEPA and EISs. The NRC is in the pocket of the nuke industry, despite pretenses otherwise. Here's hoping NIRS and Beyond Nuclear can/will engage here also.

Bill Johnston

**Hearing Identifier:** CalvertCliffs\_Unit3Cola\_Public\_EX  
**Email Number:** 1418

**Mail Envelope Properties** (19D990B45D535548840D1118C451C74D5A4E9D9C0D)

**Subject:** RE: CCNPP3 dEIS comment  
**Sent Date:** 6/28/2010 8:37:54 AM  
**Received Date:** 6/28/2010 8:37:55 AM  
**From:** Quinn, Laura

**Created By:** Laura.Quinn@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"June Sevilla" <qmakeda@chesapeake.net>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Paul Gunter Gunter" <paul@beyondnuclear.org>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Michael Marriott" <nirsnet@nirs.org>  
Tracking Status: None  
"CCNPP3COL Resource" <CCNPP3COL.Resource@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Biggins, James" <James.Biggins@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Vrahoretis, Susan" <Susan.Vrahoretis@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"William Johnston" <wj3@comcast.net>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	2353	6/28/2010 8:37:55 AM

**Options**

**Priority:** Standard

**Return Notification:** No

**Reply Requested:** No

**Sensitivity:** Normal

**Expiration Date:**

**Recipients Received:**