PMSummerColpEM Resource

From: Sebrosky, Joseph
Sent: Friday, August 27, 2010 10:55 AM
To: 'amonroe@scana.com'; 'jmgiles@scana.com'
Cc: Cook, Christopher; Karas, Rebecca; See, Kenneth; Munson, Clifford; Vega, Frankie; Thompson, Jenise; Stirewalt, Gerry; PMSummerColpEM Resource; Sheikh, Mina; Weber, Carl; Joshi, Ravindra; Wilson, Jerry
Subject: request for phone call to answer questions from recent Summer geology site visit

Amy and Julie,

The purpose of this email is to request a phone call to discuss the questions below that have been raised as a result of observations made during the recent geology site visit. Only the first question below is directly related to section 2.5 of the FSAR. The rest of the questions are based on observations made of the general construction activities. Please let me know when you can support a call on these questions. My intention is to document the results of the phone call in a public phone call summary.

Thanks,

Joe

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>questions>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

1) Could you confirm that the blasting techniques will only be used to remove the rock above foundation level, and the applicant will ensure that the blasting will have no impact on the underlying rock?

2) Has or will the large modular fabrication building be analyzed as a missile hazard for Unit 2 and 3 operations? The staff does not believe that this large building is described in the FSAR. If the fabrication building will still be in use when Unit 2 is scheduled for fuel load, it may be necessary to evaluate this building as a missile hazard.

3) Has an analysis been done of the Unit 2 and 3 nuclear island basemats to support the construction sequence envisioned by SCE&G? The staff understands that large lifts (around 1500 tons) are envisioned for the construction sequence for Unit 2 and Unit 3. What analysis, if any, has been done by SCE&G to support these lifts to ensure that they do not overstress the nuclear island basemat.

4) Has a review been done of FSAR section 1.10, “construction impacts” to determine if changes are needed to support the use of the large crane that will be used at the site? It was described to the staff that the boom of the crane will be approximately 500 feet in length. There is some discussion in FSAR section 1.10 of the distance between the centerline of the plants based on assumptions about the crane height. Is the description in the FSAR consistent with the large heavy-lift crane that is being procured for the site?

Hearing Identifier: VCSummer_COL_Public
Email Number: 338

Mail Envelope Properties (36CF286628C20846A68047F2463233093311AE2DA7)

Subject: request for phone call to answer questions from recent Summer geology site visit
Sent Date: 8/27/2010 10:54:33 AM
Received Date: 8/27/2010 10:54:35 AM
From: Sebrosky, Joseph

Created By: Joseph.Sebrosky@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Cook, Christopher" <Christopher.Cook@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Karas, Rebecca" <Rebecca.Karas@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"See, Kenneth" <Kenneth.See@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Munson, Clifford" <Clifford.Munson@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Vega, Frankie" <Frankie.Vega@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Thompson, Jenise" <Jenise.Thompson@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Stirewalt, Gerry" <Gerry.Stirewalt@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"PMSummerColpEM Resource" <PMSummerColpEM.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Sheikh, Mina" <Mina.Sheikh@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Weber, Carl" <Carl.Weber@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Joshi, Ravindra" <Ravindra.Joshi@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Wilson, Jerry" <Jerry.Wilson@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"'amonroe@scana.com'" <amonroe@scana.com>
Tracking Status: None
"'jmgiles@scana.com'" <jmgiles@scana.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	2144	8/27/2010 10:54:35 AM

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