

CCNPP3COLA PEmails

From: Steckel, James
Sent: Monday, December 06, 2010 4:49 PM
To: Miernicki, Michael; Hawkins, Kimberly; Colaccino, Joseph; Jeng, David; Arora, Surinder
Cc: CCNPP3COL Resource
Subject: RE: Requested public call for RAI 269 and 270

FYI, UniStar is still interested in a clarification call on 269 & 270.

James Steckel
Project Manager
NRC EPR Projects Branch
301 415-1026
james.steckel@nrc.gov

From: Miernicki, Michael
Sent: Monday, December 06, 2010 3:36 PM
To: Hawkins, Kimberly; Steckel, James; Colaccino, Joseph; Jeng, David; Arora, Surinder
Cc: CCNPP3COL Resource
Subject: RE: Requested public call for RAI 269 and 270

Kim and David, vice scheduling a public meeting telecon on these two RAIs at this point, it was identified that a similar question was asked in draft RAI 274 question 14.3.2-12 which has yet to have a clarification call with the applicant. We can potentially resolve the issues w/ 269 and 270 during a discussion of RAI 274.

David are you available to discuss RAI 274 this week? Please provide me some times this week when draft RAI 274 can be discussed w/ Unistar. Thanks.

Mike

Michael J. Miernicki
Sr. Project Manager
NRC/NRO/DNRL/NARP
301-415-2304

From: Hawkins, Kimberly
Sent: Friday, December 03, 2010 11:46 AM
To: Steckel, James; Colaccino, Joseph; Miernicki, Michael; Jeng, David; Arora, Surinder
Cc: CCNPP3COL Resource
Subject: RE: Requested public call for RAI 269 and 270

Does this mean there will be no public meeting?

From: Steckel, James
Sent: Friday, December 03, 2010 7:55 AM
To: Colaccino, Joseph; Miernicki, Michael; Jeng, David; Hawkins, Kimberly; Arora, Surinder
Cc: CCNPP3COL Resource
Subject: RE: Requested public call for RAI 269 and 270

UniStar has decided to respond to RAIs 269 & 270 on January 14, 2011.

Jim

James Steckel
Project Manager
NRC EPR Projects Branch
301 415-1026
james.steckel@nrc.gov

From: Colaccino, Joseph
Sent: Tuesday, November 30, 2010 3:13 PM
To: Steckel, James
Subject: FW: Requested public call for RAI 269 and 270

FYI...I like option 1 as well.

From: Jeng, David
Sent: Tuesday, November 30, 2010 1:54 PM
To: Steckel, James; Miernicki, Michael
Cc: Colaccino, Joseph; Arora, Surinder; Hawkins, Kimberly
Subject: RE: Requested public call for RAI 269 and 270

Do we really need a public meeting? What happened to the option 1 Michael Miernicki suggested?

David Jeng

From: Steckel, James
Sent: Tuesday, November 30, 2010 7:50 AM
To: Jeng, David; Miernicki, Michael
Cc: Colaccino, Joseph; Arora, Surinder; Hawkins, Kimberly
Subject: RE: Requested public call for RAI 269 and 270

I spoke with the applicant point of contact, Rob Poche, yesterday and he wants to provide suggested dates for a public meeting.

Jim Steckel

From: Jeng, David
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2010 3:52 PM
To: Miernicki, Michael
Cc: Colaccino, Joseph; Steckel, James; Arora, Surinder; Hawkins, Kimberly
Subject: RE: Requested public call for RAI 269 and 270

I agree with your option 1 suggestion.

David Jeng

From: Miernicki, Michael
Sent: Tuesday, November 23, 2010 9:25 AM
To: Jeng, David; Hawkins, Kimberly
Cc: CCNPP3COL Resource; Colaccino, Joseph; Steckel, James; Arora, Surinder
Subject: RE: Requested public call for RAI 269 and 270

Kim and David, these are RAIs that UniStar never requested a clarification call on prior to us issuing them as final. Now UniStar is arguing below that they don't want to make the NRC changes requested in the ITAAC.

We have 2 options:

- 1) Ask them to just respond to the RAI per their comments below, we deal with it, and submit a F/U RAI if we don't agree w/ their response (this is the option I recommend).
- 2) Schedule a public meeting to discuss their issues prior submittal of their response. I am reluctant to go thru the whole public meeting scheduling and noticing process etc. for what could turn out to be a very brief interaction.

What are your thoughts ?

Mike

Michael J. Miernicki
Sr. Project Manager
NRC/NRO/DNRL/NARP
301-415-2304

From: Jeng, David
Sent: Monday, November 22, 2010 5:20 PM
To: Steckel, James; Miernicki, Michael
Cc: Hawkins, Kimberly; CCNPP3COL Resource; Colaccino, Joseph
Subject: RE: Requested public call for RAI 269 and 270

We will be able to support the requested call on 12/2, 12/6 or 12/7 at 2:00 pm EST. we need a telecom bridge number for our BNL consultants to participate in the call. Thanks.

David

From: Steckel, James
Sent: Friday, November 19, 2010 1:26 PM
To: Steckel, James; Miernicki, Michael; Jeng, David
Cc: Hawkins, Kimberly; CCNPP3COL Resource; Colaccino, Joseph
Subject: RE: Requested public call for RAI 269 and 270
Importance: High

Mike, David

A suggested date and time for a public meeting with UniStar on Calvert RAIs 269 & 270 is still needed.

Jim

From: Steckel, James
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2010 4:15 PM
To: Miernicki, Michael; Jeng, David
Cc: Hawkins, Kimberly; CCNPP3COL Resource
Subject: FW: Requested public call for RAI 269 and 270

Mike, David,

Can you accommodate a public meeting with UniStar on Calvert RAIs 269 & 270 (eRAIs 5137 & 5140)? These were sent final on 11/2. The reasons for the request are presented in the email from Rob Poche, below.

Jim Steckel

From: Poche, Robert [mailto:Robert.Poche@constellation.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2010 3:00 PM
To: Steckel, James
Subject: Requested public call for RAI 269 and 270

Jim,

This is to clarify why we are requesting a conference call to discuss RAIs 269 and 270 with the NRC reviewers.

The current COLA wording, similar to the U.S. EPR DC, states that an inspection of a structure is to verify that the construction is as specified on construction drawings and deviations will be reconciled to the seismic qualification reports. In RAI 269/270, it is requested that we clarify whether an analysis for reconciling the as-built plant with structural design-basis loads will be performed, and if this will be done, clearly state that the analysis will be performed. We believe that the existing wording is sufficient to require re-analysis under those circumstances where re-analysis is required. Adding additional words adds more confusion than clarification. Re-wording makes us inconsistent with the DC, and is less specific, not more. We would like to discuss the existing COLA ITAAC wording regarding reconciliation of deviations from inspections with their respective type tests and analyses.

Robert Poche
Regulatory Affairs Project Manager
Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant Unit 3
(410) 470-5530 Constellation
(509) 528-5513 Cell
robert.poche@constellation.com
rpoche1@aol.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_Public_EX
Email Number: 1794

Mail Envelope Properties (AF843158D8D87443918BD3AA953ABF781C3D51DCAC)

Subject: RE: Requested public call for RAI 269 and 270
Sent Date: 12/6/2010 4:49:05 PM
Received Date: 12/6/2010 4:49:05 PM
From: Steckel, James

Created By: James.Steckel@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"CCNPP3COL Resource" <CCNPP3COL.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Miernicki, Michael" <Michael.Miernicki@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Hawkins, Kimberly" <Kimberly.Hawkins@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Colaccino, Joseph" <Joseph.Colaccino@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Jeng, David" <David.Jeng@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Arora, Surinder" <Surinder.Arora@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	7251	12/6/2010 4:49:05 PM

Options

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