

4/1

**Pham, Bo**

---

**From:** Pham, Bo  
**Sent:** Friday, November 06, 2009 10:48 AM  
**To:** Ennis, Rick; Holian, Brian; Screnci, Diane; Burritt, Arthur  
**Cc:** Ashley, Donnie; Eccleston, Charles; Sheehan, Neil  
**Subject:** Re: Follow-up to phone call

Brian et al,

A member of the public raised a question about the adequacy of salem/hope creek's foundation at the public meeting last night--that there was no bedrock beneath the artificial island, and they felt that this was a liquefaction concern during seismic events. We were sure that this was a design basis issue and not a part 54 question, but wasn't sure what was said by the NRC in the past.

Rick Ennis has provided the attached info regarding how we've replied to that in the past, and he also has the licensing basis as documented in their USFAR.

Not sure if that was Diane's question this morning, but that was something the staff convened about last night to see if we could get the right answer on.

Thanks, Rick!  
Sent from NRC blackberry  
Bo Pham

---

**From:** Ennis, Rick  
**To:** Jeff Keenan <Jeff.Keenan@pseg.com>  
**Cc:** Pham, Bo  
**Sent:** Fri Nov 06 09:54:28 2009  
**Subject:** Follow-up to phone call

Jeff,

As follow-up to our call this morning, attached is the letter I sent to a member of the public recently that, in part, addressed the soil liquifaction issue raised at yesterday's license renewal meeting. Bo - if you need more info on the subject, I have copies of the UFSAR sections that discuss this issue.

Also, here's the news article I mentioned regarding NJ's newly elected governor's position on cooling systems for Oyster Creek and Salem.

<http://www.courierpostonline.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=200991006030>