

Pham, Bo

2/6

From: Pham, Bo
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2010 5:32 PM
To: Eccleston, Charles
Subject: ACTION: Salem & HC SEIS

Charles, lots of actions to follow-up on here...

I haven't gone over the list of consultation letters for App D yet, but here are some comments:

1. Why are we putting the 3 letters to PSEG in there? This is a list of our correspondence with other agencies, not the applicant's.
2. You have the same ADAMS accession numbers for a lot of the letters; upon investigation, I realized that it was the package accession numbers. But, why are you putting it all under one package with the title of "Fish and Wildlife Consultation Response..."? They all have their individual accession numbers, and should not be in the same package when some letters are regarding CZMA, not Fish & Wildlife.

Also, I asked for a summary of the scope & scale of the comments received for Salem & HC (e.g., we received x number of comments, from the following org/people, the main issues of concern are x, y, z, etc.). Please provide this for me as well.

Please also figure out a way to keep track of my tasks/requests for you to take action. I will try to clearly mark the email subject lines with "ACTION" to make sure you don't miss them, but I need you to follow-up on them rather than having me ask them repeatedly. Thanks.

Bo Pham
Chief, Projects Branch 1
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
301-415-8450

D-1001