

Bauer, Laurel

From: Rebecca Karas - NR0
Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2007 4:57 PM
To: Goutam Bagchi; Annie Kammerer
Cc: Jon Ake; Laurel Bauer; Sarah Gonzalez; Nilesh Chokshi; Rosemary Hogan; Andrew Murphy; Clifford Munson; Yong Li; John Tappert; Steve OConnor
Subject: Re: Sunsetting of RG 1.165

The discussion we had with Nilesh is that for GG and North Anna, they could still obviously continue to follow it as an "alternative"....and they already have ESPs, so unless they change anything at COL, they wouldn't even need to revisit it. Is there some other reason (other than North Anna and Grand Gulf?).

>>> Goutam Bagchi 11/27/2007 4:27 PM >>>

In Grand Gulf ESP the applicant used RG 1.165 and we approved the permit with that understanding. I think that RG 1.165 needs to be out there instead of being withdrawn completely. It is my recollection that we have said that both approaches - 1.165 and 1.208 - are acceptable. Let's be careful about this. Thanks, Goutam

>>> Ann Kammerer 11/27/2007 3:38 PM >>>

Becky,

I agree with your assessment that we should sunset RG1.165 now that RG1.208 is now available. It seems like a really good idea.

Please send a request to Rosemary to get it on our to do list. I'm totally over booked for the next couple months, but as of December we have two new graduates of the NSPDP program who can do the paperwork. My sense from your email is that there is not any specific urgency, and so doing it over the next couple months is OK. Is that the case?

Regards,
Annie

>>> Rebecca Karas 11/27/2007 3:24 PM >>>

Annie,

Nilesh, Cliff and I have been discussing the continued need for RG 1.165, and in light of the fact that we have RG 1.208 in place now, we believe that RG 1.165 can be sunsetted. Could you please add it to the list of RG actions for the RG update to sunset this one, or does anyone have any objections? Is there anything we still need from this RG that would need to be incorporated anywhere (we can't think of anything).

Becky