

March 7, 2006

MEMORANDUM TO: File

FROM: Christian J. Araguas, Project Manager */RA/*
New Reactor Licensing Branch
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF FEBRUARY 2, 2006, TELEPHONE CONFERENCE
CALL WITH SYSTEM ENERGY RESOURCES INC. (SERI)
REGARDING AN EARLY SITE PERMIT AT THE GRAND GULF SITE

This memorandum documents the results of a telephone conference between the NRC staff and SERI on February 2, 2006.

A summary of the call is attached.

Attachment: As stated

Docket No. 52-009

MEMORANDUM TO: File

March 7, 2006

FROM: Christian J. Araguas, Project Manager */RA/*
New Reactor Licensing Branch
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF FEBRUARY 2, 2006, TELEPHONE CONFERENCE
CALL WITH SYSTEM ENERGY RESOURCES INC. (SERI)
REGARDING AN EARLY SITE PERMIT AT THE GRAND GULF SITE

This memorandum documents the results of a telephone conference between the NRC staff and SERI on February 2, 2006.

A summary of the call is attached.

Attachment: As stated

Docket No. 52-009

Distribution:

NRBA Rdg.

CAraguas

LDudes

JSegala

NPatel

ADAMS ACCESSION NO. ML060660123

OFFICE	PM:NRBA
NAME	CAraguas
DATE	03/07/2006

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Telephone Call Summary

Subject: Potential Hazards Along the Mississippi River
Date of Call: February 2, 2006

Participants

NRC

Christian Araguas
Laura Dudes
John Segala
Nitin Patel
Lynn Mrowca
Kazimieras Kampe
Mark Blumberg
John Mckirgan
Bret Tegeler

Applicant

George Zinke
Guy Cesare
Al Schneider

Actions

Topic

NRC

Applicant

Section 2.2 of SSAR	No Actions	Submit Supplement on February 15, 2006
---------------------	------------	--

Other Discussion

SERI discussed with the staff its plans on addressing Part 100 with respect to potential hazards to the ESP site. The applicant provided a brief summary of the type of analysis that was being conducted and what kind of information could be expected in the supplement. The staff pointed out that the approach that SERI was taking was not consistent with Regulatory Guide 1.91 but that the staff could still review an alternate methodology. The applicant agreed with the staffs comments and committed to submitting a response for the staff to review by February 15, 2006.

Attachment