

From: Guzman, Richard - NRR
To: Yerokun, Jimi; Elkins, Scott
Cc: Schaperow, Jason; Burnell, Scott; Hughey, John; Cotton, Karen
Subject: RE: SOARCA documents for review by Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station
Date: Thursday, April 01, 2010 11:13:00 AM

Jimi - I appreciate the comment, and look forward to continuing the same 'good practice' in our comms.

Scott - I'm still waiting to get word from the PMs that the information has been successfully transmitted/received.

Also, I won't be on the call for today's team meeting. Please send me an email if there's anything significant that I missed.

Thanks,
Rich

From: Yerokun, Jimi
Sent: Thursday, April 01, 2010 11:05 AM
To: Elkins, Scott; Guzman, Richard
Cc: Schaperow, Jason; Burnell, Scott; Hughey, John
Subject: RE: SOARCA documents for review by Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station

Thanks Scott and Rich for your patience and efforts with this. I like the cautionary statement about not making the draft documents public and that it may further change. Very well put and I hope the licensees properly grasp it as well.

Scott - I'm sure you plan to mention this at the team meeting today.

Rich - I hope we use the approach we used in the past to coordinate any questions/feedback from the licensees (i.e., no piece meal back and forth with the licensees, all thru NRR PM and SOARCA PM). It was effective.

Jimi T. Yerokun

From: Elkins, Scott
Sent: Thursday, April 01, 2010 9:09 AM
To: Guzman, Richard
Cc: Yerokun, Jimi; Schaperow, Jason; Burnell, Scott; Hughey, John
Subject: SOARCA documents for review by Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station

Rich,

Please find attached two SOARCA documents. These attachments include sections of the SOARCA NUREG for purposes of performing a fact check/error check by Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station personnel. The first document is a compiled collection of 13 pages extracted from the SOARCA Summary document which contains individual pages with Peach Bottom specific information to be checked for accuracy. The second attachment is the Peach Bottom Integrated Analysis document (Appendix A, 179 pages) in its entirety to be fact checked/error checked.

As we discussed in our teleconference with the licensee our interests in their review are to check the document for accuracy of facts and statements that pertain to plant specific information as stated in the documents. Consistent with the informal agreement RES made with the licensee when it volunteered to participate, we are it to review the draft NUREG for any plant-specific factual errors only. Additionally, the licensee receives this information in its pre-decisional state which is not ready for

M/85

release to the public. These documents are DRAFT and will be edited further and may include changes to how results are reported, before they are released by the NRC. It should be emphasized that this document should be controlled in such a manner as to limit its distribution to only those personnel necessary to complete the fact check/error check, as discussed in our teleconference with the licensee last week. Under no circumstances are they to be released to the public.

RES personnel are available throughout the review period for discussions/questions with the licensee regarding this request.

Regards,
Scott Elkins