

Bartley, Jonathan

From: Bartley, Jonathan
Sent: Thursday, July 19, 2012 12:58 PM
To: Boska, John; Salgado, Nancy
Subject: Re: Action: Options paper for Oconee flood concerns

Probably 1 then 3 then 2. #1 is first because the CAL process is that if the licensee wants to change the commitment its up to them to do it so we are staying in process. #3 second just because less work for the Region and more efficient to do one letter than two.

This email is being sent from an NRC mobile device.

From: Boska, John
To: Bartley, Jonathan
Sent: Thu Jul 19 12:30:23 2012
Subject: RE: Action: Options paper for Oconee flood concerns

Thanks.

John Boska
Oconee Project Manager, NRR/DORL
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
301-415-2901
email: john.boska@nrc.gov

From: Bartley, Jonathan
Sent: Thursday, July 19, 2012 11:56 AM
To: Boska, John
Cc: Salgado, Nancy
Subject: RE: Action: Options paper for Oconee flood concerns

John, looks good. I can't see anything to add or change. I will think about pros and cons while I'm on leave.

Jonathan

From: Boska, John
Sent: Thursday, July 19, 2012 9:23 AM
To: Bartley, Jonathan
Cc: Salgado, Nancy
Subject: Action: Options paper for Oconee flood concerns
Importance: High

Jonathan, attached is my first draft of the options paper, which we will use to talk to our management about the path forward. Nancy has looked at it. Please let me know if we need to reword any of the options, or add others. Also, if you think of any pros and cons for each option, that is our next step. We would appreciate some feedback before you leave today. Thanks.

John Boska
Oconee Project Manager, NRR/DORL
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
301-415-2901
email: john.boska@nrc.gov