

**From:** Stacey Imboden  
**To:** Jim.knorr@nmcco.com; Kris.mckinney@we-energies.com  
**Date:** 7/30/04 2:17PM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Re: FW: Pt Beach - Issue Realignment

Kris and Jim,

We came across an issue in the ER that was identified as Cat 2, but it should really be a Cat 1 issue for Point Beach. See attached email between NRC and LANL.

Thanks,  
Stacey

**From:** Stacey Imboden  
**To:** Allyn Pratt  
**Date:** 7/30/04 1:26PM  
**Subject:** Re: FW: Pt Beach - Issue Realignment

I agree what what you have presented here. The standard is based on the usage, not the capacity of the wells. This should be a category 1 issue for Point Beach. Let's reflect that in Appendix F and I will notify NMC about the error.

Thank you for picking up on that!! Great job!

>>> "Allyn Pratt" <pratt\_a@lanl.gov> 07/30/04 10:24AM >>>

Stacey - While preparing the draft Appendix F for Pt Beach (Issues not in Scope), I have found an error in disposition of two issues that are related.

The ER identified that the Category 1 issue "Ground-water use conflicts ... for plants that use < 100gpm" was NOT APPLICABLE

The ER identified that the Category 2 issue "Ground-water use conflicts ... for plants that use > 100gpm" was APPLICABLE

On review of the ER, page 2-11 identifies that the plant uses about 6.5 gpm (on average). Similarly on page 4-11 the ER identifies that while the plant has a capacity of >100 gpm, they only use 6.5 gpm (average). The plant interpreted that capacity was the metric. However, 10 CFR Part 51, Subpart A Appendix B Table B-1 clearly identified that use is the appropriate metric. If you agree with this assessment, we suggest that the plant be informed and we will execute the change in Appendix F of the draft SEIS. Please call if you have any questions.

**CC:** Paul Schumann; Ted B. Doerr