



# Constellation Energy

Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station

P.O. Box 63  
Lycoming, NY 13093

December 15, 2005  
NMPE 0587

RECEIVED

2005 DEC 28 AM 9:47

RULES AND DIRECTIVES  
BRANCH  
USNRC

Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Division of Administrative Services  
Office of Administration  
Mail Stop T-6D59  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

10/16/05  
70 FR 58489  
②

**Subject:** Comments regarding the Draft Plant-Specific Supplement 24 to the Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants regarding Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Docket Nos. 50-220 and 50-410 (TAC Nos. MC3274 and MC3275)

Dear Sir:

Constellation Energy has reviewed the subject document and is providing the attached comments for your consideration when developing the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, License Renewal Application. Our review focused on technical content, and the majority of our comments identify corrections.

Sincerely,

James A. Spina  
Vice President Nine Mile Point

JAS/KES/sac  
Attachment

- cc: Ms. L.C. Fields, NRC Environmental Project Manager
- Mr. L.M. Cline, NRC Senior Resident Inspector
- Mr. J. Zappieri, Coastal Resources, NY Dept. of State
- Mr. J. Feltman, Regional Permit Administrator NYSDEC Region 7
- Mr. J.A. Nasca, Environmental Permits, NYSDEC
- Mr. P.D. Eddy, Electric Division, NYS Dept. of Public Service

E-RIDS = ADM-03

SISP Review Complete  
Template = ADM-013

Att = L. Fields (Lef)

**Review Comments on GEIS, Supplement 24  
Regarding Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station,  
Units 1 & 2**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>DSEIS Page # Line #</b>	<b>Comment(s)</b>
1	Page xxi, Line 1	Acronym 'NMP' should refer to Nine Mile Point Units 1 and 2. It is used once in Draft Supplement Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) on page 5-5, Line 31 and is in context of Nine Mile Point.
2	Page 1-7, Line 23	NMP Units 1 and 2 produce enough electricity to power 2 million homes.
3	Page 1-7, Line 25	Change reference citation (NMPNS 2000) to (NMPNS 2004) to reflect cited reference in DSEIS.
4	Page 2-14, Line 34	Value for particulates should be $2.71 \times 10^{-2}$ Ci and 1003 MBq, as documented in Attachment 2 of the following references: NMPNS 2001b and c, NMPNS 2002b and c, NMPNS 2003d and e, NMPNS 2004a and b, and NMPNS 2005a and b.
5	Page 2-15, Line 5	Unit 2 value for particulates should be $2.29 \times 10^{-3}$ and 84.7 MBq, as documented in Attachment 2 of the following references: NMPNS 2001b and c, NMPNS 2002b and c, NMPNS 2003d and e, NMPNS 2004a and b, and NMPNS 2005a and b.
6	Page 2-16, Line 39 Page 2-17, Line 1	Revise "... which can handle up to $454 \text{m}^3/\text{d}$ (120,000 gpd)" to read "... which is permitted for $454 \text{m}^3/\text{d}$ (120,000 gpd) as a 30-day average. Daily flows range from $132\text{-}908 \text{m}^3/\text{d}$ (35,000-240,000 gpd)." to be consistent with information in NMPNS 2004e.
7	Page 2-31, Lines 13-23	Reference NMPNS 2004e does not support the information presented and should be removed and/or replaced.
8	Page 2-33, Lines 2-3	The text states the Oswego River is <u>the</u> spawning area for lake sturgeon. While it has been identified in the past as a spawning area based on 1982 observations as documented in NYSDEC 2004b, it is not certain if it is still a viable spawning area. More recently, NYSDEC has identified four areas where distinct and reproducing populations remain (St. Lawrence River downstream of Massena, Niagara River above and downstream of the Falls and the Grasse River in St. Lawrence County as indicated in a NYSDEC 2003 press release [ <a href="http://www.dec.state.ny.us/website/reg6/press/2003/6ro322.html">http://www.dec.state.ny.us/website/reg6/press/2003/6ro322.html</a> ]).
9	Page 2-34, Line 23	The date 1070 should be changed to 1970 as documented in reference NMPNS 2004e. Also, Provence should be changed to Province.

**Review Comments on GEIS, Supplement 24  
Regarding Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station,  
Units 1 & 2**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>DSEIS Page # Line #</b>	<b>Comment(s)</b>
10	Page 2-35, Line 11	Dreussena should be Dreissena as documented in reference NMPNS 2004e.
11	Page 2-38, Lines 18-21	Reference NMPNS 2004e does not support the information presented and should be removed and/or replaced.
12	Page 2-40, Line 20	The date of the survey should be changed from 1979 to 1976 as documented in NMPC 1985.
13	Page 2-41, Line 4	'The FWS' should be changed to 'the FWS' where it occurs.
14	Page 2-43, Line 25	Suggest adding the following: 'Occurrence at the Nine Mile Point site or associated rights-of-way has not been documented.' as supported by reference NMPNS 2004e.
15	Page 2-47 Lines 38-39	The maximum organ dose is incorrect. Revise value to 0.0000073 mSv (0.00073 mrem) as documented in the references NMPNS 2005a and 2005b.
16	Page 2-48, Line 20	The range for the maximum organ dose is incorrect. Revise the values to $8.03 \times 10^{-7}$ mSv and $4.0 \times 10^{-5}$ mSv ( $8.03 \times 10^{-5}$ mrem and $4.0 \times 10^{-3}$ mrem) as documented in the references NMPNS 2001b and c, NMPNS 2002b and c, NMPNS 2003d and e, NMPNS 2004a and b, NMPNS 2005a and b.
17	Page 2-48, Lines 23-24	The maximum organ dose presented (0.23 mrem) is the calculated average, not the maximum organ dose, for the period 2000 to 2004 (References NMPNS 2001b and c, NMPNS 2002b and c, NMPNS 2003d and e, NMPNS 2004a and b, NMPNS 2005a and b). The text should be corrected to so note.
18	Page 2-51, Line 12	"Independence Station" should be capitalized as it is a proper name.
19	Page 2-53, Table 2-10 and Page 2-52, Line 25	Percent of total acres for Oswego County in the land use categories of "Public" and "Commercial and Industrial" are not documented in Reference NMPNS 2004e. An additional reference is needed.

**Review Comments on GEIS, Supplement 24  
Regarding Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station,  
Units 1 & 2**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>DSEIS Page # Line #</b>	<b>Comment(s)</b>
20	Page 2-53 Line 32	Height of the cooling tower is 541 feet as documented in reference NMPNS 2004e.
21	Page 2-58, Line 5-14 Page 2-59, Table 2-13	Footnote should be added to Table 2-13 explaining conversion of actual dollars as found in the cited reference to '2005 dollars' used in the text and table.
22	Page 2-58, Line 12	Data for the year 2001 is not in the cited reference, NMPNS 2004e. If the 2001 data is available, add appropriate reference.
23	Page 2-63, Line 9	Fitzpatrick Nuclear Power Plant is no longer owned by the New York Power Authority. The text should be corrected to reflect ownership by Entergy.
24	Page 2-67, Lines 7-8	Information is needed to complete NOAA references 2004b and 2004c.
25	Page 2-69, Lines 11-12	Reference NMPC 1975 appears to be a duplicate of NMPC 1976 and should be deleted or corrected. Associated change will be required on page 2-27, Line 15. Also, delete 'West' from 'West Syracuse.'
26	Page 2-72, Lines 10-11	Reference RREDC 2004a appears to be incomplete. Additional information needed.
27	Page 2-73, Line 17	Reference EPA 2004 appears to be incomplete. Additional information needed.
28	Page 4-12, Lines 20-21	Clarify that the Phase II performance standards are designed to significantly reduce entrainment losses due to plant operation from a baseline condition. This fact is important because NMP already has some "credits" against the baseline condition as defined in the Phase II rule.
29	Page 4-13, Line 34	The text states that there is a discharge canal. Given that there is no discharge canal at Nine Mile Point, please revise.

**Review Comments on GEIS, Supplement 24  
Regarding Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station,  
Units 1 & 2**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>DSEIS Page # Line #</b>	<b>Comment(s)</b>
30	Page 4-15, Lines 29-30	Clarify that the Phase II performance standards are designed to significantly reduce entrainment losses due to plant operation from a baseline condition. This fact is important because NMP already has "credits" against the baseline condition as defined in the Phase II rule.
31	Page 4-16, Lines 1-12	Percent of Individuals Collected values appear to be averages of percent per year. Given the variation in total numbers impinged each year, a better representation of the percentages would be to divide the total number impinged of each species by the total impinged. For example, the latter calculation results in 82% for alewife and 7% for smelt compared to 60% and 20% as stated on page 4-16.
32	Page 4-16, Line 13	"Proceeding" should be revised to "Following."
33	Page 4-16, Line 19	Over the period discussed (1972-1983), rainbow smelt were also the most abundant species impinged in 1982, in addition to 1979 as documented in reference NMPNS 2004b.
34	Page 4-16, Line 22	As documented in reference NMPNS 2004b, the highest number of fish impinged was in 1973 rather than 1976. Greater than 5 million fish were estimated to be impinged during that year. Please revise.
35	Page 4-18, Line 6	As documented in reference 2004b, large die-offs of alewife typically occur during winter, not spring. Please revise.
36	Page 4-20, Line 34	Cited reference NMPNS 2004b does not support information presented in Lines 27-32 regarding tree trimming, herbicide use, mowing, and use of buffer strips. Please revise to clarify the source of this information.
37	Page 4-24, Lines 18-24	Cited reference NMPNS 2004b does not fully support statements on Lines 20-23 indicating that field measurements demonstrated compliance with NESC and that Nine Mile Point transmission lines are below the size of concern for induced shock. Suggest revising to indicate that compliance with the NESC code was demonstrated by field measurements and computer analyses, and deleting sentence regarding size of transmission lines.

**Review Comments on GEIS, Supplement 24  
Regarding Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station,  
Units 1 & 2**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>DSEIS Page # Line #</b>	<b>Comment(s)</b>
38	Page 4-32, Line 14	Text should be changed to reflect that tax payments to the City have fallen from 56 percent to 43 percent over the period from 1995 to 2000. Data was not available for the year 2001 in the cited reference, NMPNS 2004b. Or, if data available, add appropriate reference.
39	Page 4-37, Figure 4-1	Shaded areas on Figure 4-1 do not appear to correspond to areas noted in text of page 4-38 as having minority populations. No minority populations were identified in Oswego or Seneca Counties in the text and there are some depicted on the figure. Jefferson County is noted as having minority populations, yet none are apparent on the figure. The minority populations depicted on the figure in Cayuga County do not appear to correspond to those in the cited reference NMPNS 2004b.
40	Page 4-39, Figure 4-2	Shaded areas on Figure 4-2 do not appear to correspond to areas noted in text on page 4-38 as having low-income populations. The low-income populations depicted on the figure in Cayuga, Oswego, Oneida, and Jefferson Counties do not appear to correspond to those in the cited reference NMPNS 2004b.
41	Page 8-8, Line 8	Mention is made of the "Lakeview Subdivision immediately west" of NMP (also shown on Figure 2-3). This area is now occupied by the Ontario Bible Conference Camp, which is mentioned on page 2-1, Line 23 and shown on Figure 2-2 of the DSEIS. NRC may wish to revise this sentence to clarify this point.
42	Page 8-14, Lines 16-17 Page 8-10, Line 13	The DSEIS states particulate emissions estimate data as 181 tons PM <sub>10</sub> . The correct data are 181 tons total (filterable) and 41 tons PM <sub>10</sub> (NMPNS 2004, page 7-35).
43	Page 8-19, Line 1	The assumption of a 40-year operating life as stated here is not supported by the applicant's ER (NMPNS 2004), which is cited as the source of assumptions and numerical values in Section 8.2.2 unless otherwise indicated (page 8-18, Lines 32-33). Consider resolving the inconsistency by using the ER assumption (25 years) or citing another appropriate source.

**Review Comments on GEIS, Supplement 24  
Regarding Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station,  
Units 1 & 2**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>DSEIS Page # Line #</b>	<b>Comment(s)</b>
44	Page 8-19, Line 20	The estimated land requirement for the gas-fired alternative of 1600 acres is inconsistent with the 110 acre estimate cited elsewhere in this section (page 8-23, Line 12) and NMP ER (NMPNS 2004).
45	Page 8-34, Line 25	The statement that no groundwater is currently used for NMP operation could be viewed as inconsistent with the fact that a dewatering system is employed for NMP Unit 2 (see Section 4.5.1 of the DSEIS). Acknowledgement of the dewatering system here should be considered for clarity.
46	Page 8-46, Lines 6-8	For clarity and consistency with the analysis presented in DSEIS Section 8.2.5.10 and in the NMP ER Section 7.2.3.2 (NMPNS 2004), the phrase "retirement of other Constellation Energy Group generating units" should be replaced with "retirement of other generating units directly controlled by owners of Nine Mile Point".
47	Page 8-48, Line 7, Page 8-50, Line 1	Adverse impacts for Nine Mile Point Site alternative in the Ecology and Aesthetics impact category in this table are greater than those presented in Table 8-3, yet the primary contributor to impact is a comparable but smaller capacity gas-fired combined-cycle plant. This apparent inconsistency in the DSEIS should be resolved.
48	Page 8-52	The NMP ER (NMPNS 2004) is cited in Chapter 8 (e.g., page 8-7), but is not included in the list of references in Section 8.4.
49	Page 9-8 Lines 8, 30	Adverse impacts for Combination of Alternatives Nine Mile Point Site alternative in the Ecology and Aesthetics impact categories in this table are greater than those presented in Table 8-3, yet the primary contributor to impact is a comparable but smaller capacity gas-fired combined-cycle plant. NRC may wish to consider revising to resolve this apparent inconsistency in the DSEIS.
50	Page 9-8, Line 29)	Adverse impacts for New Nuclear Generation Alternate Site in the Aesthetics impact category in this table are different than those presented in Table 8-5, page 8-33. This inconsistency in the DSEIS should be resolved.
51	Page G-1, Line 16	Revise the initial number of potential SAMA candidates from 223 to 220 to be consistent with Chapter 5 of the DSEIS.
52	Page G-5, Line 2	Correct $7.5 \times 10^{-5}$ to $7.5 \times 10^{-6}$ .

**Review Comments on GEIS, Supplement 24  
Regarding Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station,  
Units 1 & 2**

<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>DSEIS Page # Line #</b>	<b>Comment(s)</b>
53	Page G- 17, Line 9	Revise value of CDF from 23 to 2.3 (or 2 considering significant digits) used in table to be consistent with the NMP ER (NMPNS 2004).