

**South Texas Project Units 3 and 4 COL
Site Audit and Scoping Trip Report
February 3-8, 2008**

Daily Summary

02/03/08 (Sunday) – Travel Day

All Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and PNNL staff traveled to Bay City, Texas.

02/04/08 (Monday) – Morning

PNNL staff met briefly at 7:30 a.m. at the Bay City Best Western to discuss site audit logistics, guidelines for interactions with South Texas Project Nuclear Operating Company (STPNOC) and their contractors, and ground rules for removal of informational materials from the STPNOC office.

The site audit began at 8:30 a.m. at STPNOC's Center for Energy Development (CED). Greg Gibson, STPNOC Manager of Regulatory Affairs, led an entrance meeting which included introductions of STPNOC and their contractors, NRC, and PNNL staff and an overview of site audit activities and objectives. Paul Kallan, NRC EPM, provided a brief presentation of the NRC's expectations for the site audit and the role of PNNL on behalf of the NRC. A list of entrance meeting attendees is provided in Table 1.

Following the entrance meeting, STPNOC personnel provided NRC and PNNL staff with a bus tour of the existing STP site. The following facility features were observed during the site tour: stop #1 - primary and secondary meteorological towers, groundwater wells, transmission corridors, wetlands, and radiation effluent monitoring program (REMP) sampling stations; stop #2 - essential cooling pond, nuclear support center, heavy haul road, and groundwater wells; stop #3 - intake and barge slip, including upland dredged material disposal areas and lowland habitat; stop #4 - main cooling reservoir embankment, intakes for Units 1 and 2, and sanitary waste and potable water treatment area; stop #5 - location of the new intake structure, construction material laydown areas, and construction footprints; and stop #6 - Units 3 and 4 footprint, including the steam generator storage mausoleum and the new switchyard.

After the bus tour of the STP site, STPNOC personnel and NRC and PNNL staff reconvened at the CED for break-out sessions for various technical disciplines. Staff in each discipline initiated technical discussions with their STPNOC counterparts and contractors. A list of STPNOC representatives, contractor personnel, and State and Federal agency staff who attended these technical discussions throughout the duration of the site audit is provided in Table 2.

02/04/08 – Afternoon

The following onsite and offsite excursions took place during the afternoon of 02/04/08:

- STPNOC contractors led ecology staff on a boat tour of the Colorado River. The tour included observation of the intake and discharge structures, shorelines, and the barge slip.
- STPNOC contractors led meteorology staff on a tour of the meteorological tower and associated instrumentation.
- STPNOC contractors led health physics staff on a tour of the old steam generator storage facility and associated dosimetry instrumentation locations for Units 1 and 2.
- STPNOC contractors led ecology and hydrology staff on an inspection of non-riverine wetlands and drainage ditches and various upland areas.
- Socioeconomics staff attended meetings with community representatives offsite. A list of community representatives who met with the staff on each day of the site audit is provided in Table 3.

Staff who were not engaged in the above-noted tours or offsite meetings were participating in technical discussions with STPNOC and their contractors at the CED.

Paul Kallan conducted a daily summary meeting at the CED for NRC and PNNL staff. Each technical discipline presented a summary of their break-out sessions including any issues that arose during the discussions or tours. Potential actions to resolve issues were discussed.

02/05/08 (Tuesday) – Morning

Staff continued technical discussions with STPNOC and their contractors at the CED. Socioeconomics staff attended all-day meetings with community representatives offsite.

Ecology and hydrology staff met with representatives from several resource agencies: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE); National Marine Fisheries Service; Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ); Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD). The group held discussions concerning water permits, dredging permits, wetlands delineation, threatened and endangered species, and essential fish habitat. There were additional discussions about the classification of various water bodies as “Waters of the U.S.” and “Waters of the State”. The group addressed how implementation of the Limited Work Authorization could potentially change the Memorandum of Understanding between USACE and NRC. The agencies also considered whether USACE could become a cooperating agency in the production of NRC’s EIS in order to address water issues comprehensively rather than through a separate permitting review process.

02/05/08 – Afternoon and Evening

Staff continued technical discussions with STPNOC and their contractors at the CED.

An open house was held by the NRC at the Bay City Civic Center from 12:30 to 1:30 p.m. in preparation for the afternoon public scoping meeting held from 1:30 to 4:30 p.m. and a second open house was held by the NRC from 6:00 to 7:00 p.m. in preparation for the public scoping meeting held from 7:00 to 10:00 p.m. The NRC staff gave a presentation at each meeting

covering the review process for the STPNOC COL application. The NRC staff presentations were followed by open public comment sessions. Both public scoping meetings were attended by PNNL staff.

Cristina Guerrero, NRC, conducted the daily summary meeting due to the fact that Paul Kallan was participating in the afternoon public scoping meeting. Outstanding issues that arose during the technical discussions and tours and were not resolved were presented by staff. Actions to resolve issues were discussed.

02/06/08 (Wednesday) – Morning

The following onsite and offsite excursions took place the morning of 02/06/08:

- STPNOC contractors led NRC and PNNL cultural resources staff on a boat tour of the Colorado River. The tour covered the intakes, the barge slip, and shorelines.
- NRC and PNNL cultural resources staff took a self-guided driving tour around the Bay City area and visited points of local historical and cultural interest.
- Socioeconomics staff attended all-day meetings with community representatives offsite.

PNNL staff who were not engaged in the above tours and offsite meetings continued technical discussions with STPNOC and their contractors at the CED.

02/06/08 – Afternoon

Staff continued technical discussions with STPNOC and their contractors at the CED. Staff who had completed their audit reviews left Bay City and returned home.

Paul Kallan conducted a daily summary meeting for NRC and PNNL staff. Outstanding issues that arose during the technical discussions and tours but that were not resolved were presented by staff. Actions to resolve issues were discussed.

02/07/08 (Thursday) – Morning

Socioeconomics staff attended all-day meetings with community representatives offsite.

Staff continued and finalized technical discussions with STPNOC and their contractors at the CED. The remainder of PNNL technical staff, with the exception of socioeconomics staff who continued their community visits, completed their audit reviews, left Bay City and returned home.

02/07/08 – Afternoon

William Burton, NRC, Paul Kallan, and Nona Diediker, PNNL, conducted a close out meeting with Greg Gibson and other STPNOC staff and their contractors at the CED. A table documenting the status of staff's information needs was presented to STPNOC. Information needs which were not fulfilled or only partially fulfilled during the site audit were discussed. STPNOC agreed to fulfill as many of these outstanding information needs as possible and

submit them in writing to the NRC by the end of February, 2008. It was understood that any outstanding information needs which were not completely fulfilled by the end of February would be subsequently submitted by NRC to STPNOC as formal requests for additional information (RAIs). In addition, it was understood that any new information needs developed by PNNL or NRC staff after the site audit would also be submitted as RAIs. A list of exit meeting attendees is provided in Table 4.

02/08/08 (Friday) – Travel Day

Remaining staff traveled home.

Summary of Issues or Concerns by Technical Discipline

Hydrology/Systems Alternatives

Permitting. Most prominent among permitting issues are the absence of: (1) a determination of the status of the Main Cooling Reservoir (MCR) as waters of the State or waters of the US (401 certification by TCEQ and 404 permit by USACE); (2) permitting requirements for dewatering (TCEQ); and (3) a Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) determination.

Main Cooling Reservoir (MCR). MCR issues include the absence of: (1) information on how the MCR is operated under various water use permitting limits and water quality concerns for condenser cooling operating limits; and (2) a water budget model and a water chemistry model of the MCR in order to assess impacts on water quality from the operation of Units 3 and 4.

Water Use. Water use issues of most concern include the absence of information on: (1) the magnitude, duration, and frequency of the loss of the surface and groundwater resource due to the operation of Units 3 and 4; (2) how severe droughts would affect the seniority status of STP Units 3 and 4 water use rights; and (3) the impact of water use on downstream water use requirements.

Water Quality. Important water quality issues include the absence of information regarding: (1) construction-related impacts to the unnamed onsite drainage, Texas Prairie Wetland, Little Robbins Slough, Kelly Lake, and water resources along the transmission lines; (2) uncertainty regarding the locations of drainage ditches, retention ponds, and storm water outfalls and the water bodies into which these outfalls would discharge; and (3) development of an STP 3 and 4 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and Storm Water Management Plan.

Groundwater Demand and Use. Groundwater demand and use issues include the absence of: (1) a full year of groundwater observations; (2) the rationale for the substantial decline in groundwater consumption in Matagorda County (~50%) by 2030 which was forecast by the State of Texas in 1985; (3) an understanding of the relative demand on surface water and groundwater; and (4) a projection of future groundwater use and potential impacts to nearby groundwater users.

Groundwater Construction Impacts. Most prominent among groundwater construction impacts issues are the absence of: (1) a description of the excavation and dewatering effort; (2) a discussion of where the dewatering product would be discharged and associated effects; and

(3) the expected magnitude of subsidence in relation to the tolerable level of subsidence for adjacent structures.

Groundwater Resource Sustainability. STPNOC's analysis regarding a detailed evaluation of groundwater availability and estimates of aquifer drawdown, water conservation measures, and identification of alternative sources for STP 3 and 4, is incomplete.

Groundwater Quality and Monitoring. The most significant groundwater quality and monitoring issues are the absence of information regarding: (1) chemical impacts to groundwater despite known connection between the MCR and groundwater; and (2) disposal plans for mixed waste.

Aquatic Ecology

Colorado River Aquatic Resources. Surveys of fish and macroinvertebrate species in the river continue through June. The major concern brought up during the acceptance review continues to be a concern. That is, there have been no characterization studies of aquatic resources in the river since the flow in the river was diverted in 1993 from the Gulf of Mexico to East Matagorda Bay. STP staff and contractors were still unclear about this concern when discussion on the ER began. The current study does not include species that are likely to be impinged or entrained at the Reservoir Makeup Pumping Facility (RMPF) on the Colorado River. STP feels that it is unnecessary to conduct impingement/entrainment studies until the fish and macroinvertebrate sampling is completed and only if the results indicate that the aquatic resources have changed significantly from past surveys in the 1970s and 1980s.

MCR Aquatic Resources. Two ongoing characterization studies in the MCR will be important for characterizing the aquatic resources in that water body: (1) MCR Aquatic Monitoring Final Report; and (2) Cooling Water Intake Structure (CWIS) Aquatic Monitoring Final Report. These will be completed in spring 2008. The CWIS Aquatic Monitoring report includes an impingement/entrainment study. STP staff and contractors chose to conduct only one impingement/entrainment study, and they chose the CWIS on the MCR rather than the RMPF on the Colorado River. It is unclear why this choice was made because STP considers the MCR to be an industrial facility, and they have documentation from EPA in the 1980s stating that the MCR is not considered "Waters of the U.S.". STP agrees that the CWIS does not meet the criteria for a 316(b) assessment under the Clean Water Act.

MCR and water budget. There is not enough information in the ER nor was there information available at the audit to understand the water budget onsite for the existing two units as well as the changes for adding two more units. Without the water budget, impacts to aquatic resources will be difficult to assess especially for addressing operation of the RMPF and the discharge structure.

Other Aquatic Resources. STP plans on moving the ditch that is currently through the area proposed for the foundation of reactor Units 3 and 4. The ditch would be moved further north. There has not been a designation by USACE or TCEQ as to jurisdiction of this water body. STP constructed this ditch for storm water management; however, the ditch has not been maintained. Portions of the ditch are deep, and the rapid bioassessment found relatively large specimens of bass living in the ditch. TCEQ believes that the ditch is now functioning as a stream. Such an assessment might result in TCEQ recommending mitigation actions for the movement of the ditch.

Essential Fish Habitat. Informal consultation needs to be initiated when the fish and macroinvertebrate survey of the Colorado River is complete.

Threatened and Endangered Species. There are not likely to be any issues with aquatic species and the Endangered Species Act. STP will have to initiate informal consultation under Section 10 to address construction activities. This is a change associated with the new LWA rule.

Terrestrial Ecology

Wetland, Sloughs, and Ditches. The status and of wetlands and waters on the STP site was not clarified through the site audit process. No final wetland delineation and jurisdictional determination was available from the Army Corps of Engineers.

Wildlife. There had been no surveys focused on identifying and characterizing the common wildlife species inhabiting STP lands onsite and along affected transmission line corridors. However, observations had been made while conducting surveys for threatened and endangered species but these had not been compiled into a report and were neither included in the environmental report (ER) nor provided at the site audit.

Habitat Mapping. Only generic habitat maps were provided in the ER and no detailed descriptions of the plant and animal communities were provided during the site audit. This information was neither included in the ER nor provided at the site audit.

Threatened and Endangered Species. Data exist, including county listings of State and Federal threatened and endangered species that might inhabit the alternative sites, but this information was neither included in the ER nor provided at the site audit.

In addition, no information was provided regarding the following:

- Salt deposition contours from the cooling towers and information depicting the effected habitats
- Best Management Practices to be followed for re-routing the ditch
- Potential use of STP project areas as migratory bird stopover habitat.

Socioeconomics/Environmental Justice/Need for Power/Benefit Cost

Economy/Jobs. Bay City and Matagorda County are highly motivated to capture economic benefits from STP 3 and 4. The proposed units' employment needs are being incorporated into education planning, and efforts are being made to attract the permanent work force. They do not see the plant adversely affecting local tourism.

Taxes. Because of the way Texas regulates school finance, it appears that the only operating funds that would be dispersed to impacted school districts would be through increases in student population. Palacios Independent School District (ISD) would be able to access the

property tax base of Units 3 and 4 for capital construction, but others (who likely would receive the most students) would not. It also appears that the Matagorda County property tax base would benefit, but not Bay City.

Traffic. Though perhaps not as serious a traffic disruptor as when STP 1 and 2 were built, because of the much smaller construction workforce (5000 workers—still a large number—instead of the 20,000 peak workforce during STP 1 and 2), traffic on FM 521, Texas State Route 60 and State Route 35 and other nearby routes may experience significant impacts.

Housing. It is likely that space would have to be allocated for numerous trailer parks during the construction period. Bay City is planning for new housing, but is concentrating more on permanent plant population, plus whatever part of the workforce cannot be enticed into becoming permanent. The construction workforce would not be confined to just Matagorda and Brazoria Counties, but the number that would likely decide to live in Wharton, Jackson, and Calhoun Counties is not clear.

Environmental Justice. There may be some subsistence fishing or hunting in Matagorda County; however, these activities are not believed to be widespread. No safety or health concerns were identified regarding the proposed plant among the offsite minority and social services interviewees.

Need for Power. Background verification and due diligence is required to clarify ERCOT's approach, and STP's use of the ERCOT projections.

Cultural Resources

All issues were resolved with the collection of new information at the audit, except for the lack of procedure for inadvertent discovery of archaeological remains during construction.

Meteorology/Air Quality/Accidents/Noise

Following the site audit, there were no major outstanding issues for meteorology/air quality, severe accidents, design basis accidents, noise, or cooling tower plumes. However, the following information was not obtained during the site audit and will be needed to complete these analyses:

- MACCS2 input and output and risk break-down by release category
- PAVAN input and output and dose conversion factors used in each DBA analysis
- Distances to EAB and nearest residence
- SACTI input and output and plume joint frequency distribution, direction and length

Radiological/Fuel Cycle/Waste Systems/Decommissioning

Following the site audit, there were no major outstanding issues for radiological fuel cycles, radiological waste systems, or decommissioning. However, the following information was expected to be submitted by STPNOC to NRC by the end of February, 2008. Information not received will become the subject of RAIs:

- Source term used in calculation of doses to construction workers from the LTSF
- Explanation for or resolution of incongruent onsite/offsite dose ratios with respect to other years' data
- Definitive location of the onsite storage facility
- Description of the potential effects of adding 2 ft of water to the MCR on the water balance and radionuclide mass balance and movement into the 3 water bodies used to assess dose to biota

Alternatives/Land Use/Transmission Lines

Alternative Sites. Important questions pertinent to the alternative site selection process and the viability of the selected alternative sites remained unanswered at the conclusion of the site audit. Those questions included the following:

- If dry cooling is needed at one or more alternative sites, does this affect the viability of such an alternative site given STPNOC's planned use of wet cooling at the proposed site?
- How would the potential impacts of the proposed coal-fired Unit 3 at Limestone affect the viability of Limestone as an alternative site for new nuclear units?
- Does the Allens Creek site represent one of the best available alternative sites, given that water for new nuclear units would be contingent on future development of a reservoir?
- Why did STPNOC choose a different definition for a greenfield site than that defined by the NRC as being a pristine, undisturbed site?

Energy Alternatives. Information is lacking on demand-side management or conservation programs operated by STPNOC or the entities making up STPNOC.

Land Use. The following questions were outstanding regarding land use:

- What is the status of compliance with the Texas Coastal Management Program for the proposed site?

- Do any natural gas lines traverse the STP site?
- Where would dredge spoils from the Colorado River be disposed?

Transmission Lines. Information is lacking as to whether replacement of some of the transmission line towers would impact land areas outside the existing corridor, through activities related to material laydown areas, new access roads, etc. And if land areas will be disturbed, the land cover types that would be affected and to what aerial extent have not been identified.

Transportation

Transportation was not represented at the site audit and is being addressed separately.

Data Gathering

Written documentation obtained by PNNL during the site audit was recorded and a copy of each document was provided to the NRC. The record of documents taken by PNNL staff and provided to the NRC is presented in Table 5.

Table 1. STPNOC and contractor personnel, NRC and PNNL staff, and other agency representatives who attended the STP COL site audit entrance meeting held February 4, 2008, at the Center for Energy Development in Bay City, Texas.

Name	Organization	Phone Number
Garrett Day	Bechtel	301-228-8917
Ram Yelamanchi	Bechtel	301-228-6126
Basant Dilodare	Bechtel	301-228-6236
Paul Kallan	NRC (Project Manager)	301-415-2809
Cristina Guerrero	NRC (Deputy Project Manager)	301-415-2981
Daniel Mussatti	NRC (Socioeconomics)	301-415-2394
Hosung Ahn	NRC (Hydrology)	301-415-1398
William "Butch" Burton	NRC (Branch Chief)	301-415-6332
Harriet Nash	NRC (Ecology)	301-415-4100
Barry Zalcman	NRC (Cult. Res./Alternatives/Met.)	301-415-2419
Irene Yu	NRC (Land Use)	301-415-1951
Bruce Olson	NRC (Met./Accidents/Air Qual.)	301-415-3731
Mallecia Hood	NRC (Shadow)	301-415-0673
Linda Tello	NRC (Shadow)	301-415-2907
George Cicotte	NRC (Rad/Waste Systems)	301-415-0672
Katherine Streit	NRC (Rad/Waste Systems)	301-415-3299
Sara Bernal	NRC (Rad/Waste Systems)	301-415-1027
Nona Diediker	PNNL (Team Lead)	509-372-6538
Paul Hendrickson	PNNL (Land Use/Alternatives)	509-372-4294
Charles Kincaid	PNNL (Hydrology)	509-372-6102
Janelle Downs	PNNL (Terr. Ecology)	509-371-7169
Rajiv Prasad	PNNL (Hydrology)	509-315-2096
Roger Dirkes	PNNL (Shadow)	509-371-7085
Ernest Antonio	PNNL (Rad/Waste Systems)	509-375-3809
Eva Eckert Hickey	PNNL (Rad/Waste Systems)	509-375-2065
Van Ramsdell	PNNL (Met./Accidents/Air Qual.)	509-372-6316
Amoret Bunn	PNNL (Aquatic Ecology)	509-372-4782
Jim Becker	PNNL (Deputy Team Lead)	509-371-7186
Michael Scott	PNNL (Socioecon./Env. Justice)	509-372-4273
Michelle Niemeyer	PNNL (Socioecon./Env. Justice)	509-375-4866
Larry Berg	PNNL (Met/Air Qual.)	509-375-3916
Darby Stapp	PNNL (Cult. Res.)	509-371-7091
Greg Gibson	STP	979-665-2400
Mark McBurnett	STP	361-972-7206
Sandy Dannhardt	STP	361-972-8328
Mark Fisher	TCEQ	512-239-4586
Bridget Twigg	TetraTech	713-576-6227
Lisa Matis	TetraTech	509-371-0128
Nicole Hill	TetraTech	803-641-6319
Lawson Bailey	TetraTech	706-830-7530
Daniel Theisen	TetraTech	865-220-4702
Gary Gunter	TetraTech	803-641-6318
Charles Conrad	TetraTech	803-641-4917
Philip Young	TetraTech	803-641-4940

Emily McRee	TetraTech	803-641-4942
Alan Toblin	TetraTech	301-926-05?2
Jeff Zimmerly	TetraTech	803-641-4938
Larry Bryan	TetraTech	803-641-6320
Amy Hanna	TPWD	361-648-3176
TCEQ - Texas Council on Environmental Quality		
TPWD - Texas Parks and Wildlife Department		

Table 2. STPNOC and contractor personnel and State and Federal agency staff who attended technical discussions with PNNL/NRC staff from February 4-6, 2008, at the Center for Energy Development during the STP COL site audit in Bay City, Texas.

Name	Organization	Technical Discussion
Amy Hanna	TPWD	Ecology
Celeste Brancel	TPWD	Ecology
Rusty Swafford	NMFS	Ecology
Mark Fisher	TCEQ	Ecology/Hydrology
Haskell Simon	CPGWCD	Hydrology
Neil Hudgins	CPGWCD	Hydrology
Jayson Hudson	USACE	Wetlands
Y J Lin	Bechtel	Meteorology/Air Quality
Jack Fritz	Bechtel	Meteorology/Air Quality
James Cook	STPNOC	Meteorology/Air Quality
Gordon Williams	STPNOC	Meteorology/Air Quality
Burt Schoenover	STPNOC	Meteorology/Air Quality
Andy Franklin	STPNOC	Meteorology/Air Quality
Dan Patton	Bechtel	Meteorology/Air Quality
Jeff Zimmerly	TetraTech	Noise/Cooling Tower Plumes
Lawson Barley	TetraTech	Noise/Cooling Tower Plumes
Bill Stillwell	STPNOC	Severe Accidents
Jim Tomblin	STPNOC	Severe Accidents
Alan Toblin	TetraTech	Severe Accidents/ Design Basis Accidents/ Radiation Exposure
Ken Jha	Bechtel	Severe Accidents/ Design Basis Accidents/Radiation Exposure
Milton Rejcek	STPNOC	Radioactive Waste Systems
Bridget Twigs	TetraTech	Land use
Daniel Theisen	TetraTech	Energy Alternatives
Tamar Cerafici	Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll	Alternative Sites
John Conly	Luminant	Need for Power
Fred Ruleo	STPNOC	Need for Power
James Cook	STPNOC	Need for Power
Sam Damico	STPNOC	Cultural Resources
Sandy Dunnhardt	STPNOC	Cultural Resources
CPGWCD - Coastal Plains Groundwater Conservation District NMFS - National Marine Fisheries Service TCEQ - Texas Council on Environmental Quality TPWD - Texas Parks and Wildlife Department USACE - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers		

Table 3. Community representatives who attended offsite meetings (outside the Center for Energy Development) with PNNL/NRC socioeconomics staff from February 4-8, 2008, during the STP COL site audit in Bay City, Texas.

Name/Title	Organization
James Roberson, Reverend	Ministerial Alliance, Bay City
Dick Walton, Superintendent	Independent School District, Bay City
Richard Knapik, Mayor	Bay City
Mitch Thames	Chamber of Commerce, Bay City
Bill Bell	Bill Bell Realty, Bay City
Tim Bell	Bill Bell Realty, Bay City
Jan Hales	Salvation Army, Bay City
Charlotte Hobbs	Salvation Army, Bay City
D.C. Dunham	Community Development Corporation, Bay City
Michael J. Pfeifer, Judge	Calhoun County
Harrison Stafford, Judge	Jackson County
Larry Deyton	Jackson County
Jim Frankson	Frankson and Griffin, Bay City
Paul Smith, Superintendent	Palacios ISD
Herbert Ressler, Business Manager	Palacios ISD
Joe King, Judge	Brazoria County
Heath Burns, Superintendent	Angleton ISD
Carol Berthoff, Superintendent	Columbia-Brazoria ISD
Martha Buckner, Business Manager	Columbia-Brazoria ISD
Tom Jones, Superintendent	Tidehaven ISD
Cynthia Clary, Superintendent	Van Vleck ISD
Bernard Rother	St. Anthony of Padua Church, Palacios
Natalie Rother	St. Anthony of Padua Church, Palacios

Table 4. STPNOC staff and contractor personnel and NRC and PNNL staff who attended the STP COL site audit exit meeting held February 7, 2008, at the Center for Energy Development in Bay City, Texas.

Name	Organization
Althela Wyche	Bechtel
Basant Dilodare	Bechtel
Bob Yamrus	Bechtel
Paul Kallan	NRC
William "Butch" Burton	NRC
Hosung Ahn	NRC
Cristina Guerrero	NRC
Linda Tello	NRC
Mallecia Hood	NRC
Barry Zalcman	NRC
Nona Diediker	PNNL
James Cook	STP
Kevin Richards	STP
Greg Gibson	STP
Bill Mookhoek	STP
Sandy Dannhardt	STP
Russell Kiesling	STP
Joe Savage	STP
Sam Damico	STP
Amy Ballinger	STP
John Crenshaw	STP
Philip Young	TetraTech
Robin Henderson	TetraTech

Table 5. Record of documents provided to staff by STPNOC at the site audit.

No.	Public Status N=not; P=Public ?=Unknown	PNNL Contact Name	Date	Information Requested	Provided (Y/N)	Copy to PNNL (Y/N)	Copy to NRC (Y/N)	To be Returned (Y/N)	Notes
1	P	Ernie Antonio	2/4/2008	Radwaste System (FSAR)	Y	Y	already docketed	N	Figure 11.2, 2 sheets
2	P	Van Ramsdell	2/4/2008	The Light Company Houston Lighting and Power South Texas Project Electric Generating Station. 1990. South Texas Project Electric Generating Station Units 1 and 2, Docket Nos. STN 50-498, STN 50-499 Fog Monitoring Program. October 1.	Y	Y	Y, even though already docketed	N	
3	P	Darby Stapp	2/4/2008	South Texas Project Units 1 and 2 Environmental Report, Volume 1. 1975. Section 2.3, Appendix 2.3-A, Appendix 2.3-B, Appendix 2.3-C, Appendix 2.3-D	Y	Y	Y	N	

No.	Public Status N=not; P=Public ?=Unknown	PNNL Contact Name	Date	Information Requested	Provided (Y/N)	Copy to PNNL (Y/N)	Copy to NRC (Y/N)	To be Returned (Y/N)	Notes
4	N	Darby Stapp	2/5/2008	Civil/Structural Construction Specification for Houston Lighting & Power Company South Texas Project Electric Generating Station Specification 9Y230YS0024 Division C2 Section C2.9 Plant Area Roads and Grading, Rev. 5. 1986.	Y	Y	Y	N	
5	N	Rajiv Prasad/Charley Kincaid	2/7/2008	Amended and Restated Contract By and Between The Lower Colorado River Authority and STP Nuclear Operating Company, Effective as of January 1, 2006. 26pp.	Y	Y	Y	N	
6	N	Rajiv Prasad/Charley Kincaid	2/7/2008	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality. 2005. Permit to Discharge Wastes: TPDES Permit No. WQ0001908000. Letter from TCEQ to STPNOC. July 21. 34pp.	Y	Y	Y	N	

No.	Public Status N=not; P=Public ?=Unknown	PNNL Contact Name	Date	Information Requested	Provided (Y/N)	Copy to PNNL (Y/N)	Copy to NRC (Y/N)	To be Returned (Y/N)	Notes
7	N	Rajiv Prasad/Charley Kincaid	2/7/2008	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality. 2007. Letter from TCEQ to STPNOC Regarding Cooling Water Intake Structures Phase II Rules, TPDES Permit No. WQ0001908000. June 27. 1pp.	Y	Y	Y	N	
8	N	Rajiv Prasad/Charley Kincaid	2/7/2008	South Texas Project Nuclear Operating Company. 2007. Letter from STPNOC to Texas Commission on Environmental Quality Regarding Cooling Water Intake Structures Phase II Rules, TPDES Permit No. 01908. May 24. 3pp.	Y	Y	Y	N	
9	N	Amoret Bunn/Janelle Downs	2/7/2008	Ecological Survey Report - Threatened and Endangered Species, Unit 3 and 4 Licensing Project (May 2007)	Y	Y	Y	N	

No.	Public Status N=not; P=Public ?=Unknown	PNNL Contact Name	Date	Information Requested	Provided (Y/N)	Copy to PNNL (Y/N)	Copy to NRC (Y/N)	To be Returned (Y/N)	Notes
10	N	Amoret Bunn/Janelle Downs	2/7/2008	Rapid Bioassessment Report - Main Drainage Ditch, Unit 3 and 4 Licensing Project (August 2007)	Y	Y	Y	N	
11	N	Amoret Bunn/Janelle Downs	2/8/2008	Ecological Survey Report - Unit 3 and 4 Licensing Project (March 2007)	Y	Y	Y	N	
12	N	Amoret Bunn/Janelle Downs	2/7/2008	1987-1988 Special Ecological Studies for the South Texas Project, Matagorda, County, Texas (March 1989)	Y	Y	Y	N	
13	N	Amoret Bunn/Janelle Downs	2/7/2008	Letter from Texas Parks and Wildlife to Sandra Dannhardt, (Aug. 3, 2007) RE: T&E species	Y	Y	Y	N	
14	N	Amoret Bunn/Janelle Downs	2/7/2008	Letter from U.S.D.A to Breck Sacra, NRG Energy, RE: Inventory and Evaluation of Vegetation at South Texas Nuclear Project, Bay City Texas; January 30th, 2008	Y	Y	Y	N	

No.	Public Status N=not; P=Public ?=Unknown	PNNL Contact Name	Date	Information Requested	Provided (Y/N)	Copy to PNNL (Y/N)	Copy to NRC (Y/N)	To be Returned (Y/N)	Notes
15	N	Amoret Bunn/Janelle Downs	2/7/2008	Letter from Army Corps of Engineers, Galveston District to Ms. S. L. Dannhardt, STP Nuclear Operating Company, RE: Permit No. 10570(06); Extension of Time	Y	Y	Y	Y	