

## PMSTPCOL PEmails

---

**From:** Daniel Mussatti  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 20, 2008 8:04 AM  
**To:** Andrew Kugler; NRO\_DSER\_RAP1 Distribution; NRO\_DSER\_RAP2 Distribution; NRO\_DSER\_RENV Distribution; Hickey, Eva E  
**Subject:** RE: Alternative Site Audits  
**Attachments:** image001.jpg

Andy, I think you have accurately characterized what we discussed in our meeting last week. For PM's I offer fair warning: you will need to coordinate with your PNNL counterparts to ensure the initial (long distance) assessment is performed by each discipline. I will help by working with my SE / EJ counterpart well in advance of the alternative site audit to ensure we are either (a) confident we have enough reliable information to skip a "boots on the ground" follow-up, or to (b) schedule our public outreach meetings in advance of the alt site audit.



**Daniel Charles Mussatti**

*Senior Economist*

---

**From:** Andrew Kugler  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 14, 2008 7:54 AM  
**To:** NRO\_DSER\_RAP1 Distribution; NRO\_DSER\_RAP2 Distribution; NRO\_DSER\_RENV Distribution; Hickey, Eva E  
**Subject:** Alternative Site Audits

Folks

Your input is requested.

There have been issues floating around of late regarding how we should be performing the alternative site audits. For example, one of the specific questions was whether the socio folks need to meet face-to-face with local representatives (government, Chamber of Commerce, etc.) to gather information. The guidance in this regard is very limited. See the July revision to ESRP 9.3, page 11, "As a general rule, the EPM and specific reviewers for key technical disciplines should make an onsite inspection of each alternative site identified in the application." Earlier on that page, in the list of sources of information, it includes "site-specific information from local citizens and from authorities associated with Federal, State, regional, local, and affected Native American tribal agencies, universities, and museums." But it is silent on how the subject information should be gathered.

I had sent an email to a limited group of people on this issue the other day and it engendered some good discussion. Brent Clayton, Richard Raione, Dan Mussatti and I met yesterday to discuss this issue and come up with a proposed solution. The following is what we propose:

1. We will continue to send a small team to visit every alternative site identified in the review. The minimum team composition is the EPM, and PNNL staff consisting of the TL, a hydrologist, and an ecologist (aquatic or terrestrial). This is the bare bones team. Additional members may be added based on circumstances. For example, I expect that in most cases a socioeconomics person will also go on the trip. But this will be guided by the step that follows.
2. The extent and method of reconnaissance information gathering for the alternatives sites will be based on a graded approach, as follows:

- First, each technical reviewer will gather information remotely. This step will include literature searches, and can also include phone calls to sources of information and, in some cases, letters. [Before contacting external sources, the reviewer should make sure he/she understands the EPM's expectations regarding who must be involved, e.g., the EPM may want to be on the call.]

- If the remote information gathering provides a reviewer with enough information to reach a confident conclusion about the impacts to the resource (think in terms of responding to Board questions), OR, if there is some uncertainty about the impact, but the uncertainty is not such that it could have any effect on the outcome, then no further information gathering is needed.

- If there is enough uncertainty regarding the impacts that there could be an effect on the outcome for the resource, then additional information gathering will be carried out. This can include local interviews, meetings with resource management agencies, etc.

NOTE: The decision regarding the effectiveness of remote information gathering needs to be made early enough to allow us time to perform local information gathering without affecting the schedule. Generally speaking, this would mean the decision needs to be made around the time of the site audit, perhaps shortly before the audit.

Some other items to keep in mind related to alternative site audits. If there is an alternative site near the proposed site, we may try to visit that site during the week of the audit. However, based on the experience at Lee, where we visited all of the alternative sites the same week we did the audit at the proposed site, we concluded that even when the alternative sites are in a relatively small area, attempting to do so much in one week is a bad idea. So plan on a separate trip for audits of the alternative sites for each application.

Please provide feedback to me regarding this approach by COB Friday, May 23. I know that there are different views regarding the best way to carry out the alternative site audits. But we need to reach a consensus. I'll pull together the feedback I receive and present it to management for the final decision. I've included Eva on this email so that PNNL can present its views as well.

Andrew Kugler  
Sr. Environmental Project Manager  
NRC/NRO/RAP2  
301-415-2828

**Hearing Identifier:** SouthTexas34Public\_EX  
**Email Number:** 646

**Mail Envelope Properties** (3E54A9B051CAB64F8DA8BE1178BC8D374705410082)

**Subject:** RE: Alternative Site Audits  
**Sent Date:** 5/20/2008 8:04:29 AM  
**Received Date:** 5/20/2008 8:04:33 AM  
**From:** Daniel Mussatti

**Created By:** Daniel.Mussatti@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"Andrew Kugler" <Andrew.Kugler@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Hickey, Eva E" <eva.hickey@pnl.gov>

Tracking Status: None

GROUP: "NRO\_DSER\_RAP1 Distribution"

<Adrienne.Redden@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

<Bruce.Olson@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

<Donald.Palmrose@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

<Elaine.Rodriguez@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

<Gwendolyn.Hawkins@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

<Heather.Matlack@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

<John.Fringer@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

<Mallecia.Hood@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

<Mark.Notich@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

<Michael.Willingham@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

<Paul.Kallan@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

<Robert.Schaaf@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

<Ronnie.Gorham@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

<Saprina.Coleman@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

<Shannon.King@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

<Sheila.Bunter@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

<Stacey.Imboden@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

<Stanley.Daniels@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

<Tamsen.Dozier@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Tomeka.Terry@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<William.Burton@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Zsa-Zsa.Young@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None

GROUP: "NRO\_DSER\_RAP2 Distribution"

<Adrienne.Redden@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Alicia.Williamson@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Andrew.Kugler@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Douglas.Bruner@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Gwendolyn.Hawkins@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Heather.Matlack@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Jessie.Muir@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Laura.Quinn@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Linda.Tello@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Michelle.Moser@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Patricia.Vokoun@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Paul.Michalak@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Philip.Brandt@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Richard.Raione@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Ronnie.Gorham@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Saprina.Coleman@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Shannon.King@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Sheila.Bunter@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Stanley.Daniels@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Stephen.Lemont@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Thomas.Fredrichs@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Zsa-Zsa.Young@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None

GROUP: "NRO\_DSER\_RENV Distribution"

<Adrienne.Redden@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Barry.Zalcman@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Brent.Clayton@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Daniel.Mussatti@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Gwendolyn.Hawkins@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Harriet.Nash@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Heather.Matlack@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Irene.Yu@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Michael.Masnik@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Nancy.Kuntzleman@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Joseph.Doub@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Richard.Emch@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Ronnie.Gorham@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Saprina.Coleman@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Shannon.King@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Sheila.Bunter@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Stanley.Daniels@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
<Zsa-Zsa.Young@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	5132	5/20/2008 8:04:33 AM
image001.jpg	3872	

**Options**  
**Priority:** Standard  
**Return Notification:** No  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Sensitivity:** Normal  
**Expiration Date:**  
**Recipients Received:**

