

## PMSTPCOL PEmails

---

**From:** Paul Kallan  
**Sent:** Monday, May 19, 2008 8:23 AM  
**To:** Nilesh Chokshi  
**Cc:** Andy Campbell; William Burton; Belkys Sosa  
**Subject:** Issues with STP  
**Attachments:** Issues with STP .htm

I wanted to forward this e-mail to you with regards to issues that may impact the schedule with STP. I have spoken to Butch, Belkys and Andy with regards to these issues.

regards,

Paul Kallan, Project Manager  
Office of New Reactors  
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews  
Environmental Projects Branch 1  
Tel: (301) 415-2809

**Recipient**

Nilesh Chokshi

Andy Campbell

William Burton

Belkys Sosa

**Read**

Read: 5/20/2008 1:01 PM

Read: 5/19/2008 9:42 AM

Read: 5/19/2008 8:29 AM

**Hearing Identifier:** SouthTexas34Public\_EX  
**Email Number:** 652

**Mail Envelope Properties** (88EDD64608FA36499C5AED7AC8B78FB44DA58C3FA9)

**Subject:** Issues with STP  
**Sent Date:** 5/19/2008 8:22:35 AM  
**Received Date:** 5/19/2008 8:22:00 AM  
**From:** Paul Kallan

**Created By:** Paul.Kallan@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"Andy Campbell" <Andy.Campbell@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"William Burton" <William.Burton@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status:: Response: Read : 5/19/2008 9:42:00 AM  
"Belkys Sosa" <Belkys.Sosa@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status:: Response: Read : 5/19/2008 8:29:00 AM  
"Nilesh Chokshi" <Nilesh.Chokshi@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status:: Response: Read : 5/20/2008 1:01:00 PM

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

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	365	5/19/2008 8:22:00 AM
Issues with STP .htm	33541	

**Options**

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

**To:** Andy Campbell; William Burton; Belkys Sosa; George Wunder; James Biggins; Bruce Olson; John Fringer  
**Subject:** Issues with STP

As we proceed with STP, I wanted to point out 5 issues that may impact our environmental schedule. They are as follows:

1. The design change in the cooling tower
2. Response time requested from the applicant 45/60/90 days (depending on the RAI)
3. Ecological Monitoring
4. Alternative site selection
5. Determination of the Jurisdiction of the MCR Waters

#### Design Change in the Cooling Tower

The applicant has requested an alternate design for the Ultimate Heat Sink (UHS) that involves relocating the UHS south of units 3 & 4 reactor buildings and providing a rectangular geometry cooling tower basin with six cooling tower cells for each unit. It is too early for the applicant to tell us the design on UHS or the location of the UHS and cooling tower basin. With this change, the environmental staff would need to know the impact on the wetlands and open body of water. This may have an impact on the schedule.

#### Response Time for RAIs 45/60/90 days

The applicant has requested 45/60/90 days to respond to the RAIs. This is not the usual 30 days that the NRC gives the applicant to respond to RAIs. However, since STP does not have a schedule we are working with the applicant to get responses from them. However, in our 3 pm meeting with the applicant, the NRC will mention that depending on when we get complete responses from the applicant, this may impact the schedule.

#### Ecological Monitoring

The NRC has received 3 ecological reports from the applicant (3 months, 6 months and 9 months), all of which have not provided the appropriate data for staff to start our review. The applicant has taken samples 1/2 mile down stream from the intake structure. However, they have not provided samples at the intake and discharge and how it is affecting the aquatic species. Also, the river was reconfigured and this is not reflected in the report. If in 3 months we receive the 12 month report and it is data that we can not use, the NRC has told the applicant that they would need to start over and this would set them back a year.

#### Alternative Site Selection

The applicant provided 3 alternative sites in the environmental report. They are as follows: Allens Creek, Limestone, and Malakoff. All the sites are located in Texas. Staff visited the alternative sites on March 3rd - 7th, 2008 and it appears, based on current information, that the Allens Creek Site was the only feasible site. The site had adequate ground and surface water to support 2 ABWR units. The other two sites did not have adequate ground or surface water to support the 2 ABWR units. Staff has requested additional information from the applicant with regards to the alternative site selection. If they do not provide appropriate justification as to why the Limestone and Malakoff sites were among the best, two additional sites may need to be selected which may have an impact on the schedule.

#### Determination of the Main Cooling Reservoir (MCR) Waters

The Army Corps of Engineers (ACE) is determining if the MCR is federal waters of the U.S. If the ACE takes jurisdiction over the MCR this will trigger a set of regulations and may have an impact on the schedule.

I just wanted you to be informed of these important issues.

Paul Kallan, Project Manager  
 Office of New Reactors  
 Division of Site and Environmental Reviews  
 Environmental Projects Branch 1  
 Tel: (301) 415-2809