

PMSTPCOL PEmails

From: Daniel Mussatti
Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2008 11:28 AM
To: Paul Kallan; Irene Yu; Barry Zalzman; Richard Emch; Hosung Ahn; John Fringer; Bruce Olson; Diediker, Nona H; Harriet Nash; Stephen Williams; Jay Lee; Brad Harvey; Prosanta Chowdhury; George Cicotte; Rao.Tammara@nrc.gov
Subject: RE: ABR-AE-08000052
Attachments: image001.jpg

Paul, several things I have seen on my first read of the responses related to my area. These are my opinions, and may vary from those of other experts.

1. The argument for using Census 2000 is sufficient.
2. The Moke et al study response states: " NOTE: Although this RAI is tied to Section 2.5.2, it should be addressed in Section 5.8.2 because it concerns the impacts of STP 3 & 4 operations. Therefore, the COLA revision below is to Section 5.8.2.2.2." The discussion also affects Chapter 4 for construction related effects.
3. For any reference with an internet address, we need to have a hard copy for the record of the printed page referenced in the citation (preferably with the information of importance highlighted in some manner). This printed page should have the date of the printing and the address of the cite, as well.
4. The response to Question 02.05-21 does not resolve the issues identified in the question. We need to establish the cross-walk between ESAL and LOS, not just acknowledge its existence.
5. Question 02.02-22 (mis-labeled since the section is actually 2.5-21) needs to provide references to support the response.
6. The response to Question 2.5-23 on the rail spur is not sufficient. If there is a chance the spur will be repaired or upgraded, and the work would impact traffic, then the full discussion of impacts (especially on wetlands!) seems to be needed now, not postponed. That would look too much like separation to minimize cumulative impacts.
7. The response to 2.5-29 re Palacios funding is sufficient.
8. I am not sure the response to 4.4-6 on traffic analyses being based on more reasonable numbers hits the mark. The analysis seems to focus on 24 hr averages, not on the spikes that occur during the commuting times. There needs to be further discussion to walk the reader through their analysis, if the analysis is correct. As it stands, it is not clear. From their last few sentences, it appears the road will be well beyond it carrying capacity on a regular basis.
9. The response to 4.4-07 discusses mitigation by using an alternate road, but does not define the change in effect on the road expected, nor does it address the effect on traffic at the turn-off for the new route.
10. The response to 4.4-08 misses the point by assuming hurricane evacuation will only affect workers while they are at home. In actuality, there is a chance the on-site workforce may be impacted as well, which could further expand the congestion on the roads as family members at home and workers on the site both need evacuation. The applicant needs to be clearer on whether or not work at the site would be stopped prior to an evacuation to allow workers to be at home, or if the evacuation of construction workers could take place.
11. The response to 4.4-09 seems to slightly contradict that for 2.5-23 (see above). From the chapter four discussion, it seems the full environmental effect of the rail spur must be performed.
12. The response to 4.4-10 is adequate.

13. The response to 4.4-11 is sufficient.
14. The response to 4.4-13 on local purchases is on the mark.
15. The response to 4.4-15, 16, 17 are sufficient.
16. The response to 5.8-01 on local purchases is on the mark.
17. The response to 5.8-02 misses the mark. I believe the purpose of that question was based on the ownership of the plant being part private (and taxable) and part public(and not taxable). Therefore the discussion of taxes generated is incomplete. The response does not resolve that problem.
18. The response to 5.8-03 is sufficient.
19. Given the applicant's assertion that the 2000 Census is the basis for their analysis for consistency, I cannot fault their response. However, I would have expected to see some sort of caveat or disclaimer paragraph discussion the trend in demographics since 2000 that would tend to bias their analysis (including direction and magnitude).
20. There is only one thing more: we are moving forward with a more quantified discussion of benefits and costs, and that is not reflected in the original RAIs. Much of the basic work has been done, but it needs to be carried over to the last chapter. (see me if you want more information on this)



Daniel Charles Mussatti
Senior Economist

From: Paul Kallan
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2008 1:59 PM
To: Irene Yu; Daniel Mussatti; Barry Zalcman; Richard Emch; Hosung Ahn; John Fringer; Bruce Olson; Diediker, Nona H; Harriet Nash; Stephen Williams; Jay Lee; Brad Harvey; Prosanta Chowdhury; George Cicotte; Rao.Tammara@nrc.gov
Subject: FW: ABR-AE-08000052

Folks,

Kindly review and let me know if you have any comments.

regards,

Paul

From: Kiesling, Russell W [mailto:rwkiesling@STPEGS.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2008 11:25 AM
To: Adrian Muniz; Belkys Sosa; George Wunder; Paul Kallan; Loren Plisco; Raj Anand; Rocky Foster; Tekia Govan; Tom Tai
Subject: ABR-AE-08000052

Attached is a copy of ABR-AE-08000052 transmitting responses to 64 ER RAIs. This is a courtesy copy and does not represent the official submittal. The official record was signed on July 15, 2008 and has been mailed to the NRC's Document Control Desk.

Please contact me should you have any questions regarding this submittal.

Russell W. Kiesling, PMP

Environmental Lead
Regulatory Affairs
STPNOC - Units 3 & 4
4000 Avenue F, Suite A
Bay City, Texas 77414

(361) 972-4716 (office)

(361) 972-4751 (fax)

(409) 939-5345 (cell)

rwkiesling@stpegs.com

Hearing Identifier: SouthTexas34Public_EX
Email Number: 818

Mail Envelope Properties (3E54A9B051CAB64F8DA8BE1178BC8D376BF1B6735F)

Subject: RE: ABR-AE-08000052
Sent Date: 7/30/2008 11:28:18 AM
Received Date: 7/30/2008 11:28:20 AM
From: Daniel Mussatti

Created By: Daniel.Mussatti@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Paul Kallan" <Paul.Kallan@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Irene Yu" <Irene.Yu@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Barry Zalcman" <Barry.Zalcman@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Richard Emch" <Richard.Emch@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Hosung Ahn" <Hosung.Ahn@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"John Fringer" <John.Fringer@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Bruce Olson" <Bruce.Olson@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Diediker, Nona H" <nona.diediker@pnl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Harriet Nash" <Harriet.Nash@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Stephen Williams" <Stephen.Williams@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Jay Lee" <Jay.Lee@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Brad Harvey" <Brad.Harvey@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Prosanta Chowdhury" <Prosanta.Chowdhury@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"George Cicotte" <George.Cicotte@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Rao.Tammara@nrc.gov" <Rao.Tammara@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5783	7/30/2008 11:28:20 AM
image001.jpg	3872	

Options

Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received:

