

November 18, 2008

Mr. Scott Head, Manager  
Regulatory Affairs  
STP Nuclear Operating Company  
P.O. Box 289  
Wadsworth, TX 77483

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, LETTER NUMBER TWO  
RELATED TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT FOR THE SOUTH TEXAS  
COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

Dear Mr. Head:

By letter dated September 20, 2007, South Texas Project Nuclear Operating Company (STPNOC) submitted for approval a combined license application (COLA) pursuant to 10 CFR Part 52. The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff is performing a detailed review of this application to enable the staff to reach a conclusion on the environmental impacts of issuance of a combined license. The NRC staff has identified that additional information is needed to continue portions of the review. The staff's request for additional information (RAI) is contained in the enclosure to this letter.

To support the review of the COLA, it is requested that you respond within 30 days of the date of this letter, based on the particular RAI question. If changes are needed to the environmental report, the staff requests that the RAI response include the proposed wording changes.

The application review schedule assumes technically correct and complete responses within 30 days of receipt of the request for additional information (RAIs). For any RAI information that cannot be answered in 30 days, it is expected that a date for receipt of this information will be provided to the NRC so that the staff can assess how this will impact the schedule. In addition, if any new or significant information is provided by the applicant at any point in the review process, this could result in a delay of projected completion dates.

If you have any questions or comments concerning this matter, I can be reached at 301-415-1494 or by e-mail at [paul.kallan@nrc.gov](mailto:paul.kallan@nrc.gov).

Sincerely,

*/RA/*

Paul Kallan, Environmental Project Manager  
Environmental Projects Branch 1  
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews  
Office of New Reactors

Docket Nos.: 52-012 and 52-013

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

Mr. Scott Head, Manager  
Regulatory Affairs  
STP Nuclear Operating Company  
P.O. Box 289  
Wadsworth, TX 77483

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, LETTER NUMBER TWO  
RELATED TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT FOR THE SOUTH TEXAS  
COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

Dear Mr. Head:

By letter dated September 20, 2007, South Texas Project Nuclear Operating Company (STPNOC) submitted for approval a combined license application (COLA) pursuant to 10 CFR Part 52. The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff is performing a detailed review of this application to enable the staff to reach a conclusion on the environmental impacts of issuance of a combined license. The NRC staff has identified that additional information is needed to continue portions of the review. The staff's request for additional information (RAI) is contained in the enclosure to this letter.

To support the review of the COLA, it is requested that you respond within 30 days of the date of this letter, based on the particular RAI question. If changes are needed to the environmental report, the staff requests that the RAI response include the proposed wording changes.

The application review schedule assumes technically correct and complete responses within 30 days of receipt of the request for additional information (RAIs). For any RAI information that cannot be answered in 30 days, it is expected that a date for receipt of this information will be provided to the NRC so that the staff can assess how this will impact the schedule. In addition, if any new or significant information is provided by the applicant at any point in the review process, this could result in a delay of projected completion dates.

If you have any questions or comments concerning this matter, I can be reached at 301-415-1494 or by e-mail at [paul.kallan@nrc.gov](mailto:paul.kallan@nrc.gov).

Sincerely,

Paul Kallan, Environmental Project Manager  
Environmental Projects Branch 1  
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews  
Office of New Reactors

Docket Nos.: 52-012 and 52-013

Enclosure: Request for Additional Information

**DISTRIBUTION:**

PUBLIC RidsNroDserRap1 RidsNroDser JTaylor, RI VDricks, RIV  
GWunder STP COL RidsOpaMailCenter RidsOcaMailCenter MThadani  
[Nona.diediker@pnl.gov](mailto:Nona.diediker@pnl.gov) PMNS

**ADAMS Accession Number: ML083190269**

OFFICE	PM:RAP1:DSER:NRO	LA:RAP1:DSER:NRO	OGC	BC:RAP1:DSER:NRO
NAME	PKallan:sek1	GHawkins	JBiggins NLO	WBurton
DATE	11/18/08	11/14/08	11/17/08	11/17/08

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

COL STP Nuclear - South Texas Mailing List

(Revised 08/28/2008)

cc:

Mr. Brian Almon  
Public Utility Commission  
William B. Travis Building  
PO Box 13326  
1701 North Congress Avenue  
Austin, TX 78701-3326

Ms. Michele Boyd  
Legislative Director  
Energy Program  
Public Citizens Critical Mass Energy  
and Environmental Program  
215 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE  
Washington, DC 20003

C. M. Canady  
City of Austin  
Electric Utility Department  
721 Barton Springs Road  
Austin, TX 78704

W. Craig Conklin, Director  
Chemical and Nuclear Preparedness &  
Protection Division (CNPPD)  
Office of Infrastructure Protection  
Department of Homeland Security  
Washington, DC 20528

Director  
Division of Compliance & Inspection  
Bureau of Radiation Control  
Texas Department of State Health Services  
1100 West 49th Street  
Austin, TX 78756-3189

Mr. Ted Enos  
4200 South Hulen  
Suite 422  
Ft. Worth, TX 76109

Maria Hamilton  
4605 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
Bay City, TX 77414

Mr. Marvin Fertel  
Senior Vice President  
and Chief Nuclear Officer  
Nuclear Energy Institute  
1776 I Street, NW  
Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20006-3708

Ms. Susan M. Jablonski  
Office of Permitting, Remediation  
and Registration  
Texas Comm. on Env. Quality  
MC-122  
P.O. Box 13087  
Austin, TX 78711-3087

Judge  
Matagorda County  
Matagorda County Courthouse  
1700 Seventh Street  
Bay City, TX 77414

C. Kierksey  
City of Austin  
Electric Utility Department  
721 Barton Springs Road  
Austin, TX 78704

M. A. McBurnett  
VP, Oversight/Regulatory Affairs  
STP Nuclear Operating Company  
4000 Avenue F, Suite A  
Bay City, TX 77414

Cameron Payne  
1919 A Harold St.  
Houston, TX 77098

Robert Singleton  
2048 W. Stassney Lane #234  
Austin, TX 78745

COL STP Nuclear - South Texas Mailing List

-2-

Mr. Terry Parks  
Chief Inspector  
Texas Department of Licensing  
and Regulation  
Boiler Division  
P.O. Box 12157  
Austin, TX 78711

Policy Director  
Environmental and Natural Resources  
P. O. Box 12428  
Austin, TX 78711-3189

Mr. Frank M. Quinn  
8 Oak Avenue  
Gaithersburg, MD 20877-2705

Vanessa E. Quinn, Acting Director  
Technological Hazards Division  
National Preparedness Directorate  
Federal Emergency Management Agency  
500 C Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20472

Regional Administrator  
Region IV  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
611 Ryan Plaza Drive  
Suite 400  
Arlington, TX 76011-8064

J. J. Sheppard  
President & CEO  
STP Nuclear Operating Company  
P.O. Box 289  
Wadsworth, TX 77483

Mr. Robert E. Sweeney  
IBEX ESI  
4641 Montgomery Avenue  
Suite 350  
Bethesda, MD 20814

Mr. Steve Winn  
NRG Texas LLC  
1301 McKinney, Suite 2300  
Houston, TX 77010

Mr. Jon C. Wood  
Cox, Smith, & Matthews  
112 East Pecan, Suite 1800  
San Antonio, TX 78205

Robert Alvarado  
234 Baker Avenue  
San Antonio, TX

Stephen Kale  
3010 Sable Crossing  
San Antonio, TX 78232

Ernest J. Opella  
2405 Avenue E  
Bay City, TX 77414

Karen Hadden  
SEED Coalition  
1801 Westlake Drive #209  
Austin, TX 78746

A. C. Conrad  
P.O. Box 187  
Egypt, TX

Lara Cushing  
Southwest Workers Union  
P.O. Box 830706  
San Antonio, TX 78283

James D. Mitchell  
Sheriff - Matagorda County  
2308 Avenue F  
Bay City, TX 77414

Owen Bludau  
Matagorda County EDA  
3928 Wickersham  
Bay City, TX 77414

Tony Rigdon  
Port of Palacios  
P.O. Box 551  
Palacios, TX 77465

Georgia Rice Herreth  
3224 Avenue K  
Bay City, TX 77414

Roy Craft  
1707 Pecan St  
Bay City, TX 77414

Laura G. Lewis  
P.O. Box 693  
Van Vleck, TX 77482

Mike Griffith  
34 Valhalla  
Bay City, TX 77414

Juan Parras  
6733 Harrisburg Blvd  
Houston, TX 77011

Dora Duncan  
1720 Elm Avenue  
Bay City, TX 77141

David Plunkett  
P.O. Box 65  
Lake Jackson, TX 77566-0065

John Weaver  
1013 Mockingbird Lane  
Richwood, TX 77531

Brent Marceaux  
204 Ronald  
Bay City, TX 77414

Pat Curry  
4001 Aggie Drive  
Bay City, TX 77414

Kevin Hecht  
P.O. Box 1603  
Bay City, TX 77404-1603

Stephanie Merritt  
ARC  
614 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
Bay City, TX 77414

Anna Sue Thompson  
2951 SH 35C  
Bay City, TX 77414

Mr. L. V. Harvey  
1707 Moore Avenue  
Bay City, TX 77414

Ira T. Anderson  
11839 Wink Rd  
Houston, TX 77024-7132

Becca Sitz  
2206 Avenue G  
Bay City, TX 77414

William R. Bealefield, Jr  
201 Red River Road  
Bay City, TX 77414

Ben & Sara Murphy  
4216 FM 2853  
Palacios , TX 77465

Larry Archer  
528 Walnut Street  
Lake Jackson, TX 77566

Debra Huse  
2000 Willow Street  
Bay City, TX 77414

Douglas Anderson  
253 PR 518  
Bay City, TX 77414

Lee Dannhaus  
149 PR 672  
Bay City, TX 77414

Jim Crawford  
4300 Virginia  
Bay City, TX 77414

Charles Irvine  
4709 Austin  
Houston, TX 77004

Ladell Sump  
104 Lindsey Ave  
Bay City, TX 77414

Bill Curry  
4001 Aggie Drive  
Bay City, TX 77414

Kevin Moriarty  
105 Circle Way  
Lake Jackson, TX 77566

Cathy Woods  
2300 Hillcrest Drive  
Bay City, TX 77414

Rev. John N. B. Pope  
3008 El Camino  
Bay City, TX 77414

Mike McGehearty  
3320 Avenue J  
Bay City, TX 77414

Charles R. Winfield  
315 West Craymer  
Palacios, TX 77465

James Woods  
2800 Hillcrest Drive  
Bay City, TX 77414

Blanche & Eugene Johnson  
3419 Walnut Drive  
Bay City, TX 77414

Kim Russell  
2501 Carrington  
Bay City, TX 77414

Kevin Murphy  
6406 Scott Lane  
Pearland, TX 77581

Bill & Anna Strickland  
202 CR 243  
Bay City, TX 77414

Vicki Vaughan  
Avenue E & Third St  
P.O. Box 2171  
San Antonio, TX 78297

Jim Cohenour  
Rte 1 Box 237  
Palacios, TX 77465

Larry Merritt  
614 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
Bay City, TX 77414

Kevin Anderson  
4204 Hines Lane  
Bay City, TX 77414

Mary Carter  
4709 Austin St  
Houston, TX 77004

Cristella Rodriguez  
P.O. Box 546  
Bay City, TX 77414

Cyrus Reed  
1202 San Antonio  
Austin, TX 78701

Sandra Harris  
2200 7<sup>th</sup> Street, #303  
Bay City, TX 77414

Bob Watts  
2200 7<sup>th</sup> St  
Bay City, TX 77414

Jackie Peden  
714 W House St  
Alvin, TX 77511

Mary Ruth Rhodenbaugh  
P.O. Box 368  
Brazoria, TX 77422

Roberta Ripke  
457 Commerce  
Palacios, TX 77465

Howard T. Ray  
7505 Legend Rock  
San Antonio, TX 78244

Ozell Crockett  
1901 Palm Village Blvd #123  
Bay City, TX 77414

Bobby Head  
P.O. Box 2431  
Bay City, TX 77414

Cathy Gann  
P.O. Box 289  
Wadsworth, TX 77483

Jimmy McCauley  
P.O. Box 848  
Van Vleck, TX 77482

John Corder  
313 CR 912  
Brazoria, TX 77422

Email

APH@NEI.org (Adrian Heymer)  
awc@nei.org (Anne W. Cottingham)  
bennettS2@bv.com (Steve A. Bennett)  
bob.brown@ge.com (Robert E. Brown)  
BrinkmCB@westinghouse.com (Charles Brinkman)  
chris.maslak@ge.com (Chris Maslak)  
ceja.aswunion.org (Robert Alvarado)  
charles.brookhouser@wellsfargo.com (Charles Brookhouser)  
cwaltman@roe.com (C. Waltman)  
david.lewis@pillsburylaw.com (David Lewis)  
dlochbaum@UCSUSA.org (David Lochbaum)  
dwoodla1@txu.com (Donald Woodlan)  
erg-xl@cox.net (Eddie R. Grant)  
frankq@hursttech.com (Frank Quinn)  
george.stramback@gene.ge.com (George Stramback)  
greshaja@westinghouse.com (James Gresham)  
gzinke@entergy.com (George Alan Zinke)  
jgutierrez@morganlewis.com (Jay M. Gutierrez)  
jim.riccio@wdc.greenpeace.org (James Riccio)  
JJNesrsta@cpsenergy.com (James J. Nesrsta)  
John.O'Neill@pillsburylaw.com (John O'Neill)  
Joseph\_Hegner@dom.com (Joseph Hegner)  
junichi\_uchiyama@mnes-us.com (Junichi Uchiyama)  
KSutton@morganlewis.com (Kathryn M. Sutton)  
kwaugh@impact-net.org (Kenneth O. Waugh)  
maria.webb@pillsburylaw.com (Maria Webb)  
mark.beaumont@wsms.com (Mark Beaumont)  
matias.travieso-diaz@pillsburylaw.com (Matias Travieso-Diaz)  
media@nei.org (Scott Peterson)  
mike\_moran@fpl.com (Mike Moran)  
nirsnet@nirs.org (Michael Mariotte)  
patriciaL.campbell@ge.com (Patricia L. Campbell)  
paul.gaukler@pillsburylaw.com (Paul Gaukler)  
Paul@beyondnuclear.org (Paul Gunter)  
phinnen@entergy.com (Paul Hinnenkamp)  
pshastings@duke-energy.com (Peter Hastings)  
RJB@NEI.org (Russell Bell)  
RKTemple@cpsenergy.com (R.K. Temple)  
roberta.swain@ge.com (Roberta Swain)  
sandra.sloan@areva.com (Sandra Sloan)  
sfrantz@morganlewis.com (Stephen P. Frantz)  
stephen.kale@sbcglobal.net (Stephen Kale)  
texPatriots@aol.com (Bobby Head)  
Tansel.Selekler@nuclear.energy.gov (Tansel Selekler)  
tom.miller@hq.doe.gov (Tom Miller)  
VictorB@bv.com (Bill Victor)  
Wanda.K.Marshall@dom.com  
waraksre@westinghouse.com (Rosemarie E. Waraks)  
wayne.marquino@ge.com (Wayne Marquino)

Request for Additional Information (RAI)  
 South Texas Project Units 3 and 4  
 Combined Operating License Application  
 RAI Submittal 2

RAI No.	Subject	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)	Response Date
2.3 – 2	Hydrology	Describe the existing storm water treatment and outfalls, and the water bodies into which they discharge.	Provide a better copy of Figure 1-1 from STPNOC 2004 Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan included in the earlier response.	7/2/2008
2.3 – 3	Hydrology	Provide information regarding water rights under severe droughts.	From the earlier response, it is not clear who STPNOC will request the emergency relief from under the stipulations of Texas Water Code Section 11.148. Clearly state this information.	7/2/2008
2.3 – 6	Hydrology	Provide details of MCR operation during existing two–unit and future four–unit operation to help staff independently estimate water–use and water–quality impacts.	Provide an update on the modeling effort currently underway for the MCR water budget and water quality. Include details pertaining to the approach adopted in the development of these models. Also include details regarding input data requirements for these models, with particular emphasis on modeling/simulation time steps. Describe the anticipated approach adopted for using these models to predict impacts on water use in the Colorado River Basin and on water quality in the Colorado River.	8/14/2008
2.3 – 7	Hydrology	Provide details of the process followed in the selection of the site hydrogeologic conceptual model.	<b>(A)</b> The process description is good, but could be interpreted as leading to a single alternative conceptual model. The process described does not explicitly describe the alternate conceptual models considered, and the logic that produced the plausible conservative conceptual model on which analyses are based. Identify the alternative conceptual models considered and the logic that identified the plausible conservative conceptual model employed. <b>(B)</b> A contradiction exists in item "(a) Drawdown at offsite wells." It is stated that based on the conceptual model and drawdown during construction dewatering and water production there "may" be potential impacts to offsite wells. In the next paragraph, it is stated that drawdown during dewatering will "remain within the STP site boundaries." Based on these statements, it is not clear what impacts from dewatering are expected. Clarify. <b>(C)</b> Since drawdown values are presented, it will be necessary to review calculation packages. Identify and provide the calculation package(s).	7/2/2008

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4  
RAI Submittal 2

RAI No.	Subject	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)	Response Date
2.3 – 8	Hydrology	Provide groundwater observations for a sufficiently long period to reveal seasonal trends. If available, also provide long-term trend data on groundwater in the vicinity of the proposed facility.	The RAI response and proposed revision includes the revised table providing the groundwater observations revealing seasonal trends; however, the series of figures (Figure 2.3.1-25) showing quarterly aquifer response to stress should also be revised to show the full year seasonal response in the data set. The current figure shows February and April results only. Provide the full sequence of figures.	7/2/2008
2.4.1 – 3	Terrestrial Ecology	Provide information and maps depicting all wetlands identified on the STP site during field surveys in 2006, 2007 and 2008.	Information provided at the site audit and during communications with the applicant indicates that additional wetland surveys and delineations have been conducted since the site environmental report was issued. Provide updated and complete information describing and mapping water features and related wetland features on the STP site that are not described in ER reference 2.4-3 "Ecological Survey Report Unit 3 and 4 Licensing Project, ENSR 2007 Report". Include any additional information requested by the Army Corps of Engineers to describe wetland and associated aquatic features on the STP site, including: (1) Field data sheets that describe the wetland identification and delineation for all surveys done on the site after the completion of the ENSR 2007 report. (2) Maps and tables indicating the locations, acreages and type of each of these wetlands. (3) Information describing whether each identified wetland would be impacted, either permanently or temporarily, by the project. (4) Survey data and information for wetland features associated with drainage ditches. (5) Detailed description and maps at viewable scale that identify where existing ditches and water features are planned to be re-routed. (6) Information detailing how the re-located portion of Little Robbins Slough was considered (i.e., was it identified as a wetland or on-site water feature.)	8/14/2008
2.4.1 – 6	Terrestrial Ecology	Provide the custom digital GIS coverages (shape files or geodatabases) for figures showing the construction areas and habitats on STP.	Provide the native digital GIS coverages for Figure 2.2-3, and Figure 3.9S-1 from the ER; Figure 3 describing habitats on STP site from the June 2008 ENSR report; and the updated GIS layers that map the spatial locations of wetlands, water bodies, and water features on STP.	New

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4  
RAI Submittal 2

RAI No.	Subject	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)	Response Date
2.4.2 – 11	Aquatic Ecology	Provide dataset for collection of species by sample location and gear type that is summarized in the ENSR 2008 report.	Raw data used to prepare Tables 2 and 3 in the ENSR 2008 report is needed to prepare Essential Fish Habitat consultation and for independent validation of impact evaluation using Jaccard coefficients. (ENSR 2008 report: "Aquatic Ecology - Colorado River Monitoring Report Unit 3 and 4 Licensing Project", prepared by ENSR Corporation, June 2008.)	New
2.5 – 6	Socio/EJ Need for Power	Provide a discussion of non-zoning controls on land development	Provide citations to references (and copies of the references) supporting the original answer to demonstrate where the data came from and how the conclusions in the original response were reached.	8/14/2008
2.5 – 11	Socio/EJ Need for Power	Confirm whether the 2000 Census is the most recent data available for housing availability in the counties near STP and that it remains accurate compared to newer data.	STPNOC asserts there are no differences except scale between the 2000 Census and more recent data. Support that assertion by doing an analysis of the differences. In other words, prove the hypothesis by comparing 2000 Census data and more recent information (2005 Census updates, Texas statistics, etc., along with recent housing information available from sources other than Census). If this analysis does not support the hypothesis, then revise the analysis based upon more recent data.	8/14/2008
2.6 – 1	Hydrology	Provide a summary of past and expected surface settlements and how future settlements may impact surface water drainages, a description of various dewatering options, and relative settlements expected for each dewatering option.	The response draws heavily on the assumed similarity of construction dewatering for existing STP Units 1&2 and proposed STP Units 3&4. A summary comparison of the two events is needed to support this assumption. Provide comparative information for the completed units (1&2) and proposed units (3&4) including the area dewatered, depth of dewatering, duration of dewatering, measured and expected dewatering production rates, and distances from dewatering to the site boundary and wetlands.	7/2/2008
2.7 – 5	Met/AQ Accidents	The July 2, 2008 response to RAI 2.7-5 mentions a "Construction Environmental Control Plan." Provide more information about the plan.	Does such a plan exist? If so, provide more information about that plan. If not, provide information regarding specific mitigation measures that will be incorporated into the plan and specify when the plan will be created. Will there be external review and approval?	7/2/2008

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4  
RAI Submittal 2

RAI No.	Subject	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)	Response Date
4.2 – 5	Hydrology	Provide information regarding the locations of drainage ditches and retention ponds.	The previous response stated that the final location of the main drainage ditch, which is to be relocated north of the STP Units 3 and 4, is still undetermined. Provide details of the process that is being followed to determine the final location of this ditch and when the decision may occur.	7/15/2008
4.2 – 6	Hydrology	Describe the analytical process used to determine impacts to surface water hydrology would be SMALL.	The previous response details what would be done during construction of STP Units 3 and 4, but still fails to provide a description of the analytical thought process used to determine impact levels. Provide an explanation why the activities detailed in the previous response would ensure that the impacts on surface water from the construction activities related to drainage ditches, swale relocation, soil removal, and grading, are SMALL.	7/2/2008
4.2 – 7	Hydrology	Provide a list and description of pre-construction activities mentioned in ER Section 1.1.2.7.	In STP's previous response, Power Block Earthwork (Excavation) is mentioned as a pre-construction activity. However, it is unclear if structural fill in some of the excavations will be placed prior to or following the COL being granted. Also, it is unclear if the fabrication of the reactor building base mat reinforcing module would or would not be an "in-place" assembly. Please clarify with respect to the definition of "construction" in 10 CFR 50.10(a)(1).	7/15/2008
4.2 – 8	Hydrology	Describe the dewatering calculation(s) and confirm that dewatering product would be discharged to the MCR. Also provide access to the supporting calculations.	Please identify the calculation package(s) that produce the estimated initial rate of dewatering product as 6700 gpm, and the long-term rate of 1000 gpm. Briefly summarize these calculation packages (methods applied, key data and assumptions, results) and confirm that the dewatering product will be discharged as earlier planned into the MCR. Please provide the full calculation package(s) for staff audit in reading rooms in Washington, D.C., and Richland, Washington.	7/15/2008

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4  
RAI Submittal 2

RAI No.	Subject	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)	Response Date
4.2 – 11	Hydrology	Provide a full description of the potential impacts to nearby groundwater users. Provide access to supporting calculations.	While the response may be adequate, review of the calculation package(s) will be necessary to check the potential drawdown values included in the RAI response. Identify the calculation package(s) and make it (them) available for staff audit.	7/15/2008
4.3.1 – 2	Terrestrial Ecology	Clarify information and figures describing the proposed locations and affected areas for the temporary and permanent construction project areas and activities.	Revision 2.0 of the ER refers to figure 3.9S-1 in describing the acreage to be affected by temporary and permanent construction activities. The acreages identified in figure 3.9S-1 sum to a greater total acreage to be disturbed by temporary and permanent construction activities than 244 acres (e.g., construction parking and laydown areas alone exceed 200 acres). Both the ENSR June 2008 report (Ecological Survey Report: Habitat Assessment) and the August 14 RAI response to Question 04.03.01-02 cite a total acreage of approximately 244 acres that will be disturbed by construction of facilities and list acreages. Section 4.1 of ER Rev 2, provides a table that describes more than 700 acres disturbed. <b>(A)</b> Reconcile or indicate which acreages are correct in figures and tables. <b>(B)</b> Provide information to clarify and address whether the construction borrow/spoil area identified on figure 3.9S-1 and discussed in chapter 4 will be disturbed and whether habitat will be temporarily or permanently lost due to activities in borrow area. There are conflicting statements regarding whether this area will be affected by construction. <b>(C)</b> Identify the complete pathway for the heavy haul road and the affected acreage associated with constructing the road. <b>(D)</b> Provide a figure and table that identifies the correct acreage for each construction area, the type of habitat and associated acreage that will be disturbed, and whether the disturbance will cause temporary or permanent habitat loss.	8/14/2008

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4  
RAI Submittal 2

RAI No.	Subject	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)	Response Date
4.3.1 – 3	Terrestrial Ecology	Provide information regarding planned and potential mitigation identified as a result of 2008 wetland studies including voluntary avoidance and minimization of impact or other measures as required by local, state and federal regulations or agencies.	Provide information and details of all mitigation or actions identified as a result of wetland surveys and reviews completed in 2008. Include information on required and voluntary mitigation actions such as avoidance or minimization of impact. Describe and discuss any potential areas that have been identified for mitigation of wetlands and/or terrestrial wildlife habitats.	New
4.4 – 10	Socio/EJ Need for Power	Discuss the impact of construction on housing demand.	In our interviews with local officials, there was considerable informal knowledge concerning the locations of trailer courts during STP 1 & 2 construction, though none of this information was quantitative. Characterize the general locations of trailer parks and other temporary housing during the STP 1 and 2 construction period and explain why this is or is not useful guidance for where housing of this type may develop again.	7/15/2008
4.4 – 12	Socio/EJ Need for Power	Describe impacts of overlapping construction and operations workforces.	The answer to the original RAI did not directly answer whether the net total socioeconomic effect of the operations workforce would be greater or less than the construction workforce. Is the net total socioeconomic effect greater than or less than that of peak construction? And why or why not?	7/30/2008
5.3.1.2 – 1	Aquatic Ecology	Describe the design feature of the RMPF that allows an “escape route” for fish to swim back to the river and precluding entrapment.	Based on the response to RAI in ABR-AE-08000052, the fish return system is blocked off when the river flows are high. The ER states that there are restrictions on the pumping of water from the Colorado River during low flow conditions. How often is Colorado River water pumped during high flow conditions when the fish return system is blocked off? Describe and compare the low flow conditions when the pumping is reduced or ceases, and the flow conditions when the fish return system is blocked off.	7/15/2008

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4  
RAI Submittal 2

RAI No.	Subject	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)	Response Date
5.3.1.2 – 3	Aquatic Ecology	What is the magnitude of impingement and entrainment of aquatic species at the RMPF for the species of fish currently found in the Colorado River compared to species present prior to 1993 when the diversion channel directed the river into East Matagorda Bay?	Please clarify the RAI response in ABR-AE-08000063. The 9th paragraph states, "During the 12-month period ending in April, 2008, STPNOC conducted quarterly sampling of fish and macro invertebrates in the Main Cooling Reservoir (MCR) using gill nets, trawls, beach seines, and plankton nets (ENSR 2008, page ES-1)." The reference at the end of the response is: "ENSR Corporation. 2008. Aquatic Ecology - Colorado River Monitoring Report. Unit 3 and 4 Licensing Project. Final." This reference was provided to NRC on June 17, 2008 (ABR-AE-08000045), however, this reference does not discuss the sampling of the Main Cooling Reservoir. Provide the reference that supports the response. This information is needed in order to evaluate the magnitude of impingement and entrainment of aquatic species.	8/14/2008
5.3.3.1 – 1	Met/AQ Accidents	Justify the assumption in the 2nd paragraph of ER Section 5.3.3.1.2 that there will not be increased fogging.	The initial response relies on monthly average values of temperature increase in the MCR to support the assumption. The monthly average values indicate a 37% increase in saturation vapor pressure of the MCR during the winter and about a 7% increase in radiative heat loss. Provide a technical justification using appropriate factors for MCR heat load, wind direction and speed, and temperature.	7/30/2008
7.1 – 1	Met/AQ Accidents	Provide the dose factors used in evaluation of each design basis accident and the source of the dose factors.	The initial response references whole body dose factors from a GE report (NEDO-21143-1). The report contains propriety information and is not publically available. Therefore, provide a listing of the referenced dose factors used in the DBA analysis and the source of the dose factors. Provide a duration for the instrument line break accident dose calculation.	7/15/2008
7.2 – 6	Met/AQ Accidents	Provide a list of major surface water users within 50 mi of STP Units 3 & 4, especially public water supplies.	The initial RAI response was unresponsive. Information is needed on surface water users to permit NRC staff to interpret/evaluate MACCS2 results.	7/2/2008
7.2 – 7	Met/AQ Accidents	Revise the discussion of the groundwater pathway risks for STP Units 3 & 4 to support the conclusion in the last sentence of ER Section 7.2.2.3.	The initial RAI response still lacks a complete logic chain. Provide a statement on the magnitude of potential releases to groundwater from the ABWR compared to the magnitude of potential releases from existing units.	7/2/2008

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4  
RAI Submittal 2

RAI No.	Subject	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)	Response Date
9.2.3 – 1	Energy Alternatives	Information on a coal-fired energy alternative is provided in section 9.2.3.1 of the ER. The staff requests additional information on whether more recent emission factors could be used to provide more accurate emission estimates for a new coal-fired power plant. If more accurate emission estimates can be prepared, then provide them.	The most recent published information that the staff is aware of regarding the performance of fossil energy power systems is the 2007 National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL) report <i>Cost and Performance Baseline for Fossil Energy Plants Volume 1: Bituminous Coal and Natural Gas to Electricity</i> , DOE/NETL-2007/1281 Rev. 1, online at: <a href="http://www.netl.doe.gov/energy-analyses/pubs/Bituminous%20Baseline_Final%20Report.pdf">http://www.netl.doe.gov/energy-analyses/pubs/Bituminous%20Baseline_Final%20Report.pdf</a> . The report examines four cases of subcritical and supercritical pulverized coal-fired power plants and includes emission estimates for each case. The ER uses EPA's 1998 AP-42 document to estimate emissions from a new coal-fired power plant. Emission estimates in the 2007 NETL report assume environmental regulations that would most likely apply to plants built in 2010 (see p. 18 of the report).	New
9.2.3 – 2	Energy Alternatives	Information on the natural gas combined-cycle (NGCC) energy alternative is provided in section 9.2.3.2 of the ER. The staff requests additional information on whether more recent emission factors could be used to provide more accurate emission estimates for a new NGCC power plant. If more accurate emission estimates can be prepared, then provide them.	The most recent published information that the staff is aware of regarding the performance of fossil energy power systems is the 2007 National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL) report <i>Cost and Performance Baseline for Fossil Energy Plants Volume 1: Bituminous Coal and Natural Gas to Electricity</i> , DOE/NETL-2007/1281 Rev. 1, online at: <a href="http://www.netl.doe.gov/energy-analyses/pubs/Bituminous%20Baseline_Final%20Report.pdf">http://www.netl.doe.gov/energy-analyses/pubs/Bituminous%20Baseline_Final%20Report.pdf</a> . The report includes emission estimates for NGCC power plants. Section 9.2.3.2 of the ER uses EPA's 1998 AP-42 document to estimate emissions from a new NGCC power plant. Emission estimates in the 2007 NETL report assume environmental regulations that would most likely apply to plants built in 2010 (see p. 18 of the report). The staff also notes that EPA published a version of AP-42 applicable to natural gas combustion in 2000 (see p. 8-54 of draft NUREG-1437, Supplement 36).	New

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4  
RAI Submittal 2

RAI No.	Subject	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)	Response Date
9.3 – 1	Alternative Sites	<p>Explain how the Limestone alternative site satisfies NRC's siting guidance for potential and/or candidate sites as set out in Regulatory Guides 4.2 and 4.7 and the July 2007 version (Draft Rev. 1) of ESRP 9.3. Provide information regarding the expected impacts (including impacts on current water users) if STPNOC were to withdraw water from Lake Limestone to provide wet cooling for two new ABWR units at the Limestone site. Provide information regarding the expected impacts (including impacts on current holders of mineral rights) if STPNOC were to acquire the mineral rights for the Limestone site.</p>	<p>The staff requests further information regarding how the Limestone site is among the best candidate sites that can reasonably be found for the siting of a nuclear power plant (ESRP 9.3) given the water scarcity and mineral rights issues at the site. NRG is one of the planned co-owners of STP Units 3 and 4. In NRG's Limestone 3 Expansion Project Fact Sheet (<a href="http://www.nrgenergy.com/pdf/factsheet_limestone.pdf">http://www.nrgenergy.com/pdf/factsheet_limestone.pdf</a>), NRG states that "to conserve scarce water resources in the area, Limestone 3 will use dry cooling to condense the steam back into water." Attachment 60 of STPNOC's RAI 7/15/08 response states that "it assumed that sufficient water could be purchased and developed for cooling at the site." STPNOC's 7/15/08 response also notes that "dry cooling is not necessarily an appropriate alternative cooling technology for ABWR units." The staff is having difficulty reconciling STPNOC's responses with the NRG statements in the Limestone 3 Fact Sheet. Specifically, if sufficient water could be purchased for the Limestone site (as stated in STPNOC's 7/15/08 response), the staff does not understand why NRG would propose dry cooling for Limestone 3 given the economic penalty of dry cooling in comparison to wet cooling. In addition, since dry cooling is proposed by NRG for Limestone 3, the staff does not understand how Limestone could be a candidate site for ABWR units for which dry cooling is an inappropriate cooling technology. In its 7/15/08 RAI response, STPNOC also states that it assumed that it could acquire the mineral and natural gas rights to the Limestone site. Identify the source(s) of cooling water at the site. Describe in detail the expected impacts from the use of the identified water source(s) including the impacts on the current and potential future competing water users. Describe the impacts of acquiring mineral rights at the site, including impacts on current holders of mineral rights.</p>	7/15/2008

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4  
RAI Submittal 2

RAI No.	Subject	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)	Response Date
9.3 – 2	Alternative Sites	How would inclusion of information regarding the proposed coal-fired unit 3 at the Limestone site affect the discussion of the site in section 9.3.3.1 of the ER?	<p>Attachment 61 of STPNOC's 7/15/08 RAI response states that the siting of Limestone 3 would not change the analysis in section 9.3.3.1 of the ER which currently does not address any impacts from Limestone 3. The response further states that Limestone 3 would take advantage of existing infrastructure and that new ABWR units at the Limestone site would not significantly affect the construction and operation at the site. The staff does not understand how siting of both new ABWR units and Limestone 3 at the Limestone site would not change the analysis in section 9.3.3.1 of the ER. If work on the proposed ABWR units and Limestone 3 were being conducted concurrently, it seems that at a minimum there would be enhanced socioeconomic impacts from the two construction projects that would be pertinent to the discussion in section 9.3.3.1 of the ER. In addition, STPNOC's statement at p. 1 of Attachment 60 to the 7/15/08 RAI response (In assessing the environmental impacts of ABWR units at the Limestone site, STPNOC assumed that the ABWR would be sited there instead of a third coal-fired plant) does not seem consistent with the STPNOC statements in Attachment 61 of the 7/15/08 RAI response (STPNOC anticipated that the ABWR units would be built in the Freestone County portion of the site. STPNOC assumes that the Limestone 3 plant would take advantage of the infrastructure within the coal-fired plant area in Limestone County). The staff requests clarification of the preceding statements. Specifically identify whether both the coal-fired unit and the ABWR would be built at the site, and if so, what the circumstances and impacts would be from doing so. The staff also requests information on who owns the mineral rights at the Freestone County portion of the Limestone site.</p>	7/15/2008

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4  
RAI Submittal 2

RAI No.	Subject	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)	Response Date
9.3 – 4	Alternative Sites	Explain how the Malakoff alternative site satisfies NRC's siting guidance for potential and/or candidate sites as set out in Regulatory Guides 4.2 and 4.7 and the July 2007 version (Draft Rev. 1) of ESRP 9.3. Provide information regarding the expected impacts (including impacts on current water users) if STPNOC were to withdraw water from a STPNOC-specified water body to provide wet cooling for two new ABWR units at the Malakoff site. Provide information regarding the expected impacts (including impacts on current holders of mineral rights) if STPNOC were to acquire the mineral rights for the Malakoff site.	The staff requests additional information on practical, specific water sources that could support wet cooling for new ABWR units located at the Malakoff site. Identify a specific water source(s) so that the staff can conduct a comparative impact analysis in the EIS. The staff was not able to identify any such water sources during their visit to the Malakoff site in March 2008. To complete its EIS, the staff needs information on the expected impacts on existing and potential future competing water users if water from a STPNOC-specified water body were to be used to provide wet cooling for two new ABWR units located at the Malakoff site. Similarly, the staff needs information on the expected impacts on existing mineral rights holders if STPNOC were to acquire the mineral rights at the Malakoff site.	7/15/2008
9.3 – 9	Alternative Sites	Clarify process used to select candidate sites.	The staff requests clarification of the process used by STPNOC to screen potential sites to candidate sites. Specifically, and in light of RAIs 9.3-1 and 9.3-4, identify how water availability and mineral rights were factored into the identification of the Limestone site and the Malakoff site as candidate sites.	New
10.5S – 2	Hydrology	Describe the analytical process used to determine cumulative impacts to downstream surface water users.	Operation of Units 3 and 4 will result in greater water withdrawal from the Colorado River than that currently used for Units 1 and 2 alone. Provide an estimate of the additional water required for the operation of Units 3 and 4 over and above that needed for the operation of Units 1 and 2. Also provide an estimate of the frequency of a discharge 300 cfs or smaller in the Colorado River downstream of the RMPF with all four units in operation.	8/14/2008

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4  
RAI Submittal 2

RAI No.	Subject	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)	Response Date
10.5S – 3	Land Use	How much land would be disturbed at the STP site in conjunction with construction of the proposed units?	There are several figures in the ER and RAI responses for the amount of land that would be disturbed in conjunction with construction of Units 3 and 4 at the STP site. Attachment 21 of STPNOC's 8/14/08 RAI response indicates 540 acres. Table 4.1-1 of Rev. 2 of the ER indicates 768 acres. Section 4.3.1.1 of Rev. 2 of the ER indicates 244 acres. Section 10.2.1.1 of Rev. 2 of the ER indicates 770 acres. The staff requests that STPNOC reconcile these numbers and provide an explanation for the final number.	8/14/2008