

PMSTPCOL PEmails

From: George Wunder
Sent: Tuesday, November 25, 2008 9:55 AM
To: Karen Hadden
Subject: RE: Questions / requests regarding STP

Dear Ms. Hadden,

Thank you for your email of November 20, 2008. I understand that Adrian Muniz has forwarded the meeting summary that you requested. You are on our electronic distribution list for meeting summaries and you should have received this document when it was issued. If you did not receive it, I can ask the secretary to verify your email address. If you were told that the meeting summary would be placed on the public Web site, this was incorrect information. Meeting summaries are normally made available through our ADAMS system. The Web page is not intended to be a mirror of ADAMS; rather, we use the Web site to post pieces of information that we consider to be highlights. The meeting of July 23, 2008, was a presentation of the COLA revision that would allow the staff to resume its review of the South Texas Project application in full; as such, the meeting was a highlight.

On November 6, 2008, we had another public meeting with STPNOC on the subject of soils and geosciences. I have asked Tekia Govan to make sure you receive an electronic copy of the summary when it is available.

The staff is currently reviewing Revision 2 to the application and is trying to establish a workable and realistic review schedule. Please be assured that I will inform you when a schedule is available. Once a schedule is issued, you can probably expect a Federal Register notice announcing the opportunity for a hearing to follow within a couple of weeks. Again, I will inform you when this notice is published. All hearing related information, including dates and deadlines, will be contained in the Federal Register notice.

You mentioned that the design proposed by STPNOC differs from the certified design to some extent. This is true; these differences are called departures from the certified design and they are discussed in detail in Section 7 of the COLA, the Departures Report. This report is available on our public Web site. If you have questions or comments on specific departures, I will be happy to discuss them with you.

I hope that this addresses your concerns. If not, please feel free to call or to write again.

Sincerely,

George Wunder

From: Karen Hadden [mailto:karen@seedcoalition.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 20, 2008 1:14 PM
To: George Wunder
Cc: Belkys Sosa; Paul Kallan; William Burton
Subject: Questions / requests regarding STP

November 20, 2008

To: George Wunder, COLA Project Manager
CC: Belkys Sosa, Chief, ESBWR/ ABWR Projects Branch
Paul Kallan, Environmental Project Manager

William Burton, Environmental Projects Branch

Dear Mr. Wunder,

I attended the Oct. 23, 2008 STP meeting in Rockville, Maryland regarding the proposed STP Units 3 and 4 and want to follow up on requests made at that time.

- I was told that meeting slides and minutes from that meeting would be posted on the NRC website, but they are still not there as of today,

nearly a month later. Could you please send them by email in the meantime and post them on your web site right away?

The presentations and a summary are posted for a previous meeting, held on July 23, 2008. Other than the Oct. 23 meeting have there been

other public meetings held since that date? If so, please also email the presentations and summaries for those meetings, and post them as well.

- At the Oct. 23rd meeting I asked for an update of the review of the STP application, similar to the one presented in July. I was informed that the NRC

was working to develop that schedule further. Is there now an update to what was presented in July? If so, please email it. If not, when will it be available?

What are the proposed dates for finishing the review, and for posting on the federal register? When is the 60 day window for citizens to respond likely to begin?

- What additional changes have been made to the reactor design? Are there any further changes in the departures requested, or any further correspondence

or analysis by NRC regarding the departures and their impacts?

- Please email or mail any and all analysis that documents how the changes to the instrumentation and control systems for the reactor would be improved and

and be safer. Speakers at the 10/23/08 meeting stated that the changes make the plant safer, but no documentation as to why was provided. I requested this information orally at the meeting, and have received no response. This is a second request for that information. Simply stating that the changes meet NRC guidelines is an inadequate response.

For decades, citizens have been told that numerous back up systems, safety system after safety system, are the reason why we should believe that nuclear reactors are safe. To all of a sudden be told that redundant instrumentation systems are not needed flies in the face of this oft stated NRC position. Is the change actually safer or is this simply cost-cutting that the NRC is allowing to occur? If it is safer, please document how.

- When will a final version of the design be available, since there are numerous departures from what was originally approved for the ABWRs? Is there a cut-off date

for design changes? Is there a deadline for NRG to stop submitting changes? The design should be finalized before the 60 day clock starts ticking for citizens to comment and request a hearing.

I would again like to point out a concern that I voiced at the Oct. 23rd meeting, which I hope is included in the meeting summary that has not yet been posted.

Citizens are being asked to fully develop concerns and analysis of the proposed reactors and their impacts at a time when the design itself is still changing.

We are being put at a severe disadvantage, prejudicing our case. The lack of complete information in both the COLA and reactor design harms our ability to develop our case and get expert witness testimony regarding important issues.

While the ABWR design was preapproved, the changes proposed in numerous departures make it a significantly changed design. The process should start over due to this fact. Another Bay City public meeting should be held, as requested at the July 23, 2008 meeting, one at which citizens at least know what the design is for the proposed reactor, as this can mean significant changes in the potential risks and impacts of the reactors.

Thank You,

Karen Hadden, Executive Director
Sustainable Energy & Economic Development (SEED) Coalition
1303 San Antonio, Suite 100
Austin, Texas 78701

cell: 512-797-8481
office: 512-637-9481

fax: 512-284-9589

Hearing Identifier: SouthTexas34Public_EX
Email Number: 961

Mail Envelope Properties (419623E8C7444444BF132DA3AE69EDA213FC04232A)

Subject: RE: Questions / requests regarding STP
Sent Date: 11/25/2008 9:54:38 AM
Received Date: 11/25/2008 9:54:41 AM
From: George Wunder

Created By: George.Wunder@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Karen Hadden" <karen@seedcoalition.org>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6878	11/25/2008 9:54:41 AM

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