

PMSTPCOL PEmails

From: Lopas, Sarah
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2009 11:33 AM
To: STPCOL
Subject: FW: ML092750384 - SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT UNITS 3 AND 4 (public)
Attachments: STP Alternative Sites RAIs.pdf

From: Lopas, Sarah
Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2009 12:37 PM
To: rwkiesling@stpegs.com
Subject: FW: ML092750384 - SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT UNITS 3 AND 4

Russell, attached is a PDF. The ADAMS accession number is bolded below. Talk to you at 2pm. -Sarah

From: Horne, Ronnie
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2009 5:12 PM
To: RidsNroDser Resource; RidsNroDserRap1 Resource; RidsNroDserRap2 Resource; RidsOgcMailCenter Resource; RidsNroDserRap3 Resource; Taylor, Jennifer; Dricks, Victor; Wunder, George; STPCOL; Thadani, Mohan; Spencer, Michael; Kirkwood, Sara; RidsNroDserRenv Resource; Whited, Ryan; Lopas, Sarah; rwkiesling@stpegs.com
Cc: Adrian Heymer; Anne W. Cottingham; Charles Brinkman; Chris Maslak; cindyrae_52@yahoo.com; C. Waltman; David Lewis; Donald Woodlan; Bill Stillwell; Eddie R. Grant; James Gresham; George Alan Zinke; Jerald G. Head; Jay M. Gutierrez; James Riccio; James J. Nesrsta; John O'Neill; Joseph Hegner; Junichi Uchiyama; Karen Hadden; Kevin Richards; Kathryn M. Sutton; Kenneth O. Waugh; Lawrence J. Chandler; Louis Eichenberger; Mark McBurnett; Marc Brooks; Maria Webb; Mark Beaumont; Matias Travieso-Diaz; Brad Maurer; Scott Peterson; Mike Moran; Marvin Fertel; Michael Mariotte; Patricia L. Campbell; Paul Gaukler; Paul Gunter; Peter Hastings; Russell Bell; R.K. Temple; Steve A. Bennett; Sandra Sloan; Stephen P. Frantz; Scott Head; Stephan Moen; Tansel Selekler; Tom Miller; Vanessa Quinn; Bill Victor; vochoa@mail.utexas.edu; Wanda K. Marshall; Wayne Marquino; Bill Mookhoek; William Maher; Steve A. Bennett; Charles Brookhouser; John Corder; Bobby Head; Jayson Hudson; Stephen Kale; Wanda K. Marshall; Frank Quinn; George Stramback
Subject: ML092750384 - SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT UNITS 3 AND 4

ADAMS Accession Number: **ML092750384**

LETTER To: Mr. Scott Head
From: Jessie Muir
Date: October 1, 2009

Subject: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING ALTERNATIVE SITES RELATED TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT FOR THE SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT UNITS 3 AND 4 COMBINED LICENSES APPLICATION

From: Calliste, Linda
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2009 4:36 PM
To: Horne, Ronnie
Subject: ML092750384 - HQ DPC processing is complete.

If you have any questions or require additional information, you may contact the ADAMS Customer Support Center, 415-1234, press 1 or send an e-mail to, ADAMSIM.

Hearing Identifier: SouthTexas34Public_EX
Email Number: 1789

Mail Envelope Properties (A56E37EC1CBC8045910287CEF5E7AE6CF03A7168)

Subject: FW: ML092750384 - SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT UNITS 3 AND 4 (public)
Sent Date: 10/19/2009 11:33:15 AM
Received Date: 10/19/2009 11:33:16 AM
From: Lopas, Sarah

Created By: Sarah.Lopas@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"STPCOL" <STP.COL@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2412	10/19/2009 11:33:16 AM
STP Alternative Sites RAls.pdf	221761	

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

October 1, 2009

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

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING ALTERNATIVE
SITES RELATED TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT FOR THE SOUTH
TEXAS PROJECT UNITS 3 AND 4 COMBINED LICENSES APPLICATION

Dear Mr. Head:

This letter presents requests for additional information (RAIs) for the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) review of the alternative sites related to the South Texas Project (STP) combined licenses (COL) application environmental report (Revision 3). The RAIs are presented in tabular format in Enclosure 1.

The NRC requests that the STP Nuclear Operating Company provide responses to these RAIs within 30 calendar days of this letter. If changes are needed to the environmental report, the staff requests that the RAI response include the proposed wording change. The environmental review schedule assumes that technically correct and complete responses will be received within 30 days. For any RAI information that cannot be answered in this timeframe, it is expected that a date for the receipt of this information will be provided to the NRC within the 30-day period.

If you have any questions or comments concerning this matter, you may contact me at (301) 415-0491 or via email at Jessie.Muir@nrc.gov or Ms. Sarah Lopas at (301) 415-1147 or via email at Sarah.Lopas@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Jessie M. Muir, Environmental Project Manager
Environmental Projects Branch 2
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews
Office of New Reactors

Docket Nos. 52-012 and 52-013

Enclosures:
As stated

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

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING ALTERNATIVE
SITES RELATED TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT FOR THE SOUTH
TEXAS PROJECT UNITS 3 AND 4 COMBINED LICENSES APPLICATION

Dear Mr. Head:

This letter presents requests for additional information (RAIs) for the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) review of the alternative sites related to the South Texas Project (STP) combined licenses (COL) application environmental report (Revision 3). The RAIs are presented in tabular format in Enclosure 1.

The NRC requests that the STP Nuclear Operating Company provide responses to these RAIs within 30 calendar days of this letter. If changes are needed to the environmental report, the staff requests that the RAI response include the proposed wording change. The environmental review schedule assumes that technically correct and complete responses will be received within 30 days. For any RAI information that cannot be answered in this timeframe, it is expected that a date for the receipt of this information will be provided to the NRC within the 30-day period.

If you have any questions or comments concerning this matter, you may contact me at (301) 415-0491 or via email at Jessie.Muir@nrc.gov or Ms. Sarah Lopas at (301) 415-1147 or via email at Sarah.Lopas@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Jessie M. Muir, Environmental Project Manager
Environmental Projects Branch 2
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews
Office of New Reactors

Docket Nos. 52-012 and 52-013

Enclosures:
As stated

DISTRIBUTION:
See Next Page

ADAMS Accession Number: ML092570682

OFFICE	PM:RAP2:DSER:NRO	LA:RAP1:DSER:NRO	OGC	BC:RAP2:DSER:NRO
NAME	JMuir	GHawkins	MSpencer	RWhited
DATE	09/21/09	09/16/09	09/30/09	10/01/09

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Letter to Scott Head from Jessie M. Muir dated October 1, 2009

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING ALTERNATIVE
SITES RELATED TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT FOR THE SOUTH
TEXAS PROJECT UNITS 3 AND 4 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC	RidsNroDserRap1	RidsNroDserRap2	RidsNroDserRap3
RidsNroDser	JTaylor, RI	VDricks, RIV	GWunder
STP COL	MThadani, NRR	RidsOgcMail Center	MSpencer, OGC
SKirkwood, OGC	RAP2 R/F	RidsNroDserRenv	RWhited, NRO
Nona Diediker (Nona.Diediker@pnl.gov)		Beverly Miller (Beverly.Miller@pnl.gov)	

A.C. Conrad
P.O. Box 187
Egypt TX 77436-0187

Mr. Robert Alvarado
234 Baker Ave,
San Antonio TX 78211-1806

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

Mr. Douglas Anderson
253 PR 518
Bay City TX 77414

Mr. Kevin Anderson
4204 Hines Ln.
Bay City TX 77414

Mr. Larry Archer
528 Walnut St.
Lake Jackson TX 77566

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

Mr. Owen Bludau
Matagorda County EDA
3928 Wickersham
Bay City TX 77414

Ms. Mary Carter
4709 Austin St.
Houston TX 77004

Mr. Jim Cohenour
Route 1, Box 237
Palacios TX 77465

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

Mr. Roy Craft
1707 Pecan St.
Bay City TX 77414

Mr. Jim Crawford
4300 Virginia
Bay City TX 77414

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

Pat Curry
4001 Aggie Dr.
Bay City TX 77414

Mr. Bill Curry
4001 Aggie Dr.
Bay City TX 77414

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

Mr. Lee Dannhaus
149 PR 672
Bay City TX 77414

Mr. Dora Duncan
1720 Elm Ave.
Bay City TX 77141

Mr. Marvin Fertel
Sr. VP and Chief Nuclear Officer
Nuclear Energy Institute
1776 I Street, NW, Ste. 400
Washington DC 20006-3708

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

Mr. Mike Griffith
34 Valhalla Dr.
Bay City TX 77414

Ms. Karen Hadden
SEED Coalition
1801 Westlake Dr., #209
Austin TX 78746

Ms. Maria Hamilton
4605 7th Street
Bay City TX 77414

Ms. Sandra Harris
2200 7th St., #303
Bay City TX 77414

Mr. L.V. Harvey
1707 Moore Ave.
Bay City TX 77414

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

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

Georgia Rice Herreth
3224 Avenue K
Bay City TX 77414

Ms. Debra Huse
2000 Willow St.
Bay City TX 77414

Mr. Charles Irvine
4709 Austin St.
Houston TX 77004

Blanche & Eugene Johnson
3419 Walnut Dr.
Bay City TX 77414

Mr. Stephen Kale
3010 Sable Crossing
San Antonio TX 78232

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

Mr. Brent Marceaux
204 Ronald Ave.
Bay City TX 77414

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

Mr. Mike McGehearty
3320 Avenue J
Bay City TX 77414

Mr. Larry Merritt
614 8th St.
Bay City TX 77414

Ms. Stephanie Merritt
ARC
614 8th St.
Bay City TX 77414

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

Mr. Kevin Moriarty
105 Circle Way
Lake Jackson TX 77566

Mr. Kevin Murphy
6406 Scott Ln.
Pearland TX 77581

Ben & Sara Murphy
4216 FM 2853
Palacios TX 77465

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

Mr. Juan Parras
6733 Harrisburg Blvd.
Houston TX 77011

Cameron Payne
1919 A Harold St.
Houston TX 77098

Ms. Jackie Peden
714 W. House St.
Alvin TX 77511

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

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

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

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

Mr. Cyrus Reed
1202 San Antonio
Austin TX 78701

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

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

Ms. Roberta Ripke
457 Commerce
Palacios TX 77465

Ms. Cristella Rodriquez
P.O. Box 546
Bay City TX 77414

Ms. Kim Russell
2501 Carrington
Bay City TX 77414

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

Ms. Becca Sitz
2206 Avenue G
Bay City TX 77414

Bill & Anna Strickland
203 CR 243
Bay City TX 77414

Ladell Sump
104 Lindsey Ave.
Bay City TX 77414

Ms. Anna Sue Thompson
2951 SH 35C
Bay City TX 77414

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

Mr. Bob Watts
2200 7th St.
Bay City TX 77414

Mr. John Weaver
1013 Mockingbird Ln.
Richwood TX 77531

Mr. Charles R. Winfield
315 West Craymer
Palacios TX 77465

Ms. Cathy Woods
2300 Hillcrest Dr.
Bay City TX 77414

Mr. James Woods
2800 Hillcrest Dr.
Bay City TX 77414

Certrec Corporation
4200 South Hulen, Suite 422
Fort Worth, TX 76109

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

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

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

Bill Mookhoek
Licensing Supervisor
STP Units 3 and 4
Project Electric Generating Station
P.O. Box 289
Wadsworth, TX 77483

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

Kathy C. Perkins, RN, MBA
Assistant Commissioner
Division for Regulatory Services
Texas Department of State Health Services
P.O. Box 149347
Austin, Texas 78714-9347

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

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

Alice Hamilton Rogers, PE
Inspections Unit Manager
Texas Department of State Health Services
P.O. Box 149347
Austin, Texas 78714-9347

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
STP Nuclear Operating Company
1301 McKinney, Suite 2300
Houston, TX 77010

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

Email

APH@NEI.org (Adrian Heymer)
awc@nei.org (Anne W. Cottingham)
BrinkmCB@westinghouse.com (Charles Brinkman)
chris.maslak@ge.com (Chris Maslak)
cindyrae_52@yahoo.com
cwaltman@roe.com (C. Waltman)
david.lewis@pillsburylaw.com (David Lewis)
donald.woodlan@luminant.com (Donald Woodlan)
dwstillwell@stpegs.com (Bill Stillwell)
erg-xl@cox.net (Eddie R. Grant)
greshaja@westinghouse.com (James Gresham)
gzinke@entergy.com (George Alan Zinke)
jerald.head@ge.com (Jerald G. Head)
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)
karen@seedcoalition.org (Karen Hadden)
kdrichards@stpegs.com (Kevin Richards)
KSutton@morganlewis.com (Kathryn M. Sutton)
kwaugh@impact-net.org (Kenneth O. Waugh)
lchandler@morganlewis.com (Lawrence J. Chandler)
louis.eichenberger@ge.com (Louis Eichenberger)
mamcburnett@stpegs.com (Mark McBurnett)
Marc.Brooks@dhs.gov (Marc Brooks)
maria.webb@pillsburylaw.com (Maria Webb)
mark.beaumont@wsms.com (Mark Beaumont)
matias.travieso-diaz@pillsburylaw.com (Matias Travieso-Diaz)
maurerbf@westinghouse.com (Brad Maurer)
media@nei.org (Scott Peterson)
mike_moran@fpl.com (Mike Moran)
MSF@nei.org (Marvin Fertel)
nirsnet@nirs.org (Michael Mariotte)
patriciaL.campbell@ge.com (Patricia L. Campbell)
paul.gaukler@pillsburylaw.com (Paul Gaukler)
Paul@beyondnuclear.org (Paul Gunter)
pshastings@duke-energy.com (Peter Hastings)
RJB@NEI.org (Russell Bell)
RKTemple@cpsenergy.com (R.K. Temple)
sabinski@suddenlink.net (Steve A. Bennett)
sandra.sloan@areva.com (Sandra Sloan)
sfrantz@morganlewis.com (Stephen P. Frantz)

smhead@stpegs.com (Scott Head)
stephan.moen@ge.com (Stephan Moen)
Tansel.Selekler@nuclear.energy.gov (Tansel Selekler)
tom.miller@hq.doe.gov (Tom Miller)
Vanessa.quinn@dhs.gov (Vanessa Quinn)
VictorB@bv.com (Bill Victor)
vochoa@mail.utexas.edu
Wanda.K.Marshall@dom.com (Wanda K. Marshall)
wayne.marquino@ge.com (Wayne Marquino)
wemookhoek@stpegs.com (Bill Mookhoek)
william.maher@fpl.com (William Maher)
ceja.aswunion.org (Robert Alvarado)
bennettS2@bv.com (Steve A. Bennett)
charles.brookhouser@wellsfargo.com (Charles Brookhouser)
jcorder@brazorianet.com (John Corder)
texPatriots@aol.com (Bobby Head)
Jayson.M.Hudson@usace.army.mil (Jayson Hudson)
stephen.kale@sbcglobal.net (Stephen Kale)
wanda.k.marshall@dom.com (Wanda K. Marshall)
frankq@hursttech.com (Frank Quinn)
george.stramback@gene.ge.com (George Stramback)

**Requests for Additional Information (RAIs)
South Texas Project Units 3 and 4
Combined Operating License Application
Supplemental Alternative Sites RAIS**

RAI Number	Regulatory Basis	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)
9.3 – 10	10 CFR 51.45(c) 10 CFR 51.71(d)	Clarify the assumptions behind the in-migration scenarios for each alternative.	For each alternative site a two-county Region of Interest (an additional county) is used without explanation as to how (non-host county) was chosen. Additionally, the same percentage of workers migrating used at STP (60.7% in one county, 22.4% in the other) is used for each alternative site without an explanation of why the same percentage is assumed. Given the proximity of Allens Creek to Houston, please explain why the same number of workers is expected to migrate to the Allens Creek site as to the STP site.
9.3 – 11	10 CFR 51.45(c) 10 CFR 51.71(d)	Provide additional information regarding the transportation network for each alternative site.	In regards to roads, please provide the number of lanes, current utilization, capacities, likely commuter routes and how traffic would occur during construction for each alternative site.
9.3 – 12	10 CFR 51.45(c) 10 CFR 51.71(d)	Clarify the use of census blocks, census block groups, and census block points as applied to the Environmental Justice analysis, as well as the 5-mile radius for minorities and 10-mile radius for low-income populations.	The bullet on page 48 of revised ER Section 9.3 indicates census blocks within 5 miles of the Red 2 site. But page 49 indicates 12 census block groups within a 10-mile radius. In addition, the Freestone alternative site uses census block points. Please clarify if census block points are the same as census block groups. If a 5-mile radius is used to ascertain minority populations in the Freestone area, a 10-mile radius is used for ascertaining the low-income population. Please clarify what different approaches would be used for minority versus low-income populations.
9.3 – 13	10 CFR 51.45(c) 10 CFR 51.71(d)	Provide information as to how construction of the Allens Creek Reservoir would impact the Texas Independence trail.	The ER states that construction of the Allens Creek Reservoir would impact the Texas Independence Trail. What part of the Texas Independence Trail is located near the Allens Creek site, how many visitors would be impacted, and how would construction impact it?

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4
Supplemental Alternative Sites RAIs

RAI Number	Regulatory Basis	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)
9.3 – 14	10 CFR 51.45 RG 4.2 ESRP 9.3	Explain whether the consumptive use of water at the Red 2 and Trinity 2 sites would cause significant adverse effects on other water users.	ESRP Section 9.3 (2007) states that consumptive use of water at the site should not cause significant adverse effects on other water users. That for both Red 2 and Trinity 2, the necessary water rights for consumption for the proposed two-unit plant are not presently held by STPNOC and would need to be acquired, however, the EIS does not discuss the potential impacts of consumptive water use on surrounding areas.
9.3 – 15	10 CFR 51.45 RG 4.2 ESRP 9.3	Clarify the population screening criteria in ER Table 9.3-1.	ER Table 9.3-1 indicates that urban areas were excluded from the screening criteria. What criteria were used in designating urban areas. Explain the criteria for designating urban areas.
9.3 – 16	10 CFR 51.45 RG 4.2 ESRP 9.3	Clarify why major highways were avoided in the identification of potential sites.	The first full bullet on page 9.3-6 of the ER states that areas where major highways were avoided. Explain why these areas were avoided.
9.3 – 17	10 CFR 51.45 RG 4.2 ESRP 9.3	Clarify the process used to eliminate some of the potential sites from further consideration.	The explanation for eliminating some of the potential sites from further consideration. For example, the Red 1 site looks suitable except in the “combined” ranking (ER, p. 9.3-164). Here the site is scored negatively with regard to access to transmission, barge, and rail. Using environmental-only criteria, the site ranks second (ER, p. 9.3-164). In explaining the expanded ranking, the ER (p. 9.3-8) says that rail and transmission access is a surrogate for related environmental impacts. Are the “Environmental Criteria” a mix of business and environmental factors? If so, the “Environmental Criteria” already include the environmental impacts of rail and transmission improvements such as rail and transmission access? If yes, why are scores for access as an environmental proxy would appear to be counting those impacts. That said, the explanation of Criteria D.2.2.1 (Siting Report, pages D-76 and D-83) indicates that the analysis was only done for the site area. These apparently conflicting statements need to be resolved.

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4
Supplemental Alternative Sites RAIs

RAI Number	Regulatory Basis	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)
9.3 – 18	10 CFR 51.45 RG 4.2 ESRP 9.3	Explain the use of distance as a potential site screening criterion.	In Siting Report Table 5-1, Criteria P7 and P8 are stated a distance is used as a surrogate for cost. If cost was used sites, please justify this. Cost is generally considered in a after an environmentally preferable alternative site has been usually not appropriate to use cost for screening potential distance can also potentially be a surrogate for environmental outcome may be acceptable. Explain how and why distance screening criteria.
9.3 – 19	10 CFR 51.45 RG 4.2 ESRP 9.3	Explain the use of land acquisition cost as a potential site screening criterion.	In Siting Report Table 5-1, Criterion P9 is land acquisition why land acquisition cost was chosen as a potential site s
9.3 – 20	10 CFR 51.45 RG 4.2 ESRP 9.3	Explain the use of barge access in site screening.	The proposed STP site appears to be the only site for which considered (Siting Report, p. C-71). Was barge access co the alternative sites? Further explanation is needed.
9.3 – 21	10 CFR 51.45 RG 4.2 ESRP 9.3	Why was half of the Valley Lake acreage included in the wetlands estimate for the Red 2 site?	Page C-69 of the Siting Report indicates that half the acre included in the wetlands estimate for the Red 2 site. Why included given that no plant structures would be constructed approach is taken for the Red 2 site, would it be appropriate consistency, to include half of the MCR acreage at the ST estimate?
9.3-22	10 CFR 51.70(b) 10 CFR 51 Appendix A	Provide a copy of the STP Nuclear Operating Company Nuclear Power Plant Siting Report (June 2009) on the docket.	The Siting Report contains details regarding the site selection approach that are not included in the revision to ER Section STPNOC Letter U7-C-STP-NRC-090066), and are needed alternative sites in the EIS. If the Siting Report contains p provide a redacted version that can be made publicly avail

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4
Supplemental Alternative Sites RAIs

RAI Number	Regulatory Basis	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)
9.3.2 – 6	10 CFR 51.45 10 CFR 51 Appendix A ESRP 9.3	Provide clarification on the selection process for alternative sites regarding consideration of “important species.”	The proposed text for revision to ER Section 9.3.2 (the Attachment to STPNOC Letter U7-C-STP-NRC-090066) states that “important species” are included in the criteria for primary site selection, and “important species” are included in the evaluation of threatened and endangered species. During the review of the applicant and in the staff’s review of STPNOC Nuclear Power Plant (June 2009), the evaluation of important species was conducted at the county level. However, in the proposed text for revision to ER Section 9.3.3.1 (the Attachment to STPNOC Letter U7-C-STP-NRC-090066), the discussion for the STP site includes only those species known to occur within the county. Clarify why the evaluation of important species for STP is discussed only at the site-level, rather than at the county level, as is done for the other potential sites.
9.3.2 – 7	10 CFR 51.45 10 CFR 51 Appendix A ESRP 9.3	Provide clarification as to why once-through cooling system was chosen for the coastal sites.	The proposed text for revision to ER Section 9.3.2 (the Attachment to STPNOC Letter U7-C-STP-NRC-090066) states that “For purposes of site selection, once-through cooling was assumed for the coastal location.” However, the restrictions placed on once-through cooling technology by Section 316(b) and EPA’s implementing regulations in 40 CFR 125.61 is not clear why this cooling system is considered viable. Clarify why a once-through cooling system is a viable option.
9.3.2 – 8	10 CFR 51.45 10 CFR 51 Appendix A ESRP 9.3	Provide clarification regarding the selection of Candidate Areas within the Region of Interest with respect to guidance described in Regulatory Guide 4.7, ESRP Section 9.3 and the EPRI Siting Guide as it relates to water availability.	The NRC staff’s meeting with Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) staff on August 27, 2009, regarding water availability for STPNOC’s alternative sites revealed that although it is possible to obtain a permit for a reliable supply of water in the quantities required for Units 3 and 4, obtaining such a permit would be difficult for the proposed 2 alternative sites. TCEQ staff stated that it would be significant to obtain a water use permit for sites that used waters from the Gulf of Mexico because such use would not compete with fresh surface waters. Regulatory Guide 4.7, Section 7.2, p. 4.7-13, states: “To ensure the availability of sites, there should be reasonable assurance that permits for the use of water in the quantities needed for a nuclear power plant can be obtained. The approximate capacity and type of cooling system can be determined by the applicant from the appropriate State, local, or regional agency.”

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4
Supplemental Alternative Sites RAIs

RAI Number	Regulatory Basis	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)
			<p>Explain how it was determined that there is a reasonable use permits at the alternative sites (Red 2, Trinity 2, and A obtained.</p> <p>ESRP 9.3 lists Federal, State, local, and Native American regulations affecting the siting of new energy facilities as a Further, ESRP 9.3 states “[t]he reviewer should determine employed a practicable site-selection process with the primary identifying candidate sites that would be among the best to be found for the proposed plant. This standard implies that sites should be licensable (which includes consideration of necessary Federal, State, and local permits could be obtained how TCEQ’s requirements related to water availability and considered in the alternative site selection by STPNOC, or approach.</p> <p>The EPRI Siting Guide (used by STPNOC according to states in Chapter 3, Detailed Discussion of Siting Criteria, Cooling Water Supply: (a) “Sites that are incapable of providing water supply within applicable physical <i>and regulatory constraints</i> excluded from further consideration. The evaluation of water should include both the effects on water quantity left in the and the effects on water quality as a result of reduced water capacity.” (emphasis added), (b) “The allocation <i>policies at the state level</i> govern the use and consumption of cooling of the ability to supply the facility water requirements <i>must for other uses into account.</i>” (emphasis added), and (c) “C unique physical and <i>regulatory characteristics</i> of the ROI defined...” (emphasis added).</p> <p>Explain how the guidance related to state regulatory characteristics constraints listed in the EPRI Siting Guide were used by S</p>

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4
Supplemental Alternative Sites RAIs

RAI Number	Regulatory Basis	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)
			<p>alternative site selection study. Specifically, explain how the availability and permitting issues from rivers in the state of Texas are taken into account in the exclusionary and avoidance criteria used to select Potential Sites.</p> <p>Explain how the approach used in the Siting Report, with respect to water, provides a reasonable expectation that the sites identified are among the best available in the ROI.</p>
9.3.2 – 9	10 CFR 51.45 10 CFR 51 Appendix A ESRP 9.3	Provide clarification on screening criteria used for identification of Candidate Areas with regard to proximity to rivers or the gulf.	Table 3-1 of the Siting Report sets the screening distance of 10 miles and 10 miles for the Gulf of Mexico. Explain the basis for the distances with respect to impacts from a pipeline that may be constructed from the site to the respective water body for drinking water or makeup water.

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4
Supplemental Alternative Sites RAIs

RAI Number	Regulatory Basis	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)
9.3.2 – 10	10 CFR 51.45 10 CFR 51 Appendix A ESRP 9.3	Provide clarification on screening criteria ratings for Potential Sites with regard to water supply.	<p>1. Table 9.3-2 in the proposed text for revision to ER Sec composite ratings of the Potential Sites. The Siting Re rating for a Potential Site based on the screening criteri Supply is the average of two components: (a) ability to quantity requirement and (b) availability of water rights rated 5 for the first component if the water source has the second component, a site should be rated 5 if water owned by the applicant.</p> <p>Table 9.3-2 in the proposed text for revision to ER Sec water supply criterion score for the proposed site, the 5 applicant currently holds water rights at the STP site. supply source at the STP site, the Colorado River, doe unlimited capacity. Explain why the STP site was rated</p> <p>Table 9.3-2 in the proposed text for revision to ER Sec water supply criterion scores for the two coastal sites v coastal sites, however, have access to a water source capacity. Also, the staff's discussions with TCEQ have little regulatory restriction on obtaining water rights from Given this information, explain the basis for rating the water supply.</p> <p>2. In Appendix C of the Siting Report, Section C.2, Scree details of ratings for each criterion for all Potential Site coastal sites, a note is included for the Cooling Water states: "Pipeline construction to Gulf of Mexico could e challenges from crossing critical habitat." This stateme ecology consideration and not a hydrology consideration this consideration had on the coastal sites scoring a 4 Supply criterion.</p>

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4
Supplemental Alternative Sites RAIs

RAI Number	Regulatory Basis	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)
9.3.3 – 4	10 CFR 51.45 10 CFR 51 Appendix A ESRP 9.3	Provide clarification on the evaluation of essential fish habitat at the STP site.	Section 2.4.2.4 of the Environmental Report (ER), Rev. 2, Colorado River is designated essential fish habitat (EFH) by the Fishery Management Council. The ER is also consistent with NOAA's Office of Habitat Conservation and is available to the public on NOAA's Office of Habitat Conservation website (http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/habitat/habitatprotection/efh/G). However, the proposed text for revision to ER Section 9.3.3.4.5 (the STPNOC Letter U7-C-STP-NRC-090066) implies that the Colorado River is not essential fish habitat, and that EFH is seven miles away from Matagorda Bay. Explain why there is a discrepancy regarding EFH for the lower Colorado River.
9.3.3 – 5	10 CFR 51.45 10 CFR 51 Appendix A ESRP 9.3	Provide clarification on the evaluation of water availability and aquatic resources for the Trinity 2 site.	The proposed text for revision to ER Section 9.3.3.4.5 (the STPNOC Letter U7-C-STP-NRC-090066) does not consider reservoirs within the vicinity of the Trinity 2 site. According to the Authority Basin Master Plan, there are two significant reservoirs (Colony Reservoir and Tehuacana Reservoir) that would be adjacent to Trinity 2 and would be contiguous with Lake Fairfield. Even if these reservoirs would be similar to the evaluation of Allens Creek at the proposed Allens Creek site. The impact from construction of Trinity 2 was considered MODERATE, whereas the same impact from construction of a reservoir for Allens Creek was considered MODERATE. The process of inundating land for the construction of a planned reservoir at Allens Creek appear to be similar. Clarify why Trinity 2 site was evaluated differently from Allens Creek with regard to planned reservoirs that are in the same domain.

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4
Supplemental Alternative Sites RAIs

RAI Number	Regulatory Basis	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)
9.3.3 – 6	10 CFR 51.45 10 CFR 51 Appendix A ESRP 9.3	Provide clarification on groundwater use during operations and the groundwater availability at the alternative sites.	<p>For all alternative sites, STPNOC stated that groundwater construction would be approximately 1200 gpm. There is groundwater use during operations for the alternative sites discussion of groundwater use during operations. Also provide the quantity of groundwater that may be used during construction used during operations for all alternative sites.</p> <p>In the proposed text for revision to ER Section 9.3, STPNOC alternative site: “In summary, due to the relatively small quantity and the availability of groundwater or imported water, the SMALL impact on water use for construction activity.” However, and imported water availability determined at each alternative site determined that the groundwater or imported water demand would be “relatively small?”</p>
9.3.3 – 7	10 CFR 51.45 10 CFR 51 Appendix A ESRP 9.3	Provide clarifications regarding cooling water requirements.	<p>In the proposed text for revision to ER Section 9.3.3, STPNOC maximum plant cooling design consumption for a two-unit site is 31,000 gpm (50,000 ac-ft/yr) at the proposed site and at the alternative sites.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the proposed text for revision to ER Section 9.3, Table 9.3.3 Screening Criteria, STPNOC stated that the assumed maximum requirement would be 31,000 gpm (50,000 ac-ft/yr). If consumptive use is the same as makeup water requirement, if the water requirement is larger than 31,000 gpm, provide the percentage of existing water rights that would need to be used at the alternative sites to support the operations of the potential alternative sites. 2. Clarify if the makeup water requirement stated for the alternative sites includes evaporation losses from a cooling reservoir like a cooling pond configuration were to be used at the alternative sites.

South Texas Project Units 3 and 4
Supplemental Alternative Sites RAIs

RAI Number	Regulatory Basis	RAI Summary	Full Text (Supporting Information)
9.3.3 – 8	10 CFR 51.71(d)	Provide supplemental information regarding wildlife and game species associated with the alternative sites and pipeline/transmission line corridors.	Provide additional information describing the common wildlife species that are likely to inhabit 1) forested habitat, 2) grassland habitats that are found at the Trinity 2, Allens Creek, and Llanito sites. Describe the proposed routes for pipelines and transmission corridors in the proposed routes for pipelines and transmission corridors. Describe species that may be considered ecologically, recreationally, or culturally important.
9.3.3 – 9	10 CFR 51.71(d)	Provide information regarding the presence of bird or bat migration corridors for each of the alternative sites.	Provide information to describe whether the three proposed sites are located within a major migratory corridor for birds or bats. If these sites are located within the migratory corridor, describe whether important bird or bat fallout areas are located within the proposed alternative sites.
9.3.3 – 10	10 CFR 51.71(d)	Reconcile land use impact acreage inconsistencies provided in the revised ER section 9.3.	The total acreages cited in 9.3.3.2.1 (land use) for impacts from the proposed cooling water supply pipeline, and road corridors are not equal to the individual acres attributed to each construction activity (p. 9.3-80). Also the case in section 9.3.3.4.1 (p. 9.3-80). Clarify the total acreage attributed to these activities for each of the proposed alternative sites. Describe whether this changes other summary information regarding land use acreages reported in both the land use and terrestrial ecology sections.
9.3.3 – 11	10 CFR 51.71(d)	Describe the potential construction impacts to the Attwater's Prairie Chicken National Wildlife Refuge.	The proposed Allen's Creek site lies to the south of Sealy, Texas, relatively close to the Attwater's Prairie Chicken National Wildlife Refuge, which harbors a population of Attwater's prairie-chicken, a Federally listed species. Describe the approximate distance between the proposed site and the Attwater's Prairie Chicken National Wildlife Refuge and the proposed site, provide approximate routes for associated construction activities. Describe whether proposed construction activities present the potential to affect the viability of or individuals of this species.