

PMSTPCOL PEmails

From: Muir, Jessie
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2010 9:16 AM
To: Hudson, Jayson M SWG
Cc: Lopas, Sarah; STPCOL
Subject: RE: STP DEIS comments

Jayson,

One quick followup about the river dredging. At some point I believe we decided to state that the river *might* need dredging (versus it will/wont need to dredged). This decision was based on the hearings for Vogtle where dredging was a contested issue.

So for Chapter 3 pg 3-9, I suggest this,

Dredging of the barge slip ~~and navigation channel~~ would be required to allow..... delivered to the site.

Although there are no current plans to dredge the Colorado River Navigation Channel, it is possible dredging might be required in the future.

For the pg 3-14 reference, I will just remove statements about the Colorado River Navigation Channel -- from the subheading and sentence.

We're going to change Figure 2-4 to read, "Dredge Materials Storage Area", to be consistent with the other figures.

Thanks so much for your quick feedback. If you see anything else, keep feeding it to us!

~jessie

From: Muir, Jessie [mailto:Jessie.Muir@nrc.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2010 2:45 PM
To: Hudson, Jayson M SWG
Cc: Lopas, Sarah; STPCOL
Subject: RE: STP DEIS comments

Jayson,

(1) I took a stab at making changes based on your comments. See red text below. Call me to discuss.

(2) A new question, did you notice that the BA and EFH covers include the Corps? Is that okay?

(3) Your previous email with comments said

Chapter 4 and 5 reference that no permit will be required to increase the barge slip. This is incorrect. The barge slip expansion was included in both permit determination requests. There is an existing permit to dredge the intake structure though.

To make sure I'm clear, the intake structure (or RMPF) is covered in the existing Corps permit. Barge slip expansion and maintenance dredging requires a new permit.

Thanks,
Jessie

From: Hudson, Jayson M SWG [mailto:Jayson.M.Hudson@usace.army.mil]
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2010 8:55 AM

To: Muir, Jessie
Cc: Diediker, Nona H; Cutler, Casey K SWG
Subject: STP DEIS comments

A few minor but needed revisions.

Figure 2-4 says USACE Spoil impoundment. This dredge material placement area is not owned or maintained by USACE. **Will remove "USACE".**

Chapter 3; Page 3-9 Line 9 & P 3-14 Line 21 both indicate that the Colorado River Navigation channel will be dredged. This was determined to not be correct. **Are these the only two places (Ch 3 & 4) where we mistate this....and in the rest of the EIS its correctly stated?**

Chapter 4; Section 4.1 P4-4 Line 25 Indicated dredge of Colorado River Channel... see above **see above**

Chapter 4 Section 4.1 P4-4 Line 27 When did an upgrade to the spur line come become part of the project? There is no discussion in the ecology sections of the impacts of upgrading a spur line. **Will ask Harriet if they knew about that.**

Chapter 4 Section 4-2 Does not include reference to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. **Do you have suggested language on the Section 404 permit as it relates to water use re: construction?**

Chapter 4 Section 4.3.2.1 Page 4-28 Lines 7-10 The Corps determined that the re-excavation and expansion of the barge slip would not meet the existing permit and would require authorization. The maintenance dredging of RMPF, however, does have a valid Department of the Army permit. **How about this: "Dredging around the existing barge terminal is anticipated and would require a new Corps authorization." I noticed in Section 5.3.2.1 under the "Maintenance Dredging" section (p 5-41), there is a statement that reads, "STPNOC has stated that periodic dredging in the future would be conducted in front of the RMPF and barge slip. These activities are currently covered by existing permits with the Corps for the operation of Units 1 and 2." Is that correct, based on your comments above?**

Chapter 4 Section 4.3.2.1 P-4-26 Line 18 change "drainage area" to "waters" **My line numbers don't exactly match up, is this the sentence you were referring to....."A total of seven culverts would be used to span ~~drainage areas~~ waters associated with the new roadway"**

Chapter 5 Section 5.2 Line 25-27 No reference to Section 404 Clean Water Act Permit requirement. Permit needed for expansion of barge slip, but not dredging of RMPF. **Do you have suggested language on the Section 404 permit as it relates to water use re: operation?**

Chapter 5 Table 5-21 Page 5-111 Water Quality-Surface water and/or Aquatic Ecosystems needs reference to impacts from maintenance dredge operations. **For the aquatic line item, would the following statement be okay, "Impacts from dredging on aquatic organisms would be minor". For the water quality-surface water input, how about this, "Water quality in the Colorado River would be minimally and temporarily impacted by maintenance dredging of the RMPF. "**

Working on a letter for you too. **Awesome!**

Jayson M. Hudson
Regulatory Project Manager
Galveston District

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Office: 409.766.3108 Fax 409.766.3931

To assist us in improving our service to you, please complete the survey found at

<http://per2.nwp.usace.army.mil/survey.html>

Please Consider the Environment Before Printing

Hearing Identifier: SouthTexas34Public_EX
Email Number: 2012

Mail Envelope Properties (9C2386A0C0BC584684916F7A0482B6CA0B916BE21F)

Subject: RE: STP DEIS comments
Sent Date: 2/18/2010 9:15:49 AM
Received Date: 2/18/2010 9:15:48 AM
From: Muir, Jessie

Created By: Jessie.Muir@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Lopas, Sarah" <Sarah.Lopas@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"STPCOL" <STP.COL@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Hudson, Jayson M SWG" <Jayson.M.Hudson@usace.army.mil>

Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5274	2/18/2010 9:15:48 AM

Options

Priority: Standard

Return Notification: No

Reply Requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal

Expiration Date:

Recipients Received: