

**From:** Paul Aitken [paul.aitken@dom.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 10, 2010 8:23 AM  
**To:** Susco, Jeremy  
**Subject:** RE: follow up to our conversation today  
**Attachments:** MISC-2009-0057 Cultural Resources Portection Plan 9-20-09.pdf

Jeremy,

I believe the comment about alewives comes from a statement made in the draft on page 2-26, at lines 31 and 32, regarding the presence of thiaminase in smelts. The following links will take you to aquatic biology journal articles which implicate the alewife as well.

<http://afsjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1577/H04-002.1?journalCode=aqah>

<http://afsjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1577/H03-081.1?journalCode=aqah>

I have also attached the Cultural Resources Protection Plan.

Paul

---

**From:** Susco, Jeremy [mailto:Jeremy.Susco@nrc.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 06, 2010 4:31 PM  
**To:** Paul Aitken (Generation - 6)  
**Subject:** RE: follow up to our conversation today

Paul,

Two more questions:

For 3<sup>rd</sup> comment on page 4 of your comments, can you provide the reference about alewives? According to our reference noted, smelt is correct. We are perfectly amenable to adding alewives if you could point us to the appropriate reference.

Could you forward me your Cultural Resources Protection Plan mentioned on pages 5 and 6?

Thanks,  
Jeremy

---

**From:** Paul Aitken [mailto:paul.aitken@dom.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 06, 2010 12:03 PM  
**To:** Susco, Jeremy  
**Subject:** FW: follow up to our conversation today

Hi Jeremy,

Rich has added some insights to your other question about the 50 foot buffer comment.

Paul

---

**From:** gallagher\_rj@sbcglobal.net [mailto:gallagher\_rj@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 06, 2010 11:39 AM  
**To:** Paul Aitken (Generation - 6); Theodore L Maloney (Generation - 4)  
**Subject:** Re: follow up to our conversation today

Hi Paul, yes, there was a statement in the draft that implied there are no waterways or wetlands on the transmission line ROWs. See page 2-12, lines 6 and 7:

"...Additionally, there is a 50-foot (15m) minimum buffer between the ROWs and any waterways and wetlands..."

The buffers refer to the areas that are by practice hand cut, rather than mowed (if I remember it correctly) or chemically treated. I think it should be changed so it doesn't look as if the T&D right-of-ways are free of wetlands, because they aren't (nowhere in the world as far as I know).

Maybe the following would be a good modification of the above sentence, and leave the rest of the sentence as is:

"Additionally, there is a 50-foot (15m) buffer around waterways and wetlands in which vegetation management consists of hand cutting only..."

----- Original Message -----

**From:** [Paul Aitken](mailto:Paul.Aitken@sbcglobal.net)  
**To:** [gallagher\\_rj@sbcglobal.net](mailto:gallagher_rj@sbcglobal.net) ; [Theodore L Maloney](mailto:Theodore.L.Maloney@sbcglobal.net)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 05, 2010 2:36 PM  
**Subject:** FW: follow up to our conversation today

Ted & Rich

Can you help me with this question from Jeremy? Jeremy is working with the Dan Doyle to resolve our comments and those rec'd from others. I was at the Cooper ACRS meeting this morning and he asked a couple of questions.

Also, Rich you had a comment on the draft SEI regarding the 200 foot vs. foot buffer for vegetation management. What was the intent of the comment? Was the draft SEI not clear or was it inaccurate/

Thanks

---

**From:** Susco, Jeremy [mailto:Jeremy.Susco@nrc.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 05, 2010 2:20 PM  
**To:** Paul Aitken (Generation - 6)  
**Cc:** Doyle, Daniel  
**Subject:** follow up to our conversation today

Paul,

Nice to meet you again today. Only one question remains after talking with you: On line 2 of page 9-7 of your ER, you list the underground storage tank registrations and their expiration dates. All are expired, but it looks like you submitted a "timely" renewal for 3 of the 5. What about the other two that have an expiration date of 10/28/08?

Thanks,  
Jeremy

Jeremy Susco  
Project Manager  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
(301) 415-2927  
[jeremy.susco@nrc.gov](mailto:jeremy.susco@nrc.gov)

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** This electronic message contains information which may be legally confidential and or privileged and does not in any case represent a firm ENERGY COMMODITY bid or offer relating thereto which binds the sender without an additional express written confirmation to that effect. The information is intended solely for the individual or entity named above and access by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this information is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please reply immediately to the sender that you have received the message in error, and delete it. Thank you.

---

### E-mail Properties

Mail Envelope Properties (23A2D9F7553E664B859332B337ACA83E03FEF50683)

Subject: RE: follow up to our conversation today  
Sent Date: 5/10/2010 8:22:51 AM  
Received Date: 5/10/2010 8:22:51 AM  
From: Paul Aitken

Created By: paul.aitken@dom.com

Recipients:  
Jeremy.Susco@nrc.gov (Susco, Jeremy)  
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:  
DOM-MBX03.mbu.ad.dominionnet.com

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1742549	5/10/2010
MISC-2009-0057 Cultural Resources Portection Plan 9-20-09.pdf		1710484

Options  
Expiration Date:

Priority: oImportanceNormal  
ReplyRequested: False  
Return Notification: False

Sensitivity: oNormal  
Recipients received: