

Logan, Dennis

From: Eccleston, Charles
Sent: Wednesday, April 07, 2010 8:25 AM
To: Logan, Dennis; Bacuta, George; Beissel, Dennis; Bulavinetz, Richard; Imboden, Andy; Klementowicz, Stephen; Rikhoff, Jeffrey; Travers, Allison; Pham, Bo
Cc: Stuyvenberg, Andrew
Subject: RE: Draft Outline of alternatives for Salem/Hope SEIS

Dennis,

"IDT" is a term commonly used in NEPA circles and refers to the Interdisciplinary Team which prepares the EIS. I will drop by your office today to discuss your questions about the alternatives.

Charles

From: Logan, Dennis
Sent: Wednesday, April 07, 2010 8:15 AM
To: Eccleston, Charles; Bacuta, George; Beissel, Dennis; Bulavinetz, Richard; Imboden, Andy; Klementowicz, Stephen; Rikhoff, Jeffrey; Travers, Allison; Pham, Bo
Cc: Stuyvenberg, Andrew
Subject: RE: Draft Outline of alternatives for Salem/Hope SEIS

Charles:

A couple of questions: Who is IDT? Who is actually writing alternatives? Shouldn't this also be going out to the contractors who are writing the various sections since they will actually be preparing the sections?

Regarding retirement options, we have many combinations (retire Hope Creek, relicense Salem 1 and 2; retire Hope Creek and Salem 1, retire Salem 2; retire Hope and Salem 2, relicense Salem 1, ..., retire all three). Where in the outline do we say we have all these options and explain why we assess only two of nine? Then we have each of those combinations in combination with natural gas, coal, etc. to replace the retired unit(s).

Somewhere it seems that we have got to address the problem that we have made alternatives extremely complicated by doing one EIS for three plants and that we are therefore making extreme simplifications to render the problem tractable. Perhaps Rationalization should be the first section under 8.1.

Alternative 8.2.2 seems like a reasonably foreseeable option, since PSGE has made noises about building a new plant. Likewise, many of the other alternatives in 8.2 seem to be good, realistic alternatives. Where in the outline is the rationalization and procedure for dismissing apparently viable alternatives and relegating them into section 8.2? Once again, we seem to need a Rationalization (or whatever) section for 8.2. That is, we need to explain our decision-making process to our readers rather than just give them the results of our decisions.

Where in the outline do the impacts by discipline go? Do they include cumulative?

Dennis

From: Eccleston, Charles
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 9:50 AM
To: Bacuta, George; Beissel, Dennis; Bulavinetz, Richard; Imboden, Andy; Klementowicz, Stephen; Logan, Dennis; Rikhoff, Jeffrey; Travers, Allison; Pham, Bo; Eccleston, Charles

Cc: Stuyvenberg, Andrew

Subject: Draft Outline of alternatives for Salem/Hope SEIS

IDT,

Attached is the draft list of alternatives for the Salem/Hope Creek SEIS. Please provide any comments by Friday 19th.

Charles H. Eccleston

Charles H. Eccleston
Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Licensing Renewal, Project Manager
301.415.8537
charles.eccleston@nrc.gov