

## Logan, Dennis

---

**From:** Spangler, Nicole [Nicole.Spangler@aecom.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 19, 2010 12:15 PM  
**To:** Logan, Dennis  
**Subject:** RE: Salem - hope Creek: mitigation levels

Dennis, after looking at the guidance on mitigation sections, I am confused. It seems we followed this guidance when we say that additional mitigation measures are not likely warranted. Chapter 4 is full of that sentence. Do you have any suggestions on how should I correct it?

Thanks!

**Nicole M. Spangler**  
Environmental Engineer  
D 864.234.3283  
[nicole.spangler@aecom.com](mailto:nicole.spangler@aecom.com)



Please consider the environment before you print this document

---

**From:** Logan, Dennis [<mailto:Dennis.Logan@nrc.gov>]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 16, 2010 11:34 AM  
**To:** Dillard, Steve; Duda, Steve  
**Cc:** Spangler, Nicole  
**Subject:** Salem - hope Creek: mitigation levels

Steve,

Just a note--I noticed the following in the Salem Hope Creek draft:

"The NRC staff concludes that impacts to fish and shellfish from heat shock at Salem during the renewal term would be SMALL and would warrant no additional mitigation."

NRC does not draw conclusions about mitigation being warranted or not warranted because this is the province of other (usually state) agencies. I believe I sent you NRC's guidance for writing mitigation sections. In the case of small impact levels, we usually just list the types of mitigation that we know are available. At higher impact levels, we usually describe the types of impact level that are available and refer the reader to any cost-benefit studies for those mitigation measures that have been published.

Nicole—as you are reviewing drafts you may want to look for this in other sections.

Dennis