

Rikhoff, Jeffrey

From: Eccleston, Charles
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 11:08 AM
To: Imboden, Andy; Stuyvenberg, Andrew; Klementowicz, Stephen; Rikhoff, Jeffrey; Travers, Allison
Subject: RE: Draft Outline of alternatives for Salem/Hope SEIS

Will do.

From: Imboden, Andy
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 10:54 AM
To: Eccleston, Charles; Stuyvenberg, Andrew; Klementowicz, Stephen; Rikhoff, Jeffrey; Travers, Allison
Subject: RE: Draft Outline of alternatives for Salem/Hope SEIS

Charles-

Please set up a brief get together to discuss ... I'll be in tomorrow (b)(6) I'd like to hear your and Drew's thoughts, and believe Ali/Steve/Jeff could add value too, if they are available.

Andy

From: Eccleston, Charles
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 10:51 AM
To: Stuyvenberg, Andrew; Imboden, Andy; Bacuta, George; Beissel, Dennis; Bulavinetz, Richard; Klementowicz, Stephen; Logan, Dennis; Rikhoff, Jeffrey; Travers, Allison; Pham, Bo
Cc: Eccleston, Charles
Subject: RE: Draft Outline of alternatives for Salem/Hope SEIS

Andy thanks for your swift comments. We can come in and talk to you more in detail but briefly here is the logic:

1. I originally included a combination alternative #3 for closing Hope and relicensing Salem. However, this list of alternatives was getting rather lengthy and complex and deleting this alternative simplified the analysis. The public controversy also appears to be centered mainly Salem (not Hope) so this provided a good basis for eliminating the third combination alternative.
2. Drew and I talked about this the mitigation alternative. A public comment by an environmental group has already stated that it wants a cooling tower for Salem. Drew and I talked about this and decided that such a comment would be better placed as a "potential" mitigation measure in Chapter 4 that could be considered by the state or other regulatory bodies (not NRC).
3. The ESP proposal would be considered as part of the "reasonably foreseeable" actions under the cumulative impact section. At this time the ESP proposal has very limited data available on the plant or its potential effects.

Charles

From: Stuyvenberg, Andrew
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 10:28 AM
To: Imboden, Andy; Eccleston, Charles; Bacuta, George; Beissel, Dennis; Bulavinetz, Richard; Klementowicz, Stephen; Logan, Dennis; Rikhoff, Jeffrey; Travers, Allison; Pham, Bo
Subject: RE: Draft Outline of alternatives for Salem/Hope SEIS

Andy - Without going into too much background, we can - and do - go there with regard to mitigation measures in Chapter 4. I'll show you examples if you'd like when you return. There was a long, drawn out process in establishing the approach. The main caveat is that we need to be very clear about describing where regulatory authority for those mitigation measures resides.

From: Imboden, Andy

Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 10:25 AM

To: Eccleston, Charles; Bacuta, George; Beissel, Dennis; Bulavinetz, Richard; Klementowicz, Stephen; Logan, Dennis; Rikhoff, Jeffrey; Travers, Allison; Pham, Bo

Cc: Stuyvenberg, Andrew

Subject: RE: Draft Outline of alternatives for Salem/Hope SEIS

Three points:

- 1) why isn't retirement of only Hope Creek an alternative (i.e. 8.1.5, or in 8.2)? what's the logic behind retiring both units, or just Salem, but not just HC?
- 2) don't think we can "go there" with the mitigation alternative in Chapter 4. as a legal/policy manner.
- 3) new nuclear 8.2.2 needs to be prominently discussed in light of the new proposal.

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