

Perkins, Leslie

From: Bulavinetz, Richard
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2011 8:14 AM
To: Perkins, Leslie
Subject: FW: Salem & Hope Creek Response to Comments - Follow-Up
Attachments: Response to Comments from Salem and Hope Creek DSEIS 01-14-2011.docx

Leslie:

Per our discussion, here is the last version of my response that I sent to Andy on Jan 18, 2011. Ask Mike to check and see if Andy forward to him after Andy's review.

Thanks,

Rich

<',')///>< <',')///>< <',')///>< <',')///>< <',')///><

From: Bulavinetz, Richard
Sent: Tuesday, January 18, 2011 4:14 PM
To: Imboden, Andy
Subject: Salem & Hope Creek Response to Comments - Follow-Up

Andy:

Attached is my revised response to comments for the Salem and Hope Creek DSEIS. Per my e-mail to you last Fri, I wanted to clarify one item. I was able to meet with Mike Wentzel today, who is the acting environmental PM while Leslie is out. He addressed my one remaining issue, and I have now modified my response to 2.B. Attached are the revised comments.

Thanks,

Rich

<',')///>< <',')///>< <',')///>< <',')///>< <',')///><

D-2009

Response to Comments from Salem and Hope Creek DSEIS

Comment SHC-A-1

The MODERATE determination was based upon the cumulative impacts on terrestrial communities of historical, ongoing, and future development in the region of the Salem and Hope Creek Nuclear Generating Station combined, as discussed in Chapter 4.11.3 of the Draft NUREG-1437, Vol. 1, Supplement 45, Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants Regarding Hope Creek Generating Station and Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2 (DSEIS-45). The terrestrial resources include those resources associated with uplands, wetlands, and bodies of freshwater other than the Delaware River (which are discussed in Section 4.11.2 of the DSEIS -45).

PSEG Nuclear LLC, Comments Dated Dec 16, 2010, Enclosure LR-N10-0449

Section 8.0.

1. Requested changes in Sect. 8.1 – 8.4 are acceptable.
2. Requested changes in Sect. 8.5 – 8.7 are acceptable with the following exceptions:
 - A. Regarding the requested name changes to the corridors, such as your request in Sect 8.5 of your Enclosure to change the title “New Freedom North Right-of-Way” to “North Corridor to New Freedom”, change the “to” to an “of”. The “to” implies a range, whereas the “of” denotes possession. Another acceptable option to the NRC is changing the name to “New Freedom – North Corridor”. These two options should likewise be used for the name changes requested in Sect. 8.6 and Sect 8.7.
 - B. In Sect. 8.5 of your Enclosure, the request to change “39” mi to “44” mi (and corresponding metric units) is acceptable, and the specific reference for this new data will be incorporated here and in Table 2-1 of the final SEIS-45.
3. Requested changes in Sect. 8.8 – 8.11 are acceptable.