

May 24, 2012

Ms. Marilyn C. Kray, Vice President
New Plant Development
Exelon Generation
200 Exelon Way
Kennett Square, PA 19348

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
LETTER NO. 10, RELATED TO CUMULATIVE IMPACTS FOR THE VICTORIA
COUNTY STATION EARLY SITE PERMIT APPLICATION

Dear Ms. Kray:

By letter dated March 25, 2010, Exelon Nuclear Texas Holdings, LLC (Exelon) submitted its application to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for an early site permit (ESP) for the Victoria County Station site in accordance with the requirements contained in Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) Part 52, "Licenses, Certifications and Approvals for Nuclear Power Plants." The NRC staff is performing a detailed review of this application to enable the staff to reach a conclusion regarding the environmental impacts of the proposed action.

The NRC staff has identified that additional information is needed to continue portions of the environmental review. The staff's request for additional information (RAI) is contained in the enclosure to this letter.

To support the review schedule, you are requested to respond within 60 days of the date of this letter. If you are unable to provide a response within 60 days, please state when you will be able to provide the response. In the event the response submitted is incomplete, please indicate in the response when the complete response will be provided. If changes are needed to the ESP application, the staff requests that the RAI response include the proposed wording changes. Your response should also indicate whether any of the information provided is to be withheld as exempt from public disclosure pursuant to 10 CFR 2.390.

M. Kray

- 2 -

If you have any questions or comments concerning this matter, you may contact me at 301-415-1488 or via e-mail at Tomeka.Terry@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Tomeka Terry, Environmental Project Manager
Environmental Projects Branch 2
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Docket No. 52-042
eRAI Tracking No. 6431

Enclosure:
As stated

cc: w/enclosure see next page

If you have any questions or comments concerning this matter, you may contact me at 301-415-1488 or via e-mail at Tomeka.Terry@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Tomeka Terry, Environmental Project Manager
Environmental Projects Branch 2
Division New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Docket No. 52-042
eRAI Tracking Nos. 6431
Enclosure:
As stated

cc: w/enclosure see next page

DISTRIBUTION:

TTerry, NRO AWilliamson, NRO SPrice, OGC
EPB2 R/F MEudy, NRO RJenkins, NRO
LGoldin,OGC PMadden, NRO AHisa, NRO
RidsNroDsea JCushing,NRO RidsOgcMailCenterResource
NRORidsNroDnrlEpb2
HAVci, ANL avci@anl.gov
KWescott, ANL wescott@anl.gov
KFischer, ANL kfischer@anl.gov
JHudson, USACE (jayson.m.hudson@usace.army.mil)

ADAMS Accession Number: ML12145A555 NRO-002

OFFICE	NRO/DNRL/ LA	NRO/DNRL/EPB2/PM
NAME	MBrown**	TTerry*
DATE	05/24/2012	05/24/2012

* Approval captured electronically in the electronic RAI system.

**concurred via e-mail

OFFICAL RECORDS COPY

Request for Additional Information
No. 6431 Revision 0

Victoria County Station ESP
Exelon Texas
Docket No. 52-042
SRP Section: ESP EIS 7.0 - Cumulative Impacts
Application Section: Part 3, Environmental Report Cumulative Impacts

QUESTIONS for Environmental Projects Branch 2 (EPB2)

ESP EIS 7.0-1

ESRP 4.7 and 5.11 direct the staff to obtain information from the applicant about past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (Federal, non-Federal, and private) that could have meaningful cumulative impacts on any resource area considered in the environmental impact statement (EIS), along with a characterization of their impacts for assessment of environmental consequences. The environmental report (ER) does not address cumulative impacts (or does not specify the results of the analysis) for all research areas (e.g., cultural, visual, and air quality) for actions in the vicinity of the proposed site. If an analysis was performed and the anticipated impact is low or non-existent (i.e., an activity has no significant impact), if the activity impacts only one resource area, or if the analysis was not performed, this should be stated. The ER does not identify or analyze the cumulative impacts of some known past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions in the vicinity of the proposed site (e.g., the GBRA infrastructure upgrade, US-77 upgrade, hydraulic fracturing activities, Caterpillar plant, DuPont modernization), or does not analyze the cumulative impacts for all resource areas (e.g., heavy haul road). Cumulative impacts from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions must also be considered for all alternative sites, and for all resource areas. The ER does not identify or analyze the cumulative impacts of activities in the vicinity of the four alternative sites.

(a) Provide a list (including description and status) of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects/activities in the vicinity of the proposed Victoria County Station (VCS) site and the four alternative sites that should be considered in the cumulative impact analysis.

(b) Address the cumulative impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects/activities in the vicinity of the VCS site for all resource areas and all project phases considered in the ER.

(c) Provide copies of all correspondence and documentation of personal communications used to support the cumulative impact analysis presented in the ER, including summaries of informal discussions with local government authorities on current or future activities/projects (public or private) in the vicinity of the VCS site (and alternative sites).