

PSEGESPEenveRAIPEm Resource

From: Fetter, Allen
Sent: Wednesday, August 29, 2012 4:26 PM
To: PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com
Cc: PSEGESPEenveRAIPEm Resource; Robillard, David L; Mallon, James; Hsia, Anthony; Silvia, Andrea; Saulsbury, James; Zimmerman, Gregory P.
Subject: PSEG Site ESPA Final RAI Env-02 (eRAI_6729)
Attachments: PSEG Site ESPA Final RAI Env-02 (eRAI_6729).pdf

Please find attached RAI Env-02 for the PSEG Site ESP Application. The Env-02 RAI encompasses the rLU and rTL RAIs that were provided to you on July 20, 2012 as part of a complete table of draft RAIs. At your request, a clarification discussion of rLU-11 was held on August 7, 2012. rLU-11 was deleted after noting that rHYD-29 requested information that would satisfy this request. No other changes are necessary; hence we are issuing this RAI as final.

The schedule we have established to the review of your application assumes technically correct and complete responses within 30 calendar days of receipt of RAIs. For any RAIs that cannot be responded to within 30 calendar days, it is expected that a date for receipt of this information will be provided to the staff within the 30-day period so that the staff can assess how this information might impact the published schedule.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Allen H. Fetter, Project Manager
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of New Reactors
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Environmental Projects Branch 2
Washington, D.C.

301-415-8556 (Office)
301-832-4909 (Mobile)

Hearing Identifier: PSEG_Site_EarlySitePermit_Env_RAI
Email Number: 5

Mail Envelope Properties (4AD1A659C92C8546AA34BFB9D10564E475FA4A83CD)

Subject: PSEG Site ESPA Final RAI Env-02 (eRAI_6729)
Sent Date: 8/29/2012 4:26:28 PM
Received Date: 8/29/2012 4:26:31 PM
From: Fetter, Allen

Created By: Allen.Fetter@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"PSEGESPEenveRAIPEm Resource" <PSEGESPEenveRAIPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Robillard, David L" <David.Robillard@pseg.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Mallon, James" <James.Mallon@pseg.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Hsia, Anthony" <Anthony.Hsia@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Silvia, Andrea" <Andrea.Silvia@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Saulsbury, James" <saulsburyjw@ornl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Zimmerman, Gregory P." <zimmermangp@ornl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com" <PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1203	8/29/2012 4:26:31 PM
PSEG Site ESPA Final RAI Env-02 (eRAI_6729).pdf		128760

Options

Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received:

Request for Additional Information Env-02

Issue Date: 8/29/2012

Application Title: PSEG Site ESP Environmental Review - Docket 52-043

Operating Company: PSEG Power LLC, PSEG Nuclear LLC

Docket No. 52-043

Review Section: ESP EIS 2.2 - Land Use

Application Section: ER

QUESTIONS

ESP EIS 2.2-1

rLU-02a: Provide current New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Land Use/Land Cover data for the 85-acre parcel on Artificial Island that would be acquired in the proposed land exchange with the Corps.

Supporting Information: Under ESRP 2.2.1, the following data or information should be obtained:

“land areas (hectares) devoted to major uses within the site boundary (from the ER).”

ER Section 2.2.1 does not contain Land Use/Land Cover data for the 85-acre parcel on Artificial Island that would be acquired in the proposed land exchange with the Corps.

ESP EIS 2.2-2

rLU-02b: Provide a description of the State of New Jersey’s ongoing revision to the Coastal Area Facility Review Act (CAFRA) node designation (to “utility”) for a section of the Artificial Island CDF. In particular, describe the current status of the revision, provide a map of the areas affected, and provide the acreages affected. Also, describe how this revision to a “utility” designation would facilitate the construction of a new nuclear power plant on Artificial Island.

Supporting Information: Under ESRP 2.2.1, the following data or information should be obtained:

“land-use plans that include the site and vicinity within their scope (from applicable Federal, State, regional, local, and affected Native American tribal planning agencies).”

The ER does not contain any information about the State of New Jersey’s ongoing revision of the CAFRA node designation for part of Artificial Island, but the applicant discussed this topic during the Environmental Site Audit.

ESP EIS 2.2-3

rLU-03: Provide a copy of the following report on the project docket:

Traffic Impact Analysis at the PSEG Site: Preliminary Findings Report. TR-441, Rev. 4. KLD Engineering, P.C. August 28, 2009.

Supporting Information: Under ESRP 4.4.2, the following data or information should be obtained:

“information about highways and transportation that covers:

- regional and local highway systems, including carrying capacity and condition of roads and highways (from ESRP 2.5.2)

- modifications that might affect traffic flow to and from the station site (from ESRP 2.5.2).”

The ER does not contain sufficient information about potential land use impacts from additional traffic on the proposed causeway. Staff discussed this topic with the applicant during the Environmental Site Audit, and the applicant referred staff to this document (TR-441) for additional information.

ESP EIS 2.2-4

rLU-05a: Provide a description of the Deeds of Conservation Restriction that exist for land along the proposed causeway route, for land within the boundaries of Alternative Site 7-3, and for any other lands that would be affected by project construction at the proposed site or the alternative sites. In particular, provide: (1) a map of the lands under a Deed of Conservation restriction at each site; (2) the total acreage of lands under a Deed of Conservation restriction at each site, and; (3) the total acreage of lands that would be removed from a Deed of Conservation Restriction at each site to allow causeway or project construction.

Also, provide an explanation of how Alternative Site 7-3 is a realistic siting option, potentially licensable, and capable of being developed given that lands within the site are protected under a Deed of Conservation Restriction. As part of the explanation, describe the process for removing the Deeds of Conservation Restriction to allow for causeway construction or project construction at Site 7-3. If required by the State of New Jersey, has the applicant identified “replacement” land that it could obtain and provide to the State under a Deed of Conservation?

Supporting Information: Under ESRP 2.2.2, the following data or information should be obtained:

“special land uses (e.g., recreation) other than major land uses in the site and vicinity that could be significantly affected by construction of the proposed project (from the ER and consultation with local agencies).”

Under Reg. Guide 4.2, Section 9.2.1, “candidate sites must be realistic siting options, potentially licensable, and capable of being developed.”

The ER does not contain information about the Deed of Conservation Restriction that exists for land along the proposed causeway route. The ER mentions, but does not contain specific information about, the Deed of Conservation Restriction that exists for land within the boundaries of Alternative Site 7-3.

Staff discussed this topic with the applicant during the Environmental Site Audit, but needs additional information to: (1) determine if Site 7-3 is a realistic siting option, potentially licensable, and capable of being developed and (2) assess land use impacts along the proposed causeway and at Alternative Site 7-3.

ESP EIS 2.2-5

rLU-05b: Provide a description of the County Preserved Farmland that has been designated within the boundaries of Alternative Site 4-1 and any of the other alternative sites. In particular, provide: (1) a map of the lands designated as County Preserved Farmland at each site; (2) the total acreage of lands under the County Preserved Farmland designation at each site, and; (3) the total acreage of lands that would be removed from the County Preserved Farmland designation at each site to allow project development.

Also, provide an explanation of how Alternative Sites 4-1, 7-1, 7-2, and 7-3 are realistic siting options, potentially licensable, and capable of being developed given that lands within each site are designated as County Preserved Farmlands. As part of the explanation, describe the process for removing the County Preserved Farmland designation to allow for project construction. If required by the State of New Jersey, has the applicant identified “replacement” land that it could obtain and designate as County Preserved Farmland?

Supporting Information: Under ESRP 2.2.2, the following data or information should be obtained:

“special land uses (e.g., recreation) other than major land uses in the site and vicinity that could be significantly affected by construction of the proposed project (from the ER and consultation with local agencies).”

Under Reg. Guide 4.2, Section 9.2.1, “candidate sites must be realistic siting options, potentially licensable, and capable of being developed.”

The ER contains almost no information about the County Preserved Farmland at Site 4-1, and no information about County Preserved Farmland at any of the other alternative sites. According to the applicant’s *Field Verification Report* for the alternative sites, Sites 7-1, 7-2, and 7-3 also contain County Preserved Farmland.

Staff discussed this topic with the applicant during the Environmental Site Audit, but needs additional information to: (1) determine if Sites 4-1, 7-1, 7-2, and 7-3 are realistic siting options, potentially licensable, and capable of being developed; and (2) assess land use impacts at the alternative sites.

ESP EIS 2.2-6

rLU-09: Provide an estimate of the volume of fill material that would be needed for preconstruction and construction at the proposed site and each of the alternative sites. Also, identify the location(s) of any off-site borrow pits that would be used as sources for the fill material needed at the proposed site and each of the alternative sites. Provide a copy of the following report on the project docket:

Nuclear Development Project Soil Management Study, Project No: 12310-020. SL-010093. Sargent & Lundy. 2010.

Supporting Information: Under ESRP 4.1.1, the following data or information should be obtained:

“area and location of land in the site and vicinity that will be disturbed by construction on either a long-term or short-term basis (from ESRP 3.1).”

ER Section 4.4.1.1.2.3 states: “Fill material is required to elevate the new plant facilities and structures to final grade. To the extent possible, this fill material comes from within the PSEG Site boundaries. If additional offsite fill material is required, it is expected to come from existing permitted borrow areas such as those used in the construction of HCGS.”

The ER provides no specific information on the volume of fill material that would be needed or the location of potential borrow pits. During the Environmental Site Audit, the applicant stated that about 7.5 million cubic yards of fill material would be needed at the proposed ESP site. The amount of fill material needed at the alternative sites would vary [the *Alternative Site Evaluation Study* (S&L 2010) contains rough estimates of the fill needed to grade each of the alternative sites]. The applicant also stated that it had prepared an internal report (*Nuclear Development Project Soil Management Study, Project No: 12310-020. SL-010093. Sargent & Lundy. 2010*) that identifies over 20 potential borrow sites along the Delaware River and in Maryland near Chesapeake Bay.

ESP EIS 2.2-7

rLU-14: Provide a detailed discussion of the potential visual impacts of constructing and operating the off-site transmission line, as well as any plans to address the visual impacts of the transmission line.

Supporting Information: Under ESRP 3.7, the reviewer “should obtain input from and provide input to the reviewers for the following ESRPs, as indicated:

ESRP 4.4.1 - Provide a detailed description of any power transmission system construction associated with the proposed

plant that physically impacts the region, including visual aesthetics. During the Environmental Site Audit, the applicant stated that the information specified in ESRP Section 3.7 cannot be provided until a reactor type is selected and the need for an off-site transmission line is confirmed. The Review Team cannot assess the environmental impacts of an off-site transmission line without this information.

ESP EIS 2.2-8

rLU-17: Provide a description of the existing and planned land uses and zoning at the land parcel most likely to be acquired by the Corps in the proposed land exchange ("Site 15G"), as well as any potential alternative parcels that could be acquired by the Corps if the acquisition of Site 15G cannot be completed. Include current New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Land Use/Land Cover data for Site 15G and any potential alternative parcels. Also, describe the potential land use or zoning impacts of developing and using Site 15G or any alternative parcels as a Corps CDF.

Supporting Information: Under ESRP 2.8, "The Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ's) definition of the term "scope" at 40 CFR 1508.25 calls for Federal agencies to consider the cumulative impacts of related actions that are connected, cumulative, or similar when determining the appropriate scope for an EIS . . . NRC has indicated that it will follow CEQ's definition of scope (10 CFR 51.14[b])."

The ER and the SSAR state that PSEG is "developing an agreement in principle with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to acquire an additional 85 ac. immediately to the north of HCGS. Therefore, with the land acquisition, the entire PSEG Site will be 819 ac. The specific timing of land acquisition is not currently known and is subject to further PSEG and USACE actions."

The ER does not provide any information about land use or zoning at Site 15G (or alternative CDF sites) or about the potential land use or zoning impacts of developing Site 15G (or alternative CDF sites) as a CDF.

ESP EIS 2.2-9

rTL-03: Provide a copy of the following report on the project docket:

GIS Analysis of Potential Off-Site Transmission Macro-Corridors. Revision 1. Prepared for PSEG Power, LLC. Submitted to Sargent & Lundy, LLC. Prepared by MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc. (MACTEC Project No. 325DD85298). January 26, 2010.

Supporting Information: ESRP 2.2.2 – Obtain information proposed routes for corridors that will be used for construction of transmission lines from the station site to an interconnecting point or points. ER Section 9.4.3 states that "A limited GIS study of two potential transmission macro-corridors was performed to provide a preliminary evaluation of the transmission routing alternatives that may be considered when the need for additional off-site transmission has been established."

This study is not on the project docket. The Review Team needs to cite this report to assess the environmental impacts of the proposed off-site transmission line corridors.

ESP EIS 2.2-10

rTL-07: For the potential off-site transmission line, provide a description of predicted noise levels resulting from transmission-system operation.

Supporting Information: Under ESRP 3.7, the following data or information should be obtained:

"predicted noise levels resulting from transmission-system operation (from the ER)."

During the Environmental Site Audit, the applicant stated that the information specified in ESRP Section 3.7 cannot be

provided until a reactor type is selected and the need for an off-site transmission line is confirmed. The Review Team cannot assess the environmental impacts of an off-site transmission line without this information.