

PSEGESPEnveRAIPEm Resource

From: Fetter, Allen
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2013 11:05 AM
To: PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com
Cc: PSEGESPEnveRAIPEm Resource; Robillard, David L; Saulsbury, Bo; Zimmerman, Gregory P.; Kugler, Andrew
Subject: Corrected supplemental RAI table - T-Line correction (eRAI 6974)
Attachments: PSEG ESP Draft Supplemental Environmental RAI Table 12-19-12_corrected.pdf

The supplemental RAI on importing power was not the correct version. Please see attached.

Hearing Identifier: PSEG_Site_EarlySitePermit_Env_RAI
Email Number: 20

Mail Envelope Properties (4AD1A659C92C8546AA34BFB9D10564E4773AF32CDD)

Subject: Corrected supplemental RAI table - T-Line correction (eRAI 6974)
Sent Date: 1/7/2013 11:05:05 AM
Received Date: 1/7/2013 11:05:25 AM
From: Fetter, Allen

Created By: Allen.Fetter@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"PSEGESPEnveRAIPEm Resource" <PSEGESPEnveRAIPEm.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Robillard, David L" <David.Robillard@pseg.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Saulsbury, Bo" <saulsburyjw@ornl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Zimmerman, Gregory P." <zimmernangp@ornl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Kugler, Andrew" <Andrew.Kugler@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com" <PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

| Files | Size | Date & Time |
|--|-------------|------------------------|
| MESSAGE | 91 | 1/7/2013 11:05:25 AM |
| PSEG ESP Draft Supplemental Environmental RAI Table 12-19-12_corrected.pdf | | |
| 150316 | | |

Options

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

**Draft Supplemental Requests for Additional Information (RAIs)
PSEG Early Site Permit (ESP) Application
December 19, 2012**

| <i>Item Number</i> | <i>ESRP/ER Section</i> | <i>RAI</i> | <i>Full Text (Supporting Information)</i> |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>Env-02S</p> <p>ESP EIS 2.2</p> <p>eRAI 6972</p> <p>(rTL-03S)</p> | <p>ESRP 2.2.2</p> <p>ER 9.4.3</p> | <p>Because PSEG cannot determine the need for an additional transmission line for the PSEG site until such time that a reactor technology is selected, it did not evaluate the environmental impacts of a transmission line to the depth necessary for the NRC staff to resolve the impacts of such a line in the environmental impact statement (EIS). The NRC staff requests that PSEG either acknowledge that these issues will not be resolved in the EIS, or provide the detailed information that would be necessary to resolve the issues in the EIS.</p> | <p>In Section 3.7.2 of the environmental report (ER), PSEG states:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">To support the new plant, one additional offsite transmission line may be required for transient stability purposes. Formal PJM analyses are required to fully identify the requisite transmission system upgrades that are necessary to accommodate a new nuclear plant at the PSEG Site. These PJM analyses have not been initiated, but formal entry into the PJM generation queue and commencement of these analyses is anticipated when a reactor technology is selected.</p> <p>In the ER, PSEG goes on to estimate the environmental impacts of two conceptual transmission line routes that could be used for a new line if it is needed. Because PSEG has not yet determined that a new line will be</p> |

| <i>Item Number</i> | <i>ESRP/ER Section</i> | <i>RAI</i> | <i>Full Text (Supporting Information)</i> |
|--------------------|------------------------|------------|---|
| | | | <p>necessary, the evaluation of environmental impacts was performed using available information and methods to estimate the location of the lines and the associated resources that might be affected. (A similar level of analysis was done for the alternative sites.) However, no detailed evaluation of the impacts (e.g., surveys for endangered species or cultural resources) was performed because of the uncertainty regarding the need for the lines. As a result, the NRC staff will not be able to resolve issues related to the environmental impacts of a transmission lines in the EIS for the early site permit¹ (ESP). Resolution of such issues would have to be accomplished during the review of an application for any combined license referencing an ESP for the PSEG site (if issued).</p> <p>Alternately, PSEG could select a specific transmission line route and provide the NRC staff with the detailed information necessary to evaluate the environmental impacts of building and operating a transmission line in that route. If PSEG were to</p> |

¹ However, the NRC staff intends to use the information regarding the potential impacts related to transmission lines in its comparison of the proposed and alternative sites.

| <i>Item Number</i> | <i>ESRP/ER Section</i> | <i>RAI</i> | <i>Full Text (Supporting Information)</i> |
|---|----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | choose this option, the NRC staff would evaluate the impacts of the transmission line in the ESP EIS and the associated issues would be resolved in the ESP. |
| Env-03S ESP EIS 2.3 eRAI 6973 (rHYD-21S) | ESRP 5.2.2 ER 5.2.2 and 5.2.3 | The potential magnitude of post-construction groundwater mounding is discussed within the SSAR. In order to maintain consistency with the SSAR and in accordance with guidance in ESRP 5.2.2 related to evaluation of the impacts of alterations, please discuss the impacts, if any, of post-construction groundwater mounding on quantity and quality for other uses and users of groundwater. Please also provide information and/or analysis to support this discussion. | The response to RAI ESP EIS 2.3-10 (rHYD-21) PSEG concludes that "the effects of potential groundwater mounding will be addressed in the COLA after the selection of reactor technology and development of detailed site excavation and construction plans". However, in order to maintain consistency with the SSAR Section 2.4.12 and 2.4.13, and PSEG Site ESPA RAI 68 (eRAI 6645) SRP-02.04.13 where the magnitude of mounding is addressed, the potential environmental impacts of post-construction groundwater |

| <i>Item Number</i> | <i>ESRP/ER Section</i> | <i>RAI</i> | <i>Full Text (Supporting Information)</i> |
|---|--|---|--|
| | | | mounding needs to be addressed as well. |
| Env-14S ESP EIS 9.0 eRAI 6974 (rALT-30S) | ESRPs 9.2.1 and 9.2.3 10 CFR 51.71(d) and 10 CFR 51, Appendix A to Subpart A ER Sections 9.2.1.3 and 9.2.1.4 | Explain whether importing power into New Jersey instead of generating it with new nuclear units at the PSEG ESP site is a feasible option. If it isn't a feasible option, provide an analysis that explains why not. If it is feasible, explain the basis for that conclusion and provide an analysis of the environmental impacts associated with importing power as an alternative to building new nuclear units at the proposed PSEG ESP site. | ER Sections 9.2.1.3 and 9.2.1.4, as well as the Applicant's response to RAI ESP EIS 9.0-30, state that "importing power may be a feasible alternative" Such imported power would originate from outside the state of New Jersey. The approach the staff uses in its consideration of importing power is discussed in ESRP 9.2.1 (dated 2007), pages 3 and 4. The ESRP directs the reviewer to consider power available from the regional grid and existing transmission interties. It also states that, if transmission lines and interties are not available to move the necessary power, the reviewer should "make general estimates of the costs ⁽²⁾ to construct and maintain such lines and estimates of the environmental impacts associated with their construction and maintenance." Provide an updated discussion as to whether or not imported power is a feasible alternative to the power that would be generated by new units at |

⁽²⁾ The cost analyses should be made on the basis of data available in references or that can readily be supplied by the applicant. Costs should include environmental compliance costs.

| <i>Item Number</i> | <i>ESRP/ER Section</i> | <i>RAI</i> | <i>Full Text (Supporting Information)</i> |
|--------------------|------------------------|------------|---|
| | | | <p>the PSEG ESP site.</p> <p>If imported power is not a feasible alternative, provide the analysis supporting that position. If imported power is a feasible alternative, explain the basis for that conclusion and provide an analysis of the environmental impacts associated with importing power as an alternative to building new nuclear units at the proposed PSEG ESP site. Include an explanation regarding how PSEG considered and included existing and reasonably foreseeable transmission lines (such as the Susquehanna-Roseland Transmission Line Project) in its analysis of the feasibility of importing power. If one or more new transmission lines would be required to import the power, provide a general estimate of the monetary costs and environmental impacts of building and operating such lines. The environmental impacts would also include the impacts of generating the power from locations outside New Jersey.</p> <p>The NRC staff is directed to compare the environmental impacts and health effects among competitive alternatives, defined as alternatives that are feasible and compare</p> |

| <i>Item Number</i> | <i>ESRP/ER Section</i> | <i>RAI</i> | <i>Full Text (Supporting Information)</i> |
|--------------------|------------------------|------------|---|
| | | | <p>favorably with the proposed project in terms of environmental and health impacts. Furthermore, the staff is instructed to consider whether the characteristics of the alternatives have been described in sufficient detail that a decision can be reached regarding environmental impacts. (ESRP 9.2.1)</p> <p>Under ESRP 9.2.1 and 9.2.3, the NRC staff needs to consider the environmental impacts of feasible alternatives. Detailed information is therefore requested in regard to the alternative of importing power from outside New Jersey.</p> |