## PSEGESPEnveRAIPEm Resource

**From:** Fetter, Allen
**Sent:** Monday, February 11, 2013 2:52 PM
**To:** 'PSEGRAIResponses@pseg.com'
**Cc:** PSEGESPEnveRAIPEm Resource; 'Robillard, David L'; Mallon, James; Saulsbury, Bo (saulsburyjw@ornl.gov); 'Zimmerman, Gregory P.'
**Subject:** PSEG Site ESPA Final RAI Env-09S (eRAI_7028)
**Attachments:** PSEG Site ESPA Final RAI Env-09S (eRAI_7028).pdf

Please find attached supplemental RAI Env-09S for the PSEG Site ESP Application. The Env-09S RAI contains a supplemental question (ESP EIS 9.0-15) that is related to a previous RAI on power importation feasibility: ESP EIS 9.0-9. Following a January 7, 2013 clarification call on the draft supplemental RAI, the text was modified for clarity and 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:** 23

**Mail Envelope Properties** (4AD1A659C92C8546AA34BFB9D10564E4776C660591)

**Subject:** PSEG Site ESPA Final RAI Env-09S (eRAI_7028)
**Sent Date:** 2/11/2013 2:52:11 PM
**Received Date:** 2/11/2013 2:52:12 PM
**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
"Mallon, James" <James.Mallon@pseg.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Saulsbury, Bo (saulsburyjw@ornl.gov)" <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 | 1132 | 2/11/2013 2:52:12 PM |
| PSEG Site ESPA Final RAI Env-09S (eRAI_7028).pdf | 66676 | |

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

**Request for Additional Information Env-09S**
Issue Date: 2/11/2013
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 9.0 - Environmental Impacts of Alternatives
Application Section: ER

QUESTIONS

ESP EIS 9.0-15

ESP EIS 9.0-9S: Explain whether importing power into New Jersey instead of generating it with new nuclear units at the PSEG ESP site is a feasible([1]) 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.

Supporting Information: 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 construc-tion 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 the PSEG ESP site. In discussing the feasibility of imported power include consideration of the availability of surplus power from areas near the PSEG region of interest.

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.

The NRC staff is directed to compare the environmental impacts and health effects among competitive alternatives, defined as alternatives that are feasible and compare 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)

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.

==========

([1])To be feasible for the purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), an alternative must be reasonable or practical. NEPA does not require the consideration of alternatives that are not reasonable (e.g., prohibitively expensive).

([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.