

PSEGSPEnvDocsPEm Resource

From: Davis (NRO), Jennifer
Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2015 8:13 PM
To: Fetter, Allen
Subject: Trip Reports and Teleconference Summaries Associated with Section 106 Consultation - PSEG ESP Review
Attachments: Trip Report PSEG Section 106 Mtg 01-09-2015.docx; Trip Report PSEG Section 106 Mtg 2-12-15.docx; Trip Report PSEG Section 106 Mtg 4-23-15.docx; Trip Report PSEG Section 106 Mtg_05-19-2015.docx; Summary of June 16 2015 Teleconference.docx; Summary of August 12 2015 Teleconference.docx

Allen,

Please find attached the collection of trip reports and teleconference summaries associated with Section 106 consultation subsequent to publication of the Draft EIS.

Jenny

Jennifer A. Davis
Senior Project Manager
Division of Site Safety and Environmental Analysis
Office of New Reactors
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Ph: 301-415-3835

Hearing Identifier: PSEG_Site_ESP_EnvDocs_Public
Email Number: 88

Mail Envelope Properties (b48b792377b84234a7ed0ceead350915)

Subject: Trip Reports and Teleconference Summaries Associated with Section 106
Consultation - PSEG ESP Review
Sent Date: 9/24/2015 8:12:58 PM
Received Date: 9/24/2015 8:13:01 PM
From: Davis (NRO), Jennifer

Created By: Jennifer.Davis@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Fetter, Allen" <Allen.Fetter@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQPWMSMRS03.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	375	9/24/2015 8:13:01 PM
Trip Report PSEG Section 106 Mtg 01-09-2015.docx	37568	
Trip Report PSEG Section 106 Mtg 2-12-15.docx	34358	
Trip Report PSEG Section 106 Mtg 4-23-15.docx	33913	
Trip Report PSEG Section 106 Mtg_05-19-2015.docx	32337	
Summary of June 16 2015 Teleconference.docx	23986	
Summary of August 12 2015 Teleconference.docx	25059	

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

Final Trip Report for PSEG Early Site Permit Application
National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Consultation
Visit on January 9, 2015, to Salem County, New Jersey

A draft of this report was sent to the participants in the meeting for comment. The draft trip report was revised based on the comments received. The purpose of the site visit was to discuss the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 (Section 106) consultation comments submitted by the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (NJ HPO) on the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) for the proposed PSEG Early Site Permit (ESP) at the PSEG Site in Salem County. Participants included representatives from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), NJ HPO, PSEG (the applicant), and Ms. Janet Sheridan (an interested party). Enclosure 1 is a list of individuals who attended the visit. Enclosure 2 provides the agenda.

By letter dated December 4, 2014 ([ML15005A040](#)), Mr. Daniel Saunders, the Deputy Historic Preservation Officer, provided detailed comments on the DEIS. In preparation for the meeting, Ms. Michelle Craren of the NJ HPO, in an email dated January 6, 2015 ([ML15007A522](#)), clarified the comments and identified two individuals (Ms. Janet Sheridan and Mr. Ron Magill) who expressed interest in being a consulting party to the proceeding. The NRC invited both Ms. Sheridan and Mr. Magill to the site visit, however, only Ms. Sheridan was able to attend.

All the parties met at the PSEG Energy and Environmental Resource Center (EERC) to discuss the NJ HPO comments prior to visiting the historic properties.

Mr. Allen Fetter, the NRC project manager for the PSEG ESP environmental review, opened the meeting by welcoming and expressing appreciation to everyone for attending the visit. He explained that the goal of visit was to address the NJ HPO comments on the NRC's DEIS on the proposed project.

Mr. Jack Cushing, a senior project manager from the NRC, facilitated the discussions and went through the agenda. The first part of the meeting included a discussion, so that all parties could understand the comments. Following the discussion, all parties visited the four historic sites listed on the agenda, plus an additional property, 116 Mason Point Road. At the conclusion of the tour, the parties returned to the EERC with the goal of reaching agreement on eligibility and effects on the properties listed in the agenda, determine if the report on prehistoric soils was sufficient to address the comment by the NJ HPO, and discuss the path forward to completing consultation between the NRC and NJ HPO. In addition, the USACE and the NJ HPO were to determine the next steps for consultation regarding the Money Island access road.

A question was asked about the roles of the NRC and the USACE in the Section 106 process for the proposed project. Mr. Cushing explained that both agencies are consulting under Section 106 for their respective parts of the proposed project. For this project, the NRC is

consulting on the effects associated with the direct area of potential effects (Artificial Island) and the visual effects to historic properties from potentially two 590-foot tall natural draft cooling towers. The USACE is consulting on the dredging associated with the proposed project and the effects to the permit area for the Money Island access road. The NJ HPO has concurred on the no effect determination for the proposed site (Artificial Island) and the dredging associated with the proposed project. Consultation is ongoing regarding the visual effects to historic properties (NRC) and the Money Island access road (USACE).

The NRC explained its permitting process for an ESP and a combined license (COL) and how it was different from the USACE's permitting process. An ESP resolves issues involving site safety and environmental characteristics and emergency preparedness that are independent of a specific nuclear reactor design. This permitting approach provides an applicant with an opportunity to "bank" a site for up to 20 years, reduces licensing uncertainty, and resolves siting issues before construction. The ESP does not license a nuclear power plant to be built. If the applicant decides to build and operate a nuclear power plant then it has to apply for a combined license. The NRC will issue a supplemental environmental impact statement (EIS) and perform Section 106 consultation for the combined license undertaking. For the supplemental EIS, if there is no new and significant information, then the NRC relies on the final EIS issued for the ESP. For the COL Section 106 review, the NRC would rely on the consultation performed at the ESP stage to inform the required consultation at the COL stage. The USACE permit application process is a one step process where they issue a permit for dredging and filling and the permittee is allowed to conduct those activities subject to the permit conditions.

Report on Prehistoric Soils

Mr. Vincent Maresca of the NJ HPO stated that the 2009 PSEG report on prehistoric soils for Artificial Island was sufficient to address the comment in the December 4, 2014, letter. Mr. Maresca indicated that an unanticipated discovery procedure would be appropriate for this location.

Abel and Mary Nicholson House

Mr. Ken Strait from PSEG explained PSEG's efforts to date concerning historic preservation and the Abel and Mary Nicholson and Mason-Waddington Houses. As a result of PSEG's estuary enhancement project, PSEG acquired the Nicholson House. PSEG determined that it did not need to own the Nicholson house to accomplish the estuary enhancement project and donated the property to a local historical society. PSEG replaced the roof to stabilize the property and prevent further deterioration due to roof damage.

The Abel and Mary Nicholson House is a national historic landmark that the NRC determined was not adversely affected by the visual effects from two proposed natural draft cooling towers. The basis for the NRC decision was that there is an existing cooling tower for the Hope Creek nuclear power plant and that the addition of two taller cooling towers would not change the viewshed in a manner that would adversely affect the Nicholson house. In its letter dated December 4, 2014, the NJ HPO determined that the cooling towers would adversely affect the Nicholson house. At the meeting, Mr. Saunders explained that it was the cumulative effect of the

addition of two taller towers on the viewshed that would cause the adverse effect. All the parties visited the Nicholson House to view the existing cooling tower and to reach agreement on the visual impacts. During the close out of the meeting, Mr. Dan O'Rourke, the contractor assisting the NRC on the Section 106 review, and Ms. Jennifer Davis, a senior project manager from the NRC, agreed with Mr. Saunders that there would be a minor adverse visual impact to the Abel and Mary Nicholson house.

The NRC inquired about Section 106 notification process for an adverse effect determination to a National Historic Landmark. Mr. Saunders stated that the NRC would need to notify the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and the Secretary of the Interior, who typically refers the matter to the U.S. Park Service (NPS) Landmarks Division. It was acknowledged that the NPS and the ACHP would need to be involved in negotiations regarding appropriate mitigation. Potential mitigation measures mentioned by Mr. Saunders included an architectural survey of the area around the Nicholson House or additional documentation of the Nicholson House. All parties agreed that an additional meeting to discuss the adverse effects and potential mitigation strategies is warranted. It was decided that the next meeting should be held in Salem County, New Jersey and include a visit to all affected properties. Mr. Jamie Mallon from PSEG inquired if the possible mitigation strategy could include building a bank or berm to address the water intrusion that is damaging the foundation of the house. Ms. Sheridan, an interested party, thought that the proposed mitigation could help stabilize the house.

Next Steps for NRC

The NRC will notify the Secretary of the Interior, NPS Landmark Division (Ms. Bonnie Halda), and the ACHP by letter regarding the revised determination of adverse effects to the Nicholson House. Included with the letter, the NRC will also prepare a summary package containing a description of the proposed project, reports and studies completed to date, and the final trip report. All consulting parties will be copied on NRC's letter to the NPS. In addition, the NRC will arrange a follow-up meeting and site visit to discuss mitigation strategies with the parties from the January 9th meeting, Mr. Ron Magill (Nicholson property caretaker), the NPS, and ACHP. All agreed upon mitigation would be captured in a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA).

Eligibility and Effect Determinations

- 1.) Sarah Mason House, 349 Fort Elfsborg Road. The House was identified in the NJ HPO's December 4, 2014, letter as eligible for listing on the National Register. The NJ HPO has information that the Sarah Mason House is a pattern brick house that was subsequently modified to an Italianate style dwelling. NJ HPO stated that the Sarah Mason House is a significant example of the house as it evolved through the 18th and 19th centuries. The existing cooling tower, and the proposed cooling towers will be clearly visible from the property, the effect will be adverse.
- 2.) Mason-Waddington House. The NJ HPO will assess the eligibility of the house once it receives photographs that document the interior. There is no clear view of the cooling towers from the house, so there will be no visual effect from the towers. It is possible that the road improvements may have an effect on the House. The identification of the USACE permit area will determine if the effects of the road must be considered in the

Section 106 review process. Additionally, New Jersey Land Use Regulation permits may trigger consideration of the effect of the road project on the house pursuant to State law.

- 3.) Mary and Abel Nicholson House. As noted above, the house is a National Historic Landmark and will be adversely affected by the project.
- 4.) J.M. Denn House, Hancock Bridge. The house was identified in the NJ HPO's December 4, 2014, letter as eligible for listing on the National Register. There is no clear view of the cooling tower from the house due to intervening trees. The project will have no effect on the J.M. Denn House.
- 5.) 116 Mason Point Road wood framed house. NJ HPO will prepare an evaluation of the eligibility of the house and will complete its assessment around the first week of February 2015. Given the clear visibility of the cooling tower from the house, if the house is eligible, the effect will be adverse.

Money Island Access Road

The USACE is consulting on the effects associated with the Money Island access road. Mr. Ed Bonner from the USACE indicated that the permit area for the project still needs to be defined. Additionally, Mr. Bonner stressed that the USACE must resolve adverse effects prior to issuing their permit. In order to define the permit area, PSEG will need to provide the USACE with the width of the road. PSEG agreed to provide the USACE with this information. Ms. Nikki Minnichbach, the USACE's archaeologist, noted that the permit area will determine the survey area and whether the structures on Money Island Road location are within the permit area. Mr. Maresca mentioned that even if it is outside the USACE's permit area, PSEG would need to consult with the NJ HPO under the State of New Jersey Coastal Area Facility Review Act (CAFRA) requirements. Mr. Bonner stated that a programmatic agreement to perform further Phase II archeological studies of the land to be disturbed during construction of the proposed causeway is not a viable option for the USACE because it cannot ensure compliance once the permit has been issued. Ms. Sheridan asked what happens if PSEG needs to alter the right of way after the permit has been issued¹. Mr. Bonner stated that a permit modification would be required. Mr. Maresca mentioned that there may be landscape effects to the properties along Money Island Road. Mr. Bonner agrees that this may be a USACE issue and that will be determined when the permit area is defined.

Next Steps for USACE

The USACE will define the permit area for the Money Island access road once the applicant provides the road width. Next, the USACE will determine if any additional archaeological surveys

¹ Ms. Sheridan, in her comments on the trip report, noted that the discussion of the expected right-of-way for the Money Island access road during the site visit anticipated a 50 ft wide corridor (25 ft on either side of the centerline), however, the draft Environmental Impact Statement states that the conceptual design for the permit area is 200 ft wide (100 ft on either side of the centerline). Mr. Bonner, USACE, confirmed on Jan. 22, 2015, that the right-of-way currently being discussed for the Money Island access road right-of-way is 50 ft (25 ft on other side of the centerline) and he acknowledged that earlier estimates were wider. He stressed that once the permit area is determined that the final Environmental Impact Statement will need to be updated to reflect the accurate permit area.

are required and if any historic structures are located within the permit area. If there is an adverse effect on historic properties, then the NJ HPO and the USACE would sign an MOA. Mr. Bonner noted that two MOAs will be needed, one for each agency.

The next steps for the NRC and USACE are discussed above. Below are actions not captured in the next steps.

NRC Actions

1. Prepare a draft trip report and send it to all parties who attended the January 9th site visit for comment. The NRC will then revise the draft report and issue a final trip report.
2. NRC will send photographs to PSEG for inclusion on the CD.
3. After the trip report is finalized, the NRC will take the next steps identified above.

PSEG Actions

1. Provide the width of the Money Island access road to the USACE in order to determine the permit area.
2. All parties agreed to send their photographs from the January 9th site visit to PSEG. PSEG agreed to compile the photographs on a CD, send copies to all attendees and to the NRC for docketing.

NJ HPO Actions

NJ HPO will make a determination of eligibility on 116 Mason Point Road property and the Mason-Waddington House (130 Money Island Road). It was determined that no additional information is needed from the NRC. PSEG agreed to work with Ms. Janet Sheridan to provide photographs of the interior of the house.

Conclusion

At the end of the meeting Mr. Fetter, Mr. Saunders and Mr. Mallon thanked everyone for attending and working to resolve issues.

Attendees

NRC

Allen Fetter (allen.fetter@nrc.gov)

Jack Cushing (jack.cushing@nrc.gov)

Jennifer Davis (jennifer.davis@nrc.gov)

Dan O'Rourke, Argonne National Laboratory (djorourke@anl.gov)

USACE

Ed Bonner (edward.e.bonner@usace.army.mil)

Nikki Minnichbach (nicole.c.minnichbach@usace.army.mil)

NJ HPO

Dan Saunders (dan.saunders@dep.nj.gov)

Vincent Maresca (vincent.maresca@dep.nj.gov)

Michelle Craren (michelle.craren@dep.nj.gov)

Interested Local Party

Janet Sheridan (jlsheridan@verizon.net)

PSEG

Dave Robillard (david.robillard@pseg.com)

James Mallon (james.mallon@pseg.com)

Gary Ruf (gary.ruf@pseg.com)

Mike Wiwel (michael.wiwel@pseg.com)

Ken Strait (kenneth.strait@pseg.com)

Gary Bickel, AKRF (gbickle@akrf.com)

Molly McDonald, AKRF (mmcdonald@akrf.com)

Agenda
PSEG Early Site Permit Application
National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Consultation
Visit Salem County New Jersey
January 9, 2014

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 10:30-10:45 | Introductions at the PSEG Energy and Environmental Resource Center |
| 10:45-11:30 | Discuss State Historic Preservation Office December 14, 2014 comments on DEIS and January 7, 2015 email concerns including report on prehistoric soils |
| 11:30-12:00 | Working lunch at the Energy and Environmental Resource Center |
| 12:00-3:00 | Visit historic properties to reach agreement on eligibility and effects
Abel and Mary Nicholson House (visual Impacts)
John Maddox Denn House (eligibility)
Sara Mason House (eligibility)
Mason-Waddington House at 130 Moneys Island Road (eligibility)
Money Island Access Road |
| 3:00-4:00 | Close out - Return to PSEG Energy and Environmental Resource Center summarize agreement on eligibility and effects. Document next steps to complete consultation. |

Trip Report for PSEG Early Site Permit Application
National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Consultation
Meeting on February 12, 2015 in Trenton, New Jersey

This meeting was a follow-up to the January 9, 2015 site visit and was intended to establish a common understanding between the consulting parties regarding the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 (Section 106) consultation process going forward. Another purpose of this meeting was to ensure that all interested stakeholders understood important aspects of NRC's review process and consultation processes pertaining to the Early Site Permit (ESP) and a subsequent Combined License (COL) application. Additionally the plant parameter envelope (PPE) approach used by PSEG in its application was also explained. Participants included representatives from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (NJ HPO), PSEG (the applicant), and Ms. Janet Sheridan (via teleconference) and Mr. Ron Magill (interested parties). Enclosure 1 is a list of individuals who attended the visit. Enclosure 2 provides the agenda. PSEG's slide presentation regarding the PPE is available via NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) under Accession No. ML15051A469.

All the parties met at the NJ HPO offices in Trenton, New Jersey. Mr. Allen Fetter, the NRC project manager for the PSEG ESP environmental review, opened the meeting and served as facilitator. Ms. Jennifer Davis provided a recap of the prior meeting and a status on issues stemming from the January 9th meeting.

Action Items from January 9, 2015 meeting and status

1. Trip Report for January 9, 2015 meeting complete and distributed
2. Eligibility determinations for 116 Mason Point Road and Mason Waddington House by NJ HPO still pending.
3. USACE determined that the permit area is 50 ft wide (25 ft from centerline) for Money Island access road. Documented in a memo provided to NRC (ML15051A466)
4. USACE still needs to determine what additional cultural resources surveys will be done.

The first part of the meeting included a discussion that focused on the NRC's review process for an ESP and a combined license (COL). An ESP resolves issues involving site safety and environmental characteristics and emergency preparedness that are independent of a specific nuclear reactor design. This permitting approach provides an applicant with an opportunity to "bank" a site for up to 20 years, reduces licensing uncertainty, and resolves siting issues before construction. The ESP does not license a nuclear power plant to be built. If the applicant decides to build and operate a nuclear power plant then it has to apply for a combined license. The NRC will issue a supplemental environmental impact statement (EIS) and perform Section 106 consultation for the combined license undertaking. For the supplemental EIS, if there is no new and significant information, then the NRC relies on the final EIS issued for the ESP. For

the COL Section 106 review, the NRC would rely on the consultation performed at the ESP stage to inform the required consultation at the COL stage.

The next topic discussed was the PPE for the ESP. No specific technologies are chosen for the PSEG ESP; instead, the analysis relies on a PPE. A PPE is a set of values of plant design parameters that an ESP applicant expects will bound the design characteristics of the reactor or reactors that might be constructed at a given site. The PPE values are a bounding surrogate for actual reactor design information. Analysis of environmental impacts based on a PPE approach permits an ESP applicant to defer the selection of a reactor design until the CP or COL stage. In an effort to capture all potential environmental impacts, the analysis assumes the largest cooling towers and the biggest reactors designs within the PPE. However, the applicant is in no way obligated to build the plant that matches what was used for the analysis. All features, characteristics, and components of a plant ultimately chosen must be within the parameters of the design that was analyzed in the ESP EIS. This fact is important for the Section 106 discussions because the natural draft cooling towers which are the source of the anticipated adverse effects to the Abel and Mary Nicholson House and nearby properties may not be chosen for a new plant. The applicant does have other cooling options that they could choose for a new plant which are not as tall and may not result in adverse effects to historic properties.

Mr. James Mallon and Mr. Dave Robillard from PSEG provided an overview of the PPE (Enclosure 3) included in their application and environmental report. Mr. Mallon and Mr. Robillard acknowledged that multiple cooling options were included in their application. Mr. Allen Fetter, NRC asked if, given the anticipated adverse effects from the natural draft cooling towers on historic properties, PSEG would consider removing that technology from their application. Mr. Mallon indicated that PSEG is not interested in removing that technology from their ESP application. He acknowledged that the use of mechanical draft cooling towers are possible at their preferred location, however, this technology (which require only 46 ft tall towers) releases significant amounts of particulate matter which raises an air quality issue and is a concern in southern New Jersey. PSEG's intent with the ESP environmental report (ER) is to establish the potential environmental impacts of the PPE. Identifying and resolving potential impacts is easier during the ESP stage because there are fewer scheduling pressures than there are associated with the COL process.

Mr. Ron Magill raised concerns regarding potential visual impacts resulting from the vertical height of the cooling tower plumes (going from one to three plumes) which are visible above the treeline at the John Maddox Denn House and other properties. Mr. Magill felt that relying on vegetation for screening was not sufficient to eliminate an adverse visual effect because of the relatively short lifespan for trees. He also asked if the review would consider the loss of tree cover owing to continued saltwater intrusion. Mr. Magill also inquired what could happen as a result of rising sea level resulting from global warming, especially in relation to the Abel and Mary Nicholson House.

Mr. Dan Saunders stated that the loss of trees has to be reasonably foreseeable in order to dismiss the screening provided by trees in a visual effects analysis. Mr. Saunders did not feel that there was any reason to suspect the trees at the Denn House would be removed.

Mr. Saunders suggested that a programmatic agreement (PA) would be appropriate to resolve the adverse effects from the ESP, because the actual impacts are unknown at this time due to project uncertainties. He said that the purpose of consultation when there are impacts is to mitigate, reduce or avoid those effects. A PA could identify some potential mitigation strategies. These strategies could be employed for multiple locations depending on the magnitude of the effect. The PA could document some mitigation and focus the scope at the COL stage. He felt there was a benefit to moving forward with the process at this point in order to provide PSEG some sense of the commitment of funds that would be required to address the adverse effects to historic properties resulting from the proposed project.

Mr. Saunders asked Mr. Magill and Ms. Sheridan what are the preservation needs for the local area. Potential mitigation measures raised by the consulting parties included:

- Construction of a bank to protect the Nicholson property from further saltwater intrusion and to provide a partial visual barrier to the proposed cooling towers.
- Additional research on Nicholson House along with archaeological surveys to locate former outbuildings.
- Complete architectural resources survey for the area that is up to today's standards.
- Further research that focuses on the agricultural history of the area, rather than the structures themselves – developing the historical context for the area (both Saunders and Sheridan suggested this).

NRC Actions

The NRC will prepare a draft trip report and send it to all parties who attended the February 12, 2015, consultation meeting for review and comment. The NRC will revise the draft report and issue a final trip report.

NRC will contact the ACHP to notify them of the proposed project, adverse effects to the NHL and eligible properties, and seek assistance on a proposed path forward (an MOA or a PA). NRC will arrange a teleconference at a later date with ACHP, NJ HPO, and the consulting parties.

Once the NRC receives the eligibility determinations from NJ HPO, the NRC will notify the ACHP; Secretary of the Interior, and NPS Landmark Division (Ms. Bonnie Halda) by letter regarding the revised determination of adverse effects. Included with the letter, the NRC will also prepare a summary package containing a description of the proposed project, reports and studies completed to date, the draft EIS, and the final trip reports. In addition, all consulting parties will be copied on NRC's letters.

NJ HPO Actions

Mr. Saunders stated that NJ HPO is currently conducting research on 116 Mason Point Road and the 130 Money Island Road (Mason-Waddington House). On February 6, 2015, Ms. Sheridan submitted photo documentation of the Mason-Waddington House to NJ HPO.

Eligibility determinations for both properties will be made soon and will be transmitted by formal letter to the NRC.

Another property, 337 Fort Elfsborg Road (log cabin house), was also put forward for consideration. This house was documented during a survey of architectural resources in Salem County which was never completed. The NJ HPO indicated that they do not have enough information relating to this structure's integrity to put forth a determination of eligibility at this time. Furthermore, for the purposes of the proposed project it is unlikely that this structure would be adversely affected because it is close to the road and is protected by a stand of mature trees, which minimizes any potential effects.

NJ HPO has documentation that shows that the property at 349 Fort Elfsborg Road is a pattern brick house. The pattern brick component of the house is not evident on the existing structure. NJ HPO will send the information that it was originally a pattern brick house to the NRC, so the staff can update the EIS.

Conclusion

At the end of the meeting Mr. Fetter, Mr. Saunders, and Mr. Mallon thanked everyone for attending and working to raise and address potential issues that need to be kept in mind as the consultation process continues forward.

Attendees

NRC

Allen Fetter (allen.fetter@nrc.gov)

Jennifer Davis (jennifer.davis@nrc.gov)

Dan O'Rourke, Argonne National Laboratory (djorourke@anl.gov)

NJ HPO

Dan Saunders (dan.saunders@dep.nj.gov)

Vincent Maresca (vincent.maresca@dep.nj.gov)

Michelle Craren (michelle.craren@dep.nj.gov)

Interested Local Parties

Ron Magill, Salem Old House Foundation (Local_Art@comcast.net)

Janet Sheridan, Local Preservationist (jlsheridan@verizon.net) – via phone

PSEG

Dave Robillard (david.robillard@pseg.com)

James Mallon (james.mallon@pseg.com)

Gary Bickel, AKRF (gbickle@akrf.com)

January 27, 2015

Title: Notice of Forthcoming Meeting to Discuss and Clarify Aspects of Section 106 Consultation associated with an Early Site Permit at the PSEG Site

Date(s) and Time(s): February 12, 2015, 10:00 AM to 02:00 PM

Location: NJ Historic Preservation Office
501 East State Street
Trenton, NJ

Category: This is a Category 1 meeting. The public is invited to observe this meeting and will have one or more opportunities to communicate with the NRC after the business portion of the meeting but before the meeting is adjourned.

Purpose: To discuss and clarify aspects of Section 106 Consultation associated with an Early Site Permit at the PSEG Site. Other topics related to the environmental review of the PSEGESP application may also be discussed.

Contact: Allen Fetter
301-415-8556
allen.fetter@nrc.gov

Participants: NRC External
Allen Fetter, NRC Staff

Docket No: 05200043

Trip Report for PSEG Early Site Permit Application
National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Consultation
Meeting on April 23, 2015 in Trenton, New Jersey

This meeting was a follow-up to the February 12, 2015, consultation meeting and was intended to establish a common understanding between the consulting parties regarding the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 (Section 106) consultation process going forward. Another purpose of this meeting was to develop the framework and general language of a draft memorandum of agreement (MOA) which would describe how the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) intends on resolving any adverse effects from the project, to discuss potential mitigation measures, and the proposed consultation schedule moving forward. Participants included representatives from the NRC, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (NJ HPO), PSEG (the applicant), and via teleconference, Ms. Janet Sheridan (interested party), Mr. Dan O'Rourke (ANL), and Molly McDonald (AKRF). Enclosure 1 is a list of individuals who attended the meeting. Enclosure 2 provides the agenda for this meeting.

All the parties met at the NJ HPO offices in Trenton, New Jersey. Mr. Allen Fetter, the NRC project manager for the PSEG ESP environmental review, opened the meeting and served as facilitator. Ms. Jennifer Davis (NRC) provided a brief overview on the status of NRC's review to date. As a result of the March 13, 2015 NJ HPO letter, Ms. Davis informed the parties that the NRC requested that PSEG gather additional information to assist with identification efforts relating to 116 Mason Point Drive, Isaac Smart House (489 Salem-Fort Elfsborg Road), 349 Fort Elfsborg Road (sometimes known as the Sarah Mason House), and the Joseph Darkin House (85 Amwellbury Road). The NRC also requested an assessment of the potential for the proposed project to affect these four resources and one additional resource, the Samuel and Sarah Nicholson House at 153 Amwellbury Road. The latter property was previously listed on the New Jersey and National Registers of Historic Places but was not accurately identified in the 2009 MACTEC Assessment. Mr. Jamie Mallon and Mr. David Robillard (PSEG) stated that their contractor Ms. Molly MacDonald (AKRF) was currently gathering information and indicated that this supplemental information would be submitted to NRC and the NJ HPO by May 11, 2015. In keeping with the schedule, Mr. Fetter requested an expedited concurrence review from NJ HPO. Mr. Dan Saunders (NJ HPO) indicated that his office would try to perform an expedited review.

Ms. Davis informed the parties that NRC had started drafting the framework and general language of a draft MOA. She noted that during the February 12th meeting, the development of a programmatic agreement for the project was proposed. Ms. Davis stated that the NRC prefers to develop an MOA because the potential for adverse effects to historic properties could result only from if natural draft cooling towers would be selected in a future combined license application. No other configurations are anticipated to affect historic properties. Mr. Saunders indicated that he would like the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's (ACHP) input on which type of agreement would be appropriate. Ms. Davis stated that NRC has contacted the

ACHP about the NRC's proposed path forward. She went on to specify that the draft MOA cannot be completed until the staff knows which properties will be affected. Ms. Davis stated that the NRC would not issue the adverse effect letters until PSEG submits additional information is submitted. NRC staff wants to ensure that we only send a single letter and address all issues in the MOA. Additionally, Ms. Davis stated that the NRC will be updating the final EIS with the new information resulting from the continuing consultation on this project.

The group then discussed possible schedules for completing consultation and attempted to identify target dates for finalizing the MOA. During the discussion, Mr. Saunders expressed concern that an estimated 15 days to resolve public comments after end of the public comment period was too ambitious and that 30 days would be more realistic. This would shift the remaining parts of the schedule by approximately two weeks which would move the proposed execution date of the MOA to around September 25th. All parties agreed that the revised schedule was reasonable. It was also suggested that all parties sign separate MOA signature pages which would help expedite the process. Mr. Saunders suggested that NRC invite ACHP earlier into the consultation prior to notification of adverse effect. Ms. Davis informed the parties that NRC had been in communication with the ACHP and had shared a draft of the MOA with the ACHP.

Next, the parties started reviewing the draft MOA and provided edits. Mr. Saunders asked if the USACE would be a signatory to the MOA. Both Mr. Fetter and Mr. Ed Bonner (USACE) stated that the USACE would not be a signatory. While NRC and USACE are cooperating on the environmental impact statement, each agency has their own areas of regulatory responsibility and are consulting on the areas of the project that are within their regulatory authority. Because of the limited regulatory authority of each agency, neither agency could consult on the entire project. The NRC is consulting on the impact (including visual impacts) of construction and operation of a new nuclear power plant on Artificial Island. The USACE is consulting on areas of the project that would require an Army permit due to impacts to wetlands, specifically the proposed causeway from Money Island Road to the PSEG Site and potential dredge areas (barge facility and water intake). Mr. Bonner stated that the USACE has not decided if an MOA is needed for those portions of the project under their jurisdiction.

The discussion then turned to possible mitigation strategies for any adverse effects resulting from the project. The following mitigation options were discussed:

- Construction of a dike to protect the Abel and Mary Nicholson property from further saltwater intrusion and to provide a partial visual barrier to the proposed natural draft cooling towers
- Phase I archaeological survey, utilizing ground penetrating radar and shovel testing to expand the knowledge about the Nicholson property
- Some form of architectural resource survey for the area that is up to today's standards. The survey could address targeted resources such as properties from certain time periods or sub regions within the county.

During the discussion it was determined that construction of a dike would not mitigate visual effect, but could alleviate flooding issues at the National Historic Landmark. The placement of

the dike is a crucial factor. AKRF volunteered to investigate possible configurations and locations for placement of a new dike. Ms. Janet Sheridan offered to perform research on the location where dikes were historically placed in the region. Mr. Robillard stated that he would also review records on locations of dikes in the area.

Additional archaeological investigations at the Abel and Mary Nicholson House to locate the subsurface remains of former outbuildings were also suggested as a mitigation option. During the discussion of archaeological investigation, Mr. Saunders mentioned that the extent of the investigations would be driven by the amount of funds available for this effort. Mr. Vincent Maresca suggested that a Phase I survey which only attempts to discover the presence or absence of remains be conducted.

For the architectural survey option, it was suggested that further research focus on the agricultural history of the area, rather than the structures themselves. The research could help to inform the interested parties how the area was settled and would aid in understanding those resources that remain. Mr. Saunders and Ms. Sheridan approved of this strategy.

Next Steps

Before meeting again, the additional information being collected by AKRF about dikes in the region and the costs associated with constructing new dikes should be reviewed. The parties agreed that another site visit to Salem County, New Jersey was warranted. To allow adequate time for the new information to be collected, the next meeting would be scheduled around May 19th or 20th.

Conclusion

At the end of the meeting Mr. Fetter, Mr. Saunders, and Mr. Mallon thanked everyone for attending and working to raise and address potential issues that need to be kept in mind as the consultation process continues forward.

Attendees

NRC

Allen Fetter (allen.fetter@nrc.gov)

Jennifer Davis (jennifer.davis@nrc.gov)

Dan O'Rourke, Argonne National Laboratory (djorourke@anl.gov) – via phone

USACE

Ed Bonner (edward.e.bonner@usace.army.mil)

NJ HPO

Dan Saunders (dan.saunders@dep.nj.gov)

Vincent Maresca (vincent.maresca@dep.nj.gov)

Michelle Craren (michelle.craren@dep.nj.gov)

Interested Local Party

Janet Sheridan, Local Preservationist (jlsheridan@verizon.net) – via phone

PSEG

Dave Robillard (david.robillard@pseg.com)

James Mallon (james.mallon@pseg.com)

Gary Bickel, AKRF (gbickle@akrf.com)

Molly McDonald, AKRF (mmcdonald@akrf.com) – via phone

Jeff Pantazes, AKRF (jpantazes@akrf.com)

April 13, 2015

Title: Notice of Forthcoming Meeting To Discuss Next Steps Regarding Section 106 Consultation Associated with An Early Site Permit At The PSEG Site

Date(s) and Time(s): April 23, 2015, 11:00 AM to 02:30 PM

Location: New Jersey Historic Preservation Office
501 East State Street
Trenton, NJ

Category: This is a Category 1 meeting. The public is invited to observe this meeting and will have one or more opportunities to communicate with the NRC after the business portion of the meeting but before the meeting is adjourned.

Purpose: To discuss next steps regarding Section 106 Consultation associated with an Early Site Permit at the PSEG Site. Other topics related to the environmental review of the PSEG ESP application may also be discussed.

Contact: Allen Fetter
301-415-8556
Allen.Fetter@nrc.gov

Participants: NRC External
Allen Fetter, et al., Office of New Reactors Interested Stakeholders,
PSEG Power, LLC

Docket No: 05200043

Trip Report for PSEG Early Site Permit Application

National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Consultation Meeting and Site Visit on May 19, 2015 in Salem County, New Jersey

This meeting and site visit was part of the ongoing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act consultation regarding the proposed PSEG Early Site Permit (ESP) at the PSEG site on Artificial Island. Through previous meetings, conference calls, and additional analysis, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has determined that the proposed project would have an indirect adverse (i.e., visual) effect to the Abel and Mary Nicholson House (127 Fort Elfsborg-Hancock Bridge Road), 349 Fort Elfsborg-Hancock Bridge Road, and 116 Mason Point Road, in the event that two 590 foot tall natural draft cooling towers were constructed at the proposed PSEG site. The meeting was held in at the PSEG Energy and Environmental Resource Center (EERC) located in Salem County, New Jersey. Participants included representatives from the NRC, New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (NJ HPO), the National Park Service (NPS), PSEG (the applicant), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and Ms. Janet Sheridan and Mr. Ron Magill (interested parties). Enclosure 1 is a list of individuals who attended the visit. Enclosure 2 provides the agenda.

The purpose of the May 19 meeting was threefold:

1. PSEG had their contractor, AKRF, do additional research to determine which properties had the potential to be affected by the proposed project. AKRF would provide the results of their analysis to the NRC, NJ HPO, ACHP, interested local parties, and the NPS.
2. Under the Section 106 regulations and other provisions of the NHPA, the NPS is invited to participate when there is a potential for impacts to a National Historic Landmark (NHL). The Abel and Mary Nicholson House at 127 Fort Elfsborg-Hancock Road is a NHL which could be visually affected by the construction of the proposed plant (i.e., two natural draft cooling towers) 4.9 miles away. Part of the meeting was to determine if the NPS would be a part of the consultation for the Section 106 review.
3. The NRC, through its discussions with the agencies and interested parties, proposed to draft a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to resolve the adverse effect from the proposed project on historic properties. Past consultation meetings focused on the development of potential mitigation strategies. A goal of the meeting was to reach consensus on what would be the appropriate mitigation for the effects resulting from the project. Once these items were resolved, the MOA can be signed and Section 106 for the project completed.

Mr. Allen Fetter, the NRC project manager for the PSEG ESP environmental review, opened the meeting and served as facilitator. Ms. Jennifer Davis provided an overview of consultation efforts to date. It had been previously agreed by the consulting parties that the addition of two

proposed natural draft cooling towers would be visible from the Abel and Mary Nicholson House NHL.

After the introductions and overview, Ms. Molly McDonald (AKRF) presented the findings from their additional research. AKRF found that the property at 116 Mason Point Road should be considered eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and that the property would be visually affected by the introduction of two natural draft cooling towers. AKRF also found the property at 349 Fort Elfsborg Road to be historically significant and that the natural draft cooling towers would also be visible from this property. AKRF also found that the two proposed natural draft cooling towers would not be visible from the final two properties considered: the Isaac Smart House at 489 Salem-Fort Elfsborg Road and the Joseph Darkin House at 85 Amwellbury Road. This discussion concluded with the NJ HPO mentioning the Historic District which they proposed in March 2015 which would include the properties considered by AKRF.

NRC then discussed the status of the MOA and the need to identify mitigation measures. Based on previous discussions amongst the consulting parties, there were three mitigation measures proposed:

- Archaeological investigations on the Nicholson property to determine if there are any intact archaeological remains (e.g., location of outbuildings).
- Conduct a targeted architectural study in the region to identify additional properties that retain historical significance and integrity.
- Construction of a berm on or around the Nicholson property to protect the structure from storm surges and salt water intrusion.

The majority of the discussion focused on the berm option, where it would be located, how high it would be, and how effective this approach would be in stabilizing the Nicholson House. It was agreed that the groundwater intrusion issue currently occurring at the Nicholson property would not be corrected if a berm was constructed around the property. There was also a discussion of where the historic dikes were located in the area, and if any of these dikes could be rebuilt. Concern was raised that the building of a dike or berm is a significant undertaking that would likely have numerous ancillary effects that could result in more issues than were being resolved. A berm, given the magnitude of the effort, could result in greater environmental impacts to the region, and may not be commensurate with the indirect impact from the proposed project. The discussion then turned to other potential mitigation strategies. A berm may be needed at some point in the future due to ocean level rise resulting from global warming. Parties also discussed ways to restore the historic character of the region by removing invasive species (i.e., Phragmites), and restoration of historic dikes. Mr. Bill Bolger (NPS) suggested the parties look at other examples in different parts of the country. Mr. Vincent Maresca (NJ HPO) suggested that conducting archaeological investigations at the Nicholson House could provide additional context for the NHL. Mr. Bolger stated that he had some examples of mitigation that he would share.

The parties broke for lunch and field trip to Nicholson NHL and other locations potentially affected by project.

Afternoon Discussion

After returning from site visit, discussion resumed on what the group would consider to be appropriate mitigation. PSEG representatives shared cost estimates for the various mitigation strategies, including berm construction, architectural studies, regional architectural studies, targeted architectural studies, and additional archaeology. The discussion then focused on what are the greatest preservation issues at the Nicholson House. Mr. Ron Magill stated that the two main concerns were saline groundwater intrusion affecting the foundation and vandalism. After much discussion, the parties determined that a berm would not resolve the water issue. Discussion turned to other options that could address the water issue (e.g., wells). Ms. Sarah Stokely (ACHP) recommended that options discussed University of Pennsylvania thesis paper could provide potential mitigation strategies. Other types of mitigation discussed included recordation and nomination of the proposed historic district. Mr. Mallon raised the issue that not all members of the public see being part of a historic district as a positive and noted that there could be opposition in the local community. Mr. Mallon stated that PSEG did not want to antagonize public. Mr. Bolger stated that the Nicholson NHL has considerable potential as a major visitor draw, if it were developed. He went on to state that the Nicholson house was very unique. Concern was raised that the amount of money being considered for the mitigation efforts is not commensurate with the level of impact. Mr. Mallon cited other nuclear power plant projects with greater direct effects which did not require such expensive mitigation. The parties concluded that additional studies in the region and for Nicholson House studies would be appropriate, however, consensus on what those measures entailed was not reached.

Mr. Fetter informed parties that the NRC's adverse effect letters would be coming out shortly. It was also determined that another teleconference would be necessary to discuss the NRC's effect letters and to continue discussing potential mitigation measures. In addition, the NRC will provide another draft version of the MOA. Mr. Fetter stated that another meeting would be scheduled in early July to discuss any changes to the working draft MOA (subsequently rescheduled for August 12, 2015).

Attendees

NRC

Allen Fetter (allen.fetter@nrc.gov)

Jennifer Davis (jennifer.davis@nrc.gov)

Dan O'Rourke, Argonne National Laboratory (djourourke@anl.gov) – via phone

ACHP

Sarah Stokely (sstokely@achp.gov)

NPS

Bill Bolger (bill_bolger@nps.gov)

NJ HPO

Dan Saunders (dan.saunders@dep.nj.gov)

Vincent Maresca (vincent.maresca@dep.nj.gov)

Michelle Craren (michelle.craren@dep.nj.gov)

Interested Local Party

Janet Sheridan (jls Sheridan@verizon.net)

Ron Magill (Local_Art@comcast.net)

PSEG

Dave Robillard (david.robillard@pseg.com)

James Mallon (james.mallon@pseg.com)

Gary Bickel, AKRF (gbickle@akrf.com)

Molly McDonald, AKRF (mmcdonald@akrf.com)

Jeff Pantazes, AKRF (jpantazes@akrf.com)

Agenda

PSEG Early Site Permit Application
National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Consultation
Site Visit Salem County, New Jersey
May 19, 2014

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| 10:30-10:45 | Introductions at the PSEG Energy & Environmental Resource Center
(244 Chestnut Street, Salem, NJ 08079) |
| 10:45-11:30 | Review activities to date: Effects, Mitigations, Draft MOA |
| 11:30- 12:00 | Working lunch at the Energy and Environmental Resource Center |
| 12:00- 1:30 | Visit the following properties:
Abel and Mary Nicholson House
Sara Mason House
116 Mason Point Road |
| 1:30-3:30 | Mitigation Discussion – Based on effects what is preferred mitigation? |

Publicly Noticed Teleconference
PSEG ESP Section 106 Consultation
Meeting to Discuss Changes to Draft Memorandum of Agreement
June 16, 2015

Summary of Discussion

Mr. Allen Fetter, project manager for the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), provided a brief overview and summary of the May 19, 2015, site visit and consultation meeting. At this last meeting, the parties discussed what would be the appropriate mitigation for the indirect adverse effects on historic properties resulting from the proposed ESP. At that meeting, several specific mitigation actions were discussed. Mr. Fetter then indicated that PSEG informed the NRC, after the May 19 meeting, that PSEG prefers to defer development of specific mitigation to the combined license (COL) stage. Therefore, the MOA would no longer stipulate specific mitigation and would instead set the framework for consultation at the COL stage.

Ms. Jennifer Davis and Mr. Dan O'Rourke reviewed areas in which the parties have consensus.

- Adverse effect from natural draft cooling towers on the Abel and Mary Nicholson House National Historic Landmark (NHL), the structure at 349 Fort Elfsborg-Hancock Bridge Road, and at 116 Mason Point Road.
- The parties agree that visual screening is not preferred for addressing the adverse effect resulting from the natural draft cooling towers.
- Mitigation should address the NHL and the region.

Mr. Jamie Mallon stated that PSEG prefers to defer all discussion of specific mitigation to the COL stage. Ms. Janet Sheridan expressed concern that the ideas developed thus far would be lost. Ms. Michele Craren assured Ms. Sheridan that all mitigation options discussed would be preserved in the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (NJ HPO) files. Ms. Davis stated that the EIS would document the consultation efforts and would reference the trip reports, which document the discussion of potential mitigation options, within the final environmental impact statement.

- The adverse effect from the project only results from construction of two natural draft cooling towers.

In the revised MOA, the NJ HPO suggested that plumes may be an issue in relation to mechanical draft cooling. Ms. Davis stated that the NRC does not agree because the plumes are variable and dependent on climatic conditions. Ms. Sheridan stated that she is not concerned with the effect from the plume.

The NRC reiterated its preference to address the adverse effect through an MOA, because natural draft cooling towers are the only source of impacts. Ms. Sarah Stokley explained the difference between an MOA and a programmatic agreement to the group. Mr. Vincent Maresca

stated that an MOA generally identifies what mitigation would take place. Ms. Stokely indicated that the Section 106 process allows for this approach. The primary requirement is that agency commits to resolve adverse effects and will continue consultation at the COL stage. Mr. Mallon stated that the mitigation would be developed through consultation when the COL application was submitted and that the mitigation would be completed prior to operation of a new plant.

Mr. Fetter stated that the NRC will issue its adverse effect letters soon and will provide both the NJ HPO and the ACHP 30 days to comment. The NRC will also send out the MOA under a separate letter than the adverse effect letters. Mr. Maresca stated that he had comments to be included in MOA, and that he would forward them to the NRC.

Mr. Mallon suggested that the parties chose a date to finalize the MOA. All parties agreed to hold another teleconference on July 17, 2015 to discuss the draft MOA.

Attendees

NRC

Allen Fetter (allen.fetter@nrc.gov)

Jennifer Davis (jennifer.davis@nrc.gov)

Dan O'Rourke, Argonne National Laboratory (djorourke@anl.gov)

ACHP

Sarah Stokely (sstokely@achp.gov)

NJ HPO

Vincent Maresca (vincent.maresca@dep.nj.gov)

Michelle Craren (michelle.craren@dep.nj.gov)

Interested Local Party

Janet Sheridan (jlsheridan@verizon.net)

PSEG

James Mallon (james.mallon@pseg.com)

Dave Robillard (david.robillard@pseg.com)

June 01, 2015

Title: Notice of Forthcoming Meeting to Discuss Changes to the Draft MOA and Next Steps Section 106 Consultation Associated with an Early Site Permit at the PSEG Site

Date(s) and Time(s): June 16, 2015, 01:30 PM to 03:30 PM

Location: Teleconference

Category: This is a Category 1 meeting. The public is invited to observe this meeting and will have one or more opportunities to communicate with the NRC after the business portion of the meeting but before the meeting is adjourned.

Purpose: To discuss changes to the draft MOA and next steps regarding Section 106 Consultation associated with an Early Site Permit at the PSEG Site. Other topics related to the environmental review of the PSEG ESP application may also be discussed.

Contact: Allen Fetter
301-415-8556
Allen.Fetter@nrc.gov

Participants: NRC External
Allen Fetter, Office of New Reactors

Docket No: 05200043

**Publicly Noticed Teleconference
PSEG ESP Section 106 Consultation
Meeting to Discuss Changes to Draft Memorandum of Agreement
August 12, 2015**

Summary of Discussion

Following the welcome and introductions, Mr. Allen Fetter, project manager for the NRC, stated that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for the PSEG Early Site Permit (ESP) site and to receive comments from the consulting parties. Ms. Jennifer Davis (NRC) provided a brief overview of June 16, 2015, teleconference where PSEG informed the NRC that it prefers to defer development of specific mitigation to the combined license (COL) stage. Therefore, the MOA would no longer stipulate specific mitigation and would instead set the framework for consultation at the COL stage.

Ms. Davis discussed the following topics with the consulting parties:

- The NRC reiterated that it intends to pursue a MOA to address the adverse effect rather than a programmatic agreement, because natural draft cooling towers would be the only source of impacts. Additionally, all historic properties that could be potentially affected by the ESP have been identified.

There were no specific comments regarding this approach.

- Discussed incorporating the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (NJ HPO) proposed Alloway Creek Rural Historic District into the MOA.

Mr. Dan Saunders (NJ HPO) stated that the district be acknowledged in the MOA because the 3 affected structures (Abel and Mary Nicholson House, 349 Fort Elfsborg-Hancock Bridge Road, and 116 Mason Point Road) are contributing elements to this district. Ms. Janet Sheridan (interested party) and Ms. Sarah Stokely (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation [ACHP]) also agreed that all properties in the district should be listed in the MOA. The discussion also explored how districts are nominated and listed, and whether including the district affects the NRC's previous adverse effect determination. The NRC and PSEG also asked Mr. Saunders whether acknowledging the district in the MOA changes the potential scope of mitigation. Ms. Davis asked whether acknowledging the district magnifies the impact. Mr. Jamie Mallon (PSEG) stated that the proposed action is affecting the 3 buildings, not the district. Mr. Saunders stated that effects would be considered to properties that are within the APE. No further analysis would be required for properties outside of the area of potential effect. Mr. O'Rourke asked if NRC would be required to send revised adverse effect letters. Mr. Saunders indicated that revised letters would not be necessary.

Mr. Saunders requested that NRC specify the height of mechanical draft towers in the MOA. Ms. Davis agreed to add this information.

- Cooling tower plumes

Ms. Davis noted that one of the interested parties raised a concern regarding visual effects to the historic setting of the Abel and Mary Nicholson house from cooling tower plumes. She stated that NRC's position is that plumes are ephemeral and do not have a permanent visual effect that structures have on the horizon. Visibility of plumes is dependent upon climatic conditions. Mr. Saunders agreed that plumes are not typically considered, but he did ask that the NRC put its rationale for not including the plumes in the MOA.

- Comment response for the ACHP's July 31, 2015 letter

Ms. Sheridan asked Ms. Stokely if she was satisfied with the NRC's response to the issues raised in the July 31st letter. Ms. Stokely indicated that she was generally satisfied with the NRC's response; however, there were a few issues that needed to be addressed.

- ACHP preferred that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' actions be acknowledged in the MOA.
- Stressed the need for public involvement in consultation at the COL stage.
- Requested a section in the MOA specifically addressing the process for unanticipated discoveries
- Requested a section in the MOA addressing emergency procedures

Ms. Stokely asked Mr. Bill Bolger (National Park Service [NPS]) if any decisions had been reached regarding NPS's official involvement in the MOA. Mr. Bolger indicated that the NPS was still considering its role in the process and that he intended to let all the other parties know shortly. He did indicate that Ms. Bonnie Halda would sign for the NPS if they decide to participate.

Next Steps

Ms. Davis thanked everyone for participating on the call and explained that at the conclusion of this teleconference, NRC would take all of the comments received and amend the MOA. This revised draft MOA would be issued in the *Federal Register* for a 30 day comment period.

Attendees

NRC

Allen Fetter (allen.fetter@nrc.gov)

Jennifer Davis (jennifer.davis@nrc.gov)

Kevin Roach (kevin.roachOGC@nrc.gov)

Dan O'Rourke, Argonne National Laboratory (djorourke@anl.gov)

ACHP

Sarah Stokely (sstokely@achp.gov)

NPS

Bill Bolger (bill_bolger@nps.gov)

NJ HPO

Dan Saunders (dan.saunders@dep.nj.gov)

Vincent Maresca (vincent.maresca@dep.nj.gov)

Michelle Craren (michelle.craren@dep.nj.gov)

Interested Local Party

Janet Sheridan (jlsheridan@verizon.net)

PSEG

James Mallon (james.mallon@pseg.com)

Dave Robillard (david.robillard@pseg.com)

July 13, 2015

Title: Notice of Forthcoming Meeting to Discuss Changes to the Draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and Next Steps Section 106 Consultation Associated with an Early Site Permit at the PSEG Site

Date(s) and Time(s): August 12, 2015, 01:30 PM to 03:30 PM

Location: Teleconference

Category: This is a Category 1 meeting. The public is invited to observe this meeting and will have one or more opportunities to communicate with the NRC after the business portion of the meeting but before the meeting is adjourned.

Purpose: To discuss the draft MOA prepared as part of Section 106 Consultation associated with an Early Site Permit at the PSEG Site. Other topics related to the environmental review of the PSEG ESP application may also be discussed.

Contact: Allen Fetter
301-415-8556
Allen.Fetter@nrc.gov

Participants: NRC External
Allen Fetter, Office of New Reactors

Docket No: 05200043