

August 12, 1980

Ron Ballard  
Environment and Engineering Branch  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
U. S. NRC  
Washington, DC 20555

Dear Mr. Ballard:

Enclosed are copies of the NERBC Power Plant Siting Project Phase 2 work proposal. Please direct any inquiries about this proposal, or about the Power Plant Siting Project, to Howell Thomas, project manager, or to myself, at 617-223-6244.

Sincerely,

*Terrence P McCool*

Terrence P. McCool  
Resource Planner  
NERBC Power Plant  
Siting Project

TPM/tmn  
Enclosure

X003  
5  
//1

UNSOLICITED PROPOSAL

SUBMITTED TO:

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

BY

NEW ENGLAND RIVER BASINS COMMISSION  
53 STATE STREET  
BOSTON, MA 02109

FOR

POWER PLANT SITING PROJECT

H. D. THOMAS  
PROGRAM MANAGER  
(617) 223-6244

## POWER PLANT SITING PROJECT

### Phase 2

#### ABSTRACT

This project is designed to improve the capability of public and private sector decision makers to compare and evaluate alternative base load power plant sites. In order to reach this goal, the New England River Basins Commission has established a Task Force of executives from utilities, regulatory agencies, and special interest groups from across New England. This Task Force is working by consensus to recommend improvements to criteria, methods, and processes in site selection.

Phase 1 of the project focused on identifying problems and principles for solving those problems to which the diverse interests participating on the Task Force could agree. Phase 2 will be directed toward completing the Task Force problem solving efforts and designing and conducting a technical assistance program.

## BACKGROUND: Power Plant Siting Project

This project is designed to improve the capability of public and private sector decision makers to compare and evaluate alternative base load power plant sites. In order to reach this goal, the New England River Basins Commission has established a Task Force of executives from utilities, regulatory agencies, and special interest groups from across New England. This Task Force is working by consensus to recommend improvements to criteria, methods, and processes in site selection. Examples of some problems the Task Force is addressing include:

1. Improving communications among the diverse interests concerned with power plant siting.
2. Improving the consideration of natural resource-related criteria and methods in site selection.
3. Factoring the objectives and interests of the various regulatory agencies into siting programs.
4. Improving the documentation of utility siting programs to enable regulatory and review agencies and the public to evaluate choices and tradeoffs made by the utility.

The process being used in this project is unique in that the diverse interests in siting are working together to develop solutions to problems they collectively share. The Task Force has agreed to work collaboratively and many members view this program as a model for how they might operate in their working environments. The continuing program will be focused on refining agreements, alternative solutions and recommendations by the Task Force and, then, implementing these suggestions for improving the consideration of both natural resources and the concerns of stakeholders in the site selection process.

## PROGRESS TO DATE: Hard Work and Consensus

Since June 1979, the Task Force and staff have reached several important milestones. The Task Force, for example, has:

- Agreed that their membership is complete and appropriate for addressing natural resource issues in power plant siting.
- Agreed to make decisions by consensus, with members representing the breadth and depth of their experience and knowledge rather than the more narrow mandates as employees of a particular agency or interest group.

- Agreed that procedural problems in siting are more important to address than technical problems.
- Identified and categorized the key questions in siting for further discussion and problem-solving.
- Agreed to a series of problem statements in site selection and a broad list of principles for evaluating solutions proposed to address defined problems.
- Brainstormed a wide variety of solutions to problems in siting and developed a variety of scenarios for linking these specific solutions.

NERBC staff has been conducting research, preparing reports, and organizing meetings in support of the Task Force. A principal staff function has been to help the Task Force focus on the important issues and problems for discussion leading toward potential solutions.

NEXT STEPS: Develop Recommendations, Design and Conduct Technical Assistance Program

- PROJECT GOAL To improve the consideration of water and related land resources in power plant siting.
- PHASE 2 OBJECTIVES
  - To develop recommendations on several preferable site selection process alternatives.
  - To design and conduct a technical assistance program.
- ACTIVITIES
  - Conduct up to three Task Force meetings.
  - Staff research and analysis on the alternative site selection process developed by the Task Force.
  - Present project to stakeholders and other interests in New England and elsewhere as requested.
  - Design workshop format, materials, identify likely participants such as regulatory agencies, utilities, and special interests.
  - Conduct six workshops in the New England states.
  - Present project recommendations to appropriate agencies and companies.

● PRODUCTS

Final Report: Problems, Principles, and Solutions Concerning Site Selection and Natural Resources including:

- Roles, responsibilities, and methods for natural resource stakeholders in site selection;
- Site selection process alternatives;
- Alternative solutions by phase of the siting process;
- Recommendations for improving the consideration of natural resources in siting, including institutional changes.
- Recommendations for CCJP policies.

(All funding agencies' names and report numbers will be printed on the cover of the final reports.)

Final Report: Documentation of the Consensus Building Process

Technical assistance program design.

Workshop design proposal.

Workshop Notebooks

Report of Workshops.

Overall program evaluation.

Content evaluation: comparison and evaluation of conclusions from workshops with Task Force conclusions.

Presentation package including format, handouts, other graphics.

Minutes of Task Force meetings.

Materials for general distribution as appropriate.

● SCHEDULE

Task Force meetings between September and December, 1980.

Workshops between January and May 1981.

Products delivered as prepared, no later than September 30, 1981.

The New England River Basins Commission is a federal/state planning partnership composed of representatives of the six New England states and New York, ten federal agencies and six interstate agencies. Under the provisions of Title II of the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 (PL 89-80), NERBC was created in 1968 at the request of the governors of the member states. Its primary responsibilities are:

- to be the principal agency for coordinating water and related land resource plans throughout New England;
- to prepare and update, in cooperation with its state, interstate and federal members, a comprehensive, coordinated joint plan (CCJP) for managing the region's water and related land resources;
- to recommend long-range priorities for meeting the region's most important natural resource information planning and management needs; and
- to undertake studies needed to carry out these missions adequately.

The Commission employs approximately 50 full-time professional staff and is not classified as either a minority business or small business enterprise. All work specified in this proposal will be performed in the NERBC offices in Boston, MA by the existing project staff. The Commission regularly conducts a variety of technical assistance programs and is fully qualified for the performance of the proposed Phase 2 program as a result of its experience in the field.

Consultants who may be retained to assist in the Phase 2 effort include:

- |                           |         |   |
|---------------------------|---------|---|
| ● Barry Lawson Associates | \$7,000 | Documentation and evaluation of the consensus building process. |
| ● Interaction Associates  | \$4,000 | Meeting management.   |
| ● Offices of David Sibbet | \$4,000 | Meeting management.   |

NERBC has not employed or retained a company or person (other than a full-time employee) to solicit or secure funding for this project, and agrees to furnish information relating thereto as requested by the contracting officer.

The Commission has not the necessary financial capacity, working capital, and other resources to perform the contract without assistance from any outside source. A total of one hundred sixty thousand dollars (\$160,000) has been requested from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Department of Energy, and the Environmental Protection Agency.

Howell Thomas has been employed by NERBC as the Program Manager. He has joined the Commission from Ontario Hydro where he was responsible for programs to predict, monitor, and mitigate the social and economic effects of power plant siting, construction, and operation on nearby communities. His background includes a Master's degree in Environmental Studies and work experience in other planning commissions and in secondary education.

Terrence McCool is providing staff support on the project. He has a Master's degree in Resource Economics and wrote a thesis evaluating the effects of dispersed versus centralized nuclear power plants.

NERBC has a flexible organizational structure and, as such, other staff members may participate in the program as appropriate.

#### CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

NERBC is of the opinion that no conflict of interest exists between the conduct of this project and the prospective funding agencies. There are employees of both NRC and EPA, as well as utilities, participating on the Power Plant Siting Task Force; however, the Task Force is engaged in problem-solving activities and no binding commitments to conclusions will be requested of the members.



COST ESTIMATES

October 1980 to October 1981

Staff Salaries	\$ 75,200
Consultants	30,400
Meeting Expenses	2,000
Staff Travel	2,400
Printing*	2,000
Equipment, Supplies, Telephones, Rent, ect.	<u>48,000</u>
Phase 2 TOTAL:	\$ 160,000

\* Printing responsibilities may be assumed by participating agencies.