

URS

AN INTERNATIONAL PROFESSIONAL SERVICES ORGANIZATION

URS COMPANY
FOURTH AND VINE BUILDING
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121
TEL: (206) 623-6000

SEATTLE
LAS VEGAS
ANCHORAGE
PORTLAND
SAN FRANCISCO
DENVER
DALLAS
KANSAS CITY
NEW ORLEANS
NEW YORK
WASHINGTON, D.C.
SAN MATEO
LONDON

January 6, 1982

Mr. Jan Norris
Environmental Project Manager
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555



Dear Mr. Norris:

Based on our recent telephone conversations and the information contained in the Standard Environmental Review Plan for Alternative Sites, we have developed an outline for our review of Puget Sound Power and Light's (PSP&L) site selection process leading to their application to construct and operate a nuclear power plant on the Hanford Nuclear Reservation.

The outline enclosed reflects our understanding of the review process and the specific review responsibilities of URS and the NRC. We are currently proceeding with the review and would appreciate your comments as soon as possible. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Grant Bailey
Project Manager

GB/dl

Enclosure

*Cool
S/11*

8201130292 820106
PDR ADOCK 05000522
A PDR

ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARD REVIEW
OF ALTERNATIVE SITES OUTLINE

The following outline describes the information, processes, analyses and conclusions used in reviewing the applicant's proposed site for construction and operation of a nuclear power plant. The outline uses the format suggested in the Environmental Standard Review Plan for ES Section 9.2, with the exceptions that the staff analysis section contains more detail than what might be necessary for the ES.

SECTION A - APPLICANT'S SITE-SELECTION PROCESS

This section will include descriptions of: the applicant's site-selection process and process objectives; the selected region of interest; and, a list and general description of the candidate sites.

SECTION B - STAFF ANALYSIS

This section will briefly describe the staff review process and include a detailed analysis of the applicant's site selection process as described in Sections III and IV of the Environmental Standard Review Plan for Alternative Sites.

B.1 Staff Review Process Description

B.2 Analysis of Adequacy of Reconnaissance Level Information

B.3 Review Region of Interest

- B.3.1 - Describes the size of the Region of Interest (ROI).
- B.3.2 - Compare size and locations of ROI to applicant's service area.
- B.3.3 - Compare size and location of ROI to the state in which proposed site lies.
- B.3.4 - Identify the diverse environmental qualities both inside and outside of the ROI, including:
 - 1) types of water resources
 - 2) types of physiographic units
- B.3.5 - Identify any legal, institutional, political or economic constraints on the applicant's siting options.

B.4 Review Selection of Candidate Sites

- B.4.1 - Identify the number of sites in the ROI that reasonably represent a diversity of land and water resources. Minimum number 4.
- B.4.2 - Evaluate whether sites alternatives reasonably exhaust the different types of water sources and physiographic units available in the ROI.
- B.4.3 - Identify the sites utilizing the same water sources. Minimum requirement of 1.

B.4.4 - Evaluate whether all site alternatives meet the criteria set forth in Section VI.2, Appendix A, 10 CFR Part 51 as follows:

- B.4.4.1 - Water consumption
- B.4.4.2 - Threatened and endangered species
- B.4.4.3 - Aquatic species
- B.4.4.4 - Water quality
- B.4.4.5 - Land use
- B.4.4.6 - Terrestrial (NRC) and aquatic ecosystems
- B.4.4.7 - (NRC)
- B.4.4.8 - (NRC)

A) Under the heading of each of the 8 criteria (except Numbers 7 and 8) we will discuss whether any of the sites is excluded by one or more criteria. Less than one page of discussion will be developed under each criteria which discusses all eleven sites.

B.5 Comparison of Proposed Site with Alternative Site

This section will analyze and discuss the environmental attributes of the applicant's proposed site compared to the environmental attributes of alternative sites. This analysis will lead to an evaluation as to whether one or more alternative sites are environmentally preferred to the proposed site. The environmental attributes to be evaluated include:

- B.5.1 - Hydrology
- B.5.2 - Water quality
- B.5.3 - Aquatic resources
- B.5.4 - Terrestrial resources (NRC)
- B.5.5 - Water and land use
- B.5.6 - Socioeconomics
- B.5.7 - Population (NRC)

A. This will be the longest, most detailed section. It will compare all eleven sites under each criteria for which URS/EFSEC is responsible, even if some fall out under B.4. (Except those sites with insufficient data will not be discussed.)

SECTION C - STAFF CONCLUSIONS

Based on the analysis of the previous sections and the evaluation guidelines contained in Section IV of the Environmental Standard Review Plan, conclusions will be made concerning the adequacy of the applicant's site selection process. Specifically, these conclusions will address the following features of the site selection process:

- C.1 Adequacy of reconnaissance level of information. (We will point out sites which appear to have totally inadequate information.)
- C.2 Size of Region of Interest. (We will probably conclude here that the Region is acceptable, and demonstrate why, in general terms.)

- C.3 Adequacy of the slate of candidate sites using the product-oriented criteria. (We will point out any sites which may drop out under criteria 1-6 and will also consider to some degree the process criteria, if necessary.)
- C.4 Whether an environmentally preferred site exists among the range of candidate sites. (We will state whether or not this exists and use a simple matrix of +, - and 0 to compare all sites vs. the B.5 categories for which we are responsible; excluding population, terrestrial biology.)
- C.5 Whether an obviously superior site exists among the range of candidate sites. (Probably won't do.)
- C.6 Recommendations of acceptance or rejection of applicant's proposed site. (Do we do this or not?)