



MAV  
35  
Jacket Nos. 50-516  
and 50-517

MAY 10 1975

Mr. John D. McDermott  
Director, Office of Review  
and Compliance  
Advisory Council on Historic  
Preservation  
1522 K Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20005

Dear Mr. McDermott:

Pursuant to Section 800.5 of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's Procedures for the Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties (35 CFR 800) as related to Long Island Lighting Company's proposed Jamesport Nuclear Power Station, members of the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff met with representatives of the New York State Historic Preservation Office and of the Advisory Council on April 28, 1975, in Riverhead, New York. This meeting included an on-site inspection of the Hallock's Pond archaeological property and the Northville Historic District which are located on the Jamesport site.

As a result of this on-site inspection and the subsequent meeting with the parties, the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission proposes the following conditions be made a part of a Memorandum of Agreement which would mitigate any adverse effect on the Hallock's Pond site and the Northville Historic District which might result from the construction and operation of the Jamesport Nuclear Power Station.

(1) Hallock's Pond Site

A salvage excavation of the Hallock's Pond site will be conducted prior to the start of construction of the Jamesport Nuclear Power Station. Long Island Lighting Company (applicant) will contract to have the salvage excavation performed by a professional archaeologist. The choice of archaeologist and salvage excavation proposal shall be subject to the approval of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Upon receipt of the applicant's excavation proposal, the Advisory Council shall have 30 days to notify the applicant of the acceptability of the proposal. If the Advisory Council does not respond within 30 days, the applicant's proposal shall become final.

2.5.3-A-40

9208100248 920716  
PDR ORG NRRB  
PDR


(2) Northville Historic District

Long Island Lighting Company (applicant) will be required to employ reasonable measures to limit further deterioration of the homes in the Northville Historic District. Limiting further deterioration may include such steps as termite extermination, roof repair sufficient to prevent rain damage, and measures necessary to discourage vandalism. It need not include rewiring, plastering, rebuilding, replacing fixtures, or any other measure more properly deemed restoration than prevention of further deterioration. The applicant shall consult with the New York State Historic Preservation Office with regard to the available techniques for limiting further deterioration of homes. At the expiration of the resident's life tenancy in the Hallock house (House #65 as identified in the "Report on an Archaeological Reconnaissance" prepared by Messrs. Vetter and Salwen), the applicant will, at the least, apply the above condition to this home.

The applicant shall make the homes available to qualified historic preservation groups for restoration on the condition that it shall retain responsibility for seeing to it that further deterioration is controlled in accordance with the above condition.

If acceptable to you, the above conditions will become part of any authorization, permit or license which this Commission may issue to the Long Island Lighting Company.

Sincerely,

  
Wm. H. Regan, Jr., Chief  
Environmental Projects Branch 3  
Division of Site Safety and  
Environmental Analysis

ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARD REVIEW PLAN

- FOR ES SECTION 4.1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION: HISTORIC AND  
ARCHEOLOGICAL SITES  
4.1.3.1 THE SITE AND VICINITY  
4.1.3.2 TRANSMISSION CORRIDORS AND OFFSITE AREAS

REVIEW INPUTS

Environmental Report Sections

- 2.6 Regional Historic, Scenic, Cultural, and Natural Features

Environmental Reviews

- 2.5.3 Historic and Archeological Sites and Natural Landmarks  
3 Station Description  
5.1.3 Land-Use Impact: Historic and Archeological Sites (Operation)

Standards and Guides

- 36 CFR Part 800, Procedures for the Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties

Other

- The site visit  
Responses to requests for additional information  
Consultation with local, State, and Federal agencies  
State laws and plans for historic preservation (if available)

REVIEW OUTPUTS

Environmental Statement Sections

- 4.1.3 Environmental Impacts of Construction: Historic and Archeo-  
logical Sites  
4.1.3.1 The Site and Vicinity  
4.1.3.2 Transmission Corridors and Offsite Areas

Other Environmental Reviews

- 5.1.3 Historic and Archeological sites  
9 Alternatives to the Project  
10 Evaluation of the Proposed Action

## I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this environmental standard review plan is to direct the staff's assessment of potential impacts of station construction activities on historic and cultural resources\* in the site and vicinity, along transmission corridors, and at offsite areas.

The scope of the review directed by this plan will include consideration of the impact of construction activities of the station on cultural and historic resources and the adequacy of proposed methods to mitigate any adverse impacts on these resources.

The review will be of sufficient detail to enable the reviewer to predict and assess potential impacts and to recommend how these impacts should be treated in the licensing process. Where necessary, the reviewer will recommend consideration of alternative locations, designs, practices, or procedures that would mitigate predicted adverse impacts.

## II. REQUIRED DATA

The kinds of data and information required will be affected by site- and station-specific factors and the degree of detail will be modified according to the anticipated magnitude of the potential impact. The following data or information will usually be required:

A. A description of the efforts of the applicant and the reviewer for ES Section 2.5.3 to locate, identify and evaluate archeological and historic resources, including a description of any surveys conducted and their results.

B. The comment of organizations and individuals contacted by the staff and/or applicant to identify and locate cultural and historic resources.

C. A description of the location and significance of those important historic or archeological resources identified by the applicant or by local,

\*"Important historic and cultural resources" include districts, sites, buildings, structures, or objects possessing sufficient historical, archeological architectural or cultural significance to warrant inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

State, or Federal agencies that are in or that might be eligible for inclusion in the National Register, and that are within 15 km of the proposed station or within 2 km of proposed transmission line routes, access corridors, and offsite areas.

D. A description of those historic and archeological resources identified by the applicant or by local, State, or Federal agencies and that are within the site boundary or will be physically impacted by construction or operation of the station.

E. State Laws and Plans for Historic Preservation, if available.

F. The State Historic Preservation Officer's (SHPO) comments on the impact of the proposed station on important archeological and historic resources.

### III. ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

A. The reviewer's analysis of construction impacts to historic and cultural resources will be linked to the environmental reviews directed by ESRP ESRP 2.5.3 to ensure that those environmental factors most likely to be impacted by the proposed construction are described in that section.

B. A particularly useful source of expertise in the area of historic and cultural preservation is the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation (OAHP) of the National Park Service, Department of Interior. Within this Office is the Interagency Archeological Service Division (IASD). The division consists of a headquarters office in Washington, D.C., and regional offices in Atlanta, San Francisco, and Dallas (the addresses of the regional offices are provided in Appendix A to ESRP 2.5.3).

C. The reviewer, with the assistance of the IASD and in consultation with the SHPO, will consider those cultural and historic resources that are in or are eligible for inclusion in the National Register and that may be affected by construction and operation of the proposed station. The reviewer



will use the output of appropriate environmental reviews describing proposed construction activity to identify those construction operations that could result in potential impacts. The reviewer's assessment of the potential impacts on these resources will be guided by 36 CFR Part 800 which describes in detail how to assess the impact of a proposed action on properties that are in or are eligible for inclusion in the National Register. It should be recognized that there are generally two types of impacts on a resource; direct impacts (e.g., destruction during excavation) and indirect impacts (e.g., visual impact).

D. Cultural and historic resources that are neither listed in nor eligible for inclusion in the National Register are not protected by the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act, Executive Order 11593, or 36 CFR Part 800. Nevertheless, the benefits of the proposed and alternative actions must be weighed against the loss of or damage to these resources even though they are not eligible for inclusion in the National Register.

E. When required by the analysis for the review directed by ESRP 5.1.3, the potential impacts to historic and archeological resources will be assessed concurrently with this review.

#### IV. EVALUATION

Evaluation of each identified impact will result in one on the following determinations:

- The impact of the proposed action is acceptable.
- The impact is acceptable with mitigative action that is minor in nature and this detailed evaluation of alternatives or benefit-cost analyses is not required to support the reviewer's recommendations for adoption.
- The impact is acceptable with mitigative action, but such action will be significant (e.g., major design change or relocation). When impacts of this

January 1977

type are identified, the reviewer will recommend that they be included in consideration of alternatives to the project and benefit-cost balancing. Final determination of acceptability of the impact with or without mitigation will be made on the basis of these reviews.

The reviewer will evaluate the proposed activity to ensure that the applicant is committed to use currently acceptable practices to minimize impacts. The reviewer will, in consultation with the SHPO, use 36 CFR Part 800 to evaluate the potential impacts on properties in, or eligible for inclusion in the National Register.

In the case of properties not eligible for inclusion in the National Register, assistance from the SHPO, the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, or other qualified individuals may be needed. The reviewer will consider alternatives to reduce the impact on the cultural and historic resources and make a determination of the cost of each alternative versus the benefit derived. The cost of the recovery required by the Historical and Archeological Preservation Act of 1974 should be included in the consideration of alternatives. When the evaluation does not justify preservation of the resource, the applicant should be required to recover archeological, historic, architectural, and cultural data related to the resource. This recovery may include recording by photographs and measured drawings, archeological excavations to uncover data and material, removal of structures or salvage of architectural features, and other steps that will ensure full knowledge of the lost resource. Salvaged artifacts and materials should be deposited where they are of public and educational benefit.

#### V. INPUT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

A. This section of the environmental statement should be planned to accomplish the following objectives: (1) public disclosure of impacts; (2) presentation of the basis for the staff analysis; and (3) presentation of staff conclusions, recommendations, and conditions regarding impacts of the reviewed construction activities on historic and cultural resources. The following information will usually be included in ES Section 4.1.3.

1. For properties in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register that will not be affected, provide a positive statement of no effect as described in Appendix A to ESRP 2.5.3.

2. Describe significant impacts to those properties that are in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register. Discuss the steps which led to a determination of whether or not any effects are adverse as described in Appendix A to ESRP 2.5.3.

3. Describe the significant impacts on cultural and historic resources not eligible for inclusion in the National Register.

4. Describe any alternatives considered and the reasons for their acceptance or rejection.

5. Normally this section should be divided into two subsections: 4.1.3.1, Site and Vicinity and 4.1.3.2, Transmission Corridors and Offsite

B. The reviewer will provide inputs or ensure that inputs will be made to the following ES sections:

1. Section 2.5.3. The reviewer will ensure that ES Section 2.5.3 contains descriptive information in sufficient detail to support the assessment given in ES Section 4.1.3.

2. Section 4.6. The reviewer will provide as input to ES Section 4.6 a list of applicant commitments and staff recommendations of practices to limit adverse environmental impacts of construction, including:

- a. any actions required to avoid or mitigate any adverse effects.
- b. procedures for recovery of data which the applicant must undertake.



3. Section 9. If the reviewer concludes that a predicted impact is unacceptable and cannot be mitigated, an input to ES Section 9 will be made recommending that the reviewer's conclusion be considered in the overall evaluation of alternatives and benefit-cost balancing.

4. Section 10.1. The reviewer will provide a list of the unavoidable impacts which are predicted to occur as a result of the proposed construction activity.

5. Section 10.3. The reviewer will provide a brief summary of the irreversible and irretrievable commitments of historic and cultural resources resulting from the proposed construction activity.

6. Section 10.4. The reviewer will provide as input to ES Section 10.4 a list of important impacts to be considered in the benefit-cost balancing.

#### IV. REFERENCES

References are discussed in detail in Appendix A to ESRP 2.5.3.

ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARD REVIEW PLAN

FOR ES SECTION 5.1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF STATION OPERATION -  
LAND USE IMPACTS: HISTORIC/ARCHEOLOGICAL SITES

REVIEW INPUTS

Environmental Report Sections

2.6 Regional Historic, Scenic, Cultural, and Natural Features

Environmental Reviews

2.5.3 Socioeconomics: Historic and Archeological Sites and Natural  
Landmarks  
3 Plant Description  
4.1.3 Environmental Impacts of Construction: Historic and Archeo-  
logical Sites

Standards and Guides

36 CFR Part 800, Procedures for the Protection of Historic and Cultural  
Properties

Others

The site visit  
Responses to requests for additional information  
Consultation with local, State, and Federal agencies  
State Laws and Plans for Historic Preservation (if available)

REVIEW OUTPUTS

Environmental Statement Sections

5.1.3 Environmental Impacts of Station Operation - Land Use Impacts:  
Historic/Archeological Sites

Other Environmental Reviews

9 Alternatives to the Project  
10 Evaluation of the Proposed Action

## I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this environmental standard review plan is to direct the staff's assessment of potential impacts of proposed station operation on important historic and cultural resources\* in the site and vicinity, along transmission corridors, and at offsite areas.

The scope of the review directed by this plan will include consideration of the impact of operation of the station on important cultural and historic resources and the adequacy of proposed methods to mitigate any adverse impacts on these resources.

The review will be of sufficient detail to enable the reviewer to predict and assess potential impacts and to recommend how these impacts should be treated in the licensing process. Where necessary, the reviewer will recommend consideration of alternative locations, designs, or operating procedures that would mitigate predicted adverse impacts.

## II. REQUIRED DATA AND INFORMATION

The kinds of data and information required will be affected by site- and station-specific factors and the degree of detail will be modified according to the anticipated magnitude of the potential impact. The following data or information will usually be required:

A. A description of the location and significance of those important archeological or historic resources identified by the applicant or local, State, or Federal agencies that are in or that might be eligible for inclusion in the National Register and that are within 15 km of the proposed station or within 2 km of proposed transmission line routes, access corridors, and offsite areas.

---

\* "Important historic and cultural resources" include districts, sites, buildings, structures or objects of sufficient historical, archeological, architectural or cultural significance to warrant inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

B. State Laws and Plans for Historic Preservation, if available.

C. The State Historic Preservation Officer's (SHPO) comments on the impact of the proposed station on important archeological and historic resources.

### III. ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

The reviewer's analysis and evaluation of operational impact on historic and archeological resources will be based on the concurrent review of construction impacts (ESRP 4.1.3). Only those impacts of operation that are significantly different than or greater than those resulting from construction need be assessed. In this respect, a temporal extension of an impact from the construction phase through the operational life of the station is not a significant change in the impact. Where the reviewer determines that the impacts of operation on cultural and historic resources have been adequately considered by the review directed by ESRP 4.1.3, no further review will be required. If the reviewer determines that there will be an impact of operation which is significantly greater than or different than the impact of construction (e.g., the impact of the visual plume from a cooling tower), the reviewer will assess that operational impact as part of the review directed by ESRP 4.1.3 and Appendix A to ESRP 2.5.3.

### IV. EVALUATION

Where the reviewer has determined that there will be an impact that is greater than or different than the impact of construction, the reviewer's evaluation of the impact will be done as part of the evaluation directed by the ESRP for ES Section 4.1.3.

### V. INPUT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

A. This section of the environmental statement should be planned to accomplish the following objectives: (1) public disclosure of impacts resulting from operation; (2) presentation of the basis for the staff analysis; and (3) presentation of staff conclusions, recommendations, and conditions regarding impacts of the reviewed operational activities on historic and natural resources. The following information will usually be included in ES Section 5.1.3.

D

1. Where there will be no impacts that are greater than or different than the impacts of construction, the following wording will be used:

"The staff has determined that the impacts of operation on cultural and historic resources are a temporal extension of the impacts of construction assessed in ES Section 4.1.3. Consequently, no further discussion is required."

2. Where the impacts of operation are significantly different than or greater than those described in ES Section 4.1.3, the reviewer will include a description of significant impacts on those properties that are in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register. The reviewer will discuss the steps that led to a determination of whether or not the effect is adverse as described in Appendix A to ESRP 2.5.3.

B. The reviewer will provide inputs or ensure that inputs will be made to following ES sections:

1. Section 2.5.3. The reviewer will ensure that ES Section 2.5.3 will contain descriptive information in sufficient detail to support the assessment given in ES Section 5.1.3.

2. Section 9. If the reviewer concludes that the predicted impacts are unacceptable, an input to ES Section 9 will be made recommending that the reviewer's conclusion be considered in the overall evaluation of alternatives and benefit-cost balancing.

3. Section 10.1. The reviewer will provide a list of the unavoidable impacts that are predicted to occur as a result of proposed station operation.

4. Section 10.3. The reviewer will provide a brief summary of the irreversible and irretrievable commitments of historic and cultural resources as a result of proposed station operation.

D

D



January 1977

5. Section 10.4. The reviewer will provide as input to ES Section 10.4 a list of important impacts to be considered in the benefit-cost balancing.

#### IV. REFERENCES

References are discussed in detail in Appendix A to ESRP 2.5.3.