From:	Joe OHara
Sent:	Thursday, June 26, 2025 9:02 AM
To:	ext_Mark_Feltner
Cc:	Milton Gorden; Jared Wicker; Jessica Maddocks; Robert Hoffman; ext_Dave_Goodman; Daniel Barnhurst
Subject:	Information Needs Revision 1 - Land Use (LU) - 3
Attachments:	Long Mott Generating Station Environmental Information Needs Revision 1.docx

Good morning,
We have added an additional Information Need to our original document (attached) and summarized it below.

LU-3 Please provide any information from the CZM Certification Package that submitted March 2025 that was not included in the letter to Texas General Land Office (GLO) requesting consistency certification with the TX Coastal Management Program goals and policies and any response that have been received by the Texas GLO.

If you have any questions whatsoever, please contact me.
R/

Joe O'Hara
Environmental Project Manager
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Environmental Review Project Management Branch

Hearing Identifier: XeDOW_ProjectLongMott_EnvPublic
Email Number: 8

Mail Envelope Properties (DM8PR09MB64875C3440BA2E3905BB3E00EE7AA)

Subject: Information Needs Revision 1 - Land Use (LU) - 3
Sent Date: 6/26/2025 9:01:51 AM
Received Date: 6/26/2025 9:01:00 AM
From: Joe OHara

Created By: Joe.OHara@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Milton Gorden" <mgorden@x-energy.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Jared Wicker" <jwicker@x-energy.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Jessica Maddocks" <jmaddocks@x-energy.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Robert Hoffman" <Robert.Hoffman@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"ext_Dave_Goodman" <>
Tracking Status: None
"Daniel Barnhurst" <Daniel.Barnhurst@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"ext_Mark_Feltner" <>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: DM8PR09MB6487.namprd09.prod.outlook.com

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**	
MESSAGE	651	6/26/2025 9:01:00 AM	
Long Mott Generating Station Environmental Information Needs Revision 1.docx			125921

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

Long Mott Information Needs

Info Need #	Information Need	ER Section	SME
Accidents			
ACC-1	The calculated bounding dose values for postulated accidents is supplied for the time period of 0-720 hours. Please provide an SME to discuss the dose value for the worst 2-hour period requested in guidance (see RG 4.2 Revision 3 Section 5.11.1, Design-Basis Accidents) with respect to the 0-720 hour dose values associated with this calculation and access to related calculational files. This information need and any related access to calculational files should be coordinated with the NRC Safety Staff.	5.13	Jon Napier/Don Palmrose
ACC-2	Please provide access to the MACCS calculations (input and output files in the ERR), any additional relevant calculational files or explanations, and an SME to discuss the calculations.	5.13	Jon Napier/Don Palmrose
ACC-3	Step 1 of the SAMA analysis has been described as being complete. Please provide an SME to discuss the analysis from step 1 and why the maximum benefit value (step 2) from items identified in step 1 of the analysis was not performed, and what will be addressed at the OL stage.	5.13	Jon Napier/Don Palmrose
ACC-4	SecPop version 4.3.0 is based on the 2010 census data and 2007 county data. Please confirm that the population land use data used as an input to the accident analysis has been adjusted for potential changes in use over the time period analyzed (e.g., adjustment based on 2020 census data and years beyond along with recent county data). The staff observed population data in Section 2.5.1 and Section 5.13.2.2, however it is unclear if the population projections discussed in both sections are the same. Please provide any additional relevant	5.13	Jon Napier/Don Palmrose

Info Need #	Information Need	ER Section	SME
	calculational files or explanations (in the ERR) and an SME to discuss the calculations.		
Air Quality			
AQ-1	Please provide regional NAAQS measurements, or links to publications with these measurements (ESRP-2.7)	2.7	Brad Fritz
AQ-2	Please provide monthly dewpoint and monthly average temperatures (ESRP-2.7)	2.7	Brad Fritz
AQ-3	Please provide a summary of monthly stability class (ESRP-2.7)	2.7	Brad Fritz
AQ-4	Please provide information on emissions during pre-construction and construction. While emission factors by vehicle type were provided, no data on total use of these was provided. Some mechanism to determine the total emissions during construction and pre-construction should be added. (10 CFR 51.45(c) and ESRPs 4.4.1, 5.3.2.1, and 5.3.3.1)	7.2.7	Brad Fritz
Alternatives			
ALT-1	Dow's corporate decarbonization goals are cited as one of the project needs for the installation of Xe-100 reactor. It would be beneficial to comprehend the significance of these objectives in relation to the anticipated reduction in CO2 emissions (ESRP 9.2).	9.2	Dave Goodman/Swasti Saxena
ALT-2	As outlined in ER Section 9.2.2, it appears that several energy alternatives may not fully align with the project's dual goals of 1) demonstrating the Xe-100 reactor and 2) supplying the power needs of the SDO while also reducing the carbon footprint from the current natural gas cogeneration plant, leading to their preliminary exclusion. Nonetheless, Section 9.3.1 suggests that the new power plant's main aim is to supply electricity and steam directly to SDO, which may be achievable through various energy alternatives. Could you clarify	9.2.2	Dave Goodman/Swasti Saxena

Info Need #	Information Need	ER Section	SME
	whether the primary focus is on the demonstration of the Xe-100 reactor, the generation of electricity and steam, or both? (ESRP 9.2.2).		
ALT-3	The proposed action is to authorize the construction of four Xe-100 modules; if the objective is demonstration rather than generation, why is construction and operation of four modules necessary? (ESRP 9.2.2)	9.2.2	Dave Goodman/Swasti Saxena
ALT-4	Please provide the Site Feasibility Study and Alternative Site Study, particularly to support the requirement that the reactors be located within 1.5 miles of SDO. (ESRP 9.3)	9.3.1	Dave Goodman/Swasti Saxena
ALT-5	Please clarify the comparative acreages of Sites A, B, C, and D. If Site A is the Proposed Site, then according to Sec 4.3.1 it is 1537 acres, of which appr. 721 acres would be disturbed. Site B is reported as 235 acres, Site C as 166 acres, and Site D as 193 acres. Yet in Figure 9.3-1, Site A does not appear to be several times bigger than Sites B, C, or D.	9.3.2	Dave Goodman/Swasti Saxena
Aquatic Ecology			
AE-1	Please provide any report(s) and data from the macroinvertebrate and fish surveys conducted in 2023 and 2024 that supported development of Tables 2.4-9 and 2.4-10. (ESRP 2.4.2)	2.4.2.2	Peyton Doub/Caitlin Wessel
AE-2	Please provide shapefiles OR digital, zoomable map depicting benthic macroinvertebrate sampling locations in West Coloma Creek. (ESRP 2.4.2)	2.4.2.2	Peyton Doub/Caitlin Wessel
AE-3	Please provide information on which organisms listed in Table 2.4-9 are key indicator organisms that are particularly vulnerable to impacts from plant construction or operation. (ESRP 2.4.2)	Table 2.4-9	Peyton Doub/Caitlin Wessel
AE-4	Please provide additional information (e.g. flow rates, grates and spacing, trash racks and spacing, temperature data, etc.) on the existing intake and discharge structures for the Seadrift Plant, the new	2.4.2, 3.3, 3.4.2.6, 4.2.1, 5.10.2.1,	Peyton Doub/Caitlin Wessel

Info Need #	Information Need	ER Section	SME
	pump station and water intake structure on the GBRA Calhoun Canal to provide water via Basin #5, digital, zoomable maps showing location of each structure, and copies of the current TPDES permit and SWPPP. (ESRP 2.4.2)	5.10.2.2, Figure 3.1-3	
AE-5	Please provide a digital, zoomable map OR shapefile layers for the information displayed in Figure 4.3-1. (ESRP 4.3.2)	Figure 4.3-1	Peyton Doub/Caitlin Wessel
AE-6	Please provide a proposed construction schedule, including expected timing and duration of specific construction activities. Potential activities that should be included are but are not limited to: placement of intake and discharge structures, channel modifications for navigation or flow control, placement and removal of cofferdams, construction of bulkheads, piers, jetties, basins, and storm sewers, direct dredging, including the area that may be affected by resulting siltation and turbidity, percent (or the width and depth) of the waterbody cross section that might be obstructed by construction activity at any time, time and duration of such obstruction, potential changes to water quality caused by exposure of substrate to contaminants during construction (e.g., dredging for intake channels, cofferdam construction). (ESRP 4.3.2)	Table 1.3-1 (just says “construction start Oct 2028”), 4.3.2.2	Peyton Doub/Caitlin Wessel
AE-7	Please provide information on the existing intake structure for the Seadrift Plant on GBRA Calhoun Canal. Including information on location, depth, size, intake flow velocity, any racks or grate systems, impingement and entrainment rates, etc. (ESRP 4.3.2 and 5.3.1.2, 40 CFR 125.84(b)(2))	Figure 3.1-3, Section 3.3, Section 3.4.2.6, 4.3.2.2	Peyton Doub/Caitlin Wessel
AE-8	Please provide additional information, at least at a conceptual level, about mitigation needed to offset impacts to the West Coloma Creek (per USACE). (ESRP 4.3.2)	4.3.2	Peyton Doub/Caitlin Wessel

Info Need #	Information Need	ER Section	SME
AE-9	Does the Section 10 permit currently held by the applicant for maintenance dredging apply to dredging done as part of the LMGS? If yes, please provide a copy of the permit. (ESRP 4.3.2)	Table 1.4-1	Peyton Doub/Caitlin Wessel
AE-10	Please provide copies of any responses and other related communications from USFWS, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and TPWD concerning aquatic species that have been received since writing the ER. (ESRP 2.4.2 and 4.3.2)	2.4.2.3, Appendix 1A	Peyton Doub/Caitlin Wessel/Shannon Healy
AE-11	Please provide additional information on the proposed locations of pile driving activities and any anticipated impacts to aquatic resources. (ESRP 4.3.2)	4.4.1.4	Peyton Doub/Caitlin Wessel
AE-12	What material(s) are/ will the condenser tubes be made of? (ESRP 4.3.2)	n/a	Peyton Doub/Caitlin Wessel
AE-13	Please provide the through-screen design intake velocity. (ESRP 5.3.1.2, 40 CFR 125.84(b)(2))	Table 3.3-1, 5.10.2.1	Peyton Doub/Caitlin Wessel
AE-14	Please provide information on the original source of water (natural waterbody) that will supply the LMGS, beyond GBRA Calhoun Canal, to where the Canal gets its water from. Please include a figure(s) depicting the flow path, any relevant diversion structures, and the alternate intake location mentioned in ER Section 5.2.1.1.1 that draws from “canal water downstream (east).” Please clarify the scenario in which the alternate intake will be utilized and the expected frequency of utilization. (ESRP 5.3.1.2, 40 CFR 125.84(b)(2))		Peyton Doub/Caitlin Wessel/Shannon Healy
AE-15	Please provide, if available, data about impingement and entrainment of aquatic species at the other intake structures on the GBRA Calhoun Canal and at the pump station for GBRA. (ESRP 5.3.1.2)	5.10.2.1	Peyton Doub/Caitlin Wessel

Info Need #	Information Need	ER Section	SME
AE-16	Please provide a description detailing the existing discharge structure (ex. Where it reenters the waterway, info. about current flow rate and temperature, anticipated change in discharge flow rate and variations with season once LMGS goes online, and impacts to biota downstream; ESRP 5.3.2.2)	1.2.4, 2.4.2.1	Peyton Doub/Caitlin Wessel/Shannon Healy
AE-17	Please provide a copy of TDOT, 2016- Essential Fish Habitat Assessment, Neches River Bridge Study, CSJ:7220-01-001, Texas Department of Transportation.	2.4.2, 2.11	Peyton Doub/Caitlin Wessel/Shannon Healy
AE-18	ER Section 4.3.2 mentions avoidance of building activities during ecologically sensitive times (i.e., spawning), please provide the dates during which building activities will be avoided and any supporting information for the avoided dates.	4.3.2	Shannon Healy
AE-19	The implementing regulations for Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA define "action area" as all areas affected directly or indirectly by the Federal action and not merely the immediate area involved in the action (50 CFR 402.02). The action area effectively bounds the analysis of federally listed species and critical habitats because only species and habitats that occur within the action area may be affected by the Federal action. Please provide a description of the ESA action area, including all potential direct and indirect impacts of construction and operation. In the description, address: 1. transportation activities, including the mode of transportation, route of transportation, material to be transported, the frequency and timing of the transportation, and any associated impacts; 2. the extent of impacts associated with diverting water from the Guadalupe River, including the downstream limit where flow and salinity impacts may be experienced; 3. the extent of impacts associated with the withdrawal of water from the GBRA Calhoun Canal; and		Shannon Healy

Info Need #	Information Need	ER Section	SME
	4. any other potential direct or indirect impacts associated with this action.		
Benefit-Cost			
BC-1	N/A	10.6	Jeff Rikhoff
Climate Change			
CC-1	Has X-Energy conducted thermal discharge studies that account for potential increases in water temperature in the Guadalupe River due to climate change? If so, please provide a copy.		Brian Glowacki
Cumulative Impacts			
CI-1	N/A	Chapter 7	Jeff Rikhoff
Decommissioning			
	No issues related to decommissioning were identified.		Jon Napier
Fuel Cycle			
	No issues related to the uranium cycle were identified.		Jon Napier
Historic and Cultural Resources			
HCR-1	Provide ArcGIS shapefiles of the archaeological APE, the architectural APE, and for the polygons in Figure 3.1-3.		Lindsey Renaud Cleve Davis
HCR-2	Provide a discussion on pre-construction activities covered under DOE's NEPA process and the construction activities expected to be covered under NRC's NEPA analysis, including estimated areas of disturbance and depth of excavation.		Lindsey Renaud Cleve Davis

Info Need #	Information Need	ER Section	SME
HCR-3	Section 2.5.3.1 and 2.5.3.2 mention archaeological and architectural surveys conducted but do not include any information on the purpose of the surveys, who conducted the surveys, who sponsored the surveys, or how they are connected to NRC's licensing action (issuance of a construction permit). Section 2.5.3.2.1 identified consultation that occurred through the Department of Energy for ground-disturbing site characterization and environmental monitoring activities at the LMGS site, but it is unclear how it is connected to NRC's licensing action. To support NRC's NHPA Section 106 review and avoid duplication of efforts, provide the following: 1. Provide copies of (a) the scope of work (SOW) for the July 2023 survey, and (b) correspondence from May and June 2023 regarding WSP's submission of the SOW to the Texas Historical Commission (THC) and THC's concurrence on the SOW. 2. If not described in the SOW or THC's concurrence on the SOW, provide summary descriptions of the methodologies used for both archaeological and architectural surveys. This should include a) explanation of the justification for differing APEs between archaeological and architectural surveys, b) specifics about the shovel test intervals and placement strategies, and c) criteria used for assessing architectural significance and any specific techniques applied during the surveys.	2.5.3.1 2.5.3.2	Lindsey Renaud Cleve Davis
HCR-4	Confirm that the Phase I archaeological survey results are documented in two separate reports: (1) August 1, 2023 Hunter and Cantrell, "Xe-100 Dow Seadrift Site Phase I Intensive Archaeological Survey, Calhoun County, Texas Negative Finding Short Report," and (2) February 19, 2024 Hunter and Cantrell, "Phase I Intensive Archaeological Survey for the Proposed Project Long Mott, Calhoun County, Texas – Negative Finding Report" (provided in Enclosure 6 of the ER). 1. Please provide a copy of the August 1, 2023, Hunter and Cantrell report.	Part VI Supplemental Information	Lindsey Renaud Cleve Davis

Info Need #	Information Need	ER Section	SME
	2. For both reports, describe the undertaking and activities associated with the undertaking that were considered when determining there would be no effect on historic properties. Please clarify why the reports do not address the proposed construction of a small modular reactor and nor include details on pre-construction and construction activities. 3. For both reports, please provide copies of correspondence that submitted the reports to the THC for their concurrence. (This could include correspondence from DOE to THC in August 2023, or from WSP to THC in January or February of 2024.) 4. Pages 74 and 76 in Appendix A of the ER are letters from THC concurring on the reports. Is there any other correspondence related to THC's concurrence on the reports? If so, please provide copies. It is unclear what undertaking THC was considering in its concurrence letter dated February 16, 2024. 5. In the August 1, 2023, Hunter and Cantrell report, the "Management Summary" states that from July 10-19, 2023, WSP conducted a Phase I intensive archaeological survey of 1,277 acres in support of the ER for the Xe-100 Dow Seadrift Site in Calhoun County, Texas. That report covered a 617.4-acre portion of the 1,277-acre survey. The February 19, 2024, report covers a 930.6-acre portion "portion of the Long Mott project that has not been previously submitted for consultation." This totals 1,548 acres, which is total survey acreage cited in the ER. Please explain the discrepancy between the 1,277-acreage cited in the August 1, 2023, report and 1,548-acreage cited in the ER.		
HCR-5	Based on the information provided in the ER, there is no clear indication that Traditional Cultural Places (TCPs) were considered or that efforts were made to identify them as part of the cultural resources review. Provide documentation and/or summary that demonstrates the level of effort to identify potential TCPs.	2.5.3	Lindsey Renaud Cleve Davis

Info Need #	Information Need	ER Section	SME
HCR-6	Section 4.1.3.4 of the ER mentions the development of an Inadvertent Discovery Plan with a description to provide three provisions for human burials or human remains. However, it is limited to human remains only and only supports consultation with THC and not the Tribes. Provide the Inadvertent Discovery Plan, or provide additional details about how inadvertent discoveries of cultural resources will be managed, such as: 1) immediate steps to halt work and secure the area; 2) contact details for archaeological personnel who will be involved in the evaluation of any discoveries; 3) protocols for notifying local enforcement, the coroner's office, federal agencies, Tribes, and the Texas Historical Commission; and 4) projected timeline outlining how investigations and evaluations will occur after a discovery to minimize project delays and ensure effective preservation.	4.1.3.4	Lindsey Renaud Cleve Davis
HCR-7	Provide any other company policies, procedures, and/or best management practices that address the protection of cultural resources.		Lindsey Renaud Cleve Davis
Human Health – Radiological			
HHR-1	Please provide the version number of NRCDose used to complete the GASPAR II modelling and population dose assessment for effluent releases. If NRCDose3 was used, were the generic representative biota used for the analysis. If not, what biota were modelled? Please provide any additional relevant calculational files or explanations (in the ERR) and an SME to discuss the results of the analysis discussed in Section 5.4.4 and results provided in Table 5.4-26. This information need should be coordinated with the NRC Safety Staff.	5.4.1.2	Jon Napier
Human Health – Non-Radiological			

Info Need #	Information Need	ER Section	SME
HHN-1	Per Regulatory Guide 4.2, Revision 3, Section 4.4.1, please provide a statement on blasting activities, what those noise levels would attenuate to at the nearest resident, and any mitigation that would be put in place due to blasting activities.	4.4.1	Kim Leigh/Hayley McClendon
Hydrology – Groundwater			
GW-1	ESRP 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 require maps of sufficient detail to show the relationship of the site to major hydrological systems that could affect or be affected by plant construction or operation. In conformance, the following figures are requested in higher resolution to ensure the readability of labels and descriptions - Figure 2.3.2-19, Figure 2.3.2-27, Figure 2.3.2-29, Figure 2.3.2-32, Figure 2.3.2-33, Figure 2.3.2-34, Figure 2.3.2-35.	2.3	Swasti Saxena/Rebecka Iveson/Phil Meyer/Gerry Stirewalt
GW-2	Section 6.6.3.2 of the ER describes operational monitoring of groundwater quality. The ER states, “Following the first annual monitoring interval, the list of parameters is reviewed and revised to focus on specific indicators for the long-term monitoring program.” ESRP 6.3 requires an operational monitoring program be established to identify the impacts of operation of the plant and to detect any unexpected impacts arising from plant operation. Describe in detail how the long-term monitoring program will be assessed and executed, including detail on anticipated indicator species and adherence to industry standards for groundwater protection (i.e. NEI 07-07).	6.6.3.2	Swasti Saxena/Rebecka Iveson/Phil Meyer/Gerry Stirewalt
GW-3	ESRP 4.2.1 requires identification of hydrologic alterations expected to result from the project related construction activities. ESRP 5.2.1 requires a description of operational activities expected to result in hydrologic alterations within the site and vicinity. A temporary sediment basin and permanent stormwater basin are described in section 4.2.1.1.1 of the ER. These basins may also hold construction dewatering water and may interact with groundwater. Provide additional	4.2.1.1.1	Swasti Saxena/Rebecka Iveson/Phil Meyer/Gerry Stirewalt

Info Need #	Information Need	ER Section	SME
	details about the design of the basins, including depth, lining material, and anticipated inflow and outflow rates.		
Hydrology – Surface Water			
SW-1	10 CFR 51.45(c) and (d). Please provide a knowledgeable person(s) to describe floodplains at and near the LMGS site and any federal, state, or local approvals, permits, and/or authorizations needed for the proposed project.	1.4, 2.3.1.1.2, 4.1.1.1, and 4.2.1.1.1	Rajiv Prasad
SW-2	10 CFR 51.45(c). Please provide higher-resolution ER Figures 3.4-1 and 3.4-2 for the staff's review.	3.4	Rajiv Prasad
SW-3	10 CFR 51.45(c). Please provide a knowledgeable person(s) to describe LMGS water treatment systems including treatment chemicals, points of addition, chemical quantities, treatment frequency, and water treatment operating modes.	3.3, 3.6	Rajiv Prasad
SW-4	10 CFR 51.45(c). Please provide a knowledgeable person(s) to describe LMGS cooling systems' water use and consumptive water use associated with process steam and electricity generation.	3.3	Rajiv Prasad
SW-5	10 CFR 51.45(c). Please provide a knowledgeable person(s) to discuss peak LMGS water demand and its effect on GBRA Calhoun Canal flow and diversions from the Guadalupe River.	3.3	Rajiv Prasad
SW-6	10 CFR 51.45(c). Please provide a knowledgeable person(s) to discuss the existing SDO wastewater discharge system including the outfall location, layout/drawings of the outfall structure, any needed structural modifications or constituent composition modifications related to LMGS, and physical effects including thermal and/or constituent plumes of the additional LMGS discharge.	3.6, 5.3.2, 5.5.1.2	Rajiv Prasad

Info Need #	Information Need	ER Section	SME
SW-7	10 CFR 51.45(c). Please provide a knowledgeable person(s) to discuss naturally occurring materials/chemicals in the LMGS effluent stream and in the ambient waters.	3.6, 5.5.1.2	Rajiv Prasad
SW-8	10 CFR 51.45(c). Please provide a knowledgeable person(s) to discuss LMGS plant water use during operations in relation to other surface water uses in/from the GBRA Calhoun Canal.	5.2.1	Rajiv Prasad
SW-9	10 CFR 51.45(c). Please provide a knowledgeable person(s) to discuss total and reliable water rights in the Guadalupe River, water rights of GBRA Calhoun Canal water users downstream of LMGS intake, and their relation to SDO and LNGS maximum water demand. To facilitate this discussion, please provide a clearly labeled schematic or a map showing the Guadalupe River, GBRA Calhoun Canal diversion location, USGS gauges' locations, existing SDO intake location, proposed LMGS intake location, diversion locations for other users downstream of the proposed LMGS intake, and waterways/streams/canals/bays/estuaries near the site that may have hydrologic connections to the Guadalupe River and the GBRA Calhoun Canal.	5.2.1 and 2.3.1	Rajiv Prasad
SW-10	10 CFR 51.45(c). Please provide a knowledgeable person(s) to discuss alternative intake systems for LMGS. This discussion is to include costs (capital, maintenance, operating, and site adaptation costs) associated with the alternative intake systems.	9.4	Rajiv Prasad
SW-11	10 CFR 51.45(c). Please provide a knowledgeable person(s) to discuss alternative discharge systems for LMGS. This discussion is to include costs (capital, maintenance, operating, and site adaptation costs) associated with the alternative discharge systems.	9.4	Rajiv Prasad
SW-12	10 CFR 51.45(c). Please provide a knowledgeable person(s) to discuss alternative water treatment systems. This discussion is to include costs (capital, maintenance, operating, and site adaptation costs) associated with the alternative water treatment systems.	9.4	Rajiv Prasad

Info Need #	Information Need	ER Section	SME
SW-13	10 CFR 51.45(c). Please provide a knowledgeable person(s) to discuss to discuss the development and the associated timeline of the Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan.	4.2.1	Rajiv Prasad
Land Use			
LU-1	Clarify technical basis used to identify prime farmland on the site. What about Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance? Provide NRCS 2022 reference.	2.2.1	Peyton Doub
LU-2	Provide NRCS Form AD-1006 completed for the site. Explain key assumptions used in completing the form. Provide copies of key correspondence with the NRCS, if any.	4.1.1	Peyton Doub
LU-3	Please provide any information from the CZM Certification Package that submitted March 2025 that was not included in the letter to Texas GLO requesting consistency certification with the TX Coastal Management Program goals and policies and any response that have been received by the Texas GLO.	4.1.1.1	Peyton Doub
Need for Power			
NFP-1	N/A	Chapter 8	Jeff Rikhoff
Site and Technical Overview			
STO-1	In the Approvals and Authorizations listed in Table 1.4-1, please provide the anticipated dates for approvals (column 6) as known.	Table 1.4-1	Dave Goodman
Socioeconomics			
SOC-1	N/A	4.4 and 5.8	Jeff Rikhoff
Terrestrial Ecology Resources			

Info Need #	Information Need	ER Section	SME
TE-1	Per Regulatory Guide 4.2, Revision 3, Section 2.1.1, please provide GIS data underlying Figures 4.2-1 and 4.3-1.	4.2 and 4.3	Peyton Doub/Dana Vesty
TE-2	Per Regulatory Guide 4.2, Revision 3, Section 4.3.1, provide 1) confirmation of the jurisdictional status of wetlands from USACE once received; 2) a breakout of wetland impacts by impact type, e.g., fill, vegetation conversion; and 3) copies of the jurisdictional determination package submitted to the USACE including relevant data sheets.	4.3.1.1.2	Peyton Doub/Dana Vesty/Shannon Healy
TE-3	Per Regulatory Guide 4.2, Revision 3, Section 4.3.1, provide 1) the height of building equipment that will be 50 feet or more; and 2) the height of the proposed MET tower.	4.3.1.1.3	Peyton Doub/Dana Vesty
TE-4	Per Regulatory Guide 4.2, Revision 3, Section 4.3.1, provide information on conceptual approach to meeting wetland mitigation requirements.	4.3.1.1.2	Peyton Doub/Dana Vesty
TE-5	Per Regulatory Guide 4.2, Revision 3, Section 4.3.1 and 5.3.1, provide more information on planned vegetation maintenance under onsite transmission line and switchyard. Please include the Best Management Practices for transmission line maintenance around aquatic and wetland habitats mentioned in Section 5.6.2 of the ER.	5.6	Peyton Doub/Dana Vesty/Shannon Healy
TE-6	Per Regulatory Guide 4.2, Revision 3, Section 5.3.1, provide information on measures to prevent avian injury from transmission lines and meteorological tower guy wires.	4.3.1.3	Peyton Doub/Dana Vesty/Shannon Healy
TE-7	Per Regulatory Guide 4.2, Revision 3, Section 2.3.1 and 5.3.1, provide additional information on potential habitat on the site for the monarch butterfly and the construction and operation impacts.	4.3.1, 5.3.3.2, 5.6.1, 5.3.3.2, 5.10.1, and 7.2.3.1	Peyton Doub/Dana Vesty/Shannon Healy
TE-8	Per Regulatory Guide 4.2, Revision 3, Section 9.3.5, confirm that the same studies for the site would be used for the alternatives or if another study was performed.	9.3	Peyton Doub/Dana Vesty

Info Need #	Information Need	ER Section	SME
TE-9	Please provide copies of any responses and other related communications from USFWS, NMFS, and TPWD concerning terrestrial species that have been received since writing the ER. (ESRP 2.4.1 and 4.3.1)	2.4.1.5	Shannon Healy
TE-10	Please provide details regarding any tree clearing activities on site. Include the number or acreage of trees (alive or dead) that will be removed and specify where on site the clearing will occur. (ESRP 4.1.1)		Shannon Healy
TE-11	Please provide additional information on the proposed locations of pile driving activities and any anticipated impacts to terrestrial resources. (ESRP 4.3.1)	4.4.1.4	Shannon Healy
TE-12	Please provide any report(s) and data from the terrestrial surveys conducted in 2023 that supported development of Tables 2.4-3, 2.4-4, 2.4-5, 2.4-6 and 2.4-7. (ESRP 2.4.1)	2.4.1	Shannon Healy
TE-13	Per section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act, the NRC is required to examine all potential direct and indirect impacts of the Federal action on federally listed species. To fulfill this requirement, please complete the USFWS Northern Long-Eared Bat and Tricolored Bat Range-Wide Determination Key (https://ipac.ecosphere.fws.gov/) and provide a copy of the answers.		Shannon Healy
TE-14	Please provide additional information regarding the potential non-radiological waste treatment options including whether any associated ground disturbance is anticipated and, if so, describe the potentially impacted habitats.	5.10.2.2	Shannon Healy
TE-15	Section 5.6.1 of the ER states that herbicide use around wetlands will be prohibited and Section 5.10.1.1 states that mowing and heavy equipment operation will be avoided within wetlands and streams. Please provide clarifying information including: 1. details regarding whether/how wetlands will be marked in the field to prevent mowing or herbicide use;	5.6.1, 5.10.1.1	Shannon Healy

Info Need #	Information Need	ER Section	SME
	2. whether a riparian buffer will be maintained around the streams on site or if mowing will occur up to the bank of streams on site; and 3. whether herbicides will be used onsite during the operating period for purposes other than transmission line maintenance and targeted invasive plant management.		
Transportation			
TR-1	Please provide the input and output files used for the transportation routing and risk analysis. Please include TRAGIS (or WebTRAGIS) and RADTRAN input and output files and provide an SME to discuss the analysis.		Jon Napier
Visual Resources			
VIS-1	Provide copies of one or more available ground photographs depicting the area within the site where the plant would be constructed. An ideal photograph would show in the foreground the area where the plant would be constructed and the existing Seadrift industrial complex in the background.	4.4.3.1	Peyton Doub
Waste – Non-Radiological			
WNR-1	Per Regulatory Guide 4.2, Revision 3, Section 3.4.3, please provide an estimate of the quantities of solid nonhazardous waste generated during construction.	4.4.5	Kim Leigh/Hayley McClendon
WNR-2	Per Regulatory Guide 4.2, Revision 3, Section 3.4.3, please provide a statement that outlines a proposed schedule or timeline as to when the SDO TPDES Permit No. WQ0000447000 would be modified to include the sanitary waste and other liquid process wastes from the Long Mott facility, if appropriate.	3.6	Kim Leigh/Hayley McClendon

Info Need #	Information Need	ER Section	SME
WNR-3	Per Regulatory Guide 4.2, Revision 3, Section 3.4.3, please provide a statement that clarifies whether Long Mott facility waste will be disposed of at SDO's North Landfill Expansion Cell.	3.6, 2.3.2.1.3.2	Kim Leigh/Hayley McClendon
Waste – Radiological			
WM-1	Regulatory Guide 4.2 Revision 3, Section 6.1.6 states the following should be described in the environmental report: • The annual total number of curies from low level reactor solid wastes and if it is within the bounds of the estimated total of curies of solid waste identified in Section 3.4.2 Radioactive Waste Management. (Table 3.5-2 and Table 3.5-3 provide solid waste volumes, but not activity) • Being cognizant of the analysis in NUREG-2157 "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for Continued Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel. Final Report," describe the plans for offsite storage of spent fuel. o NUREG-2157 Section 1.8.6 states that advanced reactors (e.g., high-temperature and gas-cooled reactors) are not addressed because they are not within the scope of the review. Please provide an SME to discuss the characteristics of expected radiological waste to be generated on an annual basis and to discuss the applicability of NUREG-2157 to the proposed reactor design.		Jon Napier/Don Palmrose