



May 1, 2015  
ND-2015-0007

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
ATTN: Document Control Desk  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Subject: **PSEG POWER, LLC**  
**Docket No. 52-043**  
**Documents in Support of Application**  
**Early Site Permit for the PSEG Site**  
**Comments on Advanced Safety Evaluation for Chapter 2, Section 2.4,**  
**"Hydrologic Engineering"**

Reference: 1) Letter from P. Chowdhury, USNRC, to J. Mallon, PSEG Power, LLC,  
PSEG EARLY SITE PERMIT APPLICATION – ADVANCED SAFETY  
EVALUATION WITH NO OPEN ITEMS FOR CHAPTER 2, SECTION  
2.4, "Hydrologic Engineering", dated April 22, 2015

In Reference 1, USNRC transmitted the Advanced Safety Evaluation with No Open Items for Chapter 2, Section 2.4, "Hydrologic Engineering", associated with PSEG's Early Site Permit (ESP) application, for review to confirm that the Advanced Safety Evaluation does not include any proprietary information that PSEG would seek to withhold under 10 CFR 2.390, or contain any factual errors.

PSEG has completed the review of the above referenced safety evaluation and has determined that the safety evaluation does not include any proprietary information that PSEG would seek to withhold under 10 CFR 2.390.

During PSEG's review of the advanced safety evaluation for Chapter 2, Section 2.4, PSEG compiled a list of comments that could improve the accuracy and clarity of the safety evaluation. These comments are included in Enclosure 1 to this letter.

If additional information is needed, please contact David Robillard, PSEG Nuclear Development Licensing Engineer, at (856) 339-7914.

D079  
NRO

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on the 1<sup>st</sup> day of May, 2015.

Respectfully,



James Mallon  
Early Site Permit Manager  
Nuclear Development  
PSEG Power, LLC

Enclosure 1: List of Comments on Advanced Safety Evaluation for Chapter 2, Section 2.4, "Hydrologic Engineering"

cc: USNRC Project Manager, Division of New Reactor Licensing, PSEG Site  
(w/enclosure)  
USNRC Environmental Project Manager, Division of New Reactor Licensing  
(w/enclosure)  
USNRC Region I, Regional Administrator (w/o enclosure)

**PSEG Letter ND-2015-0007, dated May 1, 2015**

**Enclosure 1**

**List of Comments on Advanced Safety Evaluation for**

**Chapter 2, Section 2.4, "Hydrologic Engineering"**

**8 Pages**



SER Chapter/Section: Chapter 2  
Title: Chapter 2, Section 2.4, "Hydrologic Engineering"

Comment No. Section_Page_Comment	Comment Description
2.4.1_2-1_001	Paragraph 2.4.1 - discusses radioactive liquid and gaseous effluents which is out of place for the Hydrologic Description section.
2.4.1.1_2-1_002	1st para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: " ... Delaware River, <b>52 miles north of</b> the mouth
2.4.1.4.1_2-5_001	1st full para., last sentence: "COL Action Item 2.4-2" should be in bold font
2.4.1.4.1_2-5_002	1st para. under "The Staff's Technical Evaluation", 2nd sentence: Recommend changing to: "In RAI 25, <b>Question 02.04.01-2</b> , the staff requested ..." RAI 25, Question 02.04.01-1 does not request "elevation information and datum conversion procedures, temporal information and gaging station identification."
2.4.1.4.1_2-5_003	1st para. under "The Staff's Technical Evaluation", 3rd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... response to RAI 25, <b>Question 02.04.01-2</b> , the applicant committed to modify ..."
2.4.1.4.1_2-5_004	1st para. under "The Staff's Technical Evaluation", last sentence: Recommend changing to: "The staff considers RAI 25, <b>Question 02.04.01-2</b> resolved."
2.4.1.4.3_2-7_001	1st full para., 4th sentence: Recommend changing to: "... the tidal <b>gauge</b> station ...". General comment: "gage" and "gauge" are used interchangeably throughout the report - recommend revising all uses to "gauge" as that spelling is more appropriate.
2.4.2.4_2-11_001	Please rewrite the second sentence of the second paragraph to state as follows: "The staff reviewed the available information provided and concluded that <b>initially</b> the SSAR did not provide sufficient detail describing the techniques and methodology used for surface water modeling and resulting flood levels at the site."
2.4.2.4_2-11_002	Section 2.4.2.4, para. under bulleted list, 3rd sentence: Recommend changing to: "Therefore, in RAI 25, <b>Question 02.04.01-1</b> , the staff requested ..." RAI No. 25, Question 02.04.01-2 requests information regarding "...elevation information and datum conversion procedures, temporal information and gaging station identification." not simulation input files or scenarios.
2.4.2_2-13_001	1st para., 3rd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... <b>6,372 m3 (225,000 ft3)</b> per second ... of greater than <b>9,314 m3 (329,000 ft3)</b> per second ..." to accurately reflect values in SSAR Rev. 3 Section 2.4.2.1 Page 2.4-23.
2.4.2.4.2_2-13_002	3rd para., 1st sentence: "Recommend changing to: "... 9.78 m (32.1 ft) NAVD88 <b>is</b> associated ..."
2.4.2.4.2_2-13_003	3rd para., 2nd sentence: "The applicant will design all SSCs with flood protection (See Section 2.4.10 of this report) features to withstand the flood height of the DBF and associated effects when a reactor technology is selected at the COL stage." This sentence is no longer applicable, because the DBF height is lower than the designed site elevation.
2.4.2.4.2_2-13_004	4th para., 1st sentence: Revise to read: " ... Delaware River adjacent <b>to the</b> site ..."
2.4.2.4.7_2-17_001	In the paragraph under "The Staff's Technical Evaluation", the 2nd sentence states: " <b>Initially, insufficient information was provided by the applicant for the staff's evaluation. This statement is derogatory in nature. PSEG recommends combining the 2nd and 3rd sentences as follows: 'Initially, further information and the applicant's calculations were needed to determine the acceptability of the computed peak flows and levels.'</b> "
2.4.2.6_2-17_002	2nd para. under 2.4.2.6, last sentence: "COL Action Item 2.4-1" should be in bold font
2.4.3.4_2-19_001	1st para., last sentence: Recommend changing to: "... review <b>topics</b> included ..."



SER Chapter/Section: Chapter 2  
Title: Chapter 2, Section 2.4, "Hydrologic Engineering"

Comment No. Section_Page_Comment	Comment Description
2.4.3.4_2-19_002	Bullet #1 uses design "bases"; Bullet #3 uses design "basis". The use of this term should be consistent. This is a global comment throughout the document.
2.4.3.4_2-19_003	2nd para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "... site visit, the staff <b><u>requested the applicant to provide additional</u></b> information relative to ...". As currently written, the 1st sentence is derogatory in nature. In response to RAI 25, the HEC-RAS input and output files were submitted for review. NUREG-0800 does not require submittal of the input and output files.
2.4.3.4_2-19_004	At the end of the second paragraph, please add the following sentence: <b><u>"As discussed below, the applicant subsequently provided sufficient and substantiated information regarding the effects of probable maximum flooding on streams and rivers."</u></b>
2.4.3.4.1_2-20_001	1st para. under Alternative II bullets, 2nd sentence: Recommend changing to read: "... and route <del>s</del> the subbasin ..."
2.4.3.4.1_2-20_002	1st para., under "The Staff's Technical Evaluation" Recommend changing to "... determination <b><u>of</u></b> flooding ..."
2.4.3.4.2_2-21_001	1st para., 3rd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... determined as <b><u>a 38,849</u></b> km2 ..."
2.4.3.4.2_2-21_002	1st para., 3rd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... determined to be <b><u>a 5,568</u></b> km2 ..."
2.4.3.4.2_2-21_003	3rd para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "... and discharge ( <b><u>41,852</u></b> m3 (1,478,000 ft3) per second)
2.4.3.4.2_2-21_004	Last para., 3rd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... 1-hour PMP of <b><u>24.1</u></b> cm ( <b><u>9.5</u></b> in.) was used ..." See SSAR Table 2.4.3-1
2.4.3.4.3_2-23_001	1st para., 1st and 2nd sentences: "COL Action Item 2.4-1" and "COL Action Item 2.4-2" should be in bold font
2.4.3.4.4_2-23_002	1st para. under 2.4.3.4.4, 2nd sentence: Recommend changing to "The applicant will monitor and maintain ..."
2.4.3.4.4_2-24_001	1st para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "... extensive <b><u>HCGS</u></b> operating ..."
2.4.4.1_2-27_001	Table 2.4.4-1 contains inaccurate conversions of flow from cubic ft. to cubic meters. The cubic meter values in the column labeled "Discharge at PSEG Site (per second) should read from top to bottom: <b><u>214,925, 184,900 / 30,576 / 50,653 / 62,570 / 31,704 / 12,879 / 30,283 / 6,058 / 3,196 / 1,458</u></b> . Add cubic meters to the Cannonsville Reservoir value in this column. The cubic meter values in the column labeled "Maximum Water Surface at PSEG Site (NAVD88) should read from top to bottom: <b><u>23,763 / 20,436 / 19,465 / 17,944</u></b> .
2.4.4_2-28_001	1st full para., 2nd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... SSAR Section <b><u>2.4.4.1</u></b> to ..."
2.4.5.4.1_2-30_001	1st para. under 2.4.5.4.1, 1st bullet: Recommend changing to: "... from <b><u>NOAA's Meteorological Criteria for Standard Project Hurricane and Probable Maximum Hurricane Windfields National Weather Service Technical Report NWS-23 (NWS-23)</u></b> ..."
2.4.5.4.1_2-30_002	1st para. under 2.4.5.4.1, 3rd bullet, 2nd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... uses <b><u>a</u></b> Category 4 hurricane."
2.4.5.4.1_2-30_003	The last sentence of the fourth bullet, recommend changing to: "The approach <b><u>does not model</u></b> effects from river flow, sea-level rise and 10 percent exceedance high tide included in the still water level (SWL) calculation."
2.4.5.4.1_2-30_004	Last para., 2nd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... (e.g., <b><u>ADCIRC</u></b> , FVCOM ..."
2.4.5.4.1_2-31_001	Last para., 1st bullet: Recommend changing to: "... surge analysis based on <b><u>the</u></b> PMH storm..."



SER Chapter/Section: Chapter 2  
Title: Chapter 2, Section 2.4, "Hydrologic Engineering"

Comment No. Section_Page_Comment	Comment Description
2.4.5.4.1_2-32_001	The first paragraph on this page describes the April 6, 2015 public meeting. The verb tense around the PSEG supplemental response is awkward and may confuse the reader. PSEG recommends that the first and second paragraphs be combined to put the emphasis on the April 15, 2015 supplement.
2.4.5.4.1_2-32_002	1st para., 2nd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... did not <b><u>provide a sufficient level of detail</u></b> for ..."
2.4.5.4.1_2-32_003	1st para., 5th sentence: Recommend changing to: "... use of the <b><u>ADCIRC</u></b> +SWAN model ..."
2.4.5.4.1_2-32_004	1st para., 6th sentence: Recommend changing to: "... rise of <b><u>0.41 m (1.35 ft)</u></b> is ..."
2.4.5.4.1_2-32_005	1st para., last sentence: Recommend changing to: "... NWS 23 is maintained, <b><u>the</u></b> description of the Bodine/HEC-RAS/Kamphuis/ CEM model is retained ..."
2.4.5.4.1_2-32_006	2nd para., 4th sentence: Recommend changing to: " <b><u>The</u></b> applicant ..."
2.4.5.4.2_2-33_001	2nd para., 4th sentence: Recommend changing to "... 145 mph ( <b><u>12.6</u></b> kt); while ..."
2.4.5_2-33_002	3rd para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "... SSAR Section <b><u>2.4.5.1.1</u></b> ."
2.4.5.4.3_2-36_001	Para. At top of page, last sentence: Recommend changing to: "... provides a <b><u>conservative</u></b> estimate."
2.4.5.4.4_2-37_001	2nd para., 4th sentence: Recommend changing to: "... Bodine model and <b><u>justification that varying track direction from that used in the analysis would not produce the maximum surge at the site.</u></b> "
2.4.5.4.5_2-39_001	1st para. under HEC-RAS Model Upgrades, 7th sentence: Recommend changing to: "In an <b><u>August 21, 2014</u></b> , response ..."
2.4.5.4.5_2-39_002	1st para. under HEC-RAS Model Setup, 2nd sentence: Recommend changing to: "Therefore, <b><u>in RAI 25, Question 02.04.01-1</u></b> , the staff ..."
2.4.5.4.5_2-39_003	1st para. under HEC-RAS Model Setup, 3rd sentence: Recommend changing to: "In a <b><u>June 23, 2011 response to RAI 25, Question 02.04.01-1</u></b> , the applicant ..."
2.4.5.4.5_2-40_001	1st para., under bullet, 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "... discussion and justification for <b><u>the</u></b> applied HEC-RAS..."
2.4.5.4.5_2-40_002	Bullet at top of page: For clarity, the instability described in HEC-RAS simulation occurred 32-miles from the PSEG Site. Recommend changing the last sentence of the bullet to: " <b><u>...The instability, which occurs approximately 32 miles from the PSEG Site, appears...</u></b> "
2.4.5.4.5_2-41_001	1st para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "... requested that the applicant <b><u>provide</u></b> a discussion ..."
2.4.5.4.5_2-41_002	2nd para.: For clarity the discussion about the model instability should note the distance between the observed model instability and the site (i.e., Approx. 32 miles). Recommend changing the text in the 2nd sentence to " <b><u>...conducted to understand the instabilities, which occur approximately 32 miles from the PSEG Site, and the influence....</u></b> "
2.4.5_2-41_003	5th para., 2nd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... versus <b><u>2.34</u></b> m ( <b><u>7.7</u></b> ft) observed; ..." See SSAR Page 2.4-74
2.4.5.4.5_2-41_004	Last para., 2nd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... values <b><u>that are</u></b> unclear ..."
2.4.5.4.5_2-43_001	3rd para., 4th sentence: Recommend changing to: "... along the <b><u>85.5</u></b> kilometer (km) ..." SER Section 2.4.5.4.5, Page 2-44, first sentence, 85.5 km is used.



SER Chapter/Section: Chapter 2  
Title: Chapter 2, Section 2.4, "Hydrologic Engineering"

Comment No. Section_Page_Comment	Comment Description
2.4.5.4.6_2-45_001	3rd para., last sentence: Recommend changing to: "... wave runup estimates for a riprap <u>embankment</u> at the proposed..."
2.4.5.4.7_2-46_001	2nd para., last sentence: Recommend changing to: <b><u>"At the time of the maximum water level, the still water level at the new plant location is calculated to be 8.1 m (26.7 ft) NAVD88."</u></b>
2.4.5.4.6_2-46_002	Para. at top of page, 1st full sentence: Recommend changing to: "In <u>an August 21, 2014</u> , response ..."
2.4.5.4.7_2-46_003	Last para., 1st and 2nd sentences: Recommend changing to: "... elevation of 10.5 m ( <u>34.6</u> ft) NAVD88. A future ... 10.9 m ( <u>35.9</u> ft) NAVD88 ..."
2.4.5.4.7_2-46_004	3rd para., 3rd sentence: Recommend changing to: "In <u>an August 21, 2014</u> , response ..."
2.4.5.4.6_2-46_006	2nd full para., 1st sentence Recommend changing to: <b><u>"After reviewing SSAR Section 2.4.5.3.2, "Wave Runup at the New Plant Location," the NRC staff determined that additional information was needed relative to the details of the analysis to estimate the wind-induced wave runup at the project site."</u></b>
2.4.5.4.6_2-46_007	3rd para., 2nd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... Question 02.04.05- <u>10</u> ..."
2.4.5.4.6_2-46_008	3rd para., 5th sentence: Recommend changing to: "... Question 02.04.05- <u>10</u> ..."
2.4.5.4.6_2-46_009	3rd para., 6th sentence: Recommend changing to: "... Question 02.04.05- <u>10</u> ..."
2.4.5.4.6_2-46_010	3rd para., last sentence: Recommend changing to: "... Question 02.04.05- <u>10</u> ..."
2.4.5.4.7_2-47_001	1st para., 5th sentence: Recommend changing to: <b><u>"... the applicant's ADCIRC+SWAN ..."</u></b> The 2D ADCIRC+SWAN model is the Licensing basis, not a confirmatory analysis.
2.4.5.4.8_2-48_001	1st para., 6th sentence: Recommend changing to: ".... In <u>RAI 39, Question 02.04.05-11</u> ..."
2.4.5.4.9_2-48_002	1st para., under "Information Submitted by the Applicant", 4th sentence: Recommend changing to: "... lower water levels <u>for the storm simulation that matches</u> the NWS-23 ..."
2.4.5.4.9_2-49_001	4th para., 5th sentence: There is a "red" comma after "Question 02.04.05-12".
2.4.5.4.9_2-53_001	1st para. at top off page, 4th full sentence: Recommend rewording to: " ... larger differences in H <sub>s</sub> do not exceed ..." (i.e. eliminate "occur")
2.4.5.6_2-56_001	Last para., 3rd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... post-addition of the 10 percent <u>exceedance</u> high tide."
2.4.5.6_2-57_001	1st para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: " ... Section_2.4.5.4.1 ..." (i.e. - add space between "Section" and 2.4.5.4.1.)
2.4.6.4.1_2-62_001	2nd para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "In the May <u>11</u> , 2011, response ..."
2.4.6.4.2_2-65_001	3rd para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "In the May <u>11</u> , 2011, response ..."
2.4.6.4.3_2-66_001	2nd para., 3rd sentence regarding runup resulting from the Canary Islands landslide identifies a land slide depth of 1695 m (5661 ft.). Rev. 3 of SSAR subsection 2.4.6.3.2 identifies the maximum depth of this landslide as 5363 ft (1695 m). Recommend changing the SER text to match that of Rev. 3 of the SSAR
2.4.6.4.3_2-66_002	Para. under "The Staff's Technical Evaluation", 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: " ... include subaerial and <u>submarine</u> landslides, ..."



SER Chapter/Section: Chapter 2  
Title: Chapter 2, Section 2.4, "Hydrologic Engineering"

Comment No. Section_Page_Comment	Comment Description
2.4.6.4.3_2-67_001	1st para. under "Volcanogenic Sources": Recommend changing to: "References 2.4.6-15 and <b>2.4.6-16</b> "
2.4.6.4.3_2-67_002	2nd full para., 3rd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... 13,000-17,000 <b>ybp</b> ..."
2.4.6.4.3_2-68_001	Last para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "... scarps <b>of</b> various sizes ..."
2.4.6.4.3_2-69_001	1st full para., 3rd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... with distance that correspond <b>to</b> coastal inundations identified <b>by</b> onshore tsunami deposits ..."
2.4.6.4.3_2-70_001	2nd para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "... that <b>progress</b> seaward across ..."
2.4.6.4.3_2-71_001	1st para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "... elevation of <b>1.4</b> m ( <b>4.5</b> ft) ..." See SSAR Section 2.4.6.4.2.
2.4.6.4.4_2-71_002	2nd para., 2nd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... intermediate- <b>resolution</b> grids ..."
2.4.6.4.4_2-71_003	Under the "Staff's Technical Evaluation, 1st para., the 100 year sea level rise value of .75 m is attributed to IPCC 2007. This value is inconsistent with the value given on page 2-36.
2.4.6.4.4_2-72_001	2nd para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "... however, <b>it</b> does ..."
2.4.6.4.4_2-72_002	The fourth paragraph on page 2-72 uses the future tense. PSEG recommends that the paragraph be modified to use either the present or past tense.
2.4.6.4.4_2-75_001	1st para. under Puerto Rico Subduction Zone Source, 5th sentence: Recommend changing to: "... rupture is composed <b>of</b> five individual ..."
2.4.6.4.4_2-76_001	2nd para., 4th sentence: Recommend changing to: "... of 40 m ( <b>131.2 ft</b> ) for ..."
2.4.6.4.5_2-76_002	1st para. under Information Submitted by the Applicant, 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "... Sections 2.4.6.4.5 – 2.4.6. <b>4.8</b> , the ..."
2.4.6.4.5_2-77_001	For the bullet titled "Effective Filtering of Delaware Bay (SSAR Section 2.4.6.4.5, 3rd Paragraph, SSAR Section 2.4.6.4.6, 1st Paragraph, and SSAR Section 2.4.6.4.7, 3rd Paragraph): Recommend deleting " <b>Provide results in a reading room.</b> "
2.4.6.4.5_2-77_002	Last para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "In the May <b>11</b> , 2011, response ..."
2.4.6.4.5_2-78_001	The concluding sentence of the section, just before the start of section 2.4.6.4.6 incorrectly states the storm surge flood height as 12.92 m (42.4 ft). <b>The statement should use the design basis DBF of 32.1 ft. (9.78m).</b>
2.4.6.4.6_2-78_002	Under "Information Submitted by the Applicant": Recommend changing to: <b>"The Delaware River in the vicinity of the Site does not contain any harbors or breakwaters. Information on bathymetry and topography in the Site vicinity is provided in SSAR Section 2.4.6.4.3.</b>



SER Chapter/Section: Chapter 2  
Title: Chapter 2, Section 2.4, "Hydrologic Engineering"

Comment No. Section_Page_Comment	Comment Description
2.4.6.4.8_2-79_001	Under 2.4.6.4.8, "Information Submitted by the Applicant", the ASER states "Although the applicant omitted a section on Hydrostatic and Hydrodynamic Forces from the SSAR, in SSAR Section 2.4.6.5, the applicant stated that hydrodynamic and hydrostatic forces will not impact any safety-related structures." This statement implies that PSEG did not provide the required information. NUREG-0800 requires an evaluation of "Hydrostatic and Hydrodynamic Forces "... including the inundation and drawdown depths, current speed, acceleration, inertial component, and momentum flux that quantify the forces on any safety-related SSC that may be exposed to the tsunami waves. SSAR 2.4.6.5 states "Therefore, PMT events do not constitute a limiting design basis for the new plant nor do hydrodynamic and hydrostatic forces impact any safety-related structures. The DBF caused by storm surge and associated wave runoff caused by the PMH, described in Subsection 2.4.5, governs the design to protect safety-related structures from wave runoff." <b>Recommend deleting "Although the applicant omitted a section on Hydrostatic and Hydrodynamic Forces from the SSAR," in the 1st sentence under "Information Submitted by the Applicant" section under 2.4.6.4.8.</b>
2.4.6.6_2-81_001	Para. at top of page, 3rd sentence: Recommend changing to " ... which is also below the <b>2D</b> PMSS ...". The 2D model is now the licensing basis for the PSEG Site.
2.4.7.3_2-81_002	1st sentence under 2.4.7.3: Recommend changing to " ... <b>ice effects</b> , and the associated acceptance criteria, are in NUREG-0800, Section 2.4.7. "
2.4.7.3_2-81_002	2nd sentence under 2.4.7.3: Recommend changing to: " ... identifying <b>ice effects</b> ..."
2.4.7.4.1_2-82_001	1st para., 2nd sentence: Recommend changing to: " ... temperature ( <b>-26 °Celsius (C) (-15 °Fahrenheit (F))</b> on ..."
2.4.7.4.4_2-84_001	1st para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: " ... sheet ice <b>that</b> has formed in the mid and upper portions of the Delaware Bay was not concentrated enough to <b>be</b> considered fast ..."
2.4.7.4.4_2-84_002	1st para., 2nd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... transition zone <b>to</b> the Delaware ..."
2.4.7.4.4_2-84_003	1st para., 3rd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... ice adjacent <b>to</b> the PSEG ..."
2.4.9.4.4_2-91_001	3rd para., 2nd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... channel diversions <b>to</b> impact the site ..."
2.4.9.4.5_2-91_002	Section heading: Recommend changing to: Human-Induced Causes <b>of</b> Channel Diversion
2.4.9.4.6_2-92_001	1st para., 3rd sentence: Recommend changing to: " ... is projected as <b>5</b> m <sup>3</sup> ( <b>175</b> ft <sup>3</sup> ) per second."
2.4.10.3_2-93_001	1st sentence under Regulatory Basis: Recommend changing to: "... <b>relevant requirements of NRC regulations and the associated acceptance criteria for flood protection</b> ..."
2.4.10.3_2-93_002	2nd sentence under Regulatory Basis: Recommend changing to: "... identifying and evaluating <b>flood protection</b> are set ..."
2.4.11.3_2-96_001	1st sentence under Regulatory Basis: Recommend changing to: "... relevant requirements of NRC regulations and the associated acceptance criteria for <b>low water considerations</b> ..."
2.4.11.3_2-96_002	2nd sentence under Regulatory Basis: Recommend changing to: " ... evaluating <b>low water consideration</b> s are ..."
2.4.11.4.1_2-97_001	1st para., last sentence: Recommend changing to: "... 90 percent exceedance <b>low</b> tide ..."
2.4.11.4.2_2-98_001	1st para., last sentence: Recommend changing to: "... to continue water withdrawal from ..."



SER Chapter/Section: Chapter 2  
Title: Chapter 2, Section 2.4, "Hydrologic Engineering"

Comment No. Section_Page_Comment	Comment Description
2.4.11.4.2_2-98_002	2nd para., 4th sentence: Recommend changing to: "... of <b>-1.52 m (-5.0 ft)</b> NAVD88 ..."
2.4.11.4.2_2-98_003	4th para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "... HEC-RAS ( <b>Reference</b> 2.4.11-5) simulation ..."
2.4.11.4.3_2-99_001	3rd para., formula for negative surge: Recommend changing to: "A x (maximum sustained winds) <sup>2</sup> "
2.4.11.4.3_2-100_001	5th para., 4th sentence, Recommend changing to: "... is brackish and would actually have a <b>lower</b> freezing point ..."
2.4.11.4.3_2-100_001	5th para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "... surge in Section <b>2.4.5</b> ..."
2.4.11.4.3_2-101_001	1st full para., 2nd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... ( <b>projected to be 5 m<sup>3</sup> (175 ft<sup>3</sup>)</b> per second)." ."
2.4.11.6_2-102_001	2nd para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "... lead to low <b>river</b> elevations ..."
2.4.12.2_2-103_001	1st para., 3rd bullet: Recommend changing to: <b>"The applicant described dewatering that will be required during construction, but due to the new plant grade elevation no dewatering will be required when the plant is operational."</b>
2.4.12.4.1_2-105_001	Add " <b>Woodbury Formation</b> " between "Englishtown" and "Mercantville" Formation bullets.
2.4.12.4.1_2-106_001	1st para., 5th sentence: Recommend changing to: "... level <b>at the power block in the Alluvium</b> was ..."
2.4.12.4.1_2-106_002	1st para., 7th sentence: Recommend changing to: <b>"Anticipated hydrostatic loading will be on average 0.9 – 1.2 m (3 – 4 ft) with a maximum water level elevation just above the retention wall at 1.6 m (5.2 ft) NAVD88."</b>
2.4.12.4_2-108_001	2nd para., 2nd sentence: COL Action Item 2.4-3 should be in bold font
2.4.12.6_2-108_002	2nd para., 2nd sentence: COL Action Item 2.4-3 should be in bold font
2.4.13.2_2-109_001	1st para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "... PSEG Site."
2.4.13.3_2-110_001	2nd para., 4th bullet entitled Consideration of Other Site-Related Evaluation Criteria: Recommend changing to: " <b>The applicant's assessment</b> ..." (i.e. eliminate "COL")
2.4.13.4.1_2-111_001	4th para., 3rd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... contour map (Figure <b>2.4.12-30</b> ) in ..."
2.4.13.4.1_2-113_001	3rd para., 3rd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... RAI 31, Question 02.04.13-1 <b>2</b> , the ..."
2.4.13.4.1_2-113_002	4th para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "... RAI 31, Question 02.04.13-1 <b>2</b> , the ..."
2.4.13.4.1_2-113_003	4th para., last sentence: Recommend changing to: "... power block area (Figure 2.4. <b>13-1 of this report</b> )."
2.4.13.4.2_2-114_001	4th para., 1st sentence: Recommend changing to: "in a June <b>30</b> , 2011, response, ..."
2.4.13.4.4_2-115_001	Please change the beginning of the first sentence of this section to state as follows: <b>"This evaluation relates to the staff's assessment of the applicant's. . ."</b>
2.4.13.4.4_2-115_002	In the second paragraph, please change "more conservative" to "less conservative". This will make the sentence consistent with Section 2.4.13.1.4 of SSAR, Revision 0.
2.4.13.4.4_2-115_003	3rd para., 2nd sentence: Recommend changing to: "... there is <b>a</b> possibility that ..."
2.4.13.4.4_2-116_001	6th para., 4th sentence: Recommend changing to: "... from 1,280m (4, 200 ft) to <b>1</b> ,158 m (3,800 ft) ..." (i.e. eliminate the parenthese in front of 1,158)



SER Chapter/Section: Chapter 2  
Title: Chapter 2, Section 2.4, "Hydrologic Engineering"

Comment No. Section_Page_Comment	Comment Description
2.4.13.4.4_2-117_001	Para. at top of page, 1st full sentence: Recommend changing to: "...change <b>and</b> calculations presented in the SSAR <b><u>are</u></b> adequate".