

NRR-PMDAPEm Resource

From: Rikhoff, Jeffrey
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2016 2:21 PM
To: JEFFREY.M.GOTO@Sargentlundy.com; NRRGotomeetingDLR Resource
Cc: Folk, Kevin; Hoffman, Robert; Martinez, Nancy
Subject: RE: Environmental Review for Subsequent License Renewal Question

Hi Jeff,

Thank you for your questions. We are primarily concerned with the choice/selection of replacement power alternatives. We realize that decisions will be based on cost and anticipated return on the capital investments. However, cost alone should not be the deciding factor.

Our goal is for license renewal applicants to provide the NRC with a realistic picture of the types of power generating facilities/technologies and other actions (e.g., demand side management, energy conservation, and purchased power) either in combination or individual stand-alone power plants that would most likely be constructed and/or implemented to replace the electric power previously generated by the nuclear plant. This could include distributed power/energy options.

Is it preferred to assess the costs and availability of power replacement alternatives by utilizing and referencing the IRPs, RTO planning documents and energy & technology portfolios by themselves?

Yes. IRPs, RTO planning documents and energy & technology portfolios can be used to identify and assess a range of reasonable replacement power alternatives. However, the applicant is not restricted to using information drawn solely from these documents, and other applicable information from State, utility, or Federal sources may be considered in making these determinations. A cost analysis is not required, though we recognize that cost can be the basis for including or excluding a replacement power generation technology. If so, this should be explained.

Or is a stand-alone, independent cost and availability analysis required as well? (i.e., costing out the construction and operation of a new plant from scratch).

No. A stand-alone, independent cost and availability analysis, costing out the construction and operation of a new plant from scratch, is not required.

Should the IRP / RTO reference documents serve as the basis for how cost and availability are developed?

Yes. IRP / RTO reference documents can be used as the basis for the identification of a range of reasonable replacement power alternatives in combination, stand-alone, or as distributed power/energy sources.

Let us know if you have any additional questions.

Thanks,

jeff

Jeffrey Rikhoff

Senior Environmental Scientist
Division of License Renewal

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
301/415-1090
Jeffrey.Rikhoff@nrc.gov

From: JEFFREY.M.GOTO@Sargentlundy.com [mailto:JEFFREY.M.GOTO@Sargentlundy.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2016 5:58 PM
To: Rikhoff, Jeffrey ; NRRGotomeetingDLR Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Environmental Review for Subsequent License Renewal Question

Dear Mr. Rikhoff,

Thank you for the insights and information you provided during the Environmental Review for SLR Teleconference last Monday. It was very helpful in better understanding the process and expectations going forward. After letting everything sink in, I did have a question regarding replacement power alternatives:

Is it preferred to assess the costs and availability of power replacement alternatives by utilizing and referencing the IRPs, RTO planning documents and energy & technology portfolios by themselves? Or is a stand-alone, independent cost and availability analysis required as well? (i.e. costing out the construction and operation of a new plant from scratch) Should the IRP / RTO reference documents serve as the basis for how cost and availability are developed?

Thank you again for your time and consideration,
Jeff

Jeffrey Goto
Environmental Associate
Sargent & Lundy, LLC
55 East Monroe Street
Chicago, IL 60603
(312) 269-8979
Jeffrey.M.Goto@sargentlundy.com

Hearing Identifier: NRR_PMDA
Email Number: 3096

Mail Envelope Properties (33765343ed9f43fdaea1f8fbcf71c64f)

Subject: RE: Environmental Review for Subsequent License Renewal Question
Sent Date: 10/11/2016 2:21:07 PM
Received Date: 10/11/2016 2:21:08 PM
From: Rikhoff, Jeffrey

Created By: Jeffrey.Rikhoff@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Folk, Kevin" <Kevin.Folk@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Hoffman, Robert" <Robert.Hoffman@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Martinez, Nancy" <Nancy.Martinez@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"JEFFREY.M.GOTO@Sargentlundy.com" <JEFFREY.M.GOTO@Sargentlundy.com>

Tracking Status: None

"NRRGotomeetingDLR Resource" <NRRGotomeetingDLR.Resource@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQPWMSMRS04.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3806	10/11/2016 2:21:08 PM

Options

Priority: Standard

Return Notification: No

Reply Requested: No

Sensitivity: Normal

Expiration Date:

Recipients Received: