

**{In Archive} Re: Merrimack Station 308 Respond Date Extension**  
**Mark Stein** to: John King

Cc: David Webster

Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

[Internal EPA email redacted.]

---

Mark A. Stein  
U.S. EPA  
Tel.: (617) 918-1077  
Fax: (617) 918-1029

**John King/R1/USEPA/US**

07/10/2007 10:48 AM

To David Webster/R1/USEPA/US@EPA, Mark  
Stein/R1/USEPA/US@EPA

cc

Subj Merrimack Station 308 Respond Date Extension  
ect

David and Mark,

As expected, Allan Palmer called me yesterday to discuss the 308 letter. Palmer stated PSNH is not irritated concerning the information the letter requested. PSNH understands that at some point in the Merrimack Station's permit development they would be required to provide the information the 308 letter requested.

PSNH is irritated with the amount of time we gave them to respond. PSNH request they be given 120 days to respond instead of 75 days. I feel their extension request is justified.

Palmer said the 75 days would not provide enough time for PSNH to develop an appropriate response. Based on the questions Palmer was asking me prior to the 308 letter being issued, PSNH needs the help of consultants to produce the economic and engineering information our 308 letter requires. Several months

ago, Palmer was asking me if I could recommend consulting firms who could accomplish the economic and engineering analysis related to cooling tower installation at Merrimack Station. I declined to help PSNH to find their consultants, but asking for consultant recommendations shows PSNH does not have the in-house expertise to produce the analysis required of our letter.

It is obvious PSNH wants this opportunity to demonstrate cooling towers would be inappropriate for Merrimack Station. It is also apparent to me PSNH wants to produce a quality response to EPA's 308 letter, and needs 120-days.

Recommend, therefore, to allow PSNH 120-days to respond.

John