

PMSTPCOL PEmails

From: Brent Clayton
Sent: Monday, August 18, 2008 8:23 AM
To: Paul Kallan
Subject: RE: Ecological Monitoring

I'm here all week.

From: Paul Kallan
Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2008 4:20 PM
To: Michael Masnik; Harriet Nash; Richard Raione; William Burton; Philip Brandt; Nancy Kuntzleman; Brent Clayton
Subject: RE: Ecological Monitoring

Please kindly let me know if you are in next week and if not we can re-schedule for the following week.

regards,

Paul

From: Michael Masnik
Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2008 4:12 PM
To: Harriet Nash; Richard Raione; William Burton; Philip Brandt; Nancy Kuntzleman; Brent Clayton
Cc: Paul Kallan
Subject: RE: Ecological Monitoring

Richard, this is a complete mischaracterization of what I said. I think you need to talk to Brent who was also at the meeting and who will collaborate my position on this issue. I stated that I believed, without any data, that in the end we will likely find that Phil was correct in assuming that the impact would be small, however the problem is getting there using a defensible and logical argument::

1. It is a high value resource - an estuary - deserves close scrutiny
2. There is no recent impingement or entrainment data either at the site or nearby
3. We will need to consult on EFH - tough to do without data
4. We learn our lessons at this agency - I do not want another contention related to the lack of data when our guidance calls for it.
5. No expert in the evaluation of impacts related to intake effects would ever feel comfortable using an assessment of short term construction impacts related to dredging to assess intake effects from water withdrawals over a period of 60 years.
6. The applicant did collect impingement data already - but in the MCR and not at the river intake.
7. A number of applicants have gotten the message and are collecting the data necessary to conduct the review even after the application has been submitted. What message does it send to them - stonewall the NRC and they will move forward anyway?
8. The applicant's riverine studies have shown that the diversity and abundance have increased and changed - increasing the value of the resource.
9. The technical staff came up with two possible alternatives that would allow the review to continue despite the present lack of data.

We, all three aquatic technical experts, cannot support the use of the Corps data and its FES to eliminate the need to properly assess impingement and entrainment at a nuclear power plant miles upstream.

I respectively suggest you rely on your SME for matters related to assessing impacts the way the SMEs rely on PMs to manage the project.

From: Harriet Nash
Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2008 3:41 PM
To: Richard Raione; William Burton; Philip Brandt; Michael Masnik; Nancy Kuntzleman; Brent Clayton
Cc: Paul Kallan
Subject: RE: Ecological Monitoring
Importance: High

Richard,

Masnik told me the complete opposite. I think you misunderstood. If you have further discussions with Butch and/or senior management, please ensure that I am included. I am the assigned technical reviewer for this project.

Mike, can you please chime in here?

Thanks,
Harriet

From: Richard Raione
Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2008 1:55 PM
To: Harriet Nash; William Burton; Philip Brandt; Michael Masnik; Nancy Kuntzleman; Brent Clayton
Subject: RE: Ecological Monitoring

From a [NEPA](#) point of view, the proposed alternative is not only viable, it is correct. Masnick agreed entirely with Phil on this point. We will need to discuss this with Butch and with our senior management.

From: Harriet Nash
Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2008 1:06 PM
To: William Burton; Richard Raione; Philip Brandt; Michael Masnik; Nancy Kuntzleman; Brent Clayton
Subject: RE: Ecological Monitoring

It's my understanding that we are not pursuing alternative methods for ecological analysis for this project. We explained why the proposed alternative is not viable.

Please keep me in the loop if this is resurrected or if anyone tries to propose anything else.

Thanks,
Harriet

From: William Burton
Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2008 1:01 PM
To: Richard Raione; Harriet Nash; Philip Brandt; Michael Masnik; Nancy Kuntzleman; Brent Clayton
Subject: Ecological Monitoring

Folks,

I understand that you met on this subject while I was in training. Has a final decision been reached on this. More specifically, are we entertaining alternatives to the collection of 1-years worth of ecological data?

William Burton, Chief
Environmental Projects Branch 1
Office of New Reactors
301-415-6332

Hearing Identifier: SouthTexas34Public_EX
Email Number: 790

Mail Envelope Properties (3AF7DEF82ADA8944AD8247B7ED7FD6516981AF4EED)

Subject: RE: Ecological Monitoring
Sent Date: 8/18/2008 8:22:41 AM
Received Date: 8/18/2008 8:22:42 AM
From: Brent Clayton

Created By: Brent.Clayton@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Paul Kallan" <Paul.Kallan@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4915	8/18/2008 8:22:42 AM

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