PMLevyCOLPEm Resource

From: Bruner, Douglas
Sent: Wednesday, August 05, 2009 2:25 PM
To: Snead, Paul
Cc: Moser, Michelle; LevyCOL Resource
Subject: Teleconference - Levy
Attachments: Teleconference Agenda 080609 - Final.doc; TE Clarifications Part I rev1.doc

Paul,

Attached are the teleconference agenda and questions / clarifications for tomorrow's call. The call will be at 1:00pm EDT. Information to dial in to the teleconference is as follows:

Toll Free Number: 800-779-5294
Participant Passcode: 39609

Please call me if you have questions.

Thanks,

Doug

Hearing Identifier: Levy_County_COL_Public
Email Number: 391

Mail Envelope Properties (5A7F273F3E481245BC055B36939D34632559D3C104)

Subject: Teleconference - Levy
Sent Date: 8/5/2009 2:25:12 PM
Received Date: 8/5/2009 2:25:14 PM
From: Bruner, Douglas

Created By: Douglas.Bruner@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Moser, Michelle" <Michelle.Moser@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"LevyCOL Resource" <LevyCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Snead, Paul" <paul.snead@pgnmail.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	352	8/5/2009 2:25:14 PM
Teleconference Agenda 080609 - Final.doc	61946	
TE Clarifications Part I rev1.doc	56314	

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

Draft Teleconference Agenda with PEF
Levy COLA
August 6, 2009, 1:00 PM EDT

Discussion Topic

Introductions

Levy County Environmental Review

- USACE Project Needs and Clarifications
  - LEDPA
  - Jurisdictional Determination

- Status of 2nd round of RAIs
  - Floodplains storage loss / floodplains compensation (to be submitted by August 17)
  - Terrestrial / Land Use
  - Requested figures
  - Dewatering
  - CREC Unit 3 uprate
  - Salt drift

- Status of PEF Environmental Report update

- COLA Rev 1 is scheduled to be submitted to the NRC on September 25, 2009

Other

- Next Teleconference: August 13, 2009, 1:00pm EDT (proposed).

- Participants on last teleconference (July 30, 2009):

Paul Snead (PEC)	Douglas Bruner (NRC)
Joseph Pavletich (PEC)	Michelle Moser (NRC)
Arun Kapur (PEC)	Ellen Kennedy (PNNL)
Scott Freeman (CH2M Hill)	Steve Wyngarden (ICF)
Martha Kline (CH2M Hill)	Don Hambrick (USACE)
Mitch Griffin (CH2M Hill)	Paul Gagliano (USEPA)
Ann Redmond (Entrix)	Van Shrieves (USEPA)

Follow-up questions/clarifications to PEF's June 12, 2009 RAI Supplement 1 Responses

Land Use

1. PEF Supplemental Response to NRC RAI 2.4.1-3:
   a) Table 2.4.1-3-002 (also repeated as Table 4.3.1-1-001) presents estimated impacts to cover types by facility for the LNP site, and for those associated offsite facility impacts exclusive of transmission lines beyond the CFBC. Confirm whether the cooling towers are accounted for in the LNP on-site impacts (perhaps they are included with the impact estimates for Unit 1 and Unit 2). Confirm whether construction lay down/staging/spoils areas are captured in the permanent and/or temporary impact estimates. Clarify whether impacts from construction of the barge slip and barge slip access road are included in the off-site impacts.
   b) Elaborate further on the 50-foot buffer to the CFBC denoted in Table 2.4.1-3-002 (also repeated as Table 4.3.1-1-001). PEF described this in the April 29 teleconference and in the June 12 RAI responses as a 50-foot zone along the shoreline of the CFBC where mechanical equipment may be operating that could result in temporary impacts to vegetation. The buffer is described as consisting of spoil material side cast from the original dredging of the CFBC. However, impacts from this 50-foot buffer are denoted on Table 2.4.1-3-002 as occurring on the LNP site as well, which is over a mile from the CFBC. Clarify whether this is a 50-foot buffer along the CFBC or a buffer along the entire length of the blowdown pipeline.

2. PEF Supplemental Response to NRC RAI 2.4.1-4:
   a) Clarify the intent of future forest management on the remaining undeveloped lands on the LNP site. It was the staff understanding that commercial forest management would cease on most remaining undeveloped lands, and that these lands would be used for mitigation. This was based on discussion presented in the ER, in the Wetland Mitigation Plan, at the site audit, and in prior conversations with PEF. Most of PEF's response to NRC RAI 2.4.1-4 appears to reinforce this. However, the Forest Management Plan submitted with PEF's response suggests a multiple resource management approach for remaining undeveloped lands that focuses on timber management to maximize net present value. We recognize that the opening paragraph of PEF's response to NRC RAI 2.4.1-4 states that the Forest Management Plan does not include details on mitigation. However, the Forest Management strategy has confused a number of staff reviewers. Clarify management intent for the majority of remaining undeveloped lands on the LNP site.

3. PEF Supplemental Response 4.3.1-1.
   a) PEF notes that the land use/cover type categories presented in Table 4.3.1-1-002 (onsite impacts compared to the vicinity) differ from the on-site impacts presented in Table 4.3.2-1-001 (also repeated as Table 2.4.1-3-002), but that the total acreage of the on-site impacts is the same. [Note – the impacts presented in Table 4.3.1-1-002 correspond to the permanent impacts presented in Table 4.3.1-1-001; temporary impacts are not addressed.] The differences in land use categories are attributed to the site-specific field work used to delineate the wetlands presented in Table 4.3.2-1-001. However, there are substantial differences between the two that are confounding. For example, area of Cypress

Formatted: Font color: Auto

impact is provided as 125.5 ac (Table 4.3.1-1-002) and 53.8 ac (Table 4.3.2-1-001); area of Other Open Lands (Rural) impact is provided as 63.1 ac (Table 4.3.1-1-002) and 31 ac (Table 4.3.2-1-001); area of Treeless Hydric Savannah (73.5 ac in Table 4.3.1-1-001) does not correlate with a cover type in Table 4.3.1-1-002; area of Tree Plantations impact is provided as 394.4 ac (Table 4.3.1-1-002) and the sum of Coniferous Plantations and Wet Planted Pine is 412.5 ac (Table 4.3.2-1-001). Please clarify apparent inconsistencies and, if necessary, provide a resolution approach.

Figures

4. PEF Supplemental Response to NRC RAI 2.4.1-3:
   a) During the 29 April 2009 teleconference with PEF to discuss staff supplemental RAI clarifications, PEF agreed to provide (as part of its June 12 response) a GIS file containing the delineated wetlands and project features that were used to produce the new wetlands map (Attachment 2.4.1-3A). This GIS file was not provided with the June 12 response. Provide this file, as updated to reflect wetland cover type revisions.
   b) During the 29 April 2009 teleconference with PEF to discuss staff supplemental RAI clarifications, PEF agreed to provide (as part of its June 12 response) a GIS file containing the modeled operational pumping groundwater drawdown isopleths (Attachment 2.4.1-3D). This GIS file was not provided with the June 12 response. Provide this file.

5. PEF Supplemental Response 4.3.1-1.
   a) During the 29 April 2009 teleconference with PEF to discuss staff supplemental RAI clarifications, PEF agreed to provide (as part of its June 12 response) a GIS file containing the FLUCCS cover types and project features used to prepare Figure 4.4.1-1 (the Habitat Impacts Map for the LNP site). Staff requested that all individual cover types be shown and that they not be consolidated as in the 3/19/09 version of Figure 4.4.1-1. Staff request that the FLUCCS cover types correspond with the cover types in Table 4.3.1-1-001. This GIS file was not provided with the June 12 response. Provide this file, as updated to reflect all current adjustments to wetland and upland cover boundaries. In summary, staff is requesting an updated cover map (uplands and wetlands) for the LNP site that includes an overlay of the limits of ground disturbance, and with LNP facilities and features depicted on the map.

Dewatering

6. PEF Supplemental Response to NRC RAI 2.4.1-3:
   a) The June 12 RAI response includes a discussion referring to groundwater modeling for the nuclear island construction dewatering. How long will construction dewatering occur for the nuclear islands? Provide groundwater isopleths derived from the modeling. Confirm that groundwater levels would be restored to pre-development conditions after the dewatering pumping ceases.
   b) Would any other substantial dewatering occur during construction (e.g., for makeup/blowdown pipelines, etc)? If so, describe the effect. Provide an analysis of the potential effect of any other dewatering on adjacent wetlands.
   c) Pumped water from construction dewatering will be “discharged to an infiltration basin sized for the estimated flow rate.” Clarify whether this infiltration basin

would become part of the stormwater retention ponds that would ultimately handle operational stormwater runoff, or would it be a new pond located at a new site.

CREC Unit 3 Uprate

7. PEF Supplemental Response to NRC RAI 5.3.2.1-2:
    a) Does the CREC Unit 3 power uprate project include plans for new transmission lines or transmission line upgrades? If new transmission lines or transmission line upgrades are planned, a description is needed to support the staff analysis of cumulative impacts.
    b) Previously, PEF indicated the CREC Unit 3 uprate application would be submitted to the FDEP in the July/August 2009 timeframe. When was (will) the application submitted to FDEP?
    c) Previously, PEF indicated the CREC Unit 3 uprate application would be submitted to the NRC in the September/October 2009 timeframe. Is the application still anticipated to be submitted to NRC in September/October 2009?

Salt Drift

8. PEF Supplemental Response to NRC RAI 5.3.3.2-1:
    a) In response to staff prior inquiry, PEF located the 1992–1993 annual report for the Crystal River Salt Drift Study, the *12th year* of the study. Unfortunately, this annual report covered only a 3-month period of operation for the newly installed mechanical draft cooling towers (similar cooling towers as proposed for Levy). Clarify whether this was the final Salt Drift annual report prepared for CREC. The PEF RAI response and the ER text refer to a *14- year* study (1981-1995); and the FDEP letter granting termination of the salt drift study was dated March 20, 1996. This suggests that 1993–1994 and 1994–1995 annual reports may have been prepared that could provide several more years of data to aid in the interpretation of potential salt drift effects from mechanical draft cooling towers. Provide the 1994–95 report, if available.
    b) Did the CREC mechanical draft cooling towers have drift eliminators installed? Would the LNP cooling towers have drift eliminators? This information is required for staff to determine applicability of previous CREC studies to the LNP.