PMLevyCOLPEm Resource

From: Bruner, Douglas
Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2009 10:14 AM
To: Smith, Michael Alan; ellen.kennedy@pnl.gov; Wyngarden, Stephen; Don Hambrick (gordon.a.hambrick@usace.army.mil); Gagliano.Paul@epamail.epa.gov
Cc: Moser, Michelle; Schaaf, Robert; Martin, Jody; Kirkwood, Sara; LevyCOL Resource
Subject: Teleconference Summary 082009 - Levy - Final
Attachments: Land Use Question Rev1.doc; Teleconference Summary 082009 - Levy - Final.doc

All,

Attached is the summary for last week's teleconference and the associate Land Use questions. Please call me if you have questions.

Thanks,

Doug

Hearing Identifier: Levy_County_COL_Public
Email Number: 446

Mail Envelope Properties (5A7F273F3E481245BC055B36939D3463255A0C6E63)

Subject: Teleconference Summary 082009 - Levy - Final
Sent Date: 8/26/2009 10:13:32 AM
Received Date: 8/26/2009 10:13:34 AM
From: Bruner, Douglas

Created By: Douglas.Bruner@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Moser, Michelle" <Michelle.Moser@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Schaaf, Robert" <Robert.Schaaf@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Martin, Jody" <Jody.Martin@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Kirkwood, Sara" <Sara.Brock@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"LevyCOL Resource" <LevyCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Smith, Michael Alan" <michael.smith@pnl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"ellen.kennedy@pnl.gov" <ellen.kennedy@pnl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Wyngarden, Stephen" <SWyngarden@icfi.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Don Hambrick (gordon.a.hambrick@usace.army.mil)" <gordon.a.hambrick@usace.army.mil>
Tracking Status: None
"Gagliano.Paul@epamail.epa.gov" <Gagliano.Paul@epamail.epa.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	169	8/26/2009 10:13:34 AM
Land Use Question Rev1.doc	28666	
Teleconference Summary 082009 - Levy - Final.doc	85498	

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

Land Use Question

Clarify the number of acres on the LNP site that are permanently impacted.

Section 4.1.1.1.2 on page 4-5 of the ER says "As mentioned previously, the LNP site is approximately 1257 ha (3105 ac) in size, with the primary location for the two reactors and ancillary power production support facilities comprising approximately 121 ha (300 ac) near the center of the site."

Section 4.1.1.1.2.1 on page 4-5 of the ER says "Table 4.1-4 summarizes the on-site land use changes anticipated by construction of the LNP by general component." Data in Table 4.1-4 were converted from hectares to acres, as follows:

- LNP Units 1 and 2 and associated cooling towers - 36.3 acres
- 500-kV switchyard - 48.2 acres
- Site access roads - 29.4 acres
- Drainage ponds - 89.7 acres
- Total onsite impacts - 203.6 acres

Clarify whether the permanent on site impacts would be 300 or 203.6 acres.

On the August 6, 2009 conference call, PEF stated that the other 100 acres are impacted during construction and would revert to open grassy areas after construction was completed. Clarify whether these 100 acres, plus the 203.6 acres accounted for in Table 4.1-4, equal the 300 acres of land impacted in the center of the site, as described on page 4-5 of the ER.

The acreages discussed above are not consistent with the data provided by PEF in their June 12th response to NRC RAI#2.4.1-3, page 74. That table shows permanent impacts to 626.97 acres on the site. Clarify whether the permanent impacts on the site encompass 626.97 acres or 300 acres or 203.6 acres.

Teleconference Summary with PEF
Levy COLA
August 20, 2009, 1:00 PM EDT

Discussion Topic

Introductions

Levy County Environmental Review

- USACE Project Needs and Clarifications
  - LEDPA
    - USACE is nearly complete with their review.
  - Jurisdictional Determination
    - USACE will make initial decision by end of August to mid-September and then forwarded to USACE HQ and USEPA for review.
  - Proposed mitigation plan for LNP (review of UMAM scoring of wetlands for the LNP project site/nearby proposed mitigation sites).
    - USACE, USEPA, and PEF (through Entrix) participated in a teleconference regarding the proposed mitigation plan for LNP. USACE and USEPA are planning on working with Entrix on October 6 and 7 to review UMAM scoring of wetlands for the LNP project site/nearby proposed mitigation sites.
  - Wetland delineations associated with pipeline corridors (meeting with CH2M Hill).
    - USACE and USEPA may meet with PEF (through CH2M Hill) on October 8 to review wetland delineations associated with the pipeline corridor.

- Questions and Clarifications
  - NRC RAI 5.2.2-3 (see RAI 5.2.2-3 under "Follow-up Items," below)
    - The stress period terminology is from Tech Memo (338884-TMEM-074). Stress period 2 was defined as a steady state run that includes all users except the LNP, which was intended to provide an assessment of currently-permitted impacts. Stress period 3 was the predictive phase of the simulation, where LNP impacts were assessed. The figure in question is predictive in that it uses population projections to account for projected increases in permitted usage, but it does not include LNP usage (referred to above as period 2). This figure was provided as attachment 5.2.2-3N.pdf (Figure 13 Simulated SAS and UFA 2078 Water Levels).
      - PEF understands the request and will provide the information. Also, period 2 referenced in parentheses above was corrected during the teleconference to period 3.
  - RAI 2.4.1-3 (specifically Table 2.4.1-3-002 provided in the 6-12-09 PEF response).
    - Land Use – Clarify the number of acres on the LNP site that are permanently impacted (see attached).
      - The discrepancies in calculating the areas impacted result from variations in the counting of footprints for various buildings, space

in-between buildings, and overall impacts. PEF will clarify the information on acreage permanently impacted.

- RAI 2.4.1-4 from the 3-27-09 PEF response (value of the retained forest buffers as future wildlife habitat).
  - Land Use – Provide a citable reference addressing fencing on PEF property. At the site audit, PEF indicated that security fencing would be limited to the developed footprint, and that no fencing would be erected around the perimeter of the LNP property. The concern was that perimeter fencing could restrict use of undeveloped lands by some wildlife species in areas PEF intends to use for mitigation.
    - A citable reference for fencing at the site does not exist. PEF has no plans to erect fencing around the perimeter of the site, and will provide information regarding fencing at the site.

- NRC RAI 2.4.1-3 (Dewatering – See RAI 2.4.1-3 under "Follow-up Items" below).
  - Calculation package LNG-0000-XEC-001 indicates that during excavation, any fractures that are encountered that leak will be drilled and pressure grouted during a second round of grouting. In addition, if leaks are identified in the diaphragm wall through the surficial aquifer, additional drilling and grouting outside the diaphragm wall will be performed to minimize leakage into the excavation. Confirm that the general description is consistent with the current grouting program.

  - Have action levels been identified that will limit dewatering pumping rates?
    - PEF will discuss the grouting program with the Shaw Group and provide information to the NRC.

Follow-up Items (these items were discussed during previous teleconferences and are included for reference).

- Requests and Clarifications
  - NRC RAI 2.4.1-3 (Land Use)
    - PEF will provide a definition as to what constitutes temporary construction impacts for the LNP site and for the associated offsite facilities, and will provide confirmation that temporary impacts resulting from transmission line construction are treated as permanent impacts for analysis purposes.

  - NRC RAI 2.4.1-3 (Dewatering)
    - The Rizzo model for nuclear island construction dewatering is in the reading room and available for review. PEF will provide a supplemental response to the RAI to address the time period over which dewatering is expected to occur.

    - PEF will supplement the RAI to provide an evaluation of the effects of dewatering on adjacent wetlands for construction of the make-up and blowdown lines.

  - NRC RAI 5.3.3.2-1 (Salt Drift)
    - PEF will provide a copy of the CREC 1993/1994 annual salt drift report.

- NRC RAI 2.4.1-3
    - See GIS_figure_requests Cross Ref 081309 for figures that PEF will provide to the NRC (per the August 6, 2009 teleconference).

- NRC RAI 4.3.1-1
    - See GIS_figure_requests Cross Ref 081309 for figures that PEF will provide to the NRC (per the August 6, 2009 teleconference).

- NRC RAI 5.2.2-3
    - NRC will provide clarification to PEF on the specific files needed as described in 8-6-09 teleconference question 4(c).

- (9) NRC RAI 5.3.3-1 (NPD-NRC-2009-044)
    - Technical Memorandum 057 is available in the reading room and describes how the model to address ground-level fogging and icing was used. NRC will follow up with the applicant on this issue if more information is found to be necessary after reviewing available documents.

- (10) RAI 2.4.1-3
    - Transmission Lines – PEF confirmed that construction impacts by cover types up to the first substation are greater than that beyond the first substation. PEF will respond to clarify the associated question.

- (11) Environmental Report Supplement
    - Threatened and Endangered Species – PEF will elaborate on the consideration and accommodation of threatened and endangered species along transmission lines post construction.

- (12) RAI 2.4.1-3
    - FLUCCS Cover Types – PEF will evaluate possible quantitative inconsistencies regarding FLUCCS cover types along the transmission corridors up to and beyond the first substations. Revised tables will be provided to the NRC that eliminates potential inconsistencies and addresses double counting.

- (13) RAI 2.4.1-3 Wetlands / FLUCCS
    - PEF will provide information on the date for completion of the field delineations.
    - PEF provided clarification on changes to wetland cover types during the call.
    - PEF will supplement the RAI with site specific descriptions for new wetland cover types identified on the LNP site.
    - PEF will provide confirmation for the validity of assumptions on derivation of coniferous plantation and acreages for the remaining cover types. PEF will evaluate this further but a supplemental response will not be necessary if there are no changes.

- Status of PEF Environmental Report Update
    - Revised ER to be submitted to the NRC on September 25, 2009.

Other

- Next Teleconference: TBD

- Participants on Teleconference (August 20, 2009):

Paul Snead (PEC)
Joseph Pavletich (PEC)
Arun Kapur (PEC)
Martha Klein (CH2M Hill)
Loren Young (CH2M Hill)
Jamie Hunter (CH2M Hill)
Jeff Lehnen (CH2M Hill)
Scott Freeman (CH2M Hill)
Bill Marsh (CH2M Hill)

Douglas Bruner (NRC)
Michelle Moser (NRC)
Bob Bryce (PNNL)
Ellen Kennedy (PNNL)
Linda Fassbender (PNNL)
Ann Miracle (PNNL)
Vince Vermeul (PNNL)
Bill Baber (ICF)
Don Hambrick (USACE)
Paul Gagliano (USEPA)
Ramona McConney (USEPA)