PMLevyCOLPEm Resource

From: Bruner, Douglas
Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2009 3:09 PM
To: Snead, Paul
Cc: Smith, Michael Alan; ellen.kennedy@pnl.gov; Bryce, Robert W; Schaaf, Robert; Moser, Michelle; adam.davis@pnl.gov; Hambrick, Gordon A SAJ; Gagliano.Paul@epamail.epa.gov; LevyCOL Resource
Subject: Teleconference - Levy
Attachments: Teleconference Agenda 091709 - Levy - Final.doc

Paul,

Attached is the agenda for tomorrow's call. Please use the following to call into the teleconference:

Toll Free Number: 888-989-9826
Participant Passcode: 26996

Please call me if you have questions.

Thanks,

Doug

Hearing Identifier: Levy_County_COL_Public
Email Number: 463

Mail Envelope Properties (5A7F273F3E481245BC055B36939D3463257937E6A5)

Subject: Teleconference - Levy
Sent Date: 9/16/2009 3:09:12 PM
Received Date: 9/16/2009 3:09:14 PM
From: Bruner, Douglas

Created By: Douglas.Bruner@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Smith, Michael Alan" <michael.smith@pnl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"ellen.kennedy@pnl.gov" <ellen.kennedy@pnl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Bryce, Robert W" <rw.bryce@pnl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Schaaf, Robert" <Robert.Schaaf@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Moser, Michelle" <Michelle.Moser@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"adam.davis@pnl.gov" <adam.davis@pnl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Hambrick, Gordon A SAJ" <Gordon.A.Hambrick@usace.army.mil>
Tracking Status: None
"Gagliano.Paul@epamail.epa.gov" <Gagliano.Paul@epamail.epa.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	256	9/16/2009 3:09:14 PM
Teleconference Agenda 091709 - Levy - Final.doc	72186	

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

Teleconference Agenda with PEF
Levy COLA
September 17, 2009, 1:00 PM EDT

<u>Discussion Topic</u>

Introductions

Levy County Environmental Review

- Floodplains Compensation – Clarifications to Supplement RAI 4.1.1-1
  - Compensation Conditions
    Tech Memo 338884-TMEM-106 states on page 7 of 153: "If off-site effects are determined by FDEP to be insignificant, no floodplain compensation is required. Floodplain storage compensation may be required if site development is expected to adversely affect off-site properties."

    SWFWMD's Basis of Review for Environmental Resource Permit Applications states (Section 4.4): "Flood plain encroachment - No net encroachment into the flood plain, up to that encompassed by the 100-year event, which will adversely affect either conveyance, storage, water quality or adjacent lands will be allowed. Any required compensating storage shall be equivalently provided between the seasonal high water level and the 100-year flood level to allow storage function during all lesser flood events."

    Explain the conditions under which FDEP and SWFWMD may determine that no floodplain compensation would be needed.

  - Floodplain Elevation
    Describe how the values for "estimated floodplain elevation" in Tables 1 and 5 were determined.

  - LiDAR Mapping

    Tech Memo 338884-TMEM-06 states on page 9 of 153: "The average 100-year floodplain elevation was determined by using Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) mapping accurate to the 1-foot contour and the FIRM boundaries which were converted to digital format in 1996. The LiDAR DTM data was produced to meet FEMA floodplain mapping specifications."

    Describe the LiDAR mapping technique. Was this mapping conducted specifically for the LNP site?

    Describe any ground-truthing that was conducted to verify elevations produced by the LiDAR mapping.

  - Floodplain Elevation
    Describe how the values for "estimated floodplain elevation" in Tables 1 and 5 were determined.

  - Fill Near Transmission Poles/Foundations
    Tech Memo 338884-TMEM-06 states on page 18 of 153 that a conservative estimate of the fill for transmission poles and foundations was made assuming

that 1 ft of floodplain depth would be filled. Explain why the 1 ft depth assumption for the fill is conservative.

- FLUCCS Cover Types
  Provide the FLUCCS cover types that comprise each of the potential floodplain compensation areas presented in Table 6.

- Restoration/Enhancement
  Provide a conceptual description of how the floodplain compensation areas would be restored/enhanced and how the floodplain compensation would be integrated with the conceptual wetland mitigation plan.

- Modeling
  Tech Memo 338884-TMEM-06 states on page 23 of 153: "The floodplain compensation requirements will be updated after further detailed modeling of the conveyance is completed."

  Tech Memo 338884-TMEM-06 states on page 26 of 153: "A separate modeling effort is currently underway to establish base flood elevations and to refine the extent of the floodplain based on the survey data that meets FEMA floodplain mapping specifications and site conditions. Modeling will also incorporate the site fill and stormwater improvements to determine the off-site rise, if any, and to develop a compensation plan."

  Is the modeling effort referred to on page 26 the same as the one referred to on page 23? Describe the modeling effort or efforts currently underway. When would the analysis results be available?

Other

- Next Teleconference: TBD

- Participants on Last Teleconference (September 11, 2009):

Paul Snead (PEC)	Douglas Bruner (NRC)
Scott Freeman (CH2M Hill)	Michelle Moser (NRC)
Loren Young (CH2M Hill)	Don Palmrose (NRC)
Jeff Lehnen (CH2M Hill)	Michael Smith (PNNL)
Chris Peterson (CH2M Hill)	Bob Bryce (PNNL)
	Vince Vermeul (PNNL)
	Tara O'Neil (PNNL)
	Jim Cabe (PNNL)