

PMLevyCOLPEm Resource

From: Moser, Michelle
Sent: Wednesday, September 23, 2009 3:45 PM
To: Snead, Paul
Cc: LevyCOL Resource; Bruner, Douglas
Subject: Teleconference Agenda 092409
Attachments: Teleconference Agenda 092409 - Levy.doc; Levy Terrestrial Ecology Clarifications 22Sep2009.doc

Paul,

Please find attached an agenda for tomorrow's teleconference and the clarifications for terrestrial ecology. As discussed, we will begin the teleconference at 1 pm with a discussion on terrestrial ecology and at 2 pm we will discuss groundwater.

Below is the phone number and pass code:

Telephone Number: 877-917-9486

Participant pass code: 53528

Michelle

Michelle Rome Moser
Environmental Project Manager
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of New Reactors
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews
Phone: 301-415-6509
Fax: 301-415-5397
Email: Michelle.Moser@nrc.gov

Hearing Identifier: Levy_County_COL_Public
Email Number: 469

Mail Envelope Properties (9C2386A0C0BC584684916F7A0482B6CA099483)

Subject: Teleconference Agenda 092409
Sent Date: 9/23/2009 3:45:09 PM
Received Date: 9/23/2009 3:45:19 PM
From: Moser, Michelle

Created By: Michelle.Moser@nrc.gov

Recipients:

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

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	689	9/23/2009 3:45:19 PM
Teleconference Agenda 092409 - Levy.doc		68090
Levy Terrestrial Ecology Clarifications 22Sep2009.doc		33274

Options

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

**Draft Teleconference Agenda with PEF
Levy COLA
September 24, 2009, 1:00 PM EDT**

Discussion Topic

Introductions

Levy County Environmental Review

- Based on last week's teleconference regarding clarifications for the floodplains bounding analysis, PEF has agreed to provide the following:
 - Synopsis of regulatory requirements related to floodplains compensation
 - Description of the current modeling underway for floodplains compensation
 - List of FLUCCS cover types that comprise each of the potential floodplain compensation areas presented in Table 6
 - Contact information for Hank Higginbotham with SWFWMD
- Terrestrial Ecology Clarifications
 - Attached are a list of clarifications for terrestrial ecology to be discussed
- Groundwater Modeling
 - Discussion regarding NRC and PNNL's conference call with SWFWMD

Other

- Next Teleconference: TBD
- Participants on Teleconference (September 17, 2009):

Paul Snead (PEC)
Scott Freeman (CH2M Hill)
Loren Young (CH2M Hill)
Joseph Pavletich (PEC)
Jamie Hunter (CH2M Hill)
Amy Windham

Douglas Bruner (NRC)
Michelle Moser (NRC)
Don Palmrose (NRC)
Michael Smith (PNNL)
Rajiv Prasad (PNNL)
Bill Baber (ICF)
Don Hambrick (USACE)
Paul Gagliano (USEPA)

Additional questions and clarifications regarding PEF's recent supplemental RAI responses for terrestrial ecology:

1. During the August 6, 2009 teleconference, NRC staff asked PEF to provide a citable time period over which nuclear island construction dewatering would span. During the teleconference, PEF indicated dewatering would occur over about a 24-month period. No citable time period is evident in the September 3, 2009 supplemental response to NRC RAI # 2.4.1-3 provided by PEF (PEF Letter No. NPD-NRC-2009-203).
2. During the August 6, 2009 and August 13, 2009 teleconferences, NRC staff indicated some confusion regarding the description of temporary land cover type impacts as used in the ER and RAI responses. NRC staff asked PEF to provide a citable definition for temporary impacts that could be included in the DEIS. PEF provided the following definitions for permanent and temporary impacts in their September 3, 2009 supplemental response to NRC RAI # 2.4.1-3 (page 8, PEF Letter No. NPD-NRC-2009-203): "Permanent impacts are those impacts that are due to permanent facilities, such as building footprints, while temporary impacts are those impacts that are of shorter duration, such as during construction." This is not consistent with the discussions on August 6th and 13th. Based upon those discussions, staff developed the following preliminary definitions: "For the purposes of this analysis, all impacts that lie within the zone of disturbance (i.e., the construction footprint) are treated as permanent impacts. Temporary impacts are represented by a 50-foot buffer around the perimeter of the construction footprint." These teleconference discussions were focused on construction impacts as presented in Table 2.4.1-3-002 (page 70) and Table 4.3.1-1-001 (page 87) of PEF's June 12, 2009 RAI Supplemental Response (PEF Letter No. NPD-NRC-2009-107). Note that the extent of construction impacts could be construed quite differently under these definitions. For example, under the September 3, 2009 definitions, cleared forestland that would not support a permanent facility but would otherwise not be restored to forestland (e.g., maintained in a disturbed or landscaped condition) could be interpreted as a temporary impact. However, the only temporary impacts identified in the September 3, 2009 revised Table 2.4.1-3-003 (page 13) and Table 2.4.1-3-004 (page 15) remain the 50 foot buffer to the CFBC identified in the previous version of these tables (Table 2-4-1-3-002 from 6-12-09, which was revised as 2 tables in the 9-3-09 supplement). Additional clarification is needed on the definition of permanent and temporary impacts.
3. During the August 13th teleconference, NRC staff asked PEF to provide a site-specific definition for "Treeless Hydric Savanna" (FLUCCS 646). It was staff's impression, reinforced by a description on page 18 of the BRA (2009) Wetland Mitigation Plan, that this cover type was not representative of the natural/native Florida vegetative community type. Rather, staff believed it to be recently harvested pine plantation located within historic wetlands that was not replanted to slash pine and was undergoing plant succession, perhaps because the proposed LNP project interrupted the prior industrial reforestation schedule. However, the following description provided in PEF's September 3, 2009 supplemental response to NRC RAI # 2.4.1-3 (page 20) gave no indication that this might not be a native, undisturbed cover type – "low-lying flats that are vegetated largely by wet prairie species such as broomsedge (*Andropogon* spp), pipeworts (*Eriocaulon* spp.), yellow-eyed grass (*Xyris* spp.), and wiregrass (*Aristida stricta*), as well as shrub species such as fetterbush (*Lyonia lucida*) and wax myrtle (*Myrica cerifera*)". If possible, provide additional clarification as to whether the Treeless Hydric Savanna of the LNP site constitutes areas disturbed by forest management or a natural Florida cover type.
4. Explain how the total wetland area for the "Associated Offsite Facilities Excluding Transmission Lines" in Table 2.4.1-3-001 (page 5 of the 9-3-09 supplemental response to NRC RAI # 2.4.1-3)

was separated out from the “Transmission Line Corridors up to the First Substation” when the 1-mile wide common corridor for the transmission lines between the LNP boundary and the CFBC includes (i.e., overlaps entirely) the remaining offsite facilities in this zone.

5. Several questions are identified for Table 2.4.1-3-004 (page 14) of the September 3, 2009 supplemental response to NRC RAI # 2.4.1-3. This new/updated table, titled Offsite Project Impacts by Facility (Excluding Transmission Lines) was derived from Table 2.4.1-3-002 of the June 12, 2009 supplemental RAI response (page 70) by separating out the offsite project impacts for the non-transmission line facilities from the onsite project impacts.
 - a) Explain the difference between facility impacts for the “Blowdown Pipeline” (page 14) and facility impacts for the “Pipeline CFBC to CREC” (page 15).
 - b) The prior version of this table (Table 2.4.1-3-002 from the June 12, 2009 supplemental RAI response) noted construction impacts to wet planted pine (FLUCCS 629) and treeless hydric savanna (FLUCCS 646) cover types for the non-transmission line facilities. However, the updated table includes no impacts to these cover types. Have impacts to these cover types been avoided, or was a decision made not to use information from the ongoing wetland delineation on the Southern Property and portions of the blowdown pipeline? If the latter, explain why this was done.
 - c) Confirm that impacts from the barge slip and barge slip access road are not included in this table.
6. During the August 13, 2009 teleconference, PEF indicated that it would update its construction impact tables for the associated offsite facilities to include all affected land use cover types, not just the 400-600 FLUCCS cover types. The updated tables would address construction impacts within corridors up to the first transmission line substation, and construction impacts within corridors beyond the first substation. This updated response is provided by PEF in Table 2.4.1-3-005 (page 17) of the September 3, 2009 supplemental response to NRC RAI # 2.4.1-3 for the transmission lines. An examination of the table indicates that construction would impact one new cover type (Utility ROW, FLUCCS 830) when compared to old Tables 2.4.1-3-003 and 2.4.1-3-004 from NRC RAI # 2.4.1-3 (June 12, 2009 supplemental RAI response, pages 79–80), and old Tables 1 and 2 from NRC RAI # USACE-5 (March 27, 2009 RAI supplement, pages 11–12), which were merged to prepare the updated Table 2.4.1-3-005. However, more than 30 additional cover types are identified as occurring within these corridors in the updated Table 2.4.1-3-002 (page 6, September 3, 2009 supplemental response to NRC RAI # 2.4.1-3), which represents the baseline/existing conditions within the associated offsite facilities corridors. Confirm that none of these other land use cover types would be affected by construction activities for the associated offsite facilities.
7. Staff requests that PEF provide PDF of Attachments 2.4.1-3A, 2.4.1-3D, and 4.3.1-1A to June 12, 2009 supplemental response (PEF Letter No. NPD-NRC-2009-107). This is an additional request, as PEF satisfied staff’s initial request by providing in its August 31, 2009 Letter No. NPD-NRC-2009-191 the native GIS files for these attachments.