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

<u>Discussion Topic</u>

Introductions

Levy County Environmental Review

- USACE Project Needs and Clarifications
  - LEDPA
    - USACE is nearly complete with its review.
  - Jurisdictional Determination
    - USACE will make initial decision by the end of August to mid-September and then will forward 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 the 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 August 8, 2009 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 eliminate 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)
Lorin 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)