

PMLevyCOLPEm Resource

From: Bruner, Douglas
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 9:47 AM
To: Snead, Paul; Smith, Michael Alan
Cc: Adam Davis (adam.davis@pnl.gov); Bob Bryce (rw.bryce@pnl.gov); Moser, Michelle; Hambrick, Gordon A SAJ; Gagliano.Paul@epamail.epa.gov; Schaaf, Robert; LevyCOL Resource
Subject: Final Teleconference Summaries for 091709 and 092409 - Levy
Attachments: Teleconference Summary 091709 - Levy - Final.doc; Teleconference Summary 092409- Levy- Final.doc

All,

Attached are the Levy teleconference summaries for the calls held with PEF on September 17, 2009 and September 24, 2009. Please call me if you have questions.

Thanks,

Doug

Hearing Identifier: Levy_County_COL_Public
Email Number: 487

Mail Envelope Properties (44CD2E65B0FF0E499CB32BC30CF781F069D12CD3)

Subject: Final Teleconference Summaries for 091709 and 092409 - Levy
Sent Date: 10/7/2009 9:46:38 AM
Received Date: 10/7/2009 9:46:48 AM
From: Bruner, Douglas

Created By: Douglas.Bruner@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Adam Davis (adam.davis@pnl.gov)" <adam.davis@pnl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Bob Bryce (rw.bryce@pnl.gov)" <rw.bryce@pnl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Moser, Michelle" <Michelle.Moser@nrc.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
"Schaaf, Robert" <Robert.Schaaf@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"LevyCOL Resource" <LevyCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Snead, Paul" <paul.snead@pgnmail.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Smith, Michael Alan" <michael.smith@pnl.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	192	10/7/2009 9:46:48 AM
Teleconference Summary 091709 - Levy - Final.doc	73722	
Teleconference Summary 092409- Levy- Final.doc	69626	

Options

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

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

Discussion Topic

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?
- Owing to this teleconference PEF has agreed to provide
 - Synopsis of regulatory requirements
 - Description of the current modeling underway for floodplains compensation
 - List of FLUCCS cover types
 - Link to SWFWMD compensation
 - Contact information for Hank Higginbotham with SWFWMD

Other

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

Paul Snead (PEC)
Scott Freeman (CH2M Hill)
Lorin Young (CH2M Hill)
Joseph Pavletich (PEC)
Jamie Hunter (CH2M Hill)
Amy Windhom (CH2M Hill)

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

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

Discussion Topic

Introductions

Levy County Environmental Review

- Terrestrial Ecology Clarifications
 - Progress Energy provided clarifications to the attached listed of terrestrial ecology clarification requests.
 - As a result of these discussions, Progress Energy agreed to provide the following:
 1. Confirm whether or not it is possible to determine if Treeless Hydric Savanna has been disturbed by forest management activities or is a natural Florida cover type.
 2. Clarify the difference between the “Area” impact and the “Estimated Clearing” impact in Table 2.4.1-3-005.
 3. Confirm whether previous pdf figures provided for Attachments 2.4.1-3A, 2.4.1-3D & 4.3.1-1A were derived from the August 31, 2009 GIS files supplied to the NRC (i.e., that these pdf’s reflect the most current map files available)
- Groundwater Modeling
 - NRC and PNNL provided a summary of their conference call with SWFWMD. As a result of these discussions, NRC will be sending PEF an additional RAI regarding calibration of the DWRM2 TMR model. PEF will contact SWFWMD and inquire about the calibration suggestions that were mentioned to the NRC and PNNL during their call with SWFWMD.

Other

- Next Teleconference: TBD
- Participants on Teleconference (September 24, 2009):

Paul Snead (PEC)	Michelle Moser (NRC)
Scott Freeman (CH2M Hill)	Mark McBride (NRC)
Lorin Young (CH2M Hill)	Henry Jones (NRC)
Joseph Pavletich (PEC)	Hosung Ahn (NRC)
Chris Peterson (CH2M Hill)	Michael Smith (PNNL)
Jamie Hunter (CH2M Hill)	Rajiv Prasad (PNNL)
Bill Marsh (CH2M Hill)	Vince Vermeul (PNNL)
Jeff Lehen (CH2M Hill)	Bill Baber (ISL/ICF)
	Cecilia Harper (USEPA)
	Paul Gagliano (USEPA)
	Ramona McConney (USEPA)