

PMLevyCOLPEm Resource

From: Bruner, Douglas
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2009 8:17 AM
To: Snead, Paul
Cc: Moser, Michelle; LevyCOL Resource
Subject: Teleconference Agenda 103009 - Levy
Attachments: Teleconference Agenda 103009 - Levy.doc

Paul,

Attached is the agenda/discussion for Friday's teleconference. My understanding is that PEF may need to consult with the SWFWMD prior to responding to the floodplains compensation issues. Hopefully there is enough time for PEF to work through these issues by Friday. If not, I can set up a subsequent teleconference. I will be sending out call in information later this week. Please give me a call if you have questions.

Doug

Hearing Identifier: Levy_County_COL_Public
Email Number: 500

Mail Envelope Properties (44CD2E65B0FF0E499CB32BC30CF781F069E36C1F)

Subject: Teleconference Agenda 103009 - Levy
Sent Date: 10/28/2009 8:16:41 AM
Received Date: 10/28/2009 8:17:06 AM
From: Bruner, Douglas

Created By: Douglas.Bruner@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Moser, Michelle" <Michelle.Moser@nrc.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	454	10/28/2009 8:17:06 AM
Teleconference Agenda 103009 - Levy.doc		51706

Options

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

**Teleconference Agenda with PEF
Levy COLA
October 30, 2009, 1:00 PM EDT**

Discussion Topic

Introductions

Levy County Environmental Review

- RAI 5.2.2-4 - Status of providing calibrated DWRM2 TMR model results that consider local scale conditions and the goodness of fit between simulated and observed hydraulic heads in the vicinity of the LNP site.
- RAI 2.4.1-3 - USACE/USEPA field inspection of wetlands delineation for blowdown pipelines identified potential impact to 25 acres of salt marsh, which was not identified for the USACE public notice. PEF response, NPD-NRC-2009-203 (page 14), indicates that 4.5 acres of saltwater marsh would be impacted. Provide clarification on the impact to salt marsh.
- Per 10 CFR 51.45, "The draft environmental impact statement will list all Federal permits, licenses, approvals, and other entitlements which must be obtained in implementing the proposed action and will **describe the status** of compliance with those requirements." NRC will seek assistance from PEF in confirming the status of compliance for Federal permits, licenses, approvals, and other entitlements.

General

- RAI General – 1 (June 23, 2009), staff requested color figures from the CH2M Hill Sampling Report; TMEM-087. The PDF of this report provided as an RAI response includes all figures in black and white, and they are of poor visual quality.

Provide files of figures that reproduce clearly in both black-and-white and color, and that can be modified as necessary by our GIS experts and graphic specialists, as specified below. For non-GIS figures, i.e., those that are drawn or otherwise created by graphic designers, provide "original" files, such as, native-platform vector files, working layered Photoshop files, Illustrator files, Cad files, Freehand files, etc. In addition, provide high-resolution (300 dpi) editable PDFs in both black-and-white and color for each figure. These files are needed because the website version of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be in color, while hard copies are printed in black-and-white. For GIS figures, provide shapefiles. Provide the following figures in the format described above:

CH2MHill Technical Memo 338884-TMEM-087 (CH2MHill, 2009, Sampling Report for Crystal River Energy Complex (CREC):

- 2-1 (CFBC Aquatic Sampling Locations),
- 2-2 (CREC Aquatic Sampling Stations),
- 2-3 (OWR Aquatic sampling Locations)

Terrestrial

- Table 2.4.1-3-005 (pages 17 -19 of the 9-3-09 supplemental response) indicates that transmission line impacts would occur to Cypress-Pine-Cabbage Palm (Segment 1),

Sand Pine (Segments 4 & 5), Xeric Oak (Segments 4 & 5), and Live Oak (Segment 4) cover types. Yet the baseline conditions for the off-site corridors (Table 2.4.1-3-002, pages 6-8 of the 9-3-09 supplemental response) do not list these cover types as occurring in the off-site facilities corridors. The Golder 2008 report (USACE Environmental Resource Permit Application for the Transmission Corridors Associated with the Levy Nuclear Plant) does list these cover types as being present in the off-site corridors. So this would suggest that the error is with the baseline conditions table (Table 2.4.1-3-002). The sand pine and xeric oak cover types provide suitable habitat for several federal and state listed plants and animals, so resolution of this discrepancy is needed.

- The Hardwood Conifer Mixed cover type (FLUCCS 434) appears to occur twice in Table 2.4.1-3-002 (on page 7 of the 9-3-09 supplemental response). The second repeat is named Upland Mixed Coniferous/Hardwood, but is identified as FLUCCS 434. There is no FLUCCS cover type named Upland Mixed Coniferous/Hardwood in the FDOT (1999) FLUCCS manual. Can the acreage for Upland Mixed Coniferous/Hardwood (FLUCCS 434) be combined with Hardwood Conifer Mixed (FLUCCS 434), or is there an error (e.g., Upland Mixed Coniferous/Hardwood [FLUCCS 434] should actually have been a different FLUCCS cover type).
- Baseline conditions Table 2.4.1-3-002 identifies two FLUCCS plantation cover types on the off-site corridors (page 7 of the 9-3-09 supplemental response) - an abundant acreage of Tree Plantations (FLUCCS 440), and a much lesser acreage of Coniferous (Pine) Plantations (FLUCCS 441). The plantation impacts due to the transmission lines (Table 2.4.1-3-005 - pages 17 -19 of the 9-3-09 supplemental response) are identified as Coniferous Plantations (FLUCCS 441). [Note the impacts for Segments 1-4, which represent transmission lines up to the first substation, exceed the amount of Coniferous Plantations identified as available in these segments in Table 2.4.1-3-002.] The plantation impacts for the off-site corridors excluding the transmission lines (Table 2.4.1-3-004 - pages 14 & 15 of the 9-3-09 supplemental response) are identified as Tree Plantations (FLUCCS 440). If PEF can confirm that all of the plantation cover types that lie within the off-site corridors are planted to pine, then the NRC will consolidate all plantation categories into the Coniferous Plantations (FLUCCS 441) cover type for the Draft EIS. Most managed forest stands in this region are planted to pine, but hardwood stands are occasionally planted. If PEF cannot confirm this, the NRC will consolidate the plantation categories into the Tree Plantations (FLUCCS 440) cover type which would encompass all plantation types.
- Column 4 of Table 4.3.1-1-002 from the 6-12-09 RAI supplemental response (page 94) provides the acreage of FLUCCS cover types that lie within the LNP site vicinity (i.e., a 6-mile radius). A quick examination of the accompanying figure (031 Attachment 4.3.1-1B – FLUCCS Habitat Types in Vicinity of LNP site) identifies substantial areas of Residential, Low Density (FLUCCS 110) and Residential, Medium Density (FLUCCS 120) cover types not accounted for in Table 4.3.1-1-002. Numerous other inconsistencies are noted between the table and figure (i.e., FLUCCS cover types in the table not shown on the figure; FLUCCS cover types shown on the figure not represented in the table). Please explain these discrepancies and provide a revised table or figure as warranted.

Floodplains Compensation

- The Floodplain Evaluation Bounding Analysis (Rev. 1) was revised to address Historic Basin Storage (HBS) by modifying Tables 4 and 5, and by revising Table 6. No clarifying discussion or definition of HBS is provided in the Bounding Analysis text; however, limited discussion is provided under Item 1 of PEF's 10/9/09 RAI supplemental response (page 4). Justify why the relevance of HBS to the issue of floodplain encroachment and compensation is not discussed in the Rev. 1 Bounding Analysis text. It seems that the HBS is estimated by subtracting the average ground elevation from the bottom of floodplain storage with a minimum of 0.5 ft. However, this rule does not agree with several HBS values reported in Table 4 of Rev 1. Provide a clear definition of HBS, supplemented by illustrations.
- The FLUCCS compensation table provided under Item 2 of PEF's 10/9/09 RAI supplemental response (page 4), and Table 6 (Volume of Estimates for Potential Compensation Locations) provided on page 24 of the Rev. 1 Bounding Analysis both identify about 322 acres of potential floodplain compensation area available to offset floodplain encroachment. This area is less than half of the 707 acres of potential floodplain compensation area that was identified for the Rev. 0 Bounding Analysis (also page 24). However, Figure 7 identifying the location of the compensation areas is exactly the same for the Rev. 0 and Rev. 1 Bounding Analyses (both located on page 25 of their respective versions). Does Figure 7 of the Rev. 1 Bounding Analysis accurately portray the location of the potential floodplain compensation areas identified under Item 2 of PEF's 10/9/09 RAI supplemental response and Table 6 of the Rev. 1 Bounding Analysis?
- Isolated floodplain units J1, K1, L1, P1, Q1, R1, S1, V1, B2, and C2 are excluded from the estimation of floodplain encroachment volume provided in the Rev. 1 Bounding Analysis. Based upon NRC staff conversations with FDEP and SWFWMD personnel, this exclusion appears to be in error, at least for estimation of HBS. Justify why it is not necessary to compensate for the loss of HBS incurred from the fill of isolated floodplain units. Have all upland HBS losses been adequately accounted and compensated for in the Rev. 1 Bounding Analysis?
- The Rev. 1 Bounding Analysis states that 6 inches (0.5 feet) was assumed to be the minimum depth of fill for both floodplain units (page 5, first paragraph) and HBS units (footnote to Table 4, page 14). However, Table 5 (page 19) appears to show 3 instances where "Depth of Fill in Floodplains" was less than 0.5 feet. If these represent errors, provide revised estimates for Floodplain Fill Volume and HBS Volume. It also appears that the column 7 from Table 4 was brought into Table 5 as column 7. However, these two columns do not match in the two tables. Please explain.
- Explain how "Bottom of Value Used" was calculated for each compensation area in Table 6 of the Rev. 1 Bounding Analysis (page 24).
- Referencing Section 4.0 (Compensation Results) of the Rev. 1 Bounding Analysis, it is stated that 257.9 acre-feet of compensating storage is needed to offset encroachment (page 23). Why is compensation for HBS encroachment (another 62.2 ac-ft) not included in this estimate? At a minimum, would not 320.1 ac-ft (257.9 + 62.2) of compensating storage be required? And compensation requirements could be higher, depending upon issues associated with revisions to account for minimum depths of fill

and HBS within isolated floodplain units, as described previously. It is stated under Section 4.0 (Compensation Results) of the Rev. 1 Bounding Analysis that 257.9 acre-feet of compensating storage is needed to offset encroachment (page 23). Why is compensation for HBS encroachment (another 62.2 ac-ft) not included in this estimate? At a minimum, would not 320.1 ac-ft (257.9 + 62.2) of compensating storage be required? And compensation requirements could be higher, depending upon issues associated with revisions to account for minimum depths of fill and HBS within isolated floodplain units, as described previously.

- The Rev. 1 Bounding Analysis does not demonstrate that “there is sufficient upland area on-site to provide cup-for-cup floodplain compensation” (page 23). Table 6 (page 24) identifies 316.4 ac-ft of estimated volume available for compensation. As noted above, a minimum of 320.1 ac-ft of compensation storage would likely be required, and this could be higher. No surplus compensation is available should site surveys of these candidate areas determine that some of these upland habitats are not low quality, or that threatened or endangered species are present (e.g., gopher tortoise).

Other

- Next Teleconference: TBD
- Participants on Teleconference (October 22, 2009):

Bob Kitchen (PEC)	Doug Bruner (NRC)
Arun Kapur (PEC)	Michelle Moser (NRC)
Jim Nevill (PEC)	Andy Kugler (NRC)
Rick Zeroko (CH2M Hill)	Barry Zalcman (NRC)
Jamie Hunter (CH2M Hill)	Peyton Doub (NRC)
Bill Marsh (CH2M Hill)	Michael Smith (PNNL)
Scott Freeman (CH2M Hill)	Linda Fassbender (PNNL)
Lorin Young (CH2M Hill)	Rajiv Prasad (PNNL)
Charlie Uhlarik (CH2M Hill)	Bill Baber (ISL/ICF)
Kyle Turner (McCallum-Turner)	Don Hambrick (USACE)
Susan Smiley (McCallum-Turner)	Cecilia Harper (USEPA)
Doug Schlagel (McCallum-Turner)	