

## **PMLevyCOLPEm Resource**

---

**From:** Bruner, Douglas  
**Sent:** Monday, January 25, 2010 4:13 PM  
**To:** Paul Snead  
**Cc:** Leigh, Kimberly D; Smith, Michael Alan; Moser, Michelle; Schaaf, Robert; LevyCOL Resource  
**Subject:** Revised Teleconference Summary - Levy  
**Attachments:** Teleconference Summary\_011410 - Final\_Rev1.doc

Paul,

Revised teleconference summary indicating that information will be provided to NRC as soon as possible.

Doug

**Hearing Identifier:** Levy\_County\_COL\_Public  
**Email Number:** 576

**Mail Envelope Properties** (44CD2E65B0FF0E499CB32BC30CF781F009B17D93CD)

**Subject:** Revised Teleconference Summary - Levy  
**Sent Date:** 1/25/2010 4:13:07 PM  
**Received Date:** 1/25/2010 4:13:16 PM  
**From:** Bruner, Douglas

**Created By:** Douglas.Bruner@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"Leigh, Kimberly D" <Kimberly.Leigh@ pnl.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Smith, Michael Alan" <michael.smith@ pnl.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Moser, Michelle" <Michelle.Moser@ nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Schaaf, Robert" <Robert.Schaaf@ nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"LevyCOL Resource" <LevyCOL.Resource@ nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Paul Snead" <paul.snead@ pgnmail.com>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE Teleconference Summary_011410 - Final_Rev1.doc	132	1/25/2010 4:13:16 PM 40442

**Options**

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

**Teleconference Summary with PEF**  
**Levy COLA**  
**January 14, 2010, 1:00 PM EDT**

## **Introductions**

### **Purpose of the call:**

NRC and Army Corps of Engineers are seeking clarification on technical issues for the Environmental Impact Statement.

### **Category 1 Meeting Summary**

This teleconference is considered a Category 1 meeting. The purpose of a category 1 meeting is to discuss one particular facility or site, for example, technical issues in an application, licensee actions, or inspection results. At this type of meeting, NRC anticipates that the public would obtain factual information to assist in understanding applicable regulatory issues and NRC actions.

The public is invited to observe the meeting and will have the opportunity to communicate with the NRC and Army Corps of Engineers after the business portion of the meeting but before the meeting is adjourned. This plan does not preclude the licensee from responding to questions if it chooses to do so.

## **Discussion Topics**

### **Hydrology**

In PEF's July 29, 2009 supplemental RAI response (PGN RAI#: L-0522- RAI response letter NPD-NRC-2009-166), simulation results were provided that quantified the incremental change in the discharge to 1) rivers and lakes and 2) Big King and Little King Springs attributed to LNP operations. This same information was not provided for the recalibrated model in the December 14 supplemental response (PGN RAI#: L-0561- RAI response letter NPD-NRC-2009-242). Provide comparable estimates of flux for the recalibrated model.

Provide publication quality gray-scale and/or native files for the following figures for the recalibrated model:

PGN RAI#: L-0561- RAI response letter NPD-NRC-2009-242, Figure 2, TMR model grid and adjacent permitted users/springs

PGN RAI#: L-0561- RAI response letter NPD-NRC-2009-242, Figure 31, Simulated incremental SAS drawdown, 60 yrs at 1.58 mgd

PGN RAI#: L-0561- RAI response letter NPD-NRC-2009-242, Figure 17, Model water balance

PGN RAI#: L-0561- RAI response letter NPD-NRC-2009-242, Figure 30, Simulated incremental SAS drawdown, 1 yr at 1.58 mgd

Summary – PEF will provide this information as soon as possible...

### **Terrestrial Ecology**

The following is related to recalibration of the groundwater model to local conditions.

In response to RAI 5.2.2-4, PEF provided a revised groundwater model evaluating the simulated hydrological effects of proposed LNP operational pumping on the groundwater aquifer (see technical memorandum 338884-TMEM-123 authored by CH2MHILL). Under the revised model, potential groundwater drawdown near the wellheads could approach 2.5 feet (30 inches), and a drawdown of 0.5 feet (6 in) could extend up to 3 miles from the wellheads (see Fig 31 of TM 338884-TMEM-123 for simulated drawdown at year 60). This groundwater drawdown zone would encompass much of the LNP site and include many acres of wetlands.

Please provide an assessment of the potential effects of LNP operational pumping on wetlands that lie in and around the wellfield site, and the need for additional wetland mitigation to compensate for any impacts identified. Provide wetland impacts (in acres) according to both FLUCCS cover types (Level 3) and NWI wetland types for each relevant drawdown category (e.g., 0.5 to 1 ft, 1 -2 ft; 2+ ft). Please consider the following issues in this evaluation:

- Wetland delineations have revealed that wetlands near the CFBC are declining in vigor to the point that some may no longer qualify as wetlands. The suspected cause is a local decline in the groundwater table that occurred following construction of the CFBC. Are these wetland changes represented in the delineation maps being prepared for this area? Do these wetland changes affect any areas identified as potential wetland enhancement sites in the BRA (2009) conceptual wetland mitigation plan?
- Many of the wetlands that could be affected by operational pumping lie within areas where wetland mitigation via enhancement is proposed (see BRA 2009). Does operational pumping have the potential to limit or eliminate the use of some wetlands for mitigation?

Summary – PEF understood the request and will provide information on the impacts of drawdown on terrestrial resources and how, if drawdown is greater than anticipated, this may affect the use of some wetlands planned to be used for mitigation. PEF will provide this information as soon as possible.

### **Socioeconomics**

PEF ER (2008, page 5-125) says “Refueling outages will last approximately 25 to 30 days and require approximately 800 additional workers every 18 months.” The ER suggests that these outages should be staggered with CREC outages so the same workers can be used. Are these 800 workers every 18 months for a single unit or for both units?

Summary – Clarification of the scheduling of outages was provided to the callers. One outage is scheduled approximately every nine months at LNP so that outages would not overlap. Additionally, PEF indicated that outages would be coordinated not to overlap with CREC Unit 3.

### **LEDPA/Alternative Sites**

PEF provided a revised LEDPA document in response to RAI USACE-14

Summary – The NRC staff and Corps are still reviewing the information and may have questions later in the process. The Corps is working with the U.S. EPA in reviewing the materials.

## **Open discussions to public**

Dan Hilliard, Cindy Mulkey, and Jim Breman were all specifically asked if they had any comments. None had technical comments.

Thomas Eppes had called earlier requesting information to call into the teleconference. He left a voicemail message indicating that he was not able to access the call. We later connected and I provided a brief summary to him on the topics discussed.

Dan Hilliard also called after the teleconference. He was satisfied to hear that the NRC was evaluating simulated results quantifying incremental change in the discharge to Big King Springs attributed to LNP operations. He mentioned that hydraulic head was not very high in this area and is concerned with cumulative impacts. The Tarmac Mine is nearby. For the next public meeting he mentioned that citizens in the area would like more information on why the plant can't be located at the existing Crystal River facility, chemical discharges to the Gulf from 3 nuclear plants, and the location of the intake structure. He also asked about the environmental schedule and issuance of the DEIS. I stated that the NRC has not reached any conclusions and that the environmental schedule is being revised to include the time necessary to incorporate information. The date for issuance of the DEIS has not been finalized.

## **Participants**

### **PEF**

Paul Snead (PEF)  
Bob Kitchen (PEF)  
Sherri Jacobs (PEF)  
Arun Kapur (PEF)  
Sherri Jacobs (PEF)

### **CH2M Hill**

Amanda Berens (CH2M Hill)  
Lorin Young (CH2M Hill)  
Scott Freeman (CH2M Hill)  
Jeff Lehnens (CH2M Hill)  
Bill Marsh (CH2M Hill)

### **McCallum-Turner**

Kyle Turner (McCallum – Turner)  
Doug Schlagel (McCallum – Turner)

### **NRC**

Robert Schaaf (NRC)  
Douglas Bruner (NRC)

### **PNNL and ISL/ICF**

Michael Smith (PNNL)  
Kimberly Leigh (PNNL)  
Linda Fassbender (PNNL)  
Vince Vermeul (PNNL)  
Bill Baber (ISL/ICF)

### **USEPA**

Paul Gagliano (USEPA)

### **USACE**

Don Hambrick (USACE)

## **Public Participants**

Dan Hilliard (representing Withlacoochee Area Residents)  
Cindy Mulkey (FDEP)  
Jim Breman (FDEP – Florida Public Service Commission)