

PMTurkeyCOLPEm Resource

From: Kugler, Andrew
Sent: Wednesday, February 09, 2011 6:38 AM
To: Craig Tepper
Cc: TurkeyCOL Resource
Subject: RE: Environmental Review of the FPL Proposal for Turkey Point Units 6 and 7

Mr. Tepper

Thank you for your email. I hope your recovery from the surgery is going well.

In response to your question, we always consider aesthetic and visual impacts in our NEPA evaluation of environmental impacts. But I will pass your comment on to my reviewers to make sure they're aware of this specific concern.

Our EIS review will include consideration of mitigation measures as appropriate, including measures that may be proposed by the applicant or identified by other resource agencies. However, given the nature of our regulatory authority, which is focused on nuclear safety, we would expect that implementation of mitigation measures associated with air quality and visibility would be managed (and, if necessary, enforced) by the agency that will issue the permits for the plant emissions. In this case I believe that would be the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. In this regard, FPL addressed visual impairment in Appendix 10.2.5 to its Site Certification Application under Florida's Power Plant Siting Act. This appendix can be viewed at:

http://publicfiles.dep.state.fl.us/Siting/Outgoing/FPL_Turkey_Point/Units_6_7/Application/SCA%20Appendix%2010.2_Federal%20Permit%20Applications%20or%20Approvals/SCA%20APPENDIX%2010.2.5_Air%20Construction%20Permit%20App%20and%20PSD%20Repo.pdf

See Section 7.4 of that appendix.

We're following the progress of the State's review of that application even as we work on our own review. At the moment, the State's review is still in the stage of evaluating the completeness of the Site Certification application. Depending on the timing of other permitting actions, we may not know at the time the final EIS is issued what mitigation will be formally imposed by other permitting authorities. However to the extent that specific mitigation has been established by other permitting authorities before we finish writing our EIS, we'll generally discuss such mitigation and its expected effects in the EIS.

I hope this answers your question, at least to the extent that I can answer it.

Andrew Kugler
Sr. Environmental Project Manager
NRC/NRO/RAP2
301-415-2828

From: Craig Tepper [mailto:CTepper@semtribe.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 08, 2011 8:53 AM
To: Kugler, Andrew
Cc: Willard Steele; Stan Rodimon
Subject: RE: Environmental Review of the FPL Proposal for Turkey Point Units 6 and 7

Mr. Kugler,

I do not know if you remember, but I received your emails below in November and December, 2010 while I was recovering from knee replacement surgery. As I work for the Seminole Tribe of Florida – Environmental Resource Management Department, I know this question may be a little late, but I would like to know if the proposed atmospheric emissions from the Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 will contribute to the Regional Haze – State Implementation Plans for southeast Florida when operational. Probably, the USEPA would classify this project as a point source and the distance to two National Parks is not great for the potential of decreasing the visibility of the Park's vistas through increased atmospheric Haze. How would this be mitigated, if found to be an impact? At this time, I do not have any other questions concerning the Turkey Point project.

I will copy Mr. Steele, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, on this email to remind him of your project and other upcoming project reviews this month. Please keep me abreast of this and other requested consultations required by the USNRC at the following:

Craig D. Tepper
Director
Environmental Resource Management Department
Seminole Tribe of Florida
6300 Stirling Road
Hollywood, Florida 33024
954-965-4380 extension 10631
ctepper@semtribe.com

Thank You,
Craig Tepper

From: Kugler, Andrew [mailto:Andrew.Kugler@nrc.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 01, 2010 9:26 AM
To: Craig Tepper
Subject: RE: Environmental Review of the FPL Proposal for Turkey Point Units 6 and 7

Thank you, Mr. Tepper. I look forward to working with you.

I hope things go well with the physical therapy. Our Scoutmaster had one of his knees replaced last year. He had put it off for years. But he's really happy with the outcome - it greatly improved his mobility. I hope you're results are equally good.

Andy Kugler

From: Craig Tepper [mailto:CTepper@semtribe.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 01, 2010 9:16 AM
To: Kugler, Andrew
Subject: Re: Environmental Review of the FPL Proposal for Turkey Point Units 6 and 7

Mr. Kugler,
Thank you for the email and attachment/web site document. I will review them in the next few days and get back to you. I think we can communicate by email or phone without the need of travel.

I am currently recovering from a Total Knee Replacement and just starting Physical Therapy, learning to walk again. I will try to meet your deadlines as best as possible.

Thank You,
Craig Tepper

From: Kugler, Andrew [mailto:Andrew.Kugler@nrc.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, November 30, 2010 07:25 AM
To: Craig Tepper
Cc: TurkeyCOL Resource <TurkeyCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>; Clouser, Megan L SAJ <Megan.L.Clouser@usace.army.mil>
Subject: Environmental Review of the FPL Proposal for Turkey Point Units 6 and 7

Mr. Tepper

I'm the environmental project manager for the NRC staff's review of an application from FPL for licenses to build and operate 2 new nuclear units at the existing Turkey Point site near Homestead, Florida. FPL also applied for a related permit from the US Army Corps of Engineers and Megan Clouser is my counterpart at the Corps of Engineers. The Corps is working with the NRC to develop a single environmental impact statement to address both requests from FPL.

We met in October with Mr. Steele and members of his staff to discuss consultation for this project under the National Historic Preservation Act. But in the wake of that meeting we've realized that we should also be talking to you and your Environmental Resources Management Department.

I know you've been contacted by NRC staff regarding a proposed nuclear project in Levy County, Florida. The review for Turkey Point isn't as far along. We completed scoping in August and we're developing specific questions we plan to ask FPL. The current schedule for the review is to issue the draft environmental impact statement in October 2011, and the final version in October 2012.

Information regarding the project is available on the NRC website at:

<http://www.nrc.gov/reactors/new-reactors/col/turkey-point.html>

Documents available from this page include the application itself, a portion of which (Part 3) is the environmental report.

Working from the assumption that your department would want to be informed regarding the progress of the NRC staff's environmental review, I would propose to add you (or a member of your staff) to our mailing list. You can receive documents in paper form, electronically, or both. Please let me know the name of the person to add, and your preference regarding the way you'll receive documents.

If it would be helpful to you, we could also meet with you and/or members of your staff to describe the project and answer questions. If you'd be interested in such a meeting, please let me know. Because I'm in Maryland, and members of my team are in various locations, we'd need to plan far enough ahead to make travel arrangements.

I look forward to talking with you and your staff regarding our review.

Andrew Kugler
Sr. Environmental Project Manager
NRC/NRO/RAP2
301-415-2828

Hearing Identifier: TurkeyPoint_COL_Public
Email Number: 208

Mail Envelope Properties (94A2A4408AC65F42AC084527534CF416443209D6FB)

Subject: RE: Environmental Review of the FPL Proposal for Turkey Point Units 6 and 7
Sent Date: 2/9/2011 6:37:32 AM
Received Date: 2/9/2011 6:37:37 AM
From: Kugler, Andrew

Created By: Andrew.Kugler@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"TurkeyCOL Resource" <TurkeyCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Craig Tepper" <CTepper@semtribe.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	7824	2/9/2011 6:37:37 AM

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