

SeabrookNPEM Resource

From: Wentzel, Michael
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2011 3:58 PM
To: Cliche, Richard
Subject: Draft Phone Call Summary
Attachments: 032111, Telecon Summary Between NRC and NextEra Seabrook, Clarifying the Seabrook Environmental RAI Responses (TAC No. ME3959).docx

Rick,

Attached is a draft summary of today's phone call. Please review and let me know if you have any comments.

Thanks,
Mike

Michael Wentzel
Project Manager
NRR/DLR/RPB1
(301) 415-6459
michael.wentzel@nrc.gov

Hearing Identifier: Seabrook_License_Renewal_NonPublic
Email Number: 1030

Mail Envelope Properties (C0A338EE37A11447B136119705BF9A3FC37D75459F)

Subject: Draft Phone Call Summary
Sent Date: 3/21/2011 3:58:05 PM
Received Date: 3/21/2011 3:58:05 PM
From: Wentzel, Michael

Created By: Michael.Wentzel@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Cliche, Richard" <Richard.Cliche@fpl.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	298	3/21/2011 3:58:05 PM
032111, Telecon Summary Between NRC and NextEra Seabrook, Clarifying the Seabrook Environmental RAI Responses (TAC No. ME3959).docx		
		40628

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

LICENSEE: NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC

FACILITY: Seabrook Station

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON MARCH 21, 2011, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND NEXTERA ENERGY SEABROOK, LLC, TO CLARIFY THE RESPONSES TO THE REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW OF THE SEABROOK STATION LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NO. ME3959)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC (NextEra or the applicant), held a telephone conference call on March 21, 2011, to clarify information in the applicant's responses to the staff's requests for additional information (RAIs) concerning the environmental review of the Seabrook Station license renewal application (LRA). The telephone conference call was useful in clarifying the information provided in NextEra's RAI responses.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains a list of issues sent to the applicant prior to the phone call to facilitate preparation for the phone call, including a brief description on the status of each item.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

Michael Wentzel, Project Manager
Projects Branch 1
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-443

Enclosures:
As stated

cc w/encls: Distribution via Listserv

LICENSEE: NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC

FACILITY: Seabrook Station

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON MARCH 21, 2011, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND NEXTERA ENERGY SEABROOK, LLC, TO CLARIFY THE RESPONSES TO THE REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW OF THE SEABROOK STATION LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NO. ME3959)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC (NextEra or the applicant), held a telephone conference call on March 21, 2011, to clarify information in the applicant's responses to the staff's requests for additional information (RAIs) concerning the environmental review of the Seabrook Station license renewal application (LRA). The telephone conference call was useful in clarifying the information provided in NextEra's RAI responses.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains a list of issues sent to the applicant prior to the phone call to facilitate preparation for the phone call, including a brief description on the status of each item.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

Michael Wentzel, Project Manager
Projects Branch 1
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-443

Enclosures:
As stated

cc w/encls: Distribution via Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:

See next page

ADAMS Accession No.:

OFFICE	LA:DLR	PM:RPB1:DLR	BC: RPB1:DLR
NAME		MWentzel	BPham
DATE	3/ /11	3/ /11	3/ /11

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Memorandum to NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC from M.Wentzel dated March XX, 2011

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON MARCH 21, 2011, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND NEXTERA ENERGY SEABROOK, LLC, TO CLARIFY THE RESPONSES TO THE REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW OF THE SEABROOK STATION LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION (TAC NO. ME3959)

DISTRIBUTION:

HARD COPY:

DLR RF

E-MAIL:

PUBLIC

RidsNrrDir Resource

RidsNrrDirRpb1 Resource

RidsNrrDirRpb2 Resource

RidsNrrDirRarb Resource

RidsNrrDirRapb Resource

RidsNrrDirRasb Resource

RidsNrrDirRerb Resource

RidsNrrDirRpob Resource

MWentzel

BPham

MMoser

DLogan

EMiller

ICouret, OPA

EDacus, OCA

MSpencer, OGC

WRaymond, RI

DTift, RI

NMcNamara, RI

NSheehan, RI

DScrenci, RI

JJohnson, RI

ABurritt, RI

**TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL
SEABROOK STATION LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION**

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
March 21, 2011

PARTICIPANTS

Michael Wentzel
Michelle Moser
Dennis Logan
Richard Cliche
Edward Carley
Al Legendre
Paul Geoghegan

AFFILIATIONS

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
NRC
NRC
NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC. (NextEra)
NextEra
NextEra
Normandeau Associates

Aquatic Ecology Clarifications for Seabrook Station

1. Clarify whether blank cells within Table 4-6 of NAI (2010) should be treated as “0” (e.g. Seabrook collected samples, but did not identify any fish of the particular species), as suggested by EPA (2002).

Discussion: *The applicant clarified that blank cells within Table 4-6 of NAI (2010) should be treated as “0.”*

2. Clarify why NAI (2010) (Table 4-6) and NextEra’s response to RAI #2 (for aquatic ecology) report different entrainment estimates for Atlantic cod, cunner, fourbeard rockling, goosefish, lumpfish, and winter flounder than U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (2002) (Table G3-6) from 1990-1998. Entrainment estimates for other species were similar among NAI (2010) and EPA (2002), as long as blank cells in Table 4-6 (NAI 2010) are treated as “0.”

Discussion: *The applicant explained that in the response to the staff’s RAIs, egg entrainment estimates for Atlantic cod included portions of the following categories: Atlantic cod, Atlantic cod/haddock, and Gadidae/witch flounder.*

NextEra assured the NRC that the data provided to EPA was the same entrainment data from 1990-1998, which is described in NextEra’s environmental monitoring report from 2009 (NAI 2010). NextEra felt it was inappropriate to speculate how EPA used the data provided in Seabrook monitoring reports to determine entrainment rates in EPA (2002). After EPA published its case study (EPA 2002), the applicant sent comments to EPA stating that EPA seemed to combine numerous species under a single species category (North Atlantic 2002).

Additional Information: *In EPA’s response to the applicant’s comment, EPA stated that its methodology, “used species aggregation to reduce the total number of distinct species requiring individual parameter sets because of the lack of life history data for many species, particularly survival rates of early life stages. EPA believes that the aggregations are reasonable and do not introduce significant biases.” (EPA 2004a).*

3. Clarify why NAI (2010) (Appendix Table 4-3) report different impingement estimates for Atlantic cod, Atlantic herring, fourbeard rockling, lumpfish, red hake, sculpin spp., killifish, threespine stickleback, windowpane, and winter flounder than EPA (2002) (Table G3-2) from 1994-1998. Impingement estimates for other species were the same among NAI (2010) and EPA (2002).

Discussion: *The applicant assured the NRC that the data provided to EPA was the same impingement data from 1994-1998, which is described in NextEra’s environmental monitoring report from 2009 (NAI 2010). NextEra felt it was inappropriate to speculate how EPA used the data provided in Seabrook monitoring reports to determine impingement rates in EPA (2002). After EPA published its case study (EPA 2002), the applicant sent comments to EPA stating that EPA seemed to combine numerous species under a single species category (North Atlantic 2002). In addition, the applicant noted in its comments to EPA that EPA (2002) reported numerical errors for impingement estimates of Atlantic cod, fourbeard rockling, and threespine stickleback (North Atlantic 2002).*

Additional Information: See additional information in Question #2 for EPA's response to species aggregations.

References cited:

Normandeau Associates Inc (NAI). 2010. Seabrook Station 2009 Environmental Monitoring in the Hampton – Seabrook Area: A Characterization of Environmental Conditions. Prepared for NextEra Energy Seabrook, LLC.

North Atlantic Energy Service Corporation (North Atlantic). 2002. Letter from John B. Hart, North Atlantic Energy Service Corporation to EPA, Cooling Water Intake Structure (Existing Facilities - Phase II) Proposed Rule Comment Clerk-W-00-32. *Seabrook Station Comments on Proposed Rule on Cooling Water Intake Structures for Phase II Existing Facilities*. April 7, 2002.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2002. Case Study Analysis for the Proposed Section 316(b) Phase II Existing Facilities Rule. EPA-821-R-02-002. Office of Water. Washington, DC.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2004a. CWA Section 316(b) Phase II Existing Facility Rule—Final; Large existing electric generating plants, Response to Public Comment. March 29, 2004. Office of Water. Washington, DC.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2004b. EPA's Phase II—Large existing electric generating plants, Final Rule - Regional Analysis Document for the Final Section 316(b) Phase II Existing Facilities Rule, Part C: North Atlantic. EPA-821-R-02-003; February 12, 2004. Office of Water. Washington, DC.