

**Craver, Patti**

---

**From:** Logan, Dennis  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 05, 2012 8:10 AM  
**To:** Grange, Briana; Doyle, Daniel; Krieg, Rebekah  
**Subject:** RE: Columbia NMFS consultation

Dan,

Briana is correct that our ESA and NEPA work often continues on separate schedules. You will see in final SEISs sometimes that the section 7 consultations are continuing at the time the FSEIS is being published. We have a contention on this procedure at Indian Point, but this is how NRC has been doing things. After the FSEIS is published, responsibility for the section 7 consultations shifts from the EPM's branch to RERB, so don't worry about being tied to this.

Also, we know from experience that Domingue and Graves work on their own schedule and rarely return our calls, so nothing new there.

Dennis

---

**From:** Balsam, Briana  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 05, 2012 7:50 AM  
**To:** Doyle, Daniel; Krieg, Rebekah  
**Cc:** Logan, Dennis  
**Subject:** RE: Columbia NMFS consultation

Dan,

I don't know what the next steps should be, but whether we continue consultation with NMFS or do not continue consultation, this shouldn't affect the FSEIS schedule or publication date. There are no statutory requirements to complete consultation under the ESA prior to completing the NEPA process. In a number of cases, we have had consultation draw out much longer than the NEPA process. For instance, Salem's consultation is still ongoing, yet we issued the renewed license for this plant in June 2011.

Briana

---

**From:** Doyle, Daniel  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 04, 2012 7:57 PM  
**To:** Krieg, Rebekah  
**Cc:** Balsam, Briana; Logan, Dennis  
**Subject:** RE: Columbia NMFS consultation

Becky,

Try this link:  
<http://adamswebsearch2.nrc.gov/webSearch2/main.jsp?AccessionNumber='ML11335A127'>

Dan

---

**From:** Krieg, Rebekah [mailto:rebekah.krieg@pnnl.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 04, 2012 7:51 PM

**To:** Doyle, Daniel; Logan, Dennis  
**Cc:** Balsam, Briana  
**Subject:** RE: Columbia NMFS consultation

I'm not able to access the letter in ADAMS. Do you think it might not have cleared the ADAMS "waiting period"?

---

**From:** Doyle, Daniel [mailto:Daniel.Doyle@nrc.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 04, 2012 3:21 PM  
**To:** Logan, Dennis; Krieg, Rebekah  
**Cc:** Balsam, Briana  
**Subject:** RE: Columbia NMFS consultation

Dennis and Becky,

The NRC response letter to NMFS was signed out on 12/20/11 (ML11335A127). Several days before it was sent, I called and left messages with Ritchie Graves and Rich Domingue giving them a heads up that our letter was coming. I haven't heard back from them.

What happens now? Do you want to call or email them again or should I? Do we need a response from them?

My main reason for asking is to determine the impact on publication of the final SEIS.

Dan

---

**From:** Balsam, Briana  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 30, 2011 11:26 AM  
**To:** Doyle, Daniel  
**Cc:** Logan, Dennis; Krieg, Rebekah  
**Subject:** RE: Columbia NMFS consultation

Okay, thanks, Dan. It's not essential that you put that in the summary. It would just be nice to people to point back to that in the future in the event that we need to!

---

**From:** Doyle, Daniel  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 30, 2011 11:22 AM  
**To:** Balsam, Briana  
**Cc:** Logan, Dennis; Krieg, Rebekah  
**Subject:** RE: Columbia NMFS consultation

Briana,

I called back and left him a voicemail asking him to confirm that NMFS does not intend to provide the NRC with EFH conservation recommendations.

He will be out until Monday, 12/5 so I will follow up with him then. I'll let you know when I hear back from him.

Dan

---

**From:** Balsam, Briana  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 30, 2011 11:10 AM  
**To:** Doyle, Daniel; Logan, Dennis; Krieg, Rebekah  
**Cc:** Wrona, David; Imboden, Andy  
**Subject:** RE: Columbia NMFS consultation

Dan,

Did Richie Graves mention anything about EFH Conservation Recommendations? I am assuming he did not since he said that NMFS does not plan to send us another letter.

You might want to rephrase the last sentence:

“NMFS does not intend to send another letter addressing the essential fish habitat assessment or provide the NRC with EFH Conservation Recommendations.”

This addition will help clarify that our responsibility to respond to NMFS within a particular timeline per the EFH regulations does not apply in this case because NMFS did not send us specific conservation recommendations.

Briana

---

**From:** Doyle, Daniel  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 30, 2011 9:28 AM  
**To:** Logan, Dennis; Krieg, Rebekah  
**Cc:** Balsam, Briana; Wrona, David; Imboden, Andy  
**Subject:** RE: Columbia NMFS consultation

I am submitting a record of conversation into ADAMS. Here is the current text...let me know if you have any comments or revisions:

*Daniel Doyle contacted Ritchie Graves regarding the NRC's consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) for the Columbia Generating Station License Renewal Environmental Review. Mr. Doyle asked about the status of NMFS's response to the NRC letter dated August 23, 2011 (ADAMS Accession Number ML11165A023). He noted that the NRC had already received a letter from NMFS dated October 24, 2011 (ADAMS Accession Number ML11307A393), but that the letter only addressed the NRC's biological assessment but did not address the NRC's essential fish habitat assessment.*

*Ritchie Graves acknowledged that the NMFS letter dated October 24, 2011, failed to address the NRC's essential fish habitat assessment. He stated that NMFS believes that the concerns expressed in the October 24, 2011, letter about the biological assessment are identical to the concerns for the essential fish habitat assessment. He also stated that the resolution of the concerns about the biological assessment would likely resolve NMFS concerns about the essential fish habitat. NMFS does not intend to send another letter addressing the essential fish habitat assessment.*

Dan

---

**From:** Logan, Dennis  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 29, 2011 8:27 AM  
**To:** Doyle, Daniel; Krieg, Rebekah  
**Cc:** Balsam, Briana; Wrona, David; Imboden, Andy; Subin, Lloyd  
**Subject:** RE: Columbia NMFS consultation

Dan,

By the way, I don't know if you noticed, but the title of ML11307A393, is wrong and misleading:

“Comment (44) of William W. Stelle, on Behalf of National Marine Fisheries Service, Opposing Proposed License Renewal for Energy Northwest's Columbia Generating Station.”

Perhaps someone with owner's rights can change it.

Regarding a response, although I talked to Rich Domingue, he obviously did not talk to Richie Graves. We have had to send other regional NMFS offices letters clarifying NRC's responsibilities, and we will use one of those as a basis of our reply here.

Dennis

---

**From:** Doyle, Daniel  
**Sent:** Monday, November 28, 2011 5:00 PM  
**To:** Logan, Dennis; Krieg, Rebekah  
**Cc:** Balsam, Briana; Wrona, David; Imboden, Andy; Subin, Lloyd  
**Subject:** RE: Columbia NMFS consultation

Dennis and Becky,

I still have not seen anything from NMFS about the Columbia EFH assessment. We received a letter from NMFS dated 10/24/11 stating that they do not concur with the conclusion in the BA but that was regarding the ESA Section 7 consultation. They didn't mention the EFH assessment.

I called Rich Domingue today at 503-231-6858 but got his voicemail and did not leave a message. As stated in the letter, he is the POC for the ESA consultation. I also called Ritchie Graves at 503-231-6891 and talked to him for a few minutes. He said he would look into it and get back to me. I'll let you know if I hear anything.

Date	Description	ADAMS #
8/23/2011	NRC letter to NMFS re: BA and EFH assessment	ML11165A023
10/24/2011	NMFS letter to NRC re: non-concurrence on BA	ML11307A393

Please let me know if you think we need to do anything else about the EFH consultation right now.

Also, please let me know how you plan to respond to the NMFS letter about the BA.

Thanks,

Dan

---

**From:** Doyle, Daniel  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 01, 2011 11:11 AM  
**To:** Logan, Dennis; 'Krieg, Rebekah'; Subin, Lloyd  
**Cc:** Wrona, David  
**Subject:** Columbia NMFS consultation

Dennis, Becky, and Lloyd,

I just received the attached letter from NMFS today about Columbia. They do not concur with the determination in the BA:

*Therefore, NMFS does not concur with your determination that the proposed action is not likely to adversely affect Upper Columbia River spring Chinook salmon and steelhead and is not likely to modify or destroy designated critical habitat.*

I will follow up with you to determine our next steps.

Thanks,

Dan Doyle

Project Manager  
Division of License Renewal  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
[daniel.doyle@nrc.gov](mailto:daniel.doyle@nrc.gov)

(301) 415-3748