

PSEGESPEnvDocsPEm Resource

From: Kuntzleman, Nancy
Sent: Monday, June 01, 2015 2:58 PM
To: Fetter, Allen
Cc: Miracle, Ann L (ann.miracle@pnnl.gov)
Subject: FW: PSEG ESP Biological Assessment Call on January 26
Attachments: 01262015 Call Record with NMFS app.doc

Hi Allen:

Did you ever get an ML # for the phone conversation record with Julie Crocker? I looked in ADAMS and could not find it.

Thank you,
Nancy

P.S. I have a couple of questions for you in the draft supplemental BA that I sent to you and Ann early this morning.

From: Kuntzleman, Nancy
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 12:12 PM
To: Fetter, Allen
Subject: FW: PSEG ESP Biological Assessment Call on January 26

Hi Allen:

Ann requested that you enter this phone call record into ADAMS. It is TN4209 in the reference database.

Thank you,
Nancy

Nancy Kuntzleman
Aquatic Biologist

Division of Site Safety and Environmental Analysis
Office of New Reactors
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
301-415-2313
nancy.kuntzleman@nrc.gov

From: Kuntzleman, Nancy
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2015 8:55 AM
To: Fetter, Allen
Subject: FW: PSEG ESP Biological Assessment Call on January 26

Hi Allen:

I think Gary should receive a copy of this phone call record before he discusses the PSEG ESP “pre-construction” with Julie Crocker, NMFS. I sent an email to Ann this morning to find out if the record now has a TN.

V/R,
Nancy

Nancy Kuntzleman
Aquatic Biologist

Division of Site Safety and Environmental Analysis
Office of New Reactors
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
301-415-2313
nancy.kuntzleman@nrc.gov

From: Miracle, Ann L [<mailto:Ann.Miracle@pnnl.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2015 2:11 PM
To: Kuntzleman, Nancy
Cc: Fetter, Allen; Saulsbury, Bo (saulsburyjw@ornl.gov)
Subject: RE: PSEG ESP Biological Assessment Call on January 26

Changes accepted.

I will add it to the references and get a TN for it. We need to have it submitted for an ML# as well.

Ann Miracle, Ph.D.
Staff Scientist
Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

From: Kuntzleman, Nancy [<mailto:Nancy.Kuntzleman@nrc.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2015 10:33 AM
To: Miracle, Ann L
Subject: FW: PSEG ESP Biological Assessment Call on January 26

Hi Ann:

Please make revisions provided by Julie.

Thank you,
Nancy

From: Julie Crocker - NOAA Federal [<mailto:julie.crocker@noaa.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2015 11:51 AM
To: Kuntzleman, Nancy
Subject: Re: PSEG ESP Biological Assessment Call on January 26

a few edits/additions.

Thanks for the opportunity to review.

Julie

On Mon, Jan 26, 2015 at 4:04 PM, Kuntzleman, Nancy <Nancy.Kuntzleman@nrc.gov> wrote:

Hi Julie:

Thank you for your time this afternoon! Ann prepared a call summary for the project file. Please review and provide any comments or concur.

V/R,

Nancy Kuntzleman

US NRC

NRO/DSEA/RENV/RWET

301-415-2313

--

Julie Crocker
Protected Resources Division
Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office
(formerly Northeast Regional Office)
National Marine Fisheries Service
55 Great Republic Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930
(978)282-8480

Hearing Identifier: PSEG_Site_ESP_EnvDocs_Public
Email Number: 78

Mail Envelope Properties (d3c7355d73bd45f79624efe721066b9a)

Subject: FW: PSEG ESP Biological Assessment Call on January 26
Sent Date: 6/1/2015 2:58:03 PM
Received Date: 6/1/2015 2:58:05 PM
From: Kuntzleman, Nancy

Created By: Nancy.Kuntzleman@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Miracle, Ann L (ann.miracle@pnnl.gov)" <ann.miracle@pnnl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Fetter, Allen" <Allen.Fetter@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQPWMSMRS03.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3397	6/1/2015 2:58:05 PM
01262015 Call Record with NMFS app.doc		110138

Options

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



Phone/Conference Call Record

Project/Plant: PSEG

Date: January 26, 2015

Time: 11:30 PST/2:30 EST

Attendees:

Name	Title	Agency/Organization
Nancy Kuntzleman	Aquatic Ecologist	NRC
Julie Crocker	Fishery Biologist	NMFS Greater Atlantic Regional Office, Protected Resources Division
Ann Miracle	Aquatic Ecologist	PNNL

Call title/subject: Clarification of ESA information needed for consultation

Purpose of call: Discuss NMFS letter sent to NRC on November 12, 2014 regarding BA and information still needed to complete consultation

Call notes:

Discussion and resolution of the following BA Comments:

Nancy provided a description of the ESP license process and the limitations of providing an assessment using only plant parameter envelope (PPE) information. Without a final reactor design, some important information related to operation cannot be determined at this time. Nancy suggested that NRC could describe the action as thus, and indicate that if the applicant pursues a construction permit (CP) and an operating license (OL) or a combined license (combined construction permit and operating license [COL]), consultation would be reinitiated to discuss those effects in a new BA.

- Julie agreed that providing this distinction and the need to assess operation effects in another BA would be appropriate. The first consultation would include an assessment of effects that are “reasonably certain to occur.” Without the reactor design selected, we expect there will be some operational effects that are not known at this time. Reinitiation of the anticipated 2015 consultation or carrying out a new consultation would be necessary to consider effects of operations once there is sufficient information such that those effects are reasonably certain to occur.

NRC proposed to better define the action for the ESP and provide a more in-depth discussion of effects from site preparation activities in order to address specific NMFS comments related to protected species. These activities include timing of in-water work, analysis of noise effects from pile-driving, better descriptions of dredging and dredging impacts, species avoidance measures during in-water work, and details regarding barging activities during construction and the potential for adverse effects. In addition, NRC would provide clarification between NEPA cumulative effects and cumulative effects in relation to ESA consultation.

- Julie agreed that addressing these comments would be appropriate for consultation on the ESP.

NRC asked how NMFS would like to receive this updated information.

- Julie suggested a supplement or additional information document format would be appropriate, and a resubmission of the entire BA was not necessary.

NRC and NMFS discussed a timeline for submission of the supplemental or additional information. NRC will be attending a permit application meeting sponsored by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on February 24th and will discuss those site preparation activities that require additional details from the applicant in order to complete consultation. A timeline will be provided to NMFS following the outcome of that meeting. NMFS understands that NRC and USACE anticipate the ESA consultation on the ESP being completed prior to the USACE's issuance of any permits authorizing site preparation and/or construction activities.