

From: [Uribe, Juan](#)
To: [Bowman, Yolanda](#); [Cho, Esther](#)
Subject: RE: RE: Palo Verde Flood Hazard Reevaluation Report (FHRR)
Date: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 2:10:55 PM

Hi Esther/Yolanda,

Can you please help me upload the following email in ADAMS and make it publically available?

I have performed a SUNSI review.

Thanks

From: Michael.Dilorenzo@aps.com [<mailto:Michael.Dilorenzo@aps.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 1:58 PM
To: Uribe, Juan <Juan.Uribe@nrc.gov>
Cc: Carl.Stephenson@aps.com; Thomas.N.Weber@aps.com; Michael.Powell@aps.com;
Warren.H.Jones@aps.com; Paul.Hom@aps.com; Hamid.Mortazavi@aps.com
Subject: [External_Sender] RE: RE: Palo Verde Flood Hazard Reevaluation Report (FHRR)

Juan, per your request, here is a more explicit statement regarding the Hassayampa River surface water elevation (see below). Please let me know if you need further information.

Mike DiLorenzo
PVNGS Licensing Section Leader
623-393-3495 (office)
623-262-0432 (cell)

Regarding the Palo Verde Flood Hazard Reevaluation Report (FHRR), the Hassayampa River surface water elevation of 942.0 ft NGVD29 was not omitted from the FHRR due to security Safeguards or confidential information purposes. As a result, the value can be made publically available and does not need to be withheld.

From: Michael.Dilorenzo@aps.com [<mailto:Michael.Dilorenzo@aps.com>]
Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2015 4:35 PM
To: Uribe, Juan
Cc: Carl.Stephenson@aps.com; Thomas.N.Weber@aps.com; Michael.Powell@aps.com;
Warren.H.Jones@aps.com; Paul.Hom@aps.com; Hamid.Mortazavi@aps.com
Subject: [External_Sender] RE: Palo Verde Flood Hazard Reevaluation Report (FHRR)

Juan,

Please see below the responses from Paul and Warren to the two NRC items. To summarize their responses: 1) the two documents in question have been uploaded to the Electronic Reading Room and 2) the Hassayampa River surface water elevation was not omitted from the FHRR due to security Safeguards or confidential information purposes.

I left you a voicemail on your phone this afternoon letting you know that I am sending this email. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have further questions or need further clarification.

Mike DiLorenzo
PVNGS Licensing Section Leader
623-393-3495 (office)
623-262-0432 (cell)

From: Jones, Warren H
Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2015 9:01 AM
To: Hom, Paul J; Dilorenzo, Michael D
Cc: Stephenson, Carl J; Weber, Thomas N; Powell, Michael E
Subject: RE: Palo Verde Flood Hazard Reevaluation Report (FHRR)

See my responses in **RED** below.

Warren Jones
82-5813

From: Hom, Paul J
Sent: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 3:15 PM
To: Dilorenzo, Michael D
Cc: Stephenson, Carl J; Weber, Thomas N; Jones, Warren H
Subject: RE: Palo Verde Flood Hazard Reevaluation Report (FHRR)

Mike,

Warren provided me the correct attachments and they have been uploaded to the ERR., the filenames are:

Palo Verde FHRR Audit follow up to NRC Conference Call on 8-20-2015 (**response to 1.b below?**)
Palo Verde FHRR Audit follow up to NRC email from 8-26-2015 (**response to 1.a below?**)

I spoke with him this afternoon, and he was in training all morning and was tied up with a security issue this afternoon and was not able to review Juan's email. He said he would look at it tomorrow and validate the responses for the two questions.

Paul

From: Uribe, Juan [<mailto:Juan.Uribe@nrc.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 9:09 AM
To: Dilorenzo, Michael D
Cc: Stephenson, Carl J; Weber, Thomas N; Hom, Paul J
Subject: Palo Verde Flood Hazard Reevaluation Report (FHRR)

Mike,

Based on our discussion last week, I owed you a summary of the NRC question/request that summarized our conversation.

There are two things I am following up with APS:

1. A verification/confirmation regarding the last two ERR docs uploaded correspond to the requests for which they were created since they appear to be duplicate items. For background, the two documents relate to:
 - a. the engineering judgement/technical basis for U2 elevations as derived from U1 and U3 in-situ survey performed to determine elevations
 - b. the correlation (for LIP) regarding the depth values vs. site elevations needed for the NRC MSFHI Tables. The staff is looking for the Max elevations for each unit including information about the flow paths that were excluded (which I believe are solely on the breezeway)

Both documents were added to the ERR in response to request 2A. The document labeled "Palo Verde FHRR Audit, follow up to NRC Conference Call on 8-20-2015" was a clarification to the document labeled "Palo Verde FHRR Audit, follow up to NRC email from 8-26-2015". The clarification was requested since our first attempt in responding to 2A did not provide the maximum surface water elevations of the rainfall runoff in the breezeway.

2. A verification/confirmation about the DB hazard elevation for the Hassayampa River to verify if this value was intentionally omitted from the FHRR for security/ safety related reasons. All other elevations for washes/Rivers were included in the FHRR Section 2.2.2 and/or Table 2-2. If the value can be made public, then the NRC will proceed with the development/issuance of the MSFHI letter in a public forum. If the value is to remain from public domain, then the staff wants to understand the reason and proceed with a redacted table for PV, if applicable.

According to our CLB/DB, the Hassayampa River and Centennial Wash have a topographic ridge that separates them from the site. These drainage basins are, "ephemeral desert streams which flow only with rainfall runoff. These streams are tributaries of the Gila River, which drains most of the southern half of Arizona. " According to UFSAR section 2.4.3, the computer PMF on the Hassayampa river has a surface water elevation at peak discharge of 942 feet, which is well below the crest of the ridge (elevation 975) located between the river and the plant site.

It is not clear as to the reason the Hassayampa River surface water elevation was omitted from the FHRR. It is not due to security Safeguards or confidential information. Perhaps it may be because the Hassayampa River is not a significant flood hazard to the site like the East and Winters Washes are.

Thanks!