

From: ^{OFC} Stephen Koenick ^{NRR}
 To: Catherine Marco; Christopher Grimes; Duke Wheeler; Janice Moore; Michael Masnik; Robert Schaaf; Stephen Hoffman; William Reckley
 Date: Thu, Dec 6, 2001 5:19 PM
 Subject: Re: St. Lucie - LRA ^{OFC}

To the addressed,

To followup with the days activity with respect to docketing the St. Lucie License Renewal Application, I have summarized our activities in the attachment.

The last item is to document our activities via a memo from myself to C. Grimes.

Please let me know if anyone has any questions.

Stephen S. Koenick
 Project Manager
 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 voice: 301 415-1239
 email: ssk2@nrc.gov

>>> William Reckley 12/06/01 12:40PM >>> ^{NRR}
 Good catch and sorry I missed that. I would suggest that we get the licensee to send us a new page with that sentence removed such that we do not need to do any redactions. (If we have an electronic copy, we can do it and coordinate with them on what is being done). If we dont have an electronic copy, all they have to do is email us the new page to insert into the report and have them revise the copies the distributed. Lets get them on the phone ASAP.

>>> Stephen Koenick 12/06/01 12:08PM >>> ^{NRR}
 Gentlemen

Bob was looking at the ER and pointed out that while FPL did not use latitude/longitude in their application, they *did* provide the "Universal Transverse Mercator" coordinates to the midpoint of the site. From the attached file, it states that you could located coordinates for an accuracy of +/- 10 meters. Do we need to redact that information?

I subsequently had a discussion with Steve Hale, Jack Hoffman and Tom Abatello. The result of our conversation was as follows:

FPL did perform an internal review of the application and ER prior to issuance. Using the issued guidance, they removed the longitude/latitude description and modified the plant description on netting in the intake cooling water tunnel. They did state that they included the "Universal Transverse Mercator"

In addition, they performed an internal review to generate a redacted copy (this copy was not issued). Using the general criteria, they would have redacted some site maps and portions of the SAMA section. They were in agreement that, in of itself, this information would not supply the necessary information to be deemed "sensitive"

With respect to availability, they confirmed they put the application and ER in the former LPDR, the Indian River Community College. The drawings and FSAR are not available. Steve mentioned that they did review the material that was available and certain documents were pulled. I assume Mike will follow this one up.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Y-10