

February 2, 2009

MEMORANDUM: Stephanie Coffin, Chief
AP1000 Projects Branch 1
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

FROM: Ravindra G Joshi, Sr. Project Manager **/RA/**
AP1000 Projects Branch 1
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

SUBJECT: TRIP REPORT – November 17-19, 2008, HYDROLOGY SITE VISIT
IN SUPPORT OF THE VIRGIL C. SUMMER NUCLEAR STATION
UNITS 2 AND 3 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

This report summarizes the NRC trip to the V. C. Summer Nuclear Station (VCSNS) Units 2 and 3 site and surrounding area during the period of November 17-19, 2008, to support the hydrology review of the VCSNS Units 2 and 3 combined license application (COLA). The morning of November 17, the staff met with the applicant at the New Nuclear Deployment building near the Summer site and was given a tour of the site. The staff viewed key hydrologic features of the site including: the Monticello Reservoir, Fairfield Pumped Storage Facility, proposed locations for containments and cooling towers for VCSNS Units 2 and 3, Parr Reservoir, the watersheds draining away from the proposed site, and a tour of the terrain around the area of the proposed Units 2 and 3. The staff returned to the New Nuclear Deployment offices to resume meetings from the afternoon of November 17 through November 18, 2008. A subgroup of hydrogeologists took a second site tour late morning on November 18, 2008 to view the unnamed creek southwest of Unit 3 and Mayo Creek east of Units 2 and 3.

In the afternoon of November 17 through November 18, 2008, the staff met with the applicant for VCSNS Units 2 and 3 and its consultants. Discussions over the period of November 17 and 18, 2008, focused primarily on topics (information needs) associated site flooding, groundwater, surface water and potential subsurface pathways available for radionuclide transport due to accidental releases.

The attendance list for the site visit is provided in Enclosure 1. The purpose of the trip was for the staff to visit the site to aid the staff in the review of Section 2.4 of the VCSNS Units 2 and 3 COLA. The site visit allowed the staff and South Carolina Electric & Gas Company (SCE&G) to discuss the information needs that had been sent prior to the site visit and to observe features that are discussed in the VCSNS Units 2 and 3 COLA. In Enclosure 2 the list of information needs provided by the staff to SCE&G prior to the visit is presented and augmented with a summary of the information provided by SCE&G and the associated disposition of each topic. After the audit, all but 11 of the 33 information needs were RESOLVED. Each UNRESOLVED information need will result in one or more Request for Additional Information (RAIs). The staff returned to the New Nuclear Deployment building on the afternoon of November 19, 2008, to discuss with the

S. Coffin

- 2 -

applicant and their contractor, some of the applicant's responses to information needs that the applicant needed more time to consider.

Enclosure 3 contains presentation materials that SCE&G provided during the site visit. Enclosure 4 contains photos from excavation of VCSNS Unit 1 (information needs item1).

Docket Nos.: 52-027 and 52-028

Enclosures:
As stated

S. Coffin

- 2 -

applicant and their contractor, some of the applicant's responses to information needs that the applicant needed more time to consider.

Enclosure 3 contains presentation materials that SCE&G provided during the site visit. Enclosure 4 contains photos from excavation of VCSNS Unit 1 (information needs item1).

Docket Nos.: 52-027 and 52-028

Enclosures:
As stated

Distribution:

PUBLIC	KSee	LGoldin, OGC	HJones
RidsNroDnrlNwe1	RJoshi	MSpencer, OGC	HAhn
RidsNroDnrlNwe2	RidsNroOd	RRaione	LAKGoldstein
RidsAcrsAcnwMailCenter	RidsNroDser	RidsRgn2MailCenter	RidsOgcMailCenter
RidsNroDnrl	RidsNrrOd	RidsNro	

ADAMS ACCESSION NO. ML083890563 - Ltr. ML083480073 – Pkg *via email

OFFICE	LA:NRO:DNRL:NWE1	DSER:RHEB	PM:DNRL:NWE1	BC: DNRL:NWE1
NAME	KGoldstein	*KSee	RJoshi	SCoffin
DATE	12/ 16 /08	12/ 10 /09	12/ 17 /09	02/02/09

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Summer 11/17—11/19 Hydrology Site Visit
List of Attendees

Name	Organization	Title	11/17 Site visit	11/17 PM	11/18 AM	11/18 PM	11/19 PM
Amy M. Monroe	SCE&G	Licensing Engineer	x	x	x	x	x
Jamie LaBorde	SCE&G	Sr. Engineer Design	x	x	x	-	x
Henry Jones	NRC	Hydrologist	x	x	x	x	-
Hosung Ahn	NRC	Hydrologist	x	x	x	x	-
Ravi Joshi	NRC	Project Manager	x	x	x	x	-
Ken See	NRC	Hydrologist	x	x	x	x	x
Lance Vail	PNNL	Hydrologist	x	x	x	x	x
Steve Summer	SCANA Services	Env. Technical Lead	x	-	-	-	-
Mark Williams	PNNL	Hydrologist	x	x	x	x	x
Garrett Day	Bechtel	Hydrologist	x	x	x	x	x
Angelos Findickakis	Bechtel	Hydrologist	x	x	x	x	x
Courtney Smyth	Bechtel	Licensing Engineer	-	x	x	x	x
Yifan Zheng	Bechtel	Hydrologist	x	x	x	x	x
Yonas Kinfu	Bechtel	Hydrologist	x	x	x	x	x
Kit Ng	Bechtel	Hydrologist	x	x	x	-	x
Jan Renfro	Bechtel	Project Manager	-	-	-	x	x
Dan Patton	Bechtel	Project Engineer	-	-	-	x	x

x—indicates individual was present at this portion of the meeting

Serial #	FSAR Section	Information Needs
1	2.4.12 & 2.4.13	<p>Provide for staff review photos or other materials from excavation of Unit 1 to provide understanding of subsurface environment</p> <p><i>The applicant provided a set of photographs from Unit 1 excavation. These photographs are included as part of the trip report and will therefore be docketed.</i></p> <p>Based on information presented at the site audit this information need is RESOLVED.</p>
2	2.4.12 & 2.4.13	<p>Provide for staff review the following reports: Mactec 2006 "Results of Geotechnical Exploration and Testing, SCE&G COL Project, V.C. Summer Nuclear Station" Mactec 2007 "Kd Distribution Coefficient Test" Report by SRNL, WSRC-STI-2007-00244, May 2007.</p> <p><i>The applicant stated that this information is in part 11 of the COLA. The applicant further stated that the FSAR will be updated to update the appropriate year of referenced document. The applicant proposed the following approach to address this information need:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The three (3) groundwater calculations developed for the preparation of FSAR 2.4.12 and FSAR 2.4.13 will be made available for NRC reviewer audit.</i> • <i>Computer program inputs files (AQTESOLV) will be released for NRC reviewer use.</i> • <i>Information on the potential use of chelates & complexants will be provided.</i> <p>Based on information presented at the site audit this information need is UNRESOLVED.</p> <p>Staff expect to prepare an RAI on the potential use and release to the groundwater of chelating / complexation agents that could impact the sorption of radionuclides.</p> <p>Staff expect to prepare an RAI requesting the AQTESOLV input files that were used for the analysis of the slug tests to be docketed.</p>
3	2.4.12 & 2.4.13	<p>Provide a subject matter expert (SME) to describe aquifer testing and analysis.</p> <p><i>The applicant stated that no large scale pumping tests in the area of the proposed unit 2 and 3 site were done. The applicant is not aware of any groundwater models for the site or the area.</i></p>

		<p><i>The applicant proposed to provide the rationale for the selection of the 75th percentile of hydraulic conductivity of saprolite / lower bedrock zone as a conservative value. The applicant proposed to perform a sensitivity analysis for the hydraulic conductivity value to check the effect on groundwater pathway travel time and concentration transport analyses.</i></p> <p><i>The applicant proposed the following approach to address this information need:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Provide an expanded discussion for the selection of the 75th percentile of hydraulic conductivity as a conservative value.</i> • <i>Further discuss the sensitivity of this parameter to site groundwater pathway travel time and to the concentration transport analyses.</i> <p>Based on information presented at the site audit the large-scale pumping test information need request is RESOLVED and the identification of groundwater models information need is RESOLVED.</p> <p>The issue of conservative hydraulic conductivity values used in the FSAR is UNRESOLVED. Staff expect to prepare an RAI on the selection and use of conservative hydraulic conductivity values from the aquifer test results.</p>
4	2.4.12	<p>Provide an SME to discuss occurrence of springs/seeps in the area and other features that may be indicative of larger-scale, interconnected fractures/joints (e.g. subtle trellis drainage pattern in area as noted in FSAR, occurrence of diabase dikes, bedding planes, geophysical surveys)</p> <p><i>The applicant stated that seeps and springs are controlled by flow through the saprolite and partially weathered rock and located consistent with the topography of the ground surface and bedrock. These features are consistent with the wetlands delineation. The applicant stated that the wetland figure will be docketed. The applicant has observed seeps in the headlands area of the unnamed creek southwest of proposed unit 3.</i></p> <p>Based on information presented at the site audit this information need is RESOLVED, once the wetland figure has been docketed.</p>
5	2.4.12	<p>Provide a map showing the locations and pumping rates of nearby groundwater supply wells</p> <p><i>The applicant presented a 'sensitive' map from the state (South Carolina) showing the location and pumping rates of public supply wells in the area.</i></p>

		<p><i>The applicant proposed the following approach to address this information need:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The applicant will review federal and state public accessible well databases for any updated information since submittal of the COLA.</i> • <i>COLA discrepancies between the State and EPA well databases will be investigated and the FSAR will be updated as appropriate.</i> • <i>Unit 1 well records and local property maps will be reviewed to postulate the location of private groundwater wells within the vicinity of the site. The location of these wells to site hydrogeologic conditions will be evaluated as appropriate.</i> • <i>The applicant will review the state Water Plan for updates. Historical groundwater use in the site vicinity and regional setting will be evaluated. A plausible future groundwater use scenario for the local site region will be presented. This will be discussed and evaluated to determine the effects (if any) to construction and operation of Units 2 & 3. Surface water is the predominant source of water for this region.</i> <p>Based on information presented at the site audit this information need is UNRESOLVED. Staff expect to prepare three RAIs for the following information needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resolve discrepancies between State and EPA public water supply well databases. - Provide information on the locations and pumping rates for private wells in the area. - Provide information on the future groundwater use in the area.
<p>6</p>	<p>2.4.12 & 2.4.13</p>	<p>Provide an SME to discuss possible eastward pathways toward Mayo Creek.</p> <p><i>The applicant stated that they expect to describe the process used to determine the alternative conceptual models for the site and the data evaluation process implemented to determine the plausible site hydrogeologic conceptual model(s) presented in the COLA. Additionally:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The applicant expects to clarify the discussion concerning potential pathways in the saprolite / shallow bedrock zone.</i> • <i>The applicant expects to clarify the discussion concerning potential pathways in the deep bedrock zone.</i> <p>Based on information presented at the site audit this information need is UNRESOLVED. Staff expects to submit two RAIs</p>

		related to possible eastward pathways in (1) the saprolite/upper bedrock zone and (2) the deep bedrock zone.
7	2.4.12 & 2.4.13	<p>Provide an SME to discuss impact of post-construction / operational setting on water table elevations (site grading including infilling on east below cooling towers, removal of saprolite/shallow bedrock zone, hydraulic properties and use of common fill and structural fill, changes in surface recharge) and pathways.</p> <p><i>Recharge is expected to be decreased due to engineered site drainage and impervious surfaces at the proposed power block areas. The applicant proposed the following approach to address this information need:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The applicant expects to discuss the hydrogeologic material properties for the proposed engineered fill and regular fill. The discussion will reference FSAR Section 2.5.4 that presents a conceptual excavation and construction approach for the power block areas.</i> <i>The material properties and the proposed site drainage and surface coverage are expected to be discussed to present a post-construction conceptual model and the expected effects on water table elevation, groundwater flow paths, and concentration transport analyses.</i> <p>Based on information presented at the site audit, this information need is UNRESOLVED. The staff expects to prepare an RAI on the impact of the post-construction / operational setting on water table elevations (site grading including infilling on east below cooling towers, removal of saprolite/shallow bedrock zone, hydraulic properties and use of common fill and structural fill, changes in surface recharge) and subsurface pathways. This would include descriptions of changes in site grading, land cover, recharge rates, and fill material properties.</p>
8	2.4.12	<p>Provide an SME to discuss impact of drought in the area the past few years and earlier in the decade on 2006-2007 water level monitoring from site.</p> <p><i>The applicant discussed the following approach that they expect to use to address this information need:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The applicant expects to present a long term, historical precipitation trend through 2007 or as appropriate. Regional groundwater level data may be evaluated to determine if the data can be used to provide a comparison of long-term precipitation data trends to those of regional and site specific groundwater level measurements.</i> <i>Available historical Unit 1 surface and groundwater level measurements are expected to be evaluated to</i>

		<p><i>determine if a data set can be identified for comparison to the precipitation and regional ground level trends.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Available post 2007 site groundwater level measurement data may be evaluated to determine if the data can be used for further correlation of the local and regional groundwater level trends and the precipitation trend.</i> • <i>The impact of droughts and excessive wet years may be evaluated from the available data trends to verify or adjust the maximum groundwater level identified for the proposed Units 2 & 3 power block area.</i> <p>Based on information presented at the site audit, this information need is UNRESOLVED. Staff expect to prepare an RAI on expanding the precipitation and long term water level trends presented in the FSAR to include the time period of the Units 2 and 3 water level monitoring period (i.e., June 2006 to June 2007).</p>
9	2.4.13	<p>Provide for staff's review all calc packages associated with assessment in 2.4.13 of FSAR.</p> <p><i>The applicant provided the calculation packages for review during the onsite audit. The applicant is working on establishing opportunities for further staff audits of these documents.</i></p> <p>Based on information presented at the site audit, this information need is UNRESOLVED (pending establishment of Reading Rooms).</p>
10	2.4.13	<p>Provide an SME to discuss why a pathway through the bedrock zone was not fully evaluated.</p> <p><i>The applicant stated that the upper part of bedrock is the predominant pathway for water movement. As depth increases in the bedrock the conductivity and porosity decreases considerably. The applicant proposes the following approach to be used to address this information need:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Summarize the regional bedrock geologic evaluation presented in FSAR 2.5.1, 2.5.2, and 2.5.3. Cross-reference as appropriate.</i> • <i>Summarize the site specific geologic and geotechnical evaluation presented in FSAR 2.5. Review site specific borehole information for data relevant to hydrogeologic rock properties and fracture analyses.</i> • <i>Revisit state well and geologic databases for updated information on local bedrock conditions.</i> • <i>Update hydrogeologic parameter estimates for geotechnical units (i.e.; saprolite, PWR{partially weathered rock}, bedrock) as appropriate.</i> <p>Based on information presented at the site audit, this information need is UNRESOLVED. The staff expects to prepare an RAI for</p>

		evaluation of potential groundwater pathways through the bedrock zone.
11	2.4.13	<p>Provide an SME to discuss possibility of deeper groundwater flow pathways that may not be intercepted by local streams adjacent to Units 2 and 3 (i.e. intercepted by water supply wells).</p> <p>Linked to #10. Based on information presented at the site audit, this information need is RESOLVED (Linked).</p>
12	2.4.13	<p>Provide an SME to discuss impact of post-construction / operational setting on groundwater pathways (site grading including infilling on east below cooling towers, removal of saprolite/shallow bedrock zone, hydraulic properties and use of common fill and structural fill, changes in surface recharge).</p> <p>Linked to #7. Based on information presented at the site audit, this information need is RESOLVED (Linked).</p>
13	2.4.13	<p>Provide an SME to discuss uncertainties in effective porosity estimate used</p> <p><i>The applicant proposed the following approach to address this information need:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Expand the discussion for the selection of the effective porosity estimate presented in FSAR 2.4.12.</i> • <i>Discuss the sensitivity of site groundwater pathway travel time and nuclide concentrations to this parameter.</i> <p>Based on information presented at the site audit, this information need is UNRESOLVED. The staff expects to prepare an RAI to describe the basis and uncertainties of the effective porosity values used in the transport analysis.</p>
14	2.4.13	<p>Provide an SME to describe the process used to determine that the conceptual model for the transport processes is the most conservative plausible conceptual model.</p> <p><i>The applicant proposed the following approach to address this information need:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The applicant will describe in greater detail the process used to determine the alternative conceptual models for the site and the data evaluation process implemented to determine the plausible site hydrogeologic conceptual model presented in the COLA (linked to #6). The applicant will clarify the discussion concerning potential pathways in the saprolite / shallow bedrock zone. The applicant will clarify the discussion concerning potential pathways in the deep bedrock zone.</i> • <i>Discuss potential receptors and the process used to select the receptor in the analyses. This will include a discussion of the onsite creeks and seeps, saprolite/PWR/rock interfaces, site boundaries. Validate</i>

		<p><i>the selection of the receptor through review of public access points, downstream water users, and SCE&G controls.</i></p> <p>Based on information presented at the site audit, this information need is UNRESOLVED. Staff expect to prepare an RAI to describe the processes used to identify the plausible conceptual models for transport and the selection of the most conservative plausible conceptual models that are assessed.</p>
15	2.4.1	<p>Provide a map clearly showing the locations and elevation of all safety related structures and the maximum water surface elevation at these locations.</p> <p><i>Applicant referred the staff to figures 220 -223 in section 2.5.4 of FSAR. HEC-RAS calc package contains the maximum WSE. The applicant provided CALCs –25242-K-009 Rev 1 (Bechtel calc) "Site Drainage Calculations" for audit by the staff.</i></p> <p>Linked to 17. Staff requests the HEC-RAS input files (RESOLVED).</p>
16	2.4.2.1 & 2.4.3.3	<p>Provide for staff's review all calculation packages related to the use of weir equations and coefficients used for Parr Reservoir water level calculations</p> <p><i>The applicant provided CALCs –25242-K-009 Rev 1 (Bechtel calc) "Site Drainage Calculations"; CALC-25242-K-003 Rev1 "Estimation of PMF Elevations" for staff audit.</i></p> <p>This issue is RESOLVED.</p>
17	2.4.2	<p>Provide for staff's review of HEC-RAS input files and topographic maps showing locations of cross-sections used in the model.</p> <p><i>The applicant provided CALCs –25242-K-009 Rev 1 (Bechtel calc) "Site Drainage Calculations" for staff audit.</i></p> <p>This issue is RESOLVED.</p>
18	2.4.2/2.4.6	<p>Provide an SME to discuss landslide induced floods.</p> <p><i>The applicant will consider revising FSAR Subsection 2.4.2.2 to include a discussion on landslide flooding to indicate that the channel slopes along the Broad River appear to have relatively gentle gradient and well-developed alluvial deposits, which suggests that there is little likelihood of slope failures. Also, the granitic rock around Monticello Reservoir has no potential failure planes that dip toward the reservoir which in combination with the typically flat and gentle topography around the reservoir precludes the possibility of slope failures and landslide-induced flooding that could impact the safety functions of the plant.</i></p>

		This issue is RESOLVED.
19	2.4.2.2.	Provide an SME to discuss the structures (dike) that would control the elevation in Monticello Reservoir. <i>The applicant provided site tour to clarify site topography and layout.</i> Based on site visit this issue is RESOLVED.
20	2.4.2.3	Provide for staff's review all calculation packages associated with assessment in 2.4.2.3 of FSAR (Effects of Local Intense Precipitation) including the Rational Method runoff rates. <i>The applicant provided CALCs –25242-K-002 Rev 1 (Bechtel calc)"Estimation of PMP for Broad River, Frees Creek and Local Site Area" and CALCs –25242-K-009 Rev 1 (Bechtel calc)"Site Drainage Calculations" for staff audit.</i> This issue is RESOLVED.
21	2.4.3	Provide for staff's review all calculation packages associated with assessment in 2.4.3 of FSAR. <i>The applicant provided CALCs –25242-K-002 Rev 1 (Bechtel calc)"Estimation of PMP for Broad River, Frees Creek and Local Site Area", CALC-25242-K-003 Rev1 "Estimation of PMF Elevations" and CALC-25242-K-004 Rev1 "GIS Analysis in Support of Hydrologic Calculations" for staff audit.</i> Linked to 16. This issue is RESOLVED
22	2.4.3	Provide calculation packages associated with the Broad River Unit Hydrograph Development including the HEC-1 model. <i>The applicant provided CALCs –25242-K-001 Rev 1 (Bechtel calc)"Validation of 1940 unit hydrograph used in the UFSAR for Unit 1" for staff audit.</i> This issue is RESOLVED.
23	2.4.3	Provide calculation packages associated with the Frees watershed PMF calculation and wind-generated wave setup. <i>The applicant provided CALCs –25242-K-002 Rev 1 (Bechtel calc)"Estimation of PMP for Broad River, Frees Creek and Local Site Area" and CALC-25242-K-003 Rev1 "Estimation of PMF Elevations" for staff audit.</i> This issue is RESOLVED.
24	2.4.3	Provide for staff's review the HEC-HMS model used to develop the PMF for Broad River. <i>The applicant provided CALC-25242-K-003 Rev1 "Estimation of PMF Elevations" for staff audit.</i>

		This issue is RESOLVED.
25	2.4.3	<p>Provide an SME to discuss the unit loss rate of 0.06 in/hr.</p> <p><i>The applicant provided CALCs –25242-K-001 Rev 1 (Bechtel calc) "Validation of 1940 Unit Hydrograph used in the UFSAR for Unit 1" and CALC-25242-K-003 Rev1 "Estimation of PMF Elevations" for staff audit, and described the additional peaking of the 1940 hydrograph. The applicant will consider providing the results of a sensitivity run with a zero constant loss rate that will demonstrate that the PMF level in the vicinity of the site would increase by approximately 3 ft to about EL. 294 ft NAVD88. This flood level would pose no concern of adverse safety impact to the plant considering the design plant grade for safety-related facilities for Units 2 and 3 is much higher at El. 400 ft NAVD88.</i></p> <p>This issue is UNRESOLVED. The staff expects to prepare an RAI regarding the justification of the loss rate.</p>
26	2.4.3	<p>Provide an SME to discuss the accuracy of the local topographic information.</p> <p><i>The applicant stated that overflow from the reservoir will not impact the proposed units 2 and 3 site.</i></p> <p>This issue is RESOLVED.</p>
27	2.4.4	<p>Provide for staff's review a copy of the following report: SCE&G, Dam Safety Analysis for Fairfield Pumped Storage Facility, FERC Project No. 1894, prepared by Post, Buckley, Schuh and Jernigan, Inc., 1990.</p> <p><i>The applicant provided a copy of this publically available report.</i></p> <p>This issue is RESOLVED.</p>
28	2.4.4.3	<p>Provide for staff's review all calculation packages associated with assessment in 2.4.4.1 thru 2.4.4.3 of the FSAR.</p> <p><i>The applicant provided CALC-25242-K-004 Rev1 "GIS Analysis in Support of Hydrologic Calculations" CALC-25242-K-005 Rev1 "Evaluation of Potential Dam Failures (Seismically Induced)" for staff audit. The applicant stated that they will consider revising the FSAR Subsection 2.4.4.1 item (1) to indicate that the likelihood for the two flood peaks (from Clinchfield and from Monticello) arriving coincidentally at Parr Shoals Dam is considered extremely remote.</i></p> <p>This issue is RESOLVED.</p>
29	2.4.4.4	Request copy of Reference 223 (Dam Safety Analysis for Fairfield Pumped Storage Facility)

		<p><i>The applicant provided a copy of this publically available document.</i></p> <p>This issue is RESOLVED.</p>
30	2.4.7	<p>Provide Monticello Reservoir and Broad River water temperatures discussed in FSAR 2.4.7.</p> <p><i>The applicant provided CALC-25242-K-007 Rev1 "Low Water Temperatures and Ice Effects" for staff audit.</i></p> <p>This issue is RESOLVED.</p>
31	2.4.11	<p>Provide an SME to discuss data and procedures for computation of low flows in rivers and streams.</p> <p><i>The applicant provided CALC-25242-K-008 Rev1 "Low Flows in the Broad River" for staff audit.</i></p> <p>This issue is RESOLVED.</p>
32	2.4.11.5	<p>Provide SME to explain significance of assuming that FERC requirement for Unit 1 will be the same for Units 2 and 3.</p> <p><i>The applicant stated that the FERC license regulates the pool elevations of the two reservoirs and minimum flows downstream of Parr hydro and will have no bearing on the operation of the existing or proposed new units. The applicant stated that the FSAR will be modified to include new language addressing this issue.</i></p> <p>Based on information presented at the site audit this issue is RESOLVED.</p>
33	2.4.13.1.2.4	<p>Provide an SME to discuss dilution calculations in Broad River.</p> <p><i>The applicant provided CALC-25242-K-019 Rev 1 "Radionuclide Transport" for staff audit.</i></p> <p>This issue is RESOLVED.</p>

Because the Calc and Data packages provided during the audit were both complex and extensive, the staff stated to the applicant that the staff will need a future opportunity for a more paced and deliberative audit of the Calc and Data packages.