***Enclosure 1***
***U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Requests for Additional Information (RAIs)***
***Levy Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2***
***Combined Operating License Application***

**Health Physics**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 2.7 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 50.34<br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.7 | Provide the second year of chi/Q data, along with associated revisions to the Environmental Report (ER) Section 2.7 and Table 2.7-58 that would reflect updated values used in GASPAR calculations. | A second year of onsite meteorological data is currently being collected by the applicant. 10 CFR 50.34 requires an analysis and evaluation of the amount of exposure to routine operation from the facility. Regulatory Guide 4.2, "Preparation of Environmental Reports for Nuclear Power Stations," describes that two annual cycles of meteorological data should be provided for an operating license. Only one year of data was provided. Provide the second year of chi/Q data, along with associated revisions to ER Section 2.7 and Table 2.7-58 that would reflect updated values used in GASPAR calculations. |
| 3.3 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.70(b)<br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 3.3<br>ESRP 3.3.1 | Provide a copy of the pending revision to the water balance description and ER Figure 3.3-2 that explains discharge rates and blowdown values. | Provide a copy of the pending revision to the water balance description and ER Figure 3.3-2 that explains discharge rates and blowdown values. During the December 2–5, 2008 site audit, Progress Energy Florida (PEF) acknowledged a pending revision to ER Section 3.3, Plant Water Use. Updated discharge rates and blowdown values are required for the NRC staff to verify estimates of water user dose rates. |

**Health Physics**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 4.5 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.5 | Provide information sufficient to demonstrate the adequacy of radiation protection for construction workers on proposed Unit 2 while proposed Unit 1 is in operation. Verify or correct numerical values in ER subsection 4.5.5. | Preliminary staff calculations resulted in an estimated 0.0756 person-Sv (0.028 mSv $\times$ 2700 workers) for the collective dose compared with 0.088 person-Sv stated in the ER. Verify or correct the 3.6 Sv per year value for average annual dose received from background radiation in ER Section 4.5.5. In addition, verify or correct construction dose estimates in the FSAR Section 12.4. Staff calculated 9.72 person-Sv collective dose from background and manmade radiation compared with the 11.43 person-Sv reported in ER Section 4.5.5. Provide information sufficient to demonstrate the adequacy of radiation protection for construction workers on proposed Unit 2 while proposed Unit 1 is in operation and verify or correct numerical values in ER subsection 4.5.5, as noted above. |
| 5.4.4 – 1<br><br>ESRP 5.4.4 | Provide an updated biota dose analysis and copies of the associated calculation package. | Provide the following in order for NRC staff to verify dose to biota calculations in the ER:<br>• The updated biota dose section (ER Section 5.4.4)<br>• Make calculation package LNG-0000-N5C available for staff, and,<br>• If dose assessment locations have changed for the biota dose section update, then provide copies of the updated GASPAR and LADTAP input/output files. |

**Accidents**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 7.1 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.50(c)<br><br>ESRP 7.1 | Provide source terms by isotope and release period for use in confirming the design basis accident dose calculations. | Provide source terms by isotope and release period for use in confirming the design basis accident (DBA) dose calculations. The confirmation of the DBA dose calculations is required because the NRC review of Revision 17 of the AP1000 design certification application has not been completed and the design is not yet certified. Staff experience from similar situations (i.e., environmental review preceding design certification) has shown that the environmental review should not proceed without verifying the DBA dose calculations because of errors identified in previous applications. |

**Meteorology/Air Quality**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 2.7.5 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 50.34<br>10 CFR 100.20(c)<br><br>ESRP 2.7.5 | Provide a second year of meteorological data (February 1, 2008 - January 31, 2009). | Provide a second year of meteorological data (February 1, 2008-January 31, 2009). 10 CFR 50.34 requires an analysis and evaluation of the amount of exposure to routine operation from the facility. Regulatory Guide 4.2, "Preparation of Environmental Reports for Nuclear Power Stations," states that two annual cycles of meteorological data should be provided for an operating license. Only one year of data was provided. |
| 3.6.3 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 3.6.3 | Describe the air quality impacts of burning cleared vegetation. | Describe the air quality impacts of burning cleared vegetation. 10 CFR 51.71 requires an analysis of the air quality impacts of the proposed action. One such impact would be emissions from prescribed controlled burns used for managing forests on the property. Controlled burns are commonly used to manage forests in the State of Florida. Will prescribed controlled burns be used to help manage forests on the LNP site? If so, what are the anticipated frequency of the burns and the impacts of the burns on air quality? |
| 5.3.3 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 50.34<br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 5.3.3 | Provide CALPUFF and AMS/EPA Regulatory Model (AERMOD) input and output files. | Provide CALPUFF and AMS/EPA Regulatory Model (AERMOD) input (including meteorological data file) and output files, or justify an alternative method. Regulatory Guide 4.7, "General Site Suitability Criteria for Nuclear Power Stations," states that nonradiological atmospheric considerations, including cooling tower plumes, should be described in the ER. |

**Hydrology**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 2.3.1 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.3.1 | Clarify the 100-year floodplain map shown in ER Figure 2.3-11. | ER Figure 2.3-11 shows the 100-year floodplain near the LNP site and vicinity. It is unclear whether the LNP site is inside the 100-year floodplain in ER Figure 2.3-11 due to the poor quality of the figure. Provide a publication-quality figure that is clearly reproducible in black and white as well as an explanation, with references, as to how the 100-year floodplain was determined. Provide an estimate of loss of floodplains due to the construction of LNP facilities and the site grading. Describe how the floodplain loss would be mitigated. |
| 2.3.1 – 2<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.3.1 | Describe instream flow requirements in the Lower Withlacoochee River downstream of the Inglis Bypass Spillway. | With respect to ER Sections 2.3.1 and 5.2.1, describe any instream flow requirements for the Lower Withlacoochee River (downstream from the Inglis Bypass Spillway) and how these requirements would be met. |
| 2.3.1 – 3<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.3.1 | Provide a publicly available reference regarding the Class III waters designation for the Crystal River Energy Complex (CREC) discharge canal and any requirements the LNP blowdown discharge into the CREC discharge canal would need to meet. | With respect to ER Section 2.3.3, provide a publicly available reference that documents the status of the CREC discharge canal as Florida Class III waters. Describe the requirements that the LNP blowdown, proposed to be discharged into the CREC discharge canal, would need to meet. |
| 2.3.1 – 4<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.3.1 | Verify the correct number of boreholes reported in ER Sections 2.3.1.5.3 and 2.6.1.3 and in FSAR Section 2.5.0.4. | Both ER Sections 2.3.1.5.3, Site Groundwater Systems, and 2.6.1.3, Geologic Units, indicate 118 boreholes were advanced during the COL Application field investigations. FSAR Section 2.5.0.4, Stability and Uniformity of Subsurface Materials and Foundations, indicates 118 boreholes; however, FSAR Section 2.4.12.1.2, Site Groundwater Systems, indicates a total of 116 boreholes were advanced during the COL Application field investigations to characterize the subsurface conditions at the LNP 1 and LNP 2 locations. Verify the correct number of boreholes. |

**Hydrology**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 2.3.1 – 5<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.3.1 | Describe the parameter estimation approach for the currently underway reanalysis that uses the MLU model, provide publication-quality graphics showing model fit of test data, and compare transmissivity values obtained from MLU analysis with those used in the SWFWMD DWRM2 TMR model. | During the site audit, PEF stated that the surficial and Floridan aquifer pump test data were being reanalyzed using the Multi-Layer Unsteady state (MLU) model of transient well flow in layered aquifer systems. Describe the parameter estimation approach and provide associated publication-quality graphics showing model fit of test data. Graphics should be clearly reproducible in black-and-white. Compare transmissivity values obtained from the MLU analysis with those used in the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) District Wide Regulation Model, Version 2, with Telescopic Mesh Refinement (DWRM2 TMR). |
| 2.3.1 – 6<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.3.1 | Discuss the difference between the estimated transmissivity range and the average transmissivity values derived from site-specific hydraulic tests at the LNP site. | ER Section 2.3.1.5.2 presented transmissivity values at the LNP site based on published literature. Site-specific measurements carried out during Summer 2008 by PEF indicated transmissivity values lower than those reported in ER Section 2.3.1.5.2. Discuss the estimated transmissivity range presented in ER Section 2.3.1.5.2 and the average transmissivity values derived from site-specific hydraulic tests. Discuss which of these values are most representative of actual site conditions. |
| 2.3.3 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.3.3 | Provide water quality sampling data from observations in and at the outlet of the CREC discharge canal. | Surface water quality data were presented in ER Section 2.3.3.1, although sampling data from the CREC discharge canal was not provided. Provide water quality sampling data from observations in and at the outlet of the CREC discharge canal. |
| 2.3.3 – 2<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.3.3 | Provide a discussion of water quality trends observed in December 2007 relative to previous monitoring periods. | Groundwater quality data were presented in ER Section 2.3.3.2. Provide a discussion of water quality trends and processes that might account for the observed change in chemical oxygen demand (COD) and oxygen reduction potential (ORP) in December 2007 relative to previous monitoring periods. NRC staff needs this information to completely characterize the affected environment and to perform a subsequent assessment of impacts. |

**Hydrology**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 4.6 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.4<br>10 CFR 51.45(c)<br><br>ESRP 4.6 | Clarify which activities are covered by "construction" as defined in 10 CFR 51.4. Clarify which activities are not covered as "construction." Describe how impacts were determined for the latter set of activities. | Regarding hydrology:<br>1. Clarify which activities would be considered "construction" as defined by 10 CFR 51.4.<br>2. Clarify which activities would not be covered by the LWA and the COL ("preconstruction"). Describe how impacts were determined for these preconstruction activities. |
| 4.6 – 2<br><br>10 CFR 51.4<br>10 CFR 51.45(c)<br><br>ESRP 4.6 | Describe why the labor hours required for construction of the SSCs is an important indicator of hydrology-related impacts. | ER Section 4.6 describes the number of hours required for construction of the Structures, Systems, and Components (SSC). Describe why the labor hours required for construction of the SSCs is an important indicator of hydrology-related impacts. This information is needed to properly separate preconstruction and construction impacts on hydrology. |
| 5.2.2 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 5.2.2 | Describe the extent of and the impacts from the saltwater drawn from the Gulf of Mexico during operations of LNP Units 1 and 2 on the old arm of the Withlacoochee River upstream of its confluence with the CFBC. | ER Section 5.2.2.2 states: "These freshwater contributions are the subject of current additional study, and the results will be presented in a supplement to the ER." During the site audit, PEF stated that the above statement refers to the study currently being conducted regarding the biological communities in the Withlacoochee River just downstream of the Inglis Dam and is anticipated to be available in February 2009. Describe the extent of and the impacts from saltwater drawn from the Gulf of Mexico during operations of LNP Units 1 and 2 on the old arm of the Withlacoochee River upstream of its confluence with the Cross Florida Barge Canal (CFBC). |

**Hydrology**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 5.2.2 – 2<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 5.2.2 | Describe the State groundwater usage permitting process that resulted in moving the water supply well field from the northern to the southern portion of the LNP site. Describe potential alternate water supplies and associated impacts if the well field is unable to meet plant water requirements. | During the site audit, NRC staff was made aware that the proposed water supply well field had been moved from the northern to the southern portion of the LNP site due to State permitting requirements. Describe the State groundwater usage permitting process that resulted in this action. Include a discussion of potential adverse impacts of this relocated well field and any potential mitigation strategies.<br><br>The assessment of groundwater usage impacts in the ER is based on the DWRM2 TMR model, which uses basin and regional-scale hydraulic property distributions. The specified transmissivity values in the vicinity of the proposed well field location are based on little or no site-specific data, which will not be available until the supply wells are installed. Groundwater usage from these wells, the only identified source of plant water supply, would still need to comply with State requirements even if actual site conditions result in larger impacts than predicted by the current assessment. Describe potential alternate water supplies and associated impacts if the well field is unable to meet plant water requirements. |

**Hydrology**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 5.2.2 – 3<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 5.2.2 | Discuss implementation of the DWRM2 TMR groundwater model. Discuss the predicted impacts of groundwater usage at LNP. | ER Section 5.2.2 stated that groundwater would be used for general plant operations. ER Section 5.2.1.4 stated that groundwater for operations would be obtained from on-site supply wells shown in ER Figure 4.2-1. During the site audit, the NRC staff became aware that the location of the supply wells had changed from those shown in ER Figure 4.2-1 and that PEF was using a groundwater model, DWRM2 TMR, to assess operational impacts of the groundwater withdrawal. Discuss implementation of the DWRM2 TMR groundwater model that is being used to assess impacts of LNP's groundwater withdrawals from the Floridan aquifer, including how surface recharge is implemented in the model and the impact associated with using projected future water use on a county-wide level (see ER Table 2.3-20) in the assessment. Discuss SWFWMD's process for managing groundwater resources.<br>Discuss the predicted impacts of LNP's groundwater usage on 1) the basin- or subbasin-scale water balance, 2) potentiometric heads within the aquifer, 3) wetlands, 4) discharge to springs and other surface water bodies, 5) other groundwater users, and 6) the potential for salt water intrusion. |
| 5.3.2.1 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 5.3.2.1 | Provide details of the thermal plume modeling in the Gulf of Mexico performed for the combined CREC and LNP discharges. | ER Section 5.3.2.1 did not provide details of the thermal plume modeling for the combined CREC and LNP discharges into the Gulf of Mexico. Provide details of the thermal plume modeling in the Gulf of Mexico performed for the combined CREC and LNP discharges. Provide details of the simulation model used in the study and input files used in the simulation. Describe the process used to set up the simulation model including selection of all parameter values used. |

**Aquatic Ecology**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 2.4.2 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.4.2 | Provide any sampling reports or data from sampling events in the CFBC and Withlacoochee River for water quality, fish, and benthic macroinvertebrates. | A full year of biological sampling has been completed to provide a biological characterization of the CFBC with additional data from the remnant arm of the Withlacoochee River. Provide final sampling reports or data from the sampling events in the CFBC and Withlacoochee River for water quality, fish, and benthic macroinvertebrates. The final sampling report should include data collected during late spring/early summer 2008 and July/August 2008. The final report should include more detail regarding catch per unit effort for crab trap sampling, and should address the reason for a lack of sampling in January through March 2008. |
| 2.4.2 – 2<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.4.2 | Provide any sampling reports or data from the sampling events in the CREC discharge canal and nearby Gulf of Mexico seagrass habitat for water quality, fish, and benthic macroinvertebrates. | A full year of biological sampling has been completed to provide a biological characterization for the CREC discharge canal and nearby Gulf of Mexico. Provide final sampling reports or data from the sampling events in the CREC discharge canal and nearby Gulf of Mexico seagrass habitat for water quality, fish, and benthic macroinvertebrates. The final sampling report should include data collected during sampling events in the spring, summer, fall, and winter of 2008. |
| 2.4.2 – 3<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.4.2<br>ESRP 5.3.1.2 | Provide a statement with supporting hydrological references regarding assumptions of what the biota/plankton community composition would be near the area of the intake in the CFBC during operations. | During operation, it is assumed that the hydrological environment would resemble current downstream portions of the CFBC. Provide a statement with supporting hydrological references regarding assumptions of what the biota/plankton community composition would be near the area of the intake in the CFBC during operations. Operation of the intake would change water quality characteristics in the CFBC near the intake as a function of altered hydrology. A referenced statement that includes expected water flow changes, water quality changes, and resulting biota/plankton community changes is needed to assess impacts during operation. |

**Aquatic Ecology**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 4.7 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.7 | Provide information on cumulative impacts to aquatic resources for proposed activities that may impact waters of the CFBC, such as Inglis Hydropower project, elimination of the Inglis Lock, US19 bridge expansion, Tarmack quarry, and plans for additional quarries or mines. | Provide information on cumulative impacts to aquatic resources for proposed activities that may impact waters of the CFBC, such as Inglis Hydropower project, elimination of the Inglis Lock, US19 bridge expansion, Tarmack quarry, and plans for additional quarries or mines. NRC staff needs this information to assess the impacts of LNP in conjunction with other proposed activities on aquatic resources within the LNP site and vicinity. |

**Terrestrial Ecology**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 2.4.1 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.4.1 | Provide additional information needed to complete the baseline characterization for terrestrial, wetland and wildlife resources. | ER section 2.4.1 provides a baseline characterization for terrestrial, wetland and wildlife resources. However, the following was not included in the baseline characterization:<br>• A master list of plant species observed over various field investigations at the site and vicinity.<br>• Notes on seasonal observations to the wildlife tables in ER Section 2.4 (ER Tables 2.4-2, 2.4-3, 2.4-4 and 2.4-5).<br>• A summary of previously conducted field studies to verify habitats, including wetlands, within the transmission corridors (up to the first substation). |
| 2.4.1 – 2<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.4.1 | Provide additional information on waterfowl resources onsite and along the transmission corridor (up to the first substation). | No discussion of waterfowl resources is presented for either the Levy site or the associated facilities in ER Section 2.4.1. Provide a description of waterfowl concentration areas and habitats onsite and along the transmission corridors (up to the first substation). |

**Terrestrial Ecology**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 2.4.1 – 3<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.4.1<br>ESRP 4.3.1 | Provide additional information needed to update and complete the baseline characterization and impact assessment for wetland resources. | Wetlands descriptions in ER Section 2.4.1 were based on the Florida Land Use and Cover Classification System (FLUCCS), as interpreted and mapped by SWFWMD and field verified by PEF. Wetland delineations for the Levy site and verification by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is ongoing. Reference is made in ER Sections 5.2.1.5 and 5.2.2.3 to groundwater pumping that could adversely affect wetlands, but little detail is provided. Provide the following items:<br>• A new wetlands map (clearly reproducible in black-and-white) for the site and south of the site that includes jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional wetlands, as well as an overlay of the limits of ground disturbance. Identify the project facilities and features depicted on the map.<br>• A new table with the existing acreage of wetlands, including jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional wetlands.<br>• A new wetland impacts table with the acreage of jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional wetlands broken out by temporary and permanent impacts and by facilities (see ER Land Use Tables 4.1-4 and 4.1-5 for a breakdown of facilities).<br>• A discussion to explain the Unified Mitigation Assessment Method (UMAM) functional assessment for impact wetlands and for mitigation wetlands.<br>• A qualitative discussion on the effects of construction dewatering on wetlands, including the disposition of water during construction.<br>• Discussions addressing groundwater drawdown due to operations and any wetlands monitoring that would be implemented.<br>• Estimated groundwater drawdown isopleths (minimum 1-foot elevation interval) resulting from operational water withdrawal overlaid on the wetland delineation map (clearly reproducible in black-and-white). |

**Terrestrial Ecology**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| | | • A discussion to describe and explain estimates of wetland loss due to the drawdown, as well as information on how impacts can be minimized and why impacts are unavoidable.<br>• Updated estimates of wetland and upland impacts along the transmission lines (up to the first substation). |
| 2.4.1 – 4<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.4.1 | Provide additional information on the value and utility of retained forest buffers on the project site as future wildlife habitat. | No discussion is presented in ER Section 5.1 on the potential future wildlife use of retained forest buffers on the LNP site. Depending on how these buffers are managed, they could provide suitable habitat for many wildlife species, including important species. Discuss how preserved forest buffers would be managed, including both forest and general land management practices, and how these practices could benefit wildlife. Provide a copy of the Timber Management and Mitigation Plan for the site, when available. |
| 2.4.1 – 5<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.4.1 | Provide additional information on the ongoing studies of important species and their habitat onsite and along the transmission corridor (up to the first substation). | ER Sections 2.4.1.1.3.2 and 2.4.1.2.2.1 indicate that studies of important species are ongoing at the Levy site and at the early infrastructure facilities. Provide a list of all ongoing and proposed future studies for terrestrial species and habitats identified as important in the ER. |

**Terrestrial Ecology**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 4.3.1 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.3.1 | Provide additional information needed to complete the impact assessment for terrestrial and wildlife resources. | ER Section 4.3.1 provides an impact assessment for terrestrial resources. However, several important pieces of information were missing and some project features have since been modified or dropped (e.g., rail line). Provide the following information:<br>• An updated habitat impacts table (Tables 4.3-1 and 4.3-2) with the acreage of temporary and permanent impacts broken out by facility (see ER Land Use Tables 4.1-4 and 4.1-5 for a breakdown of facilities).<br>• A figure (clearly reproducible in black-and-white) showing the limits of construction disturbance overlaid onto habitats. Identify the project facilities and features depicted on the figure.<br>• The proposed best management practices (BMPs) for restoration of temporary impacts on the Levy site, including information on seed mixtures for erosion control, and on invasive species monitoring and control.<br>• An approximate quantitative assessment of the proportion of habitats onsite that would be impacted compared to availability of similar habitats in the vicinity (6-mile radius).<br>• A qualitative discussion of the relative abundance of habitats along the transmission corridors (up to the first substation) compared to the ½-mile buffer.<br>• A qualitative assessment of potential wildlife impacts (including important species) resulting from new roads and traffic associated with plant construction and operation.<br>• A qualitative discussion of the potential for the three stormwater retention ponds to provide habitat for waterfowl, shorebirds, amphibians and other wildlife. |

**Terrestrial Ecology**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 4.3.1 – 2<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.3.1<br>ESRP 5.6.1 | Provide additional information on the potential for bird collisions with elevated construction equipment, cooling towers and transmission towers. | ER Section 4.3.1 states that the use of elevated construction equipment will be managed to reduce the potential for avian collisions during project construction, but no discussion on the likelihood of avian collisions with project structures is provided and no measures to minimize avian collisions are described. Provide the following items to assess the potential for bird collisions with elevated construction equipment, cooling towers, and transmission towers:<br>• A qualitative discussion of the potential for bird collisions with project structures and mitigation measures that would be taken to avoid or reduce bird collisions.<br>• A description of the avian protection plan for the transmission line corridors being negotiated by PEF with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FFWCC).<br>• A copy of the agency report issued by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) for the transmission line corridor. |

**Terrestrial Ecology**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 4.3.1 – 3<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.3.1<br>ESRP 5.6.1 | Provide additional information needed to assess the potential effects of the transmission lines (up to the first substation) on terrestrial and wildlife resources. | ER Sections 4.3.1 and 5.6.1 provides a limited discussion of how construction activities, maintenance, and BMPs applicable to the transmission lines would affect terrestrial and wildlife resources. Provide the following information to assess the potential for adverse impacts from transmission lines (up to the first substation) on terrestrial habitats:<br>• Proposed BMPs to minimize impacts to terrestrial, wetland and wildlife resources on the transmission corridors.<br>• Proposed BMPs for restoration of temporary impacts on transmission corridors (including information on seed mixtures for erosion control and on invasive species monitoring and control).<br>• Proposed wildlife enhancement practices or management along transmission lines to benefit important wildlife. |
| 4.3.1 – 4<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.3.1<br>ESRP 5.6.1 | Provide additional information needed to assess the potential impacts of noise on wildlife. | The effects of noise on wildlife are addressed in a limited manner in ER Sections 4.3.1 and 5.3.3.2. Although noise modeling was conducted for the LNP, the effects analysis was focused toward human noise impacts (see ER Section 5.3.4.2). Provide a qualitative assessment of construction (temporary) and operational (permanent) noise impacts (short-term and long-term) on wildlife, with a focus on important species identified in the ER. |

**Terrestrial Ecology**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 4.3.1 – 5<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.3.1 | Provide additional information on the fate of displaced wildlife and on the potential for invasive species introduction. | ER Sections 4.3.1 and 5.6.1 suggest that displaced wildlife, particularly more mobile species, could avoid impacts associated with project construction and operation by moving to adjacent suitable habitats. Because adjacent suitable habitats are likely occupied by wildlife at carrying capacity, the fate of displaced wildlife is questionable. The extensive land disturbance that would occur with project construction would provide conditions suitable for the establishment and spread of invasive species. However, there is limited discussion on this potential issue in ER Section 4.3.1. NRC staff requests an expanded qualitative discussion on the fate of wildlife displaced by the project (with focus on important species) and on the potential for introduction of invasive plants. |
| 4.3.1 – 6<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.3.1<br>ESRP 5.6.1 | Provide additional information on the post-certification process for addressing listed species along the proposed transmission corridor (up to the first substation). | Very little of the proposed transmission corridors have been surveyed for listed species. ER Section 5.6.1.1 states that the finalized rights-of-way for the transmission corridors will be surveyed as part of a post-certification process pursuant to state certification under the Florida Electrical Power Plant Siting Act. Provide additional information and a schedule for the post-certification process for addressing listed species along the proposed transmission corridors (up to the first substation). |
| 4.3.1 – 7<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.3.1 | Provide additional information on the potential effects of offsite fill procurement on terrestrial and wildlife resources. | No discussion of the impacts associated with the acquisition of project fill is presented in ER Section 4.3.1. PEF indicated in its response to Information Need TE-A that fill generated from onsite activities would provide much of the needed fill, that as much as 1,200,000 cubic yards of fill would be purchased off-site and hauled to the site, and that material stockpiled by the State of Florida from construction of the CFBC would be the likely source of purchased fill. NRC staff requests a general, qualitative evaluation of the effects of offsite fill procurement on terrestrial and wildlife resources. |

**Terrestrial Ecology**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 4.7 – 2<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.7 | Provide information on cumulative impacts to terrestrial resources for proposed activities that may impact terrestrial resources, such as the proposed US19 bridge expansion, Tarmack quarry, and the proposed Suncoast Parkway extension. | NRC staff requests additional, specific information on potential cumulative impacts relative to flora and fauna in the site vicinity, especially for important species and habitats identified in the ER. The cumulative assessment should consider reasonably foreseeable regional projects such as the proposed Tarmac quarry, the proposed U.S. Highway 19 bridge upgrade, and the proposed Suncoast Parkway extension. |
| 5.3.3.2 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 5.3.3.2 | Provide additional information needed to assess the potential effects of salt deposition from the cooling tower operation on terrestrial, wetland and wildlife resources. | ER Section 5.3.3.2 describes the results of modeling for particle drift from the cooling tower. However, no isopleth maps of salt drift are provided, and discussion regarding the potential effects to biota from salt accumulation over time is limited. NRC staff requests the following items to assess the potential for impacts from cooling tower operation on terrestrial habitats:<br>• Isopleth maps of seasonal high projected salt drift and deposition (in kilogram per hectare per month [kg/ha/mo]) for the project site and vicinity.<br>• A discussion of potential impacts to flora and fauna from salt deposition or accumulation over the license period.<br>• Any studies on the impacts of salt accumulation on wetlands, plants, and wildlife (if such studies are available).<br>• The final report prepared for the salt deposition study at CREC. |

**Socioeconomics/Environmental Justice**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 2.5.1 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.70(b)<br><br>ESRP 2.5.1 | Identify specific data tables that were used from cited U.S. Census Bureau web pages for ER Tables 2.5-1 through 2.5-4, 2.5-6, and 2.5-7. | Specify which data tables were used from U.S. Census Bureau web pages cited as sources for Tables 2.5-1 through 2.5-4, 2.5-6, and 2.5-7 in the ER. The U.S. Census Bureau citations in the ER lead to a menu of tables that does not allow the reader to determine which specific table was used in each case. This information will enable NRC staff to verify the baseline demographic data. |
| 2.5.2 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.5.2<br>ESRP 4.4.2 | Provide a more complete description of communities around project site. | ER Section 2.5 describes community socioeconomic characteristics at the county level and provides some data for some specific communities in additional detail. However, integrated data are not provided for individual communities. To enable NRC staff to evaluate social impacts on surrounding communities, especially those closest to the site and access routes, provide a more complete description of Inglis, Yankeetown, Crystal River, and Dunnellon. For each community, provide an integrated discussion of variables such as size, population, public services and infrastructure, major sources of income and employment, and governance. Include data on housing availability, school capacity, availability of water, and wastewater treatment. |
| 2.5.2 – 2<br><br>10 CFR 51.70(b)<br><br>ESRP 2.5.2 | Provide additional detail on sources of baseline data on public services. | The ER does not cite the source of its data in Section 2.5.2.8.2 about police, fire, emergency services and medical facilities. Identify the specific agencies contacted and the information obtained in documentation that can be cited as a reference in the NRC staff's EIS. This information will enable NRC staff to verify the baseline data for public services. |

**Socioeconomics/Environmental Justice**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 2.5.2 – 3<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.5.2<br>ESRP 4.4.2<br>ESRP 5.8.2 | Provide transient population data and projections by county. | The ER currently provides transient population baseline and projections in Tables 2.5-1 through 2.5-4 by sector, but other social and economic data are provided by county. Provide transient population baseline and projections by county to enable NRC staff to evaluate potential impacts of project-related population change. |
| 2.5.2 – 4<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.5.2<br>ESRP 4.4.2 | Verify the availability of water and wastewater treatment services in potentially affected counties. | ER Sections 2.5.2.8.1 and 2.5.2.8.2 provide data about sources of potable water and wastewater treatment practices by county. In Section 4.4.2.9, the ER states that the "excess capacity in housing implies that there is an excess capacity for water and wastewater services," but does not relate the capacity conclusion to data in Sections 2.5.2.8.1 and 2.5.2.8.2. Document the availability of water and capacity of wastewater treatment services in potentially affected counties. These data will enable NRC staff to assess project-related impacts on the availability of water and wastewater treatment services. |
| 2.5.4 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 2.5.4<br>ESRP 4.4.3 | Provide locations of block groups with specific minority populations of more than 20 percent above the state average. | Provide locations for each minority group that is found in one or more block groups within the region at a population density more than 20 percent above the state average. This will supplement data on ER Figure 2.5-14 that lumps multiple categories into a single "minority population." These data will enable NRC staff to assess potential environmental justice effects on specific minority populations. |

**Socioeconomics/Environmental Justice**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 4.4.2 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.4.2 | Provide data regarding the availability of construction workers, disaggregated by craft. | ER Section 2.5 provides information about available workers in the construction industry as a whole. Supplement the data in ER Table 2.5-9 by disaggregating construction workers by craft, as provided in Bureau of Labor statistics. These data are will enable NRC staff to estimate how many of the required craft workers would come from outside the region. |
| 4.4.2 – 2<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.4.2 | Indicate whether union or non-union labor would be used. | The ER does not specify whether union or non-union labor would be used for construction. Indicate whether PEF or its construction management contractor intends to use union or non-union labor. This information will allow NRC staff to consider how incoming construction workers would be sourced and what their patterns of residency would be. |

**Socioeconomics/Environmental Justice**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 4.4.2 – 3<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.4.2 | Provide the most current estimate of numbers of workers, by labor category, needed for construction; and provide revised impact analyses that reflect this estimate. | Section 4.4.2 of the ER provides an estimate of the construction workforce from 2010 through 2017, specifying welders, fabricators, carpenters, millwrights, electricians, ironworkers, laborers, and pipefitters as typical of the workforce. Verify that the ER reflects the most current estimate of numbers of workers needed for construction, according to the manufacturer of the reactor. If applicable, provide an updated estimate of workforce numbers broken down by craft labor categories used in Bureau of Labor statistics with estimated numbers of each category per year. If appropriate, revise impact analyses based on the revised estimate. These data will enable NRC staff to assess socioeconomic impacts associated with employment and population change. |
| 4.4.2 – 4<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.4.2 | Provide the most current assumptions about residential locations of incoming construction workers and provide revised impact analyses that reflect these assumptions. | Section 4.4.2 of the ER identifies the quantity of available housing by county as the key variable in estimating where incoming construction workers might reside, with limited consideration of convenient road access to the site. Explain the basis for this approach. If more appropriate, revise the residence methodology by weighting commuting time more heavily than the current level in Table 4.4-1 of the ER, to account for the fact that each county has more housing available than the expected total need for in-migrants. Provide the most current assumptions about residential locations of incoming construction workers. If the conclusions in Table 4.4-1 of the ER change as a result of a revised methodology, revise those impact analyses that relied on prior assumptions about worker residence. These data will enable NRC staff to evaluate socioeconomic impacts associated with population change. |

**Socioeconomics/Environmental Justice**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 4.4.2 – 5<br><br>10 CFR 51.70(b)<br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.4.2 | Present expected construction worker salaries, the basis for these estimates, and associated analyses of earnings impacts during construction. | Section 4.4.2.1.2 of the ER presents an average construction salary based on heavy construction for power and communication systems, not specifically for nuclear power construction. The ER mentions per diems and incentive programs that would be included in some compensation packages, but these are not factored into the average salary used to estimate earnings impacts. Verify the average salary presented in the ER in light of these factors, and the associated analysis of economic impacts during the construction phase. These data will enable NRC staff to assess earnings impacts during construction. |
| 4.4.2 – 6<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.4.2 | Identify potential traffic impacts to roads other than US-19. | The ER provides data on many federal and state roads in the region; however, it only assesses project impacts on the major north/south route closest to the site, US-19. The ER does not address impacts on east/west roads likely to see increased traffic because of use by workers and haulers, such as SR-121 and US-41. To enable NRC staff to assess impacts on traffic and transportation infrastructure other than US-19, identify potential use levels and associated traffic impacts on roads that would be used by workers and freight haulers to access US-19. |
| 4.4.2 – 7<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.4.2 | Verify the assumption about an overlap of workers in operations and construction phases. | The ER on page 4-60 shows an overlap of operations workers with construction workers only in the last year of construction of LNP 2. At other facilities, one-third of operations workers come onsite for training once a training facility is built, while other construction continues. Verify the ER figures for the overlap of workers in the construction and operation phases and revise tables and conclusions, as needed, if the assumption in the ER requires correction. These data will enable NRC staff to assess impacts associated with population and employment. |

**Socioeconomics/Environmental Justice**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 4.4.2 – 8<br><br>10 CFR 51.70(b)<br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.4.2 | Provide a basis for the assumption that 100 percent of operations workers would come from outside region. | Provide a basis for the assumption in ER Section 5.8.2.1.1 that all operations phase jobs would be filled by workers from outside the region. This will allow NRC staff to determine what figures to use in assessing population and employment impacts of the operations phase. Based on the existing operations phase jobs at CREC, it seems likely that some operations phase jobs could be filled from the regional workforce. |
| 4.4.2 – 9<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.4.2<br>ESRP 5.8.2 | Quantify projected sales tax revenues. | The ER concludes in Section 4.4.2.2.1 that construction-related sales tax will be less than 1 percent of state sales tax revenue. The ER provides no estimate of sales tax for operations-related expenditures. To provide input to NRC staff's benefit-cost analysis, quantify the expected project-related sales tax revenues discussed in ER Sections 4.4.2.2.1 and 5.8.2.2.1 and explain the basis for the figures provided, specifying contributions from in-migrant worker expenditures and from owner purchase of local materials. |
| 4.4.2 – 10<br><br>10 CFR 51.70(b)<br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.4.2 | Provide the most current estimate of percent and value of construction supplies and materials to be purchased locally. | Provide the most current estimate of percent and value of construction supplies and materials to be purchased locally. Address the apparent contradiction of ER Section 4.4.2.1.3, referring to 10 percent; with Section 4.4.2, 2$^{nd}$ paragraph before ER Section 4.4.2.1; which implies that 50 percent of materials and supplies may come from within the region. If the 50 percent figure is correct, verify whether this is realistic by indicating the types, quantities, and rough value of required materials that would be available locally. These data will enable NRC staff to assess the economic impacts of construction. |

**Socioeconomics/Environmental Justice**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 4.7 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.14(b)<br>40 CFR 1508.25<br><br>ESRP 4.7 | Identify past, present, and reasonably foreseeable federal, nonfederal and private actions that could have meaningful cumulative impacts with construction of the LNP and provide information on cumulative impacts of relevant actions. | ER Section 4.7 states that the "identification of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable federal, nonfederal and private actions that could have meaningful cumulative impacts with the proposed action" and "information on cumulative impacts of relevant actions within the identified geographic area" were used to identify cumulative impacts. However, the section does not identify such actions nor provide such information. This information is needed to enable NRC staff to assess cumulative socioeconomic impacts of construction. |
| 5.11 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.14(b)<br>40 CFR 1508.25 | Provide information on cumulative impacts of actions that were identified as reasonably foreseeable federal, nonfederal and private actions that could have meaningful cumulative impacts with operation of the LNP. | ER Section 5.11.1.2 refers to discussions of land use plans and regional developments that identify actions that could have cumulative impacts with operation of LNP. It does not provide information about the expected impacts of those actions. This information is needed for NRC staff to verify ER conclusions about cumulative socioeconomics impacts of operation. |
| 5.8.2 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.70(b)<br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 5.8.2 | Provide an explanation for how the projected distribution of operations workers was developed. | The ER estimates that most operations workers would live in Levy, Marion and Citrus counties because of the proximity to the site. Provide an explanation as to why commute time is the primary factor for where operations workers would live. Is the projected distribution of operations workers shown in ER Section 5.8.2.4 consistent with the distribution of current workers at CREC? This information will enable NRC staff to assess operations impacts associated with population. |

**System Design Alternatives**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 9.4.1 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.71<br><br>ESRP 9.4.1 | Provide a detailed description as to how impact levels were determined for system alternatives. | Provide a detailed description of the bases for determination of the level of impact (SMALL, MODERATE, and LARGE) for system design alternatives. |
| 9.4.1 – 2<br><br>10 CFR 51.71<br><br>ESRP 9.4.1 | Provide additional explanation for why once-through cooling is not a viable option. | 1. ER Section 9.4.1.1 states: "Based on the LNP configuration and size, the once-through cooling alternative would not support the cooling requirements for the LNP." This statement seems to imply that a once-through system may be incapable of supporting the proposed generation capacity. Provide an explanation for why once-through cooling is not a viable option.<br>2. ER Section 9.4.1.1 states: "Once-through cooling would pose risks of thermal effects and have the potential to damage aquatic organisms. Therefore, this alternative is subject to the requirements of the 316(b) Phase I rules governing new power generating facilities. USEPA regulations (40 CFR 125) governing CWIS under Section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) make the use of once-through cooling systems difficult for steam power generating facilities. As a result, once-through cooling water would require approval from the USEPA Regional Director. For these reasons, impacts from once-through cooling systems were considered SMALL to LARGE, and therefore, were eliminated from further consideration." Explain how impacts from a once-through cooling system were determined to range from SMALL to LARGE. |

**System Design Alternatives**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 9.4.2 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.71<br><br>ESRP 9.4.2 | Provide descriptions of:<br>1. all alternatives for the intake system,<br>2. how the additional LNP blowdown discharge may impact operational flexibility of CREC, and<br>3. how alternative water treatment systems were considered. | ER Section 9.4.2.1 describes the alternative intake systems for the LNP project. NRC staff needs the following additional information to have a complete understanding of all alternatives that PEF considered and the bases for why some alternatives were rejected:<br>1. Provide a description of all alternatives for the intake system considered for the proposed LNP facility. Also provide a description of the bases used to reject alternatives other than the proposed intake system.<br>2. ER Section 9.4.2.1.1.3 states: "There is the potential that NPDES permit compliance would be an issue with the blowdown to the CREC discharge canal. The CREC discharge canal receives discharge from the five CREC generating units, and additional loading of this system could limit operational flexibility. CREC has implemented helper cooling towers to meet thermal limits without cutting back on power generation." Provide a description of how the additional LNP blowdown to the CREC discharge canal may impact operational flexibility of CREC.<br>3. Provide a description of alternative water treatment systems considered. Also provide a description of the bases used to reject alternatives other than the proposed water treatment system. |
| 9.4.2 – 2<br><br>10 CFR 51.71<br><br>ESRP 9.4.2 | Describe the metrics used for low flow and flooding. | ER Table 9.3-2 provides a summary of screening criteria used for the evaluation of potential sites. Provide additional information for the following criteria that were used in this table to evaluate the potential sites:<br>1. Describe the metric used for "low flow for the period of record" that was used to evaluate potential sites to identify candidate sites.<br>2. Describe the metric used for the "difference between mean site elevation and mean water elevation." Specifically, describe how mean water elevation was determined at each alternative site. |
| 9.4.2 – 3 | Verify or revise the number of intake plan views in ER Section 9.4.2.1. Provide | Verify or revise the number of intake plan views in ER Section 9.4.2.1. PEF stated during the site audit that information related to selection of the proposed intake and discharge structures from a set of alternatives was |

**System Design Alternatives**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 10 CFR 51.71<br><br>ESRP 9.4.2 | Technical Memorandum 0018 for NRC staff's review. | contained in Technical Memorandum 0018. The NRC staff requests that this document be made available for review. ER Section 9.4.2.1 states, "A number of intake plan views are presented in Appendix D (316[b] Demonstration) of the Site Certification Application (SCA) and in ER Section 3.3." However, section 3.3 does not contain a number of intake plan views. Revise ER Section 9.4.2.1 or provide a number of intake plan views in ER Section 3.3. |

**Alternative Site Selection/Evaluation**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 9.3 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.50(c)<br><br>ESRP 9.3 | Provide the siting study. | Provide a referenceable version of the "Progress Energy, New Nuclear Baseload Generation Addition, Evaluation of Florida Sites," October 2007 (proprietary reference) report. Submit as proprietary information or redacted as appropriate. |
| 9.3.2.1 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.71<br><br>ESRP 9.3.2.1 | Clarify the upper limit of acreage used in the screening process and confirm consistency with the description provided in the siting study. | Clarify the following statement in ER Section 9.3.2.1 to indicate whether the use of 6,000 acres was the upper limit of acreage used in the screening: "Potential sites were generally 2424 ha (6000 ac) in size, although favorable sites as small as 809 ha (2000 ac) were considered." Ensure that any revision to the above sentence is consistent with the description provided in the Siting Study. |

**Transmission Lines**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 3.7 – 1<br><br>ESRP 3.7 | Provide GIS files of the planned transmission corridors expected to be impacted as a result of the proposed action for corridors going to the first substation. | Provide GIS-based transmission corridor analysis and data for NRC's review for transmission lines going to the first substation. The response to audit information needs included only the existing transmission lines. Describe the extent of any planned transmission routing and corridor widening activities. |
| 3.7 – 2<br><br>ESRP 3.7 | Provide an overall schedule for the transmission line studies and surveys for lines going to the first substation. | Provide a schedule and plan for when the transmission line studies and surveys (e.g., cultural resources, terrestrial ecology) for transmission lines going to the first substation will be completed. Indicate whether the studies will be completed for inclusion in the Final EIS. |

**Transportation**

| RAI Number | Question Summary (RAI) | Full Text (supporting information) |
|---|---|---|
| 4.8.3 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 4.8.3 | Provide the construction material amounts that are specific to an AP1000 constructed at LNP and Alternative Sites. | The basis for the construction material amounts in Section 10.2.2.1 of the ER is reference MPR-2610. Although the construction technologies discussed in MPR-2610 appear to be applicable to an AP1000, the construction material amounts used in the ER from MPR-2610 do not appear to be specific to an AP1000 constructed at the Levy or Alternative Sites. Provide construction material amounts that are specific to an AP1000 constructed at LNP and Alternative Sites. This includes materials such as fill that would be used at the LNP and Alternative Sites, and should be apportioned into the pre-construction and construction phases. |
| 6.2 – 1<br><br>10 CFR 51.71(d)<br><br>ESRP 6.2 | Provide the latitude and longitude of alternative sites. | In order for the NRC staff to verify the proximity of the alternative sites to existing transportation nodes in the TRAGIS computer code (used for transportation routing), the latitudes and longitudes of the alternative sites are necessary. |