

NRC FORM 699 (9-2003)	U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION	DATE 02/12/2009
<h2 style="margin: 0;">CONVERSATION RECORD</h2>		TIME 12:00pm

NAME OF PERSON(S) CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH YOU Peter Hastings, Chris Nolan, Ted Bowling	TELEPHONE NO. 188-839-1704	TYPE OF CONVERSATION <input type="checkbox"/> VISIT <input type="checkbox"/> CONFERENCE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TELEPHONE <input type="checkbox"/> INCOMING <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OUTGOING
ORGANIZATION Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC., and NRC		
SUBJECT Teleconference to Discuss the EIS Schedule		

SUMMARY (Continue on Page 2)

The NRC had a telephone conference with Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC. (Duke) to discuss the impacts delayed information has had on NRCs resources for reviewing the William States Lee III Nuclear Station Project (Lee) licensing application. In conference from Duke were Peter Hastings, Ted Bowling, and Chris Nolan, and from the NRC Linda Tello and Brian Hughes. The NRC requested Duke to formally submit a letter stating dates for when pending information necessary for continuing the Lee environmental review would be submitted to the NRC. Duke was informed that the NRC public website dates for the Lee application were changed to an indeterminate (TBD) designation, and would remain so until Duke submits a formal letter stating when the pending information would be submitted to the NRC - and the NRC is able to work the information through its scheduling process (EPM), construct a revised schedule, and have the revised schedule approved by the NRC resource management board (RMB).

Duke had made a verbal agreement to the NRC to submit a letter between November 2008 through December 2008 providing a timeframe for when information necessary for completing the environmental review would be presented to the NRC. Duke recognized during the teleconference that the letter was overly delayed, and acknowledged hesitation in providing the NRC a formal letter stating submission dates for the pending information until they felt reasonable certain Duke could meet a specified timeframe. Duke stated they are working within their resource constraints, are appreciative of the NRC's efforts to inform Duke of the impacts the information delay is having on the review schedule, and will work toward providing the information to the NRC on March 16, 2009. The NRC stated it understands Duke's position, however, until Duke provides a formal letter of when the necessary information will be submitted, the NRC is unable to provide a schedule because it has no formal data it can use in EPM to determine a project schedule. The NRC also informed Duke it will receive a formal letter stating that the NRC public website dates for the Lee project are TBD until the pending information is received, and that the NRC can not develop a revised schedule for the Lee project until that time. Duke stated it understood the scheduling constraints that had resulted from the information delay, and would continue working diligently and expeditiously to submit the information as soon as realistically possible given Duke's own internal resource constraints.

Continue on Page 2

ACTION REQUIRED		
NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION	SIGNATURE	DATE

ACTION TAKEN		
TITLE OF PERSON TAKING ACTION	SIGNATURE OF PERSON TAKING ACTION	DATE