

July 24, 2009

MEMORANDUM TO: Robert G. Schaaf, Branch Chief  
Environmental Projects Branch 3  
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews

FROM: Douglas Bruner, Project Manager */RA/*  
Environmental Projects Branch 3  
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SITE AUDIT AND  
ALTERNATIVE SITES VISIT RELATED TO THE REVIEW OF THE  
COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION FOR LEVY NUCLEAR PLANT,  
UNITS 1 AND 2

On December 2 through 5, 2008, personnel from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and their contractors from Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) and Information Systems Laboratory, Inc. (ISL) participated in an environmental site audit, related to the review of the combined license (COL) application submitted by Progress Energy Florida, Inc. (PEF). The primary goal of the site audit was to review documentation in the environmental report (ER) as part of the COL application, visit the proposed Levy Nuclear Power Plant (LNP) site and the Crystal River alternative site, and to interface with officials from State and Federal government agencies. In addition, on October 15 through 16, 2008, personnel from PEF provided a tour to the vicinity surrounding the four alternative sites.

The alternative sites included the Crystal River Energy Complex located in Citrus County, and the sites located in Dixie County, Putnam County and Highlands County. Information regarding the location of the alternative sites (except for the CREC) is being withheld from public disclosure pursuant to Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), Part 2, Section 2.390, as documented in the NRC proprietary determination dated April 30, 2009 (Accession No.: ML091040203)

The enclosures to this memorandum provide a summary of the site audit and various tours. Enclosure 1 includes a list of participants for the environmental site audit and tours, provides a brief schedule of each day's activities, and the daily summaries. Enclosure 2 is the site audit report that summarizes the findings of the disciplines discussed during the site audit.

CONTACTS: Douglas Bruner, NRO/DSER  
301-415-2730  
[Douglas.Bruner@nrc.gov](mailto:Douglas.Bruner@nrc.gov)

Donald Palmrose, NRO/DSER  
301-415-3803  
[Donald.Palmrose@nrc.gov](mailto:Donald.Palmrose@nrc.gov)

R. Schaaf

- 2 -

Enclosure 3 contains the information needs as discussed during the site audit and provides the status of resolving the outstanding items through the discussions held. The Enclosures reflect the status of issues as of December 5, 2008, the date of completion of the audit.

Docket Nos.: 52-029 and 52-030

Enclosures: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

Enclosure 3 contains the information needs as discussed during the site audit and provides the status of resolving the outstanding items through the discussions held. The Enclosures reflect the status of issues as of December 5, 2008, the date of completion of the audit.

Docket Nos.: 52-029 and 52-030

Enclosures: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

**DISTRIBUTION:**

**PUBLIC**

DBruner, NRO	MMoser, NRO	DPalmrose, NRO	EHylton, NRO
JMartin, OGC	SKirkwood, OGC	BAnderson, NRO	RidsOgcMailCenter
RidsNroDserRap3	RidsNroDser	RidsOcaMailCenter	RidsOpaMailResources
Michael Smith, PNNL (Michael.Smith@pnl.gov)			
Ellen Prendergast-Kennedy, PNNL (Ellen.Prendergast@pnl.gov)			

ADAMS Accession Number: **ML091250294**

OFFICE	PM:RAP3: DSER:NRO	LA: RAP3: DSER:NRO	PM:RAP3: DSER:NRO	OGC	BC:RAP3: DSER:NRO
NAME	DPalmrose	EHylton	DBruner	SKirkwood	RSchaaf
DATE	05/12/2009	05/14/2009	05/15/2009	05/26/2009	07/24/2009

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

Levy County Mailing List  
Cc:

(Revised April 28, 2009)

Pamela Albert  
5630 N. Andri Dr.  
Crystal River FL 34428

Amanda Douglas  
P.O. Box 1112  
Bronson FL 32621

Hugh P. Arnold  
14031 SE 82nd Ct.  
Inglis FL 34449

Mimi Drew  
FDEP Deputy Secretary  
3900 Commonwealth Blvd., MS 15  
Tallahassee FL 32399

Betty Berger  
P.O. Box 83  
Inglis FL 34449

Lesla Ehlers  
Coastal Region Library  
Citrus County  
8619 W. Crystal St.  
Crystal River FL 34426

Carol Bergmann  
122 No. Pompeo Ave.  
Crystal River FL 34429

Thomas Eppes  
6900 Ulmerton Rd.  
Largo FL 33771

Helen Burns  
Dunnellon Branch Library  
20351 Robinson Rd.  
Dunnellon FL 34431

Hal C. Flowers  
2919 Wallerford Ave.  
Tampa FL 33611

Troy Burrell, Jr.  
12005 N. Florida Ave.  
Dunnellon FL 34434

Patricia Foreman  
323 E. Hill St.  
Inverness FL 34452

Renate Cannon  
7451 NW 35th St.  
Chiefland FL 32626-7317

Ken Frink  
1281 N. Lombardi Ave.  
Lecanto FL 34461

Lawrence J. Chandler  
Morgan, Lewis & Bocklus LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Washington DC 20003

Carol & John Froelich  
9521 N. Alder Ave.  
Crystal River FL 34428

Ken Cheek  
12005 N. Florida Ave.  
Dunnellon FL 34434

CDR Paul S. Gagliano  
61 Forsyth St.  
Atlanta GA 30303

Betsy Cox  
5213 Relay Way  
Raleigh NC 27605

Don Hambrick  
Department of the Army  
Jacksonville District - Corps of Engineers  
Panama City Regulatory Office  
1002 West 23rd St., Suite 350  
Panama City FL 32405-3648

Avis M. Craig  
10995 N. Citrus Ave.  
Crystal River FL 34428

Darryl A. Diamond  
20165 SE 115th Ave.  
Inglis FL 34449

Cc:

Mac Harris  
2795 W. Sunrise St.  
Lecanto FL 34461

Michael A. Hernandez  
3663 S.W. 8th St., Suite 200  
Miami FL 33135

Dan Hilliard  
16551 W. River Rd.  
Inglis FL 34449

Alan Hodges  
P.O. Box 110240  
Gainesville FL 32611

Norman Hopkins  
1030 N. Crescent Dr.  
Crystal River FL 34429

Art Jones  
560 NW 14th Place  
Crystal River FL 34428

Mark P. Klutho  
14496 120th Ave. North  
Largo FL 33774

Al Latimer  
800 N. Magnolia Ave., Suite 1100  
Orlando FL 32803

Barry Lenz  
5426 Bay Center Dr., Suite 400  
Tampa FL 33609

Maloni R. Lewis  
786 NE 6th Terr.  
Crystal River FL 34428

Gary Maidhof  
3600 W. Sovereign Path, Suite 109  
Lecanto FL 34461

Paul Marraffino  
19544 SW 82nd Place Rd.  
Dunnellon FL 34432

Katrice McCray-Holly  
P.O. Box 551  
Crystal River FL 34423  
Paul Snead  
4701 Fox Rd.  
Raleigh NC 27616

Walton McJordan  
P.O. Box 688  
Cedar Key FL 32625

Sandy Moseley  
Bronson Public Library  
Levy County  
600 Gilbert St.  
Bronson FL 32621

Matt Mucci  
4300 W. Cypress St., Suite 250  
Tampa FL 33607

Heinz Mueller  
U.S. EPA  
Region 4  
61 Forsyth St.  
Atlanta GA 30303

Cindy Mulkey  
Engineering Specialist  
Florida Dept.  
of Environmental Protection  
2600 Blair Stone Rd., MS 48  
Tallahassee FL 32399

Joe Murphy  
34413 Orchid Pkwy.  
Ridge Manor FL 33523

Michael Peters  
P.O. Box 7  
Inglis FL 34449

Guy Rabens  
1417 SW 15th Ave.  
Ocala FL 34471

E. E. Renfro  
6588 W. Cannondale Dr.  
Crystal River FL 34429

John Russell  
17810 Hyland Ln.  
Dade City FL 33523

Laura Slaback  
P.O. Box 1086  
Branson FL 32621

Anita Stewart  
18809 4th St. SE  
Lutz FL 33549

James Tulenko  
202 Nuclear Science Center  
Gainesville FL 32611

Mark Vianello  
1614 SE Ft. King St.  
Ocala FL 34471

A. Vlikmir  
1498 N. Endicott Pt.  
Crystal River FL 34429

Theresa Waldron  
P.O. Box 438  
Lecanto FL 34460

John York  
210 Estado Way NE  
St. Petersburg FL 33704  
Bruce Moore  
5559 Cactus Circle  
Spring Hill, FL 34606

## Levy County Emailing List

### Email:

[ecasey21@hotmail.com](mailto:ecasey21@hotmail.com) (Emily Casey)  
[jcd1968@gmail.com](mailto:jcd1968@gmail.com) (Chris Dougherty)  
[edisonj@levy.k12.fl.us](mailto:edisonj@levy.k12.fl.us) (Jeff Edison)  
[gagliano.paul@epa.gov](mailto:gagliano.paul@epa.gov) (Cdr. Paul S. Gagliano)  
[skirk@tampabay.rr.com](mailto:skirk@tampabay.rr.com) (Susan Kirk)  
[lawterv@cf.edu](mailto:lawterv@cf.edu) (Vernon Lawter)  
[Littleton.brian@epa.gov](mailto:Littleton.brian@epa.gov) (Brian Littleton)  
[john.marmish@unitedway.org](mailto:john.marmish@unitedway.org) (John Marmish)  
[mueller.heinz@epa.gov](mailto:mueller.heinz@epa.gov) (Heinz Mueller)  
[joepavletich@aol.com](mailto:joepavletich@aol.com) (Joe Pavletich)  
[porro@optonline.net](mailto:porro@optonline.net) (Joe Porrovecchio)  
[reyes.juan@epa.gov](mailto:reyes.juan@epa.gov) (Juan Reyes)  
[Rountree.marthea@epamail.gov](mailto:Rountree.marthea@epamail.gov) (Marthea Rountree)  
[Paul.Snead@pgnmail.com](mailto:Paul.Snead@pgnmail.com) (Paul Snead)  
[greenecat9@juno.com](mailto:greenecat9@juno.com) (Jennifer Sullivan)  
[Rinck.todd@epa.gov](mailto:Rinck.todd@epa.gov) (Rinck Todd)  
[rwelker@citrusedu.com](mailto:rwelker@citrusedu.com) (Randy Welker)  
[s.dickinson@mindspring.com](mailto:s.dickinson@mindspring.com) (Josh and Sally Dickinson)  
[haghighat@ufl.edu](mailto:haghighat@ufl.edu) (Alireza Haghighat)  
[yourwhiteleys@gmail.com](mailto:yourwhiteleys@gmail.com) (Naomi Whitely)  
[marcieplus@hotmail.com](mailto:marcieplus@hotmail.com) (Marcie M. Musser)  
[tulenko@ufl.edu](mailto:tulenko@ufl.edu) (James Tulenko)  
[mail2me33853@yahoo.com](mailto:mail2me33853@yahoo.com) (Suellyn Davis)  
[roberi.hoffman@noaa.gov](mailto:roberi.hoffman@noaa.gov) (Robert Huffman)  
[SteveT@miccosukeetribe.com](mailto:SteveT@miccosukeetribe.com) (Steve Terry)  
[bulldoc@wildblue.net](mailto:bulldoc@wildblue.net) (Wade Bullock)  
[annbrownlevy@bellsouth.net](mailto:annbrownlevy@bellsouth.net) (Ann Bast Brown)

**Enclosure 1**  
**Site Audit Trip Report**  
**Levy Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2**  
**(Progress Energy Florida, Inc.)**  
**December 1–6, 2008**

---

**NRC Team**

- Doug Bruner                      Project Manager
- Jessie Muir                      Alternate Team Lead, Severe and Design Basis Accidents
  
- Henry Jones                      Meteorology, Air Quality, Groundwater and Surface Water Hydrology
- Mike Masnik                      Aquatic Ecology, Alternative Site Selection/Evaluation, Transmission Lines
- Peyton Doub                      Terrestrial Ecology, Land Use
- Dan Mussatti                      Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice (EJ), Cost Benefit, Need for Power
- Ed Roach                          Health Physics, Rad Waste Management
- Steve Schaffer                    Health Physics, Rad Waste Management
- Rich Emch                          Health Physics, Rad Waste Management, Nonrad Health, Decommissioning, Uranium Fuel Cycle, Transportation
- Andy Kugler                        Nonrad Waste Management, Alternative System Designs, Emergency Planning
- Michelle Moser                    Principal Support, Cultural Resources

**PNNL Team**

- Michael Smith                    Team Lead, Decommissioning
- Ellen Kennedy                    Deputy Team Lead
- Larry Berg                        Meteorology, Air Quality
- Rajiv Prasad                      Surface Water Hydrology
- Vince Vermeul                    Groundwater Hydrology
- Ann Miracle                        Aquatic Ecology, Transmission Lines
- Dave Anderson                    Cost Benefit, Need for Power
- Linda Fassbender                Land Use, Alternative System Designs, Alternative Site Selection/Evaluation, Transmission Lines
- Van Ramsdell                      Severe and Design Basis Accidents
- Doug McFarland                   Cultural Resources
- Steve Maheras (by telephone)                    Transportation
- Eva Hickey                         Emergency Planning



### ISL Team

- Bill Baber Terrestrial Ecology, Transmission Lines
- Polly Quick Socioeconomics, EJ
- Joe Porrovecchio Health Physics, Rad Waste Management
- Bill Mendez Nonrad Health
- Ralph Grismala Nonrad Waste Management, Uranium Fuel Cycle

### PNNL Mentors

- Amanda Stegen Terrestrial Ecology, Transmission Lines
- Eva Hickey Health Physics, Rad Waste Management, Uranium Fuel Cycle
- Dave Anderson Socioeconomics, EJ, Land Use, Alternative System Designs, Alternative Site Selection/Evaluation, Transmission Lines

### Schedule of Activities:

#### Tuesday, December 2, 2008

- 8:00 AM** Meet at Progress Energy Florida, Inc. Crystal River Training Center (CRTC)
- 8:15** Site Audit orientation
- 9:00** General Site Tour
- 9:00** Breakout Discussion
- Socioeconomics/Environmental Justice
- 11:30** NRC/State and Federal Agencies Meeting and Breakout Discussions
- 12:30 PM** Lunch
- 1:30** Specialized Tours and Breakout Discussions
- Meteorological Tower / Air Quality Tour
  - Ecology / Hydrology Tour
  - Transmission Line Tour
  - Cultural Resources
  - Health Physics
  - Cultural Resources
- 4:00** Staff Data Needs (Staff meet with Team Leads to discuss document requests and information needs)
- 4:45** Daily Close Out Meeting: Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), and ISL Teams with Progress Energy Florida, Inc. (PEF) Team
- 6:00** NRC-PNNL-ISL Team Debrief

**Wednesday, December 3, 2008**

- 8:00 AM** Meet at PEF CRTC  
**8:00** Socioeconomics, EJ, Land Use: Offsite visits  
**8:15** PEF Presentations  
**10:00** Specialized Tours and Breakout Discussions
- Accidents
  - Health Physics
  - Hydrology
  - Alternatives
- 12:00 PM** Lunch  
**1:00** Specialized Tours and Breakout Discussions
- Meteorological Tower / Air Quality Tour
  - Ecology / Hydrology Tour
  - Transmission Line Tour
  - Cultural Resources
  - Health Physics
  - Socioeconomics/Environmental Justice
- 4:00** Staff Data Needs (Staff meet with Team Leads to discuss document requests and information needs)  
**4:45** Daily Close Out Meeting: NRC-PNNL-ISL Teams with PEF Team  
**6:00** NRC-PNNL-ISL Team Debrief

**Thursday, December 4, 2008**

- 8:00 AM** Meet at PEF CRTC  
**8:00** Socio-Economics, EJ, Land Use: Offsite visits  
**8:15** Specialized Tours and Breakout Discussions
- Hydrology / Water Quality
  - State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) Visit (Tallahassee, Florida)
  - Socioeconomics/Environmental Justice
- 10:00** Government-to-Government Meeting (Florida National Guard Armory)  
**11:00** Lunch  
**12:00 PM** 1<sup>st</sup> Open House and Scoping Meeting  
**1:00** Specialized Tours and Breakout Discussions
- Meteorological Tower / Air Quality Tour
  - Ecology / Hydrology Tour
  - Transmission Line Tour
  - Cultural Resources
  - Health Physics
  - Cultural Resources
- 4:45** Daily Close Out Meeting: NRC-PNNL-ISL Teams with PEF Team  
**5:00** 2<sup>nd</sup> Open House and Scoping Meeting

**Friday, December 5, 2008**

- 8:00 AM** Meet at PEF CRTC  
**8:15** Breakout Discussions and Offsite Meeting (State Water Agencies)

**12:00 PM** Lunch  
**1:00** Exit Meeting and Closeout Discussion

**Daily Summaries:**

**12/02/08 (Tuesday) – Morning**

The site audit began at 8:00 AM at PEF CRTC with sign-ins and administrative details as appropriate. The official opening of the site audit commenced with Paul Snead of PEF and Doug Bruner, NRC Environmental Project Manager (EPM), welcoming everyone to the Site Audit and asking that those present introduce themselves. Introductions included PEF staff and their contractors, NRC, PNNL, ISL and staff from various State and Federal agencies in attendance. Doug Bruner discussed NRC's objectives and expectations for the site audit and the role of PNNL and ISL on behalf of the NRC. Paul Snead provided an overview of site audit activities for the morning as well as expectations for the week. A list of attendees present during the week is provided in Table 1.

Following the entrance meeting, PEF personnel provided a van tour of the Levy County site providing a general perspective of the area. Representative examples of existing cover types on the project site were observed, including affected upland and wetland habitats. In addition, the following features were observed during the site tour:

- reconnaissance of portions of the approximate perimeter of the site, adjoining land uses, residences, and terrestrial ecology;
- meteorological station location;
- the proposed location for Levy Unit 1 with discussion of the diaphragm wall construction and indication of the current well locations;
- indications of the general areas for Levy Unit 2 and the cooling towers;
- the location for the proposed switchyard;
- an onsite section of the proposed transmission line corridor; and
- the location of the proposed makeup water intake, barge slip, and barge slip access road and associated bridge near the Inglis Lock, along with a portion of the makeup and blowdown pipeline corridor and heavy haul road.

Following the van tour, participants reconvened at the CRTC for break-out sessions for various technical disciplines and a meeting with State and Federal Agencies. Staff in each discipline initiated technical discussions with their PEF counterparts and contractors. Some NRC and PNNL/ISL staff met with State and Federal Agencies to discuss their perspectives and expectations with regard to permits and potential ecological and hydrologic impacts of the proposed action.

NRC and ISL Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) responsible for socioeconomics and environmental justice met with PEF and their contractors at the CRTC to initiate discussions.

**12/02/08 (Tuesday) – Afternoon**

The following onsite and offsite excursions took place during the afternoon of 12/02/08:

The Applicant and their contractors led ecology staff on a boat tour of the Cross Florida Barge Canal (CFBC). The tour included observation of the proposed location where the intake structure, barge slip, and discharge piping will enter and cross the canal. Also viewed were the

Inglis lock, Withlacoochee River (disconnected reach), stream inlets, shoreline habitats, transmission line crossings, and the confluence of the CFBC with the Gulf of Mexico. The tour provided an opportunity to informally discuss the proposed project with Heath Rauschenberger of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mike Penn of the Florida State Department of Agriculture, and Ted Hoehn of the Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission.

The Applicant and their contractors led land use staff on a transmission lines tour. The tour guides were PEF staff members Amy Dierolf and Larry Watson. Several CH2M-Hill and Golder staff also participated (Jon Subacz, Carl Bullock, Kelly Gleaton, and Heather Dyke). The tour followed the planned 1-mile-wide 500-kV transmission line corridor from the LNP site's southern boundary through local neighborhoods in Citrus County. The tour included a stop at the Inglis Dam Recreation Area, where the transmission corridor traverses the CFBC. The next stop was the proposed site for the Citrus Substation in a rural area surrounded by farmland. A farm was recently purchased by PEF, on which the substation would eventually be located. The tour also stopped at the existing Ross Prairie Substation, which the planned transmission corridor will bypass. The tour participants attempted to access some State-owned forest lands expected to be impacted by right-of-way widening, but were unable to directly view those areas due to access impediments.

NRC and ISL SMEs responsible for socioeconomic and environmental justice conducted off-site visits with Citrus County Schools and Marion County Schools. A list of offsite community representatives visited during the site audit is provided in Table 2.

The remaining technical disciplines met with PEF and their contractors at the CRTC to initiate and/or continue discussions. Throughout the afternoon, SMEs presented a summary of their break-out sessions including any issues that arose during the discussions or tours.

Doug Bruner and Michael Smith briefed Paul Snead of PEF on NRC Team impressions and potential issues from the day's activities. Proposed changes to future schedule activities were also discussed.

### ***12/03/08 (Wednesday) – Morning***

PEF and their contractors provided presentations on the site selection process, alternative sites, Limited Work Authorization, State of Florida review process, transmission line impacts, and role of USACE.

The Applicant and their contractors led ecology staff on a van tour of portions of the combined 4-500kV transmission corridor from County Road 40 to the proposed Citrus substation. The tour included the proposed Citrus substation, the corridor through the Crystal Springs residential development, and the corridor crossing over the CFBC. Existing transmission line corridors were examined where they cross the Withlacoochee River and the Hillsborough River. Representative examples of existing cover types along the transmission corridor were observed, as well as typical habitats maintained by the Applicant on their existing transmission lines.

NRC and ISL SMEs responsible for socioeconomic and environmental justice conducted off-site visits with Goethe State Forest, Levy County Schools, and Levy County Tax Collector.

The remaining technical disciplines met with PEF and their contractors at the CRTC to initiate and/or continue discussions.

**12/03/08 (Wednesday) – Afternoon**

The Applicant and their contractors led meteorological staff on a tour of the meteorological tower and equipment that has been installed at the proposed Levy Nuclear Plant.

NRC and ISL SMEs responsible for socioeconomics and environmental justice conducted off-site visits with Levy County Appraiser.

The remaining technical disciplines met with PEF and their contractors at the CRTC to initiate and/or continue discussions. Throughout the afternoon, SMEs presented a summary of their break-out sessions including any issues that arose during the discussions or tours.

Doug Bruner and Michael Smith briefed Paul Snead of PEF on NRC Team impressions and potential issues from the day's activities. Proposed changes to future schedule activities were also discussed.

**12/04/08 (Thursday) – Morning**

The Applicant and their contractors led hydrology and ecology staff on a van tour of portions of the Crystal River Energy Complex (CREC). The tour included the CREC cooling towers, intake channel for Units 1, 2, and 3, intake structure, traveling screens, and discharge channel, which will serve as the discharge channel for the proposed LNP. Portions of the LNP blowdown pipeline route were also observed.

The management staff attended a morning government-to-government meeting held at the Florida National Guard Armory in Crystal River, Florida.

Cultural resources staff travelled to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) in Jacksonville, Florida, for discussion of potential issues and clarification of information needs, relative to the Levy County application.

The remaining technical disciplines met with PEF and their contractors at the CRTC to initiate and/or continue discussions.

**12/04/08 – Afternoon**

The Applicant's terrestrial ecology contractor led ecology staff on an extended field tour of the LNP site. Example cover types of upland and wetland habitats on the site were examined, including areas likely to be impacted, potential mitigation lands and retained habitats. Adjacent habitats on the Goethe State Forest were also visited.

Health physics and nonradiological staff took a van tour to view offsite receptor locations and land uses (e.g., Lake Rousseau Dam, Withlacoochee Trail).

Some technical disciplines met with PEF and their contractors at the CRTC to initiate and/or continue discussions.

The management staff and remainder of technical disciplines attended the afternoon and evening sessions of the Open House and Scoping Meeting held at the Florida National Guard Armory in Crystal River, Florida.

**12/05/08 (Friday) – Morning**

The remaining technical disciplines met with PEF and their contractors at the CRTC to initiate and/or continue discussions. Throughout the morning, SMEs presented a summary of their break-out sessions including any issues that arose during the discussions or tours.

Doug Bruner, Jessie Muir, Michael Smith, and Ellen Kennedy participated in a closeout meeting with PEF and their contractors. The status of each information need was discussed to ensure agreement on the status of the information need and that expectations regarding follow-up actions were understood by all parties. Particular attention was placed on ensuring that both teams understood what information and/or documents were being requested and that PEF was clear on their planned path forward regarding those information needs. Enclosure 3 summarizes the status of information needs and planned responses at the end of the site audit.

**12/05/08 – Afternoon**

The Applicant's terrestrial ecology contractor led ecology staff on an extended field tour of the combined 4-500kV transmission corridor between the LNP site and County Road 40. Example cover types of upland habitats, pine plantations and wetlands were examined along the corridor. Gopher tortoise habitat and gopher tortoise burrows were inspected.

Staff completed the closeout meeting initiated during the morning session.

## Enclosure 2

### Summary of Issues or Concerns by Technical Discipline:

As described previously in Enclosure 1, Doug Bruner, Jessie Muir, Michael Smith, and Ellen Kennedy participated in a closeout meeting with PEF and their contractors on Friday, December 5, 2008. The status of each information need was discussed to ensure agreement on the status of the information need and that expectations regarding follow-up actions were understood by all parties. Particular attention was placed on ensuring that both teams understood what information and/or documents were being requested and that PEF was clear on their planned path forward regarding those information needs. Enclosure 3 summarizes the status of information needs and planned responses at the end of the site audit. The following sections are brief summaries of issues or concerns by technical discipline that are covered in more detail in Enclosure 3.

No major general issues were identified during the site audit. Staff expects to receive additional information from PEF in a site audit response package that addresses issues raised at the site audit. See Enclosure 3 for additional detail (specifically information items marked as "G").

#### ***Hydrology***

No major issues associated with hydrology were identified during the site audit. Staff expects to receive additional information from PEF in a site audit response package that addresses issues raised at the site audit. See Enclosure 3 for additional detail (specifically information items marked as "H").

#### ***Aquatic Ecology***

No major issues associated with aquatic ecology were identified during the site audit. Staff expects to receive additional information from PEF in a site audit response package that addresses issues raised at the site audit. See Enclosure 3 for additional detail and specific document requests (specifically information items marked as "AQ").

Specific issues were identified relative to the following items:

- Correspondence with federal or state agencies
- Cumulative impacts to the aquatic environment
- Best management practices, especially those related to aquatic habitats
- Construction and operation of cooling water intake on the CFBC
- Construction of discharge structure
- Sampling reports or data in the CFBC, Withlacoochee River, CREC discharge canal mouth and nearby Gulf of Mexico seagrass habitat for water quality, fish and benthic macroinvertebrates
- Improvement of aquatic communities in the nearshore environment of the Gulf of Mexico in the vicinity of the CREC discharge since 1985
- Information regarding threatened and endangered (T&E) species present in water bodies associated with transmission lines
- Assumptions of changes in biota/plankton near the intake

### **Terrestrial Ecology**

No major issues associated with terrestrial ecology were identified during the site audit. Staff expects to receive additional information from PEF in a site audit response package that addresses issues raised at the site audit. See Enclosure 3 for additional detail (specifically information items marked as “TE”).

Specific issues were identified relative to the following items:

- The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers indicated that the level of information provided in the Environmental Report (ER) for T&E species along the transmission line may be inadequate to support its consultation requirements under the Endangered Species Act.
- No wetland delineations have been completed along the transmission corridors. The Applicant indicated the earliest this information may become available would be the end of March 2009. This work had not yet begun.
- The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers requested that the DEIS address impacts related to the approximately 89 miles of additional (and supplemental) transmission lines that extend beyond the 1<sup>st</sup> substation. Impact analysis should include wetlands and T&E species.
- The level of detail for terrestrial ecology, including wetlands and threatened and endangered species, provided in the ER for the alternative sites may not be sufficient to meet the needs of the USACE.

### **Socioeconomics/Environmental Justice/Benefits and Costs/Land Use/Transmission Lines**

No major issues associated with socioeconomics, environmental justice, benefits and costs, land use, or transmission lines were identified during the site audit. Staff expects to receive additional information from PEF in a site audit response package that addresses issues raised at the site audit. See Enclosure 3 for additional detail (specifically information items marked as “SE,” “CB,” “LU,” or “TL”).

Specific issues were identified relative to the following items:

- It appeared that figures in the ER for the construction and operations workforce (numbers, characteristics, and timing over the construction and operations stages), need a check against recent estimates that have come from the designer, and against the fact that some operations workers will be present for training while construction is underway.
- Staff discussed the rationale and citation for the methodology used to develop the baseline resident and transient population projections and their spatial allocation. The methodology was explained during the site audit week and PEF agreed to provide a more detailed description of the projection methodology provided by the University of Florida.
- Staff discussed the analysis of facilities and services (e.g., water, sewage, police, schools) demands and capacity. The ER did not provide the source of capacity data. Documentation of capacity data provided in phone interviews was requested.
- Staff discussed the salary assumptions used for estimating economic impacts. Staff requested clarification on the assumptions used (e.g., were benefits included or not; were analyses specific to nuclear power facilities or for all types of power generation



facilities). Staff asked the assumption be reconsidered that all operations workers will come from outside of the area.

***Need for Power/Alternatives***

No major issues associated with need for power and alternatives were identified during the site audit. Staff expects to receive additional information from PEF in a site audit response package that addresses issues raised at the site audit. See Enclosure 3 for additional detail (specifically information items marked as “Alt”). Of note, staff learned that the rail spur discussed in the ER is no longer being considered as an option by PEF.

Specific issues were identified relative to the following items:

- The expected use of borrow pits and the expected disposition of any dredged material, both of which are expected to be resolved through the Florida Site Certification Application (SCA) review.
- Staff anticipates requesting a copy of the siting study be entered to the docket.

***Cultural Resources***

No major issues associated with cultural resources were identified during the site audit. Staff expects to receive additional information from PEF in a site audit response package that addresses issues raised at the site audit. See Enclosure 3 for additional detail (specifically information items marked as “CR”).

***Meteorology/Air Quality/Accidents***

No major issues associated with meteorology, air quality, design basis accidents, or severe accidents were identified during the site audit. Staff expects to receive additional information from PEF in a site audit response package that addresses issues raised at the site audit. See Enclosure 3 for additional detail (specifically information items marked as “Met” or “Acc”).

***Radiological/Nonradiological/Fuel Cycle/Waste Systems/Decommissioning***

No major issues associated with radiological health, uranium fuel cycle, waste systems, or decommissioning were identified during the site audit. Staff expects to receive additional information from PEF in a site audit response package that addresses issues raised at the site audit. See Enclosure 3 for additional detail (specifically information items marked as “HP” and “NRHH”).

Specific issues were identified relative to the following items:

- Clearing vegetation waste from the power plant area and from rights of way (ROWs) for the permanent access roads, the cooling water and discharge pipelines, the heavy haul road, and the transmission lines will generate substantial quantities of vegetative waste. PEF informed staff that this waste will be handled onsite or within the ROWs if possible, minimizing the need for offsite landfill disposal.
- The cut and fill balance estimate for the site development indicates that approximately 1,000,000 m<sup>3</sup> of additional clean fill will need to be brought onsite. No offsite disposal of excavation spoils is envisioned. The plant layout includes a designated 740,000 ft<sup>2</sup> spoil stockpile area. To the extent practicable, organic soils will be reused to help restore disturbed areas.
- Disposition of slurry waste from construction of the proposed diaphragm wall will be a contractual responsibility of the slurry wall contractor.
- Removal and disposition of excess asphalt or asphalt waste will be a contractual responsibility of the paving contractor.
- Construction is expected to generate small quantities of building and plant construction waste, such as scrap wood, wallboard, plastics, paper, and metal.
- Hazardous wastes expected to be generated during construction may include small quantities of paints, solvents, greases, oils, hydraulic fluid, caulks, and other common building and maintenance materials.  
Hazardous wastes expected to be generated during operation may include paints, solvents, greases, oils, hydraulic fluid, and lead. No asbestos will be used on site. Site plans include a motor pool and fuel station, hazardous waste storage building, chemical storage building, and a paint/blast shop. There would also be a chemistry laboratory which would have its own materials management protocols. LNP would be a Small Quantity Hazardous Waste Generator.
- There were no major issues associated with uranium fuel cycle. Staff notified PEF that the input to scaling factor in ER is incorrect, but the scaling factor is correct. Staff also notified PEF of errors in Ra-226 and Th-230 calculations for the AP1000 in Table S-3.

### ***Transportation***

No major issues associated with transportation were identified during the site audit. Staff expects to receive additional information from PEF in a site audit response package that addresses issues raised at the site audit. See Enclosure 3 for additional detail (specifically information items marked as "T").

**Table 1**

NRC, PNNL, and ISL staff, PEF and contractor personnel, and other agency representatives who attended the Levy COL Site Audit held December 2–5, 2008 at the Crystal River Training Center, Crystal River, Florida.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Doug Bruner	NRC
Jessie Muir	NRC
Henry Jones	NRC
Mike Masnik	NRC
Peyton Doub	NRC
Dan Mussatti	NRC
Ed Roach	NRC
Steve Shaffer	NRC
Rich Emch	NRC
Andy Kugler	NRC
Michelle Moser	NRC
Michael Smith	PNNL
Ellen Kennedy	PNNL
Larry Berg	PNNL
Rajiv Prasad	PNNL
Vince Vermeul	PNNL
Ann Miracle	PNNL
Dave Anderson	PNNL
Linda Fassbender	PNNL
Van Ramsdell	PNNL
Doug McFarland	PNNL
Amanda Stegen	PNNL
Steve Maheras (phone)	PNNL
Eva Hickey	PNNL
Bill Baber	ISL
Polly Quick	ISL
Joe Porrovecchio	ISL
Bill Mendez	ISL
Ralph Grismala	ISL
Paul Snead	PEF
Bob Kitchen	PEF
Jim Nevill	PEF
Joe Pavletich	PEF
Dave Bruzek	PEF
Ron Johnson	PEF
Eric Horner	PEF
Louise England	PEF
Linda Hickok	PEF
Chase Thomas	PEF
Jamie Hunter	PEF
Amy Dierolf	PEF

Levy Site Audit Report

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
John Stephenson	PEF
Teresa Gildersleeve (phone)	PEF
Arun Kapur	PEF
Betsy Cox	PEF
Dawn Bisson	PEF
George Howroyd	CH2M Hill
Mark Carroll (phone)	CH2M Hill
Bryan Burkingstock	CH2M Hill
Mitch Griffin	CH2M Hill
Amanda Berens	CH2M Hill
Jeff Lehnen	CH2M Hill
Ray Bogardus	CH2M Hill
Steve Eakin	CH2M Hill
John Martin	CH2M Hill
Martha Klein	CH2M Hill
Scott Freeman	CH2M Hill
Heather Dyke	CH2M Hill
Jon Subacz	CH2M Hill
Charlie Uhlarick	CH2M Hill
Eric Woods	CH2M Hill
Rick Zeroka	CH2M Hill
Heather Dyke	CH2M Hill
Wayne Schofield	CH2M Hill
Ken Weise (phone)	CH2M Hill
Mike Waselus (phone)	CH2M Hill
Bill Marsh	CH2M Hill
Grant Tegarten (phone)	CH2M Hill
Sara Orton	CH2M Hill
Ryan Marlow (phone)	CH2M Hill
Lorin Young	CH2M Hill
Karen Sanders	CH2M Hill
Heather Guthrie	CH2M Hill
Rich Reeves	CH2M Hill
Steve Koski	New South
Carl Bullock	Golder and Associates
Kelly Gleaton	Golder and Associates
Paul Gagliano	EPA-Region 4
Rick Button	EPA-Region 4
Mark Sramek	NOAA NMFS-St. Petersburg
Shelley Norton	NOAA NMFS-St. Petersburg
Don Hambrick	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-Jacksonville
John Williamson	Florida Dept. of Health (DOH)-Environmental Radiation Control
Mark Seidensticker	Florida DOH-Environmental Radiation Control
Kevin Wright	Suwannee River Water Management District
Mike Penn	Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Sue Farnsworth	Citrus County Community Development Division
Bobby Lue	Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD)
Paul Williams	SWFWMD
Leonard Barrtos	SWFWMD
Jim Breman	Florida Public Service Commission (PSC)
Mark Laux	PSC
Melissa Carbonneau	Florida Dept. of Environmental Protection (DEP)
Kevin Ledbetter	Florida DEP
Bala Nori	Florida DEP
Mimi Drew	Florida DEP, Regulatory Programs
Carla Gaskins	Florida DEP, Regulatory Programs
Jeff Greenwell	Florida DEP, Southwest District Office
Mickey Thomason	Florida DEP, Office of Greenways and Trails
Mike Halpin	Florida DEP, Siting Coordination Office
Cindy Mulkey	Florida DEP, Siting Coordination Office
Ann Seiler	Florida DEP, Siting Coordination Office
Jim Maher	Florida DEP, Northeast District Office
Connie Webel	Florida DEP, Northeast District Office
Marc Harris	Florida DEP, Division of Water Resources
Theodore Hoehn	Florida Fish and Wildlife-Tallahassee
Heath Rauschenberger	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS)-Jacksonville
Linda Smith	FWS-Jacksonville

**Table 2**

Community representatives who attended offsite meetings (outside the CRTC) with ISL/NRC socioeconomics staff during the Levy COL Site Audit, December 2–5, 2008.

<b>NAME, TITLE</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION</b>
Roy Pistone, Director, Student Services	Citrus County Schools
Mike Mullen, Executive Director, School Support Services	Citrus County Schools
Chuck Dixon, Director, Planning and Growth Management	Citrus County Schools
Roy Pistone, Director, Student Services	Citrus County Schools
Wally Wagoner, Deputy Superintendent, Operations	Marion County Schools
David Herlihy, Planning	Marion County Schools
Dianne Greene, Deputy Superintendent, Curriculum and Instruction	Marion County Schools
Mike Penn, Ranger	Goethe State Forest
Mike Todd, Director, Secondary Education	Levy County Schools
Bob Bildner, Finance Officer	Levy County Schools
Jeff Edison – Assistant Superintendent	Levy County Schools
Steve Tyson – Transportation Coordinator	Levy County Schools
Linda Fugate, Tax Collector	Levy County
Francis Akins, Appraiser	Levy County

**Enclosure 3  
Information Needs  
Levy Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 Site Audit  
Record of Information Needs, Closeout, and Tracking  
December 5, 2008**

**Number = number of original information need.**

**Letter = information need added to the list of original information needs prior to or during the site audit.**

<b>Info Need #</b>	<b>Information Need</b>	<b>Summary of Site Audit Discussions</b>	<b>Document or Documented Material Needed</b>	<b>Path Forward</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>G-</b>	<b>General Information Needs</b>				
<b>G-1</b>	Provide access to originals of all ER figures in .jpeg, .png or .tif format at a resolution of at least 300 dpi, and sized correctly.	PEF plans to send these to NRC under oath and affirmation.	JPEGs.	PEF plans to send these to NRC under oath and affirmation.	Open.
<b>G-2</b>	Provide access to separate layers for GIS files.	PEF plans to send these to NRC under oath and affirmation.	GIS shapefiles.	PEF plans to send these to NRC under oath and affirmation.	Open.
<b>G-3</b>	Make available the ER references.	PEF plans to send on a disk to reading room. PEF will submit under oath and affirmation, those references specifically requested.	ER references.	PEF plans to send references to reading room (electronically). PEF will submit under oath and affirmation, those references specifically requested by SMEs as needed for docketing.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
G-4	Provide the background information that supports all statements made and conclusions reached for each subject area for each alternative site (documentation is needed to show due diligence in gathering and using the best readily available information for a reconnaissance level review).	This was done in all of the sessions.	None.	None.	Resolved.
G-5	Provide knowledgeable expert(s) in appropriate disciplines to discuss contents of Tables 10.1-1 and 10.1-2 and assure consistency between the contents of the summary tables and the results of information needs discussions. It is anticipated that this will be addressed in specific breakout sessions for the individual disciplines.	This was done during the site audit during individual group sessions. PEF will provide an update under oath and affirmation, if necessary.	None.	PEF will provide an update under oath and affirmation, if necessary.	Open.



Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
<b>G-6</b>	Provide or make available copies of permits for the CREC that may be relevant to or affected by the proposed Levy County action (e.g., USACE or NPDES permits).	SCA was provided to NRC which contains these permits	None.	None.	Resolved.
<b>G-7</b>	<p>Provide large wall map(s) at the site audit that show key features related to the proposed project, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed temporary and permanent facilities</li> <li>• Proposed construction laydown areas</li> <li>• Proposed intake pipeline</li> <li>• Proposed intake structure</li> <li>• Proposed discharge pipeline</li> <li>• Proposed transmission corridor(s)</li> <li>• Property boundaries</li> <li>• Points of interest (e.g., nearby residences, gas pipelines, nearby industries, including quarries/mines)</li> <li>• Proposed rail line spur</li> <li>• Proposed haul roads</li> <li>• Proposed barge slip</li> </ul>	These were provided at the site audit.	None.	None.	Resolved.

<b>Info Need #</b>	<b>Information Need</b>	<b>Summary of Site Audit Discussions</b>	<b>Document or Documented Material Needed</b>	<b>Path Forward</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>G-A</b>	and associated road Provide methodology from 4.6 and 4.8	PEF will prepare response that addresses information request.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will prepare response that addresses information request.	Open.
<b>LU-</b>	<b>Land Use</b>				
<b>LU-1</b>	Provide access to information regarding rail line construction length and associated rail-bed construction activities.	PEF no longer plans to construct rail spur and will provide response indicating this is so.	Something in writing about decision not to use rail.	PEF provided a letter that documents this change.	Resolved.
<b>LU-2</b>	Provide access to information regarding whether borrow pits will be constructed or expanded. Also, what volumes of borrow will be transported and used in construction?	SCA process will provide necessary information.	None.	None.	Resolved.
<b>TL-</b>	<b>Transmission Lines</b>				
<b>TL-1</b>	Provide GIS-based transmission corridor analysis for our review.	NRC requested this information be provided to the docket.	GIS files.	Should be part of response to G-4. PEF will include GIS info for non-COLA T-lines. PEF will send with GIS files.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
TL-2	Provide access to details for alternative transmission system design (e.g., voltage levels, transmission frequency, tower designs, conductor designs), construction (e.g., underground placement in certain areas, erosion control, revegetation, access roads), and maintenance practices.	SCA materials and site audit slide presentations should address this.	Slides from site audit presentations given on Wednesday, December 3, 2008.	PEF will send presentation slides as part of site audit summary. Some slides are proprietary.	Open.
TL-3	Provide access to details regarding the transmission corridor selection process and cost data for the proposed and alternative transmission corridors.	The cost information is not needed.	Slides from site audit presentation given on Wednesday, December 3, 2008.	PEF will send presentation slides as part of site audit summary. Some slides are proprietary. Cost information is not needed.	Open.
TL-A	New request to address need for overall schedule for T-line studies and surveys (cultural resources, terrestrial, etc).	Scheduled unknown at this time.	Schedule and plan for when these studies will be completed as well as indication that these will be completed for inclusion in the FEIS.	RAI needed.	Open.
<b>Met- Meteorology/Noise/Air Quality</b>					
Met-1	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss meteorology and air quality described in the ER Sections 2.7, 4.4.1.2, and	Expert provided.	None.	None.	Resolved.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
<b>Met-2</b>	5.8.1.2. Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss meteorology monitoring as described in the ER Section 2.7.5. This should include a tour of the meteorological equipment, and, if possible, a meeting with staff that operate and maintain the meteorological equipment (Section 2.7 and Section 6.4). This should also include an opportunity to review the instrument maintenance records.	Expert provided.	None.	None.	Resolved.
<b>Met-3</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the cooling system to aid our evaluation of cloud formation from the cooling towers (Section 5.3.3).	Expert provided.	None.	None.	Resolved.
<b>Met-4</b>	Provide access to electronic copies of input and output files for PAVAN, XOQDOQ, models used for cooling tower plumes, and calculation packages (Section 2.7).	PEF to provide input/output files for PAVAN and XOQDOQ models used for cooling tower plumes and met data.	Input/output files for PAVAN and XOQDOQ, calculation packages, and Year 2 met data. Plume models not needed at this time.	PEF to provide input/output files. Calculation packages will be provided in reading room. Year 2 met data will be provided, when available (March 2009). NRC already has met data from Year 1. Plume	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
				models are not needed at this time.	
<b>H-</b>	<b>Hydrology</b>				
<b>H-1</b>	Surface Water (SW) -1: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss state and federal permitting and consultation requirements for the proposed project and the statuses of the respective applications.	<p>Projected SCA schedule:</p> <p>December 15-19, 2008 – Anticipated date(s) for hearing on challenge(s) to Levy County’s Land Use Determination, if petition(s) filed.</p> <p>December 15, 2008 – Deadline for Agencies to submit reports to DEP (Main Site &amp; Associated Facilities).</p> <p>January 12, 2009 – Deadline for DEP to issue Staff Analysis Report (Main Site) &amp; Associated Facilities).</p> <p>February 23 – March 20, 2009 – Anticipated Dates for Clarification Hearing in Levy County (local subset of the certification hearing held per schedule to be established by ALJ). [Deadline is February 23, 2009].</p>	None.	None.	Resolved.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
		<p>June 8, 2009 – Anticipated date for ALJ to issue Recommended Order on Certification. (assumes transcript filed April 24, 2009)</p>			
<b>H-2</b>	<p>SW-2: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss different datums used to report elevations in the ER Sections 2.3.1 and 3.6.3.</p>	<p>August 11, 2009 – Anticipated date for Siting Board Hearing on Certification Determination. DO NOT NEED INFO. See datum changes from FSAR Audit.</p>	<p>Written response that includes datum changes from FSAR.</p>	<p>PEF will provide requested info in response.</p>	<p>Open.</p>
<b>H-3</b>	<p>SW-3: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss flooding near the LNP site described in the ER Sections 2.3.1 and 3.6.3.</p>	<p>Consider adding discussion about the derivation of the 100 year flood plain shown in FIRM (Figure 2.3-11). Discuss changes to the 100 year flood plain due to site grading (reference site grading discussion in ER Chapter 4 or 5). Consider changing the title of Figure 2.3-11 to “Existing 100 Year Flood Zone at LNP Site”. ER change only. RAI-should include proposed changes.</p>	<p>Written response that addresses information request.</p>	<p>PEF will provide requested info in response.</p>	<p>Open.</p>

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
H-4	SW-4: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the operation of the Inglis Lock with regard to discharges to Lower Withlacoochee River as described in ER Sections 2.3.1 and 5.2.1.	<p>The following references will be added to the reading room:</p> <p>ER Reference 2.3-006 – FDEP Water Control Plan, 2001</p> <p>ER Reference 2.3-023 – Structure Profile: Inglis Bypass Spillway, 2001</p> <p>ER Reference 2.3-024 – Structure Profile: Inglis Dam, 2001</p>	<p>Need documents in reading room:</p> <p>ER Reference 2.3-006 – FDEP Water Control Plan, 2001</p> <p>ER Reference 2.3-023 – Structure Profile: Inglis Bypass Spillway, 2001</p> <p>ER Reference 2.3-024 – Structure Profile: Inglis Dam, 2001</p>	PEF will send documents to reading room.	Open.
H-5	SW-5: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the availability and characteristics of the surface water sampling program in the CREC discharge canal as described in the ER Section 2.3.3.	<p>The water quality sampling results, including all tables and figures, will be added to the reading room in pdf format on a CD. The figures and tables will be updated as new data is obtained. For now reading room. May need to request these be sent to NRC.</p> <p>Confirm and revise, if necessary, the sentence in ER Section 2.3.3.1 that identifies the CREC discharge canal as a Class III water.</p>	Response that documents information request.	PEF will provide requested info in response.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
H-6	SW-6: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the water treatment system used for the raw water system with reference to the ER Sections 3.3.2, 3.6.1, and 3.6.3.	Prepare a response discussing the sodium hypochlorite dose based on estimated water quality and industry standards.	Response discussing the sodium hypochlorite dose based on estimated water quality and industry standards.	PEF will provide requested info in response.	Open.
H-7	SW-7: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss details of the CFBC makeup intake structure and the description of components used for addition of chemicals with respect to the ER Section 3.4.2.	Expert provided.	None.	None.	Resolved.
H-8	SW-8: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss details of the outfall structure with respect to the ER Section 3.4.2.	NRC staff will review this response and consult with FDEP. May need RAI depending on State consultation.	Response discussing the details of outfall structure with input from FDEP.	Open	Open.
H-9	SW-9: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss heat dissipation system performance analyses based on site-specific data with respect to the ER Section 3.4.2.	These calculation packages will be added to the reading room. An RAI will be issued if additional questions arise.	Calculation packages in reading room.	PEF will provide requested info in reading room.	Open.
H-10	SW-10: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the stormwater runoff during construction	Expert provided.	None.	None.	Resolved.



Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
	and operation.				
<b>H-11</b>	SW-11: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the site grading plan and its effects on local hydrology including runoff and infiltration during construction and operation.	NRC staff will review the maps. Need wetlands jurisdictional maps to be made available (March 2009). Potential RAI.	Wetlands jurisdictional maps and response.	PEF will provide in reading room, when available.	Open.
<b>H-12</b>	SW-12: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss Florida's Regional Off-Site Mitigation Area (ROMA) Plan.	Expert provided.	None.	None.	Resolved.
<b>H-13</b>	SW-13: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the fate of construction-related effluents with respect to the ER Section 4.2.2	See H-10. Expert provided.	None.	None.	Resolved.
<b>H-14</b>	SW-14: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss impacts on freshwater streams including the Lower Withlacoochee River during operation with respect to the ER Section 5.2.1.	See H-10. Expert provided.	None.	None.	Resolved.

<b>Info Need #</b>	<b>Information Need</b>	<b>Summary of Site Audit Discussions</b>	<b>Document or Documented Material Needed</b>	<b>Path Forward</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>H-15</b>	SW-15: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss returns of any withdrawn water under different modes of operation with respect to the ER Section 5.2.1.	See H-5. NRC staff will review provided information and issue an RAI if necessary.	Response that documents information request for response for H-5	PEF will provide as part of response to H-5	Open.
<b>H-16</b>	SW-16: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss HEC-RAS modeling of the CFBC described in the ER Sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2.	These calculation packages will be added to the reading room. HEC-RAS input files need to be provided. NRC staff will review the calculation packages.	Calculation packages to be sent to reading room. HEC-RAS input/output files.	PEF will provide this information in reading room	Open.
<b>H-17</b>	SW-17: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the study regarding freshwater contribution to CFBC described in the ER Section 5.2.2.	See H-27 and H-29.  The study will be provided to the reading room when complete.	Document: Freshwater contribution study.	PEF will make available in February 2009.	Open.
<b>H-18</b>	SW-18: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the CWIS intake design and operational characteristics described in the ER Section 5.3.1.1.	The 316b Demonstration has been made available as part of SCA.	Provided in SCA documentation	None.	Open.
<b>H-19</b>	SW-19: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the combined LNP and CREC discharges to the CREC discharge canal as described in the ER Section 5.3.2.1.	See H-5 and H-8, these will be combined.	Response to H-5 and H-8.	PEF will prepare response for H-5, H-8.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
H-20	SW-20: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss thermal plume modeling at the discharge point of the CREC discharge canal.	This TM will be added to the reading room when complete. Request input files be provided to NRC when complete	TM to be provided in reading room. Input/output files to be provided when available.	PEF will provide documents in reading room. Input files needed for visual plume.	Open.
H-21	SW-21: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss alternatives to the heat dissipation system described in the ER Section 9.4.1.	Review responses to ALT-D, -E, and -F and respond as needed.	Response to ALT-D, E, and F.	PEF will respond to ALT-D, E, and F.	Open.
H-22	SW-22: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss alternatives to the proposed intake system, discharge system, and water supply described in the ER Section 9.4.2.	NRC staff will review responses to ALT-2, -3, -4, and -G and respond as needed.	Response to ALT-2, 3, 4 and G	PEF will respond to Alt-2, 3, 4, and G.	Open.
H-23	SW-23: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the process of alternative site selection with respect to hydrology.	NRC staff will review response to ALT-K and respond as needed.	Response to ALT-K	PEF will respond to ALT-K.	Open.
H-24	SW-24: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss preconstruction activities as defined by 10 CFR 51.4 and required by 10 CFR 51.45(c).	NRC staff needs updates to ER Revision 1 Sections 4.6 and 4.8.	Response per G-A	PEF will prepare a response per G-A	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
H-25	Groundwater (GW)-1: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss hydrogeologic characterization of results from the site investigation, including development of local-scale cross-sections.	Open pending: Referenceable document that includes the LNP FSAR Figures 2.5.4.2-202A, 202B, 203A, and 203B and associated discussion.	Response that includes figures and associated discussion being requested.	PEF response will address this.	Open.
H-26	GW-2: Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe any consultations with EPA regarding the likelihood of any aquifers in the region being designated as sole source aquifer (40 CFR Part 149).	Prepare a response that references EPA website. Provide more detail discussion of the process.	Response that references EPA website. Provide more detailed discussion of the process.	PEF to provide response.	Open.
H-27	GW-3: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss hydraulic test analysis approach, the results for both the surficial and Upper Floridan aquifers, and the hydraulic properties used in the seepage velocity calculations and their impact on travel time calculations.	Provide referenceable document that includes the following: surficial and Floridan aquifer pump test data will be reanalyzed using MLU (in progress). Results will be included in the reading room when complete. Including applicable portions of the DWRM2 TMR modeling results. Compare the resultant transmissivity values from the MLU analysis to the transmissivity values used in the DWRM2 TMR model.	Referenceable document that includes the following: surficial and Floridan aquifer pump test data will be reanalyzed using MLU (in progress). Results will be included in the reading room when complete. Including applicable portions of the DWRM2 TMR modeling results. Compare the resultant transmissivity values from the MLU analysis to the transmissivity	Open	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
H-28	GW-4: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss slug testing results for the Upper Floridan aquifer and their apparent discrepancy with the estimated transmissivity range presented in ER Section 2.3.1.5.2.	Open pending receipt of FSAR RAI 2.4.12-13.	values used in the DWRM2 TMR model. Response to FSAR RAI 2.4.12-13.	PEF to provide response to FSAR RAI 2.4.12-13.	Open.
H-29	GW-5: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss LNP groundwater usage from the Upper Floridan aquifer, both during construction and operations, in relation to a basin or subbasin scale water balance.	Open pending receipt of: Referenceable document that includes: the water balance results from the DWRM2 TMR modeling effort in the EE.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF to provide response that addresses information request.	Open.
H-30	GW-6: Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe any consultations with the state of Florida or the SWFWMD regarding LNP groundwater usage in relation to the overall current and future permitted usage for Levy County.	Open pending receipt of: Referenceable document that includes a general discussion of the State permitting process (adverse impacts and mitigation strategies).	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will provide requested info in response.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
H-31	<p>GW-7: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss 1) temporal variability observed in field parameter and groundwater analytical data, most notably the ORP and COD data, 2) the reason for the generally low DO and ORP values and whether reducing conditions within the aquifer will be problematic from a water supply standpoint, 3) whether the correct units for specific conductance are presented in the text and Table 2.3-50, and 4) potential impacts to water quality associated with construction or plant operations.</p>	<p>Open pending receipt of: Referenceable document that discusses ER Section 2.3.3.2 regarding water quality trends to account for the increase in COD and ORP in December. Include a discussion regarding the design of the discharge pipeline regarding leak potential and leak detection.</p>	<p>Response that addresses information request.</p>	<p>PEF will provide requested info in response.</p>	<p>Open.</p>

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
H-32	<p>GW-8: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the use of the DWRM2 groundwater model for simulating the impacts of LNP's withdrawals from the Floridan aquifer on 1) potentiometric heads within the aquifer, 2) spring discharges, 3) other well users, and 4) upwelling of brackish water into previously fresher portions of the Floridan aquifer.</p>	<p>See H-27 and H-29.</p> <p>Open pending receipt of: Referenceable document that discusses how recharge is implemented in the DWRM2 TMR model in the ER.</p> <p>Discussion of impacts related to projected future water use, including impacts assoc with Tarmac Kings Road Limestone mine and saltwater intrusion occurring in local public wells, on a county-wide level (see ER Table 2.3-20).</p> <p>Discussion of the SWFWMD's process for managing groundwater resources.</p>	<p>Response that addresses information request.</p>	<p>PEF will provide requested info in response.</p>	<p>Open.</p>
H-33	<p>GW-9: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss groundwater monitoring systems and Provide copies of any correspondence with regulatory agencies regarding monitoring requirements.</p>	<p>See H-29.</p>	<p>Prepare a response that addresses information request.</p>	<p>PEF will provide requested info in response.</p>	<p>Open.</p>

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
<b>TE-</b>	<b>Terrestrial Ecology</b>				
TE-1	If available, provide information on correspondence with federal and state agencies regarding the impact to terrestrial species and habitats onsite and along the proposed transmission corridor.	Open pending receipt of T&E memo. May be in ER, if not needed. State of Florida State Certification RAI - completeness response.	T&E memo. SCA RAI response.	PEF will provide the correspondence being requested. Florida Natural Area inventory. SCA documentation has been made available.	Open.
TE-2	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the methods used to quantify habitat distribution onsite and methods and locations of wildlife and plant surveys.	Need a response for: summary of times of year did surveys, provide complete plant list. Rare plant surveys, add seasonal observation data to multiple tables in Section 2.4. Wetlands delineation report, Rapanos and all the UMAM data forms. Provide info on the gopher-tortoise study. T-lines writeup on ground truthing of the habitats/wetlands under corridor.	Response that addresses information request and provides documents being requested.	PEF will provide documents. Other responses will be part of future revision to the ER, including write up on ground truthing.	Open.
TE-3	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss terrestrial resources, including waterfowl onsite and along the transmission corridor.	Summary of waterfowl concentration areas along and adjacent to the t-lines corridors.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will prepare a response.	Open.



Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
TE-4	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the location of temporary and permanent facilities, including the construction laydown areas, the intake pipeline, transmission corridor and discharge pipeline.	Provide an updated table with temporary and permanent impact broken out by facility and habitat. Provide a new figure with a map showing limits of construction disturbance overlaid on habitat. Provide information of proportion of habitat on site that will be impacted compared to the region 6- mile radius. Provide relative abundance of habitat along t-lines corridor in the region comparison (1/2 mile buffer)	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will prepare a response.	Open.
TE-5	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss wetlands impacts related to temporarily and permanent construction activities onsite, including dewatering during excavation as well as impacts related to construction of the transmission corridor.	Provide the wetlands map, including jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional wetlands with the overlay of the limits of construction/disturbance. Table with acreage of impacted wetlands including jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional separated out by temp and permanent impacts for facilities. UMAM table for the impacted wetlands and any impacted wetlands within 300 feet for indirect effects and some corresponding paragraphs to describe the	Maps and response that addresses information being requested.	PEF will prepare a response.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
		<p>UMAM table. Provide a qualitative discussion on construction dewatering and the dispositioning of the water from construction. Provide discussions about the dewatering occurring due to operations and any monitoring that will be done in wetlands. Provide isopleth drawdown due to operational water withdrawal overlaid over wetland's delineation including the J and Non-J map. Add estimate of wetlands loss due to the drawdown, information on how PE have minimized impacts and why this impact is unavoidable. T-lines: provide updated acreage of wetlands and uplands that will be impacted.</p>			

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
TE-6	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss bird collisions with elevated construction equipment, cooling towers and transmission towers.	Provide qualitative descriptions of the potential for bird impacts and any mitigation measures they may take to avoid collisions. Include a description of the avian protection plan that they will produce for the t-line corridors. DEP issued an agency report for transmission line corridor.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will provide. Last item may be in SCA.	Open.
TE-7	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss salt deposition, including information on habitats that may be impacted by deposition, as well as seasonal fluctuations in deposition.	Need isopleth of salt drift, need a study on historical salt deposition at CREC. Response needed on impacts to flora/fauna from salt deposition. Provide studies on impacts of salt accumulation on wetlands and wildlife.	Documents and response that addresses information request.	PEF will provide documents. PEF needs to develop others.	Open.
TE-8	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss restoration of temporarily disturbed areas onsite and along the transmission corridor.	Provide response on the BMPs for temporary impacts on t-line corridors and information on the seed mixture used for erosion control. Also need BMPs for temporary impacts onsite and any offsite areas not covered under T-lines. Include information on invasive species monitoring and control.	Response that addresses information being requested and BMPs.	PEF needs to prepare information requested.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
TE-9	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss concentration estimates for any specific contaminants in the cooling tower basin.	Expert provided. No information needed.	None.	None.	Resolved
TE-10	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss impacts of operational noise on wildlife.	T-line corridors: information on the important species and how they handle these and how they would respond during construction (all impacts including noise). On-site: qualitative assessment of construction and operation noise onsite.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF needs to prepare response.	Open.
TE-11	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss transmission ROW maintenance practices, including specific BMPs and procedures that will be used to minimize impacts to wetlands or other sensitive habitats.	Provide transmission ROW maintenance practices, including specific BMPs and procedures that will be used to minimize impacts to wetlands or other sensitive habitats. Discuss wildlife enhancement practices or managements along T-lines	Response that addresses information being requested and BMPs.	PEF needs to prepare response to information request.	Open.
TE-12	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss information about onsite or within transmission line ROW wildlife management or enhancement practices.	Provide transmission ROW maintenance practices, including specific BMPs and procedures that will be used to minimize impacts to wetlands or other sensitive habitats. Discuss wildlife enhancement practices or managements along T-lines	Response that addresses information being requested and BMPs.	PEF needs to prepare response to information request.	Open.

<b>Info Need #</b>	<b>Information Need</b>	<b>Summary of Site Audit Discussions</b>	<b>Document or Documented Material Needed</b>	<b>Path Forward</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>TE-13</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss cumulative impacts to terrestrial resources.	On-site: Description of cumulative impacts on important species and habitat in the gen vicinity of the site. Includes projects such as tarmac quarry, bridge upgrade, suncoast extension. T-lines: Provide unique habitats and important species and description of other projects in area that may be impacting habitats or important species.	Response that addresses information being requested.	PEF needs to prepare response to information request.	Open.
<b>TE-14</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the impacts of project construction and operation on terrestrial ecology/wildlife.	TE-10 takes care of T-line corridor. On site: Provide an updated description of displaced animals and invasive plants.	Response that addresses information being requested.	PEF needs to prepare response to information request.	Open.
<b>TE-15</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the value/utility of retained forest buffers on the project site as future wildlife habitat.	On site: Provide a paragraph describing future management of the site including a conceptual mitigation plan.	Response that addresses information being requested.	PEF needs to prepare response to information request.	Open.
<b>TE-16</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the ongoing studies of important species and their habitat onsite and along the transmission corridor.	List of ongoing and future studies for important species and habitat for all. List includes the status on those studies- what has been detected and where they are in the process.	Response that addresses information being requested.	PEF will provide response.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
TE-17	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss potential project effects on important wildlife and plant species, and important habitats.	Addressed by other responses	None.	None.	Resolved.
TE-18	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the post-certification process for addressing listed species along the proposed transmission corridor.	Provide a discussion of the post-certification process including the proposed schedule.	Response that addresses information being requested.	PEF will provide response.	Open.
TE-19	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the potential effects of operational groundwater pumping on wetlands.	Addressed by other responses	None.	None.	Resolved.
TE-20	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the wetland permitting process being pursued, including avoidance, minimization and mitigation for onsite areas and the transmission corridor.	Provide information on the wetlands permitting process, status of the conceptual mitigation plan and copy when available.	Information on the wetlands permitting process, status of the conceptual mitigation plan and copy when available.	PEF will provide response, when available.	Open.
TE-A	Are any borrow areas needed or planned?	Response will include that PEF will get the borrow from commercial sources. No on-site borrow areas.	Response that addresses information being requested.	PEF will provide response.	Open.
TE-B	What is the extent of shoreline loss due to construction? (linear feet) barge and intake.	Response needed.	Response that addresses information being requested.	PEF will provide response.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
<b>AQ-</b>	<b>Aquatic Ecology</b>				
<b>AQ-1</b>	If available, Provide any correspondence with federal or state agencies (e.g., USFWS, NMFS, FDEP, FFWCC, USACOE) regarding impacts to aquatic species and proposed discussions for appropriate monitoring studies in the Cross Florida Barge Canal (CFBC), the Gulf of Mexico at the mouth of the CFBC, and the Gulf of Mexico at the Crystal River Energy Complex discharge.	Ongoing correspondence being generated. Need to request SCA application documents, etc.	All federal and state correspondence, including SCA application documents, etc.	PEF will provide a book with correspondence to reading room. Doug Bruner will be copied on all future correspondence.	Open.
<b>AQ-2</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss cumulative impacts to the aquatic environment in the region (quarries, etc).	Awaiting information on cumulative impacts (tarmac mine, widening of US 19, existing mine on CFBC).	Response that addresses information being requested.	PEF will provide response.	Open.
<b>AQ-3</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss BMPs associated with construction and operation/maintenance of the plant and transmission corridors, especially related to aquatic habitats.	Awaiting receipt of BMPs.	Number of BMPs manuals.	Seven manuals to be sent for docketing	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
<b>AQ-4</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss construction of the proposed cooling water intake structure on the CFBC, including intake design, information on proposed timing and length of the construction period, and dredging spoils disposition.	Need timeline/schedule and details of construction. Need details on disposition of dredge material per USACE.	Timeline/schedule and details of construction and details on disposition of dredge material per USACE.	PEF needs to prepare response.	Open.
<b>AQ-5</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss operation of the proposed cooling water intake structure regarding the need for future dredging in the vicinity of the intake.	Need information on dredging.	Document on decision not to do maintenance dredging.	PEF will provide response.	Open.
<b>AQ-6</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss construction of the proposed discharge structure, including design, location and placement of discharge piping, as well as any information on proposed timing and length of the construction period.	Need timeline/schedule details for construction.	Timeline/schedule and details of construction.	PEF needs to prepare response.	Open.



Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
AQ-7	Provide access to any sampling reports or data from the proposed sampling events (late spring/early summer, 2008 and July/August 2008) in the CFBC and Withlacoochee River for water quality, fish and benthic macroinvertebrates.	Sampling report- coming in January, demonstration 316(b) study that was submitted to State as part of the SCA, copy of NPDES permitting.	Sampling report- coming in January, demonstration 316(b) study that was submitted to State as part of the SCA, copy of NPDES permitting.	Sampling is coming in January. Application has been made available.	Open.
AQ-8	Provide access to any sampling reports or data from the proposed sampling events (spring, summer, fall and winter, 2008) from the CREC discharge canal mouth and nearby Gulf of Mexico seagrass habitat for water quality, fish and benthic macroinvertebrates.	Sampling report coming in January. CREC 316(b) phase II impingement study, original ER for CREC Unit 3 and NRC FEIS.	Sampling report coming in January. CREC 316(b) phase II impingement study, original ER for CREC Unit 3 and NRC FEIS	Sampling is coming in January, 2009. Application has been made available. PEF will provide other documents.	Open.
AQ-9	Provide access to any supporting documentation or references that detail improvement of aquatic communities in the nearshore environment of the Gulf of Mexico in the vicinity of the CREC discharge since 1985.	Three seagrass reports conducted by Mote Marine lab, 2000 & 2007 seagrass studies, and 1985 316 studies.	Three seagrass reports conducted by Mote Marine lab, 2000 & 2007 seagrass studies, and 1985 316 studies.	Mote reports and 316 studies were included in the State RAIs, which were provided by PEF.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
<b>AQ-A - NEW</b>	Provide information regarding new t-lines beyond first substation connected with the Levy Application.	Requested information on water bodies crossed by new T-lines and any T&E species.	Information on water bodies crossed by new T-lines and any T&E species.	PEF will provide letters received and prepare a response.	Open.
<b>AQ-B - NEW</b>	Provide justification for assumptions of changes in biota/plankton near the intake as they relate to overall impacts during operations.	Open pending validation of assumptions for changes in operations based on station 3 vs. station 4 and likely changes at the intake	Response that provides validation of assumptions for changes in operations based on station 3 vs. station 4 and likely changes at the intake.	PEF will provide a response.	Open.
<b>SE-</b>	<b>Socioeconomics/EJ</b>				
<b>SE-1</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the method underlying the BEBR population projections – do these projections consider expected development of any particular kind? Be prepared to walk through an example of how a county-wide projection is applied to a sector on ER Figures 2.5-1 and 2.5-2.	Requested a copy of Bureau of Economic Business and Research (BEBR) methodology.	BEBR methodology	PEF will provide requested document.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
SE-2	Provide a knowledgeable expert to walk through the calculation of transient population, including how recreational area use was estimated and factored in and how the statewide migrant worker estimates were distributed.	Requested record of telephone calls (recreation)- referenceable account of those phone calls. Need information regarding special populations and what did they find- look at data. Need to know how they got info- i.e., even a technical memo detailing process.	Referenceable account of phone calls (recreation).  Information regarding special populations and what did they find- look at data. Need to know how they got info- i.e., even a technical memo detailing process.	PEF will provide response describing process for recreational use. PEF will obtain and provide methodology for special populations.	Open.
SE-3	Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe how the location of major employers was used in relation to the estimates of transient population in the 16-km versus 80-km sectors?	Information is in the text of ER.	None.	None.	Resolved.
SE-4	A number of demographic figures were obtained from the 2000 Decennial census data sets included in Reference 2.5-001. Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe which tables within the cited reference were used in developing the data for different tables and conclusions in the ER (e.g. for Tables 2.5-1, 2.5-3, 2.5-6, 2.5-7).	Requested a package of validation materials ("screen" shots of census data)- Notebook full of this info.	Package of validation materials ("screen" shots of census data)- Reviewed notebook contained this information.	Depending on copyright issues, PEF will provide requested information.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
SE-5	This request embedded in SE-4 applies to a number of other references. Please revisit the reference list for the socioeconomic sections of the ER and, for those that cite web pages, provide the specific data tables within the cited page that were used.	Requested a package of validation materials, specified tables ("screen" shots of table data)- Notebook full of this info.	Package of validation materials, specified tables ("screen" shots of table data)- Reviewed notebook was full of this type of information.	Depending on copyright issues, PEF will provide requested information.	Open.
SE-6	Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe how the figures for % minority population and % population below poverty were obtained (ER 2.5.1.3.3 and 2.5.1.3.4 and Tables 2.5-6 and 2.5-7).	Closed from SME perspective- need to put in other section of ER- PEF action.	None.	PEF will add requested information to the next revision of the ER.	Resolved.
SE-7	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the figures in Table 2.5-9 and explain the relationship between numbers for the region and the three counties.	Open pending receipt of data regarding heavy construction workers- need number; break down between construction (sub-break down to two categories). Need to provide information regarding decision to use union vs. non-union labor.	Data regarding heavy construction workers- need number; break down between construction (sub-break down to two categories). Need to provide information regarding decision to use union vs. non-union labor.	Information will need to be developed by PEF.	Open.
SE-8	Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe how income figures in Tables 2.5-11 were derived from	Requested receipt of sources of information in Figure 2.5-11.	Sources of information.	PEF will prepare a response that provides table of sources.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
SE-9	Reference 2.5-016. Provide a knowledgeable expert to give a fuller description of the specific communities around the site, particularly those closest. We want to understand the nature of each community to be able to evaluate social impacts. Useful information would include an integrated discussion of variables such as: size, population, social services and infrastructure, major sources of income and employment, and governance.	Need the response.	Response that addresses information being requested.	PEF will prepare a response.	Open.
SE-10	Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe how the information in section 2.5.2.8.2 was obtained.	Request for telephone documentation police/fire, etc.	Response that documents process followed.	PEF will prepare response.	Open.
SE-11	In addition to the information provided on Figure 2.5-14, please provide the locations of the block groups with specific minority populations of more than 20% above the state average (i.e. African-American and Hispanic, as discussed in Section	Requested this information; new figures for each non-aggregated population.	Revised figures.	PEF will prepare revised figures.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
SE-12	2.5.4.2.1). Provide a knowledgeable expert to walk through the allocation of in-migrating construction workers to different cities and counties in the ER Section 4.4.	Clarification: Requested receipt of information of how many workers are needed? Double check number and provide details/current number. Affects numerous analyses. (connected changes).	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will need to develop information.	Open.
SE-13	If available, provide access to information at town and city level, particularly for the smaller towns, regarding housing availability, school capacity, public facilities and services, water and wastewater.	Need response.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will need to develop information.	Open.
SE-14	Provide a knowledgeable expert to: (1) walk through the discussion of employment and earnings impacts, (2) describe the basis for assuming that induced jobs would be taken by existing residents with no in-migration, (3) describe the basis for excluding earnings for the construction jobs that will be taken by locals, while including local expenditures and applying the RIMS	Open pending receipt of new data for total cost (salary #'s). 2 is closed. 3. Closed.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will need to develop response.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
SE-15	multiplier to the latter. Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe what historical information can be obtained about socioeconomic impacts of construction of the Crystal River Energy Complex that can illuminate the discussion of expected impacts of LNP.	Information not available.	None.	None.	Resolved.
SE-NEW-A	2-473: When describe housing available mobile home/single family; clarify school categories that are excluded.	Provide documentation that details classification of housing and school categories that were excluded.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will need to develop information.	Open.
SE-NEW-B	Context for pop changes relevant to region	Provide a wider context for the pop changes discussed for the region.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will need to develop information.	Open.
SE-NEW-C	2.5-1and 2.5-2 - convert to a single table with projections by county for all county in region.	Provide a single table with projections by county for all counties in region.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will need to develop response.	Open.
SE-NEW-D	4-63 and 4-64; Verify if 10% supplies and materials can be procured from the region.	4-63 and 4-64; Verify if 10% supplies and materials can be procured from the region.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will need to develop response.	Open.
SE-NEW-E	4-68: Impacts to Marion, Levy and Citrus Counties-revisit impacts to Levy (distribution of the impact) impacts were overestimated.	4-68: Impacts to Marion, Levy and Citrus Counties-revisit impacts to Levy (distribution of the impact)	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will need to develop response.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
<b>SE-NEW-F</b>	P. 4-71. Assumptions about availability of water and sewage- verify that there really is available water and sewage.	P. 4-71. Assumptions about availability of water and sewage- verify that there really is available water and sewage.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will need to develop response.	Open.
<b>SE-NEW-G</b>	P 4-72: Check the conclusions affecting roads- Consider HW41 and CR 121.	P 4-72: Check the conclusions affecting roads- Consider HW41 and CR 121.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will need to develop response.	Open.
<b>SE-NEW-H</b>	Section 5.2 (Operation Impacts Plumes): Provide documentation of regional haze affects in this discussion.	Provide documentation of regional haze affects in this discussion.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will need to develop response.	Open.
<b>SE-NEW-I</b>	1/3 of the ops workers will be arriving when construction workers are performing construction. Revise tables/discussions that have not included operations workers numbers. Impact during construction and operation.	Revise tables/discussions that have not included operations workers numbers.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will need to develop response.	Open.
<b>SE-NEW-J</b>	P5-127 Verify that the operation workers wage is an accurate one- Electrical power basis.	Verify that the operation workers wage is an accurate one- Electrical power basis.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will need to develop response.	Open.
<b>SE-NEW-K</b>	5.8.2.1: Revisit the assumption that 100% of the ops workers will come from outside the region.	5.8.2.1: Revisit the assumption that 100% of the ops workers will come from outside the region.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will need to develop response.	Open.



Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
<b>SE-NEW-L</b>	5.8.2.4 Reevaluate the distribution of ops workers.	5.8.2.4 Reevaluate the distribution of ops workers.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will need to develop response.	Open.
<b>SE-NEW-M</b>	5.8.2.2.1 Need numbers for sales tax (estimate)	5.8.2.2.1 Need numbers for sales tax (estimate)	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will need to develop response.	Open.
<b>CR-</b>	<b>Cultural Resources</b>				
<b>CR-1</b>	Provide a tour of cultural resources identified on PEF land associated with the Levy site, the area surveyed to date related to the preconstruction activities and proposed construction of Units 1 and 2, and any cultural resources identified during this effort. (ER Section 4.1.3 & 5.1.3)	Closed.	None.	None.	Resolved.
<b>CR-2</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe how the area of potential effect (APE) was defined for the COL effort. (ER Section 4.1.3 & 5.1.3)	Need correspondence and APE maps with laydown areas on them.	New document request for letters to SHPO regarding APE consultation. Clarify if laydowns were included in APEs. Provide figures of APE showing laydown areas.	PEF will provide information.	Open.
<b>CR-3</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe the basis for determining any previous ground disturbance at the Levy site.	Closed.	None.	None.	Resolved.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
CR-4	Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe "preconstruction" activities and how any identified or not yet identified cultural resources will be impacted by these activities.	Need new 4.8 and 4.6.	Prepare response for revisions to 4.8 and 4.6. See G-A	PEF will provide information.	Open.
CR-5	Provide a knowledgeable expert that can characterize the cultural resources at the site (areas listed below) and the impacts from construction and operation of the new units, to include discussions of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New transmission line corridor(s)</li> <li>• Proposed rail line spur</li> <li>• Haul road(s)</li> <li>• Barge slip and associated access road</li> <li>• Makeup pipeline</li> <li>• Blowdown pipeline</li> <li>• Area to be used for intake structure and other pipeline associated structures</li> <li>• The "Cross Florida Canal"</li> </ul>	Clarification- need SHPO condition of certification. Need two survey reports referenced in the SCA (Golder and Associates). Letter of concurrence from SHPO for New South Survey report.	Need condition of certification from SHPO expected 12/15. Need two survey reports referenced in the SCA (Golder and Associates). Letter of concurrence from SHPO for New South Survey report.	PEF will provide documents and information.	Open.

<b>Info Need #</b>	<b>Information Need</b>	<b>Summary of Site Audit Discussions</b>	<b>Document or Documented Material Needed</b>	<b>Path Forward</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>CR-6</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe the cultural resources scope of work to date, what remains to be completed and a schedule for completion.	Issue of transmission lines and USACE input. PEF needs to assure surveys are completed for inclusion in FEIS, per USACE. Schedule of completion needed.	Need schedule. (See TL-A).	RAI needed (See TL-A).	Open.
<b>CR-7</b>	Provide copies of all reports completed by New South for the COL effort for Unit 1 and 2, and their associated SHPO concurrence.	Need survey report and technical memo.	Survey report.	NRC will request reports from SHPO.	Open.
<b>CR-8</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe how any resources, previously identified or identified in the course of COL related work, were determined significant or not significant.	Need copy of SHPO letter to satisfy outstanding issues with SHPO (i.e. eligibility of canal).	Need copy of SHPO letter of concurrence.	PEF will provide copy of letter.	Open.
<b>CR-9</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe how it was determined that no traditional cultural properties will be impacted.	Requesting PEF letters to tribes and their responses.	Correspondence to tribes from PEF and responses.	PEF will provide correspondence.	Open.
<b>CR-10</b>	Provide access to a procedure or plan for evaluation and mitigation or avoidance of cultural and historic resources identified during any previous or current investigations (if they are likely to be	Need copy of procedure to docket. USACE needs a copy of these procedures sent to SHPO with their concurrence.	Procedure and validation on SHPO concurrence with procedure.	PEF will attempt to provide document. . If this document does not exist, then this will be an open item.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
CR-11	<p>impacted by preconstruction, construction, or operation of the facility). Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe the process for evaluating noise and viewshed impacts to cultural resources.</p>	Closed.	None.	None.	Resolved.
CR-12	Provide access to procedure(s) for post-licensing cultural resource protection and management, from site specific to corporate level.	Closed (See New CR-A).	Procedure.	Progress will provide procedures.	Open.
CR-13	Provide access to copies of ALL consultation correspondence with the SHPO, Tribes, and any other parties regarding the preconstruction and construction of the proposed Units 1 and 2 in reference to cultural and historic resources.	Open until view documents and docket. Need e-mail consultation with SHPO, all consultation letters with SHPO, 4 consultation letters with the tribes and their responses and telephone records from five individuals.	Telephone records summary with local residents	PEF will provide consultation letters and summary of phone calls.	Open.
CR-14	Provide access to copies of all survey reports referenced in the ER Sections 4.1.3 and 5.1.3.	Requested copy of data request from CH2M Hill, response from SHPO and the data. Need Site form if don't get from SHPO.	Copy of data request (all GIS data for cemeteries, bridges, standing structures, NR listed, resource groups, surveys and archaeological sites)	NRC will request data from SHPU	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
CR-15	Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe the process used to identify interested Tribes and parties regarding cultural resources.	Closed.	within a ten mile radius from CH2M Hill, response from SHPO and the data. Need Site form if don't get from SHPO. None.	None.	Resolved.
CR-16-NEW (A)	Provide access to procedures for management of cultural resources including protection of undiscovered resources and inadvertent discoveries.	Procedure.	Procedure for docket.	NRC will conduct consultation under Section 106 of the NHPA	Resolved.
CR-16-B	Provide a response provided to tribes regarding request for archaeological sites identified.	Provide response sent to tribes.	Response sent to tribes, will send per document request.	NRC will conduct consultation under Section 106 of NEPA	Resolved.
<b>Alt-</b>	<b>Alternatives</b>				
Alt-1	Provide access to the proprietary siting study for our review	Siting Study needs to be docketed, redacted version.	Siting Study needs to be docketed, redacted version.	PEF will initiate process to provide redacted version of siting study as a proprietary document.	Open.
Alt-2	Provide access to complete information on intake systems.	Need to review response to audit info needs	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will prepare a response.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
Alt-3	Provide access to complete information on discharge systems.	Need to review response to audit info needs.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will prepare a response.	Open.
Alt-4	Provide access to descriptions and details of alternative water treatment systems considered.	Need to review response to audit information needs.	Response that addresses information request.	PEF will prepare a response.	Open.
Alt-5 New- A	Basis for purchase power claim.	Information will need to be provided that is referenceable.	Response that includes limitations.	PEF will prepare a response.	Open.
Alt-6 New-B	Need application DSM resources and PEF's dispatch approach.	Information will need to be provided that is referenceable.	Document request and supplemental information.	PEF will prepare a response and document.	Open.
Alt-7 New-C	Section 9.2.4: Statement - energy alternatives are excluded b/c of cost. Need to explain basis for this.	Information will need to be provided that is referenceable.	Documentation to NRC.	PEF will prepare a response.	Open.
Alt-7 New-D	COMMENT/ISSUE: Comment from Rajiv Prasad (PNNL): Provide supplemental information to support the use of SMALL, MODERATE, and LARGE impact descriptions throughout Section 9.4.	Info will need to be provided that is referenceable.	Supplemental information.	PEF will prepare a response.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
<p><b>Alt-7 New-E</b></p>	<p>COMMENT/ISSUE: Comment from Rajiv Prasad (PNNL): Revise the following sentence, “Based on the LNP configuration and size, the once-through cooling alternative would not support the cooling requirements for the LNP” to adequately describe the reasons why once through cooling is not a viable option.</p>	<p>Information will need to be provided that is referenceable.</p>	<p>Updated ER text in response and update ER.</p>	<p>PEF will prepare a response.</p>	<p>Open.</p>
<p><b>Alt-7 New-F</b></p>	<p>COMMENT/ISSUE: Comment from Rajiv Prasad (PNNL) and Linda Fassbender (PNNL): Why would the use of once through cooling have a range of SMALL to LARGE impacts? Need to clarify the impacts to either list all of the criteria impacts (such as land use, water use etc.). Revise the text pertaining to Table 9.4.1 to explain the range of all the impacts for the once through cooling option in a future version of the ER.</p>	<p>Info will need to be provided that is referenceable.</p>	<p>Requested information and updated table.  Updated ER text in response and update ER.</p>	<p>PEF will prepare a response.</p>	<p>Open.</p>

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
<p><b>Alt-7 New-G</b></p>	<p>COMMENT/ISSUE: Comment from Rajiv Prasad (PNNL): Need to revise the following statement since Section 3.3 does not contain a number of intake plan views:</p> <p>“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.”</p> <p>Also, need to confirm that the SCA, Appendix D contains a discussion of the intake alternatives.</p>	<p>Provide Technical Memo 0018 in the reading room.</p>	<p>Technical Memo 0018.</p>	<p>PEF will provide requested document to the reading room.</p>	<p>Open.</p>
<p><b>Alt-7 New-H</b></p>	<p>COMMENT/ISSUE: Comment from Andy Kugler (NRC): Provide information pertaining to the alternative water treatment systems.</p>	<p>Response that documents information request</p>	<p>Response to requested information.</p>	<p>PEF will provide requested information.</p>	<p>Open.</p>



Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
<p><b>Alt-7 New-I</b></p>	<p>COMMENT/ISSUE: Comment from Andy Kugler (NRC): Need a redacted copy of the Progress Energy Florida, Inc., "Progress Energy, New Nuclear Baseload Generation Addition, Evaluation of Florida Sites," October, 2007 (Proprietary Reference) docketed and made available to the NRC.</p>	<p>Need document.</p>	<p>Redacted copy of siting study.</p>	<p>PEF will initiate process to provide redacted version of siting study as a proprietary document.</p>	<p>Open.</p>
<p><b>Alt-7 New-J</b></p>	<p>COMMENT/ISSUE: Comment from Rajiv Prasad (PNNL): Need to revise the following statement to show that the use of 6,000 acres was the upper limit of acreage used in the screening:</p> <p>"Potential sites were generally 2424 ha (6000 ac.) in size, although favorable sites as small as 809 ha (2000 ac.) were considered."</p>	<p>Need response.</p>	<p>Response that updates indicated sentence.</p>	<p>PEF will update information.</p>	<p>Open.</p>
<p><b>Alt-7 New-K</b></p>	<p>COMMENT/ISSUE: Comment from Rajiv Prasad (PNNL): What is the basis for the use of the low flow and mean water level metrics as evaluation</p>	<p>Need response.</p>	<p>Information requested.</p>	<p>PEF will send document.</p>	<p>Open.</p>

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
<b>Alt-7 New-L</b>	criteria? COMMENT/ISSUE: Comment from Rajiv Prasad (PNNL): Clarify the note in Table 9.3.5 that states, "No Color = Neutral ranking".	Need response.	Clarification statement in response	PEF will send document.	Open.
<b>Alt-7 New-M</b>	COMMENT/ISSUE: Provide additional socioeconomic information for each of the alternative sites.	Need response.	Requested information.	Request is understood by PEF. Information likely to be provided, but may shift.	Open.
<b>HP-</b>	<b>Health Physics</b>				
<b>HP-1</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe the liquid and gaseous source terms, release points, atmospheric dispersion models, and aquatic dispersion models.	Wayne Schofield is knowledgeable expert and these were closed out.	None.	None.	Resolved.
<b>HP-2</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe the GASPAR II and LADTAP analyses used to assess the impacts of gaseous and liquid effluents.	Wayne Schofield is knowledgeable expert and these were closed out.	None.	None.	Resolved.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
HP-3	Provide access to electronic copies of GASPAR II and LADTAP input and output files and calculation packages.	Open pending PEF action to supply electronic copies of GASPAR II and LADTAP input and output files and calculation packages. NOTE this response also resolves issues items discussed in HP-1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 11, and 12	Calculation packages and input/output files.	PEF will provide requested calculation packages to the CH2MHill reading room in New York.  PEF will provide the requested input/output files.	Open.
HP-4	Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe the waste systems including exposure rates due to onsite storage of solid waste and independent spent fuel storage.	Knowledgeable expert is Wayne Schofield this item is closed	None.	None.	Resolved.
HP-5	Provide a knowledgeable expert responsible for identifying exposure pathways and calculating doses to the public and biota from normal plant operations. Also, provide information on the presence or lack thereof of any unusual plants, animals, agricultural practices, or unusual food processing operations that can contribute 10% or more to offsite doses.	Knowledgeable expert is Wayne Schofield this item is closed	None.	None.	Resolved.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
HP-6	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the models, assumptions, and input data used to arrive at the estimates for doses to construction workers.	Knowledgeable expert is Wayne Schofield this item is closed	None.	None.	Resolved.
HP-7	Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe the uranium fuel cycle impacts and the comparison to the Table S3 values from 10 CFR 51.51(a) contained in the ER.	PEF will respond to request.	Revised response of 930 to 1037 MW(e) in Subsection 5.7.1.3	Progress will provide response.	Open.
HP-8	Provide a knowledgeable expert responsible for the radiological environmental monitoring program to discuss the design and technical basis for the program.	Knowledgeable expert is Wayne Schofield this item is closed	None.	None.	Resolved.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
HP-9	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the difference in the collective dose for construction workers calculated by the reviewer (0.028 mSv × 2700 workers = 0.0756 person-Sv) and the 0.088 person-Sv value on page 4-83 (Section 4.5.5) of the ER. Also, to discuss the difference in the collective dose to construction workers. The reviewer calculated a 9.72 person-Sv (360 mrem/yr × 2700 workers) collective dose to construction workers, however a value of 11.34 person-Sv from background and manmade radiation sources is shown on page 4-83 (Section 4.5.5) in the ER.	PEF addressing this by updating the ER- will become an RAI. Section 4.5.5 regarding construction worker collective dose. Need this as a prepared response.	Response to information request.	PEF will provide response, when validated.	Open.
HP-10	Provide a knowledgeable expert (i.e., the principal author(s) of the radiological sections of the ER) to discuss the source term, liquid and gaseous release points, transport and exposures used to calculate doses to	Knowledgeable expert is Wayne Schofield. See HP-3	See HP-3	See HP-3	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
HP-11	<p>construction workers, and MEI and population doses. Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the assumptions (chi/Q, stability classification, wind directions and speeds based on release and receptor locations) used to analyze transport of releases from specific elevations of LNP1 during construction of LNP2. This expert should also be able to discuss the uncertainty associated with less than a year of local data used to establish a correlation between site conditions and the Gainesville, Tampa and Orlando observation stations.</p>	<p>Knowledgeable expert is George Howroyd, Ph.D, PE. Second year chi/Qs. See HP-3</p>	<p>Second Year chi/Qs</p>	<p>PEF will provide information, when available.</p>	<p>Open.</p>
HP-12	<p>Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the onsite movement of nuclear fuel and radiological waste during construction of LNP2. (This could be staff responsible for the uranium fuel cycle environmental data addressed in ER section 5.7 and 10CFR51.51.)</p>	<p>Knowledgeable expert is Wayne Schofield. See HP-3</p>	<p>See HP-3</p>	<p>See HP-3</p>	<p>Open.</p>

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
HP-13	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss methods for identifying exposure pathways and calculating doses to the public and the biota from normal plant operations. In particular, would like to discuss information confirming existing and projected locations of nearby (within 10 miles) homes, off-site populations, cows/goats, gardens, sustenance forage and hunting, potable and irrigation wells, water intakes, fisheries, recreation etc.	Closed with internal discussion with PNNL hydrologist. Knowledgeable expert is Wayne Schofield.	None.	None.	Resolved.
HP-14	Provide a knowledgeable expert (preferably a cognizant Florida DEP radiological scientist, if possible) to discuss an August 12, 2008 letter from Jamie Hunter, Lead Environmental Specialist, Progress Energy, to Mr. Mike Halpin, PE, Siting Administrator, Florida DEP, responding to Determination of Incompleteness – Main Site and Associated Facilities	Cognizant representative for Florida State is John Williamson, Dept of Health Bureau of Radiation Control. This item is closed. NOTE: Control locations for CR-3 are adequate for LNP 1 and 2 however, adding an already studied point 60 miles south of CR-3 at the Tampa desalinization plant will be considered when background radiological studies are conducted for LNP 1 and 2.	None.	None.	Resolved.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
HP-15	for the Levy Nuclear Plant. Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the radiological environmental monitoring program	Knowledgeable expert is Wayne Schofield this item is closed	None.	None.	Resolved.
HP-A	Discharge rates and blowdown values need an explanation.	PEF action to update ER Fig. 3.3-2. Discussion with Mitch Griffin regarding the water balance diagram with revealed that ER Figure 3.3-2 will be revised. Need this as a prepared response.	Response that addresses information request.	Progress will prepare a response.	Open.
HP-B	Florida Dept of Health tritium intake canal concentrations that will require additional review/clarification.	Recirculation potential for CR-3 discharge into the intake canal was revealed by John Williamson, Florida Dept of Health Bureau of Radiation Control. This item is closed. NOTE: Annual Radiological Environmental Operating Report years 2006 and 2007 present tritium concentrations above detectable limits at the CR-3 intake canal.	None.	None.	Resolved.



Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
<b>HP-C</b>	One year x SECOND YEAR DATA WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE and updates to Table 2.7-58 revision to reflect actual values used in GASPAR. This is expected when the two year data is available. Expect this data by March/April 2009 timeframe.	PEF action to provide Year 2 data for chi/Q. PEF to provide specifics in transmission (letter) in March 2009 as supplemental information.	Year 2 data and related impacts.	PEF will provide schedule for response as part of site audit summary.	Open.
<b>HP-D</b>	Need to address low level waste disposal Class C and B	Needs to be clarified.	Clarification.	Response needs to be prepared.	Open.
<b>HP-E</b>	The decommissioning costs in part 2 and part 3 do not match.	Open.	Clarification of decommissioning costs.	Response will be provided as part of site audit summary.	Open.
<b>Acc-</b>	<b>Accidents</b>				
<b>Acc-1</b>	Design Basis Accident (DBA) -1: Make available the PAVAN input and output files to support the DBA analysis in the ER. Include documentation on any supporting calculations or assumptions, input and output files to the PAVAN code, and the meteorological file used in the analysis. In addition provide a knowledgeable	Need to provide meteorological data files and PAVAN input/output files to the docket.	Meteorological data files and PAVAN input/output files.	No further action (See Met-4).	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
	<p>expert to discuss the DBA analysis. Items to be reviewed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source characterization (location, release heights, building dimensions)</li> <li>• Distances to the EAB and LPZ</li> <li>• Meteorological data</li> </ul>				
<b>Acc-2</b>	<p>DBA-2: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the assumptions for the LOCA and revised LOCA dose estimates consistent with the NRC position that the assumption that a DF of 5 for particles is not acceptable (NRC 8/14/2008 letter to Westinghouse).</p>	<p>There is an existing RAI request on the safety side that addresses this.</p>	<p>Need Safety RAI.</p>	<p>NRC staff to monitor status of response to Safety RAI.</p>	<p>Open.</p>
<b>Acc-3</b>	<p>DBA-3: Provide access to isotopic release rates as a function of time for each of the DBAs. Include the release rate for the two-hour period giving the highest dose at the EAB.</p>	<p>Outstanding. May be an RAI unless provided soon.</p>	<p>Need the isotopic release rate.</p>	<p>PEF to provide requested information.</p>	<p>Open.</p>

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
Acc-4	DBA-4: Be prepared to discuss the differences in DBAs between AP1000 DCD Revision 16 and DCD Revision 17.	Closed.	None.	None.	Resolved.
Acc-5	DBA-5: Provide access to electronic copies of PAVAN input and output files.	Addressed in ACC-1 Closed. (Met 4)	PAVAN input/output files.	No further action (See Met-4).	Resolved.
Acc-6	Severe Accident (SA) -1: Make available the MACCS2 input and output files used to support the severe accident analysis. Include documentation of supporting calculations or assumptions. Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the severe accident analysis. Items to be reviewed include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source characterization (locations, release height, building dimension, core inventory, release fractions, release classes)</li> <li>• Meteorological data and assumptions</li> <li>• Population estimates</li> <li>• Land Use characterization</li> <li>• Evacuation</li> </ul>	Closed.	None.	None.	Resolved.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
	assumptions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic assumptions</li> <li>• Consistency with other parts of ER</li> </ul>				
<b>Acc-7</b>	SA-2: Provide access to electronic copies of MACCS2 input and output files.	Request for docket.	Need MACCS2 input/output files.	PEF will provide requested input/output files.	Open.
<b>Acc-8</b>	SA-3: Provide access to information of surface water users between 25 and 50 miles.	Closed.	None.	None.	Resolved.
<b>Acc-9</b>	SA-4: Provide access to an estimate of the conditional probability of basemat melt-through should core damage occur.	Applicant doesn't know, may need an RAI to Westinghouse- No Action required by PEF.	None.	None.	Resolved.
<b>Acc-10</b>	SA-5: Provide access to estimates of the severe accident risks for the Crystal River Plants, if available, for the evaluation of cumulative impacts.	License renewal application - will get info out of that unless schedule is affected for License Renewal. Closed.	CREC Unit 3 License Renewal application.	None.	Resolved.
<b>Acc-11</b>	SA-6: Be prepared to discuss how changes in the AP1000 design set forth	Closed.	None.	None.	Resolved.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
	<p>in revisions 16 and 17 of the AP1000 design control document affect the AP1000 probabilistic risk assessment and the implications of the changes on the severe accident risk assessment for Levy County. The changes of interest include but are not limited to severe accident source terms and core damage frequencies that are used in assessing severe accident risks.</p>				
<b>Acc-12</b>	SA-7: Provide access to water ingestion pathway doses by release class.	Docket list of responses as part of site audit summary or will be in input/output files for MACCS	Referenceable document response from site audit or MACCS files.	PEF will provide requested information.	Open.
<b>Acc-13</b>	Severe Accident Mitigation Alternatives (SAMA) -1: Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss SAMAs.	Closed.	None.	None.	Resolved.
<b>Acc-14</b>	SAMA-2: Be prepared to discuss the effects of DCD Revisions 16 and 17 on the AP1000 PRA and SAMDA analysis	Closed.	None.	None.	Resolved.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
<b>Acc-15</b>	SAMA-3: Provide information on when procedural SAMAs will be evaluated, and what will be considered.	Need this in their summary response letter/docketed.	Need referenceable document that discusses SAMAs. Provide info on procedure	Progress will prepare response.	Open.
<b>T-</b>	<b>Transportation</b>				
<b>T-1</b>	Provide access to electronic copies of RADTRAN input and output files.	Closed. Received these files in reading room.	None.	None.	Resolved.
<b>T-2</b>	Provide access to calculation packages for the transportation analyses presented in the ER, Sections 3.8 and 7.4, preferably making it accessible to PNNL staff in Columbus, Ohio, prior to the site audit.	Closed. These were made available in the reading room.	None.	None.	Resolved.
<b>T-3</b>	Provide access to electronic copies of TRAGIS output files for the transportation analyses presented in the ER, Sections 3.8 and 7.4. This includes routes associated with the Levy site and the alternative sites.	Open- use redacted siting study. Would like the node information used in the TRAGIS run which is proprietary.	Siting Study needs to be docketed, redacted version.	PEF will initiate process to provide redacted version of siting study as a proprietary document.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
T-4	Provide access to a copy of the reference Progress Energy Florida, Inc., "New Nuclear Baseload Generation Addition, Evaluation of Florida Sites," (Proprietary) October 2007.	Closed.	None.	None.	Resolved.
T-5	Provide access to maps denoting the locations of Dixie, Highlands, and Putnam sites.	Closed	None.	None.	Resolved.
T-6	Provide access to a copy of the reference Progress Energy and Lincks & Associates, Inc., "Transportation Analysis: Levy County Nuclear Power Plant," Project Number: L07040, February 2007.	Open pending document request.	"Transportation Analysis: Levy County Nuclear Power Plant," Project Number: L07040, February 2007.	Provide in reading room in Columbus-docket later if needed.	Open.
<b>NRHH- Non-Rad Human Health and Waste</b>					
NRHH-1	If available, provide access to any correspondence with the Florida Division of Health regarding public health concerns from thermophilic microorganisms (etiologic agents) from cooling waters.	Resolved, provide documentation of telephone contacts with state, local health authorities.	Description of process.	PEF will provide response.	Resolved.

<b>Info Need #</b>	<b>Information Need</b>	<b>Summary of Site Audit Discussions</b>	<b>Document or Documented Material Needed</b>	<b>Path Forward</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>NRHH-2</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss potential thermophilic microorganism impacts from cooling water discharge to the Gulf of Mexico.	Resolved, no action items	None.	None.	Resolved.
<b>NRHH-3</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the proximity and types of recreational activities occurring near the cooling water discharge to the Gulf of Mexico.	Open. Provide calc package (recreational analysis) and provide information as to whether there are controls for recreational activities in areas affected by thermal plumes (outfall)- institutional controls.	Calculation package and information as to whether there are controls for recreational activities in areas affected by thermal plumes.	Provide information in response and calculation package to reading room.	Open.
<b>NRHH-4</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the most recent Centers for Disease Control information regarding incidence of infection from etiological agents or diseases of concern in the ROI.	Need Results of computer literature searches of CDC and other websites	Response to provided requested information.	PEF will provide results of literature search.	Open.
<b>NRHH-5</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the following associated with the transmission system: ozone, electrostatic effects (electric shock), corona discharges, and conformance with NESC concerning steady-state currents.	Resolved, no documents, no action items	None.	None.	Resolved.



<b>Info Need #</b>	<b>Information Need</b>	<b>Summary of Site Audit Discussions</b>	<b>Document or Documented Material Needed</b>	<b>Path Forward</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>NRHH-6</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss occupational health in association with operation activities and adherence to NRC, OSHA and State safety standards, practices and procedures.	Provide referenceable document that includes statements of OSH compliance during construction and operation, OSH compliance at CREC and Levy County	Response to provide requested information.	PEF will provide response.	Open.
<b>NRHH-7</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss cumulative health impacts of construction and operation.	Provide detailed summary of cumulative health impacts from ER Chapters 4 and 5	Summary of oral response provided by PEF during site audit discussion.	PEF will provide response.	Open.
<b>NRHH-8</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss the sanitary systems and related effluents used with reference to the ER Section 3.6.2.	Provide discussion of sanitary waste disposition during construction and provide draft NPDES permit when it becomes available.	Draft NPDES permit and discussion of sanitary waste disposition.	PEF will provide response.	Open.
<b>NRHH-9</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss public and occupational health, and noise associated with pre-construction and construction activities.	Closed.	None.	None.	Resolved.
<b>NRHH-10</b>	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss possible pre-existing soil and sediment contamination on the Levy site and mobilization thereof during the preconstruction and construction phases.	Provide discussion of Phase 1 investigation, previous land uses. Establish that there is no soil contamination on site.	Response to provide requested information.	PEF will provide response.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
NRHH-11	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss possible pre-existing sediment contamination in the CFBC at the CWIS and sediment mobilization during construction and facility operation.	Resolved, provide water, sediment sampling data from CFBC in reading room.	Document, as requested in H-5.	Progress will provide requested information in reading room.	Open.
NRHH-12	Provide a knowledgeable expert to discuss human exposures to volatile and particulate chemical releases from the cooling system during facility operation.	Resolved, no further action	None.	None.	Resolved.
NRHH-13	Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe the quantities and disposition of vegetative debris from land clearing operations, including clearing of the proposed transmission line and pipeline rights-of-way.	Open pending receipt of information.	Vegetation removed from areas requiring clearing may be handled using a combination of chipping, spreading, and stockpiling for decomposition onsite or within the limits of the ROW; of burning onsite or within the limits of the ROW; and of offsite disposal in an approved disposal facility. The selection of options for individual areas of the proposed project will depend on landowner	PEF will provide requested response.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
			<p>requirements, agency permit conditions, and relative costs. Please confirm or correct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the width of the 150 ft proposed pipeline ROW will be cleared and grubbed to accommodate the trench for the six 54 inch diameter pipes, an adjacent construction road, and excavated trench spoils. Please confirm or correct.</li> <li>• Most of the width of the proposed pipeline heavy haul road will be cleared and grubbed to accommodate the 50 ft wide road and associated drainage swales. Please confirm or correct.</li> <li>• Within the transmission line ROWs, only vegetation taller than low growth shrubs will be removed, except as required for</li> </ul>		

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
			<p>towers and access roads. Please confirm or correct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If any areas to be cleared have significant tree cover, the clearing contractor will be encouraged to consider harvesting the usable trees for wood or wood pulp. Please confirm or correct.</li> <li>• The quantities of vegetative waste have not yet been estimated in part because the exact alignments within the proposed rights-of-way have not been determined and therefore the actual vegetative cover of the alignment is unknown. Please confirm or correct.</li> <li>• A spoil area of approximately 740,000 sq. ft. (Area 186) would be designated onsite for stockpiling</li> </ul>		

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
			vegetative waste. Please confirm or correct.		
NRHH-14	Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe the air quality impacts of burning cleared vegetation.	Impacts of burning cleared vegetation were discussed. PEF referenced a description in ER Section 4.4.1.2 Air Quality.	None.	PEF will summarize discussion in response to information need.	Open.
NRHH-15	Provide information on the location and capacity of permitted industrial waste landfills that will be used for disposition of construction waste.	Open pending receipt of information.	The quantity of construction waste requiring landfill disposal is expected to be limited (see details under NRHH-17), and is not expected to significantly impact the available industrial, MSW, or Construction and Demolition landfill capacity within the region. Please confirm or correct.	PEF will respond	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
NRHH-16	Provide a knowledgeable expert to identify the types and quantities of hazardous waste to be generated during construction and operation.	Open pending receipt of information.	<p>§ Hazardous wastes expected to be generated during construction may include small quantities of paints, solvents, greases, oils, caulks, and other common building and maintenance materials. Please confirm or correct.</p> <p>§ No asbestos waste will be generated during construction or operation. Please confirm or correct.</p> <p>§ Drawing LNG-G100-X2-001 shows a proposed hazardous waste storage building (No. 136). Please describe the types and quantities of hazardous wastes expected to be stored in this building.</p> <p>§ Drawing LNG-G100-X2-001 shows two proposed chemical storage buildings (No. 119 and No. 120). Please identify the chemicals expected to</p>	PEF will respond	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
NRHH-17	Provide a knowledgeable expert to describe the types and quantities of solid waste expected to require disposition during construction and operation.	Open pending receipt of information.	<p>be stored in these buildings.                      § Drawing LNG-G100-X2-001 shows a proposed painting and sandblasting shop (No. 105). Please describe the expected types and quantities of wastes expected from this shop.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The quantity of construction waste requiring landfill disposal is expected to be limited for the following reasons. Please confirm or correct.</li> </ul> <p>§ Engineering projections of the soil cut and fill balance indicate that the proposed project will require approximately 1 million cubic yards of additional clean fill to reach design grades, therefore no clean excavation spoils are expected to require disposition offsite. Please confirm or</p>	PEF will respond	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
			<p>correct.</p> <p>§ Organic soils in areas to be cleared are typically 8 to 12 inches thick. The organic soils will either be used to restore topsoil in temporarily disturbed areas (such as over the pipeline ROW after pipeline placement and soil backfill), be spread adjacent to disturbed areas, or be stockpiled in a designated stockpile area. Little or no organic soil is expected to require disposition offsite. Please confirm or correct.</p> <p>§ Disposition of slurry waste from construction of the proposed diaphragm wall will be a contractual responsibility of the slurry wall contractor. The slurry trench for the diaphragm wall is expected to be excavated in panels using mechanical or</p>		



Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
			<p>hydraulic clamshell grabs or hydrofraise mills, as opposed to trenching, minimizing slurry requirements and allowing greater slurry reuse.</p> <p>§ Disposition of excess or waste asphalt from road construction will be a contractual responsibility of the paving contractor.</p> <p>§ Most of the plant equipment will be constructed offsite and delivered in modular units, reducing the generation of onsite construction waste.</p> <p>§ Waste concrete will be crushed and used on site for road aggregate or removed from the site and disposed of by the construction contractor.</p> <p>§ Construction is expected to generate small quantities of building and plant construction waste, such as scrap wood,</p>		

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
NRHH-18	Provide information to clarify the number of proposed diesel-driven fire pumps (as referenced in Section 3.6.3.1.3 in the ER).		<p>wallboard, plastics, paper, and metal</p> <p>§ Section 3.6.3.1.3 of the Environmental Report says “Two 100-percent-capacity fire pumps will be provided. Each pump is rated for 7571 lpm (2000 gpm). The lead pump is electric motor-driven and the second pump is diesel engine-driven. The fuel tank for the diesel-driven pump holds enough fuel to operate the pump for at least 8 hours.” Please clarify if there will be two diesel-driven pumps or one electric motor-driven pump and one diesel-driven pump, and whether that</p>	PEF will respond	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
			<p>number is for each unit or for both units.                      § Enclosure 3.6-1 of the Environmental Report lists four 4000-kW standby diesel generators and four 35-kW diesel generators. Section 3.6.3.1.1 Diesel Generators does not mention any 35-kW diesel generators. Please clarify.                      § Section 3.6.3.1.2 Fuel Storage Tanks says “Two fuel oil storage tanks will be provided, one for each of the standby diesel generators.” Enclosure 3.6-2 of the Environmental Report lists four fuel storage tanks for the 4000-kW standby diesel generators, two tanks for the 35-kW diesel generators, and two tanks for the diesel-driven fire pumps. Please clarify the number of fuel storage tanks and whether that</p>		

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
			number is for each unit or for both units. § Drawing LNG-G100-X2-001 shows a proposed fuel station in the motor pool area (No. 118) which does not seem to be described in the Environmental Report. Please indicate where this fuel station is described in the Environmental Report and describe the fuel tank or tanks required in the motor pool area.		
<b>CB- CB-1</b>	<b>Cost Benefit</b>				
	Provide a knowledgeable expert (preferably the author of Section 10.4 of the ER), who can provide additional explanation and discussion of Federal incentives mentioned in Section 10.4.2.3 of the ER. Topics include the impacts of the following:	Open, pending receipt/docketing of response.	Response to information request that can be docketed.	PEF will prepare a response.	Open.

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
<p><b>CB-2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Production tax credit for the first advanced reactors brought on line in the United States</li> <li>• Federal risk insurance benefits expected as part of the Nuclear Power 2010 Partnership</li> <li>• The expected impact of these incentives in terms of their role in making the project economically viable, and the impact on the proposed action in case PEC does not qualify for some or all of the incentives.</li> <li>• How the provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 specifically mitigate projected construction and operations costs over the life of the proposed facilities.</li> </ul> <p>Provide a knowledgeable expert (preferably the author of Section 10.4 of the ER), who can provide additional discussion relative to ER Section 10.4.3. Discussion topics will include:</p>	<p>Open.</p>	<p>Response to information need.</p>	<p>PEF will provide response needed to change ER.</p>	<p>Open.</p>

Info Need #	Information Need	Summary of Site Audit Discussions	Document or Documented Material Needed	Path Forward	Status
-------------	------------------	-----------------------------------	--	--------------	--------

- The important conclusions to be drawn from the summary in Table 10.4.1.
- Balancing of all internal and external benefits and costs.
- Determination of the net economic benefit (or cost) to society of the proposed action, based on this assessment.
- Discussion of costs and benefits that cannot be precisely determined at this time in relative terms compared to the expected internal construction and operation costs – to facilitate amplified discussion of the benefit/cost balance.