

PMLevyCOLPEm Resource

From: Moser, Michelle
Sent: Wednesday, October 21, 2009 4:10 PM
To: Harper.Cecelia@epamail.epa.gov; gagliano.paul@epa.gov; 'Hambrick, Gordon A SAJ'; Doub, Peyton; Kugler, Andrew; 'Smith, Michael Alan'; Leigh, Kimberly D; 'Baber, Bill'; Prasad, Rajiv; 'Fassbender, Linda L'; 'dma@pnl.gov'
Cc: Bruner, Douglas; Schaaf, Robert; LevyCOL Resource; Martin, Jody
Subject: Levy Teleconference 102209
Attachments: Enclosure 1 NRC RAIs for Levy_ML0926502080.pdf; 101509 Telecon Summary and 102209 Telecon Agenda- Final.doc

All,

Please find attached a summary of the October 15, 2009 teleconference and additional clarifying questions to be discussed on tomorrow's conference call. For your reference, I've also attached the RAIs that were sent to Progress Energy. Information for the teleconference is below:

Date: October 22, 2009
Time: 1 pm EST
Telephone: 888-972-9932
Password: 49772

Michelle Rome Moser
Environmental Project Manager
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of New Reactors
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews
Phone: 301-415-6509
Fax: 301-415-5397
Email: Michelle.Moser@nrc.gov

Hearing Identifier: Levy_County_COL_Public
Email Number: 499

Mail Envelope Properties (9C2386A0C0BC584684916F7A0482B6CA04A8582DBC)

Subject: Levy Teleconference 102209
Sent Date: 10/21/2009 4:10:08 PM
Received Date: 10/21/2009 4:10:07 PM
From: Moser, Michelle

Created By: Michelle.Moser@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Bruner, Douglas" <Douglas.Bruner@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Schaaf, Robert" <Robert.Schaaf@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"LevyCOL Resource" <LevyCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Martin, Jody" <Jody.Martin@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Harper.Cecelia@epamail.epa.gov" <Harper.Cecelia@epamail.epa.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"gagliano.paul@epa.gov" <gagliano.paul@epa.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Hambrick, Gordon A SAJ" <Gordon.A.Hambrick@usace.army.mil>
Tracking Status: None
"Doub, Peyton" <Peyton.Doub@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Kugler, Andrew" <Andrew.Kugler@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Smith, Michael Alan" <michael.smith@pnl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Leigh, Kimberly D" <Kimberly.Leigh@pnl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Baber, Bill" <bbaber@jsanet.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Prasad, Rajiv" <Rajiv.Prasad@pnl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Fassbender, Linda L" <linda.fassbender@pnl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"dma@pnl.gov" <dma@pnl.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time	
MESSAGE	690	10/21/2009 4:10:07 PM	
Enclosure 1 NRC RAls for Levy_ML0926502080.pdf	111422		
101509 Telecon Summary and 102209 Telecon Agenda- Final.doc			45050

Options

Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No

Reply Requested:

No

Sensitivity:

Normal

Expiration Date:

Recipients Received:

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

RAI Number	Question Summary (RAI)	Full Text (supporting information)
5.2.2 – 4 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 5.2.2	Provide calibrated DWRM2 TMR model results that considers local scale conditions and the goodness of fit between simulated and observed hydraulic heads in the vicinity of the LNP site.	<p>The assessment of groundwater usage impacts in the ER is based on the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) District Wide Regulation Model, Version 2, with Telescopic Mesh Refinement (DWRM2 TMR), which uses basin and regional-scale hydraulic property distributions. In Supplement 3 Response to RAIs (Accession No: ML092240658), three modifications were made to the model to better represent the Levy Nuclear Plant (LNP) site conditions. Model results indicated a poor goodness of fit between simulated and observed hydraulic heads in the vicinity of the LNP site.</p> <p>Calibrate the DWRM2 TMR model to reflect local scale conditions in order to improve the fit between simulated and observed hydraulic heads in the vicinity of the LNP site. Consider consulting with SWFWMD staff when doing this calibration.</p> <p>Provide documentation of the DWRM2 TMR model modifications that are made and any consultations with SWFWMD staff regarding calibration of the local scale groundwater conditions. In addition, provide updated versions of all figures that were submitted in Supplement 3 Response to NRC RAI # 5.2.2-3 (Accession No: ML092240658) for results generated using the recalibrated groundwater model.</p>
9.3 – 2 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 9.3	Clarify how wetlands were included as a part of the exclusionary screening criteria for Regional Ecological Features.	Environmental Report (ER) Table 9.3.1 (page 9-86) and Progress Energy Florida (PEF's) (2007) New Nuclear Baseload Generation Addition, Evaluation of Florida Sites (EFS) Table 3-1 of Attachment IV (page 51) state that known mapped wetlands/estuaries and designated critical habitat for Federal threatened and endangered species served as the Region of Interest (Step 1) exclusionary screening criteria for the data category of Regional Ecological Features. Clarify how this screening exercise was conducted for wetlands and provide a copy of the specific data sources for wetlands information used in the analysis.

RAI Number	Question Summary (RAI)	Full Text (supporting information)
9.3 – 3 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 9.3	Clarify whether analyses were based on a 6,000-ac site.	<p>The wetlands screening criterion for potential sites (P6 in ER Table 9.3-2, page 9-89; and EFS Table 5-1 of Attachment IV, page 60), candidate sites (“Disruption of Important Species/Habitats and Wetlands” criterion and “Dewatering Effects on Adjacent Wetlands Criterion” in EFS Table 3, page 25; and ER Tables 9.3-7, pages 9-99), and alternative sites (“Disruption of Important Species/Habitats and Wetlands” criterion and “Dewatering Effects on Adjacent Wetlands Criterion” in EFS Table 4, page 30; and ER Table 9.3-8, pages 9-102) use a utility function and analysis for wetlands that is based on the acreage or percentage of wetlands within a 6000 ac site, roughly a 3-mile diameter circle (EFS page 16) (Steps 3 and 4). Staff have several questions related to these wetland analyses. The first question is presented in this RAI and the others are presented in RAIs 9.3 – 4 to 9.3 – 10.</p> <p>A 3-mile diameter circle is equivalent to about 4,500 ac, not 6,000 ac. Clarify that analyses were based on 6,000-ac sites.</p>
9.3 – 4 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 9.3	Clarify whether a uniform metric for wetlands was used to account for size variations between potential sites.	<p>Both the ER (page 9-49) and the EFS (page 55) state that potential sites were generally 6,000 ac in size, although sites as small as 2,000 ac were considered. Identify which potential sites varied from the 6,000-ac size category and provide information to indicate the size of these sites. In the EFS, Appendix C of Attachment IV, The Technical Basis for Screening Criterion Ratings, Criterion P6 - Wetlands (page 107 of EFS) indicates that acres were used as the basis for assigning the ratings score. Clarify why the proportion or percentage of wetlands was not included as a metric in the analyses.</p>
9.3 – 5 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 9.3	How were NWI maps used in analysis of alternative sites, and were the NWI data supplemented by other data sources? If so, identify the sources and explain how they were used.	<p>The table for Criterion P6 - Wetlands (page 107 of EFS) indicates that National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps served as the source for estimating the amount of wetlands present on most of the 20 potential sites, but not for all sites (see page 188 of EFS). Explain why NWI maps were not used for all potential sites. Identify what other wetland data sources were used, such as FLUCCS maps. In the Comments and Discussion (column), page 188 of EFS, it states “Could not compile local map. Wetland polygon data from radius search only.” Clarify what is meant by this statement. The table for Criterion P6 - Wetlands (page 107 of EFS) states that the wetland estimates do not include riverine wetlands. Clarify this statement. For example, are areas of open water being excluded or are floodplain wetlands associated with riverine systems being excluded?</p>

RAI Number	Question Summary (RAI)	Full Text (supporting information)
9.3 – 6 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 9.3	Clarify discrepancies in wetland acreage as reported for each site in the EFS and AA.	The table for Criterion P6 - Wetlands (page 107 of EFS) identifies 61 acres of wetlands on the Levy 2 site (i.e., the preferred LNP site analyzed in the ER). Applying the rating scale, Levy 2 was assigned a rating of 4 for containing between 60 and 300 acres of wetlands (Table 2, Potential Site Preliminary Technical Evaluation Screening, page 22 of EFS; Table 9.3-4, Technical Evaluation Screening for Potential Sites, page 9-92 of ER). Examining NWI maps suggests that many hundreds of acres of wetlands are present on the Levy 2 site. CH2M Hill's (2009) Levy Nuclear Units 1 and 2 Section 404(b)(1) Alternatives Analysis (AA) identifies 1742.38 ac of wetlands on the LNP site using the NWI maps, and 1691.96 ac using FLUCCS maps (Table 7, Total Estimated Wetland Acreages for Each of the Five Final Candidate Siting Areas, page 34). The AA estimates correspond closely with the actual field delineations conducted for the LNP site – about 2000 ac of wetlands over the 3505 ac LNP site. Table 7 from the AA identifies 2173.15 acres of wetlands (based on NWI maps) for Putnam as compared to 105 ac of wetlands in EFS Criterion P6 Table. Similarly, the AA identifies 1168.97 acres of wetlands (based on NWI maps) for Crystal River as compared to 123 acres of wetlands in the EFS. There are similar inconsistencies in the number of wetlands for the other sites. Clarify these wetland acreage discrepancies between the EFS and the AA and, as appropriate, revise the estimated number of wetlands for each site and ratings within the EFS and ER.
9.3 – 7 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 9.3	Clarify the boundaries of the Levy 2 site as reported in the EFS and ER.	Aerial photos in the unredacted version of the EFS (Appendix A, page 10 of 22) suggest that the geographical location for the Levy 2 site (i.e., the preferred LNP site analyzed in the ER) is not consistent with the location of the LNP site as presented in the ER. Provide clarification.
9.3 – 8 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 9.3	Was a uniform wetlands metric used to account for size variations between candidate/alternative sites in the "Disruption of Important Species/Habitats and Wetlands" criterion?	Were generalized 6000-acre circles used once the screening process identified the 5 best alternative sites (the "alternate" sites) or was a more refined, site-specific evaluation used to compare the best alternative sites?

RAI Number	Question Summary (RAI)	Full Text (supporting information)
9.3 – 9 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 9.3	Describe how the overall site rating for wetlands was reached for the “Disruption of Important Species/Habitats and Wetlands” criterion.	Describe how the overall site rating for wetlands was reached for the “Disruption of Important Species/Habitats and Wetlands” criterion (see EFS page 187). The wetlands component includes a total wetlands area element, a wetlands quality element, and a “flexibility to avoid wetlands during construction” element. Define each element, explain the basis for the scoring, and identify the rating scale used (rating scale appears to be the same as defined in P6 of ER Table 9.3-2, page 9-89 and EFS Table 5-1, page 59). Clarify how the wetland area discrepancies, identified in 9.3-6 above for the alternative sites, affect the wetland ratings for this component.
9.3 – 10 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 9.3	Explain how candidate/alternative sites were compared with respect to potential dewatering impacts on wetlands.	The “Dewatering Effects on Adjacent Wetlands” criterion presented in EFS Tables 3 and 4 (page 25 and 29, respectively) and ER Tables 9.3-8 and 9.3-9, (pages 9-99 and 9-102, respectively) is subject to many of the same questions noted in 9.3 – 7 and 9.3 – 8 above. Referring specifically to the evaluation process detailed on EFS page 188, this includes the issue of 6,000 acre candidate/alternative sites, as well as a wetlands quality element represented by forested wetlands. The EFS (page 187) states that high quality wetlands are denoted by forested and scrub-shrub wetlands; however, only forested wetlands are listed as a component of the Dewatering Effects on Adjacent Wetlands criterion. Clarify how the wetland area discrepancies, identified in 9.3 – 6 above for the alternative sites, affect the ratings for this component.
9.3 – 11 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 9.3	Provide an estimate of wetlands and other sensitive terrestrial ecological resources potentially affected by the construction of reservoirs required for certain alternative sites.	The need for a reservoir to provide a supplemental water source figured into the evaluation of the alternative sites and the selection of the preferred alternative (see ER Section 9.3.3, Summary Results of the Alternative Sites and Environmental Impact Evaluation, pages 9-61 to 9-81; EFS Section 4.1.1 Water Supply, page 213). Provide (at a minimum) a general estimate of wetlands and other sensitive terrestrial ecological resources (e.g., threatened and endangered species, floodplains) that would be impacted if the construction of reservoirs were required.
9.3 – 12 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 9.3	Why did the ecology screening criterion for threatened and endangered species not consider state listed species along with federal listed species?	The ecology screening criterion for potential sites (P5 in ER Table 9.3-2, page 9-89; and EFS Table 5-1 of Attachment IV, page 60), candidate sites (“Disruption of Important Species/Habitats and Wetlands” criterion in EFS Table 3, page 25; and ER Tables 9.3-7, pages 9-99) and alternative sites (“Disruption of Important Species/Habitats and Wetlands” criterion in EFS Table 4, page 30; and ER Table 9.3-8, pages 9-102) uses a utility function and analysis for threatened and endangered species that is based on the number of Federally listed aquatic and

RAI Number	Question Summary (RAI)	Full Text (supporting information)
9.3 – 12 (Cont.)		<p>terrestrial species that may occur within the host county (Steps 3 and 4). Staff have several questions related to these analyses. The first question is presented in this RAI and the others are presented in RAIs 9.3 – 13 to 9.3 – 14.</p> <p>Clarify why state listed species were not included in the analysis. NUREG-1555 states that the definition for important species includes both federal and state listed species, as well as other species that have economic value, are relied on by a valuable species, play an ecological role, or are ecologically sensitive.</p>
9.3 – 13 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 9.3	Clarify why FNAI occurrence data for Federal and state listed species were not used in the analysis of candidate and alternative sites.	Clarify why Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI) occurrence data for Federal and state listed species were not used for the threatened and endangered species utility function and analysis of the candidate sites and alternative sites. Revise the ER and EFS with this information, if appropriate.
9.3 – 14 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 9.3	Describe how the overall site rating for important terrestrial species/habitats was reached for the “Disruption of Important Species/Habitats and Wetlands” criterion.	The important terrestrial species/habitats component for the “Disruption of Important Species/Habitats and Wetlands” criterion (see EFS pages 182-187) includes two elements: habitat quantity/quality and flexibility to avoid protected species during construction. Define each element, explain the basis for the scoring, and identify the rating scale used (Note – the rating scale appears to be based on a 6000-ac baseline site; see 9.3 – 4 and 9.3 – 8 above for questions regarding the use of 6000 ac as a baseline). Describe how the overall site rating for the important terrestrial species/habitats component was reached (EFS page 186).
9.3 – 15 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 9.3	Explain why FEMA floodplain maps were not used as the technical basis for the flooding screening criterion for all 20 potential sites. Explain why the Levy 2 site was not evaluated for its location in a 100-year floodplain. Revise the ER and EFS as appropriate.	The initial Flooding screening criterion for potential sites (P2 in ER Table 9.3-2, page 9-88; and EFS Table 5-1 of Attachment IV, page 59) used a utility function and analysis based on the difference between mean site elevation and mean water elevation from the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) topographic maps and gauging station measurements. Optimal sites are described as relatively flat and above the 100-year floodplain, adjacent to streams showing topographic relief (ER page 9-50, ESF page 56). Candidate and alternative sites were screened further by examining the FEMA 100-year floodplain maps and using a refined rating scale (see EFS page 141). The Levy 2 site is described as not being located in the 100-year floodplain (EFS page 142, unredacted version; and page 217) and assigned a score of 5. However, FEMA floodplain maps show portions of the LNP site as lying within the 100-year floodplain. Confirm the flooding scores for all candidate/alternative sites. Explain why FEMA floodplain maps

RAI Number	Question Summary (RAI)	Full Text (supporting information)
9.3 – 15 (Cont.)		were not used as the flooding screening criterion for all 20 potential sites. Revise the ER and EFS as appropriate.
9.3 – 16 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 9.3	Clarify why there is a similar level of detail and information in the Technical Evaluation for the candidate and alternative site analyses.	As part of the Technical Evaluation for the candidate sites and the alternative sites, each site was rated and scored for a set of 34 general criteria that included 40 parameters that spanned health and safety, environmental, socioeconomic and engineering factors (see ER Section 9.3.2.1.4 beginning on page 9-50 and ER Section 9.3.2.1.5 beginning on page 9-53). Clarify why the level of detail and information in the Technical Evaluations for ER Table 9.3-7 for candidate sites (page 9-98) and ER Table 9.3-8 for alternative sites (page 9-101) are so similar (i.e., why is there so little refinement between these steps?).
9.3 – 17 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 9.3	Clarify how the on-ground inspections of the alternative sites were used to refine analyses for important terrestrial species/habitats.	On-ground inspections (e.g., foot, vehicle drive-overs) of the 5 alternative sites were conducted to further evaluate ecological resources (see ER page 9-56, EFS page 75). Clarify how these inspections were used to refine the ecological criteria from the Technical Evaluation, such as the “Disruption of important species/habitats and wetlands” criterion (see EFS pages 182-187) or the “Dewatering Effects on Adjacent Wetlands” criterion (see EFS pages 187-188).
9.3 – 18 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 9.3	Explain why transmission line impacts on ecological resources were rated MODERATE for Crystal River and SMALL for the LNP.	Explain why transmission line impacts on ecological resources were rated MODERATE for Crystal River (ER page 9-67) and SMALL for the LNP (ER page 9-81) when land commitments, construction impacts and operational impacts are generally expected to be similar.
9.3 – 19 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 9.3	Explain why the Dixie site was carried forward for more detailed analysis as a candidate site when land acquisition was not feasible within a timeline that would meet PEF’s business objectives.	Explain why the Dixie site was carried forward as a candidate site for more detailed analysis when land acquisition was not feasible within a timeline that would meet PEF’s business objectives (see ER page 9-58). Clarify why the Dixie site was not initially screened out using a bounding assumption in the initial evaluation process (see ER page 9-45, EFS page 7).

RAI Number	Question Summary (RAI)	Full Text (supporting information)
9.3 – 20 10 CFR 51.71(d) ESRP 9.3	Explain why the Crystal River site was carried forward for more detailed analysis as a candidate site when there were over-riding concerns about the strategic reliability of concentrating new PEF generating capacity at an existing site susceptible to a severe weather event.	Explain why the Crystal River site was carried forward as a candidate site for more detailed analysis when there were over-riding concerns about the strategic reliability of concentrating new PEF generating capacity at an existing site susceptible to a severe weather event (e.g., hurricane), and where generation loss from such an event could result in a large scale impact to the PEF system (see ER page 9-59, EFS page 32 & 36). Clarify why the Crystal River site was not initially screened out using a bounding assumption in the initial evaluation process (see ER page 9-45, EFS page 7).

**Teleconference Summary for October 15, 2009
And
Additional Clarifying Questions to be Discussed on October 22, 2009
Levy COLA**

Discussion Topic

Introductions

PEF's Approach to RAIs on Alternatives

On a teleconference held October 15, 2009, Progress Energy Florida (PEF) provided the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) with an initial overview of how they plan to approach each NRC Request for Additional Information (RAI) on alternatives (ML092650208). A summary of PEF's approach is provided below. In addition, NRC and USACE have developed additional clarifying questions to be discussed during the October 22, 2009 teleconference. Such questions are referred to as "Additional Clarifying Questions" below.

RAI Summary of PEF's Approach and Clarifying Questions

9.3-2 Summary: No digitized wetland data were used. Wetlands were used as a screening tool, but it was not considered an exclusionary criteria. PEF will clarify how wetlands were considered in the Evaluation of Florida Sites (EFS) and discuss revisions to the Environmental Report (ER) in their response.

9.3-3 Summary: Analyses were based on 6,000-ac circles, which will be clarified in the response. Updated maps of all sites will be provided in a revised Alternatives Analysis to support the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) decision. Note that maps are needed for NEPA documents as well.

Additional Clarifying Question: At the alternatives site audit, PEF said that sites as small as 2,000 acres were considered. At what point in the site selection process did PEF only consider 6,000 acre sites?

9.3-4 Summary: Wetland ratings were based on the percentage of area covered by wetlands.

9.3-5 Summary: The National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) mapper was used to account for wetlands. The NWI mapper was available for all 20 potential sites.

Additional Clarifying Question: The EFS indicates that riverine wetlands were not included in wetland estimates (page 107). Provide clarification for this statement.

9.3-6 Summary: The EFS and ER will be revised with updated wetlands estimates. There was a defect in the NWI mapper that was used to estimate wetland coverage in the EFS. Progress Energy learned about the defect in the program when responding to these RAIs.

New wetland numbers will be calculated for all sites. In addition, a supplement to the EFS and revisions to the ER will be provided which will reevaluate wetland coverage and wetland scores for all sites. If scores for the sites change based on the new wetland estimates, PEF will reevaluate all sites to determine new overall rankings for the sites.

- 9.3-7 Summary: PEF will provide a map that clearly shows the boundaries of Levy 2 site, as used in the EFS, and the boundaries of the proposed LNP site, as indicated in Chapters 3, 4, and 5 of the ER. The alternatives analysis to support the LEDPA will be based on the proposed LNP site.

If the boundary of the LNP site is not entirely contained within the Levy 2 site, PEF will reanalyze all site-specific environmental criteria for Levy as a supplement to the EFS and ER. In the supplement, PEF will examine a site that totally encompasses the current boundaries of the proposed LNP site. If any score for any environmental criteria is changed based on the revised location (such as floodplains), PEF will rescore the category and revise the site rankings as appropriate.

Additional Clarifying Question: Is the evaluation of the Levy alternative in Chapter 9 based on Levy 2 site or the proposed LNP site?

- 9.3-8 Summary: No further refinement was conducted.
- 9.3-9 Summary: PEF will provide additional clarification for each element used to score wetlands and provide updated wetland estimates and, if appropriate, site rankings, as discussed in the summary to RAI 9.3-6.
- 9.3-10 Summary: A definition of “high quality wetlands” will be provided. PEF will also provide clarification for how dewatering effects were accounted for. In addition, PEF will provide updated wetland estimates and, if appropriate, site rankings, as discussed in the summary to RAI 9.3-6.
- 9.3-11 Summary: No formal layouts for reservoirs were proposed. All reservoirs would be located within the 6,000 acre sites. More detailed information will be provided in the Alternatives Analysis to support the LEDPA. Preliminary siting of such reservoirs will be provided in the LEDPA document, which will address the potential impact to wetlands and other resources.
- 9.3-12 Summary: State species of concern were not considered in the EFS. State species of concern were considered in the ER (selection of the environmentally superior alternative) by looking at county level occurrence information. Additional details regarding state species of concern will be provided in the Alternatives Analysis to support the LEDPA decision.

Additional Clarifying Questions: What sources of data will be used to analyze state species of concern in the LEDPA document? Will revisions to Chapter 9 of the ER be provided?

- 9.3-13 Summary: State species of concern were not considered in the EFS. State species of concern were considered in the ER (selection of the environmentally superior alternative) by looking at county level occurrence information. Additional details regarding state species of concern will be provided in the Alternatives Analysis to support the LEDPA decision.

Additional Clarifying Questions: Clarify why FNAI data were not used. Will FNAI data be used in the LEDPA document?

9.3-14 Summary: PEF will define subcomponents of the criterion and clarify how the scoring was conducted.

Additional Clarifying Question: Provide additional clarification on how PEF plans to approach this RAI.

9.3-15 Summary: PEF will reanalyze the floodplain scores for LNP given that Levy 2, which was the site used in the EFS, was given a score that assumes floodplains could be avoided. After more detailed siting studies, LNP was sited in an area that would impact floodplains. PEF will examine whether other environmental categories would also be scored differently given the current location of LNP, as compared to the location of Levy 2 in the EFS. A supplement to the EFS and ER will be provided which analyzes all site-specific environmental categories for a 6,000 acre site that totally encompasses the proposed LNP site, as described above in the summary for 9.3-7.

9.3-16 Summary: Little information was added when going from the candidate sites to the alternative sites because additional research conducted for the alternative sites did not change the scoring for such sites.

Additional Clarifying Questions: Explain why more detailed data, such as FNAI data, were not used to further refine the alternative sites. Will more detailed data be provided for LEDPA document? Will sites be redefined to smaller parcels within the LEDPA document?

9.3-17 Summary: PEF conducted a "good faith attempt" to verify data gathered for the EFS using on-ground inspections. On-ground inspections were limited to public roads, which is why the underestimation of wetland numbers was not realized.

Additional Clarifying Question: Land owner agreements were obtained for borings. Explain why land owner agreements were not used to conduct more detailed on-ground inspections.

9.3-18 Summary: A revision to the ER will be provided in order to clarify this issue.

9.3-19 Summary: Dixie was carried forward as a candidate site, and not initially screened out, because land availability was not examined until later in the site selection process.

9.3-20 Summary: Crystal River was carried forward as a candidate site, and not initially screened out, because susceptibility to extreme weather events was not examined until later in the site selection process.

Other

- The approach to USACE RAIs will be discussed in November
- Participants on Teleconference (October 15, 2009):

Paul Snead (PEC)
Arun Kapur (PEC)
Jim Nevill (PEC)
Joseph Pavletich (PEC)

Michelle Moser (NRC)
Peyton Doub (NRC)
Michael Smith (PNNL)
Bill Baber (ISL/ICF)

Rick Zeroko (CH2M Hill)
Jamie Hunter (CH2M Hill)
Bill Marsh (CH2M Hill)
Scott Freeman (CH2M Hill)
Lorin Young (CH2M Hill)
Kyle Turner (McCallum-Turner)
Susan Smiley (McCallum-Turner)
Doug Schlagel (MacCallum-Turner)

Don Hambrick (USACE)
Rajiv Prasad (PNNL)