PMLevyCOLPEm Resource

From: Wilkins, Tillie [tillie.wilkins@pgnmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 03, 2010 3:19 PM
To: Anderson, Brian
Cc: Bruner, Douglas; Snead, Paul
Subject: Supplemental Environmental RAI Response Letters
Attachments: NPD-NRC-2010-008 - Final Response to NRC.pdf; NPD-NRC-2010-011 - Final Response to NRC.pdf; NPD-NRC-2010-009 Native Files re ER RAI 5_2_2-4.pdf

Brian – Three supplemental environmental RAI response letters are attached.

Tillie Wilkins
Nuclear Plant Development Licensing
Progress Energy
VNet: 770-6754
Bell: 919-546-6754

Hearing Identifier: Levy_County_COL_Public
Email Number: 589

Mail Envelope Properties (7FD614EFA33B03448166AF44364F42AE0CB1CF0F5E)

Subject: Supplemental Environmental RAI Response Letters
Sent Date: 2/3/2010 3:19:01 PM
Received Date: 2/3/2010 3:19:09 PM
From: Wilkins, Tillie

Created By: tillie.wilkins@pgnmail.com

Recipients:
"Bruner, Douglas" <Douglas.Bruner@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Snead, Paul" <paul.snead@pgnmail.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Anderson, Brian" <Brian.Anderson@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: WN000075.oak.zone1.progress-energy.com

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	206	2/3/2010 3:19:09 PM
NPD-NRC-2010-008 - Final Response to NRC.pdf	388147	
NPD-NRC-2010-011 - Final Response to NRC.pdf	342943	
NPD-NRC-2010-009 Native Files re ER RAI 5_2_2-4.pdf	403165	

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received:

Progress Energy

Serial: NPD-NRC-2010-008
January 29, 2010

10CFR52.79

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attention: Document Control Desk
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

LEVY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 52-029 AND 52-030
SUPPLEMENT 1 TO RESPONSE TO SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

References:

1. Letter from Douglas Bruner (NRC) to James Scarola (PEF), dated September 25, 2009, "Supplemental Request for Additional Information Regarding the Environmental Review of the Combined License Application for the Levy Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2"

2. Letter from John Elnitsky (PEF) to U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), dated December 14, 2009, "Response to Supplemental Request for Additional Information Regarding the Environmental Review", Serial: NPD-NRC-2009-242

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Progress Energy Florida, Inc. (PEF) hereby submits a supplemental response to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) request for additional information provided in Reference 1.

A supplemental response to one of the NRC questions (5.2.2-4) is addressed in Enclosure 1. Enclosure 2 provides a pre-flight report for the files included on the attached CD; these files have been prepared in accordance with NRC electronic submittal guidance.

If you have any further questions, or need additional information, please contact Bob Kitchen at (919) 546-6992, or me at (727) 820-4481.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on January 29, 2010.

Sincerely,

John Elnitsky
Vice President
Nuclear Plant Development

Enclosures/Attachment

Progress Energy Florida, Inc.
P.O. Box 14042
St. Petersburg, FL 33733

cc : U.S. NRC Region II, Regional Administrator (without attached CD)
Mr. Brian C. Anderson, U.S. NRC Project Manager (without attached CD)
Mr. Douglas Bruner, U.S. NRC Environmental Project Manager (3 copies of attached CD)

Levy Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2
Supplement 1 to Response to NRC Supplemental Request for Additional Information Regarding the Environmental Review for the Combined License Application, Dated September 25, 2009

NRC RAI #	Progress Energy RAI #	Progress Energy Response
5.2.2-4	L-0561 & L-0688	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242 & Supplemental response enclosed – see following pages
9.3-2	L-0562	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242
9.3-3	L-0563	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242
9.3-4	L-0564	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242
9.3-5	L-0565	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242
9.3-6	L-0566	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242
9.3-7	L-0567	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242
9.3-8	L-0568	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242
9.3-9	L-0569	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242
9.3-10	L-0570	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242
9.3-11	L-0571	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242
9.3-12	L-0572	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242
9.3-13	L-0573	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242
9.3-14	L-0574	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242
9.3-15	L-0575	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242
9.3-16	L-0576	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242
9.3-17	L-0577	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242
9.3-18	L-0578	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242
9.3-19	L-0579	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242
9.3-20	L-0580	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242
USACE-14	L-0581	December 14, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-242

NRC Letter No.: ER-NRC

NRC Letter Date: September 25, 2009

NRC Review of Environmental Report

NRC RAI #: 5.2.2-4

Text of NRC RAI:

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.

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.

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.

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.

In the January 14, 2010 Conference Call, clarifications were requested to previously submitted RAI's: The supplemental information should provide the following:

Item 1: In PEF's July 29 2009 supplemental RAI response (PGN RAI#: L-0522- RAI response letter NPD-NRC-2009-166), simulation results were provided that quantified the incremental change in the discharge to 1) rivers and lakes and 2) Big King and Little King Springs attributed to LNP operations. This same information was not provided for the recalibrated model in the December 14 supplemental response (PGN RAI#: L-0561- RAI response letter NPD-NRC-2009-242). Please provide comparable estimates of flux for the recalibrated model.

Item 2: Please provide publication quality gray-scale and/or native files for the following figures for the recalibrated model:

PGN RAI#: L-0561- RAI response letter NPD-NRC-2009-242, Figure 2, TMR model grid and adjacent permitted users/springs

PGN RAI#: L-0561- RAI response letter NPD-NRC-2009-242, Figure 31, Simulated incremental SAS drawdown, 60 yrs at 1.58 mgd

PGN RAI#: L-0561- RAI response letter NPD-NRC-2009-242, Figure 17, Model water balance

PGN RAI#: L-0561- RAI response letter NPD-NRC-2009-242, Figure 30, Simulated incremental SAS drawdown, 1 yr at 1.58 mgd

PGN RAI ID #: L-0688

PGN Response to NRC RAI:

Refer to the response provided for U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Request for Additional Information (RAI) 5.2.2-4 (PGN RAI L-0561) submitted via Progress Energy Florida, Inc. (PEF) letter, Serial No. NPD-NRC-2009-242, dated December 14, 2009.

Item 1:

The following supplemental information regarding Item 1 above is provided.

Estimates of flux to and from rivers, lakes, and streams in the recalibrated model that are comparable to those provided in the July 29, 2009 supplemental RAI response (PGN RAI L-0522; PEF RAI response letter Serial No. NPD-NRC-2009-166) are provided in Table 1. As indicated in Table 1, the incremental change in discharge into the aquifer from rivers and lakes attributed to simulated Levy Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 (LNP) operations is less than 2 percent and from the aquifer is less than 3 percent. In addition, the incremental change in discharge from the aquifer to Big King and Little King Springs attributed to simulated Levy Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 (LNP) operations is 1 percent.

Table 1
Summary of Simulated River, Lake, and Spring Fluxes

	Without LNP Withdrawals		With LNP Withdrawals		Difference		Percent Difference	
Flux	Rivers and Lakes[a]	Springs	Rivers and Lakes[a]	Springs	Rivers and Lakes[a]	Springs	Rivers and Lakes[a]	Springs
Into Aquifer from:	30.0	NA	30.5	NA	0.5	NA	1.7%	NA
Out of Aquifer to:	16.8	5.22	16.4	5.17	-0.4	-0.05	-2.4%	-1%
Net[b]:	13.2 (in)	5.22 (out)	14.1 (in)	5.17 (out)	0.9 (in)	-0.05 (out)	6.8%	-1%

Notes:

All values are presented in million gallons per day (mgd).

a. River and lake fluxes were calculated by totalizing the flux in river cells used to represent upland lakes, Lake Rousseau, the Withlacoochee River, the bypass canal, and the Cross Florida Barge Canal (CFBC). Other river cells in the model used to represent coastal discharge south of the CFBC and wetlands were not included in the calculation.

b. Net flow into the aquifer is indicated by (in), net flow out of the aquifer is indicated by (out).

NA = not applicable

In summary, fluxes into the underlying aquifers from rivers and lakes are simulated to increase and fluxes out of the underlying aquifers into rivers, lakes, and springs are simulated to decrease with the addition of LNP withdrawals.

Item 2:

The requested figures in grayscale are provided as attachments to this RAI response (see pdf files on attached CD).

Native files for these figures will be provided in a separate transmittal via PEF Letter Serial No. NPD-NRC-2010-009.

Associated LNP COL Application Revisions:

No COLA revisions have been identified associated with this response.

Attachments/Enclosures:

The following figures are provided on the attached CD:

- FIGURE 2: Location of TMR Model Grid, TMR Model Adjacent Permitted User Withdrawal Points, and Nearby Springs
  [001_TM123_ Figure_2_TMR_model_grid_BW.pdf]
- FIGURE 17: Revised TMR Model Water Budget with LNP Withdrawing 1.58 mgd
  [002_TM123_ Figure_17_Model_water_balance_BW.pdf]
- FIGURE 30: Simulated Incremental SAS Drawdown and Wetlands; 1 year; 1.58 mgd
  [003_TM123_ Figure_30_Sim_incremental_SAS_drdn_1_yr_BW.pdf]
- FIGURE 31: Simulated Incremental SAS Drawdown and Wetlands; 60 year; 1.58 mgd
  [004_TM123_ Figure_31_Sim_incremental_SAS_drdn_60_yrs_BW.pdf]

LNP ER RAI JANUARY 2010 DISC PREFLIGHT REPORT

LNP ER RAI JAN 2010 DISC PREFLIGHT REPORT

This table serves as a pre-flight report for the LNP ER RAI JANUARY 2010 DISC submittal in support of the LNP COLA (Reference: RAI 5.2.4-4 (L-688) Attachments). The following files were checked for items related to pre-flight/electronic submittal acceptance. The results of the review are shown below. All files within this submittal are deemed compliant with the NRC electronic submittal checklist as noted below.

		Acceptance Review			Preflight Review		
Item #	File Name	Word Searchable? (Y/N)	Fast Web View? (Y/N)	Fonts Embedded? (Y/N)	Preflight (Pass/Fail)	Failure Reason (<300 ppi or unembedded fonts)	Comments
Black and White							
1	001_TM123_ Figure_2_TMR_model_grid_BW.pdf	Y	Y	Y	PASS	N/A	N/A
2	002_TM123_ Figure_17_Model_water_balance_BW.pdf	Y	Y	Y	PASS	N/A	N/A
3	003_TM123_ Figure_30_Sim_incremental_SAS_drdn_1_yr_BW.pdf	Y	Y	Y	PASS	N/A	N/A
4	004_TM123_ Figure_31_Sim_incremental_SAS_drdn_60_yrs_BW.pdf	Y	Y	Y	PASS	N/A	N/A

Report Prepared by: Ingrid Nordby/CH2M HILL (919) 875-4311

Progress Energy

Serial: NPD-NRC-2010-011
January 29, 2010

10CFR52.79

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attention: Document Control Desk
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

LEVY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 52-029 AND 52-030
SUPPLEMENT 7 TO RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

References:
1. Letter from Douglas Bruner (NRC) to James Scarola (PEF), dated February 24, 2009, "Request for Additional Information Regarding the Environmental Review of the Combined License Application for the Levy Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2"
2. Letter from Garry D. Miller (PEF) to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission dated March 27, 2009, "Response to Request for Additional Information Regarding the Environmental Review", Serial NPD-NRC-2009-042

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Progress Energy Florida, Inc. (PEF) hereby submits a supplemental response to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) request for additional information provided in Reference 1. A supplemental response to one of the NRC questions (5.8.2-1) is addressed in the enclosure.

If you have any further questions, or need additional information, please contact Bob Kitchen at (919) 546-6992, or me at (727) 820-4481.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on January 29, 2010.

Sincerely,

John Elnitsky
Vice President
Nuclear Plant Development

Enclosure/Attachment

cc : U.S. NRC Region II, Regional Administrator
Mr. Brian C. Anderson, U.S. NRC Project Manager
Mr. Douglas Bruner, U.S. NRC Environmental Project Manager

Progress Energy Florida, Inc.
P.O. Box 14042
St. Petersburg, FL 33733

Levy Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2
Supplement 7 to Response to Request for Additional Information Regarding the Environmental Review, dated February 24, 2009

NRC RAI #	Progress Energy RAI #	Progress Energy Response
2.7-1	L-0076	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
3.3-1	L-0077	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
4.5-1	L-0078	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
5.4.4-1	L-0079	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
7.1-1	L-0401	June 12, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-107
2.7.5-1	L-0508	July 24, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-172
3.6.3-1	L-0082	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
5.3.3-1	L-0083	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
2.3.1-1	L-0398	June 12, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-107
2.3.1-2	L-0085	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
2.3.1-3	L-0399	June 12, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-107
2.3.1-4	L-0087	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
2.3.1-5	L-0088	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
2.3.1-6	L-0089	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
2.3.3-1	L-0090	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
2.3.3-2	L-0091	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
4.6-1	L-0092	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
4.6-2	L-0093	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
5.2.2-1	L-0396	June 12, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-107
5.2.2-2	L-0095	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
5.2.2-3	L-0522	July 29, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-166
5.3.2.1-1	L-0097	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
2.4.2-1	L-0098	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
2.4.2-2	L-0099	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
2.4.2-3	L-0100	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
4.7-1	L-0101	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
2.4.1-1	L-0402	June 12, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-107
2.4.1-2	L-0403	June 12, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-107
2.4.1-3	L-0533 & L-0674	September 3, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-203 & November 23, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-233
2.4.1-4	L-0405 & L-0538	June 12, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-107; & August 31, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-192
2.4.1-5	L-0106	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
4.3.1-1	L-0406 & L-0675	June 12, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-107 & November 23, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-233
4.3.1-2	L-0407	June 12, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-107

NRC RAI #	Progress Energy RAI #	Progress Energy Response
4.3.1-3	L-0535	August 31, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-192
4.3.1-4	L-0110	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
4.3.1-5	L-0408	June 12, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-107
4.3.1-6	L-0112	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
4.3.1-7	L-0409	June 12, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-107
4.7-2	L-0114	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
5.3.3.2-1	L-0410	June 12, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-107
2.5.1-1	L-0116	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
2.5.2-1	L-0412	June 12, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-107
2.5.2-2	L-0118	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
2.5.2-3	L-0119	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
2.5.2-4	L-0120	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
2.5.4-1	L-0413	June 12, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-107
4.4.2-1	L-0524	July 29, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-166
4.4.2-2	L-0123	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
4.4.2-3	L-0124	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
4.4.2-4	L-0125	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
4.4.2-5	L-0126	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
4.4.2-6	L-0127	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
4.4.2-7	L-0128	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
4.4.2-8	L-0129	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
4.4.2-9	L-0523	July 29, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-166
4.4.2-10	L-0131	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
4.7-1	L-0132	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
5.11-1	L-0133	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
5.8.2-1	L-0134 & L-0690	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042 & supplemental response enclosed; see following pages
9.4.1-1	L-0135	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
9.4.1-2	L-0136	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
9.4.2-1	L-0521	July 29, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-166
9.4.2-2	L-0138	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
9.4.2-3	L-0139	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
9.3-1	L-0140	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
9.3.2.1-1	L-0141	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
3.7-1	L-0142	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
3.7-2	L-0143	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
4.8.3-1	L-0144	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042
6.2-1	L-0145	March 27, 2009; NPD-NRC-2009-042

NRC Letter No.: ER-NRC

NRC Letter Date: February 24, 2009

NRC Review of Environmental Report

NRC RAI #: 5.8.2-1

Text of NRC RAI:

Provide an explanation for how the projected distribution of operations workers was developed.

The ER estimates that most operations workers would live in Levy, Marion and Citrus counties because of the proximity to the site. Provide an explanation as to why commute time is the primary factor for where operations workers would live. Is the projected distribution of operations workers shown in ER Section 5.8.2.4 consistent with the distribution of current workers at CREC? This information will enable NRC staff to assess operations impacts associated with population.

In the January 14, 2010 Conference Call, clarifications were requested to previously submitted RAI's: The supplemental information should provide the following:

PEF ER (2008, page 5-125) says "Refueling outages will last approximately 25 to 30 days and require approximately 800 additional workers every 18 months." The ER suggests that these outages should be staggered with CREC outages so the same workers can be used. Is this 800 workers every 18 months for a single unit or for both units?

PGN RAI ID #: L-0690

PGN Response to NRC RAI:

Refer to the response provided for U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Request for Additional Information (RAI) 5.8.2-1 (PGN RAI L-0134) submitted via Progress Energy Florida, Inc. (PEF) letter, Serial No. NPD-NRC-2009-042, dated March 27, 2009. In addition, the following information regarding the requested clarification (see above) is provided.

Scheduled refueling outages are planned for Levy Nuclear Plant Unit 1 (LNP 1) and Levy Nuclear Plant Unit 2 (LNP 2) every 18 months. It is anticipated that the outages will not occur at the same time for both units. Each LNP refueling outage would require approximately 800 additional workers. Furthermore, it is anticipated that outages for Crystal River Unit 3 will be scheduled so as to not overlap with the outages for LNP 1 and LNP 2.

Associated LNP COL Application Revisions:

No COLA revisions have been identified associated with this response.

Attachments/Enclosures:

None.

Progress Energy

Serial: NPD-NRC-2010-009
January 29, 2010

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attention: Document Control Desk
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

LEVY NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2
NRC DOCKET NOS. 52-029 AND 52-030
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION RELATED TO ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW – FIGURE NATIVE FILES

References:

1. NRC Teleconference Summary with PEF, Levy COLA, January 14, 2010
2. Letter from John Elnitsky (PEF) to U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), dated December 14, 2009, "Response to Supplemental Request for Additional Information Regarding the Environmental Review", Serial NPD-NRC-2009-242
3. Letter from John Elnitsky (PEF) to U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), dated January 29, 2010, "Supplement 1 to Response to Supplemental Request for Additional Information Regarding the Environmental Review", Serial NPD-NRC-2010-008

Ladies and Gentlemen:

In a January 14, 2010 teleconference (Reference 1), the NRC requested that PEF provide publication quality grayscale and/or native files for Figures 2, 17, 30 and 31 that had previously been submitted in PGN RAI#: L-0561 (Reference 2). PEF provided these figures as grayscale pdf attachments in Reference 3, and noted that native files would be provided in a separate transmittal. This letter and the attached disc provide the native files (MXDs and associated shapefiles) for each figure as requested.

The supplemental information contained in the attached native files disc is provided to support the NRC's review of the LNP Combined License Application, but does not comply with the requirements for electronic submission. The NRC staff requested the files be submitted in their native formats for utilization by their GIS experts and graphic specialists.

If you have any further questions, or need additional information, please contact Bob Kitchen at (919) 546-6992, or me at (727) 820-4481.

Progress Energy Florida, Inc.
P.O. Box 14042
St. Petersburg, FL 33733

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on January 29, 2010.

Sincerely,

John Elnitsky
Vice President
Nuclear Plant Development

Attachment

cc (with 3 copies of the attached disc):
Mr. Douglas Bruner, U.S. NRC Environmental Project Manager

cc (without attached disc):
Mr. Brian Anderson, U.S. NRC Project Manager
U.S. NRC Region II, Regional Administrator