

**Teleconference Summary for October 15, 2009
and
Additional Clarifying Questions to be Discussed on October 22, 2009
Levy Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2
Combined License Application**

Discussion Topic

Introductions

Progress Energy Florida's Approach to Requests for Additional Information 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 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System [ADAMS] Accession Number 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 Report (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 USACE Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) decision. Note that maps are needed for National Environmental Policy Act (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. PEF 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 the Levy 2 site, as used in the EFS, and the boundaries of the proposed Levy Nuclear Plant (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 the LNP site 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 alternative site in Chapter 9 based on the 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 analysis. 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 Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI) data was 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 the 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 RAI 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, was not used to further refine the alternative sites. Will more detailed data be provided for the 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)	Michelle Moser (NRC)
Arun Kapur (PEC)	Peyton Doub (NRC)
Jim Nevill (PEC)	Michael Smith (PNNL)
Joseph Pavletich (PEC)	Bill Baber (ISL/ICF)
Rick Zeroko (CH2M Hill)	Don Hambrick (USACE)
Jamie Hunter (CH2M Hill)	Rajiv Prasad (PNNL)
Bill Marsh (CH2M Hill)	
Scott Freeman (CH2M Hill)	
Lorin Young (CH2M Hill)	
Kyle Turner (McCallum-Turner)	
Susan Smiley (McCallum-Turner)	
Doug Schlagel (McCallum-Turner)	