March 9, 2011

Mr. Mano K. Nazar
Senior Vice President
and Chief Nuclear Officer
Florida Power & Light Company
Mail Stop NNP/JB
700 Universe Blvd
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LETTER 1103094 RELATED TO ESRP SECTION 9.3, ALTERNATIVE SITES, FOR THE COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION REVIEW FOR TURKEY POINT, UNITS 6 AND 7

Dear Mr. Nazar:

By letter dated June 30, 2009, as supplemented by letters dated August 7, 2009, September 3, 2010, and December 21, 2010, Florida Power and Light Company (FPL) submitted its application to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for combined licenses (COLs) for two AP1000 advanced passive pressurized water reactors in accordance with the requirements contained in 10 CFR Part 52, "Licenses, Certifications and Approvals for Nuclear Power Plants." The NRC staff is performing a detailed review of this application to enable the staff to reach a conclusion regarding the environmental impacts of the proposed action.

The NRC staff has identified that additional information is needed to continue portions of the environmental review. The staff's request for additional information (RAI) is contained in the enclosure to this letter.

To support the review schedule, you are requested to respond within 45 days of the date of this letter. If you are unable to provide a response within 45 days, please state when you will be able to provide the response. In the event the response submitted is incomplete, please indicate in the response when the complete response will be provided. If changes are needed to the final safety analysis report, the staff requests that the RAI response include the proposed wording changes. Your response should also indicate whether any of the information provided is to be withheld as exempt from public disclosure pursuant to 10 CFR 2.390.

If you have any questions or comments concerning this matter, you may contact me at 301-415-2828 or via e-mail at Andrew.kugler@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/ RA /

Andrew Kugler, Sr. Project Manager
Environmental Projects Branch 2
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews
Office of New Reactors

Docket Nos. 52-040, 52-041

Enclosure:
As stated

cc: w/enclosure see next page

If you have any questions or comments concerning this matter, you may contact me at 301-415-2828 or via e-mail at Andrew.kugler@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/ RA /

Andrew Kugler, Sr. Project Manager
Environmental Projects Branch 2
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews
Office of New Reactors

Docket Nos. 52-040, 52-041
eRAI Tracking No. 5563

Enclosure:
As stated

cc: w/enclosure see next page

DISTRIBUTION:

AKugler, NRO	TTerry, NRO	PMoulding, OGC	RBryce (rw.bryce@pnl.gov)
RAP2 R/F	MComar, NRO	JCruz, NRO	RWhited,
RidsNroDser	PDoub, NRO	NRORidsNroDserRap2	RidsOgcMailCenterResource
BClayton			

ADAMS Accession Number: ML110680062 NRO-002

OFFICE	NRO/DSER/RENV /BC	NRO/DSER/RAP2/ PM	OGC	NRO/DSER/RAP2/ PM
NAME	BClayton*	AKugler*	PMoulding*	AKugler*
DATE	02/23/2011	02/24/2011	02/28/2011	03/09/2011

* Approval captured electronically in the electronic RAI system.

OFFICAL RECORDS COPY

Request for Additional Information No. 5563

3/9/2011

Turkey Point Units 6 and 7
Florida P and L
Docket No. 52-040 and 52-041
ESRP Section: EIS 9.3 - Alternative Sites
Application Section: ER 9.3

QUESTIONS for Environmental Technical Support Branch (RENV)

EIS 9.3-1
For each alternative site, provide a map showing the site boundaries, assumed facility footprint, and land cover types based (if possible) on 3 digit FLUCCS codes. Provide estimates on area of each land cover type affected for each alternative site. Provide GIS layers so that the review team can independently verify the data. The staff requests this information in order to characterize the baseline ecological conditions at each site, and to provide a common basis for comparing the ecological impacts of each site.

EIS 9.3-2
For each alternative site, provide a map showing the site, existing transmission infrastructure, the likely connection point to the regional grid, a generalized route or macro-corridor between the plant site and the connection point, and the land cover types within and near the macro corridor. Provide a summary table, using 3-digit FLUCCS codes if possible, of potentially affected land cover acreage for each alternative site. The staff requests this information in order to compare impacts among the different alternative sites. It is understood that the exact route cannot be determined at this time, but the staff can make qualitative comparisons based on generalized routes, including the proportion of the potential route that would be expected to follow existing transmission corridors or other existing linear features.

Enclosure