DRAFT SUMMARY RECORD OF DECISION U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION DOCKET NOS. 52-029 AND 52-030 COMBINED LICENSES APPLICATION FOR THE LEVY NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2

BACKGROUND

On July 28, 2008, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) received an application from Progress Energy Florida, Inc., for combined licenses (COL) for the Levy Nuclear Plant (LNP), Units 1 and 2, located in southern Levy County, Florida. The applicant changed its name in April 2013 following a July 2012 corporate merger between Progress Energy and Duke Energy. Florida Power Corporation, doing business as Duke Energy Florida, Inc. (DEF), is the applicant for the planned LNP Units 1 and 2. The new units will be capable of providing an additional net output of 2200 megawatts of electricity (MW(e)) as a baseload source.

Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA), directs that an environmental impact statement (EIS) be prepared for major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. The NRC's regulations in Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR), Part 51 were developed to implement the agency's responsibilities under Section 102 of NEPA. Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.20(b)(2), the NRC defines issuance of a COL as an action for which the agency will prepare an EIS.

The NRC published a notice of acceptance of the LNP Units 1 and 2 COL application for docketing on October 6, 2008 (73 FR 60726), and subsequently published on October 14, 2008, a notice of intent to prepare an EIS and conduct a scoping process (73 FR 63517) upon the acceptance of the application on October 6, 2008. DEF would also require permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in order to perform certain site preparation activities associated with building the proposed facility. The NRC and USACE are responsible for evaluating any application for their respective areas of responsibility. To enable each agency to most efficiently meet its NEPA responsibilities for its license or permit decision, the NRC agreed to serve as the lead agency for preparing the EIS, with the USACE as a cooperating agency.

On December 4, 2008, the NRC and USACE held two public meetings in Crystal River, Florida, to obtain public input on the scope of the environmental review. The staff reviewed the oral and written comments received during the scoping process and contacted Federal, State, Tribal, regional and local agencies to solicit comments. A Scoping Summary Report was issued on May 28, 2009.

The NRC and USACE developed a draft EIS, and on August 13, 2010, a 75-day comment period began to allow agencies and members of the public to comment on the results of the environmental review (75 FR 49539). On September 23, 2010, the NRC and USACE staff conducted two public meeting in Crystal City, Florida, near the LNP site to describe the results of the environmental review, respond to questions, and accept public comments. All comments received during the comment period and NRC staff responses to those comments are included in Appendix E of the EIS.

The NRC issued NUREG-1941, "Final Environmental Impact Statement for Combined Licenses (COLs) for Levy Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2," Volumes 1, 2, and 3, prepared jointly with USACE in April 2012, in support of the NRC's environmental review for the COL application for two Westinghouse AP1000 advanced passive pressurized water reactors for the LNP site.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.102 and 51.103(a)(1)-(4), the NRC staff has prepared this Summary Record of Decision (ROD) to accompany its action on the COL application. This Summary ROD incorporates by reference materials contained in the final EIS. See 10 CFR 51.103(c).

DECISION

[If the Commission's mandatory hearing decision authorizes the NRC staff to issue the license, this Decision section will state:]

The NRC makes the decision to grant or deny the COL application based on whether the applicant has met all applicable requirements, including the NRC's safety and environmental regulations. The NRC's safety review of the application is documented in the final safety evaluation report (FSER) issued on May 31, 2016 (ADAMS Accession No. ML16084A664).

The final EIS presents the staff's environmental review of the application. After weighing the environmental, economic, technical, and other benefits of the facility against environmental and other costs and considering reasonable available alternatives, the NRC concluded that issuance of the COLs, subject to the conditions for protection of the environment set forth in the licenses, is in accordance with NEPA and the NRC's implementing regulations in Subpart A of 10 CFR Part 51, and that all applicable requirements have been satisfied. The final EIS as well as the Commission's Order dated [date], document these conclusions.

Accordingly, the NRC issued Combined Licenses NPF-[###] and NPF-[###] on [date], authorizing the construction and operation of LNP Units 1 and 2 at the Levy site in Levy County, Florida. The licenses are effective as of [date], and extend for 40 years from the date that the Commission finds that the acceptance criteria in the COLs are met in accordance with 10 CFR 52.103(g). These combined licenses also include the authorizations required for the licensee to receive, possess, and use source, byproduct, and special nuclear material in connection with the construction and operation of LNP Units 1 and 2, in accordance with Commission regulations in 10 CFR Part 30, "Rules of General Applicability to Domestic Licensing of Byproduct Material"; Part 40, "Domestic Licensing of Source Material"; and Part 70, "Domestic Licensing of Special Nuclear Material," and the general license authorized under 10 CFR Part 72, Subpart K, "General License for Storage of Spent Fuel at Power Reactor Sites."

AGENCIES' ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITES

The final EIS includes information on a broad range of issues that may be regulated by other Federal, State, or local authorities. As documented in the final EIS, the COL applicant must also obtain and maintain permits from other Federal, State, Tribal, and local agency permitting authorities in order to construct and operate LNP, Units 1 and 2.

Role of the NRC

The NRC was the lead agency for review of the LNP Units 1 and 2 COL application, including development of a final EIS. In the final EIS, the NRC environmental review evaluated the impacts of building and operating two Westinghouse AP1000 reactors at the LNP site. The

NRC contacted Federal, State, Tribal, and local agencies to solicit comments on the draft EIS. The NRC ensured that the NEPA process was properly conducted and completed before providing approval for this project. In addition to considering the environmental effects of the proposed action, the NRC considered alternatives to the proposed action, including the no-action alternative, alternative energy sources, the building and operation of new reactors at alternative sites, and alternative technologies. The NRC also documented applicable requirements of other Federal, State, Tribal, and local agencies in considering the environmental monitoring and mitigation that DEF may implement.

Role of USACE

The USACE participated with the NRC in the preparation of the final EIS as a cooperating agency and participated collaboratively on the review team. As part of the review team, the USACE was included in all aspects of the environmental review, including scoping, public meetings, and public comment resolution.

The USACE can issue permits, after notice and opportunity for public hearings, for the discharge of dredged or fill material into the navigable waters at specified disposal sites. With respect to the LNP site, the USACE's action concerned whether to issue a permit pursuant to the requirements in Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act of 1899. The requested permit would authorize impacts on waters of the U.S., including wetlands, for the building of LNP Units 1 and 2, and various associated, integral project components, including electrical transmission lines and associated structures, access roads, a barge slip, and a new sanitary waste treatment plant. Therefore, the USACE conducted an independent review and assessment in the preparation of the final EIS to provide the necessary environmental information required to meet its NEPA obligation to make findings of compliance with the guidelines for Section 404(b)(1) of the CWA and to meet the review criteria for the U.S. Department of the Army permit, including its Public Interest Review. After its review and analysis, the USACE adopted the final EIS to satisfy those independent regulatory obligations.

PURPOSE AND NEED

As identified in Section 1.3, "Purpose and Need for the Proposed Actions," of NUREG-1941, the final EIS, the purpose and need for the proposed action, authorization of the construction and operation of two Westinghouse AP1000 reactors at the LNP site, is to meet the public's need for electric energy and reliable increased electrical baseload generating capacity in DEF's service territory. In 2014, the State of Florida, through its Public Service Commission, concluded that by 2024, DEF will need at least as much additional generating capacity as will be available from the proposed LNP Units to meet its customer's demand and its own reserve margin requirements.

PROPOSED FEDERAL ACTION

The proposed NRC Federal action is issuance, under the provisions of 10 CFR Part 52, of two COLs authorizing the construction and operation of two new Westinghouse AP1000 advanced light water reactors at the LNP site. The location for the proposed LNP Units 1 and 2 is a 3105 acre greenfield site in Levy County, Florida, 7.9 mi east of the Gulf of Mexico and 30.1 mi west of Ocala, Florida. The proposed Units 1 and 2 will be completely within the confines of DEF's LNP site.

The EIS provides the NRC staff's analyses of the environmental impacts that could result from constructing and operating the two proposed units at the LNP site or at one of the four alternative sites. These impacts are analyzed by NRC to determine if the proposed site is suitable for the two units and whether any of the alternative sites is considered to be obviously superior to the proposed site. In addition, NRC assesses mitigation measures available for reducing or avoiding adverse environmental effects.

Environmental impacts that may arise from the construction and operation of the two LNP units were examined for the following resource areas: land use; surface water and groundwater hydrology; terrestrial and aquatic ecology; socioeconomics; environmental justice; historic and cultural resources; meteorology and air quality; geology; public and occupational health; radiological health; noise; transportation; and transmission systems. These resource areas were also considered within a defined region of influence with other development or activities that affect the resources cumulatively.

NRC EVALUATON OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

Section 102(2)(C)(iii) of NEPA states that EISs are to include a detailed statement analyzing alternatives to the proposed action. Accordingly, the NRC and USACE evaluated the proposed action and numerous alternatives to the proposed action in order to make independent determinations according to each agency's regulatory authority. Evaluation criteria included land use, air quality, water use and quality, ecology, waste management, socioeconomics, human health, historic and cultural resources, and environmental justice. Alternatives were evaluated against the proposed action to determine if any of the alternatives presented were obviously superior.

To guide its assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed action or alternative actions, the NRC has established a standard of significance for impacts based on Council on Environmental Quality guidance (40 CFR 1508.27). Table B-1 of 10 CFR Part 51, Subpart A, Appendix B, provides the following definitions of the three significance levels established by the NRC:

SMALL – Environmental effects are not detectable or are so minor that they will neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource.

MODERATE – Environmental effects are sufficient to alter noticeably, but not to destabilize, important attributes of the resource.

LARGE – Environmental effects are clearly noticeable and are sufficient to destabilize important attributes of the resource.

The final EIS presents the review team's analysis, which considers and weighs the environmental impacts of the proposed action at the LNP site. Impacts of building and operating the facility were considered SMALL for most resource areas with the exception of land use and terrestrial ecosystems for construction (both MODERATE), and MODERATE effects on aesthetics and recreation through the installation and presence of new transmission towers. A range of impact levels from SMALL to MODERATE for terrestrial ecology was determined to result from possible groundwater withdrawal effects on wetlands, and for physical socioeconomic impacts from increased traffic during construction, and increased need for education and emergency services in the region. Mitigation of environmental impacts is

discussed in more detail below. Additionally, a range of SMALL to LARGE beneficial impacts was described from the increase of tax revenue in the region.

Evaluation of Alternatives

Chapter 9, "Environmental Impacts of Alternatives," of the EIS addresses the following four categories of alternatives to the proposed action: (1) the no-action alternative, (2) energy source alternatives, (3) alternative sites, and (4) system design alternatives. As summarized below, none of the potential alternatives is environmentally preferable to the proposed action.

i. No Action Alternative

The No Action alternative, discussed in Section 9.1, "No-Action Alternative," of the final EIS refers to a scenario in which the NRC would deny the COLs requested by DEF, which would result in the proposed units not being built. Likewise, the USACE would also take no action or deny the Department of the Army Individual Permit request. Upon such a denial by the NRC or USACE, the building and operation of Units 1 and 2 at the LNP site in accordance with 10 CFR Part 52 would not occur. If no other facility would be built or strategy implemented to take its place, the electrical capacity to be provided by the proposed project would not become available. If no additional conservation measures were enacted to decrease the amount of electrical capacity that would otherwise be required for power in the region of interest (ROI), the need for power discussed in Chapter 8 would not be met. Therefore, the purpose of and need for this project would not be satisfied if the no-action alternative was chosen and the need for power was not met by other means.

ii. Alternative Energy Sources

The purpose and need for the proposed project identified in Section 1.3 is to provide additional baseload electrical generation capacity for use in DEF's service territory. Chapter 9, "Environmental Impacts of Alternatives," of the final EIS examines the potential environmental impacts associated with alternatives to construction and operation of a new baseload nuclear generating facility.

To compare different types of energy plants with the proposed LNP Units 1 and 2, NRC analyzed other power-generation sources, a combination of sources, and power-generation technologies that are technically reasonable and available. The three primary energy sources for generating electric power in the U.S. are coal, natural gas, and nuclear energy. Coal-fired plants are the primary source of baseload generation in the U.S. Natural-gas combined-cycle power-generation plants are often used as intermediate generation sources, but can also be used for baseload power. These alternatives, which would require new generating capacity, are discussed in Section 9.2.2, "Alternatives Requiring New Generating Capacity," of the final EIS.

In the coal-fired plant analysis, the EIS assumed building and operation of four coal-fired units would be required to generate the same baseload power as the LNP Units. Air emissions effects would be greater for a coal-fired plant than for the LNP plants due to the release of carbon dioxide gas and other air pollutants. Coal combustion generates waste in the form of ash. Disposal of the waste could noticeably affect land use because of the acreage needed, and could affect groundwater quality. Other environmental effects and cumulative effects would be similar to those described for the proposed LNP plants.

Four natural-gas-fired units would be required to generate the same baseload power as the LNP Units. Air emissions are similar to those for a coal-fired plant, but in lower amounts. There would be fewer ecological impacts than for a new nuclear facility because less land would be needed. Building a new underground gas pipeline to the site would result in permanent loss of some ecological resources, but the distance to connect to natural-gas distribution systems would be minimal. Other environmental effects and cumulative effects would be similar to those described for the LNP Units.

For the combined cycle natural gas-fired plant analysis, the EIS assumed the construction and operation of a natural-gas fired plant at the LNP site. Four combined-cycle, natural-gas-fired units would be required to generate the same baseload power as the LNP Units, with minor contribution from other existing energy sources such as solar, wind, and biomass. This combination of alternatives would have environmental effects similar to natural-gas-fired units.

Renewable energy sources such as wind and solar power were considered, but current technologies for these energy sources are not capable of reasonably producing baseload power similar to the LNP Units 1 and 2. The Levy County area is classified as a low potential area for wind-generated power. Even with a good, consistent wind source, more than 1000 wind turbines would be needed to produce a similar amount of power. Solar thermal technologies would require a large land area over three to seven times larger than the land used for the LNP site. Water sources would also be required for solar power generation and would presumably use sources similar to those described for the LNP Units.

The NRC also evaluated alternatives not requiring new generating capacity, as well as other alternative energy sources. Alternatives not requiring new generating capacity that the NRC considered, but determined not to be viable alternatives, were: purchasing power from other electricity suppliers, reactivating retired power plants, extending the life of existing power plants, and implementing conservation or demand-side management programs. Each alternative not requiring new generating capacity was determined not to be a viable alternative, and the basis for this determination is provided in Section 9.2.1 of the final EIS. Other alternative energy sources that the NRC considered, but determined not to be viable alternatives, were: oil-fired power generation, hydroelectric power, geothermal energy, municipal solid waste, other biomass-derived fuels, fuel cells, and wood waste. These other alternative energy sources, including wind and solar power, that were eliminated from detailed study and the basis for removal are provided in Section 9.2.3 of the final EIS.

The NRC also considered whether a combination of alternatives might be a viable alternative to the proposed action. The review team assessed the environmental impacts of the construction of four 550-MW(e) natural-gas-fired, combined-cycle power-generating units at the LNP site using closed-cycle cooling with cooling towers, and the following contributions from within the LNP ROI: 200 MW(e) from conservation and demand-side management programs beyond what is currently planned, 150 MW(e) from solar, 100 MW(e) from wind, and 100 MW(e) from biomass sources, including municipal solid waste. This combination of energy alternatives and the basis for determining it was not environmentally preferable to the proposed action are discussed in Section 9.2.4, “Combination of Alternatives,” of the final EIS.

Therefore, the review team concluded that none of the alternative energy options or the combination of the alternative energy options would be both consistent with DEF’s objective of building baseload generation units and environmentally preferable to the proposed action.

iii. Alternative Sites

The NRC independently evaluated DEF's process for screening the potential sites, which was based on guidance in the NRC's NUREG-1555, "Standard Review Plans for Environmental Reviews for Nuclear Power Plants"; NRC Regulatory Guide 4.7, "General Site Suitability Criteria for Nuclear Power Stations"; and the Electric Power Research Institute's Siting Guide. NRC's site-selection process guidance calls for identification of an ROI, followed by successive screening to identify candidate areas, potential sites, candidate sites, and the proposed site. The ROI is the geographic area considered by the applicant in searching for candidate areas and potential sites for a new nuclear power plant. The ROI is typically the State in which the proposed site is located or the relevant service area for the proposed plant.

The staff evaluated DEF's methodology for selecting its ROI, candidate areas and evaluation of potential sites, candidate sites, and alternative sites, with guidance in NUREG-1555. The staff concluded that the method used to identify candidate areas, potential sites, candidate sites, and alternative sites was reasonable, logical, and adequately satisfied applicable NRC guidance. Candidate areas for siting of LNP Units 1 and 2 were chosen after considering areas based on geology/seismicity, water availability, population, dedicated lands, and ecology. Ultimately, five candidate sites were chosen for additional site suitability analyses, which resulted in LNP site being chosen as the preferred site. The remaining four candidate sites examined are listed as alternative sites in Section 9.3, "Alternative Sites," of the final EIS:

- Crystal River, located in Citrus County;
- Dixie, located in Dixie County;
- Highlands, located in Highlands and Glades counties; and
- Putnam, located in Putnam County.

Although there are differences between the cumulative environmental impacts of building and operating nuclear generating units at the proposed LNP site and the alternative sites, the review team concluded that none of the alternative sites would be environmentally preferable or obviously superior to the proposed LNP site.

iv. Alternative System Designs

The NRC considered a variety of alternatives for heat-dissipation systems and circulating water systems. About two-thirds of the heat from a commercial nuclear reactor is rejected as heat to the environment. The remaining one-third of the reactor's generated heat is converted into electricity. Normal heat-dissipation systems transfer this rejected heat into the atmosphere as evaporation and/or heated discharge water to mix with nearby water bodies. Cooling-water systems withdraw water from the source waterbody and return a slightly reduced volume of water to the receiving waterbody at a higher temperature. The closed-cycle cooling-water system is preferred over the once-through cooling systems that have been used traditionally in the past. The closed-cycle cooling-water systems require less overall intake water than the older once-through technology and as a result, fewer aquatic organisms are affected by cooling-water system operations.

The NRC also considered alternative water sources for both the cooling-water and the service-water systems because withdrawal of water for both of these systems has the potential to affect the environment. The proposed cooling-water system is a closed-loop system that relies on evaporative cooling from mechanical draft cooling towers and draws makeup water from the

Cross Florida Barge Canal. No other nearby sources of surface water will be better to use for the cooling-water system because the nearby Withlacoochee River is a protected water source. The proposed service-water system relies on groundwater wells to provide makeup water. No other freshwater source is available as drinkable water for plant use. However, it is possible that if groundwater monitoring of the wells for the service-water system start showing lower levels of groundwater than expected, a desalination plant could be built to remove the salinity from water pumped from the Cross Florida Barge Canal to meet the service-water needs of the plant.

In sum, the review team concluded that none of the alternative system designs or water sources would be environmentally preferable or obviously superior to those for the proposed LNP facility.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The NRC has taken all practicable measures within its jurisdiction to avoid and minimize environmental harm from the alternative selected. DEF would be subject to requirements imposed by other Federal, State, and local agencies, such as USACE permit requirements and the State of Florida Conditions of Certification that relate to a number of the resource areas discussed below. The final EIS describes measures to avoid and minimize environmental harm from the building and operation of the proposed plants. The building and operation of LNP Units 1 and 2 will have effects on multiple environmental and regional resources. The EIS considers the potential for impact to each resource. Many of the SMALL impacts described above are considered minimal because monitoring and use of environmental practices and safeguards will reduce any negative effects to an environmental resource. However, as explained in the EIS, some of the impacts greater than SMALL can be reduced or compensated, or prevented from becoming disruptive. An environmental protection plan (EPP) included in the license ensures compliance with the terms and conditions of any Biological Opinions issued pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) and ensures that the NRC is kept informed of other environmental matters. The EPP applies to the licensee's actions affecting the protected environmental resources evaluated in the final EIS and the licensee's actions that may affect any newly discovered protected environmental resources. The EPP is intended to be consistent with Federal, State, and local requirements for environmental protection. The NRC is not otherwise imposing any license conditions in connection with mitigation measures or requiring any new environmental monitoring programs. Below are mitigation measures described in the final EIS with respect to individual resource areas.

Water Use and Quality

DEF developed an environmental monitoring plan to monitor impacts on groundwater levels and quality and any related impacts on wetlands. If adverse impacts are observed, an alternative source of water may be required by the State of Florida or USACE. DEF will comply with Federal, State, and local laws, ordinances, and regulations related to stormwater management, sediment control, erosion, and spill response and cleanup. DEF will comply with the cooling-water discharge permit limits and monitoring requirements for discharges to the Gulf of Mexico.

Land Use

Land that is temporarily disturbed by the activities involved in building LNP Unit 1and 2, will be restored to grassy areas after construction is finished. Over 90 percent of the new transmission lines will be placed in existing DEF transmission-line corridors.

Terrestrial Ecosystems

Excavation will be limited to only those areas needed for development-related activities, and temporarily disturbed sites will be restored in a timely manner. DEF prepared a mitigation plan that will compensate for the loss or impairment of functions to all wetlands affected by development on the LNP site and the associated offsite facilities. Vegetation control for transmission-line maintenance within wetlands will follow restrictive vegetation-clearing practices. Groundwater monitoring will detect changes in groundwater levels before negative effects are seen in wetlands.

Aquatic Ecosystem

For aquatic ecosystems, erosion and runoff control practices will be used to prevent siltation of the Cross Florida Barge Canal during installation of the barge facility, cooling-water intake, and discharge pipeline. DEF will follow the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission's Standard Manatee Conditions for In-Water Work for protection of manatees near any building activities. Cooling-water intake design and slow flow of water through the intake screens will minimize trapping aquatic life. DEF may develop a traffic-management plan that will minimize effects of increased traffic to and from the site.

Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice

DEF will communicate regularly with local government and planning officials to give them ample time to plan for the impact of additional population stress on housing, emergency services, and schools.

Historic and Cultural Properties

DEF has agreed to complete comprehensive surveys for potential historic or archaeological sites prior to transmission-line corridor clearing. DEF will take appropriate actions with the State of Florida following discovery of any potential historic or archaeological resources.

Air Quality

DEF will prepare a dust-control plan before the start of construction, and a number of dust-control measures.

Non-radiological Health

DEF will adhere to all Occupational Safety and Health Agency and State safety standards, practices, and procedures during building activities.

Radiological Health

Doses to construction workers, the public, and wildlife will be maintained below Federal standard public dose limits. A radiological environmental monitoring program will be implemented.

Nonradioactive Waste

Solid, liquid, and gas wastes generated will be handled according to county, State, and Federal regulations.

Wetlands Impacts

Approximately 668 acres of wetlands for all LNP structures will be affected by the construction and operation of the two nuclear units. DEF is working with USACE and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection to finalize a wetlands mitigation plan that describes the enhancement and restoration of other wetland habitats in each watershed affected by the LNP project.

Protected Species

There are twenty-nine Federally protected animal and plant species potentially present in habitats associated with the building and operation of the LNP. Most of these species are not likely to be adversely affected by the LNP project. Following consultation, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) issued a Biological Opinion addressing several plant and animal species and an incidental take statement for the Florida scrub jay. The FWS concluded, however, that the destruction of scrub jay habitat along new transmission corridors is not likely to jeopardize their continued existence throughout their range. The NRC and the FWS coordinated in the development of conditions to be included in the EPP to fully implement the terms and conditions of the Biological Opinion. Those conditions cover a total of three animal species (Florida scrub-jay, sand skink, and indigo snake) and two plant species (Britton's beargrass and longspurred mint) and are included in the EPP, which is included as a part of the COL.

DETERMINATION:

Based on an independent review, analysis, and evaluation contained in the final EIS; careful consideration of all the identified social, economic, and environmental factors and input received from other agencies, organizations and the public; the factors and mitigation measures outlined above; and the input received during the mandatory hearing, it is determined that the standards for issuance of a COL, as described in 10 CFR 52.97, have been met and the requirements of Section 102 of NEPA have been satisfied.

PREPARED BY:

Mallecia A. Sutton, Project Manager
Environmental Projects Branch
Office of New Reactors

REVIEWED BY:

Jennifer L. Dixon-Herrity, Branch Chief
Environmental Projects Branch
Office of New Reactors

APPROVED BY:

Jennifer Uhle, Director
Office of New Reactors