



William P. Cox Senior Attorney Florida Power & Light Company 700 Universe Boulevard Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420 (561) 304-5662 (561) 691-7135 (Facsimile)

April 7, 2021

STAFF'S SECOND DATA REQUEST

-VIA ELECTRONIC FILING-

Adam Teitzman Commission Clerk Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

> Re: Docket No. 20200257-EI Florida Power & Light Company's 2020 Nuclear Decommissioning Study

Dear Mr. Teitzman:

Please find enclosed for electronic filing Florida Power & Light Company's responses to Staff's Second Data Request (Nos. 1-8).

Please feel free to contact me at 561-304-5662 if you have any questions regarding this transmittal.

Sincerely,

/<u>s/ William P. Cox</u> William P. Cox Senior Attorney Florida Bar No. 0093531

Enclosure

cc: Suzanne Brownless, Special Counsel

Florida Power & Light Company Docket No. 20200257-EI Staff's Second Data Request Request No. 1 Page 1 of 1

QUESTION:

Please refer to the St. Lucie Decommissioning Study, Section 11, Page 7 and the Turkey Point Decommissioning Study, Section 10, Page 7.

- a. Please describe how the site-specific plant systems and building inventories were obtained and how they are used in developing a decommissioning cost estimate.
- b. Please describe what Unit Cost Factors are, how they are developed, and how they are used in developing a decommissioning cost estimate.
- c. Please describe what historical data is being referred to and how that data is used in developing a decommissioning cost estimate.
- d. Please elaborate on what the execution strategies are and how they are used in developing a decommissioning cost estimate.

RESPONSE:

- a. Plant systems and inventories were provided from the 2015 Decommissioning Cost Estimate (DCE). Based on discussions with the sites, no major additions or removal had occurred since the 2015 DCE. Inventories assist in identifying the amount of waste that is estimated to be removed from the project.
- b. Unit cost factors are the costs used to complete a single unit of work. Unit cost factors incorporate site-specific costs and location adjustments from previous projects. For example, utilizing unit costs from historical data for a project in California will require location adjustments for productivity and as well as labor costs due to the differing location.
- c. Historical data is the information that was utilized from quotes and estimates from previous proposals. This historical data used was adjusted based on the year and location of the work.
- d. Execution strategies are the methods of demolition for radiologically contaminated buildings. The standard Energy Solutions execution strategy is to minimize interior/surgical demolition and prepare the radiological buildings for open air demolition to decrease labor costs as well as increase safety by lowering the radiation exposure to the craft workers.

Florida Power & Light Company Docket No. 20200257-EI Staff's Second Data Request Request No. 2 Page 1 of 1

QUESTION:

Please refer to the St. Lucie Decommissioning Study, Section 12, Page 7 and the Turkey Point Decommissioning Study, Section 11, Page 7. Please explain the differences in security staffing that contribute to the decrease in security costs compared to the 2015 Study.

<u>RESPONSE</u>:

Both St. Lucie and Turkey Point security staffing levels were lower than in the 2015 Decommissioning Study based on the fuel schedule. The security staffing levels were reduced in the 2020 Decommissioning study once the spent fuel was removed from the spent fuel pool. Additionally, the Turkey Point subsequent license renewal resulted in lower security costs for ISFSI operation during decommissioning since the study assumes the DOE will begin to pick up spent fuel during operations vs. beginning during decommissioning.

Florida Power & Light Company Docket No. 20200257-EI Staff's Second Data Request Request No. 3 Page 1 of 1

QUESTION:

Please refer to the St. Lucie Decommissioning Study, Section 11, Pages 16-17 and the Turkey Point Decommissioning Study, Section 10, Pages 16-17. Please elaborate on the various factors that led to the reduction in the Contingency Allowances used in the 2020 Study from the 2015 Study.

RESPONSE:

Energy Solutions has placed contingency factors based on the uncertainty of the work scope in the periods based on the information that was provided. Experience of work performed and previously estimated proposals where quotes were received played a major factor in the contingency allowances utilized in the 2020 DCE.

Florida Power & Light Company Docket No. 20200257-EI Staff's Second Data Request Request No. 4 Page 1 of 1

QUESTION:

Please refer to the Turkey Point Decommissioning Study, Section 11, Pages 3 and 5. Please confirm that the 2015 dollar amounts referenced on those pages reflected the original TLG 2015 Decommissioning Cost Study, and not the amounts approved in Order No. PSC-16-0250-PAA-EI.

RESPONSE:

Yes. The 2015-dollar amounts referenced in the Turkey Point Decommissioning Study, Section 11, pages 3 and 5 of Energy Solutions comparison report are from the original 2015 TLG Decommissioning Cost Study. As alluded to by Staff's question, TLG's original cost estimate for Turkey Point was subsequently reduced by \$2.2 million due to a property tax calculation error before final commission approval (Order No. PSC-16-0250-PAA-EI).

Florida Power & Light Company Docket No. 20200257-EI Staff's Second Data Request Request No. 5 Page 1 of 1

QUESTION:

Please refer to the St. Lucie Decommissioning Study, Section 11, Page 34 and the Turkey Point Decommissioning Study, Section 10, Page 35. Please provide the 2019 RS Means labor rates referenced on those pages.

RESPONSE:

Please see Attachment No. 1 to this Data Request, No. 5.

Florida Power & Light Company Docket No. 20200257-EI Staff's Second Data Request Request No. 5 Attachment 1 of 1 Page 1 of 2

	July 1, 2017		July	1, 2018		January	1,2019		Add		nt Census F	-	-
Building Construction	Total	30	Total	30	Base	Fringe	Total	30	Additional Increments for 2019 and Beyond Second Increment Third Increment				
Trades	Wage Rate	City %	Wage Rate	City	Wage	Benefit Package	Woge Rate	City	Term/Start Date	Total	Term/Start	Third Increm Total	Term
Common Building Laborers Air Tool Laborers	E21.22	52.1	21.22	51.5		, acrogo	21.22	51.3		Rate	Date	Rote	Date
Asbestos/Insulation Workers/Pipe Coverers	E21.42	54.1	21.42	53.0			21.42	52.8	04/30/19E 04/29/19E				
Boilermakers	E48.56	85.7	48.56	84.2	327.50	1.1980	48.56	83.7	03/01/192	175 Aurora	Net states to a	Since 11, 24	10 m T - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1
Bricklavers	50.69	78.9	50.69	77.9	28.97	21.72	50.69	77.6	12/31/19		34 50	1 . W. B.	65. 2
Helpers	30.38	59.7	30.38	59.4	23.72	6.66	30.38	59.2		West Section	Partici I. Del	10.000	14 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Corpenters	E21.73	54.3	21.73	53.4			21.73	53.3					
Carpet & Linoleum Layers	E35.64	69.6	35.64	68.7	100,000	1.585	35.64	68.3	05/04/19E	()	hable margin	il	
Cement Finishers	E29.38	59.7	29.38	59.3	1 Sale	110 2 2	29.38	59.3	05/02/19E	Ster Ka			83.99
Electricians	31.42	65.2	32.50	66.0	24.60	7.90	32.50	65.6	06/30/19	No	45 N.	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	an in the
Elevator Constructors	43.91	74.7	43.91	73.0	32.11	11.80	43.91	72.5	02/26/19				
Equipment Operators, Crane or Shovel	77.18	93.9	79.17	94.2	43.07	36.10	79.17	94.2	12/31/10	2000 000	di Generata anti-	Second second	. Charles
Equipment Operators, Medium Equipment	E42.49	747	42.49	73.6	1.43/2.5	Sec.	42.49	73.3	12/31/19 06/30/19E		29.13.9	20. 10	2 8
Equipment Operators, Light Equipment	E41.25	75.3	41.25	74.5			41.25	74.2	05/02/19E	455 1 1 1	101 247 2403	64 - 18 A.S.	02.23
Equipment Operators, Oilers	E37.02	71.8	37.02	71.2			37.02	70.8	06/30/19E				
Equipment Operators, Master Mechanics	E33.68	68.7	33.68	68.0	1920	· · · · · · · · · ·	33.68	67.8	06/30/19E	Mar Ser	Coldonia To	of the second	1.000
Glaziers	E42.49	74.4	42.49	73.5	153.8		42.49	73.2	06/30/19E	1964		1 28	3.10
others	32.81	66.8	32.81	65.7	23.01	10.44	33.45	66.7	08/01/19	34.11	08/01/20	2474 0	E /21 /21
Marble Setters	E31.72	63.9	31.72	63.1			31.72	62.7	04/30/19E	04.11	00/01/20	34.76 0	5/31/21
Aosaic & Terrazzo Workers	E29.10	59.4	29.10	58.5	1. 12	1.28	29.10	58.1	04/30/19E	1920 M	Service Make	distant.	5.5
Helpers	E29.10	61.3	29.10	60.5	1.64	S. Walt	29.10	60.1	04/30/19E	R. S. S.	125- 03		1
Villwrights	E22.60	57.6	22.60	56.1			22.60	55.8	04/30/19E	and the	when it is rated	1. 1. 199	× .
ainters, Ordinary	E35.64	66.3	35.64	65.6			35.64	65.3	05/02/19E				
ainters, Spray	30.29	70.5	26.12	60.1	16.21	10.49	26.70	61.2	08/01/19	-27.18	08/01/20	07.74 A	C/01/01
ainters Structured Steel	30.29	69.7	30.29	69.0	20.21	10.08	30.29	68.9	06/30/19	A	00/01/20	27.70 0.	5/31/21
Paper Hangers	30.29 30.29	68.8	30.29	67.8	20.21	10.08	30.29	67.5	06/30/19	00.000	1. C.	6 N N N N	9 2 40
The Drivers	E35.56	70.1	26.12	59.8	16.21	10.49	26.70	61.0	08/01/19	27.18	08/01/20	27.76 0	5/21/21
aslerers.	31.42	69.5	35.64	68.0	S. Barry	6. 6. 6. 6	35.64	67.6	07/30/19E	1000	00/01/20	21.70 00	0/31/21
Helpers	E21.73	66.3	32.50	67.5	24.60	7.90	32.50	67.1	06/30/19	S.K.S.	A Start Start	1.175	8893
lumbers	39.56	53.8	21.73	52.5			21.73	52.3	04/30/19E	121 1 101	and the refer	3.1492	1
Heipers	E31.02	63.2	40.02	63.1	29.13	10.89	40.02	62.8	03/31/19				
odmen (Reinforcing)	32.49	61.8	32.02	63.1	1.	19480	32.02	63.0	03/31/19E	S. C. A.	201000	al a water	13
cofers, Composition	E28.17	59.8 63.5	34.99	63.4	24.89	10.10	34.99	63.2	09/30/19			Sec. 2.	1.138
Helpers	E20.17 E21.13		29.02	64.2			29.02	64.0	07/31/19E		1 Cellin 1 1 1 8 1	1. 1. Carlie	1.
oofers, Precast	E28.17	63.4	21.76	64.1			21.76	63.8	07/30/19E				
oofers, Tile & Slate	E28.17	63.1	29.02	64.2			29.02	63.9	07/31/19E		Stand Size	3. 1. 6 200	den este
heet Metal Workers	E36.84	61.0	29.02	63.8	(3) 段次	1. 32	29.02	63.6	07/31/19E		않는 문화	25-264	1.5
prinkler Installers	45.15	74.5	37.58	61.5			37.58	61.3	08/31/19E	1.	61. 11 1. 1987 <u>.</u>	1	2.1 . 348
teamfilters or Pipefilters	46.63	73.2	47.27	76.2	28.38	18.89	47.27	75.7	06/30/19				
tone Masons	30.38	59.6		74.2	34.48	13.47	47.95	74.0	07/15/19	Same			
tructural Steel Workers	32.49	58.7	30.38	59.3	23.72	6.66	30.38	58.9	04/30/19	2675			
Velders, Structural Steel	32.49	58.6	34.99 34.99	62.2	24.89	10.10	34.99	61.9	09/30/19				
le Lavers	E29.10	61.4	29.10	62.2	24.89	10.10	34.99	62.0	09/30/19				
Helpers	E22.60	60.4		60.6	1.35.6	a total	29.10	60.0	04/30/19E	14.23			
ruck Drivers, Light	E44.04	97.9	22.60	59.5	1.111	States.	22.60	59.0	04/30/19E	1.5			
uck Drivers, Heavy	E45.93	99.1	44.04 45.93	96.4 97.4			44.04	95.5	03/31/19E				
	-40.70	77.1	43,73	9/,4	-		45.93	96.8	03/31/19E				
killed Trade Average	36.19	67.9	36.49	67.3			36.54	67.1			Miam	ni, Flori	da

Florida Power & Light Company Docket No. 20200257-EI Staff's Second Data Request Request No. 5 Attachment 1 of 1 Page 2 of 2

Building Construction Trades Common Building Laborers Arir Tool Laborers Asbestos/Insulation Workers/Pipe Coverers Boilermokers Boilermokers	Total Wage Rate 20.39	30 City	Total	30			.,		Auuii			Ø 000 Bevo	Current Census Figures 106,77 Additional Increments for 2019 and Beyond					
Trades Common Building Laborers Air Tool Laborers Asbestos/Insulation Workers/Pipe Coverers Boilermakers	Rote 20.39	City			Base	January 1, 2019			A 11									
Common Building Laborers Arbeatos/Insulation Workers/Pipe Coverers Boilermokers	20.39	<u>%</u>	Woge	City	Wage	Fringe Benefit	Total Wage	30 City %	Y 10									
Air Tool Laborers Asbestos/Insulation Workers/Pipe Coverers Boilermakers		%	Rate		Rate	Package	age Rate		Term/Start Date	Total	Term/Start	Total	Term					
Asbestos/Insulation Workers/Pipe Coverers Boilermakers		50.1	20.39	49.5	15.00	5.39		_		Rate	Date	Rate	Date					
Dollermokers	20.89	52.7	20.89	51.7	15.50	5.39	20.39 20.89	49.3	04/30/19									
Dollermokers	E48.56	85.7	48.56	84.2	15.50	3.34	48.56	51.4	04/30/19	****								
	50.69	78.9	50.69	77.9	28.97	21.72	48.50	83.7	03/01/19E	£3	and the first	80						
	30.38	59.7	30.38	59.4	23.72	6.66	30.38	77.6	12/31/19	2.5	35 34	18						
Helpers	20.89	52.2	20.89	51.4	15.50	5.39	20.89	59.2	04/30/19									
Corpenters	E35.64	69.6	35.64	68.7	10.00	3.37	35.64	51.2	04/30/19		1							
Carpet & Linoleum Layers	27.72	56.3	27.72	56.0	22.20	5.52	27.72	55.9	05/04/19E	218	Sec. 1							
Cement Finishers Electricions	30.50	63.3	32.50	66.0	24.60	7.90	32.50	65.6	05/02/19	a_{i}	1435							
levator Constructors	41.93	71.4	41.93	69.7	30.50	11.43	41.93	69.2	06/30/19 02/28/19									
Devotor Constructors	77.18	93.9	79.17	94.2	43.07	36.10	79.17	94.2										
quipment Operators, Crane or Shovel	42.25	:74.2	42.25	73.1	33.05	9.20	42.25	72.9	12/31/19 06/30/19	10								
quipment Operators, Medium Equipment	E42.25	77.1	42.25	76.3			42.25	76.0	05/02/19	Sec								
quipment Operators, Light Equipment quipment Operators, Oilers	E36.50	70.8	36.50	70.2			36.50	69.8	06/30/19E									
guipment Operators, Master Mechanics	E33.68	68.7	33.68	68.0	1 istan	1.200	33.68	67.8	06/30/19E	594 - C	and a state of the							
Jaziers	E43.63	76.4	43.63	75.5	1 Sugar	1. 1975-	43.63	75.2	06/30/19E			6.1.28	3.5 2					
others	32.81	66.8	32.81	65.7	23.01	10.44	33.45	66.7	08/01/19	34.11	08/01/20	2474 0	E 101 10					
Aarble Setters	30.17	60.8	30.17	60.0	22.30	7.87	30,17	59.6	04/30/19	34.11	00/01/20	34.76 0	5/31/2					
Aosaic & Terrazzo Workers	E28.25	57.6	28.25	56.8	Stat.	28.5	28.25	56.4	04/30/19E	265.521	Mar - Mar	50 - AD						
Helpers	E28.25	59.5	28.25	58.7	134	S.	28.25	58.3	04/30/19E	Sec. 1	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1		573					
Ailwrights	20.89	53.3	20.89	51.8	15.50	5.39	20.89	51.6	04/30/19	N7	100, 0.51	See Suga	25.1.19					
ainters, Ordinary	E35.64	66.3	35.64	65.6			35.64	65.3	05/02/19E									
ainters, Spray	26.12	60.8	26.12	60.1	16.21	10.49	26.70	61.2		27.18	08/01/20	27.76 0	5/21/2					
ainters, Structural Steel	26.12 26.12	60.1	26.12	59.5	16.21	10.49	26.70	60.7	07/31/19	27.18	08/01/20	27.76 0	5/21/2					
aper Hangers	26.12	59.3 60.5	26.12	58.4	16.21	10.49	26.70	59.5	07/31/19	27.18	08/01/20	27.76 0	5/31/2					
ile Drivers	35.56	69.5	26.12	59.8	16.21	10.49	26.70	61.0	08/01/19	27.18	08/01/20	27.76 0	5/31/2					
asterers	30.50	64.4	35.56	67.8	25.20	10.36	35.56	67.5	07/31/19		Strate States		10172					
Helpers	20.89	51.7	32.50 20.89	67.5	24.60	7.90	32.50	67.1	06/30/19	280	all in the	아 사람	26 33					
umbers	37.75	60.3	40.89	50.5	15.50	5.39	20.89	50.3	04/30/19			A. C. M.						
Hapers	E30.20	60.2	32.71	64.4	28.06	12.83	40.89	64.1	01/02/19									
odmen (Reinforcing)	33.99	62.6	33.99	61.6	22.00	10.00	32.71	64.3	01/02/19E	S								
ooters, Composition	27.62	62.2	27.62	61.1	23.00	10.99	33.99	61.4	01/31/19	69.1.1								
Helpers	E20.72	62.2	20.72	61.0	17.72	7.90	27.62	60.9	07/31/19									
polers, Precast	27.62	62.2	27.62	61.1	19.72	7.90	20.72	60.8	07/31/19E									
pofers, Tile & Slate	27.62	61.9	27.62	60.8	19.72	7.90		60.8	07/31/19	6.80	32.							
eet Metal Workers	E42.02	69.5	42.02	68.8	17.7 4	7.90	27.62	60.5	07/31/19	V. M	10,11							
prinkler Installers	45.15	74.5	47.27	76.2	28.38	18.89	42.02 47.27	68.5 75.7	01/01/19E									
eamfilters or Pipefilters	37.75	.59.3	40.89	63.3	28.06	12.83	40.89	63.1	06/30/19									
one Masons ructural Steel Workers	30.38	59.6	30.38	59.3	23.72	6.66	30.38	58.9	01/02/19 04/30/19									
	33.99	61.4	33.99	60.4	23.00	10.99	33.99	60.2										
elders, Structural Steel e Layers	33.99	61.3	33.99	60.4	23.00	10.99	33.99	60.2	01/31/19 01/31/19									
e Layers Helpers	E28.25	59.6	28.25	58.8	1.20	10.77	28.25	58.3		in .								
uck Drivers, Light	20.89	55.8	20.89	55.0	15.50	5.39	20.89	54.6	04/30/19E 04/30/19	Ser -								
uck Drivers, Heavy	40.33	89.7	40.33	88.3	31.58	8.75	40.33	87.4	03/31/19	1212								
white a fictory	42.06	90.8	42.06	89.2	33.31	8.75	42.06	88.7	03/31/19									

Florida Power & Light Company Docket No. 20200257-EI Staff's Second Data Request Request No. 6 Page 1 of 1

QUESTION:

Please refer to FPL's 2020 St. Lucie Decommissioning Study, Section 12, Page 3 of 10, as well as FPL's 2020 Turkey Point Decommissioning Study, Section 11, Page 3 of 10. In the fourth paragraph, the Summary states, "The cost elements were assigned to one of three subcategories: License Termination, Spent Fuel Management, and Site Restoration." For each cost element identified in FPL's Response to Staff's First Data Request (Document No. 02585-2021), No. 70.a, please identify the subcategory to which the cost element belongs.

RESPONSE:

*Characterization/Surveys – License Termination, Spent Fuel Management

*Corporate Support (Fixed Overhead) – License Termination, Spent Fuel Management, Site Restoration

*Decontamination & Removal – License Termination, Site Restoration

*Energy – License Termination, Spent Fuel Management, Site Restoration

Florida LLRW Inspection Fee – License Termination

*Insurance & Regulatory Fees – License Termination, Spent Fuel Management, Site Restoration

*Misc. Equip/Site Services - License Termination, Spent Fuel Management, Site Restoration

*Program Management – License Termination, Spent Fuel Management, Site Restoration

*Property Taxes - License Termination, Spent Fuel Management, Site Restoration

*Security - License Termination, Spent Fuel Management, Site Restoration

Spent Fuel Management – Spent Fuel Management

Spent Fuel Pool Isolation – Spent Fuel Management

Waste Packaging, Transportation, & Disposal (Class A, B, C) – License Termination

Waste Packaging, Transportation, & Disposal (GTCC) – License Termination

*Items with multiple subcategories: The subcategories are dependent upon which period an item within this cost element is captured.

Florida Power & Light Company Docket No. 20200257-EI Staff's Second Data Request Request No. 7 Page 1 of 1

QUESTION:

Please refer to FPL's Response to Staff's First Data Request (Document No. 02585-2021), No. 71.e. Please explain how FPL determines whether a SNF management cost is a DOE recoverable cost.

RESPONSE:

For a cost to be recoverable from DOE, it must satisfy a multifaceted test, known as the allowable and reasonable cost test under the terms of the Settlement Agreement. FPL submits to DOE an application for all costs it believes satisfies this test each year. The submittal is comprised of thousands of pages of costs and supporting contracts and other documents. The DOE then evaluates FPL's submitted costs and determines if, in DOE's view, those costs are recoverable from DOE.

The Settlement Agreement defines allowable cost as follows:

"Allowable Costs' means those costs incurred by [FPL] for managing and storing [Spent Nuclear Fuel] which were foreseeable in the event of DOE's [delay in picking up Spent Nuclear Fuel at a prescribed rate], and that [FPL] would not have incurred but for, and which are directly related to, DOE's [delay in picking up Spent Nuclear Fuel at a prescribed rate] in performance of its acceptance obligations under the [Standard] Contracts."

As a result, all costs submitted by FPL in its annual claim are evaluated as to whether they would have been avoided had the DOE performed its obligations under the Standard Contract. If such costs would have been incurred by FPL even had DOE performed its obligations under the Standard Contract, DOE will deny recovery of those costs. As this determination can be somewhat subjective, FPL has disputed (and where appropriate, will dispute) any cost denied by the DOE for not being an "Allowable Cost."

Finally, such costs must be "Reasonable Costs" - i.e., they "would be incurred by a prudent person or entity" - and must have been "incurred specifically as a result of the delay in DOE's performance." FPL only seeks recovery of reasonable costs.

Florida Power & Light Company Docket No. 20200257-EI Staff's Second Data Request Request No. 8 Page 1 of 1

QUESTION:

Please refer to FPL's 2020 St. Lucie Decommissioning Study, Section 2, Page 10 of 11, FPL's 2020 Turkey Point Decommissioning Study, Section 2, Page 8 of 9, as well as FPL's Response to Staff's First Data Request (Document No. 02585-2021), No. 74.a. for the following questions.

- a. In FPL's 2020 St. Lucie and Turkey Point Decommissioning Studies' Assumptions section, under Spent Nuclear Fuel Storage, the narratives state, "Consistent with the Commission's prior findings, this updated 2020 decommissioning study includes the costs relating to the *construction*, operation, and dismantlement of an on-site independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI) that is required to accommodate the timely decommissioning of the St. Lucie/Turkey Point units," [emphasis added]. However, this statement appears to be contradicted in FPL's Response to Staff's First Data Request, as FPL states, "The 2020 DCEs for Turkey Point and St. Lucie assume any required ISFSI buildout will be complete prior to permanent plant shutdown, and therefore such costs are not included as decommissioning costs." Please explain this as well as how ISFSI construction costs and potential expansion costs are/will be recorded.
- b. If ISFSI construction/expansion cost reimbursements are rejected by the DOE, please explain how and when such ISFSI construction/expansion costs will be recovered.

RESPONSE:

- a. Based on the DCE assumption 37 for St. Lucie states:
 - "St. Lucie currently has an existing ISFSI on site. Construction costs for any expansion of the ISFSI that may be required has not been included, but demolition has been included in the estimate and has been split between both units." The construction costs are not included in the decommissioning study since the study assumes construction occurs during operations. The demolition is included in decommissioning study since the study assumes the demolition occurs during decommissioning.
- b. Turkey Point DCE assumption 35 states:

"Turkey Point currently has an existing ISFSI on site. Construction costs for any expansion of the ISFSI that may be required has not been included, but demolition has been included in the estimate and has been split between both units." The construction costs are not included in the decommissioning study since the study assumes construction occurs during operations. The demolition is included in decommissioning study since the study assumes the demolition occurs during decommissioning.

If ISFSI construction/expansion cost reimbursements are rejected by the DOE, such amount would be recovered through base rates.