

From: Paul Gunter <pgunter@nirs.org>
To: <mls3@nrc.gov>, <ajk1@nrc.gov>
Date: 4/2/03 5:39PM
Subject: Letter to NRC re:ESP Questions

Mr. Scott and Mr. Kugler,

Attached please find a copy of NIRS letter regarding questions raised at the North Anna Early Site Permit Public Hearing in Louisa, VA on April 01, 2003. A hard copy is also being sent to you and cc'd to other interested parties.

Thank you,
Paul Gunter, Director
Reactor Watchdog Project
Nuclear Information and Resource Service
1424 16th Street NW Suite 404
Washington, DC 20036
Tel. 202 328 0002
www.nirs.org

CC: <fxc@nrc.gov>, <bhayden37@yahoo.com>, <jbord333@cstone.net>, <zips@firstva.com>, <jim.riccio@wdc.greenpeace.org>

Nuclear Information and Resource Service
1424 16th Street NW Suite 404
Washington, DC 20036
Tel. 202 328 0002
www.nirs.org

April 02, 2003

Michael Scott
North Anna Site Safety Project Manager
New Reactor Licensing Project Office
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Andrew Kugler
North Anna Environmental Project Manager
License Renewal and Environmental Impacts Program
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

By email: mls3@nrc.gov and ajk1@nrc.gov

**VERIFICATION OF NRC COMMITMENT TO FOLLOW-UP ON
REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING
THE EARLY SITE PERMIT APPLICATION REVIEW PROCESS
FOR NORTH ANNA NUCLEAR POWER STATION**

Dear Mr. Scott and Mr. Kugler:

Thanks again for the opportunity to raise questions and concerns to you both at the public meeting yesterday in Louisa, Virginia regarding Dominion Energy's pending Early Site Permit Application to potentially expand the operational capacity at North Anna nuclear power station with new reactors.

This communication is to verify that the agency made a commitment to follow-up on the queries listed below made during the first public meeting of the NRC Early Site Permit Review for North Anna Early Site Permit Application on April 01, 2003.

1) Under what conditions can the public raise concerns/contentions in the Early Site Permit Environmental Review regarding the environmental impact from the potentially limitless and indefinite expansion of the Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation as the result of the construction and operation of an unknown number of new nuclear units given any new, significant or conflicting information affecting the Commission findings in the Final First Nuclear Waste Confidence Decision as issued on August 31, 1984, the Final Second Waste Confidence Decision of September 18, 1990 and the "Status Report on the Review of the Waste Confidence Decision" of December 06, 1999?

Currently only one deep geological repository is under consideration by the Department of Energy pending completion of a licensing proceeding before NRC and any subsequent legal challenges and appeals. Proposed operational dates for this repository have slipped. A large number of significant licensing issues are presently unresolved potentially impacting the successful licensing of the only repository under consideration which the agency has claimed is without a pre-determined outcome.

In addition to the uncertainty surrounding the outcome of the single site under consideration for a nuclear waste repository, the dry cask storage of high-level nuclear waste is not without significant uncertainties and potential problems that include age-related degradation, Quality Assurance and Quality Control, security issues and adequate regulatory oversight.

Dominion Energy has already identified to NRC indications of early degradation of one of its dry casks utilized for nuclear waste storage after less than 5 years of storage. Dominion reported to NRC secondary inner seal leakage exceeding Technical Specifications in Castor X/33 dry storage cask #I-24 at the Surry nuclear power station Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation near Newport News, VA.¹

2) Where in the Early Site Permit Application process are public concerns and contentions addressed regarding the potential socio-economic impacts from security issues arising out of expanded nuclear power plant operations on Lake Anna?

Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Company recently closed public access to Coffey County Lake in Coffey County, Kansas as a result of elevated security for Wolf Creek nuclear power station. [SEE < http://cjonline.com/stories/031803/bre_lakeclose.shtml >]

Similar actions have been taken by Exelon with public access closures on Clinton Lake which services the Clinton nuclear generating station with both cooling and receiving water.² Expanded nuclear operations potentially pose greater security requirements against terrorism resulting in a greater likelihood of more frequent, more extended or perhaps permanent lake closure due to expanded security concerns. Such restrictive actions could result in extensive socio-economic impact to affected communities.

3) By whose authority can the public's access to Lake Anna be restricted as the result of elevated security codes? What Memorandums of Agreement (MOA) or Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) with Dominion Energy with which authorities currently exist for restricting public access to Lake Anna under elevated security codes?

Sincerely,

Paul Gunter, Director
Reactor Watchdog Project, NIRS

¹ "Spent Fuel Storage Cask Secondary Seal Leak at the Surry Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation," Daily Event Report, Event #36047, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, August 19, 1999.

² "Up the Creek at Clinton Lake," The News-Gazette, Mike Monson, November 04, 2001.

Cc:

Francis X. Cameron, Esq.
Special Counsel for Public Liaison
Office of General Counsel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555
fxc@nrc.gov

William S. Hayden
Lake Anna Civic Association
6834 Lake Pointe Drive
Lake Anna, VA 23117
bhayden37@yahoo.com

William and Jean Borduin
637 Bear Castle Drive
Bumpass, VA 23024
jbord333@cstone.net

Jerry Rosenthal
Concerned Citizens of Louisa County
877 Holland Creek Rd
Louisa, VA 23093
zips@firstva.com

Jim Riccio
Nuclear Campaign
Greenpeace USA
702 H St NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20001
jim.riccio@wdc.greenpeace.org