



August 20, 2004

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attention: Document Control Desk
Washington, D.C. 20555

Serial No. 04-354
ESP/JDH
Docket No. 52-008

DOMINION NUCLEAR NORTH ANNA, LLC
NORTH ANNA EARLY SITE PERMIT APPLICATION
RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NO. 7

In its June 3, 2004 letter titled "Request for Additional Information Letter No. 7," the NRC requested additional information regarding certain aspects of Dominion Nuclear North Anna, LLC's (Dominion) Early Site Permit application. This letter contains our responses to the following requests for additional information (RAIs):

1.8-1, 2.2.3-1, 2.3.5-1, 2.3.5-2, 13.3-10, 13.3-11

Two RAI No. 7 questions have been addressed separately. A response to RAI 2.3.1-6 was provided in Dominion's August 2, 2004 letter, Serial No. 04-318. A response to RAI 2.3.4-1 was provided in Dominion's July 12, 2004 letter, Serial No. 04-170A. Responses to RAIs 13.3-12, 13.3-13, and 13.3-14 will be submitted at a later date.

Also, in response to RAI 17.1-1 contained in Dominion's August 2, 2004 letter, Serial No. 04-318, Dominion committed to update the Site Safety Analysis Report for any updated website reference information. Enclosure 2 to this letter contains updates to the list of groundwater users.

It is our intent to update the North Anna ESP application to reflect our responses to these and other RAIs to support issuance of the NRC staff's draft safety and environmental evaluations scheduled for later this year. Planned changes to the application are identified following the response to each RAI.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Mr. Joseph D. Hegner at 804-273-2770.

Very truly yours,

Eugene S. Grecheck
Vice President-Nuclear Support Services

D074

- Enclosures:
1. Response to NRC RAI Letter No. 7
 2. Revisions to SSAR Section 1.8 in Response to RAI 1.8-1
 3. Updated List of Groundwater Users Identified by EPA
 4. One CD-ROM containing XOQDOQ input file in response to RAI 2.3.5-1. The CD-ROM is labeled, "North Anna Early Site Permit Application, Docket No. 52-008, Serial No. 04-xxx, Response to RAI Letter No. 7, XOQDOQ Input File in Response to RAI 2.3.5-1," and contains the following file:

RAI 2.3.5-1 XOQ_Inp.DAT.txt; 5KB; publicly available

Commitments made in this letter:

1. Revise North Anna ESP application to reflect RAI responses.

cc: (with Enclosures 1 through 3)

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region II
Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center
61 Forsyth Street, SW
Suite 23T85
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Mr. Mike Scott (Enclosures 1 through 4)
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Mr. M. T. Widmann
NRC Senior Resident Inspector
North Anna Power Station

Mr. Andy Kugler
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Ms. Ellie Irons
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Office of Environmental Impact Review
P.O. Box 10009
Richmond, VA 23240

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

COUNTY OF HENRICO

The foregoing document was acknowledged before me, in and for the County and Commonwealth aforesaid, today by Eugene S. Grecheck, who is Vice President-Nuclear Support Services, of Dominion Nuclear North Anna, LLC. He has affirmed before me that he is duly authorized to execute and file the foregoing document on behalf of Dominion Nuclear North Anna, LLC, and that the statements in the document are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

Acknowledged before me this 20TH day of August, 2004.

My Commission expires: May 31, 2006

Vicki L. Hule
Notary Public

(SEAL)

Serial No. 04-354
Docket No. 52-008
Response to 6/3/04 RAI Letter No. 7

Enclosure 1

Response to NRC RAI Letter No. 7

RAI 1.8-1 (NRC 6/3/04 Letter)

Please provide a comprehensive listing of NRC regulations and regulatory guidance applicable to the Dominion early site permit (ESP) SSAR and the affected SSAR sections. For example, please state whether 10 CFR 100.21(f) and Regulatory Guide (RG) 4.7 apply to SSAR Section 13.6, and whether Regulatory Guide 1.183 applies to SSAR Section 15.0.

Response

SSAR Section 1.8 will be revised to provide a comprehensive listing of applicable NRC regulations and regulatory guidance applicable to the SSAR and affected SSAR sections.

In response to the specific examples, 10 CFR 100.21(f) and Regulatory Guide 4.7 do apply to SSAR Section 13.6, and Regulatory Guide 1.183 does apply to SSAR Chapter 15.

Several discrepancies in SSAR and ER references will also be corrected.

Application Revision

SSAR Section 1.8 will be revised as shown in Enclosure 2.

Reference 11 of SSAR Section 2.1 References will be revised to read as follows:

11. NRC Review Standard RS-002, Processing Applications of Early Site Permits: Draft for Interim Use and Public Comment, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, December 23, 2002, as supplemented.

Reference 27 of SSAR Section 2.3 References will be revised to read as follows:

27. Regulatory Guide 1.23, *Meteorological Programs in Support of Nuclear Power Plants*, Proposed Revision 1, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, September 1980.

Reference 3 of SSAR Section 15.2 References will be revised to read as follows:

3. Regulatory Guide 1.145, *Atmospheric Dispersion Models for Potential Accident Consequence Assessments at Nuclear Power Plants*, Revision 1, U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, November 1982.

Reference 2 of SSAR Section 15.3 References will be revised to read as follows:

2. Regulatory Guide 1.3, *Assumptions Used for Evaluating the Potential Radiological Consequences of a Loss of Coolant Accident for Boiling Water Reactors*, Revision 2, U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, June 1974.

References 6 and 10 of ER Section 7.1 References will be revised to read as follows:

6. Regulatory Guide 1.145, *Atmospheric Dispersion Models for Potential Accident Consequence Assessments at Nuclear Power Plants*, Revision 1, U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, November 1982.
10. Regulatory Guide 1.3, *Assumptions Used for Evaluating the Potential Radiological Consequences of a Loss of Coolant Accident for Boiling Water Reactors*, Revision 2, U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, June 1974.

RAI 2.2.3-1 (NRC 6/3/04 Letter)

Please identify hazards, if any, associated with the existing North Anna Units 1 and 2 that could pose an undue risk to new reactor(s) that might be constructed and operated at the ESP site.

Response

No hazards have been identified with the existing Units 1 and 2 that could pose an undue risk to new reactors that might be constructed and operated at the ESP site.

Application Revision

None.

RAI 2.3.5-1 (NRC 6/3/04 Letter)

Please provide a copy of the input file(s) used to execute XOQDOQ in support of calculating the long term (routine release) X/Q and D/Q values presented in SSAR Section 2.3.5.

Response

A copy of the input file used to execute XOQDOQ in support of the model results reported in SSAR Section 2.3.5 is provided on the enclosed compact disc (CD).

Application Revision

None.

RAI 2.3.5-2 (NRC 6/3/04 Letter)

SSAR Section 2.3.5 and Table 2.3-16 present bounding maximum annual χ/Q and D/Q values at or beyond the site boundary for routine releases. However, the SSAR Section 1.8.1 discussion on Regulatory Guide 1.70 (top of SSAR Page 2-1-63, Revision 0) states that the maximum annual average χ/Q values at or beyond the site boundary for each venting location will be provided in the COL application. Please explain the difference between these two statements.

Response

Venting locations, structural dimensions, and layout are unique to each reactor design. Therefore, an evaluation was performed of maximum annual average χ/Q and D/Q values at or beyond the site boundary for routine releases using a conservative set of values for the venting locations, structural dimensions, and layout.

Furthermore, the bounding χ/Q and D/Q analysis addressed in SSAR Section 2.3.5 and the maximum values summarized in SSAR Table 2.3-16 are based on conservative dispersion modeling assumptions (i.e., those that lead to higher relative concentration and deposition values). Assumptions that result in relatively less dispersion between the release point and downwind, ground-level receptors were used. They include a ground-level (as opposed to an elevated) release, identifying the shortest, direction-specific distances between any point on the ESP plant envelope boundary and the EAB, and assigning the shortest distance between the plant envelope boundary and the LPZ to all downwind direction sectors on the LPZ.

Actual values for venting locations, structural dimensions, and layout would be established during detailed engineering for the selected reactor design. The COL application would provide confirmation that the actual values are acceptable with respect to the evaluation in the ESP SSAR.

Application Revision

In SSAR Section 1.8.1 pertaining to conformance to 10 CFR 50, Appendix I, the "Clarifications," will be revised to read as follows:

Clarifications	Section 2.3.5 - Actual values for venting locations, structural dimensions, and layout would be established during detailed engineering for the selected reactor design. The COL application would provide confirmation that the actual values are
----------------	--

acceptable with respect to the evaluation in the ESP
SSAR.

In SSAR Section 1.8.2 pertaining to conformance to NRC Regulatory Guide 1.70, the "Exceptions" with respect to SSAR Section 2.3.5 will be revised to read as follows:

Section 2.3.5 - Actual values for venting locations, structural dimensions, and layout would be established during detailed engineering for the selected reactor design. The COL application would provide confirmation that the actual values are acceptable with respect to the evaluation in the ESP SSAR.

In SSAR Section 1.8.3 pertaining to conformance to draft RS-002 for Section 2.3.5, the "Clarifications" will be revised to read as follows:

Clarifications	Section 2.3.5 - Actual values for venting locations, structural dimensions, and layout would be established during detailed engineering for the selected reactor design. The COL application would provide confirmation that the actual values are acceptable with respect to the evaluation in the ESP SSAR.
----------------	---

RAI 13.3-10 (NRC 6/3/04 Letter)

SSAR Section 13.3.2.2.2.k (Radiological Exposure Control) relies on the existing North Anna units' radiological protection procedures, stating that the procedures would be applicable to the ESP site or would be addressed in future radiological protection procedures. SSAR Section 13.3.2.2.2.k.4 (Authorization of Exposure Above Dose Limits), which substantively repeats a portion of NAEP Section 6.4.1 (Emergency Exposure Limits), states that approval from the "emergency coordinator" is necessary for planned exposures greater than the 10 CFR 20 annual limits. NAEP Section 6.4.1 states that this approval will be from the "Station Emergency Manager." Please explain the difference in the designated approval source.

Response

NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, "Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants," Evaluation Criterion II.B.2, refers to designation of an individual as emergency coordinator. Evaluation Criterion II.K.2 refers to identification of the individual(s) who can authorize emergency workers to receive doses in excess of 10 CFR Part 20 limits. NAEP Sections 5.2.1.1 and 6.4.1 identify this individual who presently functions as the emergency coordinator and who can authorize emergency workers to receive doses in excess of the Part 20 limits at the existing units as the Station Emergency Manager.

NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, Supplement 2, Criteria for Emergency Planning in an Early Site Permit Application, did not contain an evaluation criterion corresponding with NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1 Evaluation Criterion II.B.2. Thus, as stated in SSAR Section 13.3.2.2.2.b, a description of the onsite emergency organization would be provided in a COL application. The NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, Supplement 2, evaluation criterion corresponding with NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1 Evaluation Criterion II.K.2 referenced general guidance on dose limits for workers performing emergency services. Dominion has made no decisions regarding organizational details at this time. However, it was not the intent of SSAR Section 13.3.2.2.2.k to infer any substantial difference between provisions of the NAEP and SSAR Section 13.3 in this regard.

Application Revision

None.

RAI 13.3-11 (NRC 6/3/04 Letter)

Please provide a conclusion and supporting analysis, based on extrapolation of data on permanent resident and transient population to future years, regarding whether increases in population during the term of an ESP could pose a significant impediment to development of emergency plans. Include the population increase (including staff at the North Anna Power Station) that would be expected to occur as a result of operation of new reactors at the site.

Response

The Evacuation Time Estimates for the North Anna Power Station and Surrounding Jurisdictions (SSAR Section 13.3 Reference Number 42) identified no areas of congestion during the evacuation analyses. The evacuation time estimates presented in the study results are based on a combination of warning time, warning diffusion, mobilization time and travel time. As can be inferred from the minimal effect adverse weather has on the evacuation time estimate, travel time is relatively inelastic with respect to anticipated changes in road capacity, i.e., loading of the road network. Thus, a reduction in road capacity by 40% results in no more than a 5-minute increase in any of the evacuation time estimate scenarios.

Population projections are provided in SSAR Section 2.1.3. The population increase is projected to be gradual over time. The study did indicate that planning and consideration of new roads or modification of existing roads and intersections could offset any large influx of new permanent or transient population within the plume exposure pathway emergency planning zone.

Onsite and offsite emergency planners work with their local governments counterparts on an ongoing basis. Their planning and development processes ensure that the public notification system coverage and evacuation plans for North Anna site (including the ESP site) remain adequate to protect public health and safety.

Application Revision

None.

Serial No. 04-354
Docket No. 52-008
Response to 6/3/04 RAI Letter No. 7

Enclosure 3

Updated List of Groundwater Users Identified by EPA

Updated List of Groundwater Users Identified by EPA

In response to RAI 17.1-1, the EPA's Safe Drinking Water Information System was contacted to verify public groundwater use data for Louisa County that was originally obtained from EPA's website in April of 2003. In response to our inquiry, the EPA submitted updated (July 2004) information in written correspondence.

SSAR Section 2.4.12.2, SSAR Table 2.4-19, ER Section 2.3.2.2.1, and ER Table 2.3-11 will be revised to reflect the updated data.

Application Revision

The 8th paragraph of SSAR Section 2.4.12.2 will be revised to read as follows:

There are 45 public water supplies in Louisa County capable of obtaining their water from springs or wells. Data describing these public water supplies are presented in Table 2.4-19. The public supplies closest to the existing units are Lake Anna Plaza, about 2.6 miles to the northwest, and Jerdone Island, about 4.3 miles to the south-southeast. Based on their distance from the ESP site and the presence of one or more arms of Lake Anna between the site and these public water supplies, any impact the new units may have on the aquifers beneath the site is not expected to affect these supplies. Likewise, withdrawal by these public supplies would not affect the ability of the new units to withdraw groundwater for potable water needs.

Reference 58 of SSAR Section 2.4 References will be revised to read as follows:

58. *Safe Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS), Virginia, Louisa County*, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, letter from Karen D. Johnson to Bechtel Power Corporation, July 14, 2004.

SSAR Table 2.4-19 will be replaced as shown on the following pages.

Table 2.4-19 Public Groundwater Supplies In Louisa County

Installation	Type ^(a)	Water Source	Depth (ft)	Measured Yield (gpd)	Design Yield (gpd)	Population Served ^(a)	Active/ Inactive ^(a)
Town of Louisa ^(b) (primary source is surface water)	Community	spring	NA	38,880		1950	
		3 wells	200–405	43,200–53,280			
Town of Mineral ^(b)	Community	2 springs	NA	57,600		670	A
		4 wells	200–600	14,400–165,600			
Acorn West Trailer Park ^(b)	Community	well	120	8640		70	I
Apple Grove School ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					200	I
Blue Ridge Shores ^(b)	Community	4 wells	163–405	288,000	160,000	1450	A
Bumpass Park/Lake Anna Rescue ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					250	A

a. Reference 58

b. Reference 50

Table 2.4-19 Public Groundwater Supplies In Louisa County

Installation	Type ^(a)	Water Source	Depth (ft)	Measured Yield (gpd)	Design Yield (gpd)	Population Served (a)	Active/Inactive ^(a)
Burger King Zion Crossroads (a)	Transient Non-Community					250	A
Cable Form (a)	Transient Non-Community					11	I
Christopher Run Campground (a)	Transient Non-Community					608	A
Country Side II (a)	Transient Non-Community					50	I
Crescent Inn Restaurant (a)	Transient Non-Community					150	A
Crossing Point (VA Oil Co) (b)	Non-Transient Non-Community	2 wells	305	21,600–28,800	10,400	45	A
Deb's Place (a)	Transient Non-Community					50	I

Table 2.4-19 Public Groundwater Supplies In Louisa County

Installation	Type ^(a)	Water Source	Depth (ft)	Measured Yield (gpd)	Design Yield (gpd)	Population Served ^(a)	Active/ Inactive ^(a)
East End Elementary School (b)		well	345	61,920	31,200		
Expressions Learning Center (b)	Non-Transient Non-Community	well	205	17,280		45	A
Green Springs School ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					300	I
Jerdone Island (b,c)	Community	well	200	83,520	19,600	49	A
Jouette Elementary School (b)	Non-Transient Non-Community	well	345	61,920	19,600	741	A
Junction Restaurant ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					25	I
Junction Restaurant ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					50	I

c. Reference 59

Table 2.4-19 Public Groundwater Supplies In Louisa County

Installation	Type ^(a)	Water Source	Depth (ft)	Measured Yield (gpd)	Design Yield (gpd)	Population Served (a)	Active/ Inactive ^(a)
Klockner Barrier Films ^(b)		well	305	53,280	22,000		
Klockner-Pentaplast ^(b)	Non-Transient Non-Community	2 wells	205 - 280	21,600 - 57,600	44,000	526	A
Lake Anna Estates Trailer Park ^(a)	Community					50	I
L A Pizza ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					25	I
Lake Anna Plaza ^(d)	Community	2 wells	335 - 230	11,520 - 86,400	41,200	100	A
Louisa County Senior Center ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					45	I
Louisa County Water Authority ^(a,b)	Non-Transient Non-Community	well	550	34,560		192	I

d. Reference 60

Table 2.4-19 Public Groundwater Supplies In Louisa County

Installation	Type ^(a)	Water Source	Depth (ft)	Measured Yield (gpd)	Design Yield (gpd)	Population Served (a)	Active/Inactive ^(a)
Louisa County Zion Crossroads (a)	Non-Transient Non-Community					600	A
Louisa Day Care Center (a)	Transient Non-Community					30	I
Louisa Intermediate School (a)	Transient Non-Community					900	I
Mount Garland School (a)	Transient Non-Community					140	I
Ole Country Inn (a)	Transient Non-Community					50	I
Prospect Hill (a)	Transient Non-Community					50	A

Table 2.4-19 Public Groundwater Supplies In Louisa County

Installation	Type ^(a)	Water Source	Depth (ft)	Measured Yield (gpd)	Design Yield (gpd)	Population Served (a)	Active/ Inactive ^(a)
Raynell's ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					25	I
Sandra Carter ^(a)	Community					36	I
Shenandoah Crossing ^(b)	Non-Transient Non-Community	2 wells	280 - 300	123,840 - 97,920	98,400	850	A
Siebert's Amoco & Dairy Queen ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					950	A
Six-o-Five Village ^(b)	Community	2 wells	310 - 365	64,800 - 10,800	10,700	201	A
Small Country Campground ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					112	A
Tavern on the Rail ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					150	A

Table 2.4-19 Public Groundwater Supplies In Louisa County

Installation	Type ^(a)	Water Source	Depth (ft)	Measured Yield (gpd)	Design Yield (gpd)	Population Served (a)	Active/Inactive ^(a)
Trevillians Elementary School (b)	Non-Transient Non-Community	well	204	57,600	19,600	676	A
Trevilians Square Apartments (a)	Community					61	A
Twin Oaks Community (b)	Community	well	250 (e)	7200		75	A
West End Elementary School (b)		well	204	57,600	20,000		
Wooden Nickle (a)	Transient Non-Community					25	I

Note: Blank entries indicate data not provided in cited reference.

e. Reference 1

The 6th paragraph of ER Section 2.3.2.2.1 will be revised to read as follows:

There are 45 public water supplies in Louisa County capable of obtaining their water from springs or wells. Data describing these public water supplies are presented in Table 2.3-11. The public supplies closest to the existing units are Lake Anna Plaza, about 2.6 miles to the northwest, and Jerdone Island, about 4.3 miles to the south-southeast. Based on their distance from the ESP site and the presence of one or more arms of Lake Anna between the site and these public water supplies, any impact the new units may have on the aquifers beneath the site is not expected to affect these supplies. Likewise, withdrawal by these public supplies is not expected to affect the ability of the new units to withdraw groundwater for potable water needs.

Reference 38 of ER Section 2.3 References will be revised to read as follows:

38. *Safe Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS), Virginia, Louisa County*, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, letter from Karen D. Johnson to Bechtel Power Corporation, July 14, 2004.

ER Table 2.3-11 will be replaced as shown on the following pages.

Table 2.3-11 Public Groundwater Supplies In Louisa County

Installation	Type ^(a)	Water Source	Depth (ft)	Measured Yield (gpd)	Design Yield (gpd)	Population Served ^(a)	Active/ Inactive ^(a)
Town of Louisa ^(b) (primary source is surface water)	Community	spring	NA	38,880		1950	
		3 wells	200–405	43,200–53,280			
Town of Mineral ^(b)	Community	2 springs	NA	57,600		670	A
		4 wells	200–600	14,400–165,600			
Acorn West Trailer Park ^(b)	Community	well	120	8640		70	I
Apple Grove School ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					200	I
Blue Ridge Shores ^(b)	Community	4 wells	163–405	288,000	160,000	1450	A
Bumpass Park/Lake Anna Rescue ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					250	A

a. Reference 38

b. Reference 25

Table 2.3-11 Public Groundwater Supplies In Louisa County

Installation	Type ^(a)	Water Source	Depth (ft)	Measured Yield (gpd)	Design Yield (gpd)	Population Served ^(a)	Active/ Inactive ^(a)
Burger King Zion Crossroads ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					250	A
Cable Form ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					11	I
Christopher Run Campground ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					608	A
Country Side II ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					50	I
Crescent Inn Restaurant ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					150	A
Crossing Point (VA Oil Co) ^(b)	Non-Transient Non-Community	2 wells	305	21,600–28,800	10,400	45	A
Deb's Place ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					50	I

Table 2.3-11 Public Groundwater Supplies In Louisa County

Installation	Type ^(a)	Water Source	Depth (ft)	Measured Yield (gpd)	Design Yield (gpd)	Population Served (a)	Active/ Inactive ^(a)
East End Elementary School (b)		well	345	61,920	31,200		
Expressions Learning Center (b)	Non-Transient Non-Community	well	205	17,280		45	A
Green Springs School (a)	Transient Non-Community					300	I
Jerdone Island (b,c)	Community	well	200	83,520	19,600	49	A
Jouette Elementary School (b)	Non-Transient Non-Community	well	345	61,920	19,600	741	A
Junction Restaurant (a)	Transient Non-Community					25	I
Junction Restaurant (a)	Transient Non-Community					50	I

c. Reference 39

Table 2.3-11 Public Groundwater Supplies In Louisa County

Installation	Type ^(a)	Water Source	Depth (ft)	Measured Yield (gpd)	Design Yield (gpd)	Population Served ^(a)	Active/ Inactive ^(a)
Klockner Barrier Films ^(b)		well	305	53,280	22,000		
Klockner-Pentaplast ^(b)	Non-Transient Non-Community	2 wells	205 - 280	21,600 - 57,600	44,000	526	A
Lake Anna Estates Trailer Park ^(a)	Community					50	I
L A Pizza ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					25	I
Lake Anna Plaza ^(d)	Community	2 wells	335 - 230	11,520 - 86,400	41,200	100	A
Louisa County Senior Center ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					45	I
Louisa County Water Authority ^(a,b)	Non-Transient Non-Community	well	550	34,560		192	I

d. Reference 40

Table 2.3-11 Public Groundwater Supplies In Louisa County

Installation	Type ^(a)	Water Source	Depth (ft)	Measured Yield (gpd)	Design Yield (gpd)	Population Served (a)	Active/ Inactive ^(a)
Louisa County Zion Crossroads ^(a)	Non-Transient Non-Community					600	A
Louisa Day Care Center ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					30	I
Louisa Intermediate School ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					900	I
Mount Garland School ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					140	I
Ole Country Inn ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					50	I
Prospect Hill ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					50	A
Raynell's ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					25	I

Table 2.3-11 Public Groundwater Supplies In Louisa County

Installation	Type ^(a)	Water Source	Depth (ft)	Measured Yield (gpd)	Design Yield (gpd)	Population Served ^(a)	Active/ Inactive ^(a)
Sandra Carter ^(a)	Community					36	I
Shenandoah Crossing ^(b)	Non-Transient Non-Community	2 wells	280 - 300	123,840 - 97,920	98,400	850	A
Siebert's Amoco & Dairy Queen ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					950	A
Six-o-Five Village ^(b)	Community	2 wells	310 - 365	64,800 - 10,800	10,700	201	A
Small Country Campground ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					112	A
Tavern on the Rail ^(a)	Transient Non-Community					150	A
Trevilians Elementary School ^(b)	Non-Transient Non-Community	well	204	57,600	19,600	676	A
Trevilians Square Apartments ^(a)	Community					61	A

Table 2.3-11 Public Groundwater Supplies In Louisa County

Installation	Type ^(a)	Water Source	Depth (ft)	Measured Yield (gpd)	Design Yield (gpd)	Population Served (a)	Active/Inactive ^(a)
Twin Oaks Community (b)	Community	well	250 (e)	7200		75	A
West End Elementary School (b)		well	204	57,600	20,000		
Wooden Nickle (a)	Transient Non-Community					25	I

Note: Blank entries indicate data not provided in cited reference.

e. Reference 1