

March 22, 2005

MEMORANDUM TO: Laura A. Dudes, Section Chief
New Reactors Section
New, Research and Test Reactors Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs, NRR

FROM: Michael L. Scott, Senior Project Manager */RA B. Sosa for:/*
New Reactors Section
New, Research and Test Reactors Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs, NRR

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF JANUARY 25, JANUARY 27, AND FEBRUARY 1, 2005,
TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALLS WITH DOMINION NUCLEAR
NORTH ANNA, LLC REGARDING OPEN ITEMS IN THE STAFF'S
DRAFT SAFETY EVALUATION REPORT FOR THE NORTH ANNA
EARLY SITE PERMIT APPLICATION

On Tuesday, January 25, Thursday, January 27, and Tuesday, February 1, 2005, telephone conference calls were held among representatives of Dominion Nuclear North Anna, LLC (Dominion) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff. A list of participants is attached. The purpose of the conferences, which were held at the request of Dominion, was to discuss certain open items in the staff's draft safety evaluation report (DSER) for Dominion's early site permit (ESP) application for the North Anna ESP site.

January 25, 2005 conference

During the first conference, Dominion and the staff discussed open items in DSER Section 2.3, regarding meteorology. Dominion stated a general concern about the staff's use of the phrase "design basis," in that Dominion believes design is a future issue and that the staff should be focusing on site characteristics at the ESP stage. Dominion added that additional margin may be applied to a site characteristic to produce a design basis value. The staff agreed to consider this point.

Open item 2.3-3. Dominion stated that it finds no requirement or current application that specifies a minimum ultimate heat sink (UHS) temperature, or the basis for a seven-day weather period for determining such a characteristic. The staff responded that freezing could cause loss of water supply. Dominion noted that ice would melt during UHS use, so ice would not reduce the body of water available to meet needs. The staff stated that the issue could be resolved by design. Dominion inquired as to whether its response to the staff's request for additional information (RAI) 2.4.7-4 was a sufficient commitment to address the open item. The staff responded that the staff would review Dominion's request for additional information (RAI) response and determine whether the item should be a permit condition. Dominion added that Dominion was not sure ice sheet thickness can be calculated without knowing the UHS design, and Dominion suggested use of degree-days of freezing as an alternative. The staff agreed that cumulative degree-days are more relevant than the total number of days of cooling.

Dominion and the staff also discussed the fact that Dominion had used one weather station for air temperature data, while the staff had used another in its review.

Open item 2.3-1. Dominion noted that a 70-mile per hour (mph) wind speed presented in the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) standard is a design basis, not a site characteristic. Dominion also contended that a single instance of measuring a speed of 68 mph does not invalidate the 100-year return period value of 64 mph. Dominion added that NRC Review Standard (RS)-002 calls for using the ANSI standard upon which Dominion's figures were based. The staff responded that newer data should be considered, and that this issue would need to be discussed further.

Open item 2.3-2. Dominion stated that ground snow load is a design basis input not appropriate for an ESP. Dominion added that Regulatory Guide 1.102 describes how to combine snow load and probable maximum precipitation (PMP).

Open item 2.3-4. Dominion asked what type of analysis regarding effects of the dry cooling system the staff had in mind. Dominion stated that a quantitative analysis is not feasible at the ESP stage absent a specific design. The staff responded that a relatively general and qualitative analysis based on the approach chosen is acceptable at the ESP stage, and that a more quantitative evaluation would be needed at the combined license (COL) stage.

January 27, 2005, conference

During the January 27 conference, Dominion and the staff discussed open items in DSER Section 2.4, regarding hydrology. Before this discussion began, there was additional discussion on Open Item 2.3-3. Dominion noted that its site safety analysis report (SSAR) already contains 200 degree-days (F) of freezing, and Dominion proposed that this number would be appropriate as a site characteristic related to the potential for freezing in the UHS. The staff noted that the staff obtained 321.8 °F using data from a different weather station. The staff agreed to consider whether one station would be more appropriate than the other.

The staff also provided additional rationale for why the presence of a 68-mph wind speed reading (Open item 2.3-1) needs additional consideration. Dominion noted that the SSAR states that the 68-mph reading was recorded in 1954, before the ANSI standard on the subject was written.

Open item 2.4-1. Dominion stated that it proposed to provide a cross-reference to the Virginia State Coordinate System. The staff responded that this approach was acceptable to address the open item, as long as the coordinate system and units of measure are provided.

Open item 2.4-2. Dominion referred to SSAR Figure 1.2-4 and reminded the staff that Dominion expects to use the discharge structure for canceled North Anna Units 3 and 4 for the new units. Dominion added that this structure runs within 1 foot of existing plant piping. Dominion contended that this should not be an open item or the subject of a permit condition. Interferences would be evaluated under the existing licenses and is a 10 CFR Part 50 issue, while impacts of the existing plants on the new plants would be evaluated at the COL stage. The staff replied that Dominion needs to evaluate, at ESP, the feasibility of using the existing structure given the small separation from the existing unit piping. Dominion and the staff agreed to consider this question further.

Open item 2.4-3. Dominion representatives stated their opinion that Section 5.2.2 of Dominion's environmental report for the ESP application addresses this open item. The staff replied that the analysis does not consider low-flow conditions, and Dominion responded that the water budget reflected 24 years of history. Dominion added that SSAR Table 2.4-6 addresses low-level percentages. The staff noted that the low-level limit for units 1 and 2 has been dropped to 242 feet mean sea level (MSL) and that the ESP applicant could choose to commit to that level to allow closing the open item.

Open item 2.4-4. Dominion noted that Dominion considered breach of upstream reservoirs and found no significant impact on Lake Anna, and Dominion plans to show that the impact of such breaches would bound the impact of an ice jam breakup. The staff stated that this approach was acceptable.

Open item 2.4-5. Dominion stated that Dominion could specify a minimum lake temperature for the new units' intake. The staff stated that this was a concern for frazil ice and that the design needs to address this issue. Dominion stated that such emphasis on non-safety structures is inappropriate, to which the staff replied that the concern is frequent utilization of the UHS. Dominion replied that with any unit operating, lake temperature would be well above freezing. Dominion added that SSAR page 2-2-129 contains the appropriate design commitment. The staff agreed to look at this material.

Open item 2.4-6. Dominion stated that Dominion does not have UHS design details as identified in the open item. Dominion added that Dominion has already discussed the feasibility of the underground UHS in response to an RAI. Dominion believes neither a permit condition nor an open item is needed on UHS level, and that Dominion can show the feasibility of design measures to deal with pressure head of groundwater.

Open item 2.4-7. The staff explained that the staff needs information regarding groundwater level measurements to ensure that the limited data provided to date (one year of measurements) is not anomalous due to the recovery from the recent drought conditions. Gradients observed in this short period of time might underestimate the horizontal gradient. Dominion responded that Dominion plans to obtain one additional data point. The staff replied that Dominion should provide other piezometer measurements for wells P-10, 14, and 18.

Open item 2.4-8. Dominion noted that the open item appears to question the use of a geometric mean to develop hydraulic conductivity. Dominion noted that Dominion could provide a more conservative method. Dominion would propose the maximum observed value as conservative. SSAR Section 2.4-12 (Table 2.4-16) discusses this method.

Open item 2.4-11. Dominion noted that the staff is asking in this open item for adsorption and retention coefficients (k_d). Dominion added that site-specific values for these coefficients have not been obtained for North Anna. At COL, Dominion would rely on analysis at that time. Dominion noted that NUREG/CR-6697, "Development of Probabilistic RESRAD 6.0 and RESRAD-BUILD 3.0 Computer Codes," states that there is no correlation between k_d and soil texture. Dominion proposed that the open item be closed on the basis of Dominion providing a conservative value at ESP and the approach to be used to provide site-specific values at COL. The staff replied that k_d is specific to radionuclides and that NUREG/CR-6656, "Information on Hydrologic Conceptual Models, Parameters, Uncertainty Analysis, and Data Sources for Dose Assessments at Decommissioning Sites," deals with the same subjects.

Open item 2.4-9. Dominion inquired what the wording would be for a site characteristic to represent upward hydraulic gradient. Dominion noted that there is only a certain amount of data available. Dominion could state that such gradient would be a small fraction of horizontal water movement and "bound it out." The staff replied that Dominion needs to determine whether there is a need to consider upward gradient; i.e., whether a conservative flow path would be affected by it. Dominion asserted that, if Dominion chooses the most conservative flow path, upward gradient would not matter.

Open item 2.4-10. Dominion stated that it would be straightforward to provide an additional three quarters of hydraulic gradient data and that Dominion would provide this information.

February 1, 2005, conference.

Dominion began the discussion by stating that Dominion plans to do the analysis called for in Open Item 2.5-2. Initially, Dominion plans to send the staff a letter that describes its approach and provide a completion date. Dominion expects to send the bulk of the needed information (including an explanation of the analysis method) by the staff's March 3, 2005, due date for applicant responses to open items. However, Dominion will not submit the final results (transfer function and safe shutdown earthquake) until the end of March 2005.

Dominion noted that it was important that Dominion understand the staff's position on the ground motion control point. Dominion proposed to define the control point at the top of the rock surface. The staff responded that the staff understood that the control point would be at a hypothetical rock outcrop at the top of the bedrock. Dominion replied that Dominion planned to choose an average elevation with a median shear wave velocity of 3300 feet per second and an elevation of 250 feet as the control point.

The staff asked what would happen if the transfer function is not flat and the SSE is changed from that in the SSAR. Dominion replied that Dominion would evaluate the effect of any change in the SSE for impact on other sections of the SSAR.

Docket No. 52-008

Attachment: As stated

cc w/att: See next page

conservative value at ESP and the approach to be used to provide site-specific values at COL. The staff replied that k_d is specific to radionuclides and that NUREG/CR-6656, "Information on Hydrologic Conceptual Models, Parameters, Uncertainty Analysis, and Data Sources for Dose Assessments at Decommissioning Sites," deals with the same subjects.

Open item 2.4-9. Dominion inquired what the wording would be for a site characteristic to represent upward hydraulic gradient. Dominion noted that there is only a certain amount of data available. Dominion could state that such gradient would be a small fraction of horizontal water movement and "bound it out." The staff replied that Dominion needs to determine whether there is a need to consider upward gradient; i.e., whether a conservative flow path would be affected by it. Dominion asserted that, if Dominion chooses the most conservative flow path, upward gradient would not matter.

Open item 2.4-10. Dominion stated that it would be straightforward to provide an additional three quarters of hydraulic gradient data and that Dominion would provide this information.

February 1, 2005, conference.

Dominion began the discussion by stating that Dominion plans to do the analysis called for in Open Item 2.5-2. Initially, Dominion plans to send the staff a letter that describes its approach and provide a completion date. Dominion expects to send the bulk of the needed information (including an explanation of the analysis method) by the staff's March 3, 2005, due date for applicant responses to open items. However, Dominion will not submit the final results (transfer function and safe shutdown earthquake) until the end of March 2005.

Dominion noted that it was important that Dominion understand the staff's position on the ground motion control point. Dominion proposed to define the control point at the top of the rock surface. The staff responded that the staff understood that the control point would be at a hypothetical rock outcrop at the top of the bedrock. Dominion replied that Dominion planned to choose an average elevation with a median shear wave velocity of 3300 feet per second and an elevation of 250 feet as the control point.

The staff asked what would happen if the transfer function is not flat and the SSE is changed from that in the SSAR. Dominion replied that Dominion would evaluate the effect of any change in the SSE for impact on other sections of the SSAR.

Docket No. 52-008

Attachment: As stated

cc w/att: See next page

ACCESSION NUMBER: ML050540129 * See previous concurrence

OFFICE	RNRP/PM*	SPSB/SC*	EMEB/SC *	OGC/NLO	RNRP/SC
NAME	MScott	RDennig	KManoly	RWeisman	LDudes
DATE	3/4/05	3/2/05	3/3/05	3/16/05	3/21/05

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Distribution for 01/25, 01/27, and 2/1/2005, Telephone Summary dated March 22, 2005

Hard Copy
RNRP Rdg.
PUBLIC

E-Mail
CMunson
WBeckne
GBagchi
LDudes
RWeisman
JSegala
MScott
KManoly
YLi
RAnand
RHarvey
JLee
RDennig
MTschiltz

JANUARY 25 AND 27, 2005, AND FEBRUARY 1, 2005
TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL SUMMARY
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Applicant

January 25, 2005

M. Scott
G. Bagchi
R. Harvey
S. Saslow (PNNL)

J. Hegner
M. Smith
D. Batalo
S. Semmes
T. Banks
S. Routh (Bechtel)
R. Baker (Bechtel)
C. Talbot (Bechtel)
D. Patton (Bechtel)
B. Prunty (Bechtel)

January 27, 2005

M. Scott
G. Bagchi
R. Harvey
L. Vail (PNNL)
C. Cook (PNNL)
S. Taylor (PNNL)
R. Prasad (PNNL)
L. Matthews (PNNL)

J. Hegner
T. Banks
D. Batalo
S. Routh (Bechtel)
R. Baker (Bechtel)
C. Talbot (Bechtel)
B. Prunty (Bechtel)

February 1, 2005

M. Scott
C. Munson
K. Manoly

J. Hegner
M. Smith
D. Batalo
S. Routh (Bechtel)
R. Baker (Bechtel)
J. Davie (Bechtel)
R. McGuire (Consultant)
J. Litehiser (Bechtel)
J. Maroney (Bechtel)

Mr. David A. Christian
Senior Vice President and Chief Nuclear
Officer
Dominion Resources Services, Inc.
Innsbrook Technical Center
5000 Dominion Blvd.
Glen Allen, VA 23060-6711

Dominion Resources Services, Inc.
Rope Ferry Road
Building 475, 5th Floor
Waterford, CT 06385

Ms. Lillian M. Cuoco, Esq.
Senior Counsel

Mr. C. Lee Lintecum
County Administrator
Louisa County
P.O. Box 160
Louisa, Virginia 23093

NORTH ANNA EARLY SITE PERMIT
SERVICE LIST

Mr. David R. Lewis
Shaw Pittman
2300 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

Dr. W. T. Lough
Virginia State Corporation Commission
Division of Energy Regulation
P. O. Box 1197
Richmond, Virginia 23209

Office of the Attorney General
Commonwealth of Virginia
900 East Main Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Senior Resident Inspector
North Anna Power Station
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1024 Haley Drive
Mineral, Virginia 23117

Mr. Robert B. Strobe, M.D., M.P.H.
State Health Commissioner
Office of the Commissioner
Virginia Department of Health
P. O. Box 2448
Richmond, Virginia 23218

Mr. David Lochbaum
Union of Concerned Scientists
1707 H Street, NW
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20006-3919

Mr. Paul Gunter
Director of the Reactor Watchdog Project
Nuclear Information & Resource Service
1424 16th Street, NW, Suite 404
Washington, DC 20036

Mr. Adrian Heymer
Nuclear Energy Institute
Suite 400
1776 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-3708

Mr. Russell Bell
Nuclear Energy Institute
Suite 400
1776 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-3708

Mr. Thomas P. Miller

U.S. Department of Energy
Headquarters - Germantown
19901 Germantown Road
Germantown, MD 20874-1290

Mr. James Riccio
Greenpeace
702 H Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20001

Ms. Patricia Campbell
Morgan Lewis
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20004

Mr. Ernie H. Kennedy
Vice President New Plants
Nuclear Plant Projects
Westinghouse Electric Company
2000 Day Hill Road
Windsor, CT 06095-0500

Dr. Regis A. Matzie
Senior Vice President and
Chief Technology Officer
Westinghouse Electric Company
2000 Day Hill Road
Windsor, CT 06095-0500
Mr. Gary Wright, Manager
Division of Nuclear Safety
Illinois Emergency Management Agency
1035 Outer Park Drive
Springfield, IL 62704

Mr. Glenn H. Archinoff
5275 Westview Drive
ACR Suite
Frederick, MD 21703-8306

Mr. Ed Wallace, General Manager
Projects
PBMR Pty LTD
PO Box 9396
Centurion 0046
Republic of South Africa

Mr. Brendan Hoffman
Research Associate on Nuclear Energy
Public Citizens Critical Mass Energy
and Environmental Program
215 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20003

NORTH ANNA EARLY SITE PERMIT
SERVICE LIST

-2-

Mr. Tom Clements
6703 Guide Avenue
Takoma Park, MD 20912

Mr. Paul Leventhal
Nuclear Control Institute
1000 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 410
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. Jack W. Roe
Vice President
Advanced Technologies & Laboratories
International, Inc.
20010 Century Boulevard, Suite 500
Germantown, MD 20874

Mr. Charles Brinkman
Westinghouse Electric Co.
Washington Operations
12300 Twinbrook Pkwy., Suite 330
Rockville, MD 20852

Mr. Marvin Fertel
Senior Vice President
and Chief Nuclear Officer
Nuclear Energy Institute
Suite 400
1776 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-3708

Dr. Glenn R. George
PA Consulting Group
130 Potter Street
Haddonfield, NJ 08033

Mr. Arthur R. Woods
Enercon Services, Inc.
500 TownPark Lane
Kennesaw, GA 30144

Ms. Vanessa E. Quinn, Chief
Radiological Emergency Preparedness
Section
Department of Homeland Security/FEMA
500 C Street, SW
Washington, DC 20472

Mr. Michael M. Cline, State Coordinator
Virginia Department of Emergency
Management
10501 Trade Court
Richmond, Virginia 23236-3713

Mr. Jim Debiec

Director - Power Production
Old Dominion Electric Cooperative
4201 Dominion Blvd
Glen Allen, VA 23060

Mr. Thomas Mundy
Director, Project Development
Exelon Generation
200 Exelon Way, KSA3-N
Kennett Square, PA 19348

Ms. Joanne Tetrault
Librarian
Louisa County Public Library
881 Davis Highway
Mineral, VA 23117

Ms. Abhaya Thiele
406 Key West Drive
Charlottesville, VA 22911

Mr. J. Randall Wheeler
Spotsylvania County Administrator
P.O. Box 99
Spotsylvania Courthouse
Spotsylvania, VA 22553

Mr. Ted Coberly
Orange County Administrator
P.O. Box 111
Orange, VA 22690

Mr. Jerald S. Holm
Framatome ANP, Inc.
3315 Old Forest Road
P.O. Box 10935
Lynchburg, VA 24506-0935

External E-mail

David_Christian@dom.com
Eugene_Grecheck@dom.com
Jack_Davis@dom.com
Marvin_Smith@dom.com
Joseph_Hegner@dom.com
Lillian_Cuoco@dom.com
David_Sommers@dom.com
Vicki_Hull@dom.com
Margaret_Bennett@dom.com
david.lewis@shawpittman.com
gzinke@entergy.com
jerald.holm@framatome-anp.com

NORTH ANNA EARLY SITE PERMIT
SERVICE LIST

-3-

mwetterhahn@winston.com
whorin@winston.com
mwetterhahn@winston.com
whorin@winston.com
eddie.grant@exeloncorp.com