

RDB received

3/9/05

594

From: gross.larry@gmail.com
To: <NorthAnna_ESP@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, Feb 28, 2005 8:44 AM
Subject: Comments: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site (NUREG-1811)

Please accept the following comments on behalf of the Battlefields Sierra Group in Fredericksburg, Va.

February 28, 2005

Chief, Rules and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration, Mailstop T-6D59
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Washington, DC 20555-0001

12/10/04

69 FR 71854

Re: North Anna ESP Permit and DEIS

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the DEIS.

There appear to be three major flaws with the process and the project and we are hopeful that the NRC will go back and do the appropriate research and reporting, perhaps via a revised Draft EIS that meets the intent of the National Environmental Policy Act.

It appears that information about this proposed action is incomplete at this point in time and that the public has not been provided with important information that they would need if they were to be able to make relevant comments. This would be the same information that the agency would use to make an informed decision.

The three flaws are as follows:

FIRST, the ESP process takes away citizens rights to get a complete look at the proposed action. The ESP EIS only looks at certain things, the Safety Report (which was barely made available to the public) looks at others, the COL will look at others. This is not the way the National Environmental Policy Act and its implementing regulations require the system to work. Citizens and government reviewers need to be able to get a look at the big picture of a proposed action in order make informed judgments and provide input.

For example:

- Exclusion of considerations like terrorism and nuclear material transport are major flaws in the process.
- Furthermore, by creating a twenty year window for the action, the ESP process makes conclusions about the Site and its environment, that are likely not to be true soon after the ESP is approved. The window is too large given the narrow amount of data that is being provided to the public and interested local governments.

SECOND, the EIS is seriously deficient in a number of areas especially with regard to socioeconomics and the human environment. There is a rather long list of important information that is absent ranging from questions about impacts to striped bass to basic info about the power

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add J. Cushing (Jxc9)

A. Williams (ARW1)

plant's cost, security, traffic, and plans for waste disposal.

Information about how much of the cost will be borne by Dominion and how much by taxpayers is absent. Just a few examples:

- No mention is made of the impacts of the project on property values in the Lake Anna Area.
- No mention is made of the impacts of the increased warm water in the Lake on ground fog and the traffic impacts associated therewith.
- A cost estimate for the facility is not included and thus one can't do any cost-benefit analysis for its capital and operating impacts.
- The EIS basically says that all the road problems will be fixed to support transport of the huge number of construction personnel but there is no connection to the current reality in Virginia that there is limited or no money for roads. The VTRANS 2025 report is an unbiased view of the future of traffic and roads in the area and it predicts almost total gridlock along the I-95, US1 corridor within the life of the proposed project.
- The EIS is not a true NEPA document – it does not include mitigation steps and clear discussion of irreversible and irretrievable impacts.
- The DEIS says that emergency plans are okay in part because there are two hospitals in Spotsylvania. **THERE ARE NO HOSPITALS IN SPOTSYLVANIA!** Mary Washington Hospital in Fredericksburg is the primary hospital serving this area and it is getting stretched thin.
- The list of alternatives did not include life extension of the existing two plants or retirement of those plants.

Furthermore, the DEIS does not inform the public that private insurance will not provide total coverage for this kind of facility and that, in fact, taxpayer funds are used to self insure. Is the public informed that much of the cost of security and waste disposal is also paid for not by investors but through their tax dollars? Are we willing to provide the information to the public so they can comment on it? The NRC can waiver provisions to provide this information but it cannot waiver the legitimate rights of the public to know this information especially if you invite them to comment on the proposal.

THIRD, the project itself has real problems including inadequate cooling water, ability to support construction personnel, and emergency evacuation. Dominion's concession to use dry cooling for Unit 4 is indicative of the water limitations. We mention above the road situation relative to the movement of 5,000 construction personnel – what would happen if an evacuation was required of ten or twenty times that many people? Local infrastructure can't support this project.

Nuclear power is promoted to the public as safe, clean and cheap and yet information that would enable them to understand the specifics of that claim is not provided in this proposal and that information is key if the public is to understand the merits of this proposal especially as compared to other power-generation choices such as coal, solar and wind.

I urge you to produce as complete a record as you can and suggest that only then do we have a legitimate process to receive public input on this proposal. We thus request that the NRC issue a supplemental DEIS and defer the decision making process until the record is complete.

Sincerely,

Larry Gross – Co Chair
Jim Lynch – Co Chair
For the Battlefields Sierra Group

COPIES:

Thomas E. Capps, CEO
Dominion Resources
120 Tredegar Street
Richmond, VA 23219

Nils J. Diaz, Chairman
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Michael Town
Sierra Club Virginia Chapter

Larry Gross
P.O. Box 37
Spotsylvania, Va. 22553
540-786-6843
always use this email -> lgross@pobox.com

CC: Jim Lynch <jplynch@crosslink.net>, Aviv Goldsmith <PrecursorS@aol.com>, Larry Gross <lgross@pobox.com>

Mail Envelope Properties (42232025.4A3 : 6 : 38051)

Subject: Comments: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the North Anna ESP Site (NUREG-1811)
Creation Date: Mon, Feb 28, 2005 8:43 AM
From: gross.larry@gmail.com
Created By: lgross@pobox.com

Recipients

nrc.gov
owf4_po.OWFN_DO
NorthAnna_ESP

pobox.com
lgross CC (Larry Gross)

aol.com
PrecursorS CC (Aviv Goldsmith)

crosslink.net
jplynch CC (Jim Lynch)

Post Office
owf4_po.OWFN_DO

Route
nrc.gov
pobox.com
aol.com
crosslink.net

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	6201	Monday, February 28, 2005 8:43 AM
Mime.822	7755	

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard