

May 16, 2007 (4:05pm)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

EXHIBIT B: NORTH ANNA ESP ENVIRONMENTAL QUESTIONS

No.	EIS Page	Inquiry	Answer (Including Author, SME, and Key Documents)
1	1-3 to 4	<p>The FEIS states that an ESP "applicant may elect to use a PPE approach instead of supplying specific design information," and that the PPE "should provide sufficient bounding parameters and characteristics of the reactor or reactors and the associated facilities so that an assessment of the site suitability can be made." However, the Staff acknowledges that, in numerous instances, Dominion Nuclear North Anna, LLC (Dominion) failed to provide the necessary PPE information or the specific design information. For example, the FEIS states "Dominion did not or was unable to provide information and analysis for certain issues sufficient to allow the NRC Staff to complete its analysis. For such issues, Dominion did not offer, nor did the Staff identify, bases for assumptions that would allow resolution. The Staff was unable to determine a unique significance level for such issues, and therefore, these issues are not resolved for the North Anna ESP site." P 1-5. Some specific examples are listed on FEIS Appendix J.3. Under these circumstances:</p>	
		<p>A. Please explain why the Staff did not require the applicant to at least provide the PPE information on these matters.</p>	<p>With respect to the specific issues identified as unresolved in Table J-3 relating to design:</p> <p>Water Quality-Chemical Concentrations of waste streams – FEIS Section 5.3.3 -- For Unit 3, this is a PPE value and it was requested of Dominion by the Staff in its March 2, 2006 letter requesting additional information. However, as stated in Section 5.3.3 of the FEIS, concentrations of waste streams other than Unit 3 blowdown to the WHTF were not defined. The reason is that design-level information is not available.</p>

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of Dominion Nuclear North Anna, LLC

Docket No. 52-008-ESP Official Exhibit No. 10

OFFERED BY: Applicant/Licensee Intervenor _____

NRC Staff _____

Other _____

DETERMINED ON: 1/24/08 Witness/Panel _____

ADMITTED
 REJECTED
 WITHDRAWN
 REPORTED

Template = SECY-027

Dominion North Anna, LLC.
Docket No. 52-008-ESP
Staff Exhibit 10

SECY-02

Alternatives to Mitigate Severe Accidents -FEIS Section 5.10.3 -- For the North Anna ESP application, a design was not selected. Review Standard, RS-002, Processing Applications for Early Site Permits, states that the SAMA review can be deferred to the COL stage, at which time detailed design information will be available. Therefore, this issue would need to be resolved in review of the CP or COL application with the design is known.

Design and Severe Accident Impacts - FEIS Section 5.10.3 - Design and severe accident impacts are unresolved for gas-cooled reactors due to insufficient information concerning these designs. This issue would be resolved in the CP or COL application if a gas-cooled design is selected.

Fuel Cycle Impacts and Solid Waste Management - FEIS Section 6.1- Environmental impacts from the uranium fuel cycle activities and solid waste management for other than light-water reactors are not resolved.

Transportation - FEIS 6.2.4 - For gas-cooled reactors, the impacts (of transporting fuel and radioactive waste to and from the reactor) are likely to be small, but this issue is not resolved because of the lack of verifiable information on these designs. Verifiable information is lacking about un-irradiated and spent fuel shipping cask designs, fuel performance under applied mechanical and thermal accident conditions, un-irradiated fuel initial core/refueling requirements, spent fuel generation rates, and radioactive waste generation rates.

Decommissioning - FEIS Section 6.3 - Because a design was not selected, this issue is to be resolved in a CP or COL application when a design is selected.

The chronic effect of electromagnetic fields is unresolved (see the Staff's response to Board Question 5B)

With regard to these issues, the Staff developed a reasonable estimate of the impacts for comparison purposes (see FEIS Chapter 9), but did not consider the information provided to be sufficient to resolve the issue. In accordance with Attachment 3 to Review Standard (RS)-002, the Staff requested that the applicant provide sufficient information to formulate a reasonable estimate of the impacts. The applicant did not have the information that would be necessary to resolve the issue.