

November 30, 2007

MEMORANDUM TO: Richard P. Raione, Chief
Environmental Projects Branch B
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews
Office of New Reactors

FROM: H. Brent Clayton, Chief
Environmental Technical Support Branch /RA/
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews
Office of New Reactors

SUBJECT: TRIP REPORT – JULY 26 - 27, 2007, PRE-APPLICATION
READINESS ASSESSMENT (T-2) FOR A COMBINED LICENSE
APPLICATION AT THE NORTH ANNA SITE

This report summarizes the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff's July 26 - 27, 2007, pre-application readiness assessment related to the environmental portion of a future combined license (COL) application at the North Anna site in Louisa County, Virginia. Dominion has indicated its intent to submit a COL application for this site in November 2007.

The purpose of this visit was to allow the NRC staff to gather information regarding the applicant's plans for the COL application. The visit took place at the site in Louisa County. Enclosure 1 provides a list of attendees. Enclosure 2 is the agenda used during the visit. Enclosure 3 provides a summary of the more significant issues that were discussed. Note that this assessment was conducted several months prior to the applicant's planned COL application date and the staff did not expect the environmental report to be fully developed at this stage. Furthermore, the applicant was aware of, and informed the NRC staff of some of the issues described in Enclosure 3. In summary, the staff did not identify any issues related to the environmental report that would indicate it would not be ready by the planned date of application.

CONTACT: Robert G. Schaaf, NRO/DSE/RAP1
301-415-1312

R. Raione

2

However, this was not a formal or comprehensive staff review and additional issues could be identified during the staff's formal review after the application is submitted.

Project No.: 741

Enclosures: As stated

However, this was not a formal or comprehensive staff review and additional issues could be identified during the staff's formal review after the application is submitted.

Project No.: 741

Enclosures: As stated

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC

RENV R/F

RidsNroDserRap1

RidsNroDserRap1

RidsNroDserRenv

RSchaaf, NRO

GHawkins, NRO

LQuinn, NRO

IYu, NRO

TKevern, NRO

EOesterle, NRO

MShuaibi, NRO

EHickey, PNNL

ADAMS Accession No. ML073030213 *See previous concurrence

OFFICE	PM:DSER/RAP1:NRO	LA:DSER/RAP1:NRO	BC:DSER/RENV:NRO
NAME	RSchaaf/rtg1*	GHawkins/gxh2*	HBClayton
DATE	10/30/07	10/31/07	11/31/07

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

**LIST OF ATTENDEES
NORTH ANNA READINESS ASSESSMENT VISIT (T-2)
JULY 26 – 27, 2007**

NAME	AFFILIATION
Richard Raione	Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
Robert Schaaf	NRC
Eric Oesterle	NRC
Alan Bjornsen	NRC
Laura Quinn	NRC
Nancy Kuntzleman	NRC
Mark Notich	NRC
Eva Eckert Hickey	Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL)
Lance Vail	PNNL
Dave Anderson	PNNL
Nancy Kohn	PNNL
Jeff Ward	PNNL
Joe Hegner	Dominion
Tony Banks	Dominion
Marvin Smith	Dominion
David Maynard	Dominion
Deborah Seay	Dominion
John Waddill	Dominion
Robert Atkinson	Dominion
John Larson	Dominion
Lynn Van-Derpoel	Bechtel
Dan Patton	Bechtel
Steve Routh	Bechtel
Rich Baker	Bechtel
Karen Patterson	TtNUS
Jon Cudworth	TtNUS
Derek Richard	Enercon
David Lewis	Pillsbury

AGENDA
NORTH ANNA READINESS ASSESSMENT VISIT (T-2)
JULY 26 – 27, 2007

Thursday, July 26, 2007

- 8:00-8:15 Introductions and Objectives for the Visit – NRC and Dominion
- 8:15-8:30 Overview of COL application Preparation Effort - Dominion
- 8:30-9:00 Description of Planned Contents of COL application Environmental Report - Dominion
- 9:00-9:30 Description of New and Significant Process - Dominion
- 9:30-9:45 Break
- 9:45-10:45 Review of Example Environmental Report Sections - Dominion
Section 4.2, “Water-Related Impacts”
Section 5.4, “Radiological Impacts of Normal Operations”
Section 5.5, “Environmental Impact of Waste”
Section 5.9, “Decommissioning”
Section 7.4, “Transportation Accidents”
- 10:45-11:30 Review of Chapter 3 Tables to Demonstrate Conformance With the ESP Site Characteristics and Design Parameters Identified in the Permit - Dominion
- 11:30-12:00 Description of Agency Consultation/Biological Assessment Process (follow-up from 1st pre-application meeting March 2007) - NRC
- 12:00-12:45 Lunch
- 12:45-2:00 Site Tour
- 2:00-2:15 Break
- 2:15-2:45 IFIM, Permits and Consultations – Dominion
- 2:45-3:15 Discussion of PJM Study Results (if able to do so) - Dominion
- 3:15-5:00 Breakout Sessions - Review of Preparation Status for Remaining ER Sections (Specific Technical Areas Identified by NRC) – Dominion and NRC

Wednesday, July 27, 2007

- 8:00-12:00 Continued Breakout Sessions - Review of Preparation Status for Remaining ER Sections (Specific Technical Areas Identified by NRC) – Dominion and NRC
- 12:00 Wrap-up

**SUMMARY OF ISSUES IDENTIFIED DURING
THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION (NRC) STAFF
READINESS ASSESSMENT (T-2) VISIT
TO THE NORTH ANNA SITE IN LOUISA COUNTY, VIRGINIA
JULY 26 – 27, 2007**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff did not identify any issues related to the Environmental Report (ER) that would indicate it would not be ready by the planned date of application. Dominion (the applicant) is preparing to submit a combined Construction and Operating License (COL) application for one generating unit (North Anna Unit 3) that will utilize a hybrid cooling system. The applicant intends to reference the General Electric (GE) Economic Simplified Boiling Water Reactor (ESBWR) design that is currently undergoing certification review by the NRC staff. The expected submittal date for the COL application and accompanying ER is November 2007.

COL Application Referencing an ESP

The applicant will reference the Early Site Permit (ESP) Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) in the COL application ER. This will result in a document with a considerably more limited scope than the ESP ER. The COL application ER will address 1) any issue previously resolved in the ESP FEIS for which “new and significant” information has been identified; 2) any issue not resolved in the ESP FEIS; 3) variances from the ESP plant parameter envelope (PPE); and 4) status of compliance with ESP terms and conditions (e.g., Instream Flow Incremental Methodology (IFIM) study). For previously resolved issues for which the applicant has determined that there is no new and significant information, the COL application will state that no new and significant information affecting the conclusion in the ESP FEIS has been identified. The details of the applicant’s assessment of potential new and significant information will be available to the NRC in an auditable form.

The applicant’s approach to assessment of impacts previously resolved in the ESP application review appears reasonable; however, the NRC staff is concerned that the level of detail provided in the description of the proposed action may not be sufficient to support the review the staff is required to perform under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 or to support necessary interactions with other agencies (e.g., consultation under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973. For example, the regulations require that the applicant “demonstrate” that the proposed action fits within the plant design parameters and site characteristics from the ESP. The NRC staff questioned whether simply providing a table in the COL application comparing actual design values to the relevant ESP plant design parameter or site characteristic constituted a sufficient “demonstration” in lieu of providing a complete description of the facility the applicant intends to construct.

New and Significant Information Evaluation and Documentation

The applicant has developed a methodology for assessing new and significant information as described in Regulatory Guide 1.206. An examination of a sample of the information developed under the applicant’s process for selected COL application ER chapters did not reveal evidence that the applicant consulted with outside entities (e.g., U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) to assist in identifying new and significant information.

The detailed analyses and files associated with the evaluation of new and significant information will not be included in the ER; thus, the NRC staff may need to conduct a more extensive site audit process to evaluate and document this information. The details regarding the NRC staff's conduct of this review will need to be considered in developing the schedule for the application review.

Alternative Sites

North Anna was proposed as a merchant plant in the ESP application; however, Virginia has returned to a modified form of electric power market regulation since the ESP proceedings. As a result, the plant would now not be operated as a merchant plant, but would be subject to regulation by the Commonwealth of Virginia.

When asked how the re-regulation of Virginia's electric power market could affect the alternative sites analysis conducted for the ESP, the applicant indicated that the original analysis is still valid and no changes are anticipated. The staff will need to consider the affect of the re-regulation of the Virginia electric power market on the alternative sites analysis. For example, the Virginia Power Company service area would appear to be a logical region of interest (ROI) for an alternatives analysis for a new unit proposed under the current, re-regulated Virginia electric power market, as opposed to the much larger ROI considered in the ESP application review.