From: Bo Pham
To: "Dara Gray" <DGray@entergy.com>
Date: 8/23/2007 5:10:47 PM
Subject: Site Audit checklist
cc: "Jill Caverly" <JSC1@nrc.gov>,<IPNonPublicHearingFile@nrc.gov>

Dara,

Attached are specific issues the staff would like to discuss during the site audit. Thanks.

Bo Pham
Project Manager
Division of License Renewal
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
301-415-8450
O-7B1
bmp@nrc.gov

Hearing Identifier: IndianPointUnits2and3NonPublic
Email Number: 78

Mail Envelope Properties (476633A9.HQGWDO01.OWGWPO04.200.2000006.1.15201E.1)

Subject: Site Audit checklist
Creation Date: 8/23/2007 5:10:47 PM
From: Bo Pham

Created By: BMP@nrc.gov

Recipients
"Jill Caverly" <JSC1@nrc.gov>
<IPNonPublicHearingFile@nrc.gov>
"Dara Gray" <DGray@entergy.com>

Post Office	**Route**
OWGWPO04.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	233	8/23/2007 5:10:47 PM
TEXT.htm	563	12/17/2007 8:30:33 AM
Indian Point Site Audit Information Needs.doc	53760	12/17/2007 8:30:33 AM

Options
Priority: Standard
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None
None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

Dara,

Attached are specific issues the staff would like to discuss during the site audit. Thanks.

Bo Pham
Project Manager
Division of License Renewal
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
301-415-8450
O-7B1
bmp@nrc.gov

Indian Point Site Audit Information Needs

Aquatic Review:

1. Available Impingement and entrainment data for the last 10 years (we can work with Excel, SAS, MS Access, and most other electronic media files).
2. SPDES and HRSA monitoring reports for last 10 years.
3. 316(a) demonstration study(ies) and any recent information on thermal impacts.
4. Short-nose sturgeon takes over the last 10 years.
5. Annual environmental monitoring reports for the last 10 years.
6. The ER referred to extensive NYSDEC studies on the Hudson in support of the Hudson River Utilities Monitoring Program on Page 2-9 (last sentence). Request that you make these reports available at the audit.
7. Any detailed basemaps prior to our visit that we could use to orient ourselves during the site and boat tour.
8. The ESSA reports cited in the FEIS: ESSA Technologies, Ltd. 2000. Review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for SPDES Permits for the Bowline Point 1 & 2, Indian Point 2 & 3, and Roseton 1 & 2 Steam Electric Generating Stations. Report to the Parties to the Application. Prepared by ESSA Technologies, Ltd., Richmond Hill, ON, for NYS DEC, Albany, NY. 31 pp plus Appendices; the full set of ESSA reports is included as Appendix F-V to this FEIS.

Cultural Resources Review:

Since the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 was not in existence when IP1 was built, item #1 may be a moot question. However, it is important to establish whether or not surveys were conducted prior to construction of IP1, IP2 (1966 – OL) and IP3 (1969). The environmental report (ER) states that "Construction activity at the site revealed no evidence of items having archaeological value…the site was an amusement area operated by the Hudson River Day line and, presumably, overrun by relic collectors." Another section of the ER states that 70% of the surrounding area is considered archaeologically sensitive.

1. When did Consolidated Edison purchase Indian Point? The ER states that the park closed in 1956.
2. Were any surveys conducted prior to construction of IP2 and IP3?
3. Would like a copy of any correspondence to and from the NYSHPO or NY State Museum since publication of the ER.
4. Would like a copy of the Phase 1A Literature Review and Archeological Sensitivity Assessment (November 2006).
5. ER states no prehistoric or historic sites onsite. Are there any sites associated with the mining activities? Park?
6. What portion of the site was mined?
7. Would like to confirm that all disturbed areas onsite were down to bedrock.
8. Entergy has fleet-wide procedures, has the NYSHPO reviewed them? (Note: need to verify procedure has stop work order in case of an inadvertent discovery).
9. Are there any archaeological sites or historic structures located on or adjacent to IP's transmission lines?

10. Does Entergy staff/transmission line maintenance staff have training in relation to Section 106?
11. Register Eligibility: Has IP1 been evaluated for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places/Engineering Record, State Register, or landmark status? We understand that the unit is in SAFSTOR.

Environmental Justice, Socioeconomics, and Land Use:

Environmental Justice

1. Information about current or past wildlife sampling and testing of game animals such as deer, squirrel, turkey, pheasant, and other game birds and animals that may have been conducted in the vicinity of IP by either Entergy, Con Ed, or the State of New York Departments of Health (DOH) and/or Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC). Wildlife sampling and testing may have been conducted at IP before, during, and after plant construction in the early days of plant operation by Con Ed, but may have been discontinued after determining that tissue samples were consistently showing no significant or measurable radiological impact on the environment from plant operations. We need the data to make this assessment. The purpose for this information is to demonstrate that people who may consume meat from wildlife in the vicinity of the plant are not at risk from nuclear power plant operations.

Socioeconomics

1. NRC needs clarification and source information for data presented in Table 2–9, Tax Distribution, 2003 – 2006 (ER pages 2-46 and 2-47). NRC would like to meet with plant personnel knowledgeable about PILOT and property tax payments to local communities and school district.

2. To adequately characterize the tax payment situation at IP in the SEIS, the NRC also needs the total tax and property tax revenues for each of the years 2003 through 2006 for the Town of Cortlandt, Village of Buchanan, and the Hendrick Hudson Central School District (see ER Section 2.7, Taxes, page 2-45).

Land Use

1. NRC needs more descriptive information and characterization of land use within Entergy's IP site boundary and/or property with acreages and percentages by land use categories. Onsite land use can be divided into 3 categories including (1) the amount of unused, undeveloped, and open portions of the site including fields and forest uplands; (2) non-developable wetlands, streams, and open water bodies (i.e., pond and river); and (3) developed portions of the plant site including facilities, structures, parking areas, and visitor or recreation areas. Reference is made to onsite land cover in terrestrial habitats (Section 2.4 of the ER and Table 2-3), but no actual accounting of land use can be done for the above categories. This may become part of our request for additional information.

Related Federal Project Activities and Consultations

1. NRC needs a list of all Federal facilities and lands and distances within a 50-mile proximity to the IP site. ER Section 2.1 identifies a number of federal facilities within 50 miles of IP and Figures 2-4 and 2-5 shows some of these facilities. Are these all of the federal facilities and lands within 50 miles of IP? The lack of this information impedes an assessment of the need for another Federal agency to become a cooperating agency with NRC in the preparation of this SEIS.

Hydrology:

1. We will need to see intake and discharge flow records to confirm the values reported are based on measurements and not estimates.
2. We will need a map of well locations, well logs, and sampling records particularly for the radionuclide sampling (tritium) and the apparent ISFSI leakage.

Radiological & Non-radiological Waste:

Documents, reports, and tour info needed for the Indian Point site audit; radiological and non-radiological.

1. Offsite Dose Calculation Manual.
2. Occupational Exposure Report for 2006.
3. Reports of any abnormal, unusual spills or leaks and reports contained in the 10 CFR 50.75(g) file for decommissioning.
4. Program information regarding radiological groundwater monitoring (on-site and off-site).

Radiological Tour to cover the following:

1. Gaseous, liquid, and solid radioactive waste processing.
2. Storage of low and high level radioactive waste.
3. Radioactive effluent release points
4. Radioactive effluent monitoring systems
5. Typical radiological environmental monitoring stations (including any co-located State monitoring stations)

We would also like to speak to knowledgeable personnel regarding the plant's radiological effluent monitoring program, radiological environmental monitoring program, and radioactive waste treatment systems (gaseous, liquid, and solid).

Non-Radiological Waste System Tour to cover the following:

1. Areas where non-radiological wastes are accumulated and stored.
2. Areas where mixed wastes are accumulated and stored.

Terrestrial:

1. Please provide an electronic copy of Figures 2-27, 2-28 and 2-29 that were referenced in the ER.
2. Please provide a source for the information provided in Figure 2-28.
3. In the ER, the freshwater pond on the site was stated to have been historically used. Is there any current usage of this area for recreational or other purposes?
4. Please provide any available information on the maintenance programs for the transmission lines contained within the Indian Point property.
5. Please provide, if available, NRC (1975). It is cited on pg 2-20 but was not included on the sources CD.
6. Please provide, if available, the USAEC source cited on pg 2-20. The date was omitted from the citation; it may be USACE 1975, which was listed in the references.
7. Please provide a source for the “fleet procedural controls” discussed on pg 2-22 regarding ensuring protection of environmentally sensitive areas.
8. Please provide information related to the disposal of material from dredging at IP 2 and IP3 at “upland disposal facilities” as discussed on pg 2-9: frequency of dredging and disposal, volumes disposed, location of facility.