

June 16, 2008

APPLICANT: Dominion Virginia Power

FACILITY: North Anna Power Station, Unit 3

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS WITH DOMINION VIRGINIA POWER TO DISCUSS ITEMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE ENVIRONMENTAL SITE AUDIT FOR THE COMBINED OPERATING LICENSE FOR THE NORTH ANNA POWER STATION UNIT 3

On May 16, 22, and 29 2008, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff and its contractor, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), held three conference calls with representatives from Dominion Virginia Power (Dominion) to discuss items resulting from the environmental site audit conducted the week of April 14, 2008. During the site audit, the NRC team identified a number of supplemental "information needs" to support the North Anna Power Station Unit 3 (NAPS) combined license environmental review. The conference calls were held to provide clarification and discuss information Dominion would need to submit to the NRC. Enclosure 1 is the list of participants. Dominion has had an opportunity to review and comment on this summary and has agreed to submit the information requested in Enclosure 2 via e-mail or in a supplemental letter to be submitted in June 2008.

During the site audit, the NRC staff learned that Dominion is in the process of trying to acquire an additional tract of land (approximately 95 acres) located at the Southwestern edge of the existing NAPS site boundary. Detailed information on the proposed additional land is expected to be included in NAPS Unit 3, Revision 1 combined license application. Dominion indicated Revision 1 of the application will tentatively be submitted to NRC in October 2008. Enclosure 3 is information the NRC staff requests that Dominion include in Revision 1 regarding the acquired land. Dominion has made no formal commitment to submit the information requested in Enclosure 3.

Docket No.: 52-017

Enclosures:
As stated.

cc: See next page

CONTACT: Alicia Williamson, DSER/NRO
301-415-1878

APPLICANT: Dominion Virginia Power

FACILITY: North Anna Power Station, Unit 3

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS WITH DOMINION VIRGINIA POWER TO DISCUSS ITEMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE ENVIRONMENTAL SITE AUDIT FOR THE COMBINED OPERATING LICENSE FOR THE NORTH ANNA POWER STATION UNIT 3

On May 16, 22, and 29 2008, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff and its contractor, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), held three conference calls with representatives from Dominion Virginia Power (Dominion) to discuss items resulting from the environmental site audit conducted the week of April 14, 2008. During the site audit, the NRC team identified a number of supplemental "information needs" to support the North Anna Power Station Unit 3 (NAPS) combined license environmental review. The conference calls were held to provide clarification and discuss information Dominion would need to submit to the NRC. Enclosure 1 is the list of participants. Dominion has had an opportunity to review and comment on this summary and has agreed to submit the information requested in Enclosure 2 via e-mail or in a supplemental letter to be submitted in June 2008.

During the site audit, the NRC staff learned that Dominion is in the process of trying to acquire an additional tract of land (approximately 95 acres) located at the Southwestern edge of the existing NAPS site boundary. Detailed information on the proposed additional land is expected to be included in NAPS Unit 3, Revision 1 combined license application. Dominion indicated Revision 1 of the application will tentatively be submitted to NRC in October 2008. Enclosure 3 is information the NRC staff requests that Dominion include in Revision 1 regarding the acquired land. Dominion has made no formal commitment to submit the information requested in Enclosure 3.

Docket No.: 52-017

Enclosures:
As stated.

cc: See next page

Distribution:

PUBLIC	RAP2 R/F	TDosier, NRO	
AWilliamson, NRO	RWeisman, OGC	RHolmes	RidsNroRap2
LQuinn, NRO	TKevern, NRO	KClark, RII	RidsRgn2MailCenter
RHannah, RII	RidsNroDser	RidsOpaMailResource	
Bill.Sandusky@pnl.gov	Adam.Davis@pnl.gov		

Adams Accession Number: ML081630061

OFFICE	PM:DSEER:RAP2:NRO	LA:DSEER:RAP2:NRO	BC:RAP2:DSEER:NRO
NAME	AWilliamson:sek1	ARedden	TFredrichs for RRaione
DATE	06/ /08	06/12/08	06/16/08

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

List of Participants

Friday, May 16, 2008

Alicia Williamson, NRC
Laura Quinn, NRC
Bill Sandusky, PNNL
Michael Sackschewsky, PNNL
Tony Banks, Dominion
Joyce Livingstone, Dominion
Rich Baker, Bechtel
David Holt, Bechtel
Lynn Van-Derpoel, Bechtel
Bill Heinmiller, Bechtel
Karen Patterson, Tetra Tech

Thursday, May 22, 2008

Alicia Williamson, NRC
Laura Quinn, NRC
Chris Cook, NRC
Bill Sandusky, PNNL
Lance Vail, PNNL
Tony Banks, Dominion
Joyce Livingstone, Dominion
John Waddill, Dominion
Rich Baker, Bechtel
David Holt, Bechtel
Lynn Van-Derpoel, Bechtel
Dan Patton, Bechtel
Kit Ng, Bechtel
Craig Talbot, Bechtel
Angelos Findikakis, Bechtel
Jon Cudworth, Tetra Tech

Friday, May 29, 2008

Alicia Williamson, NRC
Laura Quinn, NRC
Bill Sandusky, PNNL
Joyce Livingstone, Dominion
Rich Baker, Bechtel
David Holt, Bechtel
Lynn Van-Derpoel, Bechtel
Bill Heinmiller, Bechtel
Jill Holian, Bechtel
Karen Patterson, Tetra Tech

North Anna Power Station Unit 3
Environmental Information Needs

1. Provide a statement that there is now a great blue heron rookery on Lake Anna and describe the location in relation to the North Anna Power Station (NAPS) Unit 3 site.
2. Provide a statement that the nearest bald eagle nest to the site is located within the Contrary Creek drainage west of the NAPS Unit 3 site.
3. Provide a copy of, or website address for, the State licensing process for the transmission line installation, including the procedures and commitments involved that will cover wetlands and threatened and endangered (T&E) species in the corridor.
4. Describe the interactions the applicant has had with the Natural Heritage Program to perform rare plant surveys in the transmission corridors. Describe the rationale why the Ladysmith corridor has always been a low priority for survey.
5. Confirm that the noise produced by construction blasting is estimated to be 94 dbA at 50 feet and the attenuation will be 76 dbA at 400 feet.
6. For any NAPS historic polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB) spill, verify that the soil was sampled, excavated, and disposed in the appropriate manner. Verify NAPS Unit 3 construction activities will not disturb site of PCB spill sites before and during construction.
7. Please provide confirmation that barriers will be installed during construction to reduce sediment entrainment to the lake and through the existing units. In review of the New and Significant process, this was identified as a commitment, but Environmental Review (ER) section 4.3 Key Input S4.4-39 did not appear to be provided.
8. Please provide the Corps of Engineers report referenced in S4.4-49 that reviewed the DCR database and did not find T&E species located on the property. (Reference: ER Section 4.3)
9. Please provide response or confirmation that the cooling tower design will be within heat duty constraints as specified in a letter from Rich Baker to David Batalo. (Reference: ER section 5-3).
10. Provide a copy of the document "A Monitoring Plan for Lake Anna, the Waste Heat Treatment Facility and the North Anna River" prepared by Environmental Biology, Electric Environmental Services, and Dominion Resources Services, dated February 2008.
11. Provide a copy of the 2005, 2006, and 2007 annual reports titled "Environmental Study of Lake Anna and the Lower Lake Anna River" that were prepared by Environmental Biology, Electric Environmental Services.
12. Provide the most recently available (latest update) energy demand forecast for the PJM Interconnection (PJM) region as well updated regional population estimate data and forecasts.

North Anna Power Station Unit 3
Environmental Information Needs

13. Provide information on how electricity price is factored into the PJM forecasting model.
14. Provide a copy of, or reference to, the most recent PJM load forecasting methodology.
15. Reconcile inconsistencies in the estimates for the construction and operation work force numbers cited in Chapter 8 (section 8.0.1.6) with those cited in Chapter 10 (ER Table 10.4.1) and Chapter 3 (ER Table 3.0-2). Chapter 8 and 10 cite values of 2000 construction workers and 500 operational workers, whereas Chapter 3 cites values of 2500-3500 and 500, respectively.
16. Provide updated information on the land area that would be temporarily disturbed in conjunction with NAPS Unit 3 construction activities.
17. Provide updated information of risk (probability weighted dose) for the severe accident analysis, and how that information is evaluated in terms of "new and significant" information. Risk is considered the consequence of the accident times the probability the event will occur.
18. Provide quarterly area Thermoluminescence dosimeter (TLD) data for years 2003-2007 for monitoring location #6 (west protected area fence TLD # 9906).
19. Provide a copy of, or reference to, the final 2007 Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) permit.
20. Provide a copy of the design report for the Integrated Financial Management Information System (IFIM) study. Also, provide the estimated date for completion of the IFIM analysis report and how the NRC may obtain a copy of that report.
21. Provide a rationale why releases at the U.S. Geological Survey Partlow-gage were greater than 40 cfs during April 2008 when the water surface elevation of Lake Anna was less than 250ft?
22. Provide information on how the NRC will be notified of any change in status regarding litigation of the existing VPDES permit for the NAPS site.
23. Provide information on how the NRC will be notified of any future discussions with Virginia Department of Environmental Quality regarding possible inter-basin water transfers from James River (or other basins) to Lake Anna.
24. Is the information contained in the Early Site Permit (ESP) documentation regarding population growth for the surrounding region still consistent? What sources of information for future population growth in the region were consulted as part of the New and Significant Process? If that data is different than what was contained in the ESP, does that change the original conclusion regarding impact and explain why?
25. Is the information contained in the ESP documentation regarding permanent and transient population surrounding Lake Anna, annual number of anglers that use Lake Anna and annual boaters on Lake Anna still consistent?

North Anna Power Station Unit 3
Environmental Information Needs

26. Information regarding unemployment and workforce trends still appears to be based on 1990 and 2000 census data. What new information did Dominion review since the ESP? If none, why not? If so, what information did Dominion find and what is the basis for concluding the new information is not significant? (Chapter 2.5)
27. A commitment made at the ESP stage was to develop a traffic management plan. If one doesn't exist or is in preparation, when does Dominion anticipate developing one and will it be done in concert with studies or plans from the Virginia Department of Transportation? (Chapter 2.5)
28. The New and Significant process identified updated water/sewer data for all counties surrounding the NAPS site except Orange County. At the time the New and Significant process was completed for this subject area, was new data available? If it was available, what was the rationale for not including it in the evaluation process? (Chapter 2.5)
29. What new information is available since the ESP on housing stock, housing vacancies, and housing rental rates in Louisa, Orange, and Spotsylvania counties? Discuss how this information does or does not affect any conclusions reached in the ESP? (Chapter 2.5)
30. Describe any efforts that have been made to collect traffic counts, level of service data, and attempts made to determine whether construction traffic may exceed the existing capacity of the main commuting routes into the North Anna site. The routes in question are U.S. Highway 33 and 522 and state routes 22, 208, 606, 618, 652, and 700. Discuss how this information would or would not affect any conclusions reached in the ESP. (Chapter 2.5)
31. While the estimated number of construction workers will be less than previously estimated for ESP, how does that scale the estimated number of operational workers, reduced number of vehicles on roads, property tax revenues, and available housing units? What is the basis for the scaling factor? Does that change the ESP findings regarding both adverse and beneficial impact and the basis for that determination? (Chapter 4.4)
32. With half of the number of construction workers anticipated compared to that estimated for the ESP, what if any impact does that have on previously estimated impact on potential housing availability, availability of potable water and water disposal capability, and need for additional fire/police/medical services and educational facilities? (Chapter 4.4)
33. With the reduced number of operational workers at NAPS Unit 3, how does this alter any plans for construction of a new elementary school in Louisa County? (Chapter 5.8)
34. Provide the commitment/management practices for the new cemetery on the NAPS Unit 3 site.
35. Provide clarification that identifies the lines of communication between the applicant and the Virginia Department of Historic Resources regarding cultural resources related activities for the NAPS Unit 3 site which also addresses the following areas:

North Anna Power Station Unit 3
Environmental Information Needs

- 1) A commitment or management plan for evaluating sites found during surveys, for eligibility to National Register of Historic Places if avoidance is not the planned action.
- 2) A written procedure for establishing protective barriers for all historic sites found that were determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, if avoidance is the planned action.
- 3) If avoidance of located sites is planned, provide a written commitment to do so and schedule for fencing or other physical barrier as a double check.
- 4) If avoidance is not the planned action, a commitment or a management plan for mitigation of sites to be destroyed in construction.
- 5) Written commitment/management practices for addressing cultural resources for future ground disturbing work at the NAPS site.
- 6) Written commitment or management plan for contacting the Virginia Department of Historic Resources in case of an inadvertent or post review discovery

North Anna Power Station Unit 3
Environmental Information Needs

1. Provide information about the proposed additional land purchase including a summary of wetland mapping and report, interaction with Army Corps Of Engineers, summary of threatened or endangered species walk-over survey, map of habitats on site as of time of purchase with estimate number of acres for each type, and layout of proposed land use and construction layout for the 94 acres.
2. Provide information on the anticipated date of the acquisition of the additional 94 acres near the NAPS site. If acquired, will the additional land be considered part of the NAPS site and will the land be used in conjunction with Unit 3 construction activities.
3. Provide a write-up of a view-shed analysis for National Register eligible historic architectural resources located on the present NAPS site and additional property that might be acquired as part of the NAPS site.
4. Provide the commitment/management practices for any cultural resources identified on the additional land that may be acquired. Provide a copy of the cultural resources survey report, or date of availability of the report, for the additional land that may be acquired.