

August 13, 2008

MEMORANDUM TO: William F. Burton, Branch Chief
Environmental Projects Branch 1
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews

FROM: Mark D. Notich, Sr. Project Manager */RA/*
Environmental Projects Branch 1
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews

SUBJECT: CONFERENCE CALL – JUNE 24, 2008; DISCUSSION
WITH SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC AND GAS CONCERNING THE
STAFF'S ACCEPTANCE REVIEW OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL
REPORT FOR THE V.C. SUMMER NUCLEAR STATION UNITS 2
AND 3 COMBINED OPERATING LICENSE APPLICATION

SCE&G

Amy Monroe led off by stating that South Carolina Electric & Gas (SCE&G) is considering submitting a Limited Work Authorization (LWA) application and they are working with Nuclear Energy to develop this option. This is being considered based on the review of the construction schedule and the recent discussions between the industry and NRC on the new LWA rule interpretation. They understand that a site redress plan would be required. It is thought that this submittal would be separate from the COLA application but that the same environmental report (ER) would be used and/or incorporated by reference.

NRC

Andy Kugler recommended that 10 CFR 51.45 and 51.49 should be consulted. It calls for the LWA application to include an ER and it was noted that this is more than just an environmental issue.

NRC

Mark Notich identified three topics for discussion that are directly related to the ongoing acceptance review of the ER:

- 1 Ecological Surveys
- 2 Transmission Line Corridor Delineation
- 3 Alternative Site Selection Process

Contact: Mark Notich, NRO/DSER/RAP1
301-415-3053

Ecological Survey (Harriet Nash)

It was noted that a full year of seasonal data has not been collected for either terrestrial or aquatic ecology species that has the potential to be affected by construction and/or operation. Mapping for the sampling that was done was not presented in the ER. Submerged aquatic vegetation, ichthyoplankton, zooplankton, and benthic invertebrates near the vicinity of the site are not described. Life history, sampling procedures, and reproductive behavior are not reported. Impingement data, description of the thermal plume, and impact on organisms in the vicinity of proposed new intake/discharge areas are not presented.

SCE&G (Steve Summer) noted that this topic was discussed by SCE&G during the SCE&G/NRC COLA orientation meeting. Some of the sampling items noted were not covered in detail in the ER because they were not considered important to characterization of the site. However, based on questions posed to earlier applicants, SCE&G has opted to supplement their data to include additional sampling. SCE&G also noted that data from the existing Unit 1 intake location is representative of conditions in the new proposed intake location due to proximity. They have also added an additional sampling point to the Parr Reservoir (discharge location), bringing the total number of sample points there to four. Four seasons of complete aquatic ecological data are planned to be collected.

Harriet Nash questioned availability of data on the sub-impoundment at the upper end of Monticello Reservoir (approximately 300 acres) and Steve Summer stated that although it is remotely connected to the Monticello Reservoir, the sub-impoundment is miles north of planned activities and should not be affected.

Steve Summer also stated that the Broad River south of the Parr Dam is not expected to be affected by planned activities. The thermal plume at the discharge location is projected to be very small and north of the Parr Dam.

Reference was made to a 2-year mussel sampling study in the reservoir and downstream of the dam that is being done by the State of South Carolina Department of Natural Resources (SC DNR), of which one year is already complete. That one year worth of data should be available.

Harriet Nash also observed that there is not a full year of data on the Mayo Creek either. SCE&G stated that more seasonal sampling was being planned for the Mayo Creek aquatic survey.

Transmission Corridor Lines

The NRC is concerned that there is not sufficient information in the ER to adequately describe the location and impacts of the anticipated new transmission lines. The ER provides the counties that the new transmission lines would be located in but does not give a specific route. The staff is concerned that there are not enough data to perform an adequate study of potential impacts.

Andy Kugler provided a reminder that impacts from transmission lines are now considered as pre-construction and viewed as a cumulative impact. Rich Emch stated that the NRC would be looking for a commitment from the applicant to do detailed additional surveys when the line locations are determined.

SCE&G reported that a macro-corridor study similar to what was done for the Plant Vogtle ESP (e.g. identifying a corridor approximately three-miles wide) will be completed by August 2008. They use a three phase process to delineate the transmission line corridor. NRC noted that there would be a need for a commitment to perform surveys in the future to include ecological as well as cultural and archaeological resources.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) may come in as a cooperating agency with the NRC if wetlands or waters of the US are affected. SCE&G stated that planned transmission lines may cross bodies of water; however, very little impact to onsite wetlands is expected due to the plant layout design. SCE&G has been working with the USACE and plans to apply to the USACE later this year for a Rivers and Harbors Act, Section 10 Permit and/or Clean Water Act, Section 404 Permit.

FERC may also want to get involved. FERC licenses and regulates the project boundary area that will be involved in shoreline construction. The construction of intake/discharge structures in Monticello and Parr Reservoirs may require an approval letter or modification of the existing license by FERC. SCE&G personnel plan to meet with FERC in the future to discuss this issue and will provide a contact name for the NRC.

Alternative Site Selection Process

PNNL personnel (Jim Cabe) noted that reconnaissance level data on preferred sites are of very good quality. He noted that there appeared to be a mix of qualitative and quantitative selection criteria used in Section 9.3 and requested clarification of that process.

SCE&G is amenable to developing a business sensitive and redacted public version of the selection study.

SCE&G requested that a later teleconference be scheduled to discuss alternative site selection. A phone conference was tentatively planned for Thursday afternoon, June 26, 2008 between 1:00 pm and 3:00 pm. SCE&G personnel will include April Rice and Ann Lovell (Tetra Tech).

Andy Kugler provided a reminder that impacts from transmission lines are now considered as pre-construction and viewed as a cumulative impact. Rich Emch stated that the NRC would be looking for a commitment from the applicant to do detailed additional surveys when the line locations are determined.

SCE&G reported that a macro-corridor study similar to what was done for the Plant Vogtle ESP (e.g. identifying a corridor approximately three-miles wide) will be completed by August 2008. They use a three phase process to delineate the transmission line corridor. NRC noted that there would be a need for a commitment to perform surveys in the future to include ecological as well as cultural and archaeological resources.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) may come in as a cooperating agency with the NRC if wetlands or waters of the US are affected. SCE&G stated that planned transmission lines may cross bodies of water; however, very little impact to onsite wetlands is expected due to the plant layout design. SCE&G has been working with the USACE and plans to apply to the Army COE later this year for a Rivers and Harbors Act, Section 10 Permit and/or Clean Water Act, Section 404 Permit.

FERC may also want to get involved. FERC licenses and regulates the project boundary area that will be involved in shoreline construction. The construction of intake/discharge structures in Monticello and Parr Reservoirs may require an approval letter or modification of the existing license by FERC. SCE&G personnel plan to meet with FERC in the future to discuss this issue and will provide a contact name for the NRC.

Alternative Site Selection Process

PNNL personnel (Jim Cabe) noted that reconnaissance level data on preferred sites are of very good quality. He noted that there appeared to be a mix of qualitative and quantitative selection criteria used in Section 9.3 and requested clarification of that process.

SCE&G is amenable to developing a business sensitive and redacted public version of the selection study.

SCE&G requested that a later teleconference be scheduled to discuss alternative site selection. A phone conference was tentatively planned for Thursday afternoon, June 26, 2008 between 1:00 pm and 3:00 pm. SCE&G personnel will include April Rice and Ann Lovell (Tetra Tech).

Enclosure: As stated

Distribution:

MNotich AKugler REMch
RAP1/RF HNash GHawkins

ADAMS Accession No: ML082200442 *See Previous Concurrence

OFFICE	PM: NRO/DSER/RAP1	LA:NRO/DSER/RAP1	BC:NRO/DSER
NAME	MNotich*	GHawkins*	WBurton
DATE	08/ 11 /08	08/ 12 /08	08/ 13 /08

Official Record Copy

Attendees

NRC	PNNL	SCE&G (SCANA Corp.)	Bechtel	Tetra Tech
Mark Notich	Carl Berkowitz	Amy Monroe	Cal Reid	Lisa Matis
Harriet Nash	Amoret Bunn	April Rice	Richard Louie	
Bruce Olson	Tara O'Neil	Steve Summer	Jan Renfro	
Butch Burton	Dave Anderson	Julie Giles		
Richland WA:	Jim Cabe			
Andy Kugler				
Richard Emch				