

PMNorthAnna3COLPEmails Resource

From: Mark Thaggard
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 7:59 AM
To: Francis Cameron; Brent Clayton
Cc: Niles Chokshi; Michael Masnik; Christopher Cook
Subject: RE: Lee and North Anna public meetings

Chip,

Thanks for the feedback.

Mark Thaggard, Chief
Hydrologic Engineering Branch
Office of New Reactors
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
301-415-6971
Mark.Thaggard@nrc.gov

From: Francis Cameron
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2008 2:39 PM
To: Brent Clayton; Mark Thaggard
Cc: Niles Chokshi; Michael Masnik; Christopher Cook
Subject: FW: Lee and North Anna public meetings

Brent, Mark:

Part of my meeting summary for North Anna included a short description of the meeting that Mike Masnik, Chris Cook, and I had with Harry Ruth and the Lake Anna Lake Level Task Force on May 10th. The meeting went very well from all perspectives. I wanted to commend Mike and Chris for their work at the meeting. They demonstrated considerable expertise and we made some progress with Harry and his colleagues because of their credibility. In preparation for the meeting, Chris had prepared some new slides showing lake temperatures over time that helped explain the science to the Task Force. These types of experiences always make me proud of our staff.

Chip

From: Francis Cameron
Sent: Sunday, May 18, 2008 4:05 PM
To: Mindy Landau
Cc: Vonna Ordaz; Lance Rakovan; Bruce Mallett; Bill Borchartd; Michael Johnson; James Lyons
Subject: Lee and North Anna public meetings

Mindy:

Consistent with the new CIBB practice, I'm providing a brief summary of the two recent public meetings I facilitated on the COLA's for the Lee and North Anna sites.

Lee:

This was a scoping meeting on the preparation of the environmental impact statement on the COLA submitted by Duke Energy Carolinas for the Lee site in Cherokee County, South Carolina. The meeting was held on May 1, 2008 in Gaffney, South Carolina. The meeting was attended by approximately 200 people. We had about 50

people who requested time to comment during the meeting. Consequently, even with a three to five minute speaking guideline, we were there until 11:00 p.m. During the brief question period, the staff responded to two notable questions, one on how the EIS process has changed since the last round of plant licensing in the 1970's and the other on what is required to intervene in the NRC licensing proceeding and the difficulty of doing so. The NRO and OGC staff provided clear and correct information in response. The staff presentations on the overview of the NRC licensing process, and specifically, the environmental review process were comprehensive, crisp, and professional. Public comments from local government officials, South Carolina legislators, and economic development interests were supportive of licensing and provided various types of socioeconomic data for the staff consideration. We also received comments in support of the application from one pro-nuclear group, Young Generation Nuclear, a group composed of young professionals in nuclear power. The Vice-President for the license applicant provided some brief comments on the company's "vision" for submitting an application for a new plant. There were a number of advocacy groups and individual citizens from throughout the south - South Carolina, Georgia, and North Carolina - who expressed concern about the license application. The main concerns were water quantity, the cost of the new plant, the advisability of meeting power needs through other sources, such as conservation, and seismic concerns. These issues have been the major themes at most meetings on new plant license applications. The cost issue was timely in relation to the Duke application because the company is engaged in proceedings before the public utility commission (both North and South Carolina) on cost issues. One of the controversial issues in those proceedings is the need for Duke to provide cost data - a focus of several advocacy group comments. The meeting was very civil and the license applicant's VP, as well as the head of a major advocacy group in the South - in comments to me after the meeting - personally complimented the NRC on the meeting.

North Anna:

This was a scoping meeting on the preparation of the environmental impact statement on the COLA submitted by Dominion Virginia Power for the North Anna site in Virginia. The meeting was held on April 16, 2008, in Mineral, Virginia. The meeting was attended by approximately 200 people. However, over 60 people requested time to comment during the meeting. We were there until approximately 11:15 p.m.. During the question and answer period, we were asked questions related to the completeness of information available during the licensing hearing. For example, one question related to the fact that the design being used for the plant was not yet final and how would the public be able to comment on an "incomplete" design. In the same vein, there was a question on how interested members of the public could file contentions on the later NRC draft EIS and Safety Evaluation Report. The staff was clear on the design issue but we could have been clearer on the ability to file contentions later in the process, and under what criteria. I have since spoken to OGC management on the need to develop crisper responses to this questions. The staff presentations were comprehensive, crisp, and professional. Much like the Lee meeting, local government officials, state legislative leaders, and economic development interests, spoke in favor of the new license, and provided socioeconomic information. In addition, nine former vice-presidents, of Dominion, several members of the Young Generation Nuclear group, and several professors from Virginia Tech's mechanical engineering department, also spoke positively about nuclear power. We also had comments from advocacy groups from Virginia, Georgia, North Carolina, and national groups from Washington D.C. who were concerned about nuclear power. Seismic issues, costs of the new plant, and the availability of other sources of energy, were again the main comments. The meeting was civil but somewhat marred by the anti-nuclear advocacy groups later concern over what they called "nuclear cheerleading" in the form of the retired vice-presidents of Dominion and the other supporters of nuclear power. The fact that we received pro-nuclear comments was not unusual, but Dominion had made a concerted effort to bring in pro-nuclear support (the nine VPs all arrived on the same bus!). The NRC must provide an opportunity to all who sign up to speak - and scoping on an EIS is by its very nature, broad. However, it would be helpful if on future meetings on North Anna, the company's efforts to arrange speakers, were more modest.

Notable to the North Anna meeting was concerns expressed by a coalition of local North Anna citizens groups, the Lake Anna Lake Level Task Force, who were not against the new plant, but were concerned about the water level of the lake and the temperature rise in the lake under the current design. The lake level concerns were related to boater safety (running into submerged obstacles). This group has produced a significant amount of data on these issues and has conducted themselves very professionally. They had earlier expressed concerns, including to Commissioner Jaczko, on the NRC staff not being responsive to their calls and emails. Consequently, I, Mike Masnick, and Chris Cook from NRO held a meeting with the leaders of the Task Force, at their invitation, at Lake Anna, on May 10, 2008. The meeting was very productive for the NRC staff, both in terms of understanding Task Force concerns, but also in being able to clearly explain the NRC regulatory framework, and the limitations on NRC jurisdiction. The Task Force was extremely appreciative of NRC efforts, and formally submitted a binder of material as scoping comments on the EIS.

Hearing Identifier: NorthAnna3_Public_EX
Email Number: 128

Mail Envelope Properties (C56E360E9D804F4B95BC673F886381E714418A3AD3)

Subject: RE: Lee and North Anna public meetings
Sent Date: 5/27/2008 7:59:05 AM
Received Date: 5/27/2008 7:59:07 AM
From: Mark Thaggard

Created By: Mark.Thaggard@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Nilesh Chokshi" <Nilesh.Chokshi@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Michael Masnik" <Michael.Masnik@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Christopher Cook" <Christopher.Cook@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Francis Cameron" <Francis.Cameron@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Brent Clayton" <Brent.Clayton@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	7875	5/27/2008 7:59:07 AM

Options

Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received: