## Official Transcript of Proceedings

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title: Environmental Scoping Process for North Anna

Power Station, Units 1 and 2, License Renewal Application: Public Meeting: Afternoon Session

Docket Number: 50-338, 50-339

Location: Louisa County Office Building

Louisa, Virginia

Date: Thursday, October 18, 2001

Work Order No.: NRC-052 Pages 1-64

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC. Court Reporters and Transcribers 1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 234-4433

	1
1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2	NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
3	+ + + +
4	ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING PROCESS FOR
5	NORTH ANNA POWER STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2,
6	LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION
7	+ + + +
8	PUBLIC MEETING
9	+ + + +
10	THURSDAY,
11	OCTOBER 18, 2001
12	+ + + +
13	
14	The public meeting was held in the Public
15	Meeting Room, Louisa County Office Building, One
16	Woolfolk Avenue, Louisa, Virginia, at 1:30 p.m., Chris
17	Grimes, presiding.
18	NRC REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT:
19	CHRIS GRIMES, Chief, License Renewal and
20	Standardization Branch, Facilitator
21	ROBERT PRATO, Safety Project Manager
22	ANDREW KUGLER, Environmental Project
23	Manager
24	
25	

## 2. 1 C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S2 PAGE Introduction, Chris Grimes 3 NRC Presentations: 4 5 Robert Prato 6 Andrew Kugler 15 7 Public Comments: 8 Lee Lintecum 22 9 Linda Edwards 24 10 Jimmy Candeto 26 11 R. Duff Green 28 12 29 Ashland Fortune 13 William Hayden 31 14 Jerry Rosenthal 35 15 Lisa Gue 40 16 Dave Heacock 47 17 Bill Bolin 52 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

## P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 (1:32 p.m.)

MR. GRIMES: Ladies and gentlemen, if you'll take your seats, we'll try and get started on time, stay on time, and stop on time.

Good afternoon. My name is Chris Grimes.

I'm Chief of the License Renewal and Standardization

Branch of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Today

I'm going to step out of that role to serve as the facilitator for this public meeting and to make sure that you accomplish and we accomplish some information sharing.

The purpose of this meeting is for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to discuss a license renewal application for the nuclear power plant at North Anna Station. And we want to share some information with you about the license renewal process, and we want to get some information from you about your interest in the process and the potential impacts of the license renewal for North Anna.

Briefly, the agenda for today's meeting is, first, we will begin with some short introductory descriptions of the process and the NRC's method of conducting a license renewal review, and then we're going to offer you an opportunity to ask some

1 questions about that process and to exchange 2 information about any questions you might have about how we're going to go about satisfying our process. 3 4 And then we have a number of speakers who 5 are going to provide comments about North Anna and license renewal and the public interest in the North 6 7 Anna Station. Could I have Slide 2, please? 8 This meeting is being transcribed. 9 We 10 want to make sure that we capture all of the thoughts, concerns, and interests that you have. 11 It's very 12 important that our process provide an opportunity, an ample opportunity, for public input. 13 14 The recorder for our meeting today is Mary 15 Jo Mitchell, and she's going to make sure that we 16 capture your every word. 17 Oral comments that we receive during today's meeting will be treated exactly the same as 18 19 written comments that may be submitted to the NRC 20 related to this licensing action. 21 The staff is going to explain how to 22 submit written comments. When you ask questions or 23 when you make comments, we'd appreciate it if you 24 would identify yourself for the record and identify

your affiliation if that's appropriate.

Also make sure that you use a microphone, and for our purpose this room size is just about right, but if you'll just raise your hand, I'll bring this walking stick over to you and you can use this microphone.

Also, if you happen to have any written materials that you want to submit, please make sure that the recorder gets a copy of those written materials so that they can be included with the transcript.

The basic rules for comments are we ask each speaker to limit their comments to about five minutes so that everyone will have an opportunity to comment. That's not a rigid rule, but if I find that speakers are, you know, taking more time than we can afford, I may ask you to sum up. We want to make sure that there's ample opportunity for all of you to participate in this process.

Also, I'd like to suggest if there are detailed comments, those might be more effectively submitted to us in writing, and as I explained, we're going to describe how the written comments can be submitted.

We're going to begin with presentations by the NRC staff on the process. First we're going to

1 have Bob Prato, who is the Safety Project Manager for 2 the Dominion application, describe an overview of the 3 license renewal process. 4 Then we're going to have Andy Kugler, who 5 is the Environmental Project Manager, describe the NEPA process and the environmental review. 6 7 And also I would like to introduce Joe Nakoski or John Nakoski. 8 Excuse me. He is the Section Chief in the License Renewal Branch, and he's 9 going to be available to help field questions in the 10 event that you have questions about the plant or the 11 12 process. And with that, I'll ask Bob Prato to make 13 14 his presentation about the license renewal process. 15 MR. PRATO: Everybody can hear me? Okay. Good afternoon. I'm Bob Prato, and 16 I am the Project Manager for the safety review of the 17 North Anna Unit 1 and Unit 2 license renewal 18 19 application. And what that means is I coordinate all of 20 21 the activities that involve about 30 different staff 22 engineers and a national laboratory in the evaluation 23 of the application from the safety perspective. And what I'm going to do today is give you a short 24

In that presentation I'm going to have

presentation.

1 three objectives. 2 The first objective is to give you context and the backdrop of why we are here, what brought us 3 4 to this place today. 5 And then I'm going to discuss the staff's role and responsibilities with respect to license 6 7 renewal. And then I'm going to describe the safety 8 review process in general. 9 10 At that point I'm going to open up the 11 floor to questions. I'd like to remind you that this 12 is your day, your opportunity to ask your questions, and I strongly encourage it. If you have any 13 14 questions, please stand up and we'll be glad to answer 15 them for you. If you ask something we don't have the 16 answer to right now, we will respond to you in 17 writing. So I encourage anybody who has any questions 18 19 to please step forward. So without any further delay, let me talk 20 a little bit about the context and the background. 21 22 As most of you know, on May 29th, 2001, 23 Dominion, the corporation that owns and operates North

Anna Unit 1 and Unit 2, submitted an application to

renew the licenses for North Anna Units 1 and 2 for an

24

additional 20 years.

That was a dual application that they submitted. Now, we refer to it as a dual application because they not only submitted an application for North Anna's Unit 1 and Unit 2. They also submitted an application for Surry Unit 1 and Unit 2, the other nuclear power facility that's owned and operated by that company.

And what we're going to do as an organization is we're going to review both of those applications from the safety aspect in one single review, and the reason we're going to do that is because both of those facilities are identical or similar.

Their primary systems are identical. All four units are Westinghouse PWR, pressurized water reactors, that were built and designed during the same period, basic same period of time.

From there we're going to take a look at any differences, and we're going to evaluate the North Anna differences as entities in themselves and the Surry differences as entities in themselves.

And then we're going to take a look at any uniqueness for each of those plants and evaluate those individually, and this will help us to do a more

effective and efficient job overall.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then for the environmental review, it's going to be done a little differently, and I'm not going to steal Andy's thunder, but basically they're going to take a look at both sites independently and do separate, independent review on the environmental aspects.

The reason for this is because the environmental review is site specific, and each site is unique. So there will be two separate evaluations for the environmental side of the review.

the staff's roles As far and as responsibilities -- next slide, please -- the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as it has been amended over the years, gave the staff three basic responsibilities. The first is public health and safety. The second is to protect the environment. And the third is for the defense common and security οf nuclear facilities.

The Atomic Energy Act also limited the licensing of nuclear facilities for no more than 40 years, but at the same time gave the staff the authority to renew those licenses for additional 20-year periods.

Now, the original limitation for 40 years

was not based on any technical limitations, not even for generating facilities in the 1950s. The reason that the 40-year limitation was put on was because of antitrust and other economic reasons.

However, because the original licensing term was limited to 40 years, some of the systems, structures, and components were only designed to operate for 40 years. Realizing this, in the early '80s, about the same time as many of the early facilities started to think about relicensing of their plants, the staff recognized that they needed to identify what was needed to grant an extended license and to define the process that would need to be implemented to achieve that goal.

Therefore, the Commission set forth the requirements for license renewal in Part 54 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Now, Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations is just the laws that govern the use of nuclear material in this country. That's all nuclear material. That's medical, industrial, and power generating applications.

10 CFR, Part 50 are the rules for the operation of nuclear facilities once a license is received.

Part 54 defines the requirements for renewing those licenses.

In addition, Part 51, a companion regulation to Part 54, provides the scope of the environmental review.

Okay. Part 54 does define the process, and as far as the process goes -- next slide, please -- Part 54 allows an applicant to renew the license; allows an applicant to submit an application to renew a license after 20 years of operation. The reason they are allowed to submit an application for a renewed license with as much as 20 years of operation left on their current license is because the time for design and construction of a new, major generating facility, such as a nuclear power plant or large coal-fired unit, is approximately ten years.

Now, if an applicant comes in after 20 years of operation and submits a request to renew their license and they go through this two, three-year process, and at the end of that process they are denied permission to renew that license, then they have sufficient time to determine what alternate source they're going to use, to site that facility, to do the planning, the design and the construction without the loss of power during the period of time

where the need for power is constantly increasing.

So that's the reason why we allow them to come in with as much as 20 years left on their current license. The whole intent is to keep the lights on.

In addition, Part 54 provides the expectations for the public, the staff, and any potential applicant regarding the plant inspection and maintenance practices for the period of extended operation that must be demonstrated before a renewed license is issued.

In other words, the rule defines the safety and environmental requirements to help us determine the best decision for the facility as to whether or not to decommission it or allow it to continue to operate.

The rule, Part 54 again, focuses on the aging of passive, long-lived structures and components. The reason the Commission focused the requirements for license renewal on passive, long-lived structures and components is because there are ongoing regulatory requirements and processes in place that monitor and maintain the remaining systems, structures, and components and address emergency planning and security planning.

These are things that are constantly and

routinely attended to under the regulations. However, those processes did not explicitly look at plant design capability to manage long-term degradation of equipment due to aging.

So the license renewal application focuses on those inspection programs and maintenance practices that are used to maintain the margin of safety in plant safety equipment by managing applicable aging effects.

In light of all that has been said, the staff reviews the applicant's license renewal application from a safety and an environmental impact aspect and issues a safety evaluation report and an environmental impact statement to document our findings. Those reports are taken together with two additional independent reviews.

The Commission's Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, better known as ACRS, is an independent body of experts primarily from industry and academia who have particular expertise in safety issues, and they evaluate the quality of the staff's findings and they document these findings in a report to the Commission.

There is also an independent inspection program that verifies certain key elements of the

1 staff's safety findings as well, and these 2 documented in inspection reports also. 3 Therefore, the Commission decision on the 4 license renewal application for North Anna and Surry 5 will rely on the staff's safety evaluation, 6 environmental impact statement that includes the 7 public comments, the ACRS report, and the inspection findings. 8 The schedule for this process is about 25 9 months long from the date that the application was 10 11 submitted. If requests for petitions to intervene had 12 been received, that schedule would have been extended approximately five months to allow for the hearings, 13 14 but no petitions were received. 15 That means we are currently scheduled to make a decision as to whether or not to renew the 16 licenses for North Anna and Surry in July of 2003. 17 Now, that concludes my presentation. Does 18 19 anybody have any questions? 20 MR. GRIMES: Are there any questions about 21 the overall process for license renewal before we have 22 Mr. Kugler go into the environmental review process? 23 (No response.) 24 MR. PRATO: Before I sit down, I want you 25 to know that John and I will be available if anybody

1 has any questions that come to mind after the meeting. 2 Please approach us. We will do everything we can to make sure that your questions are answered. Okay? 3 4 Thank you. 5 MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Bob. Kuqler will now describe 6 t.he 7 environmental review process. Thank you, Chris. 8 MR. KUGLER: Good afternoon, everybody. 9 My name is Andy Kugler, and I am managing the environmental 10 11 review for the North Anna license renewal application. 12 I'm overseeing a team of experts various fields who are evaluating the impacts of this 13 14 activity. 15 Next slide, please. The first thing I'd like to do is explain 16 17 the process that we're using. It's a process that follows the quidelines in the National Environmental 18 19 Policy Act, also referred to as NEPA. 20 NEPA requires us to use a systematic 21 approach -- I'm hearing this feedback or is it just 22 me? Is it? Okay -- systematic approach to evaluating 23 the impacts of the proposed action of license renewal. 24 We look at the impacts of the action, and we also

consider mitigation for any significant impacts.

1 In addition, we'll look for any 2 alternatives to the proposed action and consider their 3 environmental impacts as well. 4 The NEPA process is a disclosure tool that's intended to involve the public and allow us to 5 gain insight into what the public's concerns are. 6 7 The Nuclear Regulatory Commission considers license renewal to be a major Federal 8 9 action, and what that means for us here is that we will prepare an environmental impact statement to 10 11 document the results of our evaluation. 12 Currently we're in the process of gathering the information we need to perform that 13 14 review, and part of that is to gather input from the 15 public. What we're looking for to a large degree is are there any issues that the public considers to be 16 a concern to the environment in relation to the 17 operation of North Anna and particularly in relation 18 19 to license renewal. 20 Next slide, please. 21 This slide gives an idea of the basic 22 approach that we take in our review. We're attempting 23 to determine whether or not license renewal 24 acceptable from an environmental perspective, and

we're looking to determine whether or not to preserve

17 this option of continued operation of these units 1 beyond the original license. 2 3 One thing I'd like to emphasize here 4 because it's not always clear to people is that our determination is simply whether or not it's acceptable 5 to continue operation. Whether or not the plants are 6 7 actually operated for an additional 20 years would be -- that decision would be made by the licensee, by 8 state and local officials. They make that decision. 9 Our decision simply gives them that option. 10 11 Next slide, please. 12 This flow chart gives a little more detail of the environmental review. It's similar to the 13 14 slide that Bob showed you on the overall process. 15 We received the application at the end of May of this year, and we issued a notice of intent in 16 17 September of this year. And the notice of intent indicated planned 18 we to issue develop or 19 environmental impact statement, and it also began the 20 scoping period, requesting public input into the 21 process.

process. We're also looking for comments in writing

if people prefer to submit them in that form.

This meeting is one part of the scoping

In addition, during this same time and

22

23

24

18 1 during our visit here, we are spending time out at the 2 site with the team, looking at the site and the 3 environment around the site. 4 As result of our review of the 5 environmental report and other inputs, we'll determine whether or not we need additional information from the 6 7 licensee, and we'll make any request for additional information by December of this year. 8 We'll then complete the development of a 9 10 draft environmental impact statement by May of next 11 year and publish it for comment. It will be available 12 for you to make comments on at that point, and we will also come back here at that time for another meeting 13 14 to give you the opportunity to provide us with 15 comments in person. After that we will take any comments that 16 17 we receive on the draft, make any appropriate changes to the document, and develop a final environmental 18 19 impact statement, and we expect to issue that around 20 December of next year. 21 Next slide, please. 22 In preparing the environmental impact 23 statement, we take inputs from a number of different

report, which was part of their application. We take

We look at the licensee's environmental

places.

24

the public comments that we get here at this meeting and submitted through other sources to us. We talk to other Federal agencies, state and local agencies, local officials, social service agencies.

So we gather information from all the sources that we can find basically that will provide us with input that we can use to make our recommendations.

Next slide, please.

The team is made up of a number of experts in various fields, and in this slide we're trying to give you an idea of the various areas that we cover. We're looking at everything from the air to the water, the ground, land use, archeological and cultural resources, and also socioeconomic impacts, an area that many people might not consider when we start talking environmental, but that is an area that we consider. And included in that is a special category called environmental justice, and we're looking at if there are any inordinate impacts on certain groups caused by the proposed action, in this case the continued operation of this plant.

The people that we have on our team are a mix of people from the NRC staff and from some of our national labs, and we bring in expertise from the labs

1 in order to make sure that we have all of the experts 2 that we need to evaluate the operation of the plant. Next slide, please. 3 4 I am the agency's point of contact for the 5 environmental review. My phone number is here if you need to reach me for some reason, if you have some 6 7 questions that you want to ask. The documents associated with license 8 9 renewal are going to be available in two places One is the library here, the Louisa County 10 11 Library, and we're also placing documents in the 12 Alderman Library at the University of Virginia. was the old local public document room if any of you 13 14 have used that previously. 15 The application is there. We will be 16 putting documents there as we generate them. 17 issue documents they will go to the libraries, and we'll also put a copy of some reference materials 18 19 there as well. So if you want to look at them first 20 hand, you have that opportunity. 21 You can also look at documents through our 22 The key documents associated with license Web site. 23 renewal are available under license renewal.

documents that come in that are associated with the

plant are available through our document management

24

system, called ADAMS.

Next slide, please.

We tried to provide you with as many ways to submit comments as we could. Obviously this meeting is one opportunity to do so. All verbal comments here will be treated as we would any written comments.

You can submit comments in writing to the address shown on this slide. You can also submit comments electronically to the E-mail address that's provided at the bottom of this slide.

And an option almost nobody takes, but you could come visit us in Rockville if you want and deliver the comments in person. People don't take that option too often.

All the comments that we receive will be considered in developing the environmental impact statement. The comments that we receive today and in writing during the scoping period will be summarized, and we'll issue a scoping summary report.

And if when you filled out the registration card you put your address on there, we will mail you a copy of that summary report so you can see it. If not, it will also obviously be available through our document management system and in the

1 libraries once it's issued. 2 That summarizes the environmental review 3 process and completes my comments. Thank you, Andy. 4 MR. GRIMES: 5 Are there any questions about the environmental review process or any questions about 6 7 what the NRC's role is in this licensing activity? 8 (No response.) MR. GRIMES: If not, I'm going to proceed 9 on and introduce the speakers who have signed up to 10 11 provide oral comments to us, and our first speaker is 12 going to be Lee Lintecum, who is the Louisa County 13 Administrator. 14 Mr. Lintecum. 15 MR. LINTECUM: Thank you very much. a pleasure to meet with you, and it's a pleasure to 16 17 have the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and allow us the opportunity to speak on the relicensing of the 18 19 North Anna nuclear power plant. Let me first say welcome to beautiful 20 21 Louisa, and thank you for affording this us 22 opportunity. And, of course, as County Administrator, 23 I'm also representing the Louisa County Board of 24 Supervisors. 25 During my tenure here, we have found Dominion to be a very good corporate citizen. Their safety and security concerns and personnel are excellent. They work very closely with the Sheriff's Department and with our emergency services personnel and keep the county personnel advised of all unusual and usual incidents that take place there.

Dominion has proved to be a very good civic citizen, contributing both time and financial resources, both corporately and through its individuals. For instance, the North Anna Volunteers recently helped us with a park by providing free labor and equipment. They erected a picnic shelter and helped develop a ball field that probably saved taxpayers \$20,000 and hastened the development of the park.

So that's the type of relationship we have enjoyed with Dominion.

I guess the biggest contribution that Dominion makes is in regard to our employment and tax base. Dominion is, by far, the largest employer in the county, employing over 900 people, and it contributes over \$12 million a year in real property tax.

To help you understand what that means is that without the North Anna nuclear power plant, in

1 order to bring in that same amount of revenue we would 2 have to double the current real estate tax rate, and 3 our citizens cannot support that at this time. We are 4 working very hard to expand our tax base and be not so 5 dependent upon one source, but we still have a long 6 way to go in that regard. 7 In summary, the North Anna power plant is vital to Louisa now, and it could have devastating 8 9 effects without it. We, again, enjoy a very good 10 relationship with the people there, and we feel good 11 about their operations. 12 Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Lintecum. 13 MR. GRIMES: 14 Our next speak is going to be Linda 15 Ms. Edwards is the Director of the Louisa Edwards. County Economic Development Administration. 16 17 MS. EDWARDS: Thank you. Thank you very much for asking me to add a few comments to Mr. 18 19 Lintecum's words. 20 I would like to just address a few 21 relevant points so as not to be redundant in what he 22 has said. 23 North Anna Power Station is a 24 economic development partner. This is to say Dominion 25 Power and Louisa County have a very good relationship

in the field of economic development. I enjoy working with Kent Hill, who is the Economic Development Director stationed in Richmond. He is always available for questions, to do research, and has at every opportunity been very helpful to me in my work.

Dominion Power has for many years provided marketing material in economic development, and up until just recently we were using this brochure, and I might add that they do this for many, many counties in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

I'm currently working with the Office of Economic Development in Richmond on a new brochure, which will be very important to us in our marketing program as we try to broaden our business base and tax base.

I'd like to mention just one simple way that it adds up, all of the many, many opportunities that Dominion provides for us, but for example, Dominion annually supports the IDA, the Industrial Development Authority's annual meeting.

In summary, North Anna is profoundly good for Louisa. Louisa needs, wants, and welcomes the North Anna Power Station. From a personal point of view, if it were not for this leader of Dominion and our key community servant, my job would be even more

1 critical and it would be even more difficult 2 provide what we need to provide for our county. 3 Thank you very much, and we are extremely 4 happy to be partners in economic development with 5 Dominion Power. Thank you, Ms. Edwards. 6 MR. GRIMES: 7 Our next speaker is going to be Jimmy 8 Candeto, who is the Mineral Town Manager. 9 MR. CANDETO: I just want to say thank you 10 for this opportunity to speak to you all on North 11 Anna's behalf. 12 I feel I've only been here a short eight months in this area, but I'm very much impressed with 13 14 what I've seen at North Anna. Louisa County is 15 extremely fortunate to have North Anna Power Station. The financial benefits are extremely attractive to the 16 17 county. The combined salaries reach almost \$50 18 million, which contributes significantly to our local 19 20 economy. They paid last year ten and a half million 21 dollars to the County of Louisa, and since the 22 inception, they have paid \$160 million in taxes to the 23 County of Louisa. 24 I personally admire the commitment to the 25 environment. The company has adopted policies that

1 are compatible with protecting our natural resources. 2 They work to protect all migratory birds with policies 3 and procedures from the U.S. Department of Wildlife. 4 Dominion biologists regularly monitor the health of 5 the fish in Lake Anna. A two-year study of Lake Anna confirms 6 7 that the lake supports a healthy fish population. North Anna desires to be a good corporate 8 9 citizen, and they've proven to be one. They've demonstrated this in the past by adopting a highway, 10 11 keeping it free of litter. They've provided 12 Thanksqiving baskets the needy. They've to contributed blood drives. They've sent mentally and 13 14 physically challenged children to camp. 15 Over the last decade, they have donated more than \$100,000 in support of the Louisa community. 16 17 Some recipients include the Louisa County Library, LinkAges of Louisa, after prom school parties, 4-H 18 19 Council, and Crime Solvers. 20 Their employees are also generous with 21 their money. From 1998 through 2000, they contributed 22 more than \$315,000 to the United Way. I admire the 23 generosity of the company and their employees and feel 24 privileged to speak on their behalf.

Thank you.

1 MR. GRIMES: Our next speaker is going to 2 be Duff Green, who is the Orange County Emergency 3 Services Coordinator. Mr. Green. 4 5 MR. GREEN: Thank you, Chris, ladies and gentlemen. 6 7 name is Duff Green, and I'm the 8 Emergency Management Coordinator for Orange County, a job in which I've been associated for about 20 years. 9 Let me state at the onset that I'm not an 10 11 employee of North Anna and have never been 12 employee, and don't stock Ι even own any in Dominion/Virginia Power. 13 14 I retired after 50 years in the newspaper 15 business and became associated with emergency 16 management when I was elected to the Orange County 17 Board of Supervisors in 1978. I was Chairman of the board my last four years, and this by Virginia law 18 19 made me automatically become Orange County's Director 20 of Emergency Management. 21 After retiring from the board, I accepted 22 the job as Emergency Management Coordinator, which is 23 mostly volunteer. 24 I have followed North Anna Nuclear Power 25 Station's progress since it first dammed the North

1 Anna River in 1970, and I have nothing but praise for 2 its safety record and environment and its efficient 3 operation. 4 This facility has had a tremendous 5 economic benefit to the citizens of Orange County and The station's its other surrounding counties. 6 7 employees are highly qualified people who also serve with numerous volunteer organizations and church 8 9 boards in Orange County. The short of it all, I strongly recommend 10 11 that North Anna be given a renewal of its operation 12 (sic) to operate. Thank you. 13 14 MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Mr. Green. 15 Our next speaker is going to be Ashland Fortune, the Louisa County Sheriff. 16 17 SHERIFF FORTUNE: Thank you, Chris. It's a pleasure to stand before you all 18 19 this afternoon to give you some of the impact that 20 North Anna has brought to Louisa County. 21 live exactly eight miles from the 22 traffic light out here to my home on Route 208. 23 times I've been out in the yard working, and people 24 have stopped and wanted to know where Lake Anna and 25 Virginia Power is located. I direct them there and

1 give them my card. I get a letter back from them 2 thanking me for letting them know about Virginia 3 Power. 4 They go out to it, come back, and they are 5 real enthused with it. Virginia Power has done a lot for Louisa 6 7 County. I've been in law enforcement in my 38th year 8 right here in Louisa Country. I see a lot of changes. 9 I see factories close up. We've got two factories that closed up about 10 to 12 years ago, and that 10 really hurt Louisa County, but Virginia Power took the 11 12 slack up and carried Louisa County on in tax revenue. And I'm here to tell you this afternoon 13 14 that I would like to see that the license be renewed 15 and Virginia Power continue because it help so many civic organizations. 16 17 I'm involved in the Crime Solvers. have played a big part with Crime Solvers, and the 18 19 money they have donated to the Crime Solvers really 20 put an impact on solving crime. The citizens know 21 their information will go a long way when they call in 22 a crime. 23 Now, also Virginia Power also has kept 24 people's tables here, clothes

children's backs, helped the school system, given

1 millions of dollars a year to needy families. 2 here to tell you that and I believe that Virginia 3 Power's license should be renewed and continued on to 4 serve the community and furnish power to all over the 5 world. Thank you. 6 7 MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Sheriff Fortune. Our next speaker is going to be William 8 Hayden with the Lake Anna Civic Association. 9 Good afternoon, ladies and 10 MR. HAYDEN: 11 gentlemen. My name is William Hayden. I am President of the Lake Anna Civic Association. 12 We presently have over 1,500 members who 13 14 live or own property in over 120 subdivisions around 15 I represent and speak for those property Lake Anna. 16 owners today. 17 Dominion Power and its predecessor, Virginia Electric Power Company, in the operation of 18 the North Anna Power Station have been an excellent 19 20 neighbor to us, and the stewardship of the environment 21 has been outstanding. 22 After the lake was created and flooded, 23 they monitored the aging or maturing of the lake for 24 over 20 years on a continuous basis at a number of

sampling points to insure that no negative impacts

were developing.

Several years ago, the North Anna Power Plant stopped their water sampling program. The Lake Anna Civic Association in the summer of 2000 formed a water quality committee, and in conjunction with the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality developed a program to monitor the water quality in Lake Anna.

As we were doing our background work to determine what had been done in the past, the personnel at the North Anna Power Station provided us with the environmental data that they had collected over a 20-year period. This data was extremely helpful in guiding us as we determined what we should do and how we should shape our program.

We started our water sampling efforts this past fall after receiving training by personnel from the York watershed and Virginia Department of Environmental Quality.

We started initially with 13 sites and now expanded from the 13 sites to 20 and anticipate further expansion to 26 sites around the various points in the lake.

As we were getting our water quality program organized, we realized very quickly that although we could collect the water samples through

the use of volunteers at virtually no cost, there was a substantial requirement for funds to purchase our initial water sampling equipment, as well as a recurring cost to have the water samples analyzed.

As an example, our initial water sampling kits cost us \$270 each, and so far we have purchased 20 sets, for a total of \$5,400 and are planning to purchase an additional six sets soon.

Although several organizations promised to assist us with funds to cover our water quality monitoring program, Dominion was the first to step forward and come through with an initial donation of \$1,500.

These funds, along with funds put up by the Lake Anna Civic Association allowed us to purchase our initial equipment and get our program started. At this time we're testing the water in Lake Anna at 20 sites, and we're testing the water for turbidity, temperature, acidity, fecal chloroform, phosphorus, and dissolved oxygen. We anticipate soon in adding nitrate and chlorophyll testing.

The present laboratory analysis cost to us is \$45 per sample for each sample analyzed. The nitrate will add another \$35. The chlorophyll will add another \$60. This will make our total test cost

1 of \$140 per site, or \$3,640 for analysis costs for one 2 test series at 26 sites. 3 The North Anna Power Plant works closely 4 with us on all of our activities. Their 5 representative to our association is George O'Connell. I do not believe he has ever missed one of our 6 7 meetings, either annual meetings or our monthly board 8 meetings. This allows Dominion to be appraised of 9 10 our thinking on issues that we are presently dealing with, as well as things that we are planning for in 11 12 the future. This past June we sponsored a Land on the 13 14 Lake Day to provide a forum for community education on 15 the environmental concerns around Lake Anna. Again, Dominion quickly stepped forward with an offer to let 16 us use their Visitor Center facilities and, 17 addition, donated \$1,000 to us to assist in funding 18 19 the program. 20 This program was extremely well attended 21 by over 700 property owners from around Lake Anna, as 22 well as the surrounding community. Again, we offer our thanks to Dominion for their assistance in helping 23 24 us carry out our environmental program.

Dominion has also supported us since the

1 formation of our association by making available their 2 Visitor Center meeting rooms for our annual meetings. This was done even though our annual meetings are on 3 4 Saturdays when the center is normally closed. So they 5 have gone out of their way to assist us. In closing, I would like to reiterate that 6 7 Dominion is well liked by all property owners around 8 Lake Anna. In our perception, they are good stewards 9 of the environment. They do not disturb us in any 10 way, and they just very quietly do their thing of generating electricity without polluting 11 our 12 environment. They run a very safe facility, and we have 13 14 all grown very comfortable with having them as 15 So much so that we often tend to forget neighbors. that there is even a nuclear facility nearby. 16 17 Thank you for affording me the opportunity to address you today in relation to your deliberations 18 19 relative to the North Anna operating permit for the 20 power station, and I would urge you to renew it. 21 Thank you. 22 Thank you, Mr. Hayden. MR. GRIMES: 23 Our next speaker is going to be Jerry 24 Rosenthal with the Concerned Citizens of Louisa. MR. ROSENTHAL: I thank you for allowing 25

1 me to speak and for holding this meeting. 2 I'm in my 22nd year of being involved with 3 North Anna, watching what goes on at the plant, and 4 the issue of getting a license renewal is much more 5 serious than just a few jobs or the taxes that's going 6 on here. 7 What's happening is this county is being asked to buy a used car. We're getting a car that's 8 9 been out there for a whole bunch of years, and we've got some serious things that need to look at it. 10 11 Let's look at several issues to begin 12 I think we can start with September 11 and look at the issue with that. 13 14 We have sitting there on the flight path 15 from Dulles. Less than seven minutes with a jet from Dulles that's in the air, it could be at North Anna. 16 What would happen if that jet crashed into the plant? 17 We need to investigate that. We need to 18 19 investigate multiple terrorists coming at the plant, 20 not one terrorist, not one group. Two groups, three 21 groups coming from land and sea at the same time. 22 What would be the effect of doing this? 23 We are sitting at the plant not just with 24 the production facilities, but storage facilities. We

have the water, the swimming pools, and we have dry

	37
1	cask.
2	What happens if a terrorist got into the
3	dry cask facility and hit the cask with a rocket
4	grenade? It doesn't have to make a nuclear explosion.
5	It can send that nuclear material out.
6	How would they feel when Lake Anna has got
7	all sorts of plutonium in there?
8	So we have September 11 as sitting right
9	there. Secondly, we have the issue of MOX. Virginia
10	Power has wavered on this MOX. They came before the
11	Board of Supervisors here, sent a letter saying they
12	should not use MOX.
13	They reneged. They said they would use
14	MOX. They changed and flipped again. Now they're not
15	going to use MOX.
16	However, if MOX is used at the plant, the
17	protocol of an accident changes, and we're set with
18	hot spots on the core.
19	Secondly, Virginia Power has not signed
20	out of the MOX agreement. While they've said they're
21	not going to use it, they're in agreement with the
22	DOE, and they haven't signed out of the agreement.
23	They're still in it.

vis-a-vis MOX? MOX use, either Virginia Power has to

So where does that leave the investigation

24

1 come straight out, say they're not going to use MOX, 2 will never use MOX, or an entire investigation needs 3 to be done of the effects of MOX in terms of the 4 environmental things that are going on. 5 We also have an issue that Virginia Power is starting to push pebble bed. Are they thinking of 6 7 putting a pebble bed at North Anna? What effect is 8 this going to have? You can't divorce these issues from a 20-9 10 year extension. 11 We need complete analysis of the concrete 12 and lining going through heat chemical heating cycles, stuff like that. 13 14 We need to deal with the regular releases 15 that come from the plant, the radioactivity that is regularly vented off of the reactors. 16 17 In terms of I heard the gentleman from Lake Anna Civic Association talk about all of the 18 19 things they're checking at the lake, but radioactivity 20 was not one of them. That's seems incongruous that 21 they would be checking fecal samples, but next to a 22 nuclear plant they're not interested in checking for 23 radioactivity in either the water, the fish, the 24 algae? 25 The Russian experience has shown over a

1 long period of time a lot of the radioactivity ends up 2 sinking to the bottom in the mud. This type of stuff 3 needs to be checked. 4 And when we're talking about monitoring, 5 it would be advantageous to have independent monitors, separate from the nuclear power company itself or the 6 7 Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Let's independent monitors, and let's monitor the workers. 8 What is the long-term health of the workers? Let's do 9 epidemiological studies. Let's monitor the community. 10 11 Let's monitor the environment, all -- all completely 12 independently. When we talk about security, we're talking 13 14 about security around the lake. What about security 15 at the dam? What about a boat riding up to the dam just full of explosives? Boom, the lake is gone. 16 17 plant's closed, and it would take years to get that back. 18 19 We have to deal with more security issues, 20 and it's not just at the plant itself. 21

And while we can acknowledge some of the

positive contributions that Virginia Power and their individuals have made, we also have to deal with the truthfulness of Virginia Power. We discussed the flip-flop of MOX. We have other issues where 24, 23

22

23

24

1 years ago they were absolutely going to build Units 3 2 and 4. Yes, we're going to build 3 and 4. Yes, we're 3 going to build 3 and 4. No, we're not. 4 We're confronted frequently with a utility 5 whose primary purpose is profit, and they are willing to say lots of things, but we have to as a community, 6 7 and the larger community of being the government, look at the long range issues about what is happening and 8 9 not rely exclusively on Virginia Power. One other issue, again related guickly to 10 our security. The NRC itself closed the Web site for 11 12 security reasons and yet left open all of the nuclear power plants. It's just something for us to think 13 14 about. 15 Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Rosenthal. 16 MR. GRIMES: 17 Our next speaker is going to be Lisa Gue with Public Citizen. 18 MS. GUE: Thanks, Chris, and thanks to all 19 20 of you for attending this important meeting. My name, again, is Lisa Gue. I work for 21 22 Public Citizen in Washington, D.C. We're a nonprofit, national nonprofit, public interest organization 23 24 celebrating our 30th anniversary this year, and I 25 appreciate this opportunity to be here in Louisa County with all of you.

Public Citizen opposes the relicensing of nuclear power plants, and I want to locate that comment not only in the context of North Anna Power Plant, but actually within the broader context of the energy policy debate that's going on nationally.

While we sit here, there are people sitting in rooms all over the country and, of course, also in Washington, D.C. discussing the issues related to energy supply and nuclear power as part of that mix.

Public Citizen reemphasizes at this point when we're talking about relicensing nuclear power plants our longstanding concerns with nuclear power, those being that it's unsafe, unclean, and expensive.

Speaking about safety, nuclear power operates at the extremes of technology, at the extremes of safety, and unfortunately we have had demonstrated most notably with the Chernobyl accident 15 years ago in the Ukraine the possibility, the real possibility that exists with every operating nuclear power plant for a catastrophic accident costing the lives of not only many people but generations to come.

Speaking of the environmental aspect or the unclean aspect of nuclear power, power plants are

not only poised on the brink of this kind of catastrophic accident at all times, but also releasing routine amounts of radiation into the air and the water.

And on top of that, there's the issue of the high level nuclear waste that is generated through the process of irradiating the fuel, and at this point there is no known way to safely dispose of high level nuclear waste.

That's something that clearly has to be taken into account as we consider relicensing because relicensing just the North Anna Power Plant for the 20 years that's being proposed would result in an additional 400 metric tons of high level waste being added to the mix, the mix being already a mounting stockpile with no solution in sight.

And finally, nuclear power has never existed without heavy government subsidies which continue, and as a consumer advocacy organization, we believe and we're convinced that it's really time to, after 50 years of nuclear power, it's time to end the subsidies and to begin the transition to a sustainable energy future.

In any case, certainly right now is the wrong moment to be discussing relicensing at all.

First of all, the licenses at the North Anna Power Plant don't expire until 2018 and 2020. Certainly the situation is going to change within the next two decades, and it would be much more logical to be having a scoping — a conversation about environmental scoping closer, when we know more about the actual environment that would be affected a few decades from now.

And, secondly, as one of the previous speakers pointed out, the events of September 11th have brought into relief some of the very real security concerns that exist around nuclear power plants. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Congress, and other government agencies dealing with nuclear projects really need to take time at this moment to pause and to demand a full and thorough, independent investigation of the security situation at the nation's nuclear power plants and what would be prudent in terms of how to move forward, keeping in mind what we now know to be not just a hypothetical threat, but a real threat.

The NRC, responding to many questions, of course, about security related in light of the September 11th attacks, responded that no nuclear power plants operating in the U.S. or around the world

1 for that matter were designed to withstand the kind of 2 attack that was experienced at the Pentagon and the 3 World Trade Center a month ago, and that is definitely 4 something that we need to keep in mind. 5 this is a time to be moving. Relicensing the North Anna Power Plant points us in 6 7 the wrong direction in terms of the transition that 8 needs to be made for a safe and secure energy future. 9 I do just want to make a few specific 10 comments when it comes to the environmental scoping aspect for this particular power plant. Public 11 12 Citizen urges the NRC to take into account in this environmental impact -- supplemental environmental 13 14 impact assessment the noncompliance reality of the 15 North Anna Power Plant. It's not very useful to have an environmental impact assessment that assumes that 16 this plant will operate in compliance at all times. 17 We know that that is not the case. 18 19 Secondly, this environmental impact 20 assessment needs to take into account the impacts of 21 aging reactor components. Just like anything else, 22 nuclear reactors get old and pose higher risks as they 23 age. 24 More uniquely than anything else though,

nuclear reactors operate under very intense conditions

to do with temperature, radiation, and corrosive environments, and this, of course, as expected takes a toll on the various components of nuclear power plants.

So issues of embrittlement with the reactor vessel and issues of degradation of other aspects of the power plant, particularly related to the cooling system, need to be taken into account in this environmental impact assessment.

And finally, the issue of high level waste needs to be looked at as a very severe environmental impact and at this point an unsolvable environmental impact of nuclear power.

I just want to take a moment now to add on a comment about the NRC's Web site being down. Public Citizen and, I know, many other organizations had requested that the NRC postpone all public meetings that had been announced and extend the public comment periods on the various rulemakings that are underway in consideration of the fact that from October 11th through yesterday no information at all was available on the NRC's Web site, including the calendar of public meetings.

This gave the impression that the NRC was closed for business, and I was very surprised to learn

that this meeting was nonetheless continuing as originally scheduled, despite the fact that the public didn't have access to information about it in the last week.

Secondly, the continued lack of access to NRC's full Web site raises a bigger issue related to the safety of nuclear power plants. The NRC has removed all other documents from its Web site, including safety and lack of compliance reports from the North Anna Power Plant and information about the regulatory processes that surround nuclear energy in this country.

And they have done so stating that it's necessary from the perspective of national security. And I guess my closing comment would just be that this is an indication that the kinds of protections that are necessary -- I put that in quotations, "necessary" -- to protect nuclear power seem incompatible with basic civil liberties and the democratic principles that we uphold in this society.

So, again, I urge the NRC, of course, to reinstate full access to its Web site, and for this issue of relicensing of the North Anna Power Plant to also be considered in the broader context of national energy policy.

1 Thank you again for the opportunity to 2 I'll leave a copy of our press release for the docket, and I have extra copies if anyone is 3 4 interested. 5 MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Ms. Gue. Our next speaker is going to be Dave 6 7 Heacock, who's the Dominion Site Vice President for 8 North Anna Power Station. Good afternoon. 9 MR. HEACOCK: It's a 10 little bit tough to follow that, but I'll try. 11 I'm Dave Heacock. I'm the Site Vice 12 President at North Anna. I want to thank, first of all, the NRC for 13 14 coming today and offering this public comment so that 15 we can have comments from all interested parties, and 16 I appreciate those comments. Some I appreciate more than others, but I appreciate all of the comments. I 17 think they're valuable as part of the process. 18 19 I'm excited about license renewal. I just 20 reached a personal milestone in my life. Over half of 21 my life has been spent at North Anna Power Station 22 this year. So I've been there for 22 years. You can 23 probably guess my age from that. 24 And I started ticking off. I wanted to 25 make a number of points. I started ticking those

48 1 points off as each speaker spoke ahead of me. 2 ticked off most of my points. So I'm going to make my 3 remarks a little briefer since I don't want to be too 4 redundant here. 5 But I was born and raised in Virginia, went to school at the University of Virginia. 6 7 nuclear engineer, and I've spent the last 22 years at 8 North Anna Power Station. We have a long history of safe 9 10 efficient operation, despite some other comments 11 you've heard earlier. We do have a very strong safety 12 acknowledged record. It's outside bу many organizations. The Institute of Nuclear 13 14 Operations has given us excellent marks for more than 15 a decade now at North Anna. The NRC, in their systematic assessment of 16 17 licensee performance process and more recently in the reactor oversight process, has given us high marks as 18 19 well. 20

We're also partially owned by an independent cooperative, Old Dominion Electric Co-op, which owns part of North Anna, and they send independent people in to review our operations several times a year, and they also give us high marks for our performance.

21

22

23

24

49 Utility Data Institute collects data for the most efficient plants in the country. North Anna has been rated number one for the last decade on a three-year average. Now, that's just nuclear plants. You have to compare the cost of operating a nuclear plant to the cost of any type of generation. There's over 850 steam electric plants in the United States. Anna, when it was last rated, was number five lowest cost producer out of 850 plants in the United States and the lowest cost nuclear plant of all the plants. I do want to address the September 11th That's foremost in many of our minds. Anna has always had very high levels of security. Anybody that's worked there or visited the plant recognizes the significant amount of security you have to go through to get to the plant.

Since September 11th, we've also had heightened levels of security at the plant. Anybody who's attempted to visit or has visited the plant since that time will recognize that.

We appreciate the help from our local law enforcement, from State Police, from the Federal government in providing intelligence to us. It has been a very, very good feeling to me to see the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

community come together to protect our own assets.

Since 1978, we've had over 30 countries represented of people coming to North Anna to visit us to learn how we do business. And we've done benchmarking all across the country and all across the world to also gather information about how other plants operate.

I do want to get to the environmental issue. That's what we're here for to talk about, is to talk about the environmental impact of North Anna. The primary advantage of a nuclear plant is that it doesn't produce any carbon — doesn't emit any carbon dioxides, carbon monoxides, nitrous oxides, sulfur dioxides. All of those things are not emitted at the plant during normal operation.

So we don't have an impact for greenhouse gases like you might have from a replacement plant, and that's one factor that goes into this decision, is if you don't operate North Anna, and that's a choice that could result from this hearing or from our decision to not operate the plant, where do you get the power that people need beyond that?

Currently North Anna generates 1,800 million watts of power. That's 17 percent of the power that's used in the State of Virginia on an

annual basis. Surry and North Anna combined provide a third of the power for the State of Virginia on an annual basis, to kind of put it in perspective.

If we didn't operate North Anna, where would that power come from? That's the question you have to answer here. That's one aspect of the license renewal process.

That's enough power for about 450,000 homes, to put it in perspective. I could also give you quotes in hair dryers or any other statistic that you like, but it's a whole bunch of energy is the bottom line.

It cost about \$1.3 billion to construct, which sounds like a large number until you compare it to what it would cost to replace in current dollars.

I've heard a lot of this information already. We have a longstanding tradition at North Anna and Dominion of investing in our communities, and you've heard other speakers here talk about that. I'm not going to repeat all of those issues, with the local library and LinkAges and blood drives and so forth. But I think the real secret here is the community. We have 300 of our employees that live in Louisa, and then we have almost 900 people who work at the plant, and then during outages, we bring another

1	eight or 900 people in from other locations to work
2	for up to a month at North Anna. About one and a half
3	times a year on average we operate fueling outages.
4	So all of the people live in the local
5	community, support the local community and the
6	restaurants here, and so forth. And I think it's
7	really important that we work together to continue the
8	operation of the plants, not to mention the Boy Scouts
9	and so forth.
10	Well, to not be redundant I'm going to end
11	my remarks here, and thank you very much for your
12	time. I appreciate it.
13	MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Mr. Heacock.
14	Our next speaker is going to be Bill Bolin
15	who's the Manager of Environmental Biology with
16	Dominion.
17	MR. BOLIN: Thank you, Chris.
18	And I, too, want to thank the Nuclear
19	Regulatory Commission for holding this meeting today
20	and allowing me to speak.
21	As Chris mentioned, my name is Bill Bolin.
22	My official title in the company is Manager,
23	Environmental Biology. My unofficial title is Chief
24	Biologist.
25	I began my career nearly 30 years ago,

1 being the first station biologist hired by what was 2 then VEPCO. When Congress passed the Clean Water Act 3 in the early '70s, utility companies such as mine had 4 to decide whether they wanted to -- how they wanted to 5 comply with the Clean Water Act provisions either by staffing in house or by hiring consultants. 6 7 What I consider personally to have been a brilliant move, VEPCO decided to staff in house, and 8 9 I was fortunate to be asked to join the company. first 10 As such, were one of the utilities nationwide to staff with environmental 11 12 professionals. Environmental considerations are a very 13 14 important aspect in the design and placement of all of 15 our power stations. For example, at North Anna Power 16 Station, when the lake was created as a source for cooling water, we also designed and constructed a 17 series of three cooling lagoons totaling 3,400 surface 18 19 designated as the heat treatment acres, waste 20 facility. 21 These lagoons receive warmer water from 22 the station and return the water to the lake with the water temperature to near ambient conditions. 23 24 While all Dominion power stations maintain

strict compliance with state and Federal environmental

regulations, the company frequently endeavors to raise the bar on environmental stewardship. This includes partnering with conservation groups, as well as state and Federal agencies, to protect as well as enhance the various ecosystems around our power stations and our transmission and distribution rights-of-way.

Let me just take a minute and share with you a few examples of how we have attempted to raise the bar at North Anna. We initiated studies of the area prior to formation of the lake, and these studies, for the most part, are still ongoing, giving us nearly 30 years of continuous and valuable information.

One of the early findings of our preimpoundment studies was that the water quality in
Contrary Creek, which was a major tributary of the
North Anna River, was extremely poor and basically had
impaired most of the North Anna River. The formation
of Lake Anna immediately improved conditions in the
Contrary Creek arm of the lake, as well as the North
Anna River below the dam.

Our post impoundment studies showed that Lake Anna behaved as most new reservoirs in that there was a period of several years of very rapid biological growth. For example, there was a great surge in the

population of Largemouth bass, and for every year since then Lake Anna has been in one of the top three states or three state lakes in producing citation Largemouth bass, which are bass over seven pounds in weight or 21 inches in length.

lake has matured the our understanding of it has grown, we are able to place emphasis on certain areas that appear to need some For example, the crappie populations did not experience this rapid period of biological growth. We felt this was due to a lack of suitable habitat in the lake. So we put in 21 artificial structures comprised of thousands of cinder blocks and tree tops. marked these structures with buoys, developed a brochure to aid the fishermen in showing their locations, and we even designed an underwater monitoring program to evaluate their effectiveness.

The crappie, as well as other species, that frequently use these types of structures have responded positively.

This habitat enhancement program is alive and well even today. The only difference is we're not the only players. Local bass clubs, tackle manufacturers, and the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries have taken the lead.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The type of structure has changed somewhat, but the principle remains the same: creating habitat.

We also assisted the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries in the construction of a fishing pier parallel to Route 622 that crosses over Dike 3 where the lake receives the cooling water discharge. This pier is handicap accessible.

The area was early discovered to be an attraction for many types of fish, especially striped bass, probably because of the current, underwater currents. We're currently working with the Game Commission to donate the land surrounding that pier to them.

Another example is when we found hydrilla in the lake, and especially the waste heat treatment facility, we funded several graduate studies to identify control options. Hydrilla is an introduced aquatic plant that has a capacity to completely take over a water body. We worked with bass clubs, marina owners, lake property owners, and the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries to identify the optimal control for this noxious weed.

Today all users of the lake are benefitting from these actions. With the improvement

1 in water quality and flow of the North Anna River 2 downstream of the dam, we were able to stock the river with Smallmouth bass. Today the river is now well 3 4 known for its Smallmouth bass fishing and recreational 5 canoeing. In fact, the North Anna River below Lake 6 7 Anna was selected by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory for a series of studies related to Smallmouth bass 8 9 populations. Over the years, we've placed a substantial 10 11 number of wood duck nesting boxes around the lake to 12 help boost this population of one of our beautiful birds. 13 14 As Dave mentioned and several others have 15 said, we also take pride in Dominion in taking an active role in whatever community we're located in, 16 17 and North Anna is no exception. We are involved in community stewardship 18 19 in many fronts. One that we're extremely proud of here at North Anna is our partnership with the Lake 20 21 Anna State Park and which at least we think is one of 22 the state's crown jewels of state parks. We have been 23 participants in the development of this park from its 24 planning stages.

on

and

on

go

Ι

could

25

other

about

environmental improvements and/or considerations at North Anna, but perhaps I should spend some of my time talking about the essence of our environmental report for North Anna Power Station.

Firstly, as you've heard the NRC say, the environmental report is required in any nuclear license renewal process as part of the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has identified nearly 100 environmental issues that must be addressed in the environmental report by all applicants, which in this case is us.

Most of these issues were determined by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to be of minor environmental impact and, therefore, may be addressed generically.

In our environmental assessment, we performed a review of these same issues, and our assessment concurred with the NRC conclusions.

Some of the other issues, environmental issues, are site specific for each facility and, therefore, must be addressed accordingly. Some of the more site specific issues include aquatic biology, terrestrial biology, demographics, and transmission line impacts.

For example, issues that we looked at at North Anna included waste heat, water withdrawal, and threatened and endangered species. The term "waste heat" refers to heat that is transferred to water as it passes through the station to cool the steam during the electrical generation process.

In the mid-'80s, we conducted a study that looked at the impacts of this waste heat on the biota of Lake Anna. Using past information, coupled with new information, we found no long-term deleterious effects, and the Virginia State Water Control Board, which is now the Department of Environmental Quality, agreed with our findings. Most of these studies are ongoing today.

Water withdrawal represents the water that I mentioned earlier that is used for cooling. We studied water withdrawal issues, and again, we demonstrated no long-term deleterious effects on the lake, and the Water Board again concurred with our findings.

The evaluation of threatened and endangered species was a little different in that we had to go to state and Federal agencies to investigate possible impacts on listed species. The research showed no impact to any threatened or endangered

2.0

species as a result of the operation of North Anna Power Station and its associated transmission lines.

A couple of other site specific issues that we looked at included socioeconomic impacts and impacts on cultural resources.

With regard to socioeconomic impacts, we found positive contribution to the local infrastructure, which you've previously heard from other speakers. Because there will be no new construction activity, continued operation of the station means that the cultural resources impacts are also negligible.

These are examples of but a few of the specific issues addressed in the environmental report. In the evaluation of these specific issues, consulted with representatives of state and Federal resources agencies, as well as universities to update information, agencies such as the Virginia our Department of Conservation and Recreation, Department  $\circ f$ Historic Resources, Department the of Transportation, and the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries were accessed.

For every issue we examined, it was determined that the continued operation of electricity or generation of electricity from North Anna Power

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 Station benefits our customers and the community, 2 while at the same time minimizing the environmental 3 impact. North Anna Power Station has a history of 4 excellent environmental stewardship. 5 One final message. I am very proud to have been but a small part of the North Anna story and 6 7 the even bigger Dominion story. Over the years it has been my distinct privilege to be a part of numerous 8 9 company-wide environmental projects, such as 10 recent Peregrine Falcon Project conducted in partnership with state and Federal agencies. 11 12 In conclusion, I would again like to thank the NRC for this opportunity. I would like to thank 13 14 everyone for coming. I think your comments and your 15 participation are extremely important to this process. 16 Thank you. 17 Thank you, Mr. Bolin. MR. GRIMES: Mr. Rosenthal and Ms. Gue both remarked on 18 the NRC's Web site has been disabled. 19 20 pulled down. I also mentioned as we started this 21 meeting a very important part of public participation 22 is our ability to share information. 23 Roger Hannah, who is with Region II Office 24 of Public Affairs, is here, and he's available to 25 provide information about what Public Affairs is doing

to try and restore Internet access to real time information coming out of the NRC.

I've also been informed that the NRC is working to restore that part of the public meeting notice to the Web, but in the meantime we're having to resort to the old fashioned paper system of meeting notices. But we are hopeful that, as Mr. Kugler pointed out, we're maintaining the information related to the license renewal applications on an internal Web site until the security review process reflects on whether or not there is information in there that is now, in light of September 11th, considered to be more sensitive.

We have become so accustomed to fully disclosing information related to safety issues and environmental issues, and September 11th has caused the NRC, along with all other Federal agencies, to reflect on that, and I'm hopeful that through that process of very carefully balancing the disclosure of information and also citizens' rights with the security of the plant, that we'll find an appropriate balance in a very short period of time.

But that completes all of the requested opportunities to speak, and I would now like to ask whether or not there are any others of you that would

like to make any comments or ask any questions.

As Mr. Prato pointed out, the staff is available after the meeting to answer any questions in a one-on-one basis.

MR. KUGLER: I was just going to ask you, Chris, do you know if the phone number is still available? People used to be able to phone in and ask about and to check on meetings.

MR. GRIMES: Yes. We have a phone system that provides the status of meetings, and we are reflecting on -- we've all become so accustomed to being able to use the Web -- but the other systems that we have, the use of the Federal Register.

The information related to the North Anna license renewal application is available in the public library that Andy referred to. Copies of the application are available there. We may find that we start pulling back some of our paper information as a result of the ongoing review of security and safeguards issues.

And I can also share with you that there has been legislation proposed for the NRC to reconsider the security and safeguards design requirements that will be going on in parallel with the rest of the agency's business.

1	Are there any other further comments or
2	questions that any of you would like to make before we
3	adjourn the afternoon session?
4	We have an evening session planned to
5	begin at seven.
6	MR. KUGLER: Seven with the open house.
7	MR. GRIMES: Seven p.m. with an open house
8	starting at six o'clock.
9	If there are no other comments or
10	questions, I thank all of you very much for attending.
11	We appreciate your participation.
12	This meeting is adjourned.
13	(Whereupon, at 2:55 p.m., the public
14	meeting was concluded.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	