

PMBeCOL PEmails

From: Bryce, Robert W [rw.bryce@pnl.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 28, 2007 5:51 PM
To: Mallecia Hood
Cc: 'Beverly M Miller'
Subject: ssummary of discussion
Attachments: November 28 telcon summary1.doc

Mallecia - here is a draft of the meeting summary

Bob

Hearing Identifier: Bellefonte_COL_Public_EX
Email Number: 210

Mail Envelope Properties (D841D501B2C4D244B75AB897F70C1494251E37679D)

Subject: ssummary of discussion
Sent Date: 11/28/2007 5:51:14 PM
Received Date: 11/28/2007 5:51:14 PM
From: Bryce, Robert W

Created By: rw.bryce@pnl.gov

Recipients:
"Beverly M Miller" <Beverly.Miller@pnl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Mallecia Hood" <Mallecia.Hood@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	57	11/28/2007 5:51:14 PM
November 28 telcon summary1.doc		31296

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

On November 28, 2007, PNNL staff participated in a telephone conference between the NRC and TVA on the status of the acceptance review of the TVA's application to construct and operate Units 3 and 4 at the Bellefonte Nuclear Power Plant facility near Scottsboro, Alabama. PNNL staff were asked to summarize their findings to date. I provided the following overview of our review:

PNNL is still in the early stages of our review so these are preliminary observations. No issues have been identified that appear to have a severe impact on the schedule for completion of the application review.

Observations about the Environmental Report

- The ER includes limited information on the cumulative impacts associated with this project and other activities in the region. This may be especially problematic in the area of socioeconomic impacts and what other activities in the area might also have an impact on infrastructure and resources.
- Inconsistencies exist within some sections and between sections of the document and the summary information included in Chapter 10. For example housing impact is identified as moderate to large on page 4.4-11 but small to moderate on page 10.1-3
- Information supporting the need for power is less than was expected. The tables in chapter 8 (Table 8.3 for example) that would contain this information are blank.
- The ER lacks a full and detailed analysis of transportation impacts. The applicant correctly determined that for irradiated fuel, the reactor and fuel parameters exceed the 10 CFR 51.52(a) conditions. However, they did not perform a "full and detailed analysis of transportation impacts" as required if the reactor, fuel, and waste parameters exceed these conditions. Rather, they referred to generic analyses that support re-licensing of current generation LWRs (NUREG-1437) and concluded the impacts are bounded by Table S-4. For other recent EIS's for applications using the AP1000 design (e.g. Vogtle) NRC has required a detailed transportation impact analysis, but one was not included in the ER.
- There are issues related to the description of ecological monitoring. Ecological impacts of modifying the barge slip and intake canal are not identified and additional detail on ecological monitoring in the reservoir are needed.
- There are issues related to the alternative site evaluation process. The site selection process seemed to be based on documents from the 1970's, with no real indication that an updated analysis had been completed.
- The application references revision 16 of the Design Control Document (DCD) for the AP1000 reactor. Staff is concerned about the timing of the approval of this design revision.

We reiterated that not all PNNL staff have progressed to the same point within the sufficiency review phase of the process, therefore, the information provided in the meeting is only intended as a very preliminary status of staff's findings.