

J. Bernie Beasley, Jr., P.E.
Vice President
Vogtle Project

**Southern Nuclear
Operating Company, Inc.**
40 Inverness Center Parkway
P.O. Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Tel 205.992.7110
Fax 205.992.0403



Energy to Serve Your WorldSM
LCV-1533

April 27, 2001

Docket Nos. 50-424
50-425

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ATTN: Document Control Desk
Washington, D. C. 20555

VOGTLE ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT
2000 ANNUAL ENVIRONMENTAL OPERATING REPORT

Gentlemen:

In accordance with subsection 5.4.1 of the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant Environmental Protection Plan, Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNC) hereby submits the Annual Environmental Operating Report for 2000.

If you have any questions, please advise.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. B. Beasley, Jr." with a stylized flourish at the end.

J. B. Beasley, Jr.

JBB/JLL

Enclosure: 2000 Annual Environmental Operating Report (Nonradiological)

IE25
11

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
LCV-1533
Page 2

Xc: Southern Nuclear Operating Company
Mr. J. T. Gasser
Mr. M. Sheibani
SNC Document Management

Georgia Power Company
Mr. M. C. Nichols

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Mr. L. A. Reyes, Regional Administrator
Mr. R. R. Assa, Project Manager, NRR
Mr. J. Zeiler, Senior Resident Inspector, Vogtle

State of Georgia
Mr. J. L. Setser, DNR

VOGTLE ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT - UNITS 1 AND 2
NRC DOCKET NOS. 50-424 AND 50-425
FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NOS. NPF-68 AND NPF-81

2000 ANNUAL ENVIRONMENTAL OPERATING REPORT
(NONRADIOLOGICAL)

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with Subsection 5.4.1 of the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP) Environmental Protection Plan (Nonradiological), Appendix B to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-68 and NPF-81, this report is submitted describing implementation of the Environmental Protection Plan for the calendar year 2000.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

- A. Summaries and Analyses of Results of Environmental Monitoring Activities for the Reporting Period in Accordance with Environmental Protection Plan (EPP) Subsection 4.2
1. Aquatic Monitoring - Liquid effluent monitoring was performed in accordance with State of Georgia National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit GA0026786; there was no additional requirement for aquatic monitoring during 2000.
 2. Terrestrial Monitoring - Terrestrial monitoring is not required.
 3. Maintenance of Transmission Line Corridors
 - a. An EPA-registered and State-approved herbicide was applied to areas inaccessible by conventional mowers on the VEGP-Thalman and VEGP-Wadley lines.
 - b. Danger tree trimming was performed on the VEGP-Thalman, VEGP-Scherer, and VEGP-Wadley lines.
 - c. The VEGP-Goshen line was mowed, and an EPA-registered and State-approved herbicide was applied as a cut stump treatment.
 - d. All routine maintenance activities within the designated cultural properties located along the transmission line corridor were conducted in accordance with the Final Cultural Resources Management Plan. This plan was developed in conjunction with the Georgia Historic Preservation Officer.
 4. Noise Monitoring - There were no complaints received by Southern Nuclear Operating Company during 2000 regarding noise along the VEGP-related, high-voltage transmission lines.

B. Comparison of the 2000 Monitoring Activities with Preoperational Studies, Operational Controls, and Previous Monitoring Reports

These programs were not required because no nonradiological environmental monitoring programs were conducted during the reporting period beyond those performed in accordance with NPDES Permit No. GA0026786 referenced in Section A above.

C. Assessment of the Observed Impacts of Plant Operation on the Environment

There were no significant adverse environmental impacts associated with plant operation during 2000.

D. EPP Noncompliance and Corrective Actions

There were no EPP noncompliances during 2000.

E. Changes in Station Design or Operation, Tests, or Experiments Made in Accordance with EPP Subsection 3.1 Which Involved a Potentially Significant Unreviewed Environmental Question

There were no changes in station design or operation, tests, or experiments in 2000 which involved a potentially significant unreviewed environmental question.

F. Nonroutine Reports Submitted in Accordance with EPP Section 5.4.2

There were no non-routine reports submitted in 2000.