

JAN 30 1979

Docket No. 50-395

Mr. E. C. Crews, Jr.
Vice President and Group Executive
Engineering and Construction
South Carolina Electric and Gas Company
P. O. Box 764
Columbia, South Carolina 29218

Dear Mr. Crews:

SUBJECT: ORDER EXTENDING CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION DATE
(Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station)

In response to your letters of December 10, 1976 and January 14 and February 2, 1977, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued an Order extending the construction completion date for the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station. The referenced Order extends the construction completion date specified in CPPR-94 of January 1, 1978, to December 31, 1980.

A copy of the Order, the staff safety evaluation, negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal are enclosed for your information. The Order and the negative declaration have been transmitted to the Office of the Federal Register for publication.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:
Roger S. Boyd

Roger S. Boyd, Director
Division of Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:
As Stated

ccs w/enclosures:
See page 2

7902270424

OELD SJ
S. GLOBERG
1/23/79

AGD
CP

OFFICE	DPM: LWR #2	DPM: LWR #2	DPM: LWR #2	DPM: LWR: AD	DD: DPM	DPM
SURNAME	JLee	DLTibbitts	RLBaer	DBVassallo	DFRoss	RSBoyd
DATE	1/22/79	1/22/79	1/22/79	1/27/79	1/17/79	1/15/79

Mr. E. H. Crews, Jr.

- 2 -

JAN 30 1979

cc: Mr. H. T. Babb, General Manager
South Carolina Electric & Gas Company
P. O. Box 764
Columbia, South Carolina 29218

G. H. Fischer, Esq.
Vice President & General Counsel
South Carolina Electric & Gas Company
P. O. Box 764
Columbia, South Carolina 29218

Mr. William C. Mescher
President & Chief Executive
South Carolina Public Service Authority
223 North Live Oak Drive
Moncks Corner, South Carolina 29461

Mr. William A. Williams, Jr.
Executive Assistant to the General Manager
South Carolina Public Service Authority
223 North Live Oak Drive
Moncks Corner, South Carolina 29461

Wallace S. Murphy, Esq.
General Counsel
South Carolina Public Service Authority
223 North Live Oak Drive
Moncks Corner, South Carolina 29461

Troy B. Conner, Jr., Esq.
Conner, Moore & Corber
1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Mr. Mark B. Whitaker, Jr.
Licensing and Staff Engineer
South Carolina Electric & Gas Company
P. O. Box 764
Columbia, South Carolina 29218

Mr. O. W. Dixon
Group Manager, Production Engineering
South Carolina Electric & Gas Company
P. O. Box 764
Columbia, South Carolina 29218

Mr. E. H. Crews, Jr.

- 3 -

JAN 30 1979

cc: Mr. Brett Allen Bursey
Route 1 Box 93C
Little Mountain, South Carolina 29076

State Clearinghouse
Office of the Governor
Division of Administration
1205 Pendleton Street
4th Floor
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Dr. Lamar Priester, Jr.
Deputy Commission for Environmental
Health and Safety
South Carolina Department of Health
and Environmental Control
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Chairman
Fairfield County Council
P. O. Box 293
Winnsboro, South Carolina 29180

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
ATTN: EIS Coordinator
Region IV Office
345 Courtland Street, N. E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY AND
SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC SERVICE AUTHORITY

VIRGIL C. SUMMER NUCLEAR STATION

DOCKET NO. 50-395

ORDER EXTENDING CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION DATE

South Carolina Electric and Gas Company and South Carolina Public Service Authority are the holders of Construction Permit No. CPPR-94 issued by the Atomic Energy Commission* on March 21, 1973 for the construction of the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station presently under construction at the company's site in Fairfield County, South Carolina. By letters dated December 10, 1976 and January 14 and February 2, 1977, the permittees filed requests for an extension of the latest construction completion date for the facility from January 1, 1978 to December 31, 1980, because construction has been delayed due to (1) the change in the design of the reactor vessel support system coupled with a delay in fabrication of the embedments for the reactor vessel support system; (2) delay due to the discovery of a shear fracture zone at the site and attendant evaluation; (3) delay caused by discovery of voids in the concrete liner behind containment liner plates and attendant evaluation and corrective action; (4) redesign of the restraint system required to mitigate high energy pipe break; (5) delays due to procurement of certain critical materials required for the main steam isolation valves, component cooling water pumps and motors, service water pumps and motors, and steel for the reactor building liner; and (6) delay in completion of additional geologic contour mapping required for seismic analysis.

7902270426

OFFICE	Effective January 20, 1975, the Atomic Energy Commission became the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and permits in effect on that day continued under the authority of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
SURNAME	
DATE	

This action involves no significant hazards consideration, good cause has been shown for the delay, and the requested extension is for a reasonable period, the bases for which are set forth in the staff evaluation dated January 30, 1979. The preparation of an environmental impact statement for this particular action is not warranted because there will be no environmental impact attributable to the Order other than that which has already been predicted and described in the Commission's Final Environmental Statement for the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, published in January 1973 and the Draft Environmental Statement published in September 1972. A negative Declaration and an Environmental Impact Appraisal have been prepared and are available, as are the above stated documents, for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20555 and at the local public document room established for the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station in the Richland County Public Library, 1400 Sumter Street, Columbia, South Carolina 29201.

It is HEREBY ORDERED THAT the latest completion date for CPPR-94 be extended from January 1, 1978 to December 31, 1980.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION,
 Original signed by:
 Roger S. Boyd
 Roger S. Boyd, Director
 Division of Project Management
 Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

DATE OF ISSUANCE: January 30, 1979

OELD
 5: 60-20000
 1/23/79

OFFICE	DPM:LWR #2	DPM:LWR #2	DPM:LWR #2	DPM:LWR:AD	DPM:DD	DPM
SURNAME	JLee:ab	DT ^{DET} Robbitts	RLBaer ^{RFB}	DBVassallo ^{PCV}	DFRoss	RSBoyd
DATE	1/18/79	1/18/79	1/22/79	1/29/79	1/179	1/30/79

EVALUATION OF REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF
CONSTRUCTION PERMIT NO. CPPR-94
FOR THE VIRGIL C. SUMMER NUCLEAR STATION
DOCKET NO. 50-395

A. INTRODUCTION

South Carolina Electric and Gas Company and South Carolina Public Service Authority (the permittees) are the holders of Construction Permit No. CPPR-94 issued by the Atomic Energy Commission on March 21, 1973 for construction of the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1. The plant is presently under construction at the permittees' site located in Fairfield County, South Carolina approximately 26 miles north of Columbia, South Carolina. In accordance with Section 185 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, 42 U. S. C. Section 2235, and in accordance with the Commission's regulations, 10 CFR Section 50.55, the Construction Permit states the earliest and latest dates for the completion of construction. By letter dated December 10, 1976, the permittees advised the NRC staff that construction could not be completed by the latest date presently specified, namely January 1, 1978.

The permittees have therefore requested in a letter dated January 14, 1977 that the Construction Permit be extended to December 31, 1980. In accordance with 10 CFR Section 50.55 (b), the staff, having found good cause shown, and for the reasons stated below, is extending the latest completion date to December 31, 1980.

This evaluation contains the following Sections: Section B, the specification of "good cause" shown by the permittees for an extension, i.e., the specific delays which the permittees have cited in support of their request for an extension; Section C, the staff's independent judgment as to the "reasonable time" necessary from the present forward to compensate for each factor of delay; Section D, a finding as to significant hazards consideration; and Section E, a conclusion and recommendation for an Order.

B. SPECIFIED DELAYS

1. Reactor Vessel Support System

When the design of the reactor vessel support system was approximately 60 percent complete, the permittees began an extensive redesign of the support for the reactor vessel. The redesign was necessitated by new design parameters for a postulated reactor coolant pipe rupture in the reactor cavity. The permittees estimated that the redesign and an additional delay in the procurement of components for the reactor vessel support system has resulted in approximately 16 months in delay.

7902270432

OFFICE >						
SURNAME >						
DATE >						

2. Geological Faults

A shear fracture zone was discovered in the excavation for the reactor building on November 26, 1973. At that time all structural work was halted. Work was not resumed until February 15, 1974 when the staff concluded that none of the fracture zones exposed in the excavation were capable faults. The permittees stated that the work stoppage resulted in a total loss of approximately five months on the completion of the reactor building base mat.

3. Containment Liner Voids

In November 1975, voids in the concrete lines were discovered behind the reactor building containment plates. All work on the reactor building basement floor was suspended while the permittees undertook a study to identify, locate and determine the size of the voids. Project work resumed in February 1976; the total time lost was approximately three months.

4. Pipe Rupture Analysis

Following issuance of the construction permit the NRC (then AEC) developed additional criteria for the protection against postulated piping failures in high and moderate energy fluid systems outside of containment. To implement the new criteria, additional analytical requirements were imposed upon the project; the additional time required delayed the completion of the analytical work approximately ten months.

5. Delays in Procurement

The permittees stated that progress in the intermediate building and the reactor building was adversely affected for approximately 12 months due to difficulties in procuring safety-related components and materials. The permittees did not estimate the impact of the delay in procurement on the overall delay in completion of construction.

6. Additional Seismic Analysis

The permittees stated that a change in the design of the foundation for the control building resulted in the diversion of construction resources from the critical path items.

OFFICE >						
SURNAME >						
DATE >						

C. REASONABLE COMPENSATION TIME

For the following items we agree with the permittees on the contribution each delay had on the overall delay in completion of construction:

- (1) Reactor Vessel Support System - We are aware of the impact of the new design criteria that have been applied to the reactor vessel support system. The permittees prudently chose to re-design to meet these criteria even though the preliminary design on which the construction permit was based did not include these criteria. Since the erection of the reactor vessel is on the critical path, we conclude that 16 months toward overall delay can be reasonably attributed to the redesign of the reactor vessel support systems.
- (2) Geological Faults - We acknowledge that the length of time required to investigate the faults found in the excavation for the reactor building has contributed to the extension of the construction schedule. We conclude that approximately five months of overall delay can be reasonably attributed to this factor.
- (3) Containment Liner Voids - We concur with the permittees that the three month interruption in the construction in the reactor building contributed three months to the overall delay of the project.

For the balance of items, we are unable to estimate each item's contribution to the overall delay of the completion of construction. However, we conclude that the combined effects of the items could contribute 12 months to the overall delay of the completion of construction. These items are:

- (1) Pipe Rupture Analysis - We find that the implementation of new criteria for postulated high energy line failures would require additional design effort for high and moderate energy systems. These criteria were not issued by the staff until after the construction permit was issued. However, we do not conclude that all of the ten month delay in completing the analytical effort can reasonably be regarded as contributing to an overall delay in the facility.
- (2) Delays in Procurement - We are aware that lack of basic material for pump castings and steel plate have caused late deliveries for critical materials and equipment. In addition, manufacturers producing valves meeting nuclear code requirements have been unable to meet scheduled delivery dates. However, we do not

conclude that all 12 months of the delay can reasonably be regarded as contributing to the overall delay.

OFFICE >

SURNAME >

DATE >

- (3) Additional Seismic Analysis - The permittees did not identify a specific length of time for the delay attributable to the change in the design of the control building foundation.

The permittees currently estimate that construction will be completed by July 1980; the total elapsed construction time would be 86 months. If the facility was completed by December 1980, the total elapsed construction time would be 93 months. The average construction time for first unit or single unit commercial pressurized water reactors scheduled to be completed in 1979 and 1980 is 92 months. In light of this and the above evaluation, a December 31, 1980 completion date for this facility is reasonable.

D. SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION

We find that because the request is merely for an extension of time to complete work already reviewed and approved, no significant hazard consideration is involved in granting the request, thus prior notice of this action is not required.

E. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

For the reasons stated herein, the staff concludes that issuance of an Order extending the latest construction completion date for construction of the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Construction Permit No. CPPR-94, to December 31, 1980 is reasonable and so orders.

Original Signed by

Dean L. Tibbitts, Project Manager
 Light Water Reactors
 Branch No. 2
 Division of Project Management

Original signed by
 Robert L. Baer

Robert L. Baer, Chief
 Light Water Reactors
 Branch No. 2
 Division of Project Management

Dated: January 30, 1979

OFFICE	DPM:LWR#2	DPM:LWR#2	OELD		
SURNAME	D.L. Tibbitts:ab	R. Baer	S. GILBERT		
DATE	1/19/79	1/22/79	1/23/79		

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

SUPPORTING: EXTENSION OF CONSTRUCTION PERMIT NO. CPPR-94

EXPIRATION DATE FOR THE

VIRGIL C. SUMMER NUCLEAR STATION

DOCKET NO. 50-395

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has reviewed the South Carolina Electric & Gas Company and the South Carolina Public Service Authority (permittees) request to extend the expiration date of the construction permit for the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station (CPPR-44) which is located near Columbia in Fairfield County, South Carolina. The permittees requested an extension of the permit to December 31, 1980 to allow for a reasonable period for completion of construction of the Virgil C. Summer plant, and further allowance for contingencies.

The Commission's Division of Site Safety and Environmental Analysis (staff) has prepared an environmental impact appraisal relative to this change to CPPR-94. Based upon this appraisal, the staff has concluded that an environmental impact statement for this particular action is not warranted because pursuant to the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR Part 51 and the Council of Environmental Quality's Guidelines, 40 CFR 1500.6, the Commission has determined that this change to the construction permit is not a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

7902270432

OFFICE >						
SURNAME >						
DATE >						

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT APPRAISAL

BY THE DIVISION OF SITE SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

SUPPORTING EXTENSION OF CONSTRUCTION PERMIT CPPR-94

VIRGIL C. SUMMER NUCLEAR STATION

DOCKET NO. 50-395

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT APPRAISAL

Description of Proposed Action

By letters dated December 10, 1976 and January 14, 1977 the applicants, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company and South Carolina Public Service Authority, filed a request with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to extend the completion date specified in Construction Permit No. CPPR-94 for the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station. The action proposed is the issuance of an order providing for an extension of the latest completion date of the construction permit from January 1, 1978 to December 31, 1980.

The staff's Final Environmental Statement relating to the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station which was published in January 1973 determined a demonstrated need for power and assumed commercial operation of the facility within the year-period 1977 to 1979. The original completion date as given in Construction Permit CPPR-94 for completion of construction of the project was January 1, 1978.

The permittees now plan to have the proposed unit in commercial operation by December 31, 1980. The permittees attribute the present delay to construction factors outside the permittees' control, including design modifications due to regulatory review and recognized improved engineering practices. The revised completion date reflects a reasonable period for allowance of uncertainties in time estimation for completion of the project.

Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action

A. Need for Power

7902270439

The permittees are now scheduled to complete construction and begin operation of the facility by December 31, 1980 and will have a net

OFFICE >						
SURNAME >						
DATE >						

electrical output of 900 MWe. The staff has reassessed the need for the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station with respect to its planned operation in 1980.

First, the staff finds the power estimates and projections contained in the Final Environmental Statement issued in January 1973 not to be significantly changed in view of present prediction technology, and continuing uncertainties as to national energy policies and conservation practices.

In contrast, the staff finds very significant consequences to be the possible result of construction delay. These include:

1. Reduced reserve margins of South Carolina Electric & Gas Company and South Carolina Public Service Authority in meeting summer peak loads. This will result in an extended reliance upon more obsolete and inefficient turbine peaking equipment that would otherwise be retired if the nuclear station were to be operational at the earlier date. Added expense and material utilization would result from increased use of fossil fuels. South Carolina Electric & Gas Company reports that in order to maintain reserve criteria for 1979, it has committed 60 megawatts capacity to the South Carolina Public Service Authority. The presently proposed delay (and particularly beyond the peak period of 1980) would further accentuate the power reserve capacity needs of the South Carolina Public Service Authority.
2. Lowering of reserve margin available in maintaining the Southeastern Electric Reliability Councils, Virginia-Carolina Subregion (VACAR) and on adverse effect on the national and regional fuel conservation policy.

In accord with the VACAR Reliability Agreement among member companies, member companies may request power capacity for emergency needs. No contractual reserve margin responsibility presently exists within the VACAR subregion, thereby accentuating the need for the plant in maintaining the VACAR reserve margin and overall reliability of power service to the subregion.

B. Social and Economic Impacts

The Final Environmental Statement for the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station issued in January 1973 includes an assessment of

OFFICE >						
SURNAME >						
DATE >						

potential environmental, economic and community impacts due to site preparation and plant construction. The only environmental impacts possibly resulting from the requested extension would be those due to transposing the impacts in time or extending the total time the regional community is subjected to temporary construction impacts. The staff concludes that environmental impacts associated with construction of the plant and described in the FES, i.e., housing, school facilities, and transportation are not affected by the proposed extension.

The remote location of the construction site results in the commuting of essentially the entire work force from larger towns in the region, such as Columbia and Greenville. The utility is disposed to maintain a reasonable continuity of work force which will have little or no economic impact on the local community or the larger nearby cities in terms of overall employment and aggregate tax revenues and expenses. Minor and temporary effects due to direct construction activities will be extended over the delayed construction period, however, no ill effects would be expected of significance with the mandated control procedures set forth in the Final Environmental Statement for the construction stage.

No significant change in socio-economic impact is expected to result from the requested extension of the term of the Construction Permit.

Summary, Conclusion and Basis for Negative Declaration

The NRC staff has reviewed the total environmental affects which may result from the requested extension by the applicant of the latest completion date of the existing construction permit for the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station.

The permittees, because of design modifications and regulatory review beyond its control, has requested extension of the Construction Permit from January 1, 1978 to December 31, 1980. The staff in conducting its assessment has concentrated principally upon possible impacts due to need for power and socio-economic considerations as these factors are judged to be of most relevance and importance in assessing any effects of plant delay.

On the basis of the foregoing analysis and the NRC staff evaluation, it is concluded that there will be no environmental impact attributable

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						

to the proposed action other than that already predicted and described in the Commission's FES issued in January 1973 and the Board's Initial Decision of March 19, 1973. Having made this conclusion, the Commission has further concluded that no environmental impact statement for the proposed action need be prepared, and that a negative declaration to this effect is appropriate. The subject change to the construction permit is judged not to be a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

Dated: January 30, 1979

See previous yellow

OFFICE	DSE:EP-1	DSE:EP-1	OELD	DSE:EP-1		
SURNAME	MSlater:aj	RWatkins		RBallard		
DATE	1/26/79	1/ /79	1/ /79	1/ /79		

Bond

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

SUPPORTING: EXTENSION OF CONSTRUCTION PERMIT NO. CPPR-94

EXPIRATION DATE FOR THE

VIRGIL C. SUMMER NUCLEAR STATION

DOCKET NO. 50-395

and the South Carolina Public Service Authority

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has reviewed the South Carolina Electric & Gas Company's (permittee) request to extend the expiration date of the construction permit for the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station (CPPR-44) which is located near Columbia in Fairfield County, South Carolina. The permittee requested an extension of the permit to December 31, 1980 to allow for a reasonable period for completion of construction of the Virgil C. Summer plant, and further allowance for contingencies.

The Commission's Division of Site Safety and Environmental Analysis (staff) has prepared an environmental impact appraisal relative to this change to CPPR-94. Based upon this appraisal, the staff has concluded that an environmental impact statement for this particular action is not warranted because pursuant to the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR Part 51 and the Council of Environmental Quality's Guidelines, 40 CFR 1500.6, the Commission has determined that this change to the construction permit is not a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

790227 0435

OFFICE >						
SURNAME >						
DATE >						

The environmental impact appraisal is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20555; and at the Richland County Public Library, 1400 Sumter Street, Columbia, South Carolina 29201.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this ^{30th} ~~6th~~ day of ^{January, 1979.} ~~July, 1978.~~

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

sl
Ronald L. Ballard, Chief
Environmental Projects Branch 1
Division of Site Safety and
Environmental Analysis

OFFICE >	DSE:EP-1	DSE:EP-1	OELD		
SURNAME >	RWatkins:mh	RLBallard	J. G. Wood		
DATE >	11/21/77/6/78	11/6/78	2/11/79		

Letterhead

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT APPRAISAL

BY THE DIVISION OF SITE SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

SUPPORTING EXTENSION OF CONSTRUCTION PERMIT CPPR-94

VIRGIL C. SUMMER NUCLEAR STATION

DOCKET NO. 50-395

and South Carolina Public Service Authority

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT APPRAISAL

Description of Proposed Action

By letters dated December 10, 1976 and January 14, 1977 the applicant, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, filed a request with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to extend the completion date specified in Construction Permit No. CPPR-94 for the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station. The action proposed is the issuance of an order providing for an extension of the latest completion date of the construction permit from January 1, 1978 to December 31, 1980.

The staff's Final Environmental Statement relating to the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station which was published in January 1973 determined a demonstrated need for power and assumed commercial operation of the facility within the year-period 1977 to 1979. The original completion date as given in Construction Permit CPPR-94 for completion of construction of the project was January 1, 1978.

The applicant ^{permitees} now plans to have the proposed unit in commercial operation by December 31, 1980. ^{permitees} The applicant attributes the present delay to construction factors outside the applicant's control, including design modifications due to regulatory review and recognized improved engineering practices. The revised completion date reflects a reasonable period for allowance of uncertainties in time estimation for completion of the project.

permitees'

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						

Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action

A. Need for Power

The ^{permitees are} South Carolina Electric & Gas Company is now scheduled to complete construction and begin operation of the facility by December 31, 1980 and will have a net electrical output of 900 MWe. The staff has reassessed the need for the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station with respect to its planned operation in 1980.

First, the staff finds the power estimates and projections contained in the Final Environmental Statement issued in January 1973 not to be significantly changed in view of present prediction technology, and continuing uncertainties as to national energy policies and conservation practices.

In contrast, the staff finds very significant consequences to be the possible result of construction delay. These include:

1. Reduced reserve margins of South Carolina Electric & Gas Company and South Carolina Public Service Authority in meeting summer peak loads. This will result in an extended reliance upon more obsolete and inefficient turbine peaking equipment that would otherwise be retired if the nuclear station were to be operational at the earlier date. Added expense and material utilization would result from increased use of fossil fuels. ~~The Applicant~~ reports that in order to maintain reserve criteria for 1979, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company has committed 60 megawatts capacity to the South Carolina Public Service Authority. The presently proposed delay (and particularly beyond the peak period of 1980) would further accentuate the power reserve capacity needs of the South Carolina Public Service Authority.
2. Lowering of reserve margin available in maintaining the Southeastern Electric Reliability Councils, Virginia-Carolina Subregion (VACAR) and on adverse effect on the national and regional fuel conservation policy.

In accord with the VACAR Reliability Agreement among member companies, member companies may request power capacity for emergency needs. No contractual reserve margin responsibility presently exists within the VACAR subregion, thereby accentuating the need for the plant in maintaining the VACAR reserve margin and overall reliability of power service to the subregion.

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						

B. Social and Economic Impacts

The Final Environmental Statement for the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station issued in January 1973 includes an assessment of potential environmental, economic and community impacts due to site preparation and plant construction. The only environmental impacts possibly resulting from the requested extension would be those due to transposing the impacts in time or extending the total time the regional community is subjected to temporary construction impacts. The staff concludes that environmental impacts associated with construction of the plant and described in the FES, i.e., housing, school facilities, and transportation are not affected by the proposed extension.

The remote location of the construction site results in the commuting of essentially the entire work force from larger towns in the region, such as Columbia and Greenville. The utility is disposed to maintain a reasonable continuity of work force which will have little or no economic impact on the local community or the larger nearby cities in terms of overall employment and aggregate tax revenues and expenses. Minor and temporary effects due to direct construction activities will be extended over the delayed construction period, however, no ill effects would be expected of significance with the mandated control procedures set forth in the Final Environmental Statement for the construction stage.

No significant change in socio-economic impact is expected to result from the requested extension of the term of the Construction Permit.

Summary, Conclusion and Basis for Negative Declaration

The NRC staff has reviewed the total environmental affects which may result from the requested extension by the applicant of the latest completion date of the existing construction permit for the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station.

^{permitters)}
The applicant because of design modifications and regulatory review beyond its control, has requested extension of the Construction Permit from January 1, 1978 to December 31, 1980. The staff in conducting its assessment has concentrated principally upon possible impacts due to need for power and socio-economic considerations as these factors are judged to be of most relevance and importance in assessing any effects of plant delay.

OFFICE >						
SURNAME >						
DATE >						

On the basis of the foregoing analysis and the NRC staff evaluation, it is concluded that there will be no environmental impact attributable to the proposed action other than that already predicted and described in the Commission's FES issued in January 1973 and the Board's Initial Decision of March 19, 1973. Having made this conclusion, the Commission has further concluded that no environmental impact statement for the proposed action need be prepared, and that a negative declaration to this effect is appropriate. The subject change to the construction permit is judged not to be a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

~~JUL 6 1978~~

OFFICE >	DSE-EP-1	DSE-EP-1	OELD		
SURNAME >	R Watkins <i>RW</i>	R Ballard <i>RL Ballard</i>	S. C. SOBERG <i>S. C. SOBERG</i>		
DATE >	11/3/78 <i>11/3/78</i>	1/16/78	1/17/78 <i>2-16-78</i>		