

# Abstract

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) considered the environmental impacts of renewing nuclear power plant operating licenses (OLs) for a 20-year period in its *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants* (GEIS), NUREG-1437, Volumes 1 and 2, and codified the results in 10 CFR Part 51. The GEIS (and its Addendum 1) identifies 92 environmental issues and reaches generic conclusions related to environmental impacts for 69 of these issues that apply to all plants or to plants with specific design or site characteristics. Additional plant-specific review is required for the remaining 23 issues. These plant-specific reviews are to be included in a supplement to the GEIS.

This Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) has been prepared in response to an application submitted to the NRC by the Virginia Electric and Power Company (VEPCo) to renew the OLs for Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2, for an additional 20 years under 10 CFR Part 54. This SEIS includes the NRC staff's analysis that considers and weighs the environmental impacts of the proposed action, the environmental impacts of alternatives to the proposed action, and mitigation measures available for reducing or avoiding adverse impacts. It also includes the staff's recommendation regarding the proposed action.

Regarding the 69 issues for which the GEIS reached generic conclusions, neither VEPCo nor the staff has identified information that is both new and significant for any of these issues that apply to Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2. In addition, the staff determined that information provided during the scoping process did not call into question the conclusions in the GEIS. Therefore, the staff concludes that the impacts of renewing the Surry Power Station OLs will not be greater than impacts identified for these issues in the GEIS. For each of these issues, the GEIS conclusion is that the impact is of SMALL<sup>(a)</sup> significance (except for collective offsite radiological impacts from the fuel cycle and from high-level waste and spent fuel, which were not assigned single significance levels).

Regarding the remaining 23 issues, those that apply to Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2, are addressed in this SEIS. For each applicable issue, the staff concludes that the significance of the potential environmental impacts of renewal of the OLs is SMALL. The staff also concludes that additional mitigation measures are not likely to be sufficiently beneficial as to be warranted. The staff determined that information provided during the scoping process did not identify any new issue that has a significant environmental impact.

The NRC staff's recommendation is that the Commission determine that the adverse environmental impacts of license renewal for Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2, are not so

---

(a) Environmental effects are not detectable or are so minor that they will neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource.

## Abstract

great that preserving the option of license renewal for energy-planning decisionmakers would be unreasonable. This recommendation is based on (1) the analysis and findings in the GEIS; (2) the Environmental Report submitted by VEPCo; (3) consultation with Federal, State, and local agencies; (4) the staff's own independent review; and (5) the staff's consideration of public comments.

# Contents

Abstract .....	iii
Executive Summary .....	xv
Abbreviations/Acronyms .....	xxi
1.0 Introduction .....	1-1
1.1 Report Contents .....	1-2
1.2 Background .....	1-3
1.2.1 Generic Environmental Impact Statement .....	1-3
1.2.2 License Renewal Evaluation Process .....	1-4
1.3 The Proposed Federal Action .....	1-7
1.4 The Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action .....	1-8
1.5 Compliance and Consultations .....	1-8
1.6 References .....	1-10
2.0 Description of Nuclear Power Plant and Site and Plant Interaction with the Environment .....	2-1
2.1 Plant and Site Description and Proposed Plant Operation During the Renewal Term .....	2-1
2.1.1 External Appearance and Setting .....	2-4
2.1.2 Reactor Systems .....	2-4
2.1.3 Cooling and Auxiliary Water Systems .....	2-7
2.1.4 Radioactive Waste Management Systems and Effluent Control Systems .....	2-8
2.1.4.1 Liquid Waste Processing Systems and Effluent Controls ...	2-10
2.1.4.2 Gaseous Waste Processing Systems and Effluent Controls .....	2-11
2.1.4.3 Solid Waste Processing .....	2-12
2.1.5 Nonradioactive Waste Systems .....	2-13
2.1.6 Plant Operation and Maintenance .....	2-13
2.1.7 Power Transmission System .....	2-14

## Contents

2.2	Plant Interaction with the Environment .....	2-17
2.2.1	Land Use .....	2-17
2.2.2	Water Use .....	2-17
2.2.3	Water Quality .....	2-18
2.2.4	Air Quality .....	2-19
2.2.5	Aquatic Resources .....	2-20
2.2.6	Terrestrial Resources .....	2-22
2.2.7	Radiological Impacts .....	2-25
2.2.8	Socioeconomic Factors .....	2-26
2.2.8.1	Housing .....	2-26
2.2.8.2	Public Services .....	2-28
2.2.8.3	Offsite Land Use .....	2-33
2.2.8.4	Visual Aesthetics and Noise .....	2-34
2.2.8.5	Demography .....	2-34
2.2.8.6	Economy .....	2-38
2.2.9	Historic and Archaeological Resources .....	2-40
2.2.9.1	Cultural Background .....	2-40
2.2.9.2	Historic and Archaeological Resources at Surry Power Station .....	2-42
2.2.10	Related Federal Project Activities and Consultations .....	2-44
2.3	References .....	2-45
3.0	Environmental Impacts of Refurbishment .....	3-1
3.1	References .....	3-4
4.0	Environmental Impacts of Operation .....	4-1
4.1	Cooling System .....	4-2
4.1.1	Entrainment of Fish and Shellfish in Early Life Stages .....	4-10
4.1.2	Impingement of Fish and Shellfish .....	4-12
4.1.3	Heat Shock .....	4-14

4.2	Transmission Lines .....	4-16
4.2.1	Electromagnetic Fields—Acute Effects .....	4-19
4.2.2	Electromagnetic Fields—Chronic Effects .....	4-20
4.3	Radiological Impacts of Normal Operations .....	4-21
4.4	Socioeconomic Impacts of Plant Operations During the License Renewal Term .....	4-22
4.4.1	Housing Impacts During Operations .....	4-24
4.4.2	Public Services: Public Utility Impacts During Operations .....	4-27
4.4.3	Offsite Land Use During Operations .....	4-28
4.4.4	Public Services: Transportation Impacts During Operations .....	4-29
4.4.5	Historic and Archaeological Resources .....	4-30
4.4.6	Environmental Justice .....	4-32
4.5	Groundwater Use and Quality .....	4-36
4.5.1	Groundwater Use Conflicts (Plants that Use >100 gpm) .....	4-37
4.6	Threatened or Endangered Species .....	4-38
4.6.1	Aquatic Species .....	4-38
4.6.2	Terrestrial Species .....	4-39
4.7	Evaluation of Potential New and Significant Information on Impacts of Operations During the Renewal Term .....	4-40
4.8	Summary of Impacts of Operations During the Renewal Term .....	4-40
4.9	References .....	4-41
5.0	Environmental Impacts of Postulated Accidents .....	5-1
5.1	Postulated Plant Accidents .....	5-1
5.1.1	Design-Basis Accidents .....	5-2
5.1.2	Severe Accidents .....	5-3
5.2	Severe Accident Mitigation Alternatives .....	5-4
5.2.1	Introduction .....	5-4
5.2.2	Estimate of Risk for Surry Power Station .....	5-5

## Contents

5.2.2.1	VEPCo's Risk Estimates . . . . .	5-5
5.2.2.2	Review of VEPCo's Risk Estimates . . . . .	5-7
5.2.3	Potential Design Improvements . . . . .	5-12
5.2.3.1	Process for Identifying Potential Design Improvements . . . . .	5-12
5.2.3.2	Staff Evaluation . . . . .	5-13
5.2.4	Risk Reduction Potential of Design Improvements . . . . .	5-15
5.2.5	Cost Impacts of Candidate Design Improvements . . . . .	5-15
5.2.6	Cost-Benefit Comparison . . . . .	5-23
5.2.6.1	VEPCo Evaluation . . . . .	5-23
5.2.6.2	Staff Evaluation . . . . .	5-26
5.2.7	Conclusions . . . . .	5-28
5.3	References . . . . .	5-29
6.0	Environmental Impacts of the Uranium Fuel Cycle and Solid Waste Management . . . . .	6-1
6.1	The Uranium Fuel Cycle . . . . .	6-2
6.2	References . . . . .	6-9
7.0	Environmental Impacts of Decommissioning . . . . .	7-1
7.1	References . . . . .	7-4
8.0	Environmental Impacts of Alternatives to Operating License Renewal . . . . .	8-1
8.1	No-Action Alternative . . . . .	8-1
8.2	Alternative Energy Sources . . . . .	8-4
8.2.1	Coal-Fired Generation . . . . .	8-6
8.2.1.1	Once-Through Cooling System . . . . .	8-7
8.2.1.2	Closed-Cycle Cooling System . . . . .	8-21
8.2.2	Natural Gas-Fired Generation . . . . .	8-21

8.2.2.1	Once-Through Cooling System .....	8-23
8.2.2.2	Closed-Cycle Cooling System .....	8-31
8.2.3	Nuclear Power Generation .....	8-31
8.2.3.1	Once-Through Cooling System .....	8-33
8.2.3.2	Closed-Cycle Cooling System .....	8-40
8.2.4	Purchased Electrical Power .....	8-40
8.2.5	Other Alternatives .....	8-42
8.2.5.1	Oil-Fired Generation .....	8-42
8.2.5.2	Wind Power .....	8-42
8.2.5.3	Solar Power .....	8-42
8.2.5.4	Hydropower .....	8-43
8.2.5.5	Geothermal Energy .....	8-43
8.2.5.6	Wood Waste .....	8-44
8.2.5.7	Municipal Solid Waste .....	8-44
8.2.5.8	Other Biomass-Derived Fuels .....	8-45
8.2.5.9	Fuel Cells .....	8-45
8.2.5.10	Delayed Retirement .....	8-46
8.2.5.11	Utility-Sponsored Conservation .....	8-46
8.2.6	Combination of Alternatives .....	8-47
8.3	Summary of Alternatives Considered .....	8-47
8.4	References .....	8-50
9.0	Summary and Conclusions .....	9-1
9.1	Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action—License Renewal .....	9-4
9.1.1	Unavoidable Adverse Impacts .....	9-5
9.1.2	Irreversible or Irretrievable Resource Commitments .....	9-6
9.1.3	Short-Term Use Versus Long-Term Productivity .....	9-6
9.2	Relative Significance of the Environmental Impacts of License Renewal and Alternatives .....	9-7
9.3	Staff Conclusions and Recommendations .....	9-7
9.4	References .....	9-9

## Contents

Appendix A – Discussion of Comments Received on the Environmental Review . . . . .	A-1
Appendix B – Contributors to the Supplement . . . . .	B-1
Appendix C – Chronology of NRC Staff Environmental Review Correspondence Related to Virginia Electric and Power Company's Application for License Renewal of Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2 . . . . .	C-1
Appendix D – Organizations Contacted . . . . .	D-1
Appendix E – Virginia Electric and Power Company's Compliance Status and Consultation Correspondence . . . . .	E-1
Appendix F – GEIS Environmental Issues Not Applicable to Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2 . . . . .	F-1



# Figures

2-1	Location of Surry Power Station, 80-km (50-mi) Region .....	2-2
2-2	Location of Surry Power Station, 10-km (6-mi) Region .....	2-3
2-3	Site of Surry Power Station .....	2-5
2-4	Surry Power Station, Showing Locations of Reactors and Other Buildings .....	2-6
2-5	Transmission Lines Attributable to the Surry Power Station .....	2-15
2-6	Area Within 32-km (20-mi) Radius of Surry Power Station .....	2-32
4-1	Census 2000 Block Groups Identified as Meeting NRC Criteria for Minority Status in an 80-km (50-mi) Area Around Surry Power Station .....	4-34
4-2	Census 1990 Block Groups Identified as Meeting NRC Criteria for Low-Income Status in an 80-km (50-mi) Area Around Surry Power Station .....	4-35

# Tables

1-1	Federal, State, and Local Authorizations and Consultations . . . . .	1-9
2-1	Surry Power Station Transmission Line Corridors . . . . .	2-16
2-2	Aquatic Species Potentially Occurring in the Lower James River that are Listed Federally and by the Commonwealth of Virginia . . . . .	2-21
2-3	Federal- and State-Listed Terrestrial Species Potentially Occurring in Surry County and in Counties Crossed by Transmission Lines Associated with Surry Power Station . . . . .	2-24
2-4	Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Permanent Employee Residence by County/Independent City . . . . .	2-27
2-5	Housing Units and Housing Units Vacant (Available) by County During 1990 and 2000 . . . . .	2-28
2-6	Major Public Water Supply Systems in Isle of Wight, James City, and Surry Counties, and City of Newport News . . . . .	2-29
2-7	Population Distribution 1990 to 2030 Within 80 km (50 mi) of the Surry Power Station, Based on 1990 Census Data . . . . .	2-35
2-8	Estimated Populations and Annual Growth Rates in Isle of Wight, James City, and Surry Counties, and City of Newport News, 1980-2030, Based on 1990 Census Data . . . . .	2-36
2-9	Major Employment Facilities Within 16 km (10 mi) of the Surry Power Station . . .	2-37
2-10	Visitors to Major Events Within 16 km (10 mi) of the Surry Power Station . . . . .	2-37
2-11	Percent Unemployment, Individual Poverty, and Median Household Income for Surry, Isle of Wight, and James City Counties and City of Newport News . . . .	2-39
2-12	Property Tax Revenues Generated in Surry County by Surry Power Station and Surry County Operating Budgets, 1995-2001 . . . . .	2-39
3-1	Category 1 Issues for Refurbishment Evaluation . . . . .	3-2
3-2	Category 2 Issues for Refurbishment Evaluation . . . . .	3-3
4-1	Category 1 Issues Applicable to the Operation of the Surry Power Station Cooling System During the Renewal Term . . . . .	4-2
4-2	Category 2 Issues Applicable to the Operation of the Surry Power Station Cooling System During the Renewal Term . . . . .	4-9
4-3	Category 1 Issues Applicable to the Surry Power Station Transmission Lines During the Renewal Term . . . . .	4-17
4-4	Category 2 and Uncategorized Issues Applicable to the Surry Power Station Transmission Lines During the Renewal Term . . . . .	4-19
4-5	Category 1 Issues Applicable to Radiological Impacts of Normal Operations During the Renewal Term . . . . .	4-21

4-6	Category 1 Socioeconomic Issues Applicable to the Operation of the Surry Power Station During the Renewal Term .....	4-22
4-7	Environmental Justice and Category 2 Issues Applicable to Socioeconomics During the Renewal Term .....	4-24
4-8	Category 1 Issue Applicable to Groundwater Use and Quality During the Renewal Term .....	4-36
4-9	Category 2 Issue Applicable to Groundwater Use and Quality During the Renewal Term .....	4-37
4-10	Category 2 Issue Applicable to Threatened or Endangered Species During the Renewal Term .....	4-38
5-1	Category 1 Issue Applicable to Postulated Accidents During the Renewal Term .....	5-3
5-2	Category 2 Issue Applicable to Postulated Accidents During the Renewal Term .....	5-4
5-3	Surry Power Station Core Damage Frequency .....	5-6
5-4	Risk Profile for Surry Power Station .....	5-7
5-5	SAMA Cost/Benefit Screening Analysis .....	5-16
5-6	Surry Power Station SAMAs with Detailed Cost Estimates .....	5-22
6-1	Category 1 Issues Applicable to the Uranium Fuel Cycle and Solid Waste Management During the Renewal Term .....	6-2
7-1	Category 1 Issues Applicable to the Decommissioning of Surry Power Station Following the Renewal Term .....	7-2
8-1	Summary of Environmental Impacts of the No-Action Alternative .....	8-2
8-2	Summary of Environmental Impacts of Coal-Fired Generation at Surry Power Station and an Alternate Greenfield Site Using Once-Through Cooling .....	8-8
8-3	Summary of Environmental Impacts of Coal-Fired Generation at an Alternate Greenfield Site with Closed-Cycle Cooling System Utilizing Cooling Towers ....	8-22
8-4	Summary of Environmental Impacts of Natural Gas-Fired Generation at Surry Power Station and an Alternate Greenfield Site Using Once-Through Cooling .....	8-24
8-5	Summary of Environmental Impacts of Natural Gas-Fired Generation at an Alternate Greenfield Site with Closed-Cycle Cooling Utilizing Cooling Towers ...	8-32
8-6	Summary of Environmental Impacts of New Nuclear Generation at Surry Power Station and an Alternate Greenfield Site Using Once-Through Cooling ...	8-34
8-7	Summary of Environmental Impacts of a New Nuclear Power Plant Sited at an Alternate Greenfield Site with Closed-Cycle Cooling .....	8-41

## Tables

8-8	Summary of Environmental Impacts for an Assumed Combination of Generating and Acquisition Alternatives .....	8-48
9-1	Summary of Environmental Significance of License Renewal, the No-Action Alternative, and Alternative Methods of Generation .....	9-8
A-1	Individuals Providing Comments During Scoping Comment Period .....	A-2
A-2	Surry Power Station Units 1 and 2 SEIS Comment Log .....	A-13
E-1	Federal, State, Local, and Regional Licenses, Permits, Consultations, and Other Approvals for Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2 .....	E-2
F-1	GEIS Environmental Issues Not Applicable to Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2 .....	F-1

# Executive Summary

By letter dated May 29, 2001, the Virginia Electric and Power Company (VEPCo) submitted an application to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to renew the operating licenses (OLs) for Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2, for an additional 20-year period. If the OLs are renewed, State regulatory agencies and VEPCo will ultimately decide whether the plants will continue to operate based on factors such as the need for power or other matters within the State's jurisdiction or the purview of the owners. If the OLs are not renewed, then the plants must be shut down at or before the expiration dates of the current OLs, which are May 25, 2012, for Unit 1 and January 29, 2013, for Unit 2.

Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 USC 4321), directs that an environmental impact statement (EIS) is required for major Federal actions that significantly affect the quality of the human environment. The NRC has implemented Section 102 of NEPA in 10 CFR Part 51. Part 51 identifies licensing and regulatory actions that require an EIS. In 10 CFR 51.20(b)(2), the Commission requires preparation of an EIS or a supplement to an EIS for renewal of a reactor OL; 10 CFR 51.95(c) states that the EIS prepared at the OL renewal stage will be a supplement to the *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants* (GEIS), NUREG-1437, Volumes 1 and 2.<sup>(a)</sup>

Upon acceptance of the VEPCo application, the NRC began the environmental review process described in 10 CFR Part 51 by publishing a notice of intent to prepare an EIS and conduct scoping. The staff visited the Surry Power Station in September 2001 and held public scoping meetings on September 19, 2001, in Surry, Virginia. In preparing this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2, the staff reviewed the VEPCo Environmental Report (ER) and compared it to the GEIS; consulted with other agencies; conducted an independent review of the issues following the guidance set forth in NUREG-1555, Supplement 1, the *Standard Review Plans for Environmental Reviews for Nuclear Power Plants, Supplement 1: Operating License Renewal*; and considered the public comments received during the scoping process. The public comments received during the scoping process that were considered to be within the scope of the environmental review are provided in Appendix A, Part I, of this SEIS.

The staff prepared the draft SEIS and on April 26, 2002, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency published an associated Notice of Availability in the *Federal Register* (FR; 67 FR 20763). A 75-day comment period began on that date during which members of the public could comment on the preliminary results of the NRC staff's review.

---

(a) The GEIS was originally issued in 1996. Addendum 1 to the GEIS was issued in 1999. Hereafter, all references to the "GEIS" include the GEIS and its Addendum 1.

## Executive Summary

- | The staff held two public meetings in Surry, Virginia, on May 29, 2002, to describe the preliminary results of the NRC environmental review, answer questions, and provide members of the public with information to assist them in formulating comments on the draft SEIS. All of the comments received on the draft SEIS were considered by the staff in developing the final document and are presented in Appendix A, Part II of this SEIS.
- | This SEIS includes the NRC staff's analysis in which the staff considers and weighs the environmental effects of the proposed action, the environmental impacts of alternatives to the proposed action, and mitigation measures for reducing or avoiding adverse effects. It also includes the staff's recommendation regarding the proposed action.

The Commission has adopted the following statement of purpose and need for license renewal from the GEIS:

The purpose and need for the proposed action (renewal of an operating license) is to provide an option that allows for power generation capability beyond the term of a current nuclear power plant operating license to meet future system generating needs, as such needs may be determined by State, utility, and, where authorized, Federal (other than NRC) decisionmakers.

The goal of the staff's environmental review, as defined in 10 CFR 51.95(c)(4) and the GEIS, is to determine

...whether or not the adverse environmental impacts of license renewal are so great that preserving the option of license renewal for energy planning decisionmakers would be unreasonable.

Both the statement of purpose and need and the evaluation criterion implicitly acknowledge that there are factors, in addition to license renewal, that will ultimately determine whether an existing nuclear power plant continues to operate beyond the period of the current OL.

NRC regulations [10 CFR 51.95(c)(2)] contain the following statement regarding the content of SEISs prepared at the license renewal stage:

The supplemental environmental impact statement for license renewal is not required to include discussion of need for power or the economic costs and economic benefits of the proposed action or of alternatives to the proposed action except insofar as such benefits and costs are either essential for a determination regarding the inclusion of an alternative in the range of alternatives considered or relevant to mitigation. In addition, the supplemental environmental impact statement prepared at the license renewal stage need not discuss other issues not related to the environmental effects of the proposed

action and the alternatives, or any aspect of the storage of spent fuel for the facility within the scope of the generic determination in § 51.23(a) ["Temporary storage of spent fuel after cessation of reactor operation—generic determination of no significant environmental impact"] and in accordance with § 51.23(b).

The GEIS contains the results of a systematic evaluation of the consequences of renewing an OL and operating a nuclear power plant for an additional 20 years. It evaluates 92 environmental issues using the NRC's three-level standard of significance—SMALL, MODERATE, or LARGE—developed using the Council on Environmental Quality guidelines. The following definitions of the three significance levels are set forth in a footnote to Table B-1 of 10 CFR Part 51, Subpart A, Appendix B:

SMALL – Environmental effects are not detectable or are so minor that they will neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource.

MODERATE – Environmental effects are sufficient to alter noticeably, but not to destabilize, important attributes of the resource.

LARGE – Environmental effects are clearly noticeable and are sufficient to destabilize important attributes of the resource.

For 69 of the 92 issues considered in the GEIS, the analysis in the GEIS led to the following conclusions:

- (1) The environmental impacts associated with the issue have been determined to apply either to all plants or, for some issues, to plants having a specific type of cooling system or other specified plant or site characteristics.
- (2) A single significance level (i.e., SMALL, MODERATE, or LARGE) has been assigned to the impacts (except for collective offsite radiological impacts from the fuel cycle and from high-level waste and spent fuel disposal).
- (3) Mitigation of adverse impacts associated with the issue has been considered in the analysis, and it has been determined that additional plant-specific mitigation measures are not likely to be sufficiently beneficial to warrant implementation.

These 69 issues were identified in the GEIS as Category 1 issues. In the absence of new and significant information, the staff relied on conclusions as amplified by supporting information in the GEIS for issues designated as Category 1 in Table B-1 of 10 CFR Part 51, Subpart A, Appendix B.

## Executive Summary

Of the 23 issues that do not meet the criteria set forth above, 21 are classified as Category 2 issues requiring analysis in a plant-specific supplement to the GEIS. The remaining two issues, environmental justice and chronic effects of electromagnetic fields, were not categorized.

Environmental justice was not evaluated on a generic basis and must be addressed in a plant-specific supplement to the GEIS. Information on the chronic effects of electromagnetic fields was not conclusive at the time the GEIS was prepared.

| This SEIS documents the staff's evaluation of all 92 environmental issues considered in the GEIS. The staff considered the environmental impacts associated with alternatives to license renewal and compared the environmental impacts of license renewal and the alternatives. The alternatives to license renewal that were considered include the no-action alternative (not renewing the OLS for Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2) and alternative methods of power generation. Based on projections made by the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE's) Energy Information Administration (EIA), gas- and coal-fired generation appear to be the most likely power-generation alternatives if the power from Units 1 and 2 is replaced. These alternatives are evaluated assuming that the replacement power generation plant is located at either the Surry Power Station or some other unspecified alternate location.

VEPCo and the staff have established independent processes for identifying and evaluating the significance of any new information on the environmental impacts of license renewal. Neither VEPCo nor the staff has identified information that is both new and significant related to Category 1 issues that would call into question the conclusions in the GEIS. Similarly, neither  
| VEPCo nor the staff has identified any new issue applicable to Surry Power Station, Units 1  
| and 2, that has a significant environmental impact. These determinations include the  
| consideration of public comments. Therefore, the staff relies upon the conclusions of the GEIS  
for all of the Category 1 issues that are applicable to Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2.

VEPCo's license renewal application presents an analysis of the Category 2 issues that are applicable to Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2. The staff has reviewed the VEPCo analysis for each issue and has conducted an independent review of each issue. In addition, the staff has evaluated the two uncategorized issues, environmental justice and chronic effects from electromagnetic fields. Five Category 2 issues are not applicable because they are related to plant design features or site characteristics not found at Surry Power Station. Four Category 2  
| issues are not discussed in this SEIS because they are specifically related to refurbishment. VEPCo has stated that its evaluation of structures and components, as required by 10 CFR 54.21, did not identify any major plant refurbishment activities or modifications as necessary to support the continued operation of Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2, for the license renewal period. In addition, any replacement of components or additional inspection activities are within the bounds of normal plant component replacement, and therefore, are not expected to affect the environment outside of the bounds of the plant operations evaluated in



the *Final Environmental Statement Related to Operation of Surry Power Station Unit 1* and *Final Environmental Statement Related to Operation of Surry Power Station Unit 2*, issued by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission in 1972.

Twelve Category 2 issues related to operational impacts and postulated accidents during the renewal term, as well as environmental justice and chronic effects of electromagnetic fields, are discussed in detail in this SEIS. Five of the Category 2 issues and environmental justice apply to both refurbishment and to operation during the renewal term and are only discussed in this SEIS in relation to operation during the renewal term. For all 12 Category 2 issues and environmental justice, the staff concludes that the potential environmental effects are of SMALL significance in the context of the standards set forth in the GEIS. In addition, the staff determined that appropriate Federal health agencies have not reached a consensus on the existence of chronic adverse effects from electromagnetic fields. Therefore, no further evaluation of this issue is required. For severe accident mitigation alternatives (SAMAs), the staff concludes that a reasonable, comprehensive effort was made to identify and evaluate SAMAs. Based on its review of the SAMAs for Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2, and the plant improvements already made, the staff concludes that none of the candidate SAMAs are cost-beneficial.

Mitigation measures were considered for each Category 2 issue. Current measures to mitigate the environmental impacts of plant operation were found to be adequate, and no additional mitigation measures were deemed sufficiently beneficial to be warranted.

If the Surry Power Station OLs are not renewed and the units cease operation on or before the expiration of their current OLs, then the adverse impacts of likely alternatives will not be smaller than those associated with continued operation of Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2. The impacts may, in fact, be greater in some areas.

The recommendation of the NRC staff is that the Commission determine that the adverse environmental impacts of license renewal for Surry Power Station, Units 1 and 2 are not so great that preserving the option of license renewal for energy planning decisionmakers would be unreasonable. This recommendation is based on (1) the analysis and findings in the GEIS; (2) the ER submitted by VEPCo; (3) consultation with other Federal, State, and local agencies; (4) the staff's own independent review; and (5) the staff's consideration of public comments.



## Abbreviations/Acronyms

μCi	microcurie(s)
ac	acre(s)
ACC	averted cleanup and decontamination costs
A.D.	Anno Domini
ADAMS	Agencywide Document Access and Management System
AEA	Atomic Energy Act of 1954, 42 USC 2011, et seq.
AEC	U.S. Atomic Energy Commission
AFW	auxiliary feedwater
AOC	averted offsite property damage costs
AOE	averted occupational exposure costs
AOSC	averted onsite costs
APE	averted public exposure costs
ATWS	anticipated transients without scram
B.C.	before Christ
BIA	U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs
Bq	becquerel(s)
Btu	British thermal unit(s)
°C	degrees Celsius
CAA	Clean Air Act of 1970, as amended, 42 USC 7401, et seq.
CCW	component cooling water
CDF	core damage frequency
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CET	containment event tree
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
Ci	curie(s)
cm	centimeter(s)
COE	cost of enhancement
COV	Code of Virginia
CWA	Clean Water Act of 1977 (also known as Federal Water Pollution Control Act), 33 USC 1251, et seq.
CZMA	Coastal Zone Management Act, 16 USC 1451, et seq.
d	day
DBAs	design-basis accidents
DoD	Department of Defense
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
DOT	U.S. Department of Transportation

## Abbreviations/Acronyms

DSM	demand-side management
EIA	Energy Information Administration
EIS	environmental impact statement
ELF-EMF	extremely low frequency electromagnetic field
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ER	Environmental Report
ESA	Endangered Species Act, 16 USC 1531, et seq.
ESGR	emergency switchgear room
ESRP	<i>Environmental Standard Review Plan</i> , NUREG-1555, Supplement 1, <i>Operating License Renewal</i>
°F	degrees Fahrenheit
FES	final environmental statement
FR	Federal Register
ft	foot/feet
FWPCA	Federal Water Pollution Control Act (also known as the Clean Water Act of 1977)
FWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
gal	gallon
GEIS	<i>Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants</i> , NUREG-1437
gpd	gallon(s) per day
gpm	gallon(s) per minute
GMP	General Maintenance Procedures
ha	hectare(s)
HEPA	high-efficiency particulate air (filter)
HIT	Hog Island Tract
HIWMA	Hog Island Wildlife Management Area
HLW	high-level waste
hr	hour(s)
HVAC	heating, ventilating, and air conditioning
Hz	hertz
in.	inch(es)
INEEL	Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory
IPA	integrated plant assessment
IPE	individual plant examination
IPEEE	individual plant examination for external events

## Abbreviations/Acronyms

ISFSI	independent spent fuel storage installation
ISLOCA	interfacing system loss-of-coolant accidents
J	joule
JCSA	James City Service Authority
km	kilometer(s)
kPa	kilopascal
kV	kilovolt(s)
kWh	kilowatt hour(s)
L	liter(s)
lb	pound
LERF	large early release frequency
LNG	liquefied natural gas
LOCAs	loss-of-coolant accidents
LOOP	loss of offsite power
Lpd	liter(s) per day
LWR	light-water reactor
m	meter(s)
mA	milliampere(s)
MACCS2	MELCOR Accident Consequence Code System 2
mi	mile(s)
min	minute(s)
mg	milligram(s)
MG	motor-generator
mGy	milligray(s)
MJ	mega-Joules
mL	milliliter(s)
mph	mile(s) per hour
mrad	millirad(s)
mrem	millirem(s)
mSv	millisievert(s)
MT	metric ton(s) (or tonne[s])
MTHM	metric tons (or tonnes) heavy metal
MW	megawatt(s)
MWd/MTU	megawatt-days per metric ton (or tonne) of uranium
MW(e)	megawatt(s) electric
MW(t)	megawatt(s) thermal
MWh	megawatt hour(s)

## Abbreviations/Acronyms

NA	not applicable
NAS	National Academy of Sciences
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 USC 4321, et seq.
NESC	National Electrical Safety Code
ng	nanogram(s)
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, 16 USC 470, et seq.
NIEHS	National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NO <sub>x</sub>	nitrogen oxide(s)
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRC	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NREL	National Renewable Energy Laboratory
ODCM	<i>Offsite Dose Calculation Manual Guidance</i> , NUREG-1301
OL	operating license
PARS	publicly available records
pCi	picocuries
PM <sub>10</sub>	particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 10 micrometers
ppt	parts per thousand
PRA	probabilistic risk assessment
PSD	prevention of significant deterioration
psig	pounds per square inch, gauge
PWR	pressurized water reactor
RAI	request for additional information
RCP	reactor coolant pump
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, 42 USC 6901, et seq.
rem	special unit of dose equivalent, equal to 0.01 Sv
REMP	radiological environmental monitoring program
rms	root mean square
RPC	averted power replacement costs
RRW	risk reduction worth
s	second(s)
SAMA	severe accident mitigation alternative
SAR	Safety Analysis Report
SBO	station blackout
SCR	selective catalytic reduction
SEIS	Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

## Abbreviations/Acronyms

SER	Safety Evaluation Report
SGTR	steam generator tube rupture
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SMITTR	surveillance, monitoring, inspections, testing, trending, and recordkeeping
SO <sub>2</sub>	sulfur dioxide
SO <sub>x</sub>	sulfur oxide(s)
STC	source-term category
Sv	sievert
SW	service water
TBq	terabecquerel
TDAFW	turbine-driven auxiliary feedwater (pump)
UFSAR	Updated Final Safety Analysis Report
USC	United States Code
USCB	U.S. Census Bureau
USCOE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
V	volt(s)
VAC	Virginia Administrative Code
VDCR	Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation
VDEQ	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
VDGIF	Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries
VDH	Virginia Department of Health
VDHR	Virginia Department of Historic Resources
VDOT	Virginia Department of Transportation
VEC	Virginia Employment Commission
VEPCo	Virginia Electric and Power Company
VIMS	Virginia Institute of Marine Sciences
VMRC	Virginia Marine Resources Commission
yr	year(s)