

9.0 Summary and Conclusions

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 (VEPCo 2001). 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 of the current OLs, which expire on 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, which 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 (NRC 1996; 1999).^(a)

Upon acceptance of the VEPCo application, the NRC began the environmental review process described in 10 CFR Part 51 for Surry Units 1 and 2 by publishing a notice of intent to prepare an EIS and conduct scoping (66 FR 42897 [NRC 2001]) on August 15, 2001. The staff visited the Surry Power Station in September 2001 and held public scoping meetings on September 19, 2001, in Surry County, Virginia. The staff reviewed the VEPCo Environmental Report for Surry Units 1 and 2 (ER; VEPCo 2001) and compared it to the GEIS, consulted with other agencies, and 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* (NRC 2000). The staff also considered the public comments received during the scoping process for preparation of this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for Surry Units 1 and 2. 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 (EPA) published an associated Notice of Availability in the *Federal Register* (67 FR 20763; EPA 2002). 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.

Summary and Conclusions

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 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 available for reducing or avoiding adverse effects. It also includes the staff's recommendation regarding the proposed action.

The NRC 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) and in accordance with § 51.23(b).^(a)

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 shows the following:

- (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 characteristic.
- (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 [HLW] 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 likely not 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

(a) The title of 10 CFR 51.23 is "Temporary storage of spent fuel after cessation of reactor operations-generic determination of no significant environmental impact."

Summary and Conclusions

the GEIS for issues designated Category 1 in Table B-1 of 10 CFR Part 51, Subpart A, Appendix B.

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 also 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. These alternatives were evaluated assuming that the replacement power generation plant is located at either the Surry Power Station site or some other unspecified location.

9.1 Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action— License Renewal

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 Category 1 issues which are applicable to Surry Units 1 and 2.

VEPCo's license renewal application presents an analysis of the Category 2 issues that are applicable to Surry 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 (VEPCo 2001) 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 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* (AEC 1972a) and *Final Environmental Statement Related to Operation of Surry Power Station Unit 2* (AEC 1972b).

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 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.

The following sections discuss unavoidable adverse impacts, irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources, and the relationship between local short-term use of the environment and long-term productivity.

9.1.1 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

An environmental review conducted at the license renewal stage differs from the review conducted in support of a construction permit because the plant is in existence at the license renewal stage and has operated for a number of years. As a result, adverse impacts associated with the initial construction have been avoided, have been mitigated, or have already occurred. The environmental impacts to be evaluated for license renewal are those associated with refurbishment and continued operation during the renewal term.

Summary and Conclusions

The adverse impacts of continued operation identified are considered to be of SMALL significance, and none warrants implementation of additional mitigation measures. The adverse impacts of likely alternatives if Surry Units 1 and 2 cease operation at or before the expiration of the current OLS will not be smaller than those associated with continued operation of these units, and they may be greater for some impact categories in some locations.

9.1.2 Irreversible or Irrecoverable Resource Commitments

The commitment of resources related to construction and operation of Surry Units 1 and 2 during its current license period was made when the plant was built. The resource commitments to be considered in this SEIS are associated with continued operation of the plant for an additional 20 years. These resources include materials and equipment required for plant maintenance and operation, the nuclear fuel used by the reactors, and ultimately, permanent offsite storage space for the spent fuel assemblies.

The most significant resource commitments related to operation during the renewal term are the fuel and the permanent storage space. Surry Units 1 and 2 replace approximately one-third of the fuel assemblies in each of the two units during every refueling outage, which occurs on an 18-month cycle.

If Surry Units 1 and 2 cease operation on or before the expiration of the current OLS, the likely power generation alternatives will require a commitment of resources for construction of the replacement plants as well as for fuel to run the plants.

9.1.3 Short-Term Use Versus Long-Term Productivity

An initial balance between short-term use and long-term productivity of the environment at the Surry Power Station site was set when the plants were approved and construction began. That balance is now well established. Renewal of the OLS for Surry Units 1 and 2 and continued operation of the plants will not alter the existing balance, but may postpone the availability of the site for other uses. Denial of the application to renew the OLS will lead to shutdown of the plants and will alter the balance in a manner that depends on subsequent uses of the site. For example, the environmental consequences of turning the Surry Power Station site into a park or an industrial facility are quite different.

9.2 Relative Significance of the Environmental Impacts of License Renewal and Alternatives

The proposed action is renewal of the OLS for Surry Units 1 and 2. Chapter 2 describes the site, power plants, and interactions of the plant with the environment. As noted in Chapter 3, no refurbishment and no refurbishment impacts are expected at Surry Units 1 and 2. Chapters 4 through 7 discuss environmental issues associated with renewal of the OLS. Environmental issues associated with the no-action alternative and alternatives involving power generation and use reduction are discussed in Chapter 8.

The significance of the environmental impacts from the proposed action (approval of the application for renewal of the OLS), the no-action alternative (denial of the application), alternatives involving nuclear, coal, or gas generation of power at the Surry Units 1 and 2 an unspecified greenfield site, and a combination of alternatives are compared in Table 9-1.

Table 9-1 shows that the significance of the environmental effects of the proposed action are SMALL for all impact categories (except for collective offsite radiological impacts from the fuel cycle and from HLW and spent fuel disposal, for which a single significance level was not assigned [see Chapter 6]). The alternative actions, including the no-action alternative, may have environmental effects in at least some impact categories that reach MODERATE or LARGE significance.

9.3 Staff Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on (1) the analysis and findings in the GEIS (NRC 1996; 1999), (2) the ER submitted by VEPCo (VEPCo 2001), (3) consultation with Federal, State, and local agencies, (4) the staff's own independent review, and (5) the staff's consideration of public comments, the recommendation of the staff is that the Commission determine that the adverse environmental impacts of license renewal for Surry Units 1 and 2 are not so great that preserving the option of license renewal for energy planning decisionmakers would be unreasonable.

Table 9-1. Summary of Environmental Significance of License Renewal, the No-Action Alternative, and Alternative Methods of Generation

Impact Category	Proposed Action—License Renewal	No Action Alternative—Denial of Renewal	Coal-Fired Generation		Natural-Gas-Fired Generation		New Nuclear Generation		Combination of Alternatives	
			Surry Power Station	Greenfield Site ^(a)	Surry Power Station	Greenfield Site ^(a)	Surry Power Station	Greenfield Site ^(a)	Surry Power Station	Greenfield Site ^(a)
Land Use	SMALL	SMALL	MODERATE	MODERATE to LARGE	MODERATE to LARGE	MODERATE to LARGE	MODERATE	MODERATE to LARGE	MODERATE to LARGE	MODERATE to LARGE
Ecology	SMALL	SMALL	MODERATE to LARGE	MODERATE to LARGE	MODERATE to LARGE	MODERATE to LARGE	MODERATE	MODERATE to LARGE	MODERATE to LARGE	MODERATE to LARGE
Water Use and Quality	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL to MODERATE	SMALL	SMALL to MODERATE	SMALL	SMALL to MODERATE	SMALL	SMALL to MODERATE
Air Quality	SMALL	SMALL	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	MODERATE	SMALL	SMALL	MODERATE	MODERATE
Waste	SMALL	SMALL	MODERATE	MODERATE	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL
Human Health ^(b)	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL
Socio-economics	SMALL	LARGE	SMALL to LARGE	SMALL to LARGE	MODERATE	MODERATE to LARGE	MODERATE to LARGE	MODERATE to LARGE	MODERATE	MODERATE to LARGE
Aesthetics	SMALL	SMALL	MODERATE to LARGE	MODERATE to LARGE	MODERATE	SMALL to LARGE	SMALL	SMALL to LARGE	MODERATE	SMALL to LARGE
Historic and Archaeological Resources	SMALL	SMALL to MODERATE	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL	SMALL
Environmental Justice	SMALL	MODERATE to LARGE	MODERATE	MODERATE to LARGE	MODERATE	MODERATE to LARGE	SMALL	MODERATE to LARGE	MODERATE	MODERATE to LARGE

(a) A greenfield site is assumed, for the purpose of bounding potential impacts, to be an undeveloped site with no previous construction.
 (b) Excludes collective offsite radiological impacts from the fuel cycle and from HLW and spent-fuel disposal, for which single significance levels were not assigned. See Chapter 6 for details.

9.4 References

10 CFR Part 51. Code of Federal Regulations, *Title 10, Energy*, Part 51, “Environmental Protection Regulations for Domestic Licensing and Related Regulatory Functions.”

10 CFR Part 54. Code of Federal Regulations, *Title 10, Energy*, Part 54, “Requirements for Renewal of Operating Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants.”

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). 42 USC 4321, et seq.

U.S. Atomic Energy Commission (AEC). 1972a. *Final Environmental Statement Related to Operation of Surry Power Station, Unit 1*. Docket No. 50-250, AEC, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Atomic Energy Commission (AEC). 1972b. *Final Environmental Statement Related to Operation of Surry Power Station, Unit 2*. Docket No. 50-281, AEC, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2002. “Notice of Availability of Environmental Impact Statements”. *Federal Register*, Vol. 67, No. 81, pp. 20763-20764 (April 26, 2002).

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). 1996. *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants*. NUREG-1437, Volumes 1 and 2, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). 1999. *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants: Main Report*, “Section 6.3–Transportation, Table 9.1 Summary of findings on NEPA issues for license renewal of nuclear power plants, Final Report.” NUREG-1437, Volume 1, Addendum 1, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). 2000. *Standard Review Plans for Environmental Reviews for Nuclear Power Plants, Supplement 1: Operating License Renewal*. NUREG-1555, Supplement 1, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). 2001. “Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and Conduct Scoping Process.” *Federal Register*. Vol. 66, No. 158, pp. 42897-42898. (August 15, 2001).

Virginia Electric and Power Company (VEPCo). 2001. *Application for License Renewal for Surry Power Stations, Units 1 and 2, “Appendix E, Environmental Report -Operating License Renewal Stage.”* Richmond, Virginia.