J. Barnie Beasley, Jr., P.E.

Vice President

Southern Nuclear
Operating Company, Inc.
40 Inversess Center Parkwa

40 Inverness Center Parkway Post Office Box 1295 Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Tel 205.992.7110 Fax 205.992.0341



April 28, 2003

Docket Nos.: 50-321 50-348 50-424

50-366 50-364 50-425

NL-03-0894

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission ATTN: Document Control Desk Washington, D. C. 20555-0001

Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant
Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant
Vogtle Electric Generating Plant
Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Reports for 2002

Ladies and Gentlemen:

In accordance with Subsection 5.4.1 of the referenced plants' Environmental Protection Plan (Appendix B to the Operating Licenses), Southern Nuclear Operating Company hereby submits the Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Reports for 2002.

This letter contains no NRC commitments. If you have any questions, please advise.

Sincerely,

JBB/sdl

Enclosures: 1. Hatch Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2002

2. Farley Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2002

3. Vogtle Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2002

JE2S

cc: Southern Nuclear Operating Company

Mr. J. D. Woodard, Executive Vice President (w/o Enclosure)
Mr. J. B. Beasley, Jr., Vice President, Plant Farley
Mr. H. L. Sumner, Jr., Vice President, Plant Hatch (w/o Enclosure)

Mr. J. T. Gasser, Vice President, Plant Vogtle (w/o Enclosure)

Mr. D. E. Grissette, General Manager - Plant Farley

Mr. P. H. Wells, General Manager - Plant Hatch

Mr. G. R. Frederick, General Manager - Plant Vogtle

Mr. W. C. Carr, Environmental Services Manager

Document Services RTYPE: CFA04.054; CHA02.004; CVC7000; LC# 13767

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Mr. L. A. Reyes, Regional Administrator

Mr. F. Rinaldi, NRR Project Manager - Farley

Mr. S. D. Bloom, NRR Project Manager - Hatch

Mr. F. Rinaldi, NRR Project Manager - Vogtle

Mr. T. P. Johnson, Senior Resident Inspector - Farley

Mr. N. P. Garrett, Acting Senior Resident Inspector - Hatch

Mr. J. Zeiler, Senior Resident Inspector - Vogtle

State of Alabama

Mr. K. E. Whatley, Department of Public Health, Division of Radiation Control

State of Georgia

Mr. J. L. Setser, Department of Natural Resources

Georgia Power Company

Mr. M. C. Nichols

American Nuclear Insurers

Mr. R. A. Oliveira

Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant

Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2002

Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant

Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2002

I. Introduction

This report is submitted in accordance with Subsection 5.4.1 of the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant Environmental Protection Plan, Appendix B to Facility Operating Licenses DPR-57 and NPF-5. This report describes implementation of the Environmental Protection Plan for the calendar year 2002.

II. Reporting Requirements

A. Summaries and Analyses of Results of Environmental Protection Activities Required by Subsection 4.2 of the Environmental Protection Plan (EPP) for the Reporting Period

1. Aquatic Monitoring

Liquid effluent monitoring was performed in accordance with the State of Georgia National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit GA0004120; there was no additional requirement for aquatic monitoring during 2002.

2. Terrestrial Monitoring

Terrestrial monitoring is not required.

3. Maintenance of Transmission Line Corridors

- a. Mowing, vegetation re-clearing, and danger tree trimming activities were performed on the HNP-Vidalia and HNP-Baxley corridor during 2002.
- b. Mowing was performed along the GTC-Eastman and GTC-Bonair lines. No chemicals or herbicides were used. No activities took place on the GTC-North Tifton line.

B. Comparison of the 2002 Monitoring Activities with Preoperational Studies, Operational Controls, and Previous Non-Radiological Environmental Monitoring Reports

These comparisons were not required because no non-radiological environmental monitoring programs were conducted during the reporting period beyond those performed in accordance with NPDES Permit No. GA0004120.

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

There were no significant adverse environmental impacts associated with plant operation during 2002.

Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant

Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2002

D. EPP Noncompliance and Corrective Actions

There were no EPP noncompliances during 2002.

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

During 2002, a power uprate request on both Unit 1 and Unit 2 was submitted to the NRC. More accurate feedwater flow devices will be installed to support development of more precise factors for determining the rated reactor power output. The uprates will produce slight changes in the operational parameters associated with the circulating water system. Based on a review of the changes in operating parameters conducted in accordance with Section 3.1 of the EPP, the power uprates proposed on Unit 1 and Unit 2 do not result in a significant adverse environmental impact and are bounded by the conclusions of the Final Environmental Statement. No unreviewed environmental question was involved and no change to the EPP is required.

F. Nonroutine Reports Submitted in Accordance with EPP Subsection 5.4.2

There were no nonroutine reports submitted in 2002.

Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant

Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2002

Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant

Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2002

I. Introduction

In accordance with Subsection 5.4.1 of the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant Environmental Protection Plan, Appendix B to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-2 and NPF-8, this report is submitted summarizing implementation of the Environmental Protection Plan for calendar year 2002.

II. Reporting Requirements

- A. Summaries and Analyses of Results of Environmental Protection Activities Required by Subsection 4.2 of the Environmental Protection Plan (EPP) for the Reporting Period
 - 1. Aerial Remote Sensing Aerial Remote Sensing is no longer required.
 - 2. Herbicide Application There is no reporting requirement associated with this condition.
 - 3. Land Management There is no reporting requirement associated with this condition.
- B. Comparison of the 2002 Monitoring Activities with Preoperational Studies, Operational Controls, and Previous Non-Radiological Environmental Monitoring Reports

These comparisons were not required because no non-radiological environmental monitoring programs were conducted during the reporting period beyond those performed in accordance with NPDES Permit No. AL0024619.

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

There were no significant adverse environmental impacts associated with plant operation during 2002.

D. EPP Noncompliance and Corrective Actions

There were no EPP noncompliances during 2002.

Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant

Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2002

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 Ouestion

There were no changes in station design or operation, tests, or experiments in 2002, which involved a potentially significant, unreviewed environmental question.

F. Nonroutine Reports Submitted in Accordance with EPP Subsection 5.4.2

There were no nonroutine reports submitted in 2002.

Vogtle Electric Generating Plant

Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2002

Vogtle Electric Generating Plant

Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2002

I. Introduction

In accordance with Subsection 5.4.1 of the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP) Environmental Protection Plan (Non-radiological), 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 2002.

II. Reporting Requirements

- A. Summaries and Analyses of Results of Environmental Protection Activities Required by Subsection 4.2 of the Environmental Protection Plan (EPP) for the Reporting Period
 - 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 2002.
 - 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 wetland and upland areas along the VEGP-Scherer line. Re-clearing of vegetation was also performed on the VEGP-Scherer line.
 - b. Danger tree trimming was performed on the VEGP-Scherer and VEGP-SCE&G lines.
 - c. Side trimming was performed on the VEGP-SCE&G line.
 - d. Trees were trimmed on the VEGP-Goshen line and an EPA-registered and Stateapproved herbicide was aerially applied to swamp areas. Danger trees were also cut.
 - e. 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 2002 regarding noise along the VEGP-related, high-voltage transmission lines.

Vogtle Electric Generating Plant

Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2002

B. Comparison of the 2002 Monitoring Activities with Preoperational Studies, Operational Controls, and Previous Non-Radiological Environmental Monitoring Reports

These programs were not required because no non-radiological 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 2002.

D. EPP Noncompliance and Corrective Actions

There were no EPP noncompliances during 2002.

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 2002, which involved a potentially significant, unreviewed environmental question.

F. Nonroutine Reports Submitted in Accordance with EPP Subsection 5.4.2

There were no nonroutine reports submitted in 2002.