Jeffrey T. Gasser Vice President

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc. 40 Inverness Center Parkway Post Office Box 1295 Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Tel 205.992.7721 Fax 205.992.0403



Energy to Serve Your World sa

April 30, 2004

NL-04-0661

Docket Nos.: 50-321 50-348

> 50-366 50-364 50-425

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 2003

50-424

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 2003.

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

Sincerely.

Jeffrey T. Gasser

JTG/JCM

- Enclosures: 1. Hatch Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2003
 - 2. Farley Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2003
 - 3. Vogtle Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2003

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission NL-04-0661

Page 2

Southern Nuclear Operating Company cc:

Mr. J. B. Beasley, Jr., Executive Vice President

(w/o Enclosure)

Mr. L. M. Stinson, Vice President, Plant Farley

(w/o Enclosure)

Mr. H. L. Sumner, Jr., Vice President, Plant Hatch

(w/o Enclosure)

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

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

Mr. W. F. Kitchens, General Manager - Plant Vogtle

Mr. W. C. Carr, Environmental Services Manager

RType: CFA04.054; CHA02.004; CVC7000; LC# 14014

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Mr. L. A. Reyes, Regional Administrator

Mr. S. E. Peters, NRR Project Manager - Farley

Mr. C. Gratton, NRR Project Manager - Hatch

Mr. C. Gratton, NRR Project Manager - Vogtle

Mr. C. A. Patterson, Senior Resident Inspector – Farley

Mr. D. S. Simpkins, 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 – UNITS 1 AND 2

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 2003.

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 the State of Georgia National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit GA0004120; there was no additional requirement for aquatic monitoring during 2003.
 - 2. Terrestrial Monitoring Terrestrial monitoring is not required.
 - 3. Maintenance of Transmission Line Corridors Herbicide treatment and danger tree trimming were performed on the HNP-Vidalia corridor.

B. Comparisons of the 2003 Monitoring Activities with Preoperational Studies, Operational Controls, and Previous Nonradiological Environmental Monitoring Reports

These comparisons were not required because no nonradiological 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 2003.

D. EPP Noncompliance and Corrective Actions

There were no EPP noncompliances during 2003.

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

In January 2003, Hatch Nuclear Plant began construction activities associated with the replacement of the existing mechanical draft cross-flow cooling towers with mechanical draft counterflow cooling towers of similar size and

functionality. The replacement towers will be placed in service during the spring Unit 1 outage in 2004. Based on a review of the replacement cooling tower operational parameters and design conducted in accordance with Section 3.1 of the EPP, the plant operating parameters impacted by the replacement cooling towers 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 Section 5.4.2

There were no nonroutine reports submitted in 2003.

JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT - UNITS 1 AND 2

I. <u>Introduction</u>

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 2003.

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 2003 Monitoring Activities with Preoperational Studies, Operational Controls, and Previous Non-Radiological Monitoring Reports

These comparisons were not required because no nonradiological 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 2003.

D. EPP Noncompliance and Corrective Actions

There were no EPP noncompliances during 2003.

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

In early 2003, Farley Nuclear Plant began the replacement of the Unit 1 and Unit 2 cooling towers. The existing mechanical draft cross-flow cooling towers will be replaced with mechanical draft counterflow cooling towers of similar size and functionality. Construction began on the Unit 1 towers in January 2003 with a projected in-service date in 2004. The Unit 2 towers began construction in 2003 with a projected in-service date in 2004. Based on a

review of the replacement cooling tower operational parameters and design conducted in accordance with Section 3.1 of the EPP, the plant operating parameters impacted by the replacement cooling towers 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 Section 5.4.2

There were no nonroutine reports submitted in 2003.

VOGTLE ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT - UNITS 1 AND 2

I. <u>Introduction</u>

In accordance with Subsection 5.4.1 of the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP) Environmental Protection Plan (Nonradiological), Appendix B to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-68 and NPF-81, this report is submitted describing implementation of the Environmental Protection Plan for the calendar year 2003.

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 State of Georgia National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit GA0026786; there was no additional requirement for aquatic monitoring during 2003.
 - 2. Terrestrial Monitoring Terrestrial monitoring is not required.
 - 3. Maintenance of Transmission Line Corridors
 - a. Re-clearing of vegetation was performed on the VEGP-Wadley and VEGP-SCE&G lines.
 - b. A combination of EPA-registered and State-approved herbicides was applied along the VEGP-Thalmann and VEGP-Scherer lines.
 - c. The VEGP-Goshen line was re-cleared.
 - d. Danger trees were trimmed along VEGP lines as necessary.
 - 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 2003 regarding noise along the VEGP-related, high-voltage transmission lines.
- B. Comparison of the 2003 Monitoring Activities with Preoperational Studies, Operational Controls, and Previous Monitoring Reports

These programs were not required because no nonradiological environmental monitoring programs were conducted during the reporting period beyond those

performed in accordance with NPDES Permit No. GA0026786 referenced in Section A above.

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

There were no significant adverse environmental impacts associated with plant operation during 2003.

D. EPP Noncompliance and Corrective Actions

There were no EPP noncompliances during 2003.

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 2003 which involved a potentially significant, unreviewed environmental question.

F. Nonroutine Reports Submitted in Accordance with EPP Section 5.4.2

There were no nonroutine reports submitted in 2003.