

**Don E. Grissette**  
Vice President

**Southern Nuclear  
Operating Company, Inc.**  
40 Inverness Center Parkway  
Post Office Box 1295  
Birmingham, Alabama 35201  
  
Tel 205.992.6474  
Fax 205.992.0341



April 25, 2005

Docket Nos.: 50-321 50-348 50-424  
50-366 50-364 50-425

NL-05-0761

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 2004

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 2004.

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Don E. Grissette", is written over a faint, larger version of the same signature.

Don E. Grissette

DEG/JMG

Enclosures: 1. Hatch Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2004  
2. Farley Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2004  
3. Vogtle Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2004

IE25

cc: Southern Nuclear Operating Company  
Mr. J. T. Gasser, Executive Vice President (w/o Enclosures)  
Mr. L. M. Stinson, Vice President – Plant Farley (w/o Enclosures)  
Mr. H. L. Sumner, Jr., Vice President – Plant Hatch (w/o Enclosures)  
Mr. J. R. Johnson, General Manager – Plant Farley  
Mr. G. R. Frederick, General Manager – Plant Hatch  
Mr. W. F. Kitchens, General Manager – Plant Vogtle  
RType: CFA04.054; CHA02.004; CVC7000; LC# 14260

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Dr. W. D. Travers, 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. G. J. McCoy, 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 2004.

### **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 2004.
2. Terrestrial Monitoring - Terrestrial monitoring is not required.
3. Maintenance of Transmission Line Corridors
  1. Herbicide treatment and danger tree cutting were performed on the HNP-Vidalia and HNP-Baxley corridors. The herbicide treatment consisted of a combination of EPA-registered and State-approved herbicides.
  2. Danger tree cutting was performed along the HNP-Offerman, HNP-Bonaire, HNP-Douglas, HNP-Eastman, and HNP-North Tifton corridors

#### **B. Comparisons of the 2004 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 2004.

**D. EPP Noncompliance and Corrective Actions**

There were no EPP noncompliances during 2004.

**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 2004 which involved a potentially significant, unreviewed environmental question.

In January 2003, Hatch Nuclear Plant began construction activities associated with the replacement of the mechanical draft cross-flow cooling towers with mechanical draft counterflow cooling towers of similar size and functionality. The replacement towers were 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 2004.

## JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT - UNITS 1 AND 2

### 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 2004.

### 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 2004 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 2004.

#### D. **EPP Noncompliance and Corrective Actions**

There were no EPP noncompliances during 2004.

#### 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**

There were no changes in station design or operation, tests, or experiments in 2004 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 mechanical draft cross-flow cooling towers were

replaced with mechanical draft counterflow cooling towers of similar size and functionality. Construction began on the Unit 1 and Unit 2 towers in 2003 and was completed 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 2004.

## VOGTLE ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT - UNITS 1 AND 2

### **I. Introduction**

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 2004.

### **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 2004.
2. Terrestrial Monitoring - Terrestrial monitoring is not required.
3. Maintenance of Transmission Line Corridors
  - a) A combination of EPA-registered and State-approved herbicides was applied along the VEGP-Goshen, VEGP-Scherer, and VEGP-SCE&G (Georgia portion only) corridors.
  - b) Danger trees were cut along the VEGP-Thalman, VEGP-Scherer, VEGP-Goshen, and VEGP-SCE&G (Georgia portion only) corridors as necessary. Additional tree trimming was performed along the VEGP-Thalman corridor.
  - c) 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 2004 regarding noise along the VEGP-related, high-voltage transmission lines.

#### **B. Comparison of the 2004 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 2004.

**D. EPP Noncompliance and Corrective Actions**

There were no EPP noncompliances during 2004.

**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 2004 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 2004.