

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 28, 2006

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

NL-06-0765

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 2005

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 2005.

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", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Don E. Grissette

DEG/JMG/sdl

- Enclosures: 1. Hatch Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2005
2. Farley Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2005
3. Vogtle Annual Non-Radiological Environmental Operating Report for 2005

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. D. R. Madison, General Manager – Plant Hatch
Mr. T. E. Tynan, General Manager – Plant Vogtle
RType: CFA04.054; CHA02.004; CVC7000; LC# 14425

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Dr. W. D. Travers, Regional Administrator
Mr. R. E. Martin, 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**

In accordance with Subsection 5.4.1 of the Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant (HNP) Environmental Protection Plan (Nonradiological), Appendix B to Facility Operating Licenses DPR-57 and NPF-5, this report is submitted summarizing implementation of the Environmental Protection Plan for calendar year 2005.

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 2005.
2. Terrestrial Monitoring - Terrestrial monitoring is not required.
3. Maintenance of Transmission Line Corridors
 - a. Herbicide treatment and danger tree cutting was performed on the Hatch-North Tifton corridor. The herbicide treatment consisted of a combination of EPA-registered and State-approved herbicides.
 - b. Danger tree cutting was performed along the HNP-Offerman, HNP-Bonaire, HNP-Douglas, HNP-Eastman, HNP-Vidalia and HNP-Baxley corridors.

B. Comparisons of the 2005 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 2005.

D. EPP Noncompliance and Corrective Actions

There were no EPP noncompliances during 2005.

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 2005 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 2005.

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 (FNP) 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 2005.

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 2005 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 2005.

D. EPP Noncompliance and Corrective Actions

There were no EPP noncompliances during 2005.

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 2005 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 2005.

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 summarizing implementation of the Environmental Protection Plan for calendar year 2005.

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 2005.
2. Terrestrial Monitoring - Terrestrial monitoring is not required.
3. Maintenance of Transmission Line Corridors
 - a. No herbicide treatment occurred on the VEGP transmission corridors.
 - b. Danger trees were cut along the VEGP-Thalman, VEGP-Scherer, VEGP-Goshen, Vogtle-Wadley and VEGP-SCE&G (Georgia portion only) corridors as necessary.
 - 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 2005 regarding noise along the VEGP-related, high-voltage transmission lines.

B. Comparison of the 2005 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 2005.

D. EPP Noncompliance and Corrective Actions

There were no EPP noncompliances during 2005.

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 2005 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 2005.