



Southern Nuclear Operating Company Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 3 & 4 COL Application

COLA Table of Contents

- Part 1 General and Financial Information
- Part 2 Final Safety Analysis Report
- Part 3 Applicant's Environmental Report Combined License Stage
- Part 4 Technical Specifications
- Part 5 Emergency Plan
- Part 6 LWA Request
- Part 7 Departures, Exemptions, and Variances
- Part 8 Safeguards/Security Plans
- Part 9 Withheld Information
- Part 10 Proposed License Conditions (Including ITAAC)
- Part 11 Enclosures

Vogtle Early Site Permit Application

Overall Table of Contents

Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 3 & 4

COL Application

Part 3

Applicant's Environmental Report — Combined License Stage

Revision 0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title

Section

Page

1.0 1.1 1.1.2 1.2 1.3 1.4 1.5 1.5.1 1.5.2 1.6 1.7 1.7.1 1.7.2	Introduction	1-1 1-1 1-2 1-2 1-3 1-3 1-3 1-3 1-20 1-20 1-20 1-20 1-20 1-20 1-20
1.8	References	1-24
2.0	Affected Environment	2-1
2.1	Site Location	2-1
2.2	Meteorology and Air Quality	2-1 2-1
2.4	Geology	2-1
2.5	Radiological Environment	2-1
2.6	Water	2-2
2.7	Ecology	2-2
2.8	Socioeconomics	2-2
2.9	Historic and Cultural Resources	2-2
2.10	Environmental Justice	2-2
2.11	Related Federal Projects and Consultation	2-2
3.0	Site Lavout and Plant Description	3-1
3.1	External Appearance and Layout	3-14
3.2	Plant Description	3-14
3.2.1	Plant Water Use	3-14
3.2.2	Cooling System	3-17
3.2.3	Radioactive Waste Management System	3-17
3.2.4	Nonradioactive Waste Systems	3-17
3.3	Power Transmission System	3-17
3.4	References	3-18
4.0	Construction Impacts at the Proposed Site	4-1
4.1	Land-Use Impacts	4-1
4.2	Meteorological and Air-Quality Impacts	4-1
4.3	Water-Related Impacts	4-1
4.4	Ecological Impacts	4-1
4.5	Socioeconomic Impacts	4-2

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Section	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.6	Historic and Cultural Resource Impacts	4-2
4.7	Environmental Justice Impacts	4-2
4.8	Non-Radiological Health Impacts	4-2
4.9 4.10	Radiological Health Impacts Measures and Controls to Limit Adverse Impacts During Site Preparation Activities	4-2
	and Construction	4-3
4.11	Site Redress Plan	4-3
4.12	Summary of Construction Impacts	4-3
4.13	References	4-3
5.0	Station Operational Impacts at the Proposed Site	5-1
5.1	Land-Use Impacts	5-1
5.2	Meteorological and Air-Quality Impacts	5-1
5.3	Water-Related Impacts	5-1
5.4	Ecological Impacts	5-1
5.5	Socioeconomic Impacts	5-2
5.6	Historic and Cultural Resource Impacts	5-2
5.7	Environmental Justice Impacts	5-2
5.8	Non-Radiological Health Impacts	5-2
5.9	Radiological Impacts of Normal Operations	5-2
5.10	Environmental Impacts of Postulated Accidents	5-3
5.11	Measures and Controls to Limit Adverse Impacts During Operation	5-6
5.12	Summary of Operational Impacts	5-6
6.0	Fuel Cycle, Transportation, and Decommissioning	6-1
6.1	Fuel Cycle Impacts and Solid Waste Management	6-1
6.2	Transportation Impacts	6-1
6.3	Decommissioning	6-1
7.0	Cumulative Impacts	7-1
7.1	Land Use	7-1
7.2	Air Quality	7-1
7.3	Water Use and Quality	7-1
7.4 7.5	I errestrial Ecosystem	7-1
7.5 7.0	Aquatic Ecosystem	7-2
7.0 7.7	Socioeconomics, Historic and Cultural Resources, Environmental Justice	7-2
1.1 7 0	Rediclogical Impacts of Normal Operations	7-2
7.0 7.0	Sovere Accidents	7-2
7.9	Fuel Cycle Transportation Decommissioning	7-3
7.10	NRC Staff Conclusions and Recommendations	7_3
1.11		7-5
8.0	Need for Power	8-1
0. I	Description of Power System	0-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Section	<u>n</u> <u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
8.2	Power Demand / Integrated Resource Planning	8-1
8.3	Power Supply / Integrated Resource Planning in the State of Georgia	8-1
8.4	Assessment of Need for Power / NRC Findings on GPC's IRP	8-1
8.5	References	8-1
9.0	Environmental Impacts of Alternatives	9-1
9.1	No-Action Alternative	9-1
9.2	Energy Alternatives	9-1
9.3	System Design Alternatives	9-1
9.4	Region of Interest and Alternative Site Selection Process	9-2
9.5	Evaluation of Alternative Sites	9-2
9.6	Issues Among Sites Handled Generically	9-2
9.7	Summary of Alternative Site Impacts	9-2
9.8	References	9-2
10.0	Comparison of Impacts of the Proposed Action and the Alternative Sites	10-1
10.1	Comparison of the Proposed Site with the Alternative Sites	10-1
10.2	Environmentally Preferable Sites	10-1
10.3	Obviously Superior Sites	10-1
10.4	Comparison with the No-Action Alternative	10-1
11.0 11.1 11.2 11.3 11.4	Conclusions and Recommendations Impacts of the Proposed Action Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Impacts Alternatives to the Proposed Action Relationship Between Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity of the Human Environment	11-1 11-1 11-1 11-2
11.5 11.6 11.7	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources Benefit-Cost Balance NRC Staff Summary and Conclusions	11-2 11-2 11-2 11-2

LIST OF TABLES

Title

<u>Table</u>

Page

Table 1.5-1	Authorizations Required for Early Site Permit	1-4
Table 1.5-2	Authorizations Required for Site Preparation Activities that Do Not Require	
	a Limited Work Authorization	1-7
Table 1.5-3	Authorizations Required for Redress Activities	1-12
Table 1.5-4	Authorizations Required for Construction Activities	1-15
Table 1.5-5	Authorizations Required for Operation	1-18
Table 1.7-1	10 CFR 51.50(c)(1) Requirements and EIS Table J-1 Commitments	1-21
Table 3.0-1	VEGP Site Characteristics, AP1000 Design Parameters, and Site Interface	
	Values	3-2
Table 3.0-2	XOQDOQ-Predicted Maximum χ/Q and D/Q Values at Receptors of	
	Interest	3-13
Table 3.2-1	Revised Cooling Water System Estimates for Two Units	3-14
Table 3.2-2	Revised Plant Groundwater Estimates and Plant Effluent Streams	
	for Two Units	3-15
Table 5.10-1	Doses from Design-Basis Accidents Using Updated Information from	
	DCD Rev. 16	5-4

LIST OF FIGURES

Title

Figure

Page

Figure 3.1-1 Revised Site Plan 3-1 Figure 3.2-1 Revised Intake Dimensions 3-2 Figure 3.2-2 Revised Intake Elevation 3-2	igure 3.1-1	Revised Site Plan	3-19
	igure 3.2-1	Revised Intake Dimensions	3-20
	igure 3.2-2	Revised Intake Elevation	3-21

ACRONYMS

ACRONYM	DEFINITION
ASLB	Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
Btu	British thermal units
CAA	[Federal] Clean Air Act
CCW	Component Cooling Water
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
COL	Combined Operating License
COLA	Construction and Operating License Application
CWA	[Federal] Clean Water Act
DCD	Design Control Document
EAB	Exclusion Area Boundary
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPM	Environmental Project Manager
ER	Environmental Report ^(a)
ESP	Early Site Permit
ESPA	Early Site Permit Application
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
GDNR	Georgia Department of Natural Resources
GDOT	Georgia Department of Transportation
GPC	Georgia Power Company
gpm	gallons per minute
GPSC	Georgia Public Service Commission
IRP	Integrated Resource Plan
LPZ	Low Population Zone
LWA	Limited Work Authorization
МТО	metric tons uranium
MWd	megawatt days
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRC	[U.S.] Nuclear Regulatory Commission

ACRONYMS

ACRONYM	DEFINITION
NSSS	Nuclear Steam Supply System
O.C.G.A.	Official Code of Georgia Annotated
SME	subject matter experts
SNC	Southern Nuclear Operating Company
SWS	Service Water System
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USDOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
VEGP	Vogtle Electric Generating Plant

a) The term EIS is used in the context of the COLA to represent the Early Site Permit draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) at the time of COLA submittal. After the NRC issues the Final EIS (FEIS) for the Early Site Permit, the term will be represent the Final EIS.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In August 2006, Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNC), Inc. submitted an Early Site permit (ESP) application for two additional units at the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP) site. At that time, SNC indicated to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) that the ESP Application Environmental Report (ER) was developed with the intent of leaving no items unresolved in the ESP Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), thus supporting finality for environmental issues in the COLA. In September 2007, the NRC issued the draft EIS for the Vogtle ESP application. The draft EIS did not identify any unresolved items.

1.1 BACKGROUND

Georgia Power Company (GPC), Oglethorpe Power Corporation (an Electric Membership Corporation), the Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, and the City of Dalton, Georgia, an incorporated municipality in the State of Georgia acting through its Board of Water, Light, and Sinking Fund Commissioners City of Dalton (Dalton Utilities) are co-owners of VEGP Units 1 and 2 in Burke County, Georgia. The nuclear reactors are operated for the co-owners by SNC.

In 2006, SNC submitted an application to the NRC for an ESP for the VEGP site. As part of the process of granting an ESP the NRC must determine if a site is environmentally suitable for the generation of nuclear power, and if a nuclear reactor could be safely sited, constructed, and operated at the selected location. If these determinations are favorable, the ESP allows the company to maintain the option, for up to 20 years, of applying for a COL to construct and operate a nuclear power reactor at the site. In addition, if the applicant can provide adequate information to resolve environmental issues and the NRC concludes in the ESP EIS that no unresolved issues are present, then all issues are considered to have finality and do not require action during the COLA process other than to determine if new and significant information exists that would alter the original NRC conclusion on a specific issue stated in the ESP EIS.

SNC, on behalf of the co-owners, is submitting this application for COLs to construct and operate two Westinghouse AP1000 reactors at the VEGP site. Because the NRC has performed an environmental review to establish VEGP site suitability as part of the ESP process, and the NRC has prepared an EIS documenting their findings and conclusions, SNC has chosen to reference that ESP EIS in this ER. Because at the time of this submittal, the ESP EIS exists only in draft form, the convention associated with the use of the term EIS in this COLA must be explained. The COLA rule (10 CFR 52) requires the NRC to issue the COL based on the conclusions of the ESP EIS. NRC has indicated to SNC that this should be interpreted as final EIS. Because the final EIS does not currently exist, but will be issued by NRC prior to the COL, SNC has elected to use the term EIS in this COLA to refer to the draft EIS before the final EIS is issued, and the final EIS after the final EIS is issued. If no changes to the conclusions of the draft EIS are reflected in the final EIS, no action to revise the COLA ER should be necessary. If such changes occur, SNC will revise the COLA ER, as appropriate, to address the changes. The COLA, including this environmental report, is based on the expectation that all environmental protection issues will be resolved during the ESP review process.

1.1.1 SITE PREPARATION AND PRELIMINARY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

SNC will initiate site preparation activities that do not require a Limited Work Authorization (LWA) with the issuance of an ESP, as described in Section 4.11 of the EIS. In addition, SNC has

requested the NRC to authorize limited work to perform preliminary construction activities as prescribed in 10 CFR 50.10(e). Part 6 of this application refers to the site redress plan that is a component of the ESP application (SNC 2008) and that addresses the measures SNC would take to ensure that, should construction be terminated prior to completion of the plant, LWA activities would be remediated to return the site to an acceptable environmental condition.

1.1.2 COL APPLICATION AND REVIEW

The NRC established the licensing process used by SNC in 10 CFR Part 52. NRC Regulation 10 CFR 52 Subpart C, Combined Licenses, allows generating entities to apply for a combined license, that is, a combined construction permit and operating license for a nuclear facility. A COL authorizes construction and operation of the facility.

A COLA can reference an ESP issued under 10 CFR 52 Subpart A, Early Site Permits (51.50(c)(1)). Additionally, under 10 CFR 52.27(c), a COLA can reference an ESP application that has been docketed but not yet issued. In general, if the COLA references an ESP, the COLA's ER need not contain certain information or analyses previously submitted to the NRC in connection with the ESP Application. Instead, the COLA's ER must contain the following:

- Information and analyses otherwise required.
- Information sufficient to demonstrate that the facility falls within the parameters specified in the ESP.
- Information to resolve any other significant environmental issue not considered in any previous proceeding on the site or design.

A COLA can also reference a standard design certification (51.50(c)(2)). If the COLA references a standard design certification, the ER may incorporate by reference the environmental assessment prepared by the NRC for the referenced design certification, and must demonstrate that the site characteristics for the COL site fall within the parameters in the design certification environmental assessment.

In accordance with NRC regulations, SNC, as agent for the co-owners, submitted an application for an ESP in August 2006 and is referencing it in this COLA. The NRC published an environmental assessment relating to the AP1000 design certification in 2005 (NRC 2005). This COLA incorporates the information presented in both the SNC ESP Application and the AP1000 design certification, as amended.

1.2 PROPOSED FEDERAL ACTION

The proposed Federal action is the issuance of combined construction and operating licenses for two nuclear units, as described in the design certification for the Westinghouse Electric Company, LLC (Westinghouse) AP1000 advanced light water reactors. The reactors would be sited as described in the ESP application prepared for the VEGP site in Burke County, Georgia.

1.3 THE PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

GPC, through the Georgia Public Service Commission's Integrated Resource Planning (IRP) process, has identified a need for additional base load generation by 2015/2017 (GPC 2007). This need was identified through a detailed economic analysis associated with the IRP process.

In addition, the Georgia legislature has pointed out that virtually all new power plants built in Georgia in the last 15 years are fueled by natural gas, exposing electricity consumers to punishing price volatility, and went on to urge Georgia utilities to study the feasibility of building new nuclear power plants (Senate Resolution 865). It is SNC's purpose to be responsive to this resolution.

The new units would be co-located at the site of two nuclear generating facilities owned jointly by GPC, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, the Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, and Dalton Utilities. SNC has been authorized by GPC, acting as agent for the owners of VEGP, to apply for COLs for the VEGP Units 3 and 4.

SNC is submitting the COLA to the NRC for the authority to construct new nuclear generation to meet GPC needs and the projected needs of the co-owners.

1.4 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION

For the purposes of this COLA, the only relevant alternative to the NRC granting the COLs is the no-action alternative of the NRC not granting the COLs. In this scenario, the construction and operation of two additional nuclear units would not occur. The environmental impacts of operating the nuclear units described in Chapter 5 of the EIS would not occur. Some impacts from preliminary site preparation activities not requiring an LWA may occur.

The no-action alternative would result in none of the benefits ascribed to the COLs:

- Meeting future energy needs identified by the co-owners.
- Maintaining long-term price stability for electricity in the relevant service area.
- Enhancing energy security and fuel diversity.
- 1.5 COMPLIANCE AND CONSULTATIONS

As part of its ER preparation process, SNC contacted relevant federal, state, and local agency personnel to confirm that no significant changes in laws or regulations had occurred that could materially affect the conclusions in the ESP EIS and thus require action in the COLA. No such information was identified.

SNC has completed all communications required for the EIS process and no unresloved issues remain.

SNC has initiated discussions with Federal and state regulatory authorities regarding authorizations and permits needed for the construction and operation of the VEGP Units 3 and 4.

			License/	Expiration		
Agency	Authority	Requirement	(1)	Date (1)	Activity Covered	Status
U.S.Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Endangered Species Act	Consultation regarding potential to adversely impact protected species (non-marine species)	NA	NA	Concurrence with no adverse impact or consultation on appropriate mitigation measures.	On Oct 12, 2007, the NRC wrote the USFWS describing the project and asking for a list of protected species and habitats at the proposed site and alternative sites, and for any information under the jurisdiction of the USFWS that the agency considered pertinent to the project
National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)	Endangered Species Act	Consultation regarding potential to adversely impact protected species (marine species)	NA	NA	Concurrence with no adverse impact or consultation on appropriate mitigation measures.	On Oct 12, 2007, the NRC wrote the NMFS describing the project and asking for a list of protected species and habitats at the proposed site and alternative sites, and for any information under the jurisdiction of the NMFS that the agency considered pertinent to the project
South Carolina Department of Archives and History	National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR 800)	Consultation regarding potential to adversely affect historic resources	NA	NA	Confirm site construction or operation would not affect protected historic resources.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
Alabama Historical Commission	National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR 800)	Consultation regarding potential to adversely affect historic resources	NA	NA	Confirm site construction or operation would not affect protected historic resources.	On Oct 12, 2007, the NRC wrote the Alabama Historical Commission describing the project and inviting the SHPO to consult with the NRC regarding the proposed project

Table 1.5-1 Authorizations Required for Early Site Permit

Table 1.5-1 Authorizations Required for Early Site Permit (Continued)

			License/ Permit No.	Expiration		
Agency	Authority	Requirement	(1)	Date (1)	Activity Covered	Status
Georgia Department of Natural Resources (GDNR)	National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR 800)	Consultation regarding potential to adversely affect historic resources	NA	NA	Confirm site construction or operation would not affect protected historic resources.	On Oct 12, 2007, the NRC wrote the Georgia SHPO describing the project and inviting the SHPO to consult with the NRC regarding the proposed project
GDNR	Federal Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) (CWA)	Section 401 Certification	NA	NA	Compliance with water quality standards.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
Native American Nations:	Environmental Protection	Consultation regarding protection of traditional	NA	NA	Confirm that traditional Native American religious	On Oct 12, 2007 and Oct 16, 2007 the NRC wrote the
Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma	Regulations for Native Ameril Domestic Licensing religious or cl and Related resources	religious or cultural resources	ral		protected	groups describing the project and inviting them to consult
Chickasaw Nation	(10 CFR 51) require Protection of Historic					proposed project.
Chickasaw Nation of Oklahoma	Properties (36 CFR 800)					
Georgia Tribe of Eastern Cherokee						
Alabama-Quassarte Tribal Town						
Seminole Nation of Oklahoma						
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians						
United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians						

			Liconso/	Larry One re		
			Permit No	Expiration		
Agency	Authority	Requirement	(1)	Date (1)	Activity Covered	Status
Poarch Band of Creek Indians	`					
Coushalta Tribe of Louisanna						
Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma						
Muscogee (Creek) Nation of Oklahoma						
Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas						
Catawba Indian Tribe						
Seminole Tribe of Florida						
Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians						
Kidegee Tribal Town						
Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida						
Thlopthlocco Tibal Town						
Muscogee (Creek) Nation						

Table 1.5-1 Authorizations Required for Early Site Permit (Continued)

¹ No licenses or permits have been issued to this project

Agency	Authority	Requirement	License/	Expiration	Activity Covered	Status
			Permit No. (1)	Date (1)		
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	CWA	Section 404 Permit			Disturbance or crossing wetland areas or navigable waters. For site and rail corridor upgrade ² .	SNC has completed jurisdictional determinations for all site wetlands with the exception of the required metes and bounds survey.
USACE	33 CFR 323	Dredge and Fill Discharge Permit			Construction/ modification of intake/ discharge to Savannah River. For site and rail corridor upgrade ² .	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
USACE	Rivers and Harbors Act	Section 10 Permit			Barge slip modification impacts to navigable waters of the U.S.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
U.S. Department of Transporation (USDOT)	49 CFR 107, Subpart G	Certificate of Registration			Transportation of hazardous materials.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
USFWS	Migratory Bird Treaty Act, 50 CFR 21	Federal Depredation Permit			Adverse impacts on protected species and/or their nests. For site and rail corridor upgrade ² .	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)	49 USC 1501 14 CFR 77	Construction Notice			Notice of erection of structures (>200 feet high) potentially impacting air navigation.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.

Table 1.5-2 Authorizations Required for Site Preparation Activities that Do Not Require a Limited Work Authorization

Agency	Authority	Requirement	License/	Expiration	Activity Covered	Status
			Permit No.	Date (1)		
Georgia Public Service Commission (GPSC)	GA Public Utilities Act (O.C.G.A. Section 46-3-1 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 515-3-407	Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity	(1)		Present and future public convenience and necessity require the operation of such equipment or facility.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	GA Endangered Wildlife Act (O.C.G.A. Section 27-3-130 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-4- 10	Depredation Permit			Adverse impacts on state designated protected species and/or their habitat. For site and rail corridor ² .	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	Federal Clean Air Act (CAA), GA Air Quality Act (O.C.G.A. Section 12-9-1 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-1	Part 70 Air Quality Construction Permit			Construction air emission sources.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	CWA, GA Water Quality Control Act	Revision of existing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit			Regulates limits of pollutants in liquid discharge to surface water	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	CWA, GA Water Quality Control Act (O.C.G.A. 12-5-20), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-6	General Permit Registration for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity for Common Developments	GAR10000 3	July 31, 2008	Discharge storm water from site during construction	SNC initiated development of Erosion, Sedimentation and Pollution Control Plan in February 2008.

Table 1.5-2 Authorizations Required for Site Preparation Activities that Do Not Require a Limited Work Authorization (Continued)

Agency	Authority	Requirement	License/ Permit No. (1)	Expiration Date (1)	Activity Covered	Status
GDNR	CWA, GA Water Quality Control Act (O.C.G.A. 12-5-20), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-6	General Permit Registration for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity for Infrastructure Construction Projects	GAR10000 2	July 31, 2008	Discharge storm water from linear construction sites (e.g., roadways and rail corridor)	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	GA Safe Drinking Water Act (O.C.G.A. 12-5-170 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-5	Revision of existing permit to operate a public water system			Operate a public, non- transient, non-community water system.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	GA Safe Drinking Water Act (O.C.G.A. 12-5-170 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-5	Revision of existing permit to operate a public water system			Operate a public, transient, non-community water system.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	GA Groundwater Use Act (O.C.G.A. 12-5-90 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-2- .03	Modification of Existing Permit to Use Groundwater			Consumptive use of 100,000 gallons per day or more of groundwater.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	GA Groundwater Use Act (O.C.G.A. 12-5-90 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-2- .09	Permit to Withdraw Groundwater			Dewater for foundation if needed for more than 60 days.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.

Table 1.5-2 Authorizations Required for Site Preparation Activities that Do Not Require a Limited Work Authorization (Continued)

Agency	Authority	Requirement	License/ Permit No. (1)	Expiration Date (1)	Activity Covered	Status
GDNR	GA Groundwater Use Act (O.C.G.A. 12-5-90 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-2- .14	Certification of Abandoned Wells			Abandoned wells have been filled, plugged and sealed.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	GA Erosion and Sedimentation Act (O.C.G.A. Section 12-7-1 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-7	Land Disturbing Activity Permit			Permission to conduct land disturbing activities of one acre or larger, or within 200 feet of the bank of any state waters. For site and rail corridor upgrade ² .	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	GA Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Act (O.C.G.A. 12-8-20 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-4- .06	Permit by Rule - Inert Landfill Permit			On-site disposal of solid waste consisting of earth and earth-like products, concrete, cured asphalt, rock, bricks, and land clearing debris.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	GA Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Act (O.C.G.A. 12-8-20 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-4	Private Industry Landfill Permit			On-site disposal of solid waste consisting of construction and demolition debris.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	GA Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Act (O.C.G.A. 12-8-20 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-4	Solid Waste Handling Permit			Disposal of industrial solid wastes. Transportation of putrescible waste for disposal in a permitted landfill.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.

Table 1.5-2 Authorizations Required for Site Preparation Activities that Do Not Require a Limited Work Authorization (Continued)

Agency	Authority	Requirement	License/ Permit No. (1)	Expiration Date (1)	Activity Covered	Status
GDNR	Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA), GA Air Quality Act (O.C.G.A. Section 12-9-1 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-1	Revision of existing Title V Operating Permit			Operation of air emission sources.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
Burke County Building Office	Burke County Code of Ordinances, Article VII, Sec. 26- 331	Land Disturbing Activity Permit			All land disturbing activities within the boundaries of Burke County.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
Burke County Building Office	Burke County Code of Ordinances, Article VII, Sec. 26- 336	Building Permit			Construction, alteration, repair, or demolition of any building or structure within the boundaries of Burke County.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.

Table 1.5-2 Authorizations Required for Site Preparation Activities that Do Not Require a Limited Work Authorization (Continued)

1

No permits specific to this project have been issued. The VEGP rail spur was recently upgraded, and SNC will verify that additional upgrades are not needed. For completeness, 2 this table assumes upgrades to the rail corridor will be made.

			License/			
			Expiration			
Agency	Authority	Requirement	No. (1)	Date (1)	Activity Covered	Status
USACE	CWA	Section 404 Permit			Disturbance or crossing wetland areas or navigable waters.	SNC has completed jurisdictional determinations for all site wetlands with the exception of the required metes and bounds survey.
USDOT	49 FR 107, Subpart G	Certificate of Registration			Transportation of hazardous materials.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	CWA	Section 401 Certification			Compliance with water quality standards.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	CWA, GA Water Quality Control Act (O.C.G.A. 12-5-20), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-6	General Permit Registration for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity for Common Developments	GAR10000 3	July 31, 2008	Discharge storm water from site during construction (might be covered by existing registration).	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	CWA, GA Water Quality Control Act (O.C.G.A. 12-5-20), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-6	General Permit Registration for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity for Infrastructure Construction Projects	GAR10000 2	July 31, 2008	Discharge storm water linear construction sites (e.g., roadways, transmission lines) during construction) (might be covered by existing registration).	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.

Table 1.5-3 Authorizations Required for Redress Activities

Table 1.5-3 Authorizations Required for Redress Activities (Continued)

			License/ Permit	Expiration		
Agency	Authority	Requirement	No. (1)	Date (1)	Activity Covered	Status
GDNR	GA Erosion and Sedimentation Act (O.C.G.A. Section 12-7-1 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-7	Land Disturbing Activity Permit			Permission to conduct land disturbing activities of one acre or larger, or within 200 feet of the bank of any state waters. For site and rail corridor.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	CAA, GA Air Quality Act (O.C.G.A. Section 12-9-1 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-1	Part 70 Air Quality Construction Permit			Construction air emission sources.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	GA Safe Drinking Water Act (O.C.G.A. 12-5-170 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-5	Notice of Termination (NOT) - Permit to operate a Public Water System			Operate a public, non- transient, non-community water system.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	GA Safe Drinking Water Act (O.C.G.A. 12-5-170 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-5	NOT - Permit to operate a Public Water System			Operate a public, transient, non-community water system.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	GA Groundwater Use Act (O.C.G.A. 12-5-90 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-203	NOT - Permit to Use Groundwater			Consumptive use of 100,000 gallons per day or more of groundwater.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	GA Groundwater Use Act (O.C.G.A. 12-5-90 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-209	Permit to Withdraw Groundwater			Dewater for foundation if needed for more than 60 days.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.

Table 1.5-3 Authorizations Required for Redress Activities (Continued)

			License/ Permit	Expiration		
Agency	Authority	Requirement	No. (1)	Date (1)	Activity Covered	Status
GDNR	GA Groundwater Use Act (O.C.G.A. 12-5-90 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-214	Certification of Abandoned Wells			Abandoned wells have been filled, plugged and sealed.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	GA Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Act (O.C.G.A. 12-8-20 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-4- .06	Permit by Rule - Inert Landfill Permit			On-site disposal of solid waste consisting of earth and earth-like products, concrete, cured asphalt, rock, bricks, and land clearing debris.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	GA Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Act (O.C.G.A. 12-8-20 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-4	Private Industry Landfill Permit			On-site disposal of solid waste consisting of construction and demolition debris.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	GA Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Act (O.C.G.A. 12-8-20 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-4	Solid Waste Handling Permit			Disposal of industrial solid wastes. Transportation of putrescible waste for disposal in a permitted landfill.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
Burke County Building Office	Burke County Code of Ordinances, Article VII, Sec. 26- 331	Land Disturbing Activity Permit			All land disturbing activities within the boundaries of Burke County	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
Burke County Building Office	Burke County Code of Ordinances, Article VII, Sec. 26- 336	Building Permit			Construction, alteration, repair, or demolition of any building or structure within the boundaries of Burke County.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.

¹ No permits specific to this project have been issued.

			License/ Permit	Expiration			
Agency	Authority	Requirement	No. (2)	Date (2)	Activity Covered	Status	
NRC	10 CFR 52, Subpart C	Combined Operating License			Safety-related construction for a nuclear power facility.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and	
	or	or				compliance actions relative to this issue.	
	10 CFR 50.10(e)(3)	Limited Work Authorization					
FAA	49 USC 1501	Construction			Notice of erection or structures	SNC has initiated preliminary	
	14 CFR 77			impacting air navigation.	agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.		
USACE	CWA	Section 404 Permit			Disturbance or crossing wetland areas or navigable waters. For transmission line corridor.	SNC has completed jurisdictional determinations for all site wetlands with the exception of the required metes and bounds survey.	
USACE	33 CFR 323	Dredge and Fill Discharge Permit			Construction/ modification of intake/ discharge to Savannah River. For transmission line corridor.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.	
USFWS	Migratory Bird Treaty Act, 50 CFR 21	Federal Depredation Permit			Adverse impacts on protected species and/or their nests. For site transmission line corridor.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.	

Table 1.5-4 Authorizations Required for Construction Activities¹

Table 1.5-4 Authorizations Required for Construction Activities¹ (Continued)

Agency	Authority	Requirement	License/ Permit No. (2)	Expiration Date (2)	Activity Covered	Status
GDNR	GA Endangered Wildlife Act (O.C.G.A. Section 27-3-130 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391- 4-10	Depredation permit			Adverse impacts on state designated protected species and/ or their habitat. For transmission line corridor.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	CAA, GA Air Quality Act (O.C.G.A. Section 12-9-1 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391- 3-1	Part 70 Air Quality Construction Permit			Construction air emission sources.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	CWA, GA Water Quality Control Act (O.C.G.A. 12- 5-20), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-6	General Permit Registration for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity for Infrastructure Construction Projects	GAR10000 2	July 31, 2008	Discharge storm water from linear construction sites (e.g., roadways, transmission lines) during construction.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	GA Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Act (O.C.G.A. 12-8-20 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-4	Solid Waste Handling Permit			Disposal of industrial solid wastes. Transportation of putrescible waste for disposal in a permitted landfill.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.

Table 1.5-4 Authorizations Required for Construction Activities¹ (Continued)

Agency	Authority	Requirement	License/ Permit No. (2)	Expiration Date (2)	Activity Covered	Status
GDNR	GA Erosion and Sedimentation Act (O.C.G.A. Section 12-7-1 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391- 3-7	Land Disturbing Activity Permit			Permission to conduct land disturbing activities of one acre or larger, or within 200 feet of the bank of any state waters. For transmission line corridor.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
GDNR	CWA, GA Water Quality Control Act (O.C.G.A. 12- 5-20), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-6	General Permit Registration for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity for Infrastructure Construction Projects	GAR10000 2	July 31, 2008	Discharge storm water from linear construction sites. For transmission line corridor.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT)	23 CFR 1.23	Permit			Utility right-of-way easement.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
Burke County Building Office	Burke County Code of Ordinances, Article VII, Sec. 26-331	Land Disturbing Activity Permit			All land disturbing activities within the boundaries of Burke County.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.
Various county offices responsible for land disturbing activities	Jefferson, Warren, and McDuffie County Ordinances	Land Disturbing Activity Permit			Land disturbing activities within county boundaries for transmission line corridor.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.

Assumes that SNC obtained the authorizations that Table 1.5-2 identifies. No permits specific to this project have been issued. 1

2

			License/ Expiration							
Agency	Authority	Requirement	Permit No. ²	Date ²	Activity Covered	Status				
GDNR	FCWA, GA Water Quality Control Act	Revision of existing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit			Regulates limits of pollutants in liquid discharge to surface water.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.				
GDNR	Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA), GA Air Quality Act (O.C.G.A. Section 12-9-1 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-1	Revision of existing Title V Operating Permit			Operation of air emission sources.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.				
GDNR	GA Groundwater Use Act (O.C.G.A. 12-5-90 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-2- .03	Revision of existing Permit to Use Groundwater			Consumptive use of 100,000 gallons per day or more of groundwater.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.				
GDNR	GA Water Quality Control Act (O.C.G.A. 12-5-31 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391-3-6	Revision of existing Surface Water Withdrawal Permit to Withdraw, Divert or Impound Surface Water			Withdraw water from the Savannah River for cooling makeup and in-plant use.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.				
State of Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation Division of Radiological Health	Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation Rule 1200-2-10.32	Revision of existing Tennessee Radioactive Waste License-for-Delivery			Transportation of radioactive waste into the State of Tennessee.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.				
State of Utah Department of Environmental Quality Division of Radiation Control	R313-26 of the Utah Radiation Control Rules	Revision of existing General Site Access Permit			Transportation of radioactive materials into the State of Utah.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.				

Table 1.5-5 Authorizations Required for Operation¹

Table 1.5-5	Authorizations	Required	for Operation	¹ (Continued)

			License/	Expiration		
Agency	Authority	Requirement	Permit No. ²	Date ²	Activity Covered	Status
GPSC	GA Radiation Control Act (O.C.G.A. 31-13- 1 et seq.), GA Rules and Regulations 391- 3-1706	Revision of existing General Permit – Transportation of Radioactive Materials			Transportation of radioactive materials in the State of Georgia.	SNC has initiated preliminary discussions with permitting agency regarding permits and compliance actions relative to this issue.

¹ Assumes that SNC obtained the authorizations that Tables 1.5-2 and 1.5-4 identify.

² No permits specific to this project have been issued.

1.5.1 STATUS OF REGULATORY AGENCY CONSULTATIONS

An applicant referencing an ESP EIS must provide the status of environmentally related authorizations and permits potentially required to construct and operate new nuclear units. Tables 1.5-1 through 1.5-5 provide the status of authorizations and permits required at VEGP.

1.5.2 CONFORMANCE WITH DIVISION 4 REGULATORY GUIDES

The supplemental analyses presented in this ER were prepared using the guidance provided in NUREG-1555, "Standard Review Plans for Environmental Reviews for Nuclear Power Plants." The content guidelines outlined in NUREG-1555 are generally consistent with the guidance contained in Regulatory Guide 4.2. No other Division 4 regulatory guides are applicable to the supplemental analyses presented in the ER.

1.6 REPORT CONTENTS

The ER is organized as follows. Chapter 1 provides the purpose and need for the proposed action, altenatives to the proposed action, the status of regulatory compliance and consultation activities, and the methodology used to prepare the ER. Chapter 2 describes the proposed site and environment that would be affected by the addition of two new reactors at VEGP. Chapter 3 describes the characteristics of the AP1000 power plant, and its interfaces with the environment that are the bases for evaluating environmental impacts. Chapter 4 examines the environmental impacts of construction and Chapter 5 evaluates the environmental impacts of operations to determine the suitability of the VEGP site for the new units. Chapter 6 evaluates the impacts of the uranium fuel cycle, transportation associated with constructing and operating the facility, and decommissioning of the units at the end of plant life. Chapter 7 evaluates the cumulative impacts of the proposed action, and other past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions in the vicinity of VEGP. Chapter 8 examines the need for power. Chapter 9 examines alternatives to the proposed action, alternative locations, and alternative energy sources. Chapter 10 compares the proposed action with alternatives, and Chapter 11 summarizes the findings and conclusions.

1.7 ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT METHODOLOGY

1.7.1 DEMONSTRATION THAT ER CONFORMS WITH REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

10 CFR Section 51.50(c)(1) states that COLAs referencing an ESP need not contain information or analyses submitted in the ESP application or resolved in the ESP EIS. Alternatively, the COLA may reference an ESP application that has been docketed but not issued (10 CFR 52.27(c). Still, the ER must contain, in addition to the environmental information and analyses otherwise required (10 CFR 51.50(c)(1)):

- (i) Information to demonstrate that the design of the facility falls within the site characteristics and design parameters specified in the ESP.
- (ii) Information to resolve any significant environmental issue that was not resolved in the ESP proceeding.
- (iii) Any new and significant information for issues related to the impacts of construction and operation of the facility that were resolved in the ESP proceeding.

- (iv) A description of the process used to identify new and significant information regarding the NRC's conclusions in the ESP EIS.
- (v) A demonstration that all environmental terms and conditions that have been included in the ESP will be satisfied by the date of the issuance of the combined license.

10 CFR 51.50(c)(2) states that if a standard design certification is referenced, the COLA ER must contain information to demonstrate that the site characteristics fall within the parameters in the design certification environmental assessment.

While SNC believes that all significant environmental issues have been resolved, two contentions are pending before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board (ASLB) based on the ESP application. SNC believes that the Board will ultimately decide these issues .

Table 1.7-1 lists the report sections that fulfill the requirements of 10 CFR 51.50(c)(1).

	Requirement/Commitment	COLA ER Section that Addresses
(i)	information to demonstrate that the design of the facility falls within the site characteristics and design parameters specified in the early site permit	Table 3.0-1
	Table J-1 An applicant referencing this EIS will demonstrate its application is bounded by the ESP site characteristics contained in Table I-1, Part 1	
	Table J-1 An applicant referencing this EIS will demonstrate its application is bounded by the AP 1000 design values contained and referenced in Table I-1, Part 2	
(ii)	information to resolve any significant environmental issue that was not resolved in the early site permit proceeding	The NRC staff did not identify any unresolved issues in preparation of the draft EIS. Currently two contentions are before the ASLB. SNC belives these will be resolved by the ASLB in its decision on the contested issue.
(iii)	any new and significant information for issues related to the impacts of construction and operation of the facility that were resolved in the early site permit proceeding	No new and significant information was identified. Section 1.7.2 describes the process used to make this determination.
	Table J-1 An applicant referencing this EIS will provide, in its application, any new information that could affect the technical basis of conclusions for determination of an impact level in the EIS.	
(iv)	a description of the process used to identify new and significant information regarding the NRC's conclusions in the early site permit environmental impact statement. The process must use a reasonable methodology for identifying such new and significant information	Section 1.7.2

Table 1.7-1 10 CFR 51.50(c)(1) Requirements and EIS Table J-1 Commitments

Table 1.7-1 10 CFR 51.50(c)(1) Requirements and EIS Table J-1 Commitments (Continued)

	Requirement/Commitment	COLA ER Section that Addresses
(v)	a demonstration that all environmental terms and conditions that have been included in the early site permit will be satisfied by the date of the issuance of the combined license	The ESP is scheduled to be issued in 2009. After the ESP is issued, and prior to the issuance of the draft EIS for the COLA, SNC would amend its COLA, as necessary, to reference the ESP and discuss how SNC meets or will meet the ESP terms and conditions.
(vi)	information to demonstrate that the site characteristics for the combined license site fall within the site parameters in the design certification environmental assessment	Table 3.0-1
	Table J-1 An applicant referencing this EIS will demonstrate its application is bounded by the site interface values contained in Table I-1, Part 3	
	Table J-1 An applicant referencing this EIS will provide the status of the authorizations and permits specified in Appendix H.	Tables 1.5-1 to 1.5-5.
	Table J-1 An applicant referencing this EIS will demonstrate its application contains the mitigation measures contained in Section 4.10.	Section 1.7.2 describes the process that SNC used to verify that there is no new and significant information pertaining to EIS Section 4.10. SNC remains committed to the mitigation measures that Section 4.10 describes.
	Table J-1 An applicant referencing this EIS will demonstrate its application contains the mitigation measures contained in Section 5.11.	Section 1.7.2 describes the process that SNC used to verify that there is no new and significant information pertaining to EIS Section 5.11. SNC remains committed to the mitigation measures that Section 5.11 describes.
	Procedures for reporting and keeping records of environmental data, and any conditions and monitoring requirements for protecting the non- aquatic environment proposed for possible inclusion in the license as conditions.	COLA Part 10, as referenced in the COLA ER Sections 4.10 and 5.11.

1.7.2 NEW AND SIGNIFICANT REVIEW

In order to satisfy the requirements of 10 CFR 51.50(c), SNC developed a process to identify any new and significant information regarding issues addressed in the ESP draft EIS that are required to be included in the environmental review for the COLA. The purpose of the new and significant review is to provide a methodical, comprehensive review of the conclusions presented in the ESP EIS and the supporting information for those conclusions to identify any new and significant information that has the potential to change the NRC's conclusions presented in the ESP EIS. The process ensures that, taken together, the ESP EIS and the COLA EIS present a complete and clear description of the proposed project and its impacts on the affected environment. The search for new and significant information is based on a reasonable process, systematically performed by a qualified investigative team using their best professional judgment. The preamble to the final rule for 10 CFR 50.51 states that in the COL ER review process, the COL EIS "brings forward the Commission's earlier conclusions from the ESP EIS and articulates the activities undertaken by the NRC staff to ensure that an issue that was resolved can remain resolved. If there is new and significant information on a previously

resolved issue, then the Staff will limit its inquiry to determine if the information changes the Commission's earlier conclusion" (72 Fed Reg. 49431, Aug. 28, 2007). Per the regulation, the process was applied only to NRC conclusions, most of which occur in Chapters 4 for construction and 5 for operations.

SNC's process for identifying new and significant information began with a systematic review of the EIS conclusions and supporting information to identify the EIS "key inputs." SNC defines "key inputs" as information or assumptions that the NRC staff relied on to support their findings and conclusions in the EIS. Information on the affected environment and its interactions with the proposed action are found throughout much of the EIS. Key assumptions are in Appendix J of the EIS. Key site characteristics, AP1000 Design Control Document parameters, and site interface values are in Appendix I of the EIS. These key inputs identify the main sources of information used in developing the evaluations in the EIS.

New information related to conclusions in the EIS must be identified and evaluated to determine if the new information could alter the evaluation supporting the EIS conclusions, and change the conclusion. The NRC defines new information as any information that was both (1) not considered in preparing the ESP environmental report or EIS and (2) not generally known or publicly available during the preparation of the EIS. For new information to be significant it must be material to the issue being considered, that is, it must have the potential to affect the finding or conclusions of the NRC staff's evaluation of the issue (72 FR 166, pg 49431). For the VEGP EIS, new information was information that became available after April 2007 or that was generally not available or not known about during the preparation of the ER and draft EIS. After key inputs were identified, subject matter experts (SMEs), SNC and contractor technical personnel with expert knowledge in their designated subject areas, determined if new information on each key input was available. The SMEs were identified and assigned appropriate topics by the Environmental Project Manager (EPM) with input from contractor management.

The SMEs reviewed recent publications, news releases, and project documents and contacted resource agencies or government offices to inquire if the inputs used in the original analysis were still valid. The conclusion of their search for new information was documented for each key input. Any new information was documented for further review. The SMEs then determined if the new information was of such significance that it could possibly affect the conclusions in the EIS. The basis for the determination of whether the new information was significant or not was also documented. Once the SMEs had identified new information in each topical area, determined if the information was significant, and documented their decision and the rationale for that decision, a package was compiled which included the reference materials that supported the new information. The EPM convened a review team of senior SMEs who reviewed each topical area with the SME to concur or dispute the SME's conclusions.

SNC retained all documentation of the new and significant review process, which is available for an NRC onsite environmental audit.

Because no new and significant information was identified, this ER relies entirely on the conclusions of the ESP EIS. SNC's ESP ER was developed with the intent of leaving no items unresolved, in order to minimize the number of environmental issues left unresolved by the ESP proceeding. In September 2007, NRC issued the draft EIS for ESP which did not identify any unresolved items. The ESP is scheduled to be issued in 2009. After the ESP is issued, and prior to the issuance of the draft EIS for the COLA, SNC would amend its COLA, as necessary, to

reference the ESP and discuss how SNC meets or will meet the ESP terms and conditions. Because the environmental review for the ESP and COL overlap, there is a low probability of any new or significant information in the COL proceeding related to issues resolved in the ESP proceeding. In each chapter of the COLA ER, SNC provides a brief summary description of the information covered by the chapter and references to the relevant chapter of the ESP EIS. Updated information is provided, where appropriate.

1.8 REFERENCES

GPC 2007. Georgia Power Company. 2007. Application for Approval of Its 2007 Integrated Resource Plan; Docket Number 24505-U. Atlanta Ga. January 30, 2007.

NRC 2005. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. 2005. Environmental Assessment by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Relating to the Certification of the AP1000 Standard Plant Design. Docket No. 52-006. Washington, D.C. March 18, 2005.

SNC 2008. Southern Nuclear Operating Company. 2008. Vogtle Early Site Permit Application: Environmental Report, Rev. 4. Birmingham, AL. March 31.

2.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Chapter 2 describes the VEGP site, the vicinity or the region, as appropriate, for each environmental topic that could be affected by the construction or operation of two new nuclear units at the VEGP site.

2.1 SITE LOCATION

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 2, Section 2.1 described the VEGP site and the proposed locations of the new reactors. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to the site location.

2.2 LAND

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 2, Section 2.2 described the habitat types on the VEGP site and the proposed transmission line corridor, the land uses in the vicinity and region, access to the site, and nearby communities. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this resource.

2.3 METEOROLOGY AND AIR QUALITY

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 2, Section 2.3 described the climate and air quality of the VEGP site and region and the existing meteorological monitoring program at the VEGP site. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to these topics.

2.4 GEOLOGY

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 2, Section 2.4 described the basic geology underlying the VEGP site and region. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this topic.

2.5 RADIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 2, Section 2.5 described radiological doses to the maximally exposed individual due to operation of VEGP Units 1 and 2 as <0.1 mrem per year for the years 2001 – 2004. The NRC also reviewed studies of tritium concentrations in the water table aquifer and determined that atmospheric deposition, not transriver flow from the Savannah River Site, is the source of elevated tritium concentrations. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to the radiological environment.

2.6 WATER

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 2, Section 2.6 described the hydrological processes governing movement and distribution of ground water and surface water, water use, and water quality in the vicinity of the VEGP site. Section 2.6 also described the existing VEGP hydrological monitoring program and the chemical monitoring required under the existing VEGP National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this resource.

2.7 ECOLOGY

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 2, Section 2.7 described the terrestrial and aquatic ecology in the vicinity of the VEGP site. Section 2.7 also described the ecology in the vicinity of the proposed transmission line. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2 SNC identified no new and significant information related to ecological resources.

2.8 SOCIOECONOMICS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 2, Section 2.8 described the socioeconomics of the region of interest for the VEGP site. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this topic.

2.9 HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 2, Section 2.9 described the historic background and cultural resources known on the site. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to historic or cultural resources.

2.10 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 2, Section 2.10 described the minority and low-income populations within the region around VEGP. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this topic.

2.11 RELATED FEDERAL PROJECTS AND CONSULTATION

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 2, Section 2.11 described Federal activities in the region surrounding VEGP. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this topic.

3.0 SITE LAYOUT AND PLANT DESCRIPTION

Chapter 3 describes the two AP1000 units proposed for the VEGP site and their auxiliary systems.

NRC regulations at 10 CFR 51.50(c)(1)(i) require that a COL application referencing an ESP contain information to demonstrate that the design of the facility falls within the site characteristics and design parameters specified in the ESP. NRC regulations at 10 CFR 51.50(c)(2) require a COLA environmental report referencing a standard design certification to demonstrate that the site characteristics fall within the parameters in the design certification environmental assessment.

Although the NRC has not issued SNC an ESP for two additional units at the VEGP site, Table 3.0-1 demonstrates that the site characteristics, design parameters, and site interface values considered in this COL application fall within those described in the ESP application or within Rev. 16 of the AP1000 Design Control Document (DCD) and its associated technical reports.
Part I Site Characteristic	ESP			COL		
Item	Single Unit [T	wo Unit] Value	Description and Reference	Single Unit [1	wo Unit] Value	Comments
Airborne Effluent Release	Point					
Minimum Distance to Exclusion Area Boundary (EAB)	½ mi (~800 m)		The lateral distance from the release point (power block area) to the modeled EAB for dose analysis.	½ mi (~800 m)		Unchanged from ESP.
Atmospheric Dispersion (χ/Q) (Accident)	The atmospheric dispersion coefficients used to estimate dose consequences of accident airborne releases.					
	Time (hour)	Site χ/Q	Atmospheric dispersion	Time (hour)	Site χ/Q	Unchanged from ESP.
ΕΑΒ (χ/Q)	0 - 2 EAB	7.38E-5 sec/m ³	estimate dose consequences of	0 - 2 EAB	7.38E-5 sec/m ³	
Low Population Zone (LPZ) (χ/Q)	0 - 8 LPZ 8 - 24 LPZ 24 - 96 LPZ 96 - 720 LPZ	1.40E-5 sec/m ³ 1.22E-5 sec/m ³ 9.15E-6 sec/m ³ 6.04E-6 sec/m ³	accident airborne releases. (From Table 5-13 of the EIS)	0 - 8 LPZ 8 - 24 LPZ 24 - 96 LPZ 96 - 720 LPZ	1.40E-5 sec/m ³ 1.22E-5 sec/m ³ 9.15E-6 sec/m ³ 6.04E-6 sec/m ³	

Part I Site Characteristic	ESP		COL	1
Item	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Description and Reference	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Comments
Gaseous Effluents Disper	rsion, Deposition (Annual Average)			
Atmospheric Dispersion (χ/Q)	See Table 3.0-2 .	The atmospheric dispersion coefficients used to estimate dose consequences of normal airborne releases.	χ/Q values as described in ESP	Unchanged from ESP.
Population Density		-	-	
Population density over the lifetime of the new units until 2090	Population density meets the guidance of RS-002, Attachment 3		Population density meets the guidance of RS-002, Attachment 3	Unchanged from ESP.
EAB	Refer to Figure 2-1 in the EIS	The exclusion area boundary generally follows the plant property line.	Refer to Figure 3.1-1 in the ER	Unchanged from ESP.
LPZ	A 2-mile-radius from the midpoint between the containment buildings of Units 1 and 2	The LPZ is a circle with a radius of 2 miles, centered on the midpoint between Unit 1 and Unit 2 containment buildings	A 2-mile-radius from the midpoint between the containment buildings of Units 1 and 2	Unchanged from ESP.
Height	234 ft 0 in	The height from finished grade to the top of the tallest power block structure, excluding cooling towers	229 ft 0 in	(DCD Rev 16, Table 3.3-5) The height affects aesthetic impacts and the potential for bird collisions. Because this height is lower than that analyzed in the ESP application, the impacts are bounded by those impacts

Part II Design Parameters	's ESP			COL
Item	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Description and Reference	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Comments
Facility Characteristics				
Foundation Embedment	39 ft 6 in to bottom of basemat from plant grade	The depth from finished grade to the bottom of the basemat for the most deeply embedded power block structure.	39 ft 6 in to bottom of basemat from plant grade	Unchanged from ESP.
Max Inlet Temp Condenser / Heat Exchanger	91°F	The maximum acceptable design circulating water temperature at the inlet to the condenser or cooling water system heat exchangers.	91°F	Unchanged from ESP.
Condenser / Heat Exchanger Duty	7.55E9 BTU/hr [1.51E10 BTU/hr]	Design value for the waste heat rejected to the circulating water system across the condensers. Selected value includes part of the service water system heat duty (from turbine equipment heat exchanger).	7.63E9 BTU/hr [1.53E10 BTU/hr]	Estimated heat load has increased by 1 percent. See Section 3.2.2.
Cooling Tower Temperature Range	25.2°F	The temperature difference between the hot water entering the tower and the cold water leaving the tower.	25.2°F	Unchanged from ESP.
Cooling Tower Cooling Water Flow Rate	600,000 gpm [1,200,000 gpm]	The total nominal cooling water flow rate through the condenser/ heat exchangers.	631,000 gpm [1,262,000 gpm]	Estimated flow rate has increased by 62,000 gpm or 5 percent. See Section 3.2.2.

Part II Design Parameters	ESP		COL				
Item	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Description and Reference	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Comments			
Auxiliary Heat Sink							
Component Cooling Water (CCW) Heat Exchanger Duty	8.3E7 BTU/hr normal 2.96E8 BTU/hr shutdown [1.66E8 BTU/hr normal 5.92E8 BTU/hr	The heat transferred from the CCW heat exchangers to the service water system for rejection to the environment.	8.3E7 BTU/hr normal 2.96E8 BTU/hr shutdown [1.66E8 BTU/hr normal 5.92E8 BTU/hr	Unchanged from ESP.			
Service Water System (SWS)	shutdown] 9,000 gpm normal 18,000 gpm shutdown	The total nominal cooling water	shutdown] 9,000 gpm normal 18,000 gpm shutdown	Unchanged from ESP.			
Flow Rate	[18,000 gpm normal 36,000 gpm shutdown]		[18,000 gpm normal 36,000 gpm shutdown]				
Plant Characteristics							
Rated Thermal Power (RTP)	3,400 MWt	The thermal power generated by the core.	3,400 MWt	Unchanged from ESP.			
Rated Nuclear Steam Supply System (NSSS) Thermal Output	3,415 MWt [6,830 MWt]	The thermal power generated by the core plus heat from the reactor coolant pumps.	3,415 MWt [6,830 MWt]	Unchanged from ESP.			
Average Fuel Enrichment	2.35 wt % to 4.45 wt %	Concentration of U-235 in fuel - initial load.	2.35 wt % to 4.45 wt %	Unchanged from ESP.			
	4.51 wt %	Average concentration, in weight percent, of U-235 in reloads	4.51 wt %				

Part II Design Parameters	ESP		COL		
Item	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Description and Reference	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Comments	
Fuel Burn-up	60,000 MWd/MTU (design max) 48,700 MWd/MTU (expected)	Value derived by multiplying the reactor thermal power by time of irradiation divided by fuel mass (expressed in megawatt - days per metric ton of uranium fuel).	60,000 MWd/MTU (design max) 48,700 MWd/MTU (expected)	Unchanged from ESP.	
Normal Releases					
Liquid Source Term	See Table G-1 of the EIS 0.26 curies total nuclides except tritium [0.52 curies]	The annual activity, by isotope, contained in routine liquid effluent streams.	0.26 curies total nuclides except tritium [0.52 curies]	Unchanged from ESP.	
Tritium (liquid)	1010 curies [2020 curies	The annual activity of tritium contained in routine liquid effluent streams	1010 curies [2020 curies]	Unchanged from ESP.	
Gaseous Source Term	See Table G-4 of the EIS 11,000 curies total nuclides except tritium [22,000 total curies]	The annual activity, by isotope, contained in routine plant airborne effluent streams.	11,000 curies total nuclides except tritium [22,000 total curies]	Unchanged from ESP.	
Tritium (gaseous)	350 curies [700 curies]	The annual activity of tritium contained in routine plant airborne effluent streams.	350 curies [700 curies]	Unchanged from ESP.	

Part II Design Parameters	ESP		COL		
ltem	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value Description and Reference		Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Comments	
Solid Waste Activity	1764 curies [3528 curies]	The annual activity contained in solid radioactive wastes generated during routine plant operations.	1764 curies [3528 curies]	Unchanged from ESP.	
Dry Active ("Solid") Waste Volume	4994 ft³The expected volume of solid radioactive wastes generated during routine plant operations.∠		4994 ft ³ [9988 ft ³]	Unchanged from ESP.	
Part III Site Interface Values		ESP	COL		
Item	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Description and Reference	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Comments	
Accident Releases					
Elevation (Post Accident)	groundlevel at edge of power block circle	The elevation above finished grade of the release point for accident sequence release analyses	groundlevel at edge of power block circle	Unchanged from ESP.	
Gaseous Source Term (Post- Accident)	See ESP Application ER Table 7.1-11	The activity, by isotope, contained in post-accident airborne effluents.	See DCD, Rev 16, Table 15A-5.	Unchanged from ESP. Doses resulting from changes to γ/\mathbf{Q} ratios are presented and	

Part III Site Interface Values	ESP			COL				
ltem	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value Description and Reference		Comments				
Normal Plant Heat Sink (cond	Normal Plant Heat Sink (condenser and turbine auxiliary cooling)							
CWS Cooling Tower Acreage	Cooling Tower Acreage 38 acres The land required for draft cooling towers, [69.3 acres] [69.3 acres] support facilities such equipment sheds, ba canals,		38 acres [69.3 acres]	Unchanged from ESP.				
CWS Cooling Tower Approach Temperature	11°F	The difference between the cold water temperature leaving the tower and the ambient wet bulb temperature.	11°F	Unchanged from ESP.				
CWS Cooling Tower Blowdown Temperature	91°F	The design maximum expected blowdown temperature at the point of discharge to the receiving water body.	91°F	Unchanged from ESP.				
CWS Cooling Tower Evaporation Rate	13,950 gpm (14,440 gpm) [27,900 gpm (28,880 gpm)]	The expected (and maximum) rate at which water is lost by evaporation from the cooling water systems.	14,550 gpm (15,280 gpm) [29,100 gpm (30,560 gpm)]	Average expected evaporation rates have increased by 4 percent and maximum expected evaporation rates have increased by 6 percent. See Section 3.2.1.				
CWS Cooling Tower Drift Rate	12 gpm [24 gpm]	The maximum rate at which water is lost by drift from the cooling water systems.	12.5 gpm [25 gpm]	Maximum expected drift loss has increased by 0.5 gpm per unit. See Section 3.2.1.				
CWS Cooling Tower Height	600 ft	The vertical height above finished grade of the natural draft cooling tower.	600 ft	Unchanged from ESP.				

Part III Site Interface Values		ESP	COL	
Item	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Description and Reference	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Comments
CWS Cooling Tower Make-up Flow Rate	18,612 gpm (28,892 gpm) [37,224 gpm (57,784 gpm)]	The expected (and maximum) design rate of removal of water from the Savannah River to replace water losses from circulating water systems. The make-up flow rate is a calculated value based on the sum of the evaporation rate plus the blowdown flow rate plus drift.	19,412 gpm (30, 572 gpm) [38,825 gpm (61,145)]	The expected design rate of removal of water from the Savannah River has increased 4% and the maximum has increased 6%. See Section 3.2.1.
CWS Cooling Tower Offsite Noise Levels	<30 to <u><</u> 40 dBa	The maximum expected sound level at the site boundary.	<30 to <u><</u> 40 dBa	Unchanged from ESP.
CWS Cooling Tower Heat Rejection Rate (Blowdown)	4650 gpm (expected), 14,440 gpm (max) @91°F [9300 gpm (expected), 28,880 gpm (max] @91°F	The expected heat rejection rate to a receiving water body, expressed as flow rate in gallons per minute at a temperature in degrees Fahrenheit.	4850 gpm (expected) 15,280 gpm (max) @91°F [9700 gpm (expected) 30,560 gpm (max)] @ 91°F	The expected heat rejection rate to the receving body has increased by 4 percent and the maximum by 6 percent. See Section 3.2.1.
CWS Cooling Tower Maximum Consumption of Raw Water	14,452 gpm [28,904 gpm]	The expected maximum short- term consumptive use of water by the circulating water systems (evaporation and drift losses).	15,292 gpm [30,585 gpm]	The expected maximum short- term consumptive use of water by the circulating water systems (evaporation and drift losses) has increased 6 percent. See Section 3.2.1.
CWS Cooling Tower Expected Consumption of Raw Water	13,692 gpm [27,924 gpm]	The expected normal operating consumptive use of water by the circulating water systems (evaporation and drift losses).	14,562 gpm [29,125 gpm]	The expected normal operating consumptive use of water by the circulating water systems (evaporation and drift losses) has increased 4 percent. See Section 3.2.1.

Part III Site Interface Values	ESP		COL		
Item	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Description and Reference	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Comments	
SWS Cooling Tower Makeup Rate	269 gpm (1177 gpm) [537 gpm (2353 gpm)]	The expected (maximum) rate of removal of water from wells to replace water losses from auxiliary heat sink.	269 gpm (800 gpm) [537 gpm (1600 gpm)]	The expected normal groundwater makeup rate for the auxiliary heat sink is unchanged from ESP. The maximum rates have decreased. SNC believes that the analysis in the EIS is bounding, and that any impacts would be less than those described in the EIS. The decrease would not change the NRC's analysis of SMALL impacts. See Section 3.2.1.	
Airborne Effluent Release Po	int				
Normal Dose Consequences to the Maximally Exposed Individual	Total body: 1.12 mrem [2.24 mrem]	The estimated annual design radiological dose consequences due to gaseous releases from normal operation of the plant (Table 3.0-1 of ESP Application ER Rev 4) is not correct. See Section 5.4.2.2.	Total body: 1.12 mrem [2.24 mrem]	Unchanged from ESP.	
Post-Accident Dose Consequences	See Tables 5-14 in the EIS.	The estimated design radiological dose consequences due to gaseous releases from postulated accidents.	See Table 5.10-1	Design-basis accidents were recalculated using updated information from DCD, Rev 16. All dose consequences remained the same or decreased.	
Liquid Radwaste System					
Normal Dose Consequences	10 CFR 50, App I, 10 CFR 20	The estimated design radiological dose consequences due to liquid effluent releases from normal	10 CFR 50, App I, 10 CFR 20	Unchanged from ESP.	
	40 CFK 190	operation of the plant.	40 CFK 190		

Part III Site Interface Values	ESP			COL		
ltem	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Description and Reference	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Comments		
Plant Characteristics						
Total Acreage	310 acres for 2 units	The land area required to provide space for all plant facilities, including power block, switchyard, spent fuel storage, and administrative facilities.	320 acres for 2 units	Acreage increased by approximately 10 acres. SNC does not believe this increase on a site with additional undeveloped acreage in a rural county would change NRC's significance evaluation of SMALL impacts on land use.		
Groundwater Consumptive Use	376 gpm (1570 gpm) [752 gpm (3140 gpm)]	The expected (maximum) rate of withdrawal of groundwater to serve the new units. (Table 3.0-1 in the ESP Application listed the expected gpm for 2 units as 762, which was a typographical error.)	376 gpm (1398.5 gpm) [752 gpm (2797 gpm)	The maximum rate of withdrawal of groundwater to serve the new units has decreased by approximately 11 percent. See Section 3.2.1. SNC believes that the analysis in the ESP bounds this value, and that NRC's conclusion of SMALL impacts would not change.		
Plant Population						
Operation	345 [600]	The number of people required to operate and maintain the plant	400 [800]	SNC reviewed the socioeconomic impacts of the increased workforce on the counties most likely to be affected and concluded that because the increase would occur as the larger construction workforce left the area, NRC's conclusions on the significance of the impacts would not change.		

Part III Site Interface Values	ESP		COL	
Item	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Description and Reference	Single Unit [Two Unit] Value	Comments
Refueling / Major Maintenance	1000	The additional number of temporary staff required to conduct refueling and major maintenance activities	1000	Unchanged from ESP.
Construction	1576 people monthly average [3152 people monthly average]	The monthly average estimated construction workforce staffing for two AP1000 units being constructed simultaneously. This assumes a site preparation schedule of 18 months, 48 months from first concrete to fuel load, with 6 months from fuel load to commercial operation and 12 months between commercial operation of each unit. This assumes 20.5 job hours per net kilowatt installed, giving credit for offsite modular construction. The peak number of construction workforce personnel could reach the 4400 range.	[3500], excluding SNC and NRC employees	The ESP estimated a peak construction work force of 4400. The COLA estimate has been reduced. Because the COLA estimate does not include the SNC and the NRC staff that would be in the area, SNC has determined that the ESP conclusions are bounding and that the NRC's significance determination of the impacts of the construction workforce would not change.

Table 3.0-2 XOQDOQ-Predicted Maximum χ /Q and D/Q Values at Receptors of Interest

Type of Location	Direction from Site	Distance in meters (Miles)	χ/Q (sec/m ³) (No Decay) (Undepleted)	χ/Q (sec/m ³) (2.26 Day Decay) (Undepleted)	χ/Q (sec/m ³) (8 Day Decay) (Depleted)	D/Q (1/m ²)
Residence	NE	1071 (0.67)	3.4E-06	3.4E-06	3.0E-06	1.0E-08 ^a
Dose Calculation EAB	NE	800 (0.5)	5.5E-06	5.5E-06	5.0E-06	1.7E-08 ^b
Meat Animal	NE	1071 (0.67)	3.4E-06	3.4E-06	3.0E-06	1.0E-08 ^a
Vegetable Garden	NE	1071 (0.67)	3.4E-06	3.4E-06	3.0E-06	1.0E-08 ^a

a. NE, ENE, and E

b. NE and ENE

3.1 EXTERNAL APPEARANCE AND LAYOUT

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 3, Section 3.1 described the external appearance and layout of the new reactors at VEGP. Figure 3.1-1 provides the most recent plant layout. SNC has identified no new information related to this topic.

3.2 PLANT DESCRIPTION

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 3, Section 3.2 described the AP1000 reactor and its primary auxiliary systems. The EIS did not identify any required information or analyses that were not resolved.

3.2.1 PLANT WATER USE

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 3, Section 3.2.1 described the estimated plant surface and groundwater use. The plant water use presented here differs from that presented in the VEGP ESP Application ER (SNC 2008).

3.2.1.1 Surface Water

The circulating water system's estimated normal evaporation, drift, blowdown, and makeup values have increased by 4 percent, based on conservative assumptions and a different cooling tower vendor's design specifications than those used for the ESP application; the maximum estimates have increased 6 percent (Table 3.2-1).

Parameter	Normal Operations (gpm)			Maxim	um Operations (gpm)		
	ESPA	COLA	percent change	ESPA	COLA	percent change	
Evaporation	27,900	29,100	+4	28,880	30,560	+6	
Drift (0.002%)	24	25	+4	24	25	+4	
Blowdown	9300	9700	+4	28,880	30,560	+6	
Total Make Up	37,224	38,825	+4	57,784	61,145	+6	

 Table 3.2-1
 Revised Cooling Water System Estimates for Two Units

gpm = gallons per minute

The final cooling tower design and vendor have not been determined for the new units at VEGP; however, SNC believes that the assumptions made to estimate the values presented in Table 3.2-1 provide an upper limit to the design parameters of any natural draft cooling tower that would be constructed at VEGP. SNC also believes that these increases in evaporation and drift would not significantly change the rate of salt deposition or the size or duration of cooling tower plumes, so SNC has not reanalyzed these impacts. The change in blowdown would not alter the conclusions regarding the thermal plume in the Savannah River, therefore SNC has not reanalyzed those impacts.

3.2.1.2 Groundwater

Groundwater use during operations is now estimated to be 2797 gpm in the maximum use case, an 11 percent decrease (Table 3.2-2). The decrease is primarily due to decrease in service water system make-up water needs. Table 3.2-2 describes all revisions to the plant water use system.

SNC has identified no additional new information related to plant water use. The EIS did not identify any required information or analyses that were not resolved.

	Normal Ca	ase ^a gpm	Maximum gp	Case ^{a,b} m	Comments
Stream Description	ESPA	COLA	ESPA	COLA	
Groundwater (Well) Strreams:					
Plant Well Water Demand	752	752	3140	2797	
Well Water for Service Water System Makeup	537	537	2353	1600	
Service Water System Consumptive Use	403	403	1177		
- Service Water System Evaporation	402	402	1176		
- Service Water System Drift	1	1	1		
Service Water System Blowdown	134	134	1176	500	
Well Water for Power Plant Make-up/ Use	215	215	787	1197	
Demineralized Water System Feed	150	150	600	1080	
 Plant System Make-up/ Processes 	109	41	519		
- Misc. Well Water Users	41	41	81		
Potable Water Feed	42	42	140	70	
Fire Water System	10	10	12		
Misc. Well Water Users	13	13	35		

Table 3.2-2 Revised Plant Groundwater Estimates and Plant Effluent Streams for Two Units

Table 3.2-2	Revised Plant Groundwater	Estimates an	d Plant Effluent	Streams
	for Two Units	(Continued)		

	Normal Ca	ase ^a gpm	Maximum gpi	Case ^{a,b} n	Comments
Stream Description	ESPA	COLA	ESPA	COLA	
Plant Effluent Streams					
Plant Effluent Discharge to River					
Blowdown Sump Discharge	9608	9608	30,701	30,015	С
- Wastewater Reterntion Basin Discharge	171	171	505	435	С
- Miscellaneous Low Volume Waste	129	129	365		
- Treated Sanitary Waste	42	42	140	70	с
- Service Water System Blowdown	134	134	1176	500	d
- Circulating Water / Turbine Plant Cooling Water System Blowdown	9,700	9,700	30,560		d
- Start-up Pond Discharge	0	0	0		е
Treated Liquid Radwaste	3	3	200		f

NOTES:

^a The flow rate values are for two AP1000 units.

^b These flows are not necessarily concurrent.

^c Per SNC the sanitary waste from Units 3 and 4 will be routed to the existing Unit 1 and 2 sewage treatment plant and will be discharged via the existing Unit 1 and 2 outfall. (No change in value, change in discharge point). Because of this the 70 gpm is not included in the "Blowdown Sump Discharge" figure but is included in the "Final Effluent Discharge to the River.".

^d For the normal case, the cooling towers are assumed operating at four cycles of concentration. For the service water cooling tower (maximum case), both unit towers are assumed operating at two cycles of concentration. For the main condenser / turbine auxiliary cooling water tower (maximum case), both towers are assumed operating at two cycles of concentration. Flows are determined by weather conditions water chemistry, river conditions (circulating water / turbine plant cooling water system only) and operator discretion.

e Start-up flushes and start-up pond discharge would occur only during the initial plant start-up phase and potentially after unit outages when system flushes are required.

f The short-term liquid waste discharge flow rate may be up to 200 gpm. However, given the waste liquid activity level, the discharge rate must be controlled to be compatible with the available dilution (cooling tower blowdown) flow.

3.2.2 COOLING SYSTEM

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 3, Section 3.2.2 described the proposed cooling system for the new units at VEGP, including operational modes and cooling water intake, treatment, and discharge systems.

Cooling tower heat load has increased from 7.55E9 Btu/hr per unit to 7.63E9 Btu/hr per unit and cooling water flow rate has increased to 631,000 gallons per minute from 600,000 (Westinghouse 2007; Table 10.4.5-1). SNC believes that a 1 percent change in heat load would not significantly change the impacts of cooling towers or thermal discharge to the Savannah River or the NRC's conclusions regarding those impacts. SNC believes that a 5 percent increase in flow would not change the impacts to the Savannah River, or NRC's conclusions regarding those impacts.

The dimensions of the intake structure have been modified slightly and the dimensions as currently planned are shown in Figures 3.2-1 and 3.2-2. The intake design contains a weir wall with an elevated lip segregating the intake canal bottom from the river bottom. However, the location and overall design are unchanged from that presented in the ESP application.

SNC has identified no additional new information related to the plant's cooling system. The EIS did not identify any required information or analyses that were not resolved.

3.2.3 RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 3, Section 3.2.3 described the proposed liquid, gaseous, and solid radioactive waste management systems.

SNC has identified no other new information related to this topic. The EIS did not identify any required information or analyses that were not resolved.

3.2.4 NONRADIOACTIVE WASTE SYSTEMS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 3, Section 3.2.4 described the nonradioactive waste management systems including effluents containing chemicals or biocides, sanitary system effluents, and other effluents.

SNC has identified no new information related to effluents containing chemicals or biocides, sanitary system effluents, or other effluents. The EIS did not identify any required information or analyses that were not resolved.

3.3 POWER TRANSMISSION SYSTEM

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 3, Section 3.3 described the proposed power transmission system from VEGP Units 3 and 4. SNC has identified no new information related to this topic. The EIS did not identify any required information or analyses that were not resolved.

3.4 REFERENCES

SNC 2008. Southern Nuclear Operating Company. 2007. Vogtle Early Site Permit Application: Environmental Report, Rev. 4. Birmingham, AL. March 31.

Westinghouse 2007. Westinghouse Electric Company. 2007. AP1000 Design Control Document. AP1000 Document APP-GW-GL-700, Rev. 16. Pittsburgh, PA.



VEGP COL

Figure 3.1-1 Revised Site Plan



Figure 3.2-1 Revised Intake Dimensions

VEGP COL







4.0 CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS AT THE PROPOSED SITE

Chapter 4 describes the effects of constructing two new units at the VEGP site and a new transmission line. The NRC staff relied on mitigation measures; the required federal, state, and local permits and authorizations; and on infrastructure upgrades planned by counties, cities and towns in reaching its conclusions regarding the significance of the effects.

4.1 LAND-USE IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 4, Section 4.1 described the land-use effects of constructing two new units at the VEGP site and of constructing a new transmission line. Land-use effects, except for the transmission line, would be limited to the VEGP site, and all effects to the VEGP site would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation beyond that identified by SNC. Impacts along the final route of the transmission line cannot be fully characterized at this time, and could be MODERATE. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this issue.

4.2 METEOROLOGICAL AND AIR-QUALITY IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 4, Section 4.2 described the effects of constructing two new units at VEGP on the climate and air quality of the VEGP site and region. Construction effects would be temporary and SMALL and would not require additional mitigation beyond what SNC proposed. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this issue.

4.3 WATER-RELATED IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 4, Section 4.3 described the effects of constructing two new nuclear units at the VEGP site including the water usage by construction activities on hydrological processes, water resources, and water quality, and noted that the effects would be similar to those associated with any large construction project, and would be SMALL and would not require additional mitigation beyond what SNC proposed. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this issue.

4.4 ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 4, Section 4.4 described the effects of constructing two new nuclear units at the VEGP site and a new transmission line on terrestrial and aquatic ecology, including protected species and wildlife habitat. The NRC concluded that construction activities at the VEGP site would have SMALL effects on terrestrial and aquatic resources, and that mitigation beyond what SNC has proposed would not be warranted. The precise route of the transmission line has not been identified. Therefore, the NRC determined that effects to terrestrial resources along the transmission line could be MODERATE, but effects to aquatic resources would be SMALL. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this issue.

4.5 SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 4, Section 4.5 described the effects of constructing two new nuclear units at the VEGP site on socioeconomic conditions. Construction effects on the local economies would be beneficial and SMALL. The effect on tax revenues would be beneficial and SMALL, except in Burke County where they are expected to be beneficial and MODERATE. The temporary effects of construction traffic would be MODERATE on the two-lane highways in Burke County, particularly River Road and the roadways that feed into it and SMALL elsewhere. Aesthetic and recreational effects would be SMALL at the VEGP site, but aesthetic effects of the transmission line could be MODERATE. The effects on public services would be SMALL. The overall effects on infrastructure and community services would be SMALL. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2 SNC identified no new and significant information related to this issue.

4.6 HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCE IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 4, Section 4.6 described the effects of constructing two new nuclear units at the VEGP site, and a new transmission line on historic and cultural resources. The NRC concluded that effects to cultural resources would be MODERATE. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this issue.

4.7 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 4, Section 4.7 evaluated the effects of construction on the health and welfare of minority or low income populations within the region. The NRC concluded that adverse effects to these populations would be SMALL. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this issue.

4.8 NON-RADIOLOGICAL HEALTH IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 4, Section 4.8 evaluated the health effects of constructing two new units at VEGP on the residents in the area, the Units 1 and 2 workforce, and the construction workforce. Non-radiological effects from fugitive dust, noise, transport of materials and personnel, and occupational injuries would be SMALL, and would not warrant mitigation beyond that proposed by SNC. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this issue.

4.9 RADIOLOGICAL HEALTH IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 4, Section 4.9 described the effects of radiation exposure from Units 1 and 2 on the construction workforce. Doses to the workforce would be well below NRC annual exposure limits and the effects of radiological exposure to the construction workforce would be SMALL. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this issue.

4.10 MEASURES AND CONTROLS TO LIMIT ADVERSE IMPACTS DURING SITE PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND CONSTRUCTION

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 4, Section 4.10 summarizes the measures and controls SNC would invoke to ensure that effects are minimized. EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this topic. Part 10 of the COLA includes a draft environmental protection plan that identifies proposed conditions, monitoring, reporting, and record keeping for environmental data during construction.

4.11 SITE REDRESS PLAN

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 4, Section 4.11 described SNC activities to redress the VEGP site should the project be cancelled after construction began. In November 2007 SNC submitted a revised site redress plan that addressed activities subject to regulation 10 CFR 50.10(d) that became effective November 8, 2007 (SNC 2008). The revised site redress plan provides reasonable assurance that construction activities conducted under an LWA would be remediated to return the site to an acceptable environmental condition.

In the EIS the NRC determined that site preparation activities addressed in the site redress plan were bounded by environmental effects for construction of the entire project. This assessment remains resolved under the current site redress plan. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Moreover, having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to the current site redress plan.

4.12 SUMMARY OF CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 4, Section 4.12 summarizes the effects of constructing two new nuclear units at VEGP and a transmission line.

4.13 REFERENCES

SNC 2008. Southern Nuclear Operating Company, 2008. Vogtle Early Site Permit Application: Environmental Report, Rev. 4. Birmingham, AL. March 31.

5.0 STATION OPERATIONAL IMPACTS AT THE PROPOSED SITE

Chapter 5 describes the environmental issues associated with operating two new units at VEGP for an initial 40-year license period. The NRC staff relied on mitigation measures and activities planned by various government agencies in reaching its conclusions regarding the significance of the impacts.

5.1 LAND-USE IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 5, Section 5.1 described the land-use effects of operating two new units at the VEGP site. Most land use effects would occur offsite as the result of new residents moving to the area to staff the new units. Land-use effects would be SMALL and would not warrant mitigation beyond that identified by SNC. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this issue.

5.2 METEOROLOGICAL AND AIR-QUALITY IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 5, Section 5.2 described the effects of operating two new units at VEGP on the climate and air quality of the VEGP site and region. Operations effects would result from cooling towers, the infrequent operation of standby diesel generators, and the priority pollutants generated by transmission lines. Effects from all sources would be SMALL and would not require additional mitigation beyond what SNC proposed. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this issue.

5.3 WATER-RELATED IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 5, Section 5.3 described the effects of surface and groundwater withdrawals and discharges to surface water related to the operation of two new nuclear units at the VEGP site on hydrological processes, water resources, and water quality. Effects would be SMALL and would be limited and regulated through the Georgia Department of Natural Resources National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting process. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this issue.

5.4 ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 5, Section 5.4 described the effects of operating two new nuclear units at the VEGP site and a new transmission line on terrestrial and aquatic resources, including protected species and wildlife habitat. The NRC concluded that effects on all terrestrial and aquatic resources would be SMALL, and that mitigation beyond what SNC has proposed would not be warranted. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this issue.

5.5 SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 5, Section 5.5 described the effects of operating two new nuclear units at the VEGP site on socioeconomic conditions. Operations effects on the local economies would be beneficial and SMALL throughout most of the region, and beneficial and MODERATE in Burke County. The effects of tax revenues would be beneficial and SMALL except for property taxes in Burke County which would be beneficial and LARGE. The effects of traffic from the increased workforce would be SMALL. The effects on public services would be SMALL. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this issue.

5.6 HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCE IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 5, Section 5.6 described the effects of operating two new nuclear units at the VEGP site and a new transmission line on historic and cultural resources. The NRC concluded that effects to cultural resources would be SMALL. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this issue.

5.7 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 5, Section 5.7 evaluated the effects of operating two new nuclear units on the health and welfare of minority or low-income populations within the region. The NRC concluded that adverse effects to these populations would be SMALL. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this issue.

5.8 NON-RADIOLOGICAL HEALTH IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 5, Section 5.8 evaluated the effects of operating two new units at VEGP on the health of the residents in the area and the VEGP workforce. Non-radiological effects would be SMALL, and would not warrant mitigation beyond that proposed by SNC. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this issue.

5.9 RADIOLOGICAL IMPACTS OF NORMAL OPERATIONS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 5, Section 5.9 described the effects of radiation exposure from normal operations on members of the public, the workforce, and the local biota. Doses to the workforce would be SMALL based on individual doses being maintained within 10 CFR 20.1201 limits. Health effects to members of the public would be SMALL and not observable. Effects to local biota would be SMALL and mitigation would not be warranted. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this issue.

5.10 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF POSTULATED ACCIDENTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 5, Section 5.10 describes the types of radioactive materials, the paths to the environment, the relationship between radiological dose and health effects, and the environmental effects of reactor accidents. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved.

Doses from design-basis accidents presented in the ESP application were updated with information from DCD Rev 16. Site-specific c/Qs used in the ESP application were identical to those used in this evaluation. Site specific doses were calculated by multiplying the AP1000 DCD Rev 16 dose by the ratio of the site-specific χ/Q value to the DCD χ/Q value. All accident doses remained the same or decreased (Table 5.10-1).

The severe accidents' baseline cost and dose risk were calculated using the MACCS2 code, which uses SECPOP2000 as an ancillary code. Output from SECPOP2000 provides Year 2000 residential population distribution, and agricultural (e.g., fraction of land used in farming, farm sales) and economic (e.g., farm land property values, non-farm property values) parameters for the 50-mile radius surrounding a proposed site. MACCS2 uses these parameters in the consequence calculations, which, with accident probabilities, produce a risk estimate.

Three issues related to the SECPOP2000 code have recently been identified and publicized throughout the industry: (1) a formatting error in the regional economic data block text file generated by SECPOP2000 results in MACCS2 selecting the wrong data; (2) an error associated with the formatting of the COUNTY97.DAT economic database file used by SECPOP2000 results in SECPOP2000 processing incorrect economic and land use data (essentially SECPOP2000 selects data from the wrong county); and (3) gaps in the numbered entries in the COUNTY97.DAT economic database file results in SECPOP2000 treating any county numbered beyond 955 incorrectly. These issues with SECPOP2000 affect the agricultural and economic parameters input to MACCS2 but not the population distributions.

The published VEGP Units 3 and 4 severe accident analysis includes workarounds for issues (1) and (2), but not the third. However, SNC performed a sensitivity analysis and determined that the resolution of issue (3) would not affect the conclusions of the NRC regarding severe accidents.

The accident analysis presented in the ESP application remains bounding. The environmental consequences of design-basis accidents would be SMALL. The probability-weighted consequences of severe accidents would be SMALL.

Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this issue.

Table 5.10-1	Doses from	Design-Basis A	ccidents Usin	g Updated Inf	formation from	DCD Rev. 16
--------------	------------	----------------	---------------	---------------	----------------	-------------

DCD		Dose (rem TEDE)						
Section	Accident		EAB LPZ			LPZ		Regulatory Criteria ^a
		ESP	COL	Percent Difference ((COL-ESP)/ ESP) * 100	ESP	COL	Percent Difference ((COL-ESP)/ ESP) * 100	
15.1.5	Main Steam Line Break							
	Pre-Existing Iodine Spike	0.07	0.07	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.00	25
	Accident-Initiated Iodine Spike	0.08	0.08	0.00	0.08	0.08	0.00	2.5
15.2.8	Feedwater System Pipe Break		see note					2.5
15.3.3	Locked Rotor Accident							
	No Feedwater	0.06	0.06	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	2.5
	Feedwater Available	0.05	0.04	-20.22	0.02	0.02	0.00	2.5
15.3.4	Reactor Coolant Pump Shaft Break		see note					2.5
15.4.8	Rod Ejection Accident	0.27	0.27	0.00	0.17	0.17	0.00	6.3
15.6.2	Small Line Break Outside Containment	0.16	0.15	-6.25	0.03	0.03	0.00	2.5
15.6.3	Steam Generator Tube Rupture							

Table 5.10-1 Doses from Design-Basis Accidents Using Updated Information from DCD Rev. 16 (Continued)

	Pre-Existing lodine Spike	0.17	0.16	-5.88	0.04	0.04	0.00	25
	Accident-Initiated Iodine Spike	0.08	0.08	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.00	2.5
15.6.5	Loss-of-Coolant Accident	3.50	0.85	-75.71	1.50	0.45	-70.00	25
15.7.4	Fuel Handling Accident	0.52	0.38	-26.92	0.10	0.07	-30.00	6.3
Note - Feedwater System Pipe Break is bounded by Main Steam Line Break. Reactor Coolant Pump Shaft Break is bounded by Locked Rotor Accident. All doses are within the acceptance criteria of NUREG-0800.								
EAB = exclusion area boundary								

LPZ = low population zone

TEDE = total effective dose equivalent

^a 10 CFR 50.34(a)(1), 10 CFR 100.21 or NUREG-1555 criterion

5.11 MEASURES AND CONTROLS TO LIMIT ADVERSE IMPACTS DURING OPERATION

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 5, Section 5.11 summarizes the measures and controls SNC would invoke to ensure that effects of operations are minimized. The EIS did not identify any significant issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this topic. Part 10 of the COLA is a draft environmental protection plan that identifies proposed conditions, monitoring, reporting, and record keeping for environmental data during operations.

5.12 SUMMARY OF OPERATIONAL IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 5, Section 5.12 summarizes the effects of operating two new nuclear units at VEGP and a transmission line.

6.0 FUEL CYCLE, TRANSPORTATION, AND DECOMMISSIONING

Chapter 6 addresses the environmental effects from the uranium fuel cycle and solid waste management; the transportation of radioactive material; and the decommissioning of two new nuclear units at the VEGP site.

6.1 FUEL CYCLE IMPACTS AND SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 6, Section 6.1 concluded that the environmental effects of the uranium fuel cycle to produce fuel for the two new units at VEGP would be SMALL and that mitigation would not be warranted. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2 SNC identified no new and significant information related to this topic.

6.2 TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 7, Section 7.4 concluded that the environmental effects of transporting construction materials, personnel, fuel, and radioactive wastes to and from VEGP would be SMALL and consistent with effects associated with those activities at existing nuclear sites. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this topic.

6.3 DECOMMISSIONING

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 6, Section 6.3 concluded that regulatory requirements for decommissioning activities would limit the effects of decommissioning to SMALL impacts. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC identified no new and significant information related to this topic.

7.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Chapter 7 evaluates the effects of the proposed action, the construction and operation of two new nuclear units at the VEGP site combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions in the vicinity to determine the magnitude of the cumulative impacts.

7.1 LAND USE

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 7, Section 7.1 addresses cumulative impacts to land use. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved. The NRC concluded that the cumulative impacts to land use would be the result of the effects of construction combined with the effects of new home or business construction generated by the construction workforce at VEGP. The NRC concluded that cumulative impacts would be SMALL and that additional mitigation would not be warranted. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC has identified no new and significant information for this issue.

7.2 AIR QUALITY

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 7, Section 7.2 addresses cumulative impacts to air quality. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved. The NRC concluded that the cumulative impacts to air quality would be the result of the cumulative emission of the four nuclear plants, the Wilson combustion turbine plant, and operations at the Savannah River Site (SRS), across the Savannah River from VEGP. The NRC concluded that cumulative impacts would be SMALL and would not warrant additional mitigation. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC has identified no new and significant information for this issue.

7.3 WATER USE AND QUALITY

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 7, Section 7.3 addresses cumulative impacts to water use and quality. EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved. The NRC evaluated the cumulative impacts of consumptive use of surface water from the Savannah River by four units at VEGP, the SRS, and the Urquhart Power Station near the VEGP site, and determined that the effects would be SMALL and not warrant mitigation. The NRC also evaluated cumulative impacts to groundwater caused by four units at VEGP, saltwater intrusion in Georgia's coastal counties, the presence of tritium in the water table aquifer, and groundwater contamination under the SRS, and determined that the effects would be SMALL and not warrant additional mitigation. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC has identified no new and significant information for this issue.

7.4 TERRESTRIAL ECOSYSTEM

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 7, Section 7.4 addresses cumulative impacts to terrestrial ecosystems. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved. The NRC evaluated the cumulative impacts of construction at the VEGP site, construction of the new transmission line, and operation of cooling towers on wildlife and wildlife habitats. No activities near the site that have or would be likely to have similar effects were identified. No activities in the area of the proposed transmission line that would significantly affect wildlife or wildlife habitats were identified. The NRC concluded that cumulative impacts to terrestrial ecosystems

would be SMALL and would not require additional mitigation. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC has identified no new and significant information for this issue.

7.5 AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 7, Section 7.5 addresses cumulative impacts to aquatic ecosystems. EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved. The NRC evaluated the cumulative impacts of activities that occur or could occur on the Savannah River from upstream of VEGP to the mouth of the Savannah River. The staff considered cumulative impacts of four units at VEGP, activities at the SRS that discharge to the Savannah River, and anthropogenic activities that are not directly related to VEGP or the Savannah River. The major factors that would affect cumulative impacts are adequate water flow past the industrial facilities and maintenance of adequate freshwater flow in the lower river. The amount of VEGP's consumptive use and the high degree of regulation of water flow in the river led the NRC staff to conclude that cumulative impacts would be SMALL and would not warrant additional mitigation. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC has identified no new and significant information for this issue.

7.6 SOCIOECONOMICS, HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 7, Section 7.6 addresses cumulative impacts to socioeconomics, historic and cultural resources, and environmental justice. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved. The NRC evaluated the cumulative socioeconomic effects of construction and operation at the VEGP site and the construction of the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication (MOX) facility at SRS, the only other major construction project identified in the area/time frame considered in the EIS, and concluded that adverse effects to socioeconomics and environmental justice would be SMALL and would not warrant additional mitigation. Because cultural resources are non-renewable, the cumulative impacts of VEGP and other construction activities in the area would have MODERATE impacts on them. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC has identified no new and significant information for this issue.

7.7 NON-RADIOLOGICAL HEALTH

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 7, Section 7.7 addresses cumulative impacts to nonradiological health. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved. The NRC evaluated the cumulative effects of construction and operation of Units 3 and 4 and the operation of Units 1 and 2, on the potential for adverse effects from thermophilic organisms and on industrial accident rates. The NRC concluded that two new units are not likely to increase the population of thermophilic organisms, and that risks of industrial accidents are expected to remain below average U.S. industrial rates. Cumulative impacts would be SMALL and additional mitigation would not be warranted. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC has identified no new and significant information for this issue.

7.8 RADIOLOGICAL IMPACTS OF NORMAL OPERATIONS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 7, Section 7.8 addresses cumulative impacts to radiation doses. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved. The NRC

evaluated the cumulative impacts of the operation of four units at VEGP; the SRS, including the new MOX facility; Chem-Nuclear; Starmet; and area hospitals. The NRC concluded that cumulative impacts would be SMALL. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC has identified no new and significant information for this issue.

7.9 SEVERE ACCIDENTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 7, Section 7.9 addresses cumulative impacts from severe accidents. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved. The NRC evaluated the cumulative risks of accidents at four reactors, which is the sum of the independent risks for each reactor. The NRC concluded that cumulative impacts would be SMALL and additional mitigation is not warranted. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC has identified no new and significant information for this issue.

7.10 FUEL CYCLE, TRANSPORTATION, DECOMMISSIONING

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 7, Section 7.10 addresses cumulative impacts to the fuel cycle, transportation and from decommissioning. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved. The NRC evaluated the cumulative effects of additional nuclear fuel manufacturing and determined that the cumulative impacts of the fuel cycle would be SMALL and would not warrant additional mitigation. The NRC evaluated the cumulative impacts of additional shipments of fuel and materials to and from the VEGP site, both for dose to transportation workers and the public along the transportation routes and for highway accidents and concluded that cumulative impacts would be SMALL and additional mitigation is not warranted. The NRC determined that the cumulative impacts of decommissioning would be SMALL and additional mitigation would not be warranted. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC has identified no new and significant information for this issue.

7.11 NRC STAFF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

NRC concluded that the potential for cumulative impacts resulting from construction and operations of VEGP Units 3 and 4 would be SMALL, and additional mitigation is not warranted. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC has identified no new and significant information for this issue.

8.0 NEED FOR POWER

During the preparation of the VEGP ESP EIS, NRC staff reviewed the Georgia Power Company's 2007 Integrated Resource Plan (IRP; GPC 2007), which included a need for power determination, and determined the plan is systematic, comprehensive, subject to confirmation and responsive to forecasting uncertainty. The NRC staff concluded that the GPC's detailed prediction of future load demand is a reasonable basis for planning from 2007 to 2030, and that GPC cannot adequately satisfy a significant portion of that demand load with additional electric purchases from neighboring producers. The NRC reviewed and accepted the Need for Power evaluation contained in the IRP submitted to the Georgia Public Service Commission and concluded that there is a justified Need for Power in the region of interest.

The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved.

8.1 DESCRIPTION OF POWER SYSTEM

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 8, Section 8.1 described the GPC and VEGP co-owners' service areas and customers. The EIS did not identify any required information or analyses that were not resolved.

8.2 POWER DEMAND / INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLANNING

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 8, Section 8.2 described the objectives of integrated resource planning and the basic steps involved in preparing an integrated resource plan. The EIS did not identify any required information, analyses, or significant environmental issues that were not resolved.

8.3 POWER SUPPLY / INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLANNING IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 8, Section 8.3 described the mission of the Georgia Public Service Commission, the requirements of the Georgia Integrated Resource Planning Act and the regulatory requirements for preparing an IRP. Although the complete IRP is proprietary, GPC granted the NRC access to the entire 2007 IRP. The NRC reviewed the document in March 2007. The EIS did not identify any required information or analyses that were not resolved.

8.4 ASSESSMENT OF NEED FOR POWER / NRC FINDINGS ON GPC'S IRP

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 8, Section 8.4 concluded that GPC's IRP and the need for power analysis within it is systematic, comprehensive, subject to confirmation, and responsive to forecasting uncertainty. The NRC also concluded that GPC's future load demand is a reasonable basis for planning for 2007 to 2030, and that GPC cannot expect to satisfy a significant portion of that demand load with additional electric purchases from neighboring producers. The EIS did not identify any required information or analyses that were not resolved.

8.5 REFERENCES

GPC 2007. Georgia Power Company. 2007. Application for Approval of Its 2007 Integrated Resource Plan; Docket Number 24505-U. Atlanta Ga. January 30, 2007.

9.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES

The NRC evaluated alternative energy sources to nuclear, alternative cooling systems to natural draft wet cooling towers, and alternative sites to VEGP. No energy sources or system design alternatives were deemed to have less environmental impact. No alternative site was deemed obviously superior to the VEGP site.

9.1 NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The COL no-action alternative is a scenario in which the NRC would deny the COL request. The following discussion addresses this scenario.

In this scenario, the construction and operation of two additional nuclear units would not occur. The environmental effects of operating the nuclear units described in Chapter 5 of the EIS would not occur. Some effects from construction activities may occur. If so, SNC would restore the site as described in the site redress plan submitted with the ESP application, Rev 4 (SNC 2008). The no-action alternative would result in none of the following benefits ascribed to the COL. (SNC 2008)

- Meeting future energy needs identified by GPC.
- Maintaining long-term price stability for electricity in the relevant service area.
- Enhancing energy security and fuel diversity.

9.2 ENERGY ALTERNATIVES

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 9, Section 9.2 evaluated alternatives not requiring new generating capacity, alternatives requiring new generating capacity, and a combination of alternatives. The NRC concluded that, from an environmental perspective, none of the viable energy alternatives is clearly preferable to construction of a new baseload nuclear power generation plant. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved.

9.3 SYSTEM DESIGN ALTERNATIVES

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 9, Section 9.3 evaluated once-through cooling and dry or hybrid wet/dry cooling towers. NRC staff concluded that a wet cooling tower would be preferable to any other cooling system. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved.

9.4 REGION OF INTEREST AND ALTERNATIVE SITE SELECTION PROCESS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 9, Section 9.4 evaluated SNC's alternative site selection process and concluded that SNC's process for selection of potential and candidate sites was reasonable. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved.

9.5 EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE SITES

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 9, Section 9.5 evaluated three alternative sites in detail: Plant Hatch in Appling and Toombs Counties, Georgia; Plant Farley in Houston County, Alabama; and a greenfield site owned by Southern Company in Chilton and Elmore Counties, Alabama. Section 9.5 evaluates independently for each site the effects of construction and operation that could vary among sites. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved.

9.6 ISSUES AMONG SITES HANDLED GENERICALLY

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 9, Section 9.6 evaluated issues among sites handled generically. Section 9.6 evaluated effects that would not vary among sites, and would not affect the evaluation of whether a site was environmentally preferable to the proposed site. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved.

9.7 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE SITE IMPACTS

In the VEGP ESP EIS, the NRC evaluated three alternative sites in detail: Plant Hatch in Appling and Toombs Counties, Georgia, Plant Farley in Houston County, Alabama, and a Greenfield site owned by Southern Company in Chilton and Elmore Counties, Alabama. Section 9.7 of the ESP EIS summarizes the findings reported in Sections 9.5 and 9.6 in tabular form.

9.8 REFERENCES

SNC 2008. Southern Nuclear Operating Company. 2008. Vogtle Early Site Permit Application: Environmental Report, Rev. 4. Birmingham, AL. March 31.
Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 3 & 4 COL Application Part 3 – Environmental Report

10.0 COMPARISON OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND THE ALTERNATIVE SITES

In Chapter 10 of the EIS, the NRC compared the environmental effects of the proposed action described in Chapters 4 and 5 to the effects of two new units at alternative sites described in Chapter 9. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved.

10.1 COMPARISON OF THE PROPOSED SITE WITH THE ALTERNATIVE SITES

Construction effects for the majority of the environmental categories at most of the sites would be SMALL. Some environmental effects are generic to all sites and do not influence the comparisons among sites: radiological and non-radiological health, postulated accidents, and some aspects of ecology and socioeconomics. Effects associated with transmission lines ranged from SMALL to MODERATE at all sites because of the potential changes to the transmission system at all sites. Land-use effects at the greenfield site would be greater than those at the other alternative sites or the VEGP site. Operations effects to most of the environmental issues at most sites would be SMALL. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved.

10.2 ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERABLE SITES

No alternative site was identified as environmentally preferable to the VEGP site. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved.

10.3 OBVIOUSLY SUPERIOR SITES

No alternative site was identified as environmentally preferable to the VEGP site; therefore no alternative site is obviously superior. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved.

10.4 COMPARISON WITH THE NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The no-action alterative is a scenario in which the NRC denies SNC's request for a combined construction and operating license. As identified below, SNC could follow several paths to satisfy electric power needs. Each would have associated environmental impacts.

- Reapply with a revised application for the same proposed site.
- Seek a COL for a different reactor type and/or a different location.
- Purchase power from other electricity providers.
- Establish conservation and demand-side management programs.
- Construct new generation facilities other than nuclear at the proposed site or at another location.
- Delay retirement of existing generating facilities.
- Reactivate previously retired generating facilities.

Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 3 & 4 COL Application Part 3 – Environmental Report

11.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In Chapter 11 of the VEGP ESP EIS, the NRC summarized the conclusions and recommendations made throughout the EIS.

11.1 IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 11, Section 11.1 summarized the potential cumulative impacts from construction and operation of Units 3 and 4 at the VEGP site with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved. The NRC determined that for each impact area, the cumulative impacts would be SMALL and mitigation would not be warranted. A few impact areas have the potential for MODERATE effects, most of which would be temporary or associated with a larger-than-anticipated construction workforce settling near the site. Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC has identified no new and significant information for this issue.

11.2 UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 11, Section 11.2 identified the unavoidable adverse impacts from construction and operation of Units 3 and 4 at the VEGP site (summarized in EIS Tables 11-1 for construction and 11-2 for operations).

The VEGP ESP EIS stated that unavoidable construction effects include the permanent disturbance of 310 acres of land at the VEGP site, and the temporary disturbance of additional areas. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved. The revised site plan (Figure 3.1-1) identifies 320 acres of permanently disturbed land, and 200 acres of temporarily disturbed land. SNC does not consider this new information significant because VEGP is in a rural area adjacent to a 7,800-acre game management area with similar habitats and most of the land that would support construction is previously disturbed and thus not high-quality natural habitat. The increase of 20 acres of disturbed land does not change the NRC's conclusion that impacts would be SMALL.

Other unavoidable adverse impacts of construction include loss of terrestrial habitat, including wetlands; temporary dewatering of the water table aquifer in the vicinity of the construction; increases in local traffic; the potential for a short-term shortage of available housing; doses to construction workers from Units 1 and 2; and emissions from construction equipment.

Unavoidable impacts of operations include the likelihood that some undeveloped land would be converted to housing or retail developments; increased surface and groundwater use; increased use of publicly-funded services such as schools and police and fire protection; and doses to the workers, the public, and biota.

Having implemented the process described in Section 1.7.2, SNC has identified no new and significant information for this issue.

Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 3 & 4 COL Application Part 3 – Environmental Report

11.3 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION

In VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 11, Section 11.3, the NRC presented their determination that none of the alternative sites is environmentally preferable or obviously superior to the proposed VEGP site. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved.

11.4 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES AND LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY OF THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

In VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 11, Section 11.4 noted that if Units 3 and 4 are constructed and operated, power production would continue until the expiration of the licenses or until the licensee chooses to cease operations, at which time the reactors would be decommissioned according to NRC regulations. Once decommissioning is complete and the NRC license is terminated, the site would be available for other uses. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved.

11.5 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

In VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 11, Section 11.5 the NRC determined that irretrievable commitments of resources during the construction of Units 3 and 4 at the VEGP site would be similar to those of any large construction project such as concrete, steel, and other building materials. While these construction materials are irretrievable, the quantities used would be of small consequence with respect to the availability of these resources. The main irretrievable resource during operations would be the uranium used as fuel. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved.

11.6 BENEFIT-COST BALANCE

In VEGP ESP EIS Chapter 11, Section 11.6 the NRC determined that the potential societal benefits of constructing and operating Units 3 and 4 at the VEGP site are substantial, and that the costs would be relatively low. The EIS did not identify any significant environmental issues that were not resolved.

11.7 NRC STAFF SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Upon evaluation of this application for a COL, and an independent analysis of the impacts of such an activity, the NRC staff will make a recommendation to the Commission on the advisability of issuing the COL to SNC.