



Bryan J. Dolan
VP, Nuclear Plant Development

Duke Energy
EC09D/ 526 South Church Street
Charlotte, NC 28201-1006

Mailing Address:
P.O. Box 1006 – EC09D
Charlotte, NC 28201-1006

704-382-0605

bjdolan@duke-energy.com

December 11, 2008

Document Control Desk
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Subject: Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC
William States Lee III Nuclear Station - Docket Nos. 52-018 and 52-019
AP1000 Combined License Application for the
William States Lee III Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2
Response to Request for Additional Information
Ltr# WLG2008.12-12

Reference: Letter from J.M. Muir (NRC) to B.J. Dolan (Duke Energy), *Request for Additional Information Regarding the Environmental Review of the Combined License Application for William States Lee Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2*, dated August 21, 2008

This letter provides the Duke Energy response to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) request for the following additional information (RAI) item listed in the reference letter:

RAI 32, Socioeconomics

The response to this NRC request is addressed in the enclosure which also identifies any associated changes that will be made in a future revision of the William States Lee III Nuclear Station application.

If you have any questions or need any additional information, please contact Peter S. Hastings at 980-373-7820.

Bryan J. Dolan
Vice President
Nuclear Plant Development

DO93
NRC

Document Control Desk
December 11, 2008
Page 2 of 4

Enclosure:

1. Response to RAI 32, Socioeconomics


AFFIDAVIT OF BRYAN J. DOLAN

Bryan J. Dolan, being duly sworn, states that he is Vice President, Nuclear Plant Development, Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC, that he is authorized on the part of said Company to sign and file with the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission this supplement to the combined license application for the William States Lee III Nuclear Station and that all the matter and facts set forth herein are true and correct to the best of his knowledge.



Bryan J. Dolan

Subscribed and sworn to me on December 11, 2008



Notary Public

My commission expires: June 26, 2011

SEAL



Document Control Desk
December 11, 2008
Page 4 of 4

xc (wo/enclosure):

Luis Reyes, Regional Administrator, Region II
Loren Plisco, Deputy Regional Administrator, Region II
Stephanie Coffin, Branch Chief, DNRL
Gregory Hatchett, Branch Chief, DSER

xc (w/enclosure):

Linda Tello, Project Manager, DSER
Brian Hughes, Senior Project Manager, DNRL

Lee Nuclear Station Response to request for Additional Information (RAI)

RAI Letter Dated: August 21, 2008

Reference NRC RAI Number: ER RAI-32

NRC RAI:

Provide additional socioeconomic information for alternative sites.

Duke Energy Response:

Demographic assumptions for the alternative site analysis have been modified to be consistent with the assumptions used for detailed evaluation of the preferred Lee Nuclear Site. These assumptions, which provide the basis for the number of in-migrating construction workers and operations workforce, as well as the expected number of family members, are provided in the response to RAI-31 and in revisions to ER Chapter 9, Subsection 9.3.2.5, as described in RAI-31. Assumptions regarding the number of school-age children in-migrating to the site, as used in the alternative site analysis, are based on an average of state percentages and are identical for the preferred and alternative sites. These are described in the revised ER 9.3, Subsection 9.3.2.5, and in the response below. Note that this approach differs slightly from that used in the detailed evaluation of the Lee Nuclear Site in ER Section 4.4, Subsection 4.4.2.5, in order to make it applicable to all four sites located in two states.

To all three of the alternative sites, Duke Energy is applying the same workforce assumptions (i.e., number of construction and operations workers and the percentages that are in-migrating) that were applied to the Lee Nuclear Site.

Lee ER Section 9, Subsection 9.3.2.5, has been revised and expanded to further address impacts from the projected in-migrating population on the region and on local populations at each site. Specifically, the evaluation considers potential impacts to demography, the local economy, tax revenues, housing, public services, education, recreation, and transportation, and it identifies those notable community characteristics that would be impacted at a given site.

In general, the preferred site and all three alternative sites are located in rural settings in the same general area of western North Carolina and northwestern South Carolina. Each of the three alternatives sites is located within 80 –100 mi. of the Lee Nuclear Site, and the Keowee and Middleton Shoals sites are located within 35 mi. of each other and have overlapping regional areas. Each host county has a relatively low population, ranging from 34,835 for Davie County (Perkins Site) to 165,740 for Anderson County (Middleton Shoals), based on U.S. Census Bureau 2000 data. The population in Cherokee (Lee Nuclear Site) and Oconee counties (Keowee Site) is at 52,537 and 66,215, respectively. Given similar rural settings and locations in general proximity to one another, the projected socioeconomic impacts at each site are expected to be very similar to one another. Regional impacts for each site would be essentially identical (SMALL), while local impacts to the host county or two-county areas, in the event that the majority of in-migrating population chose to reside in closer proximity to the site, would be greater (MODERATE to LARGE) in areas such as housing and schools. Local impacts between sites were found to vary only slightly based on host county, or two-county, population levels and proximity of each site to a major metropolitan area.

Associated Revisions to the Lee Nuclear Station Combined License Application:

1. Revise COLA Part 3, ER Chapter 9, Subsection 9.3.2.5, beginning with Paragraph 9, as follows:

~~Sites were rated according to economic impacts based on the following criteria: economic effects were considered small if peak construction related employment accounted for less than 5 percent of total study area employment; moderate if it accounted for 5 to 10 percent of total study area employment; and large if it accounted for more than 10 percent of total study area employment.~~

~~The available population and work force data for the host county and surrounding counties are presented in the following tables. Projected growth rates from 2000—2010 are assumed to be the same as growth rates found between 1990 and 2000, based on U.S. Census data.~~

| Site | Total Pop | | Total Construction Workforce | |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------|--------|
| | (2000) | (2000) | (2000) | (2000) |
| Lee (SC) | 1,419,710 | 1,769,357 | 781,819 | 58,767 |
| Keowee (SC) | 1,019,627 | 1,174,608 | 488,649 | 38,991 |
| Perkins (NC) | 1,287,650 | 1,546,061 | 649,073 | 45,381 |
| Middleton Shoals (SC) | 1,045,794 | 1,203,313 | 500,216 | 42,949 |

Source: Reference 3

~~Given the large population projections for the area in 2010 when construction is anticipated to start, and based on conservative workforce levels using 2000 Census Bureau data (construction workers only and without expected increases in 2010, although such increases might be used to support other large (non-nuclear) construction projects at that time), results indicate that the impact on study area employment from construction of two new units would be low at each site.~~

~~In conclusion, a comparison of socioeconomic conditions between the four candidate sites reveals minimal differences such that the impact will be small for all sites.~~

~~The preferred and alternative sites currently meet the population requirements of 10 CFR 100. The population distribution near each site is low with typically rural characteristics.~~

Demography

Based on the estimated in-migrating population (5552) and the U.S Census Bureau 2000 population levels for the study area and host county for each site, the percent increases in population would be as shown in Table 9.3-4.

Potential increases in population during construction for the proposed project within the multi-county study area would represent a less than 1 percent increase in population for each site area, and impacts would be expected to be SMALL. Under the most conservative scenario, where all in-migrating workers and their families choose to reside in the host county at each site, the potential impacts on the existing population in each host county would be SMALL to MODERATE at Middleton Shoals, where the population in Anderson County would increase by 3.3 percent, and MODERATE to LARGE at the other three sites, based on a host county population increase ranging from 8.4 percent (Keowee) to 15.9 percent (Perkins). Note that all impacts would be temporary and are based on conservative 2000 U.S.

Census Bureau population levels. A comparison to 2006 estimated populations for the host counties resulted in slightly reduced percentage increases for all sites, with the greatest change occurring for Davie County, which experienced a 14.9 percent population increase between 2000 and 2006. However, factoring in 2006 population estimates, even for the Perkins Site, which showed the greatest change, would still result in a MODERATE to LARGE impact on the host county for the Lee, Keowee, and Perkins sites. Finally, it should be noted that expanding the in-migration to a two-county area for each site, including the significantly more populated York County for Lee; Pickens County for Keowee; and Davidson County for Perkins (Abbeville County for Middleton Shoals is less populated than host Anderson County), would result in decreased impacts at each site. The in-migrating population would represent a smaller percentage increase to these more highly populated counties, which are also likely to offer more amenities. Based on the percentage increase in population for a two-county area, which ranges between 2.5 and 3.1 percent, the impacts at all sites would be expected to be SMALL to MODERATE.

Local Economy

As described in Subsection 4.4.2.2, the wages and salary of the construction and operations workforce would have a multiplier effect that could result in an increase in business activity, particularly in the retail and service sectors. This would have a positive impact on the business community and could provide opportunities for new business and increased job opportunities for residents. The economic effect in the study area would be beneficial for each site. Duke Energy assumes that direct jobs would be filled by an in-migrating workforce, but most indirect jobs would be service-related, not highly specialized, and filled by the existing workforce in the study area at each site. As discussed in Subsection 4.4.2.2, Duke Energy estimates that an in-migrating workforce of 3120 (70 percent of 4398 construction workers plus 36 percent of 114 operation workers) during peak construction would create 1424 indirect jobs for a total of 4544 new jobs in the region. Expenditures made by the direct and indirect workforce would strengthen the regional economy. Unemployment rates in 2000 within each of the host counties were 3.8 percent in Cherokee County (Lee Nuclear Site), 2.6 percent in Oconee County (Keowee Site), 2.7 percent in Anderson County (Middleton Shoals Site), and 2.4 percent in Davie County (Perkins Site). The impacts of the proposed project on the economy would be beneficial and SMALL in the region of all of the sites, and beneficial and MODERATE to LARGE in the host counties for each site.

Taxes

The tax structure and revenue categories for South Carolina are described in detail for the Lee Nuclear Site in Subsection 2.5.2.3 and are expected to also apply to the Keowee and Middleton Shoals sites because they are located in South Carolina. The Perkins Site is located in North Carolina, and the types of taxes generated by construction activities and purchases, and by site workforce expenditures, are expected to be similar as well. Duke Energy currently operates the existing McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, and pays property taxes to both Mecklenburg County and the town of Huntersville, which benefits the total operating budget of Mecklenburg County. Because host Davie County for the Perkins Site is significantly less populated than Mecklenburg County, the benefits to Davie County are expected to be even greater than those realized by Mecklenburg County for McGuire. In summary, the increase in collected taxes as a result of constructing and operating the proposed project would be viewed as a benefit to the state and local taxing jurisdictions for the preferred site and for each of the alternative sites. It is expected that the impacts on the economy of the region would be beneficial and SMALL, while the impacts to the host county for each site are expected to be beneficial and LARGE.

Transportation

The existing transportation network surrounding the Lee Nuclear Site has been described previously in Subsection 2.5.2.2, and impacts to this network from construction activities have been described in Subsection 4.4.1.3. Cherokee County sits just off Interstate-85 between Charlotte-Gastonia and Greenville-Spartanburg. The Lee Nuclear Site is located off McKowns Mountain Road, which connects to Road 105 leading into Gaffney, and Highway 329, which leads north to U.S. Highway 29 (Gaffney and Blacksburg) and I-85 (about 6 – 8 mi. to the north). Upgrades would be required if the site is developed. Based on the size of the construction workforce and the associated number of vehicles added to the roadways, the impacts from construction workers and deliveries on smaller two-lane state and county highways and local roads, primarily McKowns Mountain Road, are MODERATE to LARGE within the immediate vicinity of the site. Mitigation measures would be required and could include the following:

- Widening of McKowns Mountain Road to accommodate the additional traffic.
- Installing traffic-control lighting and directional signage.
- Creating an additional entrance to the site to alleviate traffic at the primary plant entrance.
- Shuttling construction workers to and from the site.
- Encouraging carpooling.
- Staggering shifts to avoid traditional traffic congestion time periods.

The Keowee Site is located in Oconee County, which is served by I-85 in the southeast corner, as well as U.S. Highways 76 and 123, State Highway 28, and State Scenic Highway 11. The proposed site is on a two-lane highway with service to the site being convenient from four main directions. Highway 123 runs the length of adjacent Pickens County from east to west with four-lane service to Greenville. State Highway 133 (which runs north-south on the east side of Lake Keowee) and State Highway 183 from Pickens serve as commuting highways from Pickens County to the existing Oconee Nuclear Station, which is adjacent to the proposed Keowee Site. Adjacent Pickens County is not served by the Interstate Highway System, but has ready access to the I-85 corridor via U.S. 76, 123, and 178. State Highways 8, 96, 135, 137, 124, and State Scenic Highway 11 complete the major road network. The existing transportation routes adequately serve the site area, which includes the existing Oconee Nuclear Station, located approximately 1 mi. to the north. However, development of the Keowee Site would likely require the widening of Highway 183, the relocation of an existing road that currently runs next to the Keowee Site and connects to Highway 183 at the existing Oconee Nuclear Station, and development of a new access road to the site. In addition, development at the Keowee Site would add commuters, deliveries, and congestion to the existing and significant workforce and delivery system associated with the nearby Oconee Nuclear Station, local residents, and recreational users of Lake Keowee. Impacts, particularly potential cumulative impacts from activities at both plants, would be MODERATE to LARGE. Mitigation measures for the access road and surrounding roads would be required, and these measures would be similar to those identified for the Lee Nuclear Site.

There is good access to the Middleton Shoals Site from local roads on the east side of the Savannah River. Routes 187 and 184 converge near the site and connect to SC Highways 81 to the east (Iva) and 181 to the north (into Anderson). Larger routes include State Road (SR) 72 to the south (15 mi.) and U.S. Highway 29 to the north (7-8 mi.). The closest interstate is

I-85 to the north (5 mi. north of Anderson), which connects to the Greenville–Spartanburg area. Similar to that at the Lee and Keowee sites, development of the Middleton Shoals Site, which is currently served by 2-lane roads, would require widening of some surrounding roads. This could include the widening of Highways 181 (coming in from Anderson) and 187, both of which access the site from the north, as well as construction of a new road for direct site access. Impacts would be MODERATE to LARGE and would require mitigation measures similar to those for the Lee Nuclear Site.

The Perkins Site is close to Mocksville, which is where U.S. Highways 158, 64, and 601 meet. These highways join Interstate-40 approximately 9 mi. to the northwest of the site. Access from the site (Davie County) is via Route 801 just to the north of site. This route then connects with SR 601 (runs north-south west of site) and also connects with SR 64 about 4 mi. north (east-west route). Interstate-85 is about 9 mi. southeast of the site. The primary site access from I-85 would be via U.S. Highways 64 and 801, which are also two-lane roads. Development of the Perkins Site would require similar road widening and site access. Impacts would be MODERATE to LARGE and would require similar mitigation measures, as described for the Lee Nuclear Site.

In summary, the preferred site and all three alternative sites are greenfield sites located along two-lane roads that would require upgrading for site development. Impacts at all sites are expected to be the same (MODERATE to LARGE). While Keowee has the advantage of being near the existing Oconee Nuclear Station and an already developed infrastructure, the site itself is undeveloped and would require new access roads. The potential cumulative impacts from continued operation of Oconee and new construction and operations at Keowee need to be recognized. In addition, significant upgrading of most arterial links and main highways is likely to be required within both North and South Carolina, including areas around each of the sites, in order to accommodate projected growth over the next 10 – 20 years.

Recreation

Nearby recreational facilities at the Lee Nuclear Site have been described previously in Subsection 2.5.2.5 and include Kings Mountain State Park and the adjoining Kings Mountain National Military Park, which are located approximately 8 mi. northeast of the site center point. A comparison of nearby state parks and game preserves at the three alternative sites reveals the following:

Keowee: Oconee State Park is located to the west (over 5 mi.), Keowee Toxaway State Natural Area to the north (10 mi.); and Lake Keowee with a shoreline located approximately 1 mi. from the site.

Lake Keowee is smaller than Lake Hartwell on which the Middleton Shoals site is located, but it supports similar activities, including boating, skiing and fishing. Lake Keowee was formed by damming the water of the Little River and Keowee River above the Hartwell Reservoir. Hartwell Reservoir, a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers reservoir, is located south and downstream of the site. Keowee Lake covers about 18,500 ac. and has 300 mi. of shoreline, which is developed with both permanent and vacation residences, along with campgrounds, boat launch areas, marinas, golf courses, and some small retail establishments. Lake Keowee is used as a source of municipal drinking water by Greenville and Seneca and is extensively used for recreation by fishermen, swimmers, skiers, and boaters.

Middleton Shoals: Saddler's Creek State Recreation Area (approximately 10 mi. to the north) and 56,000-ac. Lake Hartwell in Anderson County, on which the site is located.

The lake includes 962 mi. of shoreline and has over 80 public boat launch, recreation, and park areas. One of the boat launches, located at the Highway 368 crossing of the Savannah River into Anderson County, SC, is located immediately south of the site.

Perkins: Boone's Cave State Park located in adjacent Davidson County to the southeast (approximately 5 mi.), which has never been intensely developed as a recreation site; Perkins State Game Preserve to the east (approximately 1.3 mi.); and, Alcoa State Game Lands to the south of the site (approximately 5 mi.).

Impacts to recreational areas near the Lee Nuclear Site were addressed in Subsection 4.4.2.6. Given the distance to the nearest state park, impacts to recreational facilities for the Lee Nuclear Site are expected to be SMALL. Impacts to recreational areas at the Perkins Site are also expected to be SMALL, given the distance to the nearest state park and the nature of activities that occur at the nearby game preserve. Impacts to recreation at Keowee and Middleton Shoals would be expected to be SMALL to MODERATE, given their proximity to reservoirs that support recreational use. In addition, development of the Middleton Shoals Site would adversely impact the existing boat launch located next to the site. Mitigation would be required and would likely include relocation of the boat launch to a different location.

Housing

The impacts of plant construction on housing depend upon the number of workers already residing in the study area and the number that would relocate and require housing. As discussed previously, Duke Energy estimates that approximately 3120 workers and their families (for a total of 5552 persons) would migrate into the region. Assuming these workers are dispersed throughout the multi-county region, the impacts on housing at each site are expected to be SMALL, based on the small percentage increases in total study area population occurring at each site. However, under a more conservative assumption that all of the in-migrating workers and their families would prefer to live close to the site in a two-county area, the percentage use of the existing vacant housing inventory is provided in Table 9.3-5. These numbers are based on housing data for 2000 (vacant) and assume one housing unit per worker.

Based on absolute numbers, the available housing would be sufficient to house the workforce at the preferred and alternative sites, with the lowest available housing found near the Perkins Site (although also note that the Perkins Site is within 20 mi. of the large metropolitan area of Winston-Salem in Forsyth County, which had 9242 vacant housing units in 2000). The available housing may not be sufficient, however, in terms of the type, size, and pricing desired by the workers. In this case, workers could relocate to other areas in the region, such as to larger metropolitan areas within commuting distance; have new homes constructed; bring their own homes; or live in hotels and motels. Single workers could also share apartments, which would reduce the total number of housing units needed. An increase in housing demand could result in an increase in housing prices and rent, which could result in pricing some low-income populations out of their rental housing. In the long-term, however, the study area, and particularly the host county of each site, would benefit from increased property values and the addition of new houses to the tax rolls.

In general, impacts on housing are considered to be SMALL when a small change in housing availability occurs and MODERATE when there is a discernable but temporary reduction in the availability of housing units. Duke Energy concludes that the potential impacts on housing could be MODERATE to LARGE if the majority of workers choose to reside in the small towns closest to the Lee Nuclear Site and SMALL if the workers are dispersed

throughout the larger study area. These findings are applicable to the preferred site and the three alternative sites.

Public Services

Public services include water supply and wastewater treatment facilities, police, fire and medical facilities, and social services. New construction or operations workers relocating from outside the region would most likely live in residentially-developed areas where adequate water supply and wastewater treatment facilities already exist. Small increases in the regional population would not materially affect the availability of police, fire, or medical services. It is not expected that public services would be materially impacted by new construction or operations employees relocating into the region. Therefore, the impacts on public services would be SMALL at the preferred and alternative sites.

Schools

According to the 2000 census estimate, the percentages of school age children between the ages of 5 and 19 in South Carolina and North Carolina are 21.7 percent and 20.5 percent, respectively. Applying the two-state average percentage of 21.1 percent to the total in-migrating population at the preferred and alternative sites, based on the assumption that most of these workers would come from the two-state area, the anticipated school age population derived from the in-migrating family total is 1171 (total in-migrating population of 5552 x 21.1 percent). [Note that this works out to 1.4 school-age children per family, based on the assumption that a total of 811 in-migrating construction and operation workers would bring families.] Further assuming a conservative scenario where the majority of workers would in-migrate into a two-county area, with half residing in each county, an additional 586 children would be added to the existing county school district system. The percentage increases for each county are identified in Table 9.3-6.

The projected increase in school age children within the two-county area is very similar across the sites, ranging from 2.4 percent (Lee) to 3.2 percent (Perkins), and is expected to result in SMALL to MODERATE impacts. Impacts on the educational systems of individual counties are more variable. For each site, the increase in one county is low (2.0 percent or less) and would likely result in SMALL impacts, but in the other county, the projected increase is significantly higher and would likely result in MODERATE to LARGE impacts. Specifically, impacts on Cherokee County with a 5.2 percent increase (Lee Nuclear Site), and on Oconee and Pickens counties with 4.6 and 2.4 percent increases, respectively (Keowee Site) would be expected to be MODERATE. Impacts on Davie County with an 8.5 percent increase (Perkins Site) and Abbeville County with a 10.4 percent increase (Middleton Shoals) would be expected to be LARGE. The quickest mitigation measure would be to hire additional teachers and move modular classrooms to existing schools. Increased property and sales tax revenues as a result of the increased population would fund additional teachers and facilities. It should also be noted that while this is a conservative estimate, in the case of Middleton Shoals, more than 50 percent of the in-migrating workers and their families are likely to reside in the more populated Anderson County. The educational school district system of Anderson County is expected to more easily absorb an influx of school age children than the less populated Abbeville County, even at a greater than 50-50 split. In the case of the Perkins Site, the large metropolitan area of Winston-Salem, located in a third county (Forsyth County) approximately 20 mi. to the north of the site, is likely to draw some percentage of workers and their school-age children, thereby helping to further reduce the impacts on Davie and Davidson counties, as analyzed in this conservative scenario.

Operation Related Effects

The anticipated operational plant staff is ~~957800~~1000 individuals. Based on the previous analysis that indicated construction related socioeconomic impacts for all four sites are SMALL, it may also be assumed that operation related socioeconomic impacts would also be SMALL.

Associated Attachments:

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| Attachment 32-1 | Table 9.3-4. Percent Increase In Population For Study Area And Host County For Each Site. |
| Attachment 32-2 | Table 9.3-5. Percentage Use Of Existing Vacant Housing. |
| Attachment 32-3 | Table 9.3-6. Projected Increase In School-Age Children Within The Two-County Area. |

TABLE 9.3-4
 PERCENT INCREASE IN POPULATION FOR STUDY AREA
 AND HOST COUNTY FOR EACH SITE

| | <u>Total Study Area* Population (2000)</u> | <u>Percentage Increase</u> | <u>Host County Population (2000)</u> | <u>Percentage Increase</u> | <u>Two- County Population (2000)</u> | <u>Percentage Increase</u> |
|---|--|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| <u>Lee Nuclear Site (SC)</u> | <u>1,420,710</u> | <u>0.39%</u> | <u>Cherokee 52,537</u> | <u>10.6%</u> | <u>217,151 (Cherokee and York)</u> | <u>2.5%</u> |
| <u>Keowee Site (SC)</u> | <u>1,019,627</u> | <u>0.54%</u> | <u>Oconee 66,215</u> | <u>8.4%</u> | <u>176,972 (Oconee and Pickens)</u> | <u>3.1%</u> |
| <u>Middleton Shoals Site (SC)</u> | <u>1,045,794</u> | <u>0.53%</u> | <u>Anderson 165,740</u> | <u>3.3%</u> | <u>191,907 (Anderson and Abbeville)</u> | <u>2.9%</u> |
| <u>Perkins Site (NC)</u> | <u>1,228,090</u> | <u>0.45%</u> | <u>Davie 34,835</u> | <u>15.9%</u> | <u>182,081 (Davie and Davidson)</u> | <u>3.0%</u> |

*Study Areas for each site are defined as follows:

Lee Nuclear Site – Cherokee, York, Union, Chester, and Spartanburg counties, SC, and Gaston and Mecklenberg counties, NC.

Keowee Site – Oconee, Pickens, Anderson, Greenville and Spartanburg counties, SC; and Elbert and Hart counties, GA.

Middleton Shoals Site – Anderson, Abbeville, Oconee, Pickens, Greenville, and Spartanburg counties, SC, and Elbert and Hart counties, GA.

Perkins Site – Davie, Davidson, Rowan, Forsyth, Guilford, Randolph, and Stanly counties

TABLE 9.3-5
 PERCENTAGE USE OF EXISTING VACANT HOUSING

| <u>Site</u> | <u>Two-County Area</u> | <u>Required Housing Units (assuming 1 per worker)</u> | <u>Total Housing Available *(Vacant) (2000)</u> | <u>Percent Utilized</u> |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| <u>Lee Nuclear Site</u> | <u>Cherokee and York</u> | <u>3120</u> | <u>6915</u> | <u>45%</u> |
| <u>Keowee Site</u> | <u>Oconee and Pickens</u> | | <u>9794</u> | <u>32%</u> |
| <u>Middleton Shoals Site</u> | <u>Anderson and Abbeville</u> | | <u>9089</u> | <u>34%</u> |
| <u>Perkins Site</u> | <u>Davie and Davidson</u> | | <u>5479</u> | <u>57%</u> |

* Vacant housing units available for sale or rent by county.

TABLE 9.3-6
PROJECTED INCREASE IN SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN WITHIN THE TWO-COUNTY AREA

| <u>Site</u> | <u>County</u> | <u>Percent School Age Children (Ages 5-19) (2000)</u> | <u>Total Population School Age Children (5-19) (2000)*</u> | <u>Percent Increase in School-Age Children by County</u> | <u>Percent Increase for Two-County Area</u> |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| <u>Lee Nuclear Site</u> | <u>Cherokee (host county)</u> | <u>21.5%</u> | <u>11,277</u> | <u>5.2%</u> | <u>2.4%</u> <u>(48,311)</u> |
| | <u>York</u> | <u>22.5%</u> | <u>37,034</u> | <u>1.6%</u> | |
| <u>Keowee Site</u> | <u>Oconee (host county)</u> | <u>19.2%</u> | <u>12,675</u> | <u>4.6%</u> | <u>3.2%</u> <u>(36,981)</u> |
| | <u>Pickens</u> | <u>22%</u> | <u>24,306</u> | <u>2.4%</u> | |
| <u>Middleton Shoals Site</u> | <u>Anderson (host county)</u> | <u>20.4%</u> | <u>33,802</u> | <u>1.7%</u> | <u>3.0%</u> <u>(39,451)</u> |
| | <u>Abbeville</u> | <u>21.6%</u> | <u>5,649</u> | <u>10.4%</u> | |
| <u>Perkins Site</u> | <u>Davie (host county)</u> | <u>19.9%</u> | <u>6,913</u> | <u>8.5%</u> | <u>3.2%</u> <u>(36,370)</u> |
| | <u>Davidson</u> | <u>19.9%</u> | <u>29,457</u> | <u>2.0%</u> | |

* Population estimates for school age children, including age brackets 5-9, 10-14, and 15-19.