Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc. 40 Inverness Center Parkway Birmingham, Alabama 35242



JUL 16 2010

Docket Nos.: 52-025 52-026 ND-10-1389 10 CFR 51.50

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

> Southern Nuclear Operating Company Vogtle Electric Generating Plant Units 3 and 4 Combined License Application New and Significant Information Evaluation for the <u>Transportation of Backfill from an Additional Offsite Source</u>

Ladies and Gentlemen:

On March 28, 2008, Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNC) submitted an application to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) requesting combined licenses (COLs) for two AP1000 advanced passive pressurized water reactors designated Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP) Units 3 and 4. Subsequently, on September 23, 2009, SNC submitted Revision 1 to COL Application Part 3, "Applicant's Environmental Report [ER] – Combined License Stage."

SNC letter ND-10-0526, dated March 12, 2010, contained a new and significant evaluation for transporting backfill from an offsite borrow source located approximately fifty miles from the VEGP site. Subsequent to the March 12, 2010 submittal, SNC identified an additional potential offsite borrow source from a location approximately sixty miles from the VEGP site. The enclosure to this letter provides the new and significant evaluation for transporting backfill by truck from the new location using two potential routes and utilizing multiple roads. SNC has not made a final decision on using an offsite source for backfill, nor have we determined that backfill material onsite is insufficient to complete backfill activities. The schedule for determination if an offsite source is needed has not been developed and to prevent unnecessary delays in the issuance of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the COL, SNC requests the environmental impacts associated with transporting backfill material from offsite sources be included in the COL draft SEIS as an optional activity.

This submittal contains no restricted data or national defense information requiring separation in accordance with 10 CFR 50.33(j).

The SNC licensing contacts for this application are D. L. Fulton at (205) 992-7536 or W. A. Sparkman at (205) 992-5061.

DO42 NRO

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission ND-10-1389 Page 2 of 4

Mr. C. R. Pierce states he is the AP1000 Licensing Manager of Southern Nuclear Operating Company, is authorized to execute this oath on behalf of Southern Nuclear Operating Company and to the best of his knowledge and belief, the facts set forth in this letter are true.

Respectfully submitted,

SOUTHERN NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY

C. R. Pierce

C. R. Pierce

Sworn to and subscribed before me this <u>16th</u> day of <u>Ju</u> Notary Public: <u>Dana Marie Williams</u> 29 My commission expires: CRP/DLF

Enclosure: VEGP Units 3 and 4 - New and Significant Information Evaluation Involving Transportation of Backfill from an Additional Offsite Source U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission ND-10-1389 Page 3 of 4

#### cc: <u>Southern Nuclear Operating Company</u>

Mr. J. H. Miller, III, President and CEO (w/o enclosure) Mr. J. A. Miller, Executive Vice President, Nuclear Development (w/o enclosure) Mr. J. T. Gasser, Executive Vice President, Nuclear Operations (w/o enclosure) Mr. B. L. Ivey, Vice President, Nuclear Development Support Mr. D. H. Jones, Site Vice President, Vogtle 3 & 4 (w/o enclosure) Mr. T. E. Tynan, Vice President - Vogtle (w/o enclosure) Mr. M. K. Smith, Technical Support Director (w/o enclosure) Mr. D. M. Lloyd, Vogtle 3 & 4 Project Support Director (w/o enclosure) Mr. M. J. Ajluni, Nuclear Licensing Manager Mr. J. D. Williams, Vogtle 3 & 4 Site Support Manager Mr. J. T. Davis, Vogtle 3 & 4 Site Licensing Manager Mr. W. A. Sparkman, COL Project Engineer Mr. B. W. Waites, Construction Licensing Project Engineer Mr. T. C. Moorer, Manager - Environmental Affairs, Chemistry and Radiological Services Document Services RTYPE: AR01.1053 File AR.01.01.06

#### Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Mr. L. A. Reyes, Region II Administrator

Mr. F. M. Akstulewicz, Deputy Director Div. of Safety Systems & Risk Assess. (w/o encl.)

Mr. R. G. Joshi, Lead Project Manager of New Reactors

Ms. T. E. Simms, Project Manager of New Reactors

Mr. B. C. Anderson, Project Manager of New Reactors

Mr. M. M. Comar, Project Manager of New Reactors

Ms. S. Goetz, Project Manager of New Reactors

Mr. J. M. Sebrosky, Project Manager of New Reactors

Mr. D. C. Habib, Project Manager of New Reactors

Ms. D. L. McGovern, Project Manager of New Reactors

Ms. T. L. Spicher, Project Manager of New Reactors

Ms. M. A. Sutton, Environmental Project Manager

Mr. M. D. Notich, Environmental Project Manager

Mr. L. M. Cain, Senior Resident Inspector of VEGP 1 & 2

Mr. J. D. Fuller, Senior Resident Inspector of VEGP 3 & 4

#### Georgia Power Company

Mr. T. W. Yelverton, Nuclear Development Director Ms. A. N. Faulk, Nuclear Regulatory Affairs Manager

#### Oglethorpe Power Corporation

Mr. M. W. Price, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Mr. K. T. Haynes, Director of Contracts and Regulatory Oversight

#### Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia

Mr. J. E. Fuller, Senior Vice President, Chief Financial Officer Mr. S. M. Jackson, Vice President, Power Supply

#### Dalton Utilities

Mr. D. Cope, President and Chief Executive Officer

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission ND-10-1389 Page 4 of 4

Bechtel Power Corporation

Mr. J. S. Prebula, Project Engineer (w/o enclosure) Mr. R. W. Prunty, Licensing Engineer

<u>Tetra Tech NUS, Inc.</u>

Ms. K. K. Patterson, Project Manager

Shaw Stone & Webster, Inc.

Mr. C. A. Fonseca, Vogtle Project Manager (w/o enclosure) Mr. J. M. Oddo, Licensing Manager

Mr. D. C. Shutt, Licensing Engineer

Westinghouse Electric Company, LLC

Mr. S. D. Rupprecht, Vice President of Regulatory Affairs & Strategy (w/o enclosure)
Mr. N. C. Boyter, Consortium Project Director Vogtle Units 3 & 4 (w/o enclosure)
Mr. S. A. Bradley, Vogtle Project Licensing Manager
Mr. M. A. Melton, Manager, Regulatory Interfaces
Mr. R. B. Sisk, Manager, AP1000 Licensing and Customer Interface
Mr. D. A. Lindgren, Principal Engineer, AP1000 Licensing and Customer Interface

NuStart Energy

Mr. R. J. Grumbir Mr. E. R. Grant Mr. P. S. Hastings Mr. B. Hirmanpour Mr. N. Haggerty Ms. K. N. Slays

Other NuStart Energy Associates

Ms. M. C. Kray, NuStart Mr. S. P. Frantz, Morgan Lewis Mr. J. A. Bailey, TVA Ms. A. L. Sterdis, TVA Mr. J. P. Berger, EDF Mr. M. W. Gettler, FP&L Mr. P. Hinnenkamp, Entergy Mr. G. D. Miller, PG&N Mr. N. T. Simms, Duke Energy Mr. G. A. Zinke, NuStart & Entergy Mr. R. H. Kitchen, PGN Ms. A. M. Monroe, SCE&G Mr. T. Beville, DOE/PM

# Southern Nuclear Operating Company

## ND-10-1389

## Enclosure

VEGP Units 3 and 4

# New and Significant Information Evaluation

# Involving

# Transportation of Backfill from an Additional Offsite Source

Note: The enclosed document is four (4) pages in length.

# Southern Nuclear Operating Company ND-EV-VNP-001-F01 Southern Nacion Form Guidance For New And Significant Information ND-EV-VNP-001-F01 Energy is Serve Your World\* Page 1 of 4 Page 1 of 4

## **VEGP EIS KEY INPUTS OR ASSUMPTIONS**

## **Traffic Analysis for Backfill**

EIS Section	Input Number	Key Input or Assumption	New Information (Yes/No)	Significant (Yes/No)	Rationale
NA	PS 3a	Evaluate the acceptability of the potential procurement of Category 1 and/or 2 fill material from an offsite supplier with delivery by truck to the site. Distance from site to supplier will be approximately 60	Yes	No	SNC is exploring an offsite borrow source in the event sufficient quantities of Category 1 and/or 2 material are not available onsite. The offsite backfill will come from an established permitted quarry. Accordingly, any environmental concerns regarding the operation of the quarry are the responsibility of the appropriate regulatory agencies and were addressed during the quarry's permitting process. Environmental impacts associated with the operation of the quarry are not subject to the NEPA process for Vogtle Units 3 & 4 and thus not included in this evaluation. Offsite backfill delivery environmental impacts were not evaluated in the ESP FEIS and the impact of 250 trucks per day on local traffic is relevant to the project under NEPA. SNC has analyzed transportation impacts to incorporate delivery of offsite backfill from a quarry in Aiken County, South Carolina, approximately 60 miles from the VEGP site.
		miles from the VEGP site. Material will be obtained from SP and SP-SM sand deposits. containing the same general			<ol> <li>The backfill will be delivered during the 10-hour construction day shift and consist of two hundred fifty (250) truck loads per day (equivalent to 25 trips per hour). The South Carolina Highway Design Manual was not available for review. However, GDOT assesses trucks of the size used to deliver the backfill as 3.5 vehicle equivalents so this value was used for South Carolina roads as well.</li> <li>The location of the quarry would be within 60 miles of VEGP. SNC evaluated the transportation impacts on two routes.</li> </ol>
		geological properties as the upper sands onsite and a professional geologist will be used to characterize the similarity of the			The first route assumed that trucks would travel south on SC 19 from Reynolds Pond Road to SC 118, and then west to US 1. The trucks would then travel west on US 1 to I-520, and then to Ga SR 56, to GA SR 23. I-520 is a new road and traffic counts are not available, but it is a 4-lane, limited access, divided highway and SNC assumes that I-520 traffic capacity is equivalent to I-20 traffic capacity. Leaving VEGP trucks would use River Road to SR 56 going north to I-520. The maximum length of time for the backfill deliveries is expected to be seven months. (SC 2009 and GDOT 2009a)
		borrow source to the onsite Category 1 and 2 borrow sources. The material will be tested using commercial grade lab analysis and geotechnical			<ul> <li>The second route assumed that trucks would travel north on SC 19 from Reynolds Pond Road to I-20, and then west to I-520, and then to Ga SR 56, to GA SR 23. I-520 is a new road and traffic counts are not available, but it is a 4-lane, limited access, divided highway and SNC assumes that I-520 traffic capacity is equivalent to I-20 traffic capacity. Leaving VEGP, trucks would use River Road to SR 56 spur to SR 56 going north to I-520. The maximum length of time for the backfill deliveries is expected to be seven months. (SC 2009 and GDOT 2009a)</li> <li>GADOT considers the ideal capacity of a 4-lane roadway as 2,000 vehicles per lane per hour, and the ideal capacity of a 2-lane roadway as 1700 vehicles per lane per hour (GDOT 2009b). South</li> </ul>

## **Southern Nuclear Operating Company**

SOUTHERN AS COMPANY Energy to Serve Your Warld'

characterization prior to delivery to

a segregated stockpile onsite.

It is conservatively estimated that roughly 800,000 cubic yards of material may be required from this offsite source. Based on the estimated quantity and a maximum daily delivery of 5000 cubic yards, this activity could require seven months to complete. Delivery of 5000 cubic yards per day would translate into roughly 250 truck loads per day at 20 cubic yards per truck. It is estimated that 50 trucks would be required to make these deliveries.

Guidance For New And Significant Information

ND-EV-VNP-001-F01 Version 1.0 Page 2 of 4

Carolina d	apacity was	s not avai	ilable, so	Georaia	capacity	was use	d as a∍su	rroaate.		•
4. Backfill we existing u	ould not be nits' workfol	delivered rce shift c	during co hange. E	onstructi Because	ion shift o very few	hange, b of the VI	ut would EGP worl	be delivered force live o or South Ca	r are e	xpected
5. 2008 annual average daily traffic (AADT) counts were the most recent available (GDOT 2010, SC 2009).										
SNC analyzed trafi	fic impacts f	rom the a	nticipate	d volum	e of back	fill moved	l in a sing	le shift or 5	i,000 cı	ıbic
The following tab South Carolina, a			•			ay delivei	red from a	a quarry in J	Aiken C	County,
		AADT 2-way counts (per hr in a 10 hr shift) <sup>2</sup>	er Shift Change EIS) <sup>4</sup>	Shift change (% direction factor) <sup>3 &amp; 4</sup>	vehicle ts/ hr	raffic count/hr during non- shift times	Γraffic count∕shift change	Roadway two-way design capacity/hr*	-ur	3.5 vehicle equivalents/hr
Road	2008 AADT 2-way counts <sup>1</sup>	AADT 2-wa n a 10 hr s	/ehicles p from ESP	Shift chan actor) <sup>3 &amp; 4</sup>	Frucks as vehicle equivalents/ hr	raffic cou	lraffic co	Roadway Capacity/I	trucks/hour=	3.5 vehicl
Road	AADT		Vehicles per Shift (from ESP EIS) <sup>4</sup>					Roadway tw capacity/hr*	trucks/ho	3.5 vehicl
	AADT 2-way					Traffic cor shift times		Roadway capacity/I	trucks/ho	3.5 vehicl
Road SC Hwy 19 (2 Iane)	AADT 2-way							Capacity/I	trucks/ho	<b>3.5 vehicl</b>
SC Hwy 19 (2	AADT 2-way counts <sup>1</sup>	Route	<u>1: HWY</u>	<u>19 to U</u>	S 1 to I-5	20 to SR	56		<u>-</u>	
SC Hwy 19 (2 lane)	AADT 2-way counts <sup>1</sup>	<b>Route</b> 1,130	1: HWY N/A	19 to U N/A	<b>S 1 to I-5</b>	20 to SR	56 N/A	3,400	50	175
SC Hwy 19 (2 lane) SC 118 (2 lane)	AADT 2-way counts <sup>1</sup> 11,300 8,900	<b>Route</b> 1,130 890	1: HWY N/A N/A	19 to U N/A N/A	<b>S 1 to I-5</b> 175 175	20 to SR 1,305 1,065	56 N/A N/A	3,400 3,400	50 50	<u>175</u> 175
SC Hwy 19 (2 lane) SC 118 (2 lane) US 1 (4 lane) I-520 (4 lane) <sup>5</sup> SR 56 (4 lane)	AADT 2-way counts <sup>1</sup> 11,300 8,900 26,100	<b>Route</b> 1,130 890 2,610	1: HWY N/A N/A N/A	19 to U N/A N/A N/A	<b>S 1 to I-5</b> 175 175 175	20 to SR 1,305 1,065 2,785	56 N/A N/A N/A	3,400 3,400 8,000	50 50 50	175 175 175
SC Hwy 19 (2 lane) SC 118 (2 lane) US 1 (4 lane) I-520 (4 lane) <sup>5</sup>	AADT 2-way counts <sup>1</sup> 11,300 8,900 26,100 28,800	Route 1,130 890 2,610 2,880	1: HWY N/A N/A N/A	19 to U N/A N/A N/A N/A	<b>S 1 to I-5</b> 175 175 175 175	20 to SR 1,305 1,065 2,785 3,055	56 N/A N/A N/A N/A	3,400 3,400 8,000 8,000	50 50 50 50	175 175 175 175 175
SC Hwy 19 (2 lane) SC 118 (2 lane) US 1 (4 lane) I-520 (4 lane) <sup>5</sup> SR 56 (4 lane) SR 56 spur (2	AADT 2-way counts <sup>1</sup> 11,300 8,900 26,100 28,800 29,180	Route 1,130 890 2,610 2,880 2,918	1: HWY N/A N/A N/A N/A 1,200	19 to U N/A N/A N/A N/A 792	<b>S</b> 1 to I-5 175 175 175 175 175 175	<b>20 to SR</b> 1,305 1,065 2,785 3,055 3,093	56 N/A N/A N/A 3,885	3,400 3,400 8,000 8,000 8,000	50 50 50 50 50	175 175 175 175 175 175

# Southern Nuclear Operating Company



Form

# Guidance For New And Significant Information

ND-EV-VNP-001-F01 Version 1.0 Page 3 of 4

20 (4 lane) <sup>5</sup> 28,800       2,880       N/A       N/A       175       3,055       N/A       8,000       50         56 (4 lane)       29,180       2,918       1,200       792       175       3,093       3,885       8,000       50         56 spur (2 lane)       2,210       221       1,200       792       87.5       308.5       879.5       3,400       25         23 (2 lane)       2,350       235       1,200       408       87.5       322.5       495.5       3,400       25         e ideal design capacity of a two lane roadway is 1,700 vehicles per hour (vph) in each direction. The design capacity of a multi-lane roadway is 2,000 vph per lane. South Carolina Design Manual not lable so roadway capacity for South Carolina not known. Used Georgia design capacity as surrogate erence: GDOT Design Policy Manual ver. 2.0 Revised 05/21/2009, p 13-19         f more than one traffic station existed on a roadway along the proposed route, the station with the hord											
Hwy 19 (2 lane)11,3001,130N/AN/A1751,305N/A3,4005020 (4 lane)28,8002,880N/AN/A1753,055N/A8,0005020 (4 lane)28,8002,880N/AN/A1753,055N/A8,0005020 (4 lane)29,1802,9181,2007921753,0933,8858,0005056 (4 lane)29,1802,9181,2007921753,0933,8858,0005056 spur (2 lane)2,2102211,20079287.5308.5879.53,4002523 (2 lane)2,3502351,20040887.5322.5495.53,40025a ideal design capacity of a two lane roadway is 1,700 vehicles per hour (vph) in each direction. The idesign capacity of a multi-lane roadway is 2,000 vph per lane. South Carolina Design Manual not 	·····										
Hwy 19 (2 lane)11,3001,130N/AN/A1751,305N/A3,4005020 (4 lane)28,8002,880N/AN/A1753,055N/A8,0005020 (4 lane)28,8002,880N/AN/A1753,055N/A8,0005020 (4 lane)29,1802,9181,2007921753,0933,8858,0005056 (4 lane)29,1802,9181,2007921753,0933,8858,0005056 spur (2 lane)2,2102211,20079287.5308.5879.53,4002523 (2 lane)2,3502351,20040887.5322.5495.53,40025a ideal design capacity of a two lane roadway is 1,700 vehicles per hour (vph) in each direction. The idesign capacity of a multi-lane roadway is 2,000 vph per lane. South Carolina Design Manual not lable so roadway capacity for South Carolina not known. Used Georgia design capacity as surroga erence: GDOT Design Policy Manual ver. 2.0 Revised 05/21/2009, p 13-19f more than one traffic station existed on a roadway along the proposed route, the station with the h nt was used.Conservatively assumed that all traffic recorded in 24 hours was recorded during the 10-hour shift Based on county residence information of existing workforce, 66 % live north or east of the site (and du use Rt 56), and 34% live south or west (and would use Rt 23)Shift change not relevant to South Carolina Roads.520 is a new road and traffic counts are not available, but it is a 4-lane, limited access divid					· .•						
Hwy 19 (2 lane)11,3001,130N/AN/A1751,305N/A3,4005020 (4 lane)28,8002,880N/AN/A1753,055N/A8,0005020 (4 lane)28,8002,880N/AN/A1753,055N/A8,0005020 (4 lane)29,1802,9181,2007921753,0933,8858,0005056 (4 lane)29,1802,9181,2007921753,0933,8858,0005056 spur (2 lane)2,2102211,20079287.5308.5879.53,4002523 (2 lane)2,3502351,20040887.5322.5495.53,40025a ideal design capacity of a two lane roadway is 1,700 vehicles per hour (vph) in each direction. The idesign capacity of a multi-lane roadway is 2,000 vph per lane. South Carolina Design Manual not lable so roadway capacity for South Carolina not known. Used Georgia design capacity as surroga erence: GDOT Design Policy Manual ver. 2.0 Revised 05/21/2009, p 13-19f more than one traffic station existed on a roadway along the proposed route, the station with the h nt was used.Conservatively assumed that all traffic recorded in 24 hours was recorded during the 10-hour shift Based on county residence information of existing workforce, 66 % live north or east of the site (and du use Rt 56), and 34% live south or west (and would use Rt 23)Shift change not relevant to South Carolina Roads.520 is a new road and traffic counts are not available, but it is a 4-lane, limited access divid						-					
Iane)11,3001,130N/AN/A1751,305N/A3,400500 (4 lane)28,8002,880N/AN/A1753,055N/A8,000500 (4 lane)28,8002,880N/AN/A1753,055N/A8,0005056 (4 lane)29,1802,9181,2007921753,0933,8858,0005056 (4 lane)29,1802,9181,2007921753,0933,8858,0005056 (4 lane)29,1802,9181,20079287.5308.5879.53,40025lane)2,2102211,20079287.5308.5879.53,40025lane)2,3502351,20040887.5322.5495.53,40025ideal design capacity of a two lane roadway is 1,700 vehicles per hour (vph) in each direction. Th design capacity of a multi-lane roadway is 2,000 vph per lane. South Carolina Design Manual not able so roadway capacity for South Carolina not known. Used Georgia design capacity as surroga rence: GDOT Design Policy Manual ver. 2.0 Revised 05/21/2009, p 13-19more than one traffic station existed on a roadway along the proposed route, the station with the P t was used.onservatively assumed that all traffic recorded in 24 hours was recorded during the 10-hour shift ased on county residence information of existing workforce, 66 % live north or east of the site (and d use Rt 56), and 34% live south or west (and would use Rt 23)hift change not relevant to South Carolina Roads.	Hwy 19 (2		Route	e 2: HWY	′ 19 to l-	20 to I-5	20 to SR	56			
20 (4 lane) <sup>5</sup> 28,8002,880N/AN/A1753,055N/A8,0005056 (4 lane)29,1802,9181,2007921753,0933,8858,0005056 spur (2 lane)2,2102211,20079287.5308.5879.53,4002523 (2 lane)2,3502351,20040887.5322.5495.53,40025a ideal design capacity of a two lane roadway is 1,700 vehicles per hour (vph) in each direction. The design capacity of a multi-lane roadway is 2,000 vph per lane. South Carolina Design Manual not lable so roadway capacity for South Carolina not known. Used Georgia design capacity as surrogate erence: GDOT Design Policy Manual ver. 2.0 Revised 05/21/2009, p 13-19f more than one traffic station existed on a roadway along the proposed route, the station with the fit was used.Conservatively assumed that all traffic recorded in 24 hours was recorded during the 10-hour shift du use Rt 56), and 34% live south or west (and would use Rt 23)Shift change not relevant to South Carolina Roads.520 is a new road and traffic counts are not available, but it is a 4-lane, limited access divided high SNC assumes that I-520 traffic capacity is equivalent to I-20 traffic capacity.0 cy/day (250 trucks/day) = 25 trucks per hour one way or 50 trucks per hour two ways		11,300	1,130	N/A	N/A	175	1,305	N/A	3,400	50	
56 (4 Iane)29,1802,9181,2007921753,0933,8858,0005056 spur (2 Iane)2,2102211,20079287.5308.5879.53,4002523 (2 Iane)2,3502351,20040887.5322.5495.53,40025a ideal design capacity of a two lane roadway is 1,700 vehicles per hour (vph) in each direction. The design capacity of a multi-lane roadway is 2,000 vph per lane. South Carolina Design Manual not lable so roadway capacity for South Carolina not known. Used Georgia design capacity as surroga erence: GDOT Design Policy Manual ver. 2.0 Revised 05/21/2009, p 13-19f more than one traffic station existed on a roadway along the proposed route, the station with the h twas used.Conservatively assumed that all traffic recorded in 24 hours was recorded during the 10-hour shift Based on county residence information of existing workforce, 66 % live north or east of the site (and du use Rt 56), and 34% live south or west (and would use Rt 23)Shift change not relevant to South Carolina Roads520 is a new road and traffic counts are not available, but it is a 4-lane, limited access divided high SNC assumes that I-520 traffic capacity is equivalent to I-20 traffic capacity.0 cy/day (250 trucks/day) = 25 trucks per hour one way or 50 trucks per hour two ways	I-20 (4 lane)	28,800	2,880	N/A	N/A	175	3,055	N/A	8,000	50	
56 spur (2 lane)       2,210       221       1,200       792       87.5       308.5       879.5       3,400       25         23 (2 lane)       2,350       235       1,200       408       87.5       322.5       495.5       3,400       25         a ideal design capacity of a two lane roadway is 1,700 vehicles per hour (vph) in each direction. The design capacity of a multi-lane roadway is 2,000 vph per lane. South Carolina Design Manual not lable so roadway capacity for South Carolina not known. Used Georgia design capacity as surrogate errore: GDOT Design Policy Manual ver. 2.0 Revised 05/21/2009, p 13-19         at more than one traffic station existed on a roadway along the proposed route, the station with the hot was used.         Conservatively assumed that all traffic recorded in 24 hours was recorded during the 10-hour shift Based on county residence information of existing workforce, 66 % live north or east of the site (and lou use Rt 56), and 34% live south or west (and would use Rt 23)         Shift change not relevant to South Carolina Roads.         520 is a new road and traffic counts are not available, but it is a 4-lane, limited access divided high SNC assumes that I-520 traffic capacity is equivalent to I-20 traffic capacity.         0 cy/day (250 trucks/day) = 25 trucks per hour one way or 50 trucks per hour two ways	520 (4 lane) <sup>5</sup>	28,800	2,880	N/A	N/A	175	3,055	N/A	8,000	50	
Iane)2,2102211,20079287.5308.5879.53,4002523 (2 lane)2,3502351,20040887.5322.5495.53,40025a ideal design capacity of a two lane roadway is 1,700 vehicles per hour (vph) in each direction. The design capacity of a multi-lane roadway is 2,000 vph per lane. South Carolina Design Manual not lable so roadway capacity for South Carolina not known. Used Georgia design capacity as surrogation and the source of the station existed on a roadway along the proposed route, the station with the finance than one traffic station existed on a roadway along the proposed route, the station with the finance of the substitution of existing workforce, 66 % live north or east of the site (and use Rt 56), and 34% live south or west (and would use Rt 23)State of the site (and would use Rt 23)Shift change not relevant to South Carolina Roads.520 is a new road and traffic counts are not available, but it is a 4-lane, limited access divided high SNC assumes that 1-520 traffic capacity is equivalent to 1-20 traffic capacity.0 cy/day (250 trucks/day) = 25 trucks per hour one way or 50 trucks per hour two ways	R 56 (4 lane)	29,180	2,918	1,200	792	175	3,093	3,885	8,000	50	
e ideal design capacity of a two lane roadway is 1,700 vehicles per hour (vph) in each direction. The I design capacity of a multi-lane roadway is 2,000 vph per lane. South Carolina Design Manual not lable so roadway capacity for South Carolina not known. Used Georgia design capacity as surroga erence: GDOT Design Policy Manual ver. 2.0 Revised 05/21/2009, p 13-19 f more than one traffic station existed on a roadway along the proposed route, the station with the h the was used. Conservatively assumed that all traffic recorded in 24 hours was recorded during the 10-hour shift Based on county residence information of existing workforce, 66 % live north or east of the site (and Id use Rt 56), and 34% live south or west (and would use Rt 23) Shift change not relevant to South Carolina Roads. 520 is a new road and traffic counts are not available, but it is a 4-lane, limited access divided high SNC assumes that I-520 traffic capacity is equivalent to I-20 traffic capacity. 0 cy/day (250 trucks/day) = 25 trucks per hour one way or 50 trucks per hour two ways	• •	2,210	221	1,200	792	87.5	308.5	879.5	3,400	25	
e ideal design capacity of a two lane roadway is 1,700 vehicles per hour (vph) in each direction. The I design capacity of a multi-lane roadway is 2,000 vph per lane. South Carolina Design Manual not lable so roadway capacity for South Carolina not known. Used Georgia design capacity as surroga erence: GDOT Design Policy Manual ver. 2.0 Revised 05/21/2009, p 13-19 f more than one traffic station existed on a roadway along the proposed route, the station with the h the was used. Conservatively assumed that all traffic recorded in 24 hours was recorded during the 10-hour shift Based on county residence information of existing workforce, 66 % live north or east of the site (and Id use Rt 56), and 34% live south or west (and would use Rt 23) Shift change not relevant to South Carolina Roads. 520 is a new road and traffic counts are not available, but it is a 4-lane, limited access divided high SNC assumes that I-520 traffic capacity is equivalent to I-20 traffic capacity. 0 cy/day (250 trucks/day) = 25 trucks per hour one way or 50 trucks per hour two ways	R 23 (2 lane)	2,350	235	1,200	408	87.5	322.5	495.5	3.400	25	
ld use Rt 56), and 34% live south or west (and would use Rt 23) Shift change not relevant to South Carolina Roads. 520 is a new road and traffic counts are not available, but it is a 4-lane, limited access divided high SNC assumes that I-520 traffic capacity is equivalent to I-20 traffic capacity. 10 cy/day (250 trucks/day) = 25 trucks per hour one way or 50 trucks per hour two ways		ne traffic sta	ation exist	ed on a r	oadway	along the	-	, ,	the station v	vith the	e hi
Shift change not relevant to South Carolina Roads. 520 is a new road and traffic counts are not available, but it is a 4-lane, limited access divided high SNC assumes that I-520 traffic capacity is equivalent to I-20 traffic capacity. 10 cy/day (250 trucks/day) = 25 trucks per hour one way or 50 trucks per hour two ways	count was used. 2. Conservatively	assumed t	hat all tra	ffic record	ded in 2	4 hours v	e propose vas recor	ed route, t ded durin	g the 10-ho	ur shift	:
520 is a new road and traffic counts are not available, but it is a 4-lane, limited access divided high SNC assumes that I-520 traffic capacity is equivalent to I-20 traffic capacity. 0 cy/day (250 trucks/day) = 25 trucks per hour one way or 50 trucks per hour two ways	count was used. 2. Conservatively 3. Based on cour	assumed t	hat all tra	ffic record	ded in 24 kisting w	4 hours v orkforce,	e propose vas recor 66 % live	ed route, t ded durin	g the 10-ho	ur shift	
SNC assumes that I-520 traffic capacity is equivalent to I-20 traffic capacity.	ount was used. . Conservatively . Based on cour /ould use Rt 56),	assumed t nty residenc and 34% li	that all tra te informative south o	ffic record ation of ex or west (a	ded in 2 kisting w and wou	4 hours v orkforce,	e propose vas recor 66 % live	ed route, t ded durin	g the 10-ho	ur shift	:
0 cy/day (250 trucks/day) = 25 trucks per hour one way or 50 trucks per hour two ways	ount was used. Conservatively Based on cour Jould use Rt 56), Shift change n	v assumed t nty residenc and 34% li ot relevant	hat all tra e informa ve south ( to South (	ffic record ation of ex or west (a Carolina I	ded in 2 kisting w and wou Roads.	4 hours v orkforce, ld use Rt	e propose vas recor 66 % live 23)	ed route, t ded durin e north or	g the 10-ho east of the	ur shift site (a	nd
	Conservatively Based on cour yould use Rt 56), Shift change n E I-520 is a new	assumed to nty residence and 34% li ot relevant road and tr	that all tra that all tra to South ( affic coun	ffic record ation of ex or west (a Carolina I ts are no	ded in 2 kisting w and wou Roads. t availab	4 hours v orkforce, ld use Rt	e propose vas recor 66 % live 23) is a 4-lan	ed route, t ded durin e north or e, limited	g the 10-ho east of the	ur shift site (a	nd
	ount was used. Conservatively Based on cour ould use Rt 56), Shift change n I-520 is a new nd SNC assume	v assumed t nty residenc and 34% li ot relevant road and tr s that I-520	that all tra te informa ve south to to South to affic coun traffic ca	ffic record ation of ex or west (a Carolina I ts are no pacity is o	ded in 2 kisting w and wou Roads. t availab equivale	4 hours v orkforce, ld use Rt ele, but it nt to I-20	e propose vas recor 66 % live 23) is a 4-lan traffic ca	ed route, t ded durin e north or e, limited pacity.	g the 10-ho east of the access divi	ur shift site (a	nd
	: was used. onservatively ased on cour d use Rt 56), nift change n 520 is a new SNC assume o cy/day (250 oparing the ta	r assumed t nty residence and 34% li ot relevant road and tr s that I-520 trucks/day raffic estime	that all tra that all tra to South ( affic coun traffic ca ) = 25 true ates in the	ffic record ation of ex or west (a Carolina I its are no pacity is o cks per ho e columns	ded in 2 kisting w and wou Roads. t availab equivale our one	4 hours v orkforce, Id use Rt Ide, but it nt to I-20 way or 5 Traffic co	e propose vas recor 66 % live 23) is a 4-lan traffic ca 0 trucks p unt/hr dui	ed route, t ded durin e north or e, limited pacity. <u>per hour t</u> <i>ing non-s</i>	g the 10-ho east of the access divi wo ways shift times" a	ur shift site (a ded hig and "Tr	gr
s/shift change" with the column titled "Roadway two-way design capacity/hr" (for the Georgia analy ne column titled "Traffic count/hr" with the column titled "Roadway two-way design capacity/hr" (for	nt was used. Conservatively Based on cour Id use Rt 56), Shift change n -520 is a new SNC assume 10 cy/day (250 Imparing the ta s/shift change	r assumed to and 34% li ot relevant road and tr s that I-520 trucks/day raffic estime " with the c	that all tra that all tra to South ( affic coun traffic ca ) = 25 true ates in the olumn title	ffic record ation of ex or west (a Carolina I its are no pacity is o cks per ho e columns ed "Road	ded in 2 kisting w and wou Roads. t availab equivale our one s titled " way two	4 hours v orkforce, Id use Rt ele, but it nt to I-20 <u>way or 5</u> <i>Traffic co</i> <i>-way des</i>	e propose vas recor 66 % live 23) is a 4-lan traffic ca 0 trucks p unt/hr dui sign capa	ed route, t ded durin e north or e, limited pacity. per hour to ing non-s city/hr" (fc	g the 10-ho east of the access divi wo ways shift times" a or the Georg	ur shift site (a ded hig and "Tr gia ana	gh
ne column titled "Traffic count/hr" with the column titled "Roadway two-way design capacity/hr" (for Carolina analyses), one can determine that the additional traffic due to the delivery of backfill to V	unt was used. Conservatively Based on cour uld use Rt 56), Shift change n I-520 is a new d SNC assume 00 cy/day (250 omparing the to the column title the column title	r assumed t and 34% li ot relevant road and tr s that I-520 trucks/day raffic estima " with the c ed "Traffic c lyses), one	that all trace informative south of to South of affic count traffic ca ) = 25 true ates in the olumn title ount/hr" w can dete	ffic record ation of ex- or west (a Carolina I ats are no pacity is o cks per ho e columns ed "Road with the co rmine tha	ded in 2 kisting w and wou Roads. t availat equivale our one s titled " way two olumn tit t the ad	4 hours v orkforce, Id use Rt ole, but it nt to I-20 <u>way or 5</u> <i>Traffic co</i> <i>-way des</i> <i>Ied "Roa</i> <i>ditional ti</i>	e propose vas recor 66 % live 23) is a 4-lan traffic ca 0 trucks p unt/hr dui sign capa dway two raffic due	ed route, t ded durin e north or e, limited pacity. <u>per hour th</u> <i>ing non-s</i> <i>city/hr" (fc</i> <i>-way des</i> <i>to the del</i>	g the 10-ho east of the access divi wo ways shift times" a br the Georg ign capacity livery of bac	ur shift site (a ded hig and "Tr gia ana y/hr" (fc skfill to	gh
ne column titled "Traffic count/hr" with the column titled "Roadway two-way design capacity/hr" (for Carolina analyses), one can determine that the additional traffic due to the delivery of backfill to V of exceed road capacity in either state. Impacts to traffic due to the addition of 250 trucks per day	unt was used. Conservatively Based on cour buld use Rt 56), Shift change n I-520 is a new d SNC assume 2000 cy/day (250 comparing the tr nts/shift change the column title th Carolina ana not exceed road	r assumed t and 34% li ot relevant road and tr s that I-520 trucks/day raffic estima " with the c ed "Traffic c lyses), one d capacity in	that all tra e informa ve south to South ( affic coun traffic ca ) = 25 true ates in the olumn title ount/hr" w can dete n either si	ffic record ation of ex- or west (a Carolina I ats are no pacity is o cks per ho e columns ed "Road with the co rmine that tate. Imp	ded in 2 kisting w and wou Roads. t availat equivale our one s titled " way two olumn tit ourn tit acts to t	4 hours v orkforce, Id use Rt ole, but it nt to I-20 way or 5 Traffic co I-way des Ied "Roa ditional tr raffic due	e propose vas recor 66 % live 23) is a 4-lan traffic ca 0 trucks p unt/hr dui sign capa dway two raffic due to the ac	ed route, t ded durin e north or e, limited pacity. <u>per hour th</u> <i>ing non-s</i> <i>city/hr" (fo</i> <i>-way des</i> <i>to the del</i> <i>ddition of</i>	g the 10-ho east of the access divi wo ways shift times" a or the Georg ign capacity livery of bac 250 trucks p	ur shift site (a ded hig and "Tr yia ana y/hr" (fo kfill to ber day	gh
ne column titled "Traffic count/hr" with the column titled "Roadway two-way design capacity/hr" (for Carolina analyses), one can determine that the additional traffic due to the delivery of backfill to V	unt was used. Conservatively Based on cour buld use Rt 56), Shift change n I-520 is a new d SNC assume 200 cy/day (250 comparing the t nts/shift change the column title th Carolina ana not exceed road vering backfill to	assumed t and 34% li ot relevant road and tr s that I-520 trucks/day raffic estima of "Traffic c lyses), one d capacity in o VEGP wo	that all transfer that all transfer to South () affic count traffic can ) = 25  true ates in the olumn title ount/hr" we can deten in either staud be SM	ffic record ation of ex- or west (a Carolina I ts are no pacity is o cks per ha e columns ed "Road with the co rmine tha tate. Imp MALL (not	ded in 2 kisting w and wou Roads. t availab equivale our one s titled "T way two olumn tit dat the ad acts to t	4 hours v orkforce, Id use Rt ole, but it nt to I-20 way or 5 Traffic co -way des Ied "Roa ditional tr raffic due ble or so	e propose vas recor 66 % live 23) is a 4-lan traffic ca 0 trucks p unt/hr dui sign capa dway two raffic due to the ac minor as	ed route, 1 ded durin e north or e, limited pacity. <u>ber hour th</u> <i>ing non-s</i> <i>city/hr" (fc</i> <i>-way des</i> <i>to the dei</i> <i>dition of</i> <i>to not de</i>	g the 10-ho east of the access divi wo ways shift times" a or the Georg ign capacity livery of bac 250 trucks p estabilize no	ur shift site (a ded hig and "Tr gia ana "/hr" (fo skfill to oper day r notic	gh afi

Southern Nuclear Operating Company									
<b>SOU</b> Eurgy (	SOUTHERN A COMPANY Energy to Serve there World*		Form	Guidance For New And Significant Information	ND-EV-VNP-001-F01 Version 1.0 Page 4 of 4				
				not impede their travel. Additionally the impact would be to seven months to deliver the backfill to the site.	emporary. SNC estimates it will take approximately				
				SNC will minimize impacts by specifying that incoming and (inbound on SR 23 and outbound on SR 56 spur) as evaluated	- ·				
				As noted in the ESP FEIS, Section 4.5.1.3, some roads use upgrades to allow safe access to the plant. At this time, SN upgrades.	-				
	7			Based on the evaluation, the average 25 truck loads per ho evaluated in the ESP FEIS at peak construction. The ESP vehicles per hour including traffic associated with Vogtle Ur represent the increased traffic at peak construction. The tra- prior to the peak construction workforce period such that the such, the impacts associated with additional truck deliveries	FEIS evaluated peak construction rates of 2,950 nits 1 and 2. Of the 2,950 vehicles, 1,750 vehicles uck delivery of backfill material will be complete e impacts of these events are not additive. As				

**References:** 

GDOT 2009a. Functional Classification Maps, Burke County and Richmond County, Georgia. October.

GDOT 2009b. GDOT Design Policy Manual, ver. 2, Revised 5/21/2009.

GDOT 2010. Georgia Department of Transportation. 2010. Annual Average Daily Traffic Reports by County and Year - 2008 reports. Available at www.dot.state.ga.us/statistics/TrafficDATA/Pagers/TrafficCounts.aspx . Accessed February 23, 2010.

SC 2009. South Carolina Department of Transportation. 2009. Annual Average Daily Traffic by County and Year - 2008 reports. Available at www.dot.state.sc.us/getting/aadt.asp. Accessed July 8, 2010.

Prepared By:	Karen Patterson	Kan K. Pan
	(Print)	(Skinature)
Reviewed By:	Matthen T Montz	Mator
	(Print)	(Signature)
Approved By:	Dale L. Fulton	Ekh fatte
	(Print)	(Signature)

7/8/2010 Date:

Date:  $\frac{7/16/2010}{16/2010}$