NRC-0012



10/05/2016

Hearing

ion Mandatory

Identified: Withdrawn: Stricken:

Docket # Exhibit # Admittec Rejectec

n Official Hearing Exhibi 3Y CAROLINAS, LLC Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2)

United States Nuclear Regulatory In the Matter of: DUKE

DUKE (William State

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Protecting People and the Environment

# **Combined License Application Review** William States Lee III Units 1 and 2 **Overview Panel October 5, 2016**

# **Overview of Staff Review**

- Lee COL Application and Contents
- AP1000 Design Certification
- Lee COL Overview Safety
- Lee COL Overview Environmental
- Summary of Staff Findings

# Lee 1 and 2 COL Application

- In December 2007, Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (DEC) submitted the application
- DEC would be licensed to construct and operate Lee Units 1 and 2

# Lee 1 and 2 COL Application

- Incorporates by reference the AP1000 DCD, Revision 19

   NUREG-1793 and supplements
- Plant-specific information
- COL Information Items
- Departures from AP1000 DCD

# Lee 1 and 2 COL Overview: Safety Review

- ACRS Review, 10 CFR 52.87
  - -Subcommittee 10/2015
  - -Full Committee 12/2015
  - -ACRS Report 12/14/2015
  - Supported License issuance
- FSER issued August 1, 2016

- Findings 10 CFR 52.97
  - 1. Applicable standards and requirements of the AEA and the Commission's regulations have been met
  - 2. Required notifications to other agencies or bodies have been duly made

- 3. Reasonable assurance that the facility will be constructed and will operate in conformity with the license, the AEA, and NRC regulations
- 4. Applicant is technically and financially qualified to engage in the activities authorized

- 5. Issuance of the licenses will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public
- 6. Findings required by Subpart A of 10 CFR Part 51 have been made

- EIS completed in accordance with:
  - -NEPA of 1969
  - -10 CFR Part 51
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers was a cooperating agency

- Staff follows a systematic approach to evaluate impacts:
  - Solicit and reconcile scoping comments
  - Conduct technical review

- Issue draft EIS for public/stakeholder comment
- Consider and respond to comments in preparing final EIS

- Stakeholder involvement is a key aspect of the process
- Final EIS published December 20, 2013, as NUREG-2111

## **Record of Decision**

- States the decision
- Identifies alternatives considered
- Discusses preferences among alternatives
- States whether the Commission has taken all practicable measures to avoid or minimize environmental harm

- Findings 10 CFR 51.107(a)
  - Requirements of Section 102(2)(A),(C), and (E) of NEPA and the regulations in 10 CFR Part 51, Subpart A, have been met

2. After considering the final balance among conflicting factors in the record of the proceeding, the appropriate action is issuance of the COLs

3. After weighing the environmental, economic, technical, and other benefits against environmental and other costs, and considering reasonable alternatives, the COLs should be issued

4. The staff's National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review has been adequate

## **Overview of Panel Presentations**

Panel	Issues Discussed
Safety (FSER)	<ul> <li>Site Foundation Response Spectra</li> <li>Emergency Operations Facility</li> </ul>
Environmental (Final EIS)	• Make-Up Pond C

# Acronyms

- ACRS Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards
- AEA Atomic Energy Act
- CFR Code of Federal Regulations
- COL Combined License

# Acronyms

- DCD Design Certification
   Document
- DEC Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC
- EIS Environmental Impact Statement

# Acronyms

- FSER Final Safety Evaluation Report
- NEPA National Environmental Policy Act