AEC DISTRIBUTION FOR PART 50 DOCKET MATERIAL
(TEMPORARY FORM)

CONTROL NO: 2902

FILE: ENVIRO

FROM:	DATE OF DOC	DATE REC'D	LTR	MEMO	RPT	OTHER
Federal Power Commission Washington, D. C. 20426 T. A. Phillips	4-3-74	4-4-74	X			

TO:	ORIG	CC	OTHER	
Mr. Muller	1 signed			SENT AEC PDR X SENT LOCAL PDR X

CLASS	UNCLASS	PROP INFO	INPUT	NO CYS REC'D	DOCKET NO:
	XXXXX			2	50-389

DESCRIPTION:
Ltr re our 2-11-74 ltr.....furnishing comments on the Draft Enviro Statement for the St. Lucie Plant Unit No. 2.....

ENCLOSURES:

ACKNOWLEDGED
Do Not Remove

PLANT NAME: St. Lucie Unit # 2

FOR ACTION/INFORMATION 4-4-74 AB

BUTLER(L)	SCHWENCER(L)	ZIEMANN(L)	REGAN(E)
W/ Copies	W/ Copies	W/ Copies	W/1 Copies
CLARK(L)	STOLZ(L)	DICKER(E)	
W/ Copies	W/ Copies	W/ Copies	W/ Copies
GOLLER(L)	VASSALLO(L)	KNIGHTON(E)	
W/1 Copies(Info)	W/ Copies	W/ Copies	W/ Copies
KNIEL(L)	SCHEMEL(L)	YOUNGBLOOD(E)	
W/ Copies	W/ Copies	W/ Copies	W/ Copies

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

REG FILE	TECH REVIEW	DENTON		A/T IND
AEC-PDR	HENDRIE	GRIMES	LIC ASST	BRAITMAN
OGC, ROOM P-506A	SCHROEDER	GAMMILL	DIGGS (L)	SALTZMAN
MUNTZING/STAFF	MACCARY	KASTNER	GEARIN (L)	B. HURT
CASE	KNIGHT	BALLARD	GOULBOURNE (L)	PLANS
GIAMBUSSO	PAWLICKI	SPANGLER	LEE (L)	MCDONALD
BOYD	SHAO		MAIGRET (L)	DUBE w/Input
MOORE (L)(BWR)	STELLO	ENVIRO	REED (E)	
DEYOUNG(L)(PWR)	HOUSTON	MULLER	SERVICE (L)	INFO
SKOVHOLT (L)	NOVAK	DICKER	SHEPPARD (L)	C. MILES
P. COLLINS	ROSS	KNIGHTON	SLATER (E)	B. KING
DENISE	IPPOLITO	YOUNGBLOOD	SMITH (L)	
REG OPR	TEDESCO	REGAN	TEETS (L)	
FILE & REGION(3)	LONG	PROJECT LDR	WADE (E)	
MORRIS	LAINAS	S.T MARY(2)	WILLIAMS (E)	
STEELE	BENAROYA	HARLESS	WILSON (L)	
	VOLLMER			

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

1 - LOCAL PDR Ft. Pierce, Fla.		
1 - DTIE(ABERNATHY)	(1)~~(2)(10)~~-NATIONAL LAB'S PNWL	1-PDR-SAN/LA/NY
1 - NSIC(BUCHANAN)	1-ASLBP(E/W Bldg,Rm 529)	1-GERALD LELLOUCHE
1 - ASLB(YORE	1-W. PENNINGTON, Rm E-201 GT	BROOKHAVEN NAT. LAB
	1-CONSULTANT'S	1-AGMED(Ruth Gussman)
16 - CYS ACRS HOLDING	NEWMARK/BLUME/AGBABIAN	RM-B-127, GT.
	1-GERALD ULRIKSON...ORNL	1-ED..MULLER..F-309 GT

Regulatory File Cy.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20426

50-389

APR 3 1974

Mr. Daniel R. Muller
Assistant Director for
Environmental Projects
Directorate of Licensing
Office of Regulation
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D. C. 20545

Dear Mr. Muller:

This is in response to your letter dated February 11, 1974, requesting comments on the AEC Draft Environmental Statement related to the proposed issuance of a construction permit to the Florida Power and Light Company (Applicant) for the construction of the St. Lucie Plant Unit No. 2 (Docket No. 50-389). The proposed 850-megawatt unit would be located on Hutchinson Island on the east coast of Florida in St. Lucie County and would share the same site on which Unit No. 1 is currently under construction and which is scheduled for commercial service in December 1975. Unit No. 2 is scheduled for commercial service in December 1979.

These comments by the Federal Power Commission's Bureau of Power staff are made in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the August 1, 1973, Guidelines of the Council on Environmental Quality, and are directed to the need for the capacity represented by the St. Lucie Plant Unit No. 2, and to related bulk power supply matters.

In preparing these comments, the Bureau of Power staff has considered the AEC Draft Environmental Statement; the Applicant's Environmental Report and Amendments thereto; related reports made in accordance with the Commission's Statement of Reliability and Adequacy of Electric Service (Docket No. R-362); and the staff's analysis of these documents together with related information from other FPC reports. The staff generally bases its evaluation of the need for a specific bulk power facility upon long-term considerations as well as upon the load-supply situation for the peak load period immediately following the availability of the new facility. It

should be noted that the useful life of the St. Lucie Unit No. 2 is expected to be 30 years or more. During that period, the unit will make a significant contribution to the reliability and adequacy of electric power supply in the Applicant's service area.

The Applicant is a member of the Florida subregion of the Southeastern Electric Reliability Council (SERC) which coordinates the planning of the members' bulk power facilities. The Applicant is interconnected with other utility systems located in peninsular Florida; however, no formal power pool exists. A group of electric systems, including the Applicant, formed the Florida Electric Power Coordinating Group, effective October 1, 1972, "to assure an adequate and reliable electric power supply in Florida at the lowest possible cost consistent with economic factors and environmental standards established in the public interest." Active coordination of planning, construction, and utilization of generation and transmission facilities in Florida was included as a means of attaining the objectives of this coordinating group.

The difference in capability of the unit, as shown in table 8.2 and table 8.4 of the Draft Environmental Statement (850 versus 853 megawatts), is trivial and has no significant effect upon the conclusions reached.

The historical annual peak (winter) loads on the Applicant's system reflect an average annual rate of load growth of 11.8 percent, which was projected for the 1973-1982 period. The projected loads for the SERC area as a whole have been reported at an annual rate of growth of 9.0 percent. Both the annual growth rate of load on the Applicant's system and that of the SERC area as a whole are greater than the 7.2 percent historic annual load growth for the contiguous United States. This may be due in part to the steady growth of economic activity in this area. Although the winter peaks of the Florida systems are slightly greater than the preceding summer peaks, the summer peak loads are generally of longer duration than winter peak loads, and both present planning and operating problems.

Florida systems use a reliability planning criterion that the loss-of-load probability will not exceed one day in ten years. Many U. S. systems report the use of the same criterion with the general result that the magnitude of reserve margins fall within a range of 15 to 25 percent of annual peak load. The Bureau of Power staff recognizes that the peninsular nature of the service area of the Florida systems favors the consideration of the upper range for planned reserve margins, primarily due to the need for a higher degree of self-reliance where support from surrounding systems is limited.

The Draft Environmental Statement reports a 1980 summer reserve margin of 2,591 megawatts, or 17.2 percent of Applicant's peak load with the subject unit available; and 1,741 megawatts, or 11.5 percent, if it is not available. The 1980 summer reserve margin for the Florida systems is reported to be 5,303 megawatts, or 20.4 percent of the peak load with St. Lucie Unit No. 2 in service; and 4,450 megawatts, or 17.1 percent, if the unit is not available.

The Bureau of Power staff concludes that the additional capacity equivalent to that represented by the St. Lucie Unit No. 2 is desirable to provide for the projected load growth of the affected systems and to provide reserve capacity with which to withstand normally encountered contingencies, thus affording a reasonable level of reliability of service to their customers.

Very truly yours,

T. A. Phillips
Chief, Bureau of Power