



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT APPRAISAL

BY THE DIVISION OF SITE SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

SUPPORTING EXTENSION OF CONSTRUCTION PERMIT NO. CPPR-103

EXPIRATION DATE FOR THE

WATERFORD STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNIT NO. 3

DOCKET NO. 50-382

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT APPRAISAL

Description of Proposed Action

By letter dated June 23, 1977, as supplemented by letter dated September 5, 1978, Louisiana Power and Light Company (LP&L) filed a request with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to extend the earliest and latest dates for completion of construction of the Waterford Steam Electric Station, (SES) Unit No. 3, as specified in Construction Permit No. CPPR-103. The action proposed by the permittee is the issuance of an Order providing for extension of the earliest and latest construction completion dates from June 1, 1978 and December 31, 1979 to August 1, 1980 and August 1, 1982.

The staff's Final Environmental Statement (FES) relating to the Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit No. 3, was published in March 1973 in support of issuance of the construction permit

Environmental Impact of the Proposed Act on

A. Need for Power

The Louisiana Power and Light Company is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Middle South Utilities (MSU) and one of five operating electric utility companies comprising the MSU System.

LP&L has revised the commercial operating date for its Waterford SES Unit 3 from the summer of 1977 to October 1981. This new proposed commercial operating date represents approximately a four-year delay from that considered when the construction permit was initially issued in 1973. This delay is consistent, however, with the lower demand growth experienced since 1973 and the applicant's latest growth projections for the future. Based on data submitted by LP&L in its ER (OL), Waterford 3 would be required in the early 1980's by both LP&L and the MSU System to maintain acceptable peak load reserve margin requirements.

7908150 454

G

691031

The staff has reviewed the LP&L and MSU System capacity plans and demand projections and concludes that Waterford 3 can be delayed to October 1981 without adversely affecting reliability on their systems.

The staff bases this conclusion on its review of an independent forecasting model which provides demand projections pertinent to these service areas. This review examined demand forecasts prepared for the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission by the Energy Division of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.<sup>1/</sup> This study supports the applicant's decision to slip the proposed commercial operation of Waterford 3, as it indicates that demand will grow at even a slower rate than that presently envisioned by the applicant.

#### B. Community and Economic Impacts

The construction of Waterford 3 is reported to be 64% complete and the project is currently employing construction labor at levels which are below those prevailing at peak.<sup>2/</sup> The staff expects that the required work force will commute from the area within approximately 50 miles of the station site. Within this area, the major labor pools are New Orleans (estimated 1977 population of 1,643,646) and Baton Rouge (estimated 1977 parish population of 321,647). As the station's requirements for craftsmen and managerial labor are only a small percentage of the regional work force in the construction industry, the staff expects that the aggregate migration of labor during the construction phase will be negligible. Such in-movement that does occur will be distributed to a number of communities within proximity of the construction site and in no individual community should the impact be significant.

The staff confirmed that labor supply has been generally adequate to meet demand, that spot shortages among highly skilled craftsmen (pipefitters and electricians) had occurred, but that such shortages were eventually being filled without any significant adverse impact on the construction schedule.<sup>3/</sup> The local school system has not been measurably overloaded by children whose families work at the plant. Moreover, residents living closest to the construction site have not voiced complaints to Parish officials.<sup>4/</sup>

Within three miles of the plant, the estimated 1977 population is 2,303 (Table 2.1-1, ER (OL)). Louisiana Highway 18 which provides access to the site from New Orleans and Baton Rouge is expected to carry the bulk of the construction-related traffic. Because of the low resident population concentration in the area, and because highway traffic would move only through small communities within 10 miles of the site, the staff expects that traffic congestion would not produce impacts other than those associated with temporary inconvenience.

The staff has confirmed that traffic congestion has been notable on Highway 18, but that several Parish deputies have been hired part-time by the Applicant to assist in traffic control. In addition, violations for speeding in the vicinity of the construction site have increased. Complaints regarding traffic congestion on roads other than Highway 18 have not been voiced by local residents.<sup>5/</sup> The staff concludes that as construction has passed the phase of peak manpower utilization, the communities surrounding the site have already experienced the maximum level of socioeconomic impacts associated with Waterford 3. Moreover, the staff's judgment is that the impacts at peak are not significant and are acceptable to the community at large. Finally, extension of the permit should not result in impacts which have not been previously identified by the staff and may result in a moderation of impacts compared to those associated with a compressed construction schedule.

#### Conclusion and Basis for Negative Declaration

On the basis of the foregoing analysis and the NRC staff evaluation, it is concluded that there will be no environmental impact attributable to the proposed action other than that already predicted and described in the Commission's FES in March 1973 (as updated by changes and corrections to the FES presented during the construction permit public hearing held in February 1974) and the Board's Initial Decision of April 30, 1974. Having made this conclusion, the Commission has further concluded that no environmental impact statement for the proposed action need be prepared, and that a negative declaration to this effect is appropriate.

Dated: July 19, 1979

## REFERENCES

- 1/ Regional Econometric Model for Forecasting Electricity Demand by Sector and by State. NUREG/CR-0250, ORNL/NUREG-49, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, October 1978.
- 2/ U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Construction Status Report, Nuclear Power Plants: Data as of April 30, 1979 (NUREG-0030), Vol. II, No. 2, May 1979, p. 3-90. Also, telephone conversation between Phillip C. Cota, U.S.N.R.C., and PLP officials on 7/6/79.
- 3/ Telephone conversation with Joseph Bertucci, Executive Secretary of the Building Trades Council in New Orleans, on 7/2/79.
- 4/ Telephone conversation with Kevin Friloux, St. Charles Parish Administrator, on 7/2/79.
- 5/ Telephone conversation with Herbert P. LeRay, Chief Deputy of the St. Charles Parish Sheriff's Office, on 7/2/79. Also, Friloux interview.

631034