

RECORD OF DECISION

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKET NUMBERS: 50-335 AND 50-389

SUBSEQUENT LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION FOR

ST. LUCIE PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC, the Commission) received an application dated August 3, 2021 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Package Accession No. ML21215A314), from Florida Power and Light Company (FPL) filed pursuant to Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Part 51, “Environmental Protection Regulations for Domestic Licensing and Related Regulatory Functions,” and 10 CFR Part 54, “Requirements for Renewal of Operating Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants,” for subsequent renewal of the renewed facility operating licenses for St. Lucie Plant (St. Lucie), Units 1 and 2. The application was supplemented by letters through November 20, 2025.

St. Lucie is a steam electric generating facility situated on the east coast of Florida, approximately 7 miles (11 kilometers) southeast of the city of Fort Pierce, Florida. FPL is authorized to operate St. Lucie, Units 1 and 2 at reactor core power levels not in excess of 3,020 megawatts thermal for each unit.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (AEA), specifies that licenses for commercial nuclear power reactors can be granted for up to 40 years. The initial 40-year licensing period was based on economic and antitrust considerations rather than on technical limitations of the nuclear facility. The NRC regulations allow for an option to renew such licenses beyond the initial 40-year term for an additional period of time, limited to 20-year increments per renewal, based on the results of an assessment to determine whether the nuclear facility can continue to operate safely during the proposed period of extended operation. There are no limitations in the AEA or NRC regulations restricting the number of times a license may be renewed.

Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA), directs that an environmental impact statement (EIS) be prepared for any major Federal action that has the potential to significantly affect the quality of the human environment. In accordance with 10 CFR 51.20(b)(2), the NRC prepares an EIS or a supplement to an EIS for the renewal of facility operating licenses. The NRC’s Federal action is to determine whether to issue subsequent renewed facility operating licenses for St. Lucie, Units 1 and 2 for an additional 20 years. The current renewed facility operating license for Unit 1 expires at midnight on March 1, 2036, and the current renewed facility operating license for Unit 2 expires at midnight on April 6, 2043. If the NRC subsequently renews the renewed facility operating licenses, FPL would be authorized to operate Unit 1 until midnight on March 1, 2056, and Unit 2 until midnight on April 6, 2063.

On September 29, 2021, after reviewing the subsequent license renewal application, including the environmental report (ER), for sufficiency, the NRC staff published a notice of acceptance for docketing and opportunity to request a hearing in the *Federal Register* (86 FR 53986). On October 22, 2021, the NRC staff published a notice of intent to conduct an environmental

scoping process, which began a 30-day scoping comment period, and to prepare an EIS as a supplement to NUREG-1437, *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants, Final Report* (86 FR 58701). At the conclusion of the scoping process, the NRC staff issued a scoping summary report (ML22124A011).

On February 24, 2022, the Commission issued three memoranda and orders that addressed the NRC staff's subsequent license renewal environmental review process. In CLI-22-03 (ML22055A533), the Commission directed the NRC staff to update NUREG-1437, Revision 1, *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants, Final Report* (the 2013 LR GEIS) (ML13107A023), so that it covers the environmental impacts of renewing the operating license of a nuclear power plant for the subsequent license renewal term. The Commission stated that it believed the most efficient way to proceed would be for the NRC staff to update the 2013 LR GEIS and then take appropriate action with respect to pending subsequent license renewal applications, such as the St. Lucie subsequent license renewal application, to ensure that the environmental impacts for the subsequent license renewal term were considered. Alternatively, the Commission allowed subsequent license renewal applicants to submit a revised ER providing additional information about environmental impacts during the subsequent license renewal term, in which they would evaluate, on a site-specific basis, the environmental impacts that were dispositioned in Table B-1 in Appendix B to Subpart A of 10 CFR Part 51 and the 2013 LR GEIS as Category 1 issues (generic to all or a distinct subset of nuclear power plants).

FPL did not revise the St. Lucie subsequent license renewal application prior to the publication of NUREG-1437, Revision 2, *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants, Final Report*, in August 2024 (the 2024 LR GEIS) (ML24087A133). Instead, after the publication of the 2024 LR GEIS, by letter dated February 3, 2025, FPL submitted a supplement to the ER (ML25034A029) to (1) update the status of permits, licenses, and authorizations; (2) provide the results of a review of potentially new and significant information since the submittal of the ER; and (3) provide an assessment of applicable new Category 2 issues from the 2024 LR GEIS.

In December 2025, the NRC staff issued *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants, Supplement 11, Second Renewal, Regarding Subsequent License Renewal for St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 and 2, Draft Report for Comment*, which supplemented the 2024 LR GEIS and provided the preliminary results of the NRC staff's environmental review of the St. Lucie subsequent license renewal application (ML25349A162). Two notices of availability (NOAs) regarding this draft supplemental EIS were published in the *Federal Register* on January 9, 2026: one by the NRC (91 FR 1005) and one by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (91 FR 997). Members of the public and agencies were provided an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results of the environmental review for 45 days from the publication of the EPA NOA (i.e., until February 23, 2026).

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

In accordance with 10 CFR 51.95(c), the NRC staff documents its environmental review of each license renewal application and publishes it as a plant-specific supplement to NUREG-1437, Revision 2, *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants, Final Report*, dated August 2024 (the LR GEIS) (ML24087A133). The LR GEIS documents the results of the NRC staff's systematic approach to evaluating the environmental consequences of renewing the licenses of individual nuclear power plants and operating them for an additional 20 years. The LR GEIS provides the technical bases for the NRC staff's environmental impact

findings on generic (Category 1) issues for license renewal contained in Table B-1, “Summary of Findings on Environmental Issues for Initial and One Term of Subsequent License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants,” in Appendix B, “Environmental Effect of Renewing the Operating License of a Nuclear Power Plant,” to Subpart A, “National Environmental Policy Act—Regulations Implementing Section 102(2),” of 10 CFR Part 51. Category 2 issues are to be evaluated by license renewal applicants and by the NRC staff on a plant-specific basis.

In March 2026, the NRC staff issued *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants, Supplement 11, Second Renewal, Regarding Subsequent License Renewal for St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 and 2, Final Report*, which supplemented the LR GEIS and provided the final results of the NRC staff’s environmental review of the St. Lucie subsequent license renewal application (ML26070A148). The NRC NOA was published in the *Federal Register* (91 FR 13640) on March 20, 2026. Also on March 20, 2026, the EPA NOA was published in the *Federal Register* (91 FR 13603). Consistent with the NRC’s regulations, the NRC staff’s final supplemental EIS for the St. Lucie subsequent license renewal application evaluated the environmental impacts for Category 2 (plant-specific) issues and relied upon the determinations in the LR GEIS for Category 1 (generic to all or a distinct subset of nuclear power plants) issues. Appendix A to the final supplemental EIS discusses the comments received during the draft supplemental EIS comment period. In the final supplemental EIS, the NRC staff’s recommendation is that the adverse environmental impacts of subsequent license renewal for St. Lucie are not so great that preserving the option of subsequent license renewal for energy-planning decision-makers would be unreasonable. This recommendation was based on (1) the analysis and findings in the LR GEIS, (2) the ER submitted by the applicant, as supplemented, (3) the NRC staff’s consultation with Federal, State, and local governmental agencies and Indian Tribes, (4) the NRC staff’s independent environmental review, and (5) the NRC staff’s consideration of public comments received during the scoping process and on the draft supplemental EIS.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.102(b) and 51.103(a)(1) - (5), the NRC staff has prepared this record of decision (ROD) to accompany its Federal action on the St. Lucie subsequent license renewal application. This ROD incorporates by reference materials contained in the final supplemental EIS, in accordance with 10 CFR 51.103(c).

The final supplemental EIS evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Federal action of subsequent license renewal for St. Lucie. The NRC designates these environmental impacts as SMALL, MODERATE, or LARGE.

SMALL: Environmental effects are not detectable or are so minor that they will neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource.

MODERATE: Environmental effects are sufficient to alter noticeably, but not to destabilize, important attributes of the resource.

LARGE: Environmental effects are clearly noticeable and are sufficient to destabilize important attributes of the resource.

The NRC staff’s recommendation is that the adverse environmental impacts of subsequent license renewal for St. Lucie (i.e., the continued operation of St. Lucie for a period of 20 years beyond the expiration dates of the renewed facility operating licenses) are not so great that

preserving the option of subsequent license renewal for energy-planning decision-makers would be unreasonable.

## DECISION

Pursuant to 10 CFR 54.29, “Standards for issuance of a renewed license,” a renewed license may be issued if the Commission finds, in part, that any applicable requirements of Subpart A of 10 CFR Part 51 have been satisfied; pursuant to 10 CFR 51.102, this includes the completion of a ROD.

The final supplemental EIS, which is incorporated by reference herein, documents the NRC staff’s recommendation that the adverse environmental impacts of subsequent license renewal for St. Lucie are not so great that preserving the option of subsequent license renewal for energy-planning decision-makers would be unreasonable, in accordance with 10 CFR 51.103(a)(5). In the 1996 final rule amending 10 CFR Part 51 (61 FR 28467), the Commission explained this as follows:

Given the uncertainties involved and the lack of control that the NRC has in the choice of energy alternatives in the future, the Commission believes that it is reasonable to exercise its NEPA authority to reject license renewal applications only when it has determined that the impacts of license renewal sufficiently exceed the impacts of all or almost all of the alternatives that preserving the option of license renewal for future decision makers would be unreasonable.

In making its licensing decision on the proposed Federal action to authorize the continued operation of St. Lucie, Units 1 and 2, until midnight on March 1, 2056, and until midnight on April 6, 2063, respectively, the NRC must also make a favorable safety finding. The purpose of the NRC’s safety review is to determine whether the applicant has adequately demonstrated that the effects of aging will not adversely affect the intended functions of any systems, structures, and components specified in 10 CFR 54.4, “Scope,” and 10 CFR 54.21, “Contents of application—technical information.” The applicant must demonstrate that the effects of aging will be adequately managed so that the intended functions will be maintained during the license renewal period. The NRC staff documented the results of its safety review of the St. Lucie subsequent license renewal application in “Safety Evaluation Related to the Subsequent License Renewal of St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 and 2,” dated July 2023 (ML23200A146), as revised in September 2023 (ML23219A003). The Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards provided its independent review and report (ML23257A271) to the Commission in accordance with 10 CFR 54.25, “Report of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards,” regarding the St. Lucie subsequent license renewal application.

## PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose and need for the proposed Federal action (i.e., issuance of subsequent renewed licenses for St. Lucie) is to provide an option that allows for power generation capability beyond the term of the current renewed facility operating licenses to meet future system generating needs, as such needs may be determined by authorized Federal (other than the NRC) and State decision-makers, as well as utility stakeholders. This definition of purpose and need reflects the Commission’s recognition that, absent findings in the NRC’s safety review required by the AEA or in the NRC’s environmental review required by NEPA that would lead the NRC to reject a subsequent license renewal application, the NRC has no role in the energy-planning decisions of State regulators and utility officials. If the subsequent renewed licenses are issued,

the power plant owners, State regulators, and, in some cases, other Federal agencies will ultimately decide whether the nuclear power plant will continue to operate based on economics, energy reliability goals, and other factors within their jurisdiction or the owners' purview. The issuance of subsequent renewed licenses is one of the requirements that FPL must address to operate St. Lucie during the subsequent license renewal term.

## NRC EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

In subsequent license renewal environmental reviews, the NRC considers the environmental consequences of the proposed action (i.e., issuance of subsequent renewed facility operating licenses) and the environmental consequences of the no-action alternative (i.e., not issuing subsequent renewed facility operating licenses). Chapter 2 of the final supplemental EIS, "The Proposed Federal Action and the No-Action Alternative," presents the NRC staff's evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposed action, as well as the no-action alternative and its negative environmental impacts from the shutdown of St. Lucie and from the construction and operation of reasonable replacement energy alternatives/new energy generation. The evaluation considered the environmental impacts of the proposed action and the no-action alternative across the following impact areas: land use, visual resources, air quality, noise, geologic environment, water resources, terrestrial resources, aquatic resources, Federally protected ecological resources, historic and cultural resources, socioeconomics, human health, waste management, and greenhouse gas emissions.

As explained in the discussion of purpose and need for the proposed Federal action, outside of its safety and environmental reviews, the NRC does not have a role in the energy-planning decisions as to whether a particular nuclear power plant should continue to operate. Should the St. Lucie renewed facility operating licenses not be subsequently renewed, and the plant shuts down at the end of its current renewed licenses, the appropriate energy-planning decision-makers will decide how best to replace the nuclear power plant's generating capacity. In evaluating the no-action alternative in the final supplemental EIS, the NRC staff considered energy technologies or options in commercial operation, as well as technologies not currently in commercial operation but likely to be commercially available by the time the current St. Lucie renewed facility operating licenses expire.

Table 1 provides a summary (comparison) of environmental impacts of the proposed action and the no-action alternative. As summarized in Table 1, if the NRC does not subsequently renew St. Lucie's renewed facility operating licenses (i.e., the no-action alternative), energy-planning decision-makers would have to choose replacement energy alternatives/new energy generation similar to the ones evaluated in the final supplemental EIS. Replacement energy alternatives/new energy generation have the potential to have greater environmental impacts in any number of the applicable resource areas. Based on its review of the proposed action and the no-action alternative, the NRC staff concludes that the environmentally preferred alternative is the proposed action of St. Lucie subsequent license renewal.

**Table 1: Comparison of Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Federal Action and the No-Action Alternative at the St. Lucie Plant**

<b>Resource Area</b>	<b>Proposed Federal Action</b>	<b>No-Action Alternative (Impacts of St. Lucie Shutdown)</b>	<b>No-Action Alternative (Impacts of New Energy Generation)</b>
Land Use	SMALL	SMALL. Onsite land use would remain similar to that during operations. Plant structures and other facilities would remain in place until decommissioning. Transmission lines and ROWs would remain in place after the cessation of reactor operations.	SMALL to LARGE, depending on the location and type of new energy generation. New transmission line and pipeline construction also could have potential land use impacts; use of existing infrastructure would minimize these impacts during construction.
Visual Resources	SMALL	SMALL. Termination of reactor operations if the licenses are not renewed would not immediately change the visual appearance of the St. Lucie site. The most visible structures would likely remain in place for some time during decommissioning until they are eventually dismantled.	SMALL to LARGE, depending on the location and type of new energy generation.
Air Quality	SMALL	SMALL. Permanent cessation of St. Lucie operations would reduce overall air emissions (e.g., the SMALL air emissions from boiler, diesel generators, and vehicle traffic would be reduced).	SMALL to LARGE. Construction of new energy generating facilities would result in temporary air quality impacts. Additionally, depending on the type of new energy generation (i.e., fossil fuel, nuclear, renewable), air emissions from operations can be significant. New natural gas-fired combined cycle units would result in substantial new pollutant emissions. Operations of new nuclear or solar with storage would have minimal emissions.
Noise	SMALL	SMALL. Permanent cessation of St. Lucie operations would result in a reduction in the otherwise SMALL noise impacts associated with emergency diesel generators and from vehicle traffic (e.g., workers, deliveries). As site activities are reduced, the impact on ambient noise levels from the plant are expected to be lower than those from current plant operations.	SMALL to MODERATE. Noise associated with new energy generation would occur during construction. Depending on the distance between the facility site and transmission line corridor to noise-sensitive receptors, noise may occur at noticeable levels during construction. During operations of new natural gas-fired combined cycle units, noise from pipeline blowdowns could constitute a new noise source. Depending on the distance of noise-sensitive receptors to the pipeline corridor, noise from pipeline blowdowns may be noticeable. Noise from operations of new nuclear or solar with storage would likely be SMALL but would

Resource Area	Proposed Federal Action		No-Action Alternative	
	Federal Action	(Impacts of St. Lucie Shutdown)	(Impacts of St. Lucie Shutdown)	(Impacts of New Energy Generation)
Geologic Environment	SMALL	SMALL. There would be few or no incremental impacts on site geology and soils associated with the shutdown of St. Lucie. In this case, before beginning decommissioning activities, little or no new ground disturbance would occur at the plant site while operational activities are being reduced and eventually terminated.	SMALL to MODERATE. Ground disturbance would occur during construction of new energy generating facilities, regardless of whether the new facility is sited on a brownfield or greenfield site and regardless of the type of facility. Depending on the location of the facilities, impacts to prime or important farmlands could occur.	depend on the distance between the facility site and transmission line corridor to noise-sensitive receptors.
Water Resources	SMALL	SMALL. Water withdrawals would greatly decrease and eventually cease. Stormwater would continue to be discharged from the site, but wastewater discharges would be reduced considerably.	SMALL to LARGE. Impacts would occur associated with the construction of all types of new energy generating facilities. Operations of new nuclear or natural gas-fired combined cycle facilities could have cooling water requirements similar to those of the existing St. Lucie plant and impacts would vary depending on the location of the facilities, whereas operations of solar with storage facilities would have SMALL impacts. Use of existing infrastructure would minimize construction impacts.	SMALL to MODERATE. Impacts would depend on the location and footprint of the new energy generating facility and would be minimized through the use of best management practices and adherence to applicable regulations. Construction impacts would be further minimized through the use of existing infrastructure.
Terrestrial Resources	SMALL	SMALL. Much of the operational noise and human activity at St. Lucie would cease, thereby reducing the already SMALL disturbances to wildlife in forest cover and other natural vegetation on and near the site. Reducing human activity and frequency of operational noise may constitute minor beneficial effects on wildlife inhabiting nearby natural habitats.	SMALL to MODERATE. Impacts would depend on the location and footprint of the new energy generating facility and would be minimized through the use of best management practices and adherence to applicable regulations. Construction impacts would be further minimized through the use of existing infrastructure.	SMALL to MODERATE. Impacts would depend on the location and footprint of the new energy generating facility and would be minimized through the use of best management practices and adherence to applicable regulations. Construction impacts would be further minimized through the use of existing infrastructure.
Aquatic Resources	SMALL	SMALL. Some withdrawal of water would continue during the shutdown period to provide cooling to spent fuel in the spent fuel pool until that fuel could be transferred to dry storage. The amount of water withdrawn for these purposes would be a small fraction of water withdrawals during operations (which are already SMALL), would decrease over time, and would likely end within the first few years following shutdown. The reduced demand for cooling water would substantially decrease the effects of impingement, entrainment, and thermal effluent on aquatic	SMALL to MODERATE. Impacts would depend on the location and footprint of the new energy generating facility and would be minimized through the use of best management practices and adherence to applicable regulations. Construction impacts would be further minimized through the use of existing infrastructure.	SMALL to MODERATE. Impacts would depend on the location and footprint of the new energy generating facility and would be minimized through the use of best management practices and adherence to applicable regulations. Construction impacts would be further minimized through the use of existing infrastructure.

Resource Area	No-Action Alternative	
	Proposed Federal Action	(Impacts of St. Lucie Shutdown)
	No-Action Alternative (Impacts of New Energy Generation)	
Federally Protected Ecological Resources	Varies by specific protected species and habitat; see Note <sup>(a)</sup>	<p>Impacts on federally protected ecological resources would depend on the specific shutdown activities, the action area of those activities, and whether any listed species or critical habitats are present in that area when the no-action alternative is implemented.</p> <p>Impacts on federally protected ecological resources would depend on various factors including site selection, current land uses, planned construction activities, temporary and permanent structure locations and parameters, the timeline of the new energy generating facility, and the federally protected ecological resources present in the action area. Consultation with appropriate agencies would be conducted and would minimize impacts. Additionally, the requirements for consultation under the ESA, MSA, and NMSA would depend on whether Federal permits or authorizations are required to implement each new energy generating facility.</p>
Historic and Cultural Resources	NO ADVERSE EFFECT on historic properties	NO EFFECT on historic properties or historic cultural resources. Shutdown activities would not impact such properties or resources.
Socioeconomics	SMALL	<p>SMALL to LARGE. The loss of jobs, income, and tax revenue would have an immediate, noticeable socioeconomic impact. As jobs are eliminated, some, but not all, workers could leave. Income from the buying and selling of goods and services needed to maintain the nuclear power plant also would be reduced. In addition, loss of tax revenue could affect the availability of public services. If workers and their families move away, increased vacancies and reduced demand for housing would likely cause property values to fall.</p> <p>SMALL to MODERATE. Construction and operations of new energy generating facilities would depend on the location, type, and size of the facilities and could result in added services jobs, as well as indirect impacts on taxes, housing, land use, and public services in the area surrounding the facility.</p>

<b>Resource Area</b>	<b>Proposed Federal Action</b>	<b>No-Action Alternative (Impacts of St. Lucie Shutdown)</b>	<b>No-Action Alternative (Impacts of New Energy Generation)</b>
Human Health	SMALL and UNCERTAIN <sup>(b)</sup>	SMALL. Human health risks following nuclear power plant shutdown would be smaller than the SMALL risks during operations. The reactor units, which currently operate within regulatory limits, would emit less radioactive gaseous, liquid, and solid material to the environment. In addition, following shutdown, the variety of potential accidents at the nuclear power plant (radiological or industrial) would be reduced to a limited set associated with shutdown events and fuel handling and storage.	SMALL and UNCERTAIN. Construction and operations of new energy generating facilities could result in human health impacts. However, those impacts would be mitigated by adherence to best management practices, safety standards, and applicable regulations. Given the regulatory oversight exercised by Federal and State agencies, the NRC staff concludes that the human health impacts from construction and operations of the new energy generating facilities would be SMALL, except for "chronic effects of electromagnetic fields (EMFs)," for which the impacts are UNCERTAIN. Human health impacts are discussed in Section D.4.8 of the LR GEIS.
Waste Management	SMALL <sup>(c)</sup>	SMALL to MODERATE. Continued at-reactor storage of spent fuel would generate much less low-level, mixed, and nonradioactive waste than an operating facility. Any replacement of the ISFSI, repackaging of spent fuel canisters, and construction, operation, and replacement of dry transfer system would generate a small fraction of the low-level waste generated during reactor decommissioning. The quantity of mixed waste generated from storage would be a small fraction of that generated during the licensed life of the reactor. Although large amounts of nonradioactive waste would be generated by any replacement of dry cask storage facilities, it would still be less than the waste generated during reactor decommissioning and would not likely have a noticeable impact on local or regional landfill capacity and operations. It is expected that sufficient low-level waste disposal capacity would be made available when needed. A relatively small quantity of mixed waste would be generated from storage, and proper management and disposal regulations would be followed. The amount of nonradioactive waste that would be generated and impacts to nonradioactive waste landfill capacity are difficult to accurately estimate for the storage timeframe.	SMALL. The amount and types of waste generated would depend on the size and type of the new energy generating facility. Impacts would be minimized by adherence to best management practices and proper onsite management and offsite disposal management.

<b>Resource Area</b>	<b>Proposed Federal Action</b>	<b>No-Action Alternative (Impacts of St. Lucie Shutdown)</b>	<b>No-Action Alternative (Impacts of New Energy Generation)</b>
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	SMALL	SMALL. Shutdown of St. Lucie would result in a reduction to the otherwise SMALL GHG emissions from operations of the facility.	SMALL to MODERATE <sup>(d)</sup> . GHG emissions would occur associated with the construction of all types of new energy generating facilities. Operations of new nuclear or solar with storage facilities could have GHG emissions similar to those of the existing St. Lucie plant, whereas operations of natural gas-fired combined cycle facilities would have significantly more GHG emissions.

EMF = electromagnetic field; ESA = Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended; GHG = greenhouse gas; ISFSI = independent spent fuel storage installation  
 LR GEIS = Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants, Final Report; MSA = Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976, as amended; NMSA = National Marine Sanctuaries Act; NRC = U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission; ROW = right-of-way; SLR = subsequent license renewal; SMR = small modular reactor.

a) For a full listing of effect determinations for ecological resources protected under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976, as amended, essential fish habitat effect determinations, and National Marine Sanctuaries Act, see the final supplemental EIS at Table 3-3, Table 3-5, Table 3-6, and Section 3.5.4.

b) The chronic effects of electromagnetic fields on human health associated with operating nuclear power and other electricity generating plants are uncertain as discussed in Section 3.7.3 of the final supplemental EIS.

c) NUREG-2157, *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for Continued Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel* (NRC 2014-TN4117), discusses the environmental impacts of spent fuel storage beyond reactor operations.

d) Consideration of GHG emissions is presented in Table 8.0-3 of FPL's ER.

## ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT CONSULTATION AND MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION ACT

As part of the subsequent license renewal application environmental review, the NRC consulted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) pursuant to Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (ESA). On December 19, 2025, the NRC requested the FWS's written concurrence with the NRC's determinations that the proposed action of St. Lucie subsequent license renewal is not likely to adversely affect ten federally listed species, two designated critical habitats, one proposed species, and one proposed critical habitat that occur or may occur in the action area (ML25237A042). In its concurrence request, the NRC also acknowledged its determination that the likelihood of adverse effects of entrapment in St. Lucie water control structures on the West Indian manatee (*Trichechus manatus*) during the proposed subsequent license renewal term is not discountable or insignificant and that, therefore, the proposed action may affect and is likely to adversely affect the West Indian manatee. The NRC stated that it understood that the FWS could not complete ESA consultation for the proposed action until all applicable requirements under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, as amended (MMPA), for the West Indian manatee have been fulfilled by FPL.

By letter dated February 10, 2026, the FWS concurred with the NRC's "not likely to adversely affect" determinations (ML26041A264). The FWS also stated that the potential for West Indian manatee take during the proposed subsequent license renewal term would still need to be addressed to complete consultation. Therefore, ESA Section 7(a)(2) consultation with the FWS is not yet complete.

The NRC also consulted with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) pursuant to ESA Section 7(a)(2). Specifically, the NRC initiated formal consultation with the NMFS on July 16, 2025, to address both the proposed action of St. Lucie subsequent license renewal, as well as incidents in 2024 that met or exceeded the authorized level of incidental take specified in the NMFS's 2022 biological opinion for the 2022–2024 period for several species and categories of take. These species and categories of take were: live green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) captures, live leatherback (*Dermochelys coriacea*) captures, causal Kemp's ridley (*Lepidochelys kempii*) mortalities, and live loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*) captures. This consultation is not yet complete. At the conclusion of the consultation, the NMFS will issue a new biological opinion that will replace the 2022 biological opinion. The new biological opinion will contain revised levels of authorized incidental take for sea turtles and other marine species in the action area that may be affected by continued operations of St. Lucie, as well as updated reasonable and prudent measures and terms and conditions, as appropriate. Sections 7(b)(4) and 7(o)(2) of the ESA specify that take that is incidental to an otherwise lawful agency action is not considered to be prohibited under the ESA if that action is performed in compliance with the terms and conditions of an incidental take statement, which are nondiscretionary.

ESA Section 7(d) states that after the initiation of ESA Section 7(a)(2) consultation, the Federal agency and the license applicant shall not make any irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources with respect to the agency action which has the effect of foreclosing the formulation or implementation of any reasonable and prudent alternative measures which would not violate ESA Section 7(a)(2). As described above, the NRC has initiated ESA Section 7(a)(2) consultations with the FWS and the NMFS and those consultations are not yet complete. The NRC staff has determined that the issuance of St. Lucie subsequent renewed licenses before the completion of the consultations would be consistent with ESA Section 7(d). This is because the current renewed licenses already authorize St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 to operate until March 1, 2036, and April 6, 2043, respectively, because the subsequent renewed licenses do not authorize any significant environmental impacts not already authorized by the current renewed

licenses, and because the NRC retains discretionary involvement or control over the subsequent license renewal action. Moreover, because the completion of the FWS consultation is dependent on FPL first satisfying the applicable requirements of the MMPA regarding potential West Indian manatee entrapment in the St. Lucie intake canal system, the NRC is including in the subsequent renewed licenses the following language:

The licensee must obtain authorization in accordance with Section 101(a)(5) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, as amended (MMPA), for the incidental taking of the West Indian manatee (*Trichechus manatus*) related to the continued operation of St Lucie Plant Unit Nos. 1 and 2. This authorization must be obtained prior to Unit No. 1 operation during the subsequent license renewal term, which begins on March 2, 2036. After authorization is initially obtained, authorization must be maintained as may be needed to comply with the MMPA, and the requirements of any authorization must be adhered to while that authorization is in effect. The licensee must, within 10 business days, provide the NRC a copy of documentation related to obtaining and maintaining authorization, including, as applicable, any petition for the FWS to develop an incidental take regulation, any request for a letter of authorization, and any request for an incidental harassment authorization, as well as related correspondence and *Federal Register* notices.

Based on the above, the issuance of St. Lucie subsequent renewed licenses before the completion of the FWS and the NMFS consultations will not result in irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources that have the effect of foreclosing the formulation or implementation of any permissible reasonable and prudent alternative measures and, thus, this issuance is consistent with the ESA.

### MITIGATION MEASURES

The NRC has taken all practicable measures within its jurisdiction to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the alternative selected, which is the proposed action of St. Lucie subsequent license renewal. The final supplemental EIS concludes that the continued operation of St. Lucie for an additional 20 years would have SMALL environmental impacts in all resource areas, with one exception: Federally Protected Ecological Resources. For a full listing of effect determinations for ecological resources protected under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976, as amended, essential fish habitat effect determinations, and National Marine Sanctuaries Act, see Table 3-3, Table 3-5, Table 3-6, and Section 3.5.4 of the final supplemental EIS. The NRC staff concluded that there are no additional mitigation measures warranted. However, ESA Section 7(a)(2) consultations with the FWS and the NMFS are not yet complete. It is anticipated that at the conclusion of these consultations, the FWS and the NMFS will issue new biological opinions that contain incidental take statements, reasonable and prudent measures, and terms and conditions that the FWS and the NMFS determine to be necessary and appropriate to minimize the amount and the extent of the incidental take of federally listed species resulting from the continued operations of St. Lucie. Accordingly, the St. Lucie subsequent renewed licenses include that FPL must adhere to any requirements within currently applicable biological opinions. Additionally, St. Lucie is subject to requirements, including permits, authorizations, and regulatory orders, imposed by other Federal, State, and local agencies governing facility operation. The NRC is not requiring any new environmental monitoring programs outside what is required by St. Lucie's current National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits and

water quality certification or is otherwise required of FPL under the NRC's regulations or by other Federal, State, or local agencies, as described in the final supplemental EIS.

#### DETERMINATION

The NRC has determined that the standard for issuance of subsequent renewed facility operating licenses in 10 CFR 54.29(b) that any applicable requirements of Subpart A of 10 CFR Part 51 have been satisfied is met as are the requirements of Section 102 of NEPA. This determination is based on: (1) the analysis and findings in the LR GEIS, (2) the ER submitted by the applicant, as supplemented, (3) the NRC staff's consultation with Federal, State, and local governmental agencies and Indian Tribes, (4) the NRC staff's independent environmental review, and (5) the NRC staff's consideration of public comments received during the scoping process and on the draft supplemental EIS. The NRC has determined that the adverse environmental impacts of issuing subsequent renewed facility operating licenses for St. Lucie are not so great that preserving the option of subsequent license renewal for energy-planning decision-makers would be unreasonable.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 28th day of April 2026.

APPROVED BY:

**/RA/**

Michele Sampson, Director  
Division of New and Renewed Licenses  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation