

# Abstract

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) considered the environmental impacts of renewing nuclear power plant operating licenses (OLs) for a 20-year period in its *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants* (GEIS), NUREG-1437, Volumes 1 and 2, and codified the results in 10 CFR Part 51. In the GEIS (and its Addendum 1), the staff identifies 92 environmental issues and reaches generic conclusions related to environmental impacts for 69 of these issues that apply to all plants or to plants with specific design or site characteristics. Additional plant-specific review is required for the remaining 23 issues. These plant-specific reviews are to be included in a supplement to the GEIS.

This Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) has been prepared in response to an application submitted to the NRC by the Florida Power and Light Company (FPL) to renew the OLs for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 for an additional 20 years under 10 CFR Part 54. This SEIS includes the NRC staff's analysis that considers and weighs the environmental impacts of the proposed action, the environmental impacts of alternatives to the proposed action, and mitigation measures available for reducing or avoiding adverse impacts. It also includes the staff's preliminary recommendation regarding the proposed action.

Neither FPL nor the staff has identified information that is both new and significant for any of the issues for which the GEIS reached generic conclusions. The staff determined that information provided during the scoping process did not call into question the generic conclusions in the GEIS. Therefore, the staff concludes that the impacts of renewing the St. Lucie OLs will not be greater than impacts identified for these issues in the GEIS. For each of these issues, the staff's conclusion in the GEIS is that the impact is of SMALL<sup>(a)</sup> significance (except for collective offsite radiological impacts from the fuel cycle and from high-level waste and spent fuel, which were not assigned a single significance level).

Each of the remaining issues that applies to St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 is addressed in detail in this SEIS. For each applicable issue, the staff concludes that the significance of the potential environmental impacts of renewal of the OLs is SMALL. The staff also concludes that additional mitigation measures are not likely to be sufficiently beneficial as to be warranted. The staff determined that information provided during the scoping process did not identify any new issue that has a significant environmental impact.

The NRC staff's recommendation is that the Commission determine that the adverse environmental impacts of license renewal for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 are not so great that

---

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

## Abstract

preserving the option of license renewal for energy-planning decisionmakers would be unreasonable. This recommendation is based on (1) the analysis and findings in the GEIS; (2) the Environmental Report submitted by FPL; (3) consultation with Federal, State, and local agencies; (4) the staff's own independent review; and (5) the staff's consideration of public comments received during the scoping process.

# Contents

Abstract .....	iii
Executive Summary .....	xv
Abbreviations/Acronyms .....	xxi
1.0 Introduction .....	1-1
1.1 Report Contents .....	1-2
1.2 Background .....	1-3
1.2.1 Generic Environmental Impact Statement .....	1-3
1.2.2 License Renewal Evaluation Process .....	1-4
1.3 The Proposed Federal Action .....	1-7
1.4 The Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action .....	1-8
1.5 Compliance and Consultations .....	1-8
1.6 References .....	1-9
2.0 Description of Nuclear Power Plant and Site and Plant Interaction with the Environment .....	2-1
2.1 Plant and Site Description and Proposed Plant Operation During the Renewal Term .....	2-1
2.1.1 External Appearance and Setting .....	2-5
2.1.2 Reactor Systems .....	2-5
2.1.3 Cooling and Auxiliary Water Systems .....	2-7
2.1.4 Radioactive Waste Management Systems and Effluent Control Systems .....	2-10
2.1.4.1 Liquid Waste Processing Systems and Effluent Controls .....	2-11
2.1.4.2 Gaseous Waste Processing Systems and Effluent Controls .....	2-12
2.1.4.3 Solid Waste Processing .....	2-13
2.1.5 Nonradioactive Waste Systems .....	2-13
2.1.6 Plant Operation and Maintenance .....	2-14
2.1.7 Power Transmission System .....	2-14

## Contents

2.2	Plant Interaction with the Environment	2-15
2.2.1	Land Use	2-15
2.2.2	Water Use	2-16
2.2.3	Water Quality	2-16
2.2.4	Air Quality	2-17
2.2.5	Aquatic Resources	2-18
2.2.5.1	Atlantic Ocean	2-18
2.2.5.2	Indian River Lagoon	2-21
2.2.5.3	Threatened or Endangered Aquatic Species	2-22
2.2.6	Terrestrial Resources	2-24
2.2.7	Radiological Impacts	2-32
2.2.8	Socioeconomic Factors	2-34
2.2.8.1	Housing	2-34
2.2.8.2	Public Services	2-36
2.2.8.3	Offsite Land Use	2-37
2.2.8.4	Visual Aesthetics and Noise	2-39
2.2.8.5	Demography	2-40
2.2.8.6	Taxes	2-42
2.2.9	Historic and Archaeological Resources	2-42
2.2.9.1	Cultural Background	2-42
2.2.9.2	Historic and Archaeological Resources at St. Lucie Site	2-46
2.2.10	Related Federal Project Activities and Consultations	2-47
2.3	References	2-48
3.0	Environmental Impacts of Refurbishment	3-1
3.1	References	3-3
4.0	Environmental Impacts of Operation	4-1
4.1	Cooling Systems	4-2
4.1.1	Entrainment of Fish and Shellfish in Early Life Stages	4-9
4.1.2	Impingement of Fish and Shellfish	4-10

4.1.3	Heat Shock .....	4-12
4.2	Transmission Lines .....	4-13
4.2.1	Electromagnetic Fields – Acute Effects .....	4-16
4.2.2	Electromagnetic Fields – Chronic Effects .....	4-17
4.3	Radiological Impacts of Normal Operations .....	4-18
4.4	Socioeconomic Impacts of Plant Operations During the License Renewal Period .....	4-19
4.4.1	Housing Impacts During Operations .....	4-21
4.4.2	Public Services: Public Utility Impacts During Operations .....	4-23
4.4.3	Offsite Land Use During Operations .....	4-24
4.4.4	Public Services: Transportation Impacts During Operations .....	4-26
4.4.5	Historic and Archaeological Resources .....	4-27
4.4.6	Environmental Justice .....	4-28
4.5	Groundwater Use and Quality .....	4-33
4.6	Threatened or Endangered Species .....	4-34
4.6.1	Aquatic Species .....	4-34
4.6.1.1	Turtles .....	4-35
4.6.1.2	Mammals .....	4-38
4.6.1.3	Johnson's Seagrass .....	4-40
4.6.1.4	Fish .....	4-40
4.6.2	Terrestrial Species .....	4-40
4.6.3	Conclusion .....	4-42
4.7	Evaluation of Potential New and Significant Information on Impacts of Operations During the Renewal Term .....	4-42
4.8	Summary of Impacts of Operations During the Renewal Term .....	4-43
4.9	References .....	4-43
5.0	Environmental Impacts of Postulated Accidents .....	5-1
5.1	Postulated Plant Accidents .....	5-1
5.1.1	Design-Basis Accidents .....	5-2
5.1.2	Severe Accidents .....	5-3

## Contents

5.2	Severe Accident Mitigation Alternatives . . . . .	5-4
5.2.1	Introduction . . . . .	5-5
5.2.2	Estimate of Risk for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 . . . . .	5-5
5.2.2.1	FPL's Risk Estimates . . . . .	5-6
5.2.2.2	Review of FPL's Risk Estimates . . . . .	5-8
5.2.3	Potential Design Improvements . . . . .	5-14
5.2.3.1	Process for Identifying Potential Design Improvements . . . . .	5-14
5.2.3.2	Staff Evaluation . . . . .	5-15
5.2.4	Risk Reduction Potential of Design Improvements . . . . .	5-16
5.2.5	Cost Impacts of Candidate Design Improvements . . . . .	5-19
5.2.6	Cost-Benefit Comparison . . . . .	5-20
5.2.7	Conclusions . . . . .	5-24
5.3	References . . . . .	5-25
6.0	Environmental Impacts of the Uranium Fuel Cycle and Solid Waste Management . . . . .	6-1
6.1	The Uranium Fuel Cycle . . . . .	6-2
6.2	References . . . . .	6-9
7.0	Environmental Impacts of Decommissioning . . . . .	7-1
7.1	References . . . . .	7-4
8.0	Environmental Impacts of Alternatives to Operating License Renewal . . . . .	8-1
8.1	No-Action Alternative . . . . .	8-1
8.1.1	Land Use . . . . .	8-3
8.1.2	Ecology . . . . .	8-3
8.1.3	Water Use and Quality . . . . .	8-4
8.1.4	Air Quality . . . . .	8-4
8.1.5	Waste . . . . .	8-4
8.1.6	Human Health . . . . .	8-5
8.1.7	Socioeconomics . . . . .	8-5
8.1.8	Aesthetics . . . . .	8-6

8.1.9	Historic and Archaeological Resources .....	8-6
8.1.10	Environmental Justice .....	8-7
8.2	Alternative Energy Sources .....	8-7
8.2.1	Coal-Fired Generation .....	8-10
8.2.1.1	Closed-Cycle Cooling System .....	8-11
8.2.1.2	Once-Through Cooling System .....	8-21
8.2.2	Natural-Gas-Fired Generation .....	8-21
8.2.2.1	Closed-Cycle Cooling System .....	8-24
8.2.2.2	Once-Through Cooling System .....	8-29
8.2.3	Nuclear Power Generation .....	8-29
8.2.3.1	Closed-Cycle Cooling System .....	8-30
8.2.3.2	Once-Through Cooling System .....	8-35
8.2.4	Purchased Electrical Power .....	8-35
8.2.5	Other Alternatives .....	8-36
8.2.5.1	Oil-Fired Generation .....	8-36
8.2.5.2	Wind Power .....	8-37
8.2.5.3	Solar Power .....	8-37
8.2.5.4	Hydropower .....	8-38
8.2.5.5	Geothermal Energy .....	8-38
8.2.5.6	Wood Waste .....	8-38
8.2.5.7	Municipal Solid Waste .....	8-39
8.2.5.8	Other Biomass-Derived Fuels .....	8-40
8.2.5.9	Fuel Cells .....	8-40
8.2.5.10	Delayed Retirement .....	8-41
8.2.5.11	Utility-Sponsored Conservation .....	8-41
8.2.6	Combination of Alternatives .....	8-42
8.3	Summary of Alternatives Considered .....	8-44
8.4	References .....	8-45

## Contents

9.0 Summary and Conclusions .....	9-1
9.1 Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action – License Renewal .....	9-4
9.1.1 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts .....	9-5
9.1.2 Irreversible or Irretrievable Resource Commitments .....	9-6
9.1.3 Short-Term Use Versus Long-Term Productivity .....	9-6
9.2 Relative Significance of the Environmental Impacts of License Renewal and Alternatives .....	9-7
9.3 Staff Conclusions and Recommendations .....	9-7
9.4 References .....	9-9
Appendix A - Comments Received on the Environmental Review .....	A-1
Part I - Comments Received During Scoping .....	A-1
A.1 Introduction .....	A-1
A.2 Comments Received During Scoping that are Applicable to this Environmental Review .....	A-5
Part II - Comments Received on the Draft SEIS .....	A-16
A.3 Introduction .....	A-16
A.4 Comments and Responses on the Draft SEIS .....	A-25
A.5 Public Meeting Transcript Excerpts and Comment Letters .....	A-72
Appendix B - Contributors to the Supplement .....	B-1
Appendix C - Chronology of NRC Staff Environmental Review Correspondence Related to the Florida Power and Light Company's Application for License Renewal of St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 .....	C-1
Appendix D - Organizations Contacted .....	D-1
Appendix E - Florida Power and Light Company's Compliance Status and Consultation Correspondence .....	E-1
Appendix F - GEIS Environmental Issues Not Applicable to St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 .....	F-1



# Figures

2-1	Location of St. Lucie Units 1 and 2, 80-km (50-mi) Region . . . . .	2-2
2-2	Location of St. Lucie Units 1 and 2, 10-km (6-mi) Region . . . . .	2-3
2-3	St. Lucie Units 1 and 2, Site Boundary . . . . .	2-4
2-4	St. Lucie Units 1 and 2, Power Block Area . . . . .	2-6
4-1	Geographic Distribution of Minority Populations Within 80 km (50 mi) of the St. Lucie Site Based on Census Block Group Data . . . . .	4-31
4-2	Geographic Distribution of Low-Income Populations Within 80 km (50 mi) of the St. Lucie Site Based on Census Block Group Data . . . . .	4-32

# Tables

2-1	Calculated Flow Velocities at Various Points in the Intake System of St. Lucie Units 1 and 2	2-9
2-2	Federally Listed and State of Florida-Listed Aquatic Species Occurring in St. Lucie County	2-22
2-3	Terrestrial Species Listed as Threatened or Endangered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that Have Been Reported to Occur Within St. Lucie County, Florida	2-26
2-4	Additional Terrestrial Species Listed by the State of Florida as Threatened, Endangered, or of Special Concern that Have Been Reported in St. Lucie County	2-30
2-5	St. Lucie Units 1 and 2, Employee and Contract Employee Residence by County	2-34
2-6	Total Occupied and Vacant (Available) Housing Units by County, 1990 and 2000	2-35
2-7	Population Growth in St. Lucie and Martin Counties, 1970 to 2020	2-35
2-8	Major Public Water Supply Systems in St. Lucie and Martin Counties	2-36
2-9	Land Use in St. Lucie and Martin Counties, Florida	2-38
2-10	Major Employment Sectors in St. Lucie and Martin Counties (2000)	2-41
2-11	Property Taxes Paid to St. Lucie County by FPL for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2	2-42
3-1	Category 1 Issues for Refurbishment Evaluation	3-2
3-2	Environmental Justice and GEIS Category 2 Issues for Refurbishment Evaluation	3-3
4-1	Category 1 Issues Applicable to the Operation of the St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 Cooling System During the Renewal Term	4-2
4-2	Category 2 Issues Applicable to the Operation of the St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 Cooling System During the Renewal Term	4-9
4-3	Category 1 Issues Applicable to the St. Lucie Transmission Lines During the Renewal Term	4-14
4-4	Chronic Effects of Electromagnetic Fields and GEIS Category 2 Issue Applicable to the St. Lucie Transmission Lines During the Renewal Term	4-16
4-5	Category 1 Issues Applicable to Radiological Impacts of Normal Operations During the Renewal Term	4-18
4-6	Category 1 Issues Applicable to Socioeconomics During the Renewal Term	4-20
4-7	Environmental Justice and GEIS Category 2 Issues Applicable to Socioeconomics During the Renewal Term	4-21
4-8	Category 1 Issues Applicable to Groundwater Use and Quality During the Renewal Term	4-33
4-9	Category 2 Issue Applicable to Threatened or Endangered Species During the Renewal Term	4-34

5-1	Category 1 Issue Applicable to Postulated Accidents During the Renewal Term . . . . .	5-3
5-2	Category 2 Issue Applicable to Postulated Accidents During the Renewal Term . . . . .	5-4
5-3	St. Lucie Core Damage Frequency . . . . .	5-7
5-4	Breakdown of Population Dose by Containment Release Mode . . . . .	5-8
5-5	SAMA Cost-Benefit Screening Analysis . . . . .	5-17
5-6	Uncertainty in the Calculated CDF for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 . . . . .	5-23
6-1	Category 1 Issues Applicable to the Uranium Fuel Cycle and Solid Waste Management During the Renewal Term . . . . .	6-2
7-1	Category 1 Issues Applicable to the Decommissioning of St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 Following the Renewal Term . . . . .	7-2
8-1	Summary of Environmental Impacts of the No-Action Alternative . . . . .	8-3
8-2	Summary of Environmental Impacts of Coal-Fired Generation Using Closed-Cycle Cooling at an Alternate Florida Site . . . . .	8-11
8-3	Summary of Environmental Impacts of Coal-Fired Generation at an Alternate Florida Site with Once-Through Cooling . . . . .	8-21
8-4	Summary of Environmental Impacts of Natural-Gas-Fired Generation Using Closed-Cycle Cooling at an Alternate Florida Site . . . . .	8-23
8-5	Summary of Environmental Impacts of Natural-Gas-Fired Generation with Once-Through Cooling at an Alternate Florida Site . . . . .	8-29
8-6	Summary of Environmental Impacts of New Nuclear Generation Using Closed-Cycle Cooling at an Alternate Florida Site . . . . .	8-32
8-7	Summary of Environmental Impacts of New Nuclear Generation Using Once-Through Cooling at an Alternate Florida Site . . . . .	8-35
8-8	Summary of Environmental Impacts for an Assumed Combination of Generating and Acquisition Alternatives . . . . .	8-43
9-1	Summary of Environmental Significance of License Renewal, the No-Action Alternative, and Alternative Methods of Generation Using Closed-Cycle Cooling . . . . .	9-8
A-1	Individuals Providing Comments During Scoping Comment Period . . . . .	A-3
A-2	Comment Log . . . . .	A-18
E-1	Federal, State, Local, and Regional Licenses, Permits, Consultations, and Other Approvals for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 . . . . .	E-2
F-1	GEIS Environmental Issues Not Applicable to St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 . . . . .	F-1



# Executive Summary

By letter dated November 29, 2001, the Florida Power and Light Company (FPL) submitted an application to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to renew the operating licenses (OLs) for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 for an additional 20-year period. If the OLs are renewed, State regulatory agencies and FPL will ultimately decide whether the two units will continue to operate based on factors such as the need for power or other matters within the State's jurisdiction or the purview of the owners. If the OLs are not renewed, then the units must be shut down at or before the expiration dates of the current OLs, which are March 1, 2016, for Unit 1, and April 6, 2023, for Unit 2.

Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 USC 4321) directs that an environmental impact statement (EIS) is required for major Federal actions that significantly affect the quality of the human environment. The NRC has issued regulations implementing Section 102 of NEPA in 10 CFR Part 51. Part 51 identifies licensing and regulatory actions that require an EIS. In 10 CFR 51.20(b)(2), the Commission requires preparation of an EIS or a supplement to an EIS for renewal of a reactor OL; 10 CFR 51.95(c) states that the EIS prepared at the OL renewal stage will be a supplement to the *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants* (GEIS), NUREG-1437, Volumes 1 and 2.<sup>(a)</sup>

Upon acceptance of the FPL application, the NRC staff began the environmental review process described in 10 CFR Part 51 by publishing, in the Federal Register, a notice of intent to prepare an EIS and conduct scoping. The staff visited the St. Lucie site in April 2002 and held public scoping meetings on April 3, 2002, in Port St. Lucie, Florida. In the preparation of the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2, the staff reviewed the FPL Environmental Report (ER) and compared it to the GEIS, consulted with other agencies, conducted an independent review of the issues following the guidance set forth in NUREG-1555, Supplement 1, the *Standard Review Plans for Environmental Reviews for Nuclear Power Plants, Supplement 1: Operating License Renewal*, and considered the public comments received during the scoping process. The comments and responses that were considered to be within the scope of the environmental review are provided in Appendix A, Part I, of this SEIS.

A draft SEIS was published for comment in November 2002. The staff held two public meetings in Port St. Lucie, Florida, in December 2002, to describe the preliminary results of the NRC environmental review, answer questions, and provide members of the public with information to assist them in formulating comments on the draft SEIS. When the comment period ended, the staff considered and dispositioned all of the comments received. These comments are addressed in Appendix A, Part II, of this SEIS.

---

1 (a) The GEIS was originally issued in 1996. Addendum 1 to the GEIS was issued in 1999. Hereafter,  
2 all references to the "GEIS" include the GEIS and its Addendum 1.

## Executive Summary

- | This SEIS includes the NRC staff's analysis that considers and weighs the environmental effects of the proposed action, the environmental impacts of alternatives to the proposed action, and mitigation measures for reducing or avoiding adverse effects. It also includes the staff's
- | recommendation regarding the proposed action.

The Commission has adopted the following statement of purpose and need for license renewal from the GEIS:

The purpose and need for the proposed action (renewal of an operating license) is to provide an option that allows for power generation capability beyond the term of a current nuclear power plant operating license to meet future system generating needs, as such needs may be determined by State, utility, and, where authorized, Federal (other than NRC) decisionmakers.

The goal of the staff's environmental review, as defined in 10 CFR 51.95(c)(4) and the GEIS, is to determine

... whether or not the adverse environmental impacts of license renewal are so great that preserving the option of license renewal for energy planning decisionmakers would be unreasonable.

Both the statement of purpose and need and the evaluation criterion implicitly acknowledge that there are factors, in addition to license renewal, that will ultimately determine whether an existing nuclear power plant continues to operate beyond the period of the current OL.

NRC regulations [10 CFR 51.95(c)(2)] contain the following statement regarding the content of SEISs prepared at the license renewal stage:

The supplemental environmental impact statement for license renewal is not required to include discussion of need for power or the economic costs and economic benefits of the proposed action or of alternatives to the proposed action except insofar as such benefits and costs are either essential for a determination regarding the inclusion of an alternative in the range of alternatives considered or relevant to mitigation. In addition, the supplemental environmental impact statement prepared at the license renewal stage need not discuss other issues not related to the environmental effects of the proposed action and the alternatives, or any aspect of the storage of spent fuel for the facility within the scope of the

generic determination in § 51.23(a) ["Temporary storage of spent fuel after cessation of reactor operation—generic determination of no significant environmental impact"] and in accordance with § 51.23(b).

The GEIS contains the results of a systematic evaluation of the consequences of renewing an OL and operating a nuclear power plant for an additional 20 years. It evaluates 92 environmental issues using the NRC's three-level standard of significance—SMALL, MODERATE, or LARGE—developed using the Council on Environmental Quality guidelines. The following definitions of the three significance levels are set forth in footnotes to Table B-1 of 10 CFR Part 51, Subpart A, Appendix B:

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.

For 69 of the 92 issues considered in the GEIS, the analysis in the GEIS reached the following conclusions:

- (1) The environmental impacts associated with the issue have been determined to apply either to all plants or, for some issues, to plants having a specific type of cooling system or other specified plant or site characteristics.
- (2) A single significance level (i.e., SMALL, MODERATE, or LARGE) has been assigned to the impacts (except for collective offsite radiological impacts from the fuel cycle and from high-level waste and spent fuel disposal).
- (3) Mitigation of adverse impacts associated with the issue has been considered in the analysis, and it has been determined that additional plant-specific mitigation measures are not likely to be sufficiently beneficial to warrant implementation.

These 69 issues were identified in the GEIS as Category 1 issues. In the absence of new and significant information, the staff relied on conclusions as amplified by supporting information in the GEIS for issues designated as Category 1 in Table B-1 of 10 CFR Part 51, Subpart A, Appendix B.

## Executive Summary

Of the 23 issues that do not meet the criteria set forth above, 21 are classified as Category 2 issues requiring analysis in a plant-specific supplement to the GEIS. The remaining two issues, environmental justice and chronic effects of electromagnetic fields, were not categorized. Environmental justice was not evaluated on a generic basis and must be addressed in a plant-specific supplement to the GEIS. Information on the chronic effects of electromagnetic fields was not conclusive at the time the GEIS was prepared.

This SEIS documents the staff's evaluation of all 92 environmental issues considered in the GEIS. The staff considered the environmental impacts associated with alternatives to license renewal and compared the environmental impacts of license renewal and the alternatives. The alternatives to license renewal that were considered include the no-action alternative (not renewing the OLs for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 and not replacing the power generated by these units [a conceptual alternative]) and alternative methods of power generation. Based on projections made by the U.S. Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration, gas- and coal-fired generation appear to be the most likely power-generation alternatives if the power from Units 1 and 2 is replaced. These alternatives are evaluated in detail, assuming that the replacement power generation plant is located at an unspecified alternate location in Florida.

FPL and the staff have established independent processes for identifying and evaluating the significance of any new information on the environmental impacts of license renewal. Neither FPL nor the staff has identified information that is both new and significant related to Category 1 issues that would call into question the conclusions in the GEIS. Similarly, neither FPL, the scoping process, nor the staff have identified any new issue applicable to St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 that has a significant environmental impact. Therefore, the staff relies upon the conclusions of the GEIS for all of the Category 1 issues that are applicable to St. Lucie Units 1 and 2.

FPL's license renewal application presents an analysis of the Category 2 issues plus environmental justice. The staff has reviewed the FPL analysis for each issue and has conducted an independent review of each issue. Six Category 2 issues are not applicable, because they are related to plant design features or site characteristics not found at St. Lucie. Nine Category 2 issues are not discussed in this SEIS, because they are specifically related to refurbishment. FPL has stated that its evaluation of structures and components, as required by 10 CFR 54.21, did not identify any major plant refurbishment activities or modifications as necessary to support the continued operation of St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 for the license renewal period. In addition, any replacement of components or additional inspection activities are within the bounds of normal plant component replacement, and therefore, are not expected to affect the environment outside of the bounds of the plant operations evaluated in the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission's 1973 *Final Environmental Statement Related to Operation of St. Lucie Plant Unit No. 1* and U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's 1982 *Final Environmental Statement Related to Operation of St. Lucie Plant, Unit No. 2*.



Eleven Category 2 issues related to operational impacts and postulated accidents during the renewal term, as well as environmental justice and chronic effects of electromagnetic fields, are discussed in detail in this SEIS. For all 11 Category 2 issues and environmental justice related to the renewal term, the staff concludes that the potential environmental effects are of SMALL significance in the context of the standards set forth in the GEIS. In addition, the staff determined that appropriate Federal health agencies have not reached a consensus on the existence of chronic adverse effects from electromagnetic fields. Therefore, no further evaluation of this issue is required. For severe accident mitigation alternatives (SAMAs), the staff concludes that a reasonable, comprehensive effort was made to identify and evaluate SAMAs. Based on its review of the SAMAs for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 and the plant improvements already made, the staff concludes that none of the candidate SAMAs are cost-beneficial.

Mitigation measures were considered for each Category 2 issue. Current measures to mitigate the environmental impacts of plant operation were found to be adequate, and no additional mitigation measures were deemed sufficiently beneficial to be warranted.

If the St. Lucie OLs are not renewed and the units cease operation on or before the expiration of their current OLs, then the adverse impacts of likely alternatives will not be smaller than those associated with continued operation of St. Lucie Units 1 and 2. The impacts may, in fact, be greater in some areas.

The recommendation of the NRC staff is that the Commission determine that the adverse environmental impacts of license renewal for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 are not so great that preserving the option of license renewal for energy-planning decisionmakers would be unreasonable. This recommendation is based on (1) the analysis and findings in the GEIS; (2) the ER submitted by FPL; (3) consultation with other Federal, State, and local agencies; (4) the staff's own independent review; and (5) the staff's consideration of public comments received during the scoping process and on the draft SEIS.



## Abbreviations/Acronyms

°	degree(s)	
μCi	microcurie(s)	
μCi/mL	microcurie(s) per milliliter	
μGy	microgray(s)	
μm	micrometer(s)	
μSv	microsievert(s)	
AB	auxiliary building	
ac	acre(s)	
AC	alternating current	
ACC	averted cleanup and decontamination costs	
AEA	Atomic Energy Act of 1954	
AEC	U.S. Atomic Energy Commission	
AOC	present value of averted offsite property damage costs	
AOE	present value of averted occupational exposure	
AOSC	present value of averted onsite costs	
AOT	allowed outage time	
APE	present value of averted public exposure	
ATWS	anticipated transient without scram	
BEA	Bureau of Economic Analysis	
Bq	becquerel(s)	
BMT	basemat melt-through	
Btu	British thermal unit(s)	
C	Celsius	
CCW	component cooling water	
CDF	core damage frequency	
CEOG	Combustion Engineering Owners Group	
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality	
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations	
CHRS	containment heat removal system	
Ci	curie(s)	
cm	centimeter(s)	
COE	cost of enhancement	
COPC	chemicals of potential concern	
CSS	containment spray system	
CVCS	chemical and volume control system	
CWA	Clean Water Act	
CZMA	Coastal Zone Management Act	

## Abbreviations/Acronyms

DBA	design-basis accident
DCH	direct containment heating
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
DOH	Department of Health
DPR	demonstration project reactor
DSM	demand-side management
EDG	emergency diesel generator
EIA	Energy Information Administration (of DOE)
EIS	environmental impact statement
ELF-EMF	extremely low frequency-electromagnetic field
EOP	Emergency Operating Procedure
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EQ	equipment qualification
ER	Environmental Report
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESRP	Environmental Standard Review Plan, NUREG-1555, Supplement 1, Operating License Renewal
F	Fahrenheit
FAA	U.S. Federal Aviation Administration
FES	Final Environmental Statement
FDEP	Florida Department of Environmental Protection
FFWCC	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
FNAI	Florida Natural Areas Inventory
FPL	Florida Power and Light Company
FPSC	Florida Public Service Commission
FR	Federal Register
FSAR	Final Safety Analysis Report
ft	foot/feet
FWPCA	Federal Water Pollution Control Act (also known as the Clean Water Act of 1977)
FWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
gal	gallon(s)
GDC	general design criteria
GEIS	Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants, NUREG-1437
gpm	gallons per minute

## Abbreviations/Acronyms

ha	hectare(s)
HHSI	high head safety injection
HLW	high-level waste
HPSI	high pressure safety injection
hr	hour(s)
Hz	Hertz
in.	inch(es)
IPE	Individual Plant Examination
IPEEE	Individual Plant Examination of External Events
ISFSI	independent spent fuel storage installation
ISLOCA	interfacing system loss-of-coolant accident
J	joule(s)
kg	kilogram(s)
km	kilometer(s)
kV	kilovolt(s)
kV/m	kilovolt(s) per meter
kWh	kilowatt hour(s)
L	liter(s)
lb	pound
LLW	low-level waste
LNG	liquefied natural gas
LOCA	loss-of-coolant accident
LOOP	loss-of-offsite power
LOS	level-of-service (designation)
LWR	light-water reactor
m	meter(s)
m/s	meter(s) per second
m <sup>3</sup> /d	cubic meter(s) per day
m <sup>3</sup> /s	cubic meter(s) per second
mA	milliampere(s)
MAB	maximum attainable benefit
MACCS	MELCOR Accident Consequence Code System
MACCS2	MELCOR Accident Consequence Code System 2
MBq	megabecquerel(s)
MGD	million gallons per day
mGy	milligray(s)
mi	mile(s)

## Abbreviations/Acronyms

MJ	megajoule(s)
mL	milliliter(s)
mph	mile(s) per hour
mrad	millirad(s)
mrem	millirem(s)
mSv	millisievert(s)
MT	metric ton(s) (or tonne[s])
MTHM	metric ton(s) heavy metal
MTU	metric ton(s)-uranium
MW	megawatt(s)
MWd/MTU	megawatt-day(s) per metric ton of uranium
MW(e)	megawatt(s) electric
MW(t)	megawatt(s) thermal
MWh	megawatt hour(s)
NA	not applicable
NAS	National Academy of Sciences
NCI	National Cancer Institute
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
NESC	National Electric Safety Code
ng/J	nanogram(s) per joule
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NIEHS	National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NO <sub>x</sub>	nitrogen oxide(s)
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRC	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ODCM	Offsite Dose Calculation Manual
OL	operating license
PAR	passive autocatalytic recombiners
PARS	Publicly Available Records System
PDS	plant damage state
PM <sub>10</sub>	particulate matter, 10 microns or less in diameter
PORV	power-operated relief valve
ppt	parts per thousand
PRA	Probabilistic Risk Assessment
PSA	Probabilistic Safety Assessment
PSD	prevention of significant deterioration
PSW	plant service water

## Abbreviations/Acronyms

PWR	pressurized water reactor
QA	quality assurance
RAB	reactor auxiliary building
RAI	request for additional information
RCP	reactor coolant pump
RCS	reactor coolant system
REMP	radiological environmental monitoring program
rms	root mean square
RPC	replacement power cost
RRW	risk reduction worth
RWST	refueling water storage tank
ry	reactor-year(s)
s	second(s)
SAG	Severe Accident Guideline
SAMA	severe accident mitigation alternative
SAMG	Severe Accident Management Guideline
SAR	safety analysis report
SBO	station blackout
SCR	selective catalytic reduction
SEIS	supplemental environmental impact statement
SER	safety evaluation report
SFWMD	South Florida Water Management District
SG	steam generator
SGTR	steam generator tube rupture
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SO <sub>2</sub>	sulfur dioxide
SO <sub>x</sub>	sulfur oxide(s)
SR	State Road or State Route
SSC	species of special concern
Sv	sievert(s)
TBq	terrabecquerel(s)
UDB	urban development boundary
UFSAR	Updated Final Safety Analysis Report
U.S.	United States
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USB	Urban Service Boundary
USC	United States Code

## Abbreviations/Acronyms

USCB	U.S. Census Bureau
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
yr	year(s)