

RULEMAKING ISSUE
NOTATION VOTE

RESPONSE SHEET

TO: Brooke P. Clark, Secretary


FROM: Commissioner Caputo

SUBJECT: SECY-22-0109: Proposed Rule - Renewing Nuclear
Power Plant Operating Licenses - Environmental
Review

Approved X Disapproved Abstain Not Participating

COMMENTS: Below Attached X None

Entered in STAR

Yes 

No



Signature

1-9-23

Date

**Commissioner Caputo's Comments on SECY-22-0109, "Proposed Rule:
Renewing Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses—Environmental Review
(RIN 3150-AK32; NRC-2018-0296)"**

I commend the staff for its timely work on this update to the Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants (LR GEIS). In reviewing SECY-22-0109 and the accompanying draft proposed rule, though, I must reflect on what brought us here. The 2013 update of the LR GEIS resulted in a few ambiguities regarding the applicability of the GEIS to license renewal applications for operation of 60-80 years (i.e., subsequent license renewals or SLRs). Following years of research and analysis on the environmental impacts for 60-80 years of operation,¹ staff determined that the LR GEIS could apply to SLRs as noted in the definition of "license renewal term" as "[that] period of time past the original or current license term for which the renewed license is in force."² Nonetheless, the ambiguous language led an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board in the Turkey Point SLR proceeding to refer the question to the Commission.³ In CLI-20-03, the Commission addressed the referred question and resolved the regulatory ambiguity that existed in § 51.53(c) in favor of an interpretation that the staff's extensive work on the 2013 version of the LR GEIS covered subsequent license renewal despite the failure to remove the word "initial" from § 51.53(c)(3). Subsequently, despite no new information or discussion on this issue, a differently constituted Commission in CLI-22-02 arbitrarily reversed this interpretation, instigating regulatory uncertainty for licensees interested in operation past 60 years. This is contrary to the agency's Reliability Principle of Good Regulation, which states: "Once established, regulation should be perceived to be reliable and not unjustifiably in a state of transition. Regulatory actions should be...decisively administered so as to lend stability to the nuclear operational and planning process." Such a drastic change in direction with no new or additional information or discussion is, at its very best, arbitrary and capricious and in conflict with the Administrative Procedure Act.⁴

¹ The NRC clearly and consistently expressed to all stakeholders the intent to update the license renewal infrastructure to support review of applications for license renewal beyond 60 years during the development of the 2013 GEIS. See "Congressional Budget Justification for FY 2011," NUREG-1100, Volume 26 at 31. See also, "Frequently Asked Questions on License Renewal of Nuclear Power Reactors," NUREG-1850, dated March 2006, at 4-3, stating that "For license renewal, the NRC has issued a GEIS, Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants, NUREG-1437. The GEIS assesses the scope and impact of environmental effects at all of the currently existing U.S. nuclear power plant sites." (Emphasis added.) These FAQs further document that 39 renewed licenses had been issued at the time of publication of NUREG-1850, clearly implying that nuclear power plant sites with renewed licenses are assessed within the scope of the GEIS.

² 2013 GEIS at 7-27. The 2013 GEIS documents that its scope includes subsequent license renewal in many other places. For example, the no-action alternative described in section 2.2 is "a decision by the NRC not to renew the operating license of a nuclear power plant beyond the current operating license term. (2013 GEIS at 2-17.)" Additionally, when the staff provided the final report for the 2013 to the Commission, it noted that 71 nuclear units had already received renewed operating licenses using the 1996 GEIS and rule (SECY-12-0063, Final Rule: Revisions to Environmental Review for Renewal of Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses (10 CFR Part 51; RIN 3150-AI42), page 3), but retained all of those nuclear units in the listing of commercial nuclear power plants in the affected environment considered in the scope of the 2013 GEIS in Table 3.1-1.

³ See LBP-19-3, 89 NRC 245 (2019).

⁴ 5 U.S.C. 706(2)(A).

The Commission subsequently attempted to address the regulatory uncertainty they created in the LR GEIS by instructing the staff to conduct an expedited, surgical rulemaking to update § 51.53(c) to remove the word "initial". The flaw in that approach is that it leaves ambiguous language in other portions of part 51 that creates absurdities that would have otherwise been resolved by the holistic review of the regulation established by the Commission in CLI-20-03. For example, the remainder of § 51.53(c)(3) limits its applicability to licensees "holding an operating license, construction permit, or combined license as of June 30, 1995." Under our regulations, a licensee in the period of extended operations provided for in part 54 holds neither an operating license nor a construction permit but instead a renewed license.⁵

In addition to the issue of applicability to holders of renewed licenses, two licensees currently hold operating licenses issued after the cutoff date of June 30, 1995, having been built under construction permits issued prior to that date. While Watts Bar Nuclear Units 1 and 2 were explicitly listed in the scope of facilities for the LR GEIS,⁶ they would be excluded by the rule language if interpreted on its face, as the Commission in CLI-22-02 erroneously established. The Tennessee Valley Authority no longer holds a construction permit for either unit. I have addressed this convolution and other ambiguities in my edits to the draft proposed rule.

The staff's efforts have provided the "hard look" required by the National Environmental Policy Act for the items this action proposes to resolve generically for license renewal of nuclear power plants regardless of the term of renewal. I note, though, that the work in this area is incomplete. Vogtle 3 and 4 are not within the scope of this LR GEIS. Given the expedited timeframe for this rulemaking and the need to expeditiously clear up the disarray created by the Commission in CLI-22-02, I therefore approve publication of the proposed rule in the *Federal Register* for a 60-day comment period as edited in the attached. However, at the next review of the LR GEIS, staff should expand the scope to ensure that Vogtle 3 and 4 and any other light-water reactor facilities licensed before that time are covered. Failure to do so would produce an incoherent, illogical, and impractical result of disparate treatment among comparable licensed facilities, contrary to the tenets of our Clarity Principle of Good Regulation.

One of my colleagues suggests that "[t]o avoid any ambiguity in these documents, the NRC staff should also modify the proposed rule and draft GEIS to explicitly state that the scope of the GEIS is initial license renewal and one term of subsequent license renewal." Given the absence

⁵ 10 C.F.R. § 54.31(c).

⁶ Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants, NUREG-1437, vol. 2 (May 1996) at A-78 (ML040690738). Watts Bar, Unit 2 was explicitly removed from the scope of the 2013 GEIS as listed in Table 3.1-1 and described in note (a) to that table, which reads "The 1996 GEIS included a number of nuclear plants that are not being considered for license renewal and are not included in this table. They include the following plants ... Watts Bar, Unit 2: Construction halted in 1988, but approval to complete construction was approved in August 2007. Construction was to begin in 2007, with operation beginning in 2013." This clearly demonstrates the scope of nuclear power plants considered as part of the affected environment of the 2013 GEIS included all then operating nuclear power plants whether under an initial operating license or a renewed license and excluded plants that were not under consideration for license renewal for the reasons listed. Watts Bar, Unit 2 is restored to the scope of plants in the draft GEIS provided in SECY-22-0109. SECY-22-0109, Enclosure 2, Table 3.1-1 at 3-8.

of a sound rational basis for this suggestion, I must respectfully disagree. As noted above, the staff's efforts have provided the NEPA-required "hard look" regardless of the term of renewal.⁷

Another of my colleagues has suggested that "It benefits the agency and the public it serves to use the ten-year review cycle of the LR GEIS as designed—to evaluate and incorporate new information gleaned from experience to generically address known impacts of continued operation. Therefore, the NRC staff should modify the proposed rule and draft GEIS to explicitly state that the scope of the GEIS is initial license renewal and one term of subsequent license renewal." (Emphasis added.) Again, I respectfully disagree - the staff should evaluate the known impacts of continued operation using the best understanding currently available and update the LR GEIS based on a sound technical evaluation at the ten-year point if there is a need to do so.

In "Staff Requirements – SECY-21-0066 – Rulemaking Plan for Renewing Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses – Environmental Review (RIN 3150 AK32; NRC 2018 0296)," the Commission directed the staff to update the "GEIS ... to clearly include, but not be limited to, a thorough evaluation of the environmental impacts of renewing the operating license of a nuclear power plant for one term of SLR." The staff has done so, providing a hard look at the generic environmental effects of renewing the licenses to operate nuclear power plants within the scope of the LR GEIS for any 20-year increment of license renewal plus the time remaining on the current licenses, up to a maximum of 40 years irrespective of the prior number of years of reactor operation. The staff executed its tasking to update the LR GEIS in this way because it could not find a rational basis to exclude license renewal terms beyond the first subsequent license renewal.⁸

As noted in CLI-20-03, the 1996 GEIS introduced a standard that "[will] require a determination of whether or not the adverse environmental impacts of license renewal are so great, compared with the set of alternatives, that preserving the option of license renewal for future decisionmakers would be unreasonable."⁹ CLI-20-03 further states that the agency:

based the framework of the environmental analysis for license renewal on the following factors: data from operating experience, the fact that environmental impacts of license renewal are expected to be bounded by data from operating experience given that license renewal is twenty additional years of continued operation, and our understanding that changes in the environment around nuclear plants are gradual and predictable. For these reasons, the NRC has concluded that the environmental impacts from operation during a license renewal term would be similar to those during the current license term....¹⁰

⁷ Additionally, making such a change would perpetuate the ambiguity between the scope of plants considered in the affected environment for the GEIS and the wording of the rule as several plants holding subsequently renewed licenses were explicitly included in the scope of this GEIS. See SECY-22-0109, Enclosure 3, Appendix C, which includes Turkey Point Nuclear Plant, Units 3 and 4, noting that the subsequent renewed licenses are in place with the expiration dates to be corrected upon completion of the review of generic environmental issues for subsequent license renewal.

⁸ SECY-22-0109 at 6.

⁹ 1996 Final Rule, 61 Fed. Reg. at 28,468.

¹⁰ CLI 20-03 at 24-25 (references omitted).

This logic and resulting conclusion, originating in 1996 and reaffirmed in 2013, remains sound today. Limiting the applicability of the draft proposed rule to one subsequent license renewal diverges from 27 years of established regulatory practice and operating experience, injecting unnecessary uncertainty into nuclear licensee planning processes without any justification for doing so.

Limiting the applicability of this draft proposed GEIS is wholly unjustified for two reasons. First, every license renewal review, regardless of term, includes a site-specific environmental review. Anything not resolved by the GEIS must be evaluated and discussed in the site-specific Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. That review would also include an evaluation of new and significant information regarding matters covered by the GEIS.

Second, the practical reality is that the GEIS will be updated every 10 years. Lessons learned during that time will be incorporated into the GEIS at the end of each cycle. In fact, the modifications to the 2013 GEIS directed in the SRM have in fact been incorporated into the current draft revision of the GEIS. I agree with staff's analysis that its hard look at the environmental effects of license renewal does not depend on the term of renewal and extends beyond 80 years. Disregarding this analysis in favor of an arbitrary limit at 80 years runs directly contrary to our Efficiency Principle of Good Regulation and, without justification, is a waste of resources. Thus, a more limited approach to the GEIS is unnecessary.

For the above reasons, I approve publication of the proposed rule in the *Federal Register* for a 60-day comment period as edited in the attached.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

10 CFR Part 51

[NRC-2018-0296]

RIN 3150-AK32

Renewing Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses – Environmental Review

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is proposing to amend its environmental protection regulations by updating the Commission's 2013 findings on the environmental effect of renewing the operating license of a nuclear power plant. The NRC proposes to redefine the number and scope of the environmental issues that must be addressed during the review of each application for license renewal. As part of this update, the NRC has prepared draft Revision 2 to NUREG–1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants" (LR GEIS), to account for new information and to address the impacts of initial license renewals, which the previous versions considered, as well as subsequent license renewals. The draft revised LR GEIS provides the technical basis for this proposed rule. The NRC is providing an opportunity for interested parties to submit comments on this proposed rule, the draft revised LR GEIS, and associated draft guidance.

DATES: Submit comments by **[INSERT DATE 60 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE *FEDERAL REGISTER*]**. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the NRC is able to ensure consideration only for comments received on or before this date.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by any of the following methods (unless this document describes a different method for submitting comments on a specific subject):

- **Federal rulemaking website:** Go to <https://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2018-0296. Address questions about NRC dockets to Dawn Forder; telephone: 301-415-3407; email: Dawn.Forder@nrc.gov. For technical questions contact the individuals listed in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section of this document.

- **Email comments to:** Rulemaking.Comments@nrc.gov. If you do not receive an automatic email reply confirming receipt, then contact us at 301-415-1677.

- **Mail comments to:** Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, ATTN: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff.

For additional direction on obtaining information and submitting comments, see “Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments” in the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section of this document.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Yanely Malave-Velez, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, telephone: 301-415-1519, email: Yanely.Malave-Velez@nrc.gov, Jennifer Davis, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, telephone: 301-415-3835, email: Jennifer.Davis@nrc.gov, or Kevin Folk, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, telephone 301-415-6944, email:

Formatted: Font color: Hyperlink

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Kevin.Folk@nrc.gov. All are staff of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

A. Purpose of the Regulatory Action

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (AEA) authorizes the NRC to issue licenses to operate commercial nuclear power plant for up to 40 years. The AEA and the NRC's regulations allow for the renewal of these licenses for up to an additional 20 years for each renewal term, which could either be an initial license renewal (initial LR) or subsequent license renewal (SLR). There are no limitations in the AEA or the NRC's regulations restricting the number of times a license may be renewed. The NRC's review of a license renewal application proceeds along two independent regulatory tracks: one for safety issues and another for environmental issues. The NRC's regulations for the license renewal safety review are set forth in part 54 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), "Requirements for Renewal of Operating Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants." The NRC's environmental protection regulations are set forth in 10 CFR part 51, "Environmental Protection Regulations for Domestic Licensing and Related Regulatory Functions."

The license renewal application includes both general and technical information that demonstrates that an applicant is in compliance with the NRC's regulations in 10 CFR part 54. During the safety review, the license renewal applicant must demonstrate that the effects of aging will be adequately managed so that the intended function(s) will

Deleted: operating licenses

Deleted: operating

be maintained consistent with the current licensing basis for the period of extended operation. Information in the application must be sufficiently detailed to permit the NRC staff to complete its review and develop the safety finding.

Separate from the safety analysis, the applicant prepares an evaluation of the potential impacts to the environment of facility operation for an additional 20 years, which the NRC uses to inform its environmental analysis. Under the NRC's environmental protection regulations in 10 CFR part 51, which implements the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), renewal of a nuclear power plant operating license requires the preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS). To support the preparation of these EISs, the NRC issued a rule in 1996 (61 FR 28467) and a supporting analysis in NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants" (LR GEIS). The LR GEIS defines which impacts would essentially be the same at all nuclear power plants or a subset of plants (i.e., generic or Category 1 issues) and which ones could be different at different plants and would require a plant-specific analysis to determine the impacts (Category 2 issues). The determinations are codified in Table B-1, "Summary of Findings on NEPA Issues for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants," of appendix B to subpart A of 10 CFR part 51 (hereafter referred to as "Table B-1").¹ For each license renewal application, those impacts that require a plant-specific analysis must be analyzed by the applicant in its environmental report and by the NRC in a supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) to NUREG-1437. The 1996 rule was amended in 2013 (78 FR 37281) by the issuance of an updated rule and publication of LR GEIS, Revision 1. In 2014, the NRC

¹ As stated in the introductory paragraph of appendix B to subpart A of 10 CFR part 51, the Commission has assessed the environmental impacts associated with granting a renewed operating license for a nuclear power plant to a licensee who holds either an operating license or construction permit as of June 30, 1995.

issued a final rule that addressed the generic determination of the environmental impacts of continued storage of spent nuclear fuel beyond a reactor's licensed life for operation (79 FR 56238). That rule amended 10 CFR part 51 by revising the findings of two environmental issues listed in Table B-1.

This proposed rule would further redefine the number and scope of the environmental issues that must be addressed by the NRC and applicants during license renewal environmental reviews. These changes are based primarily on the lessons learned and knowledge gained from initial LR and SLR reviews performed by the NRC since development of the 2013 LR GEIS. The changes also address Commission direction in Staff Requirements Memorandum (SRM)-SECY-22-0024, "Rulemaking Plan for Renewing Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses – Environmental Review (RIN 3150-AK32, NRC-2018-0296)," by thoroughly evaluating SLR in this review and update. In addition, new scientific research, public comments, changes in environmental regulations and impacts methodology, and other new information were considered in evaluating the significance of impacts associated with license renewal.

B. Major Provisions

In the 2013 rule, there were 78 environmental issues, 17 of which required a plant-specific analysis (Category 2 issues) during license renewal environmental reviews. In this proposed rule, there are 80 environmental issues, 20 of which require a plant-specific analysis. The following points summarize the primary proposed changes to the NRC's requirements in part 51:

1. Several issues were consolidated, including some issues that were combined with other related Category 1 or Category 2 issues.

2. One new Category 1 issue was added: "Greenhouse gas impacts on climate change."

3. One issue was changed from Category 2 to Category 1: "Severe accidents."

4. Two new Category 2 issues were added: "Climate change impacts on environmental resources" and "National Marine Sanctuaries Act: sanctuary resources."

5. One Category 2 issue was divided into three separate Category 2 issues: "Endangered Species Act: federally listed species and critical habitats under U.S. Fish and Wildlife jurisdiction," "Endangered Species Act: federally listed species and critical habitats under National Marine Fisheries Service jurisdiction," and "Magnuson-Stevens Act: essential fish habitat."

C. Costs and Benefits

The NRC prepared a draft regulatory analysis to determine the expected quantitative and qualitative costs and benefits of the proposed rule and associated guidance. The draft regulatory analysis concluded that the proposed rule and associated guidance would result in undiscounted total net savings of \$91.4 million to the industry and \$31.7 million to the NRC.

The draft regulatory analysis also reflected qualitative factors to be considered in the NRC's rulemaking decision. Qualitative factors include regulatory stability, predictability, and clarity in the licensing process. The proposed rule would reduce the cost to the industry of preparing environmental reports for license renewal applications by focusing resources on plant-specific analyses. The NRC would also recognize similar reductions in cost and be able to better focus its resources on plant-specific environmental issues during reviews of reactor license renewal applications.

For more information, see the draft regulatory analysis (available as indicated in Section XV, Availability of Documents, of this document).

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

- I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments
 - A. Obtaining Information
 - B. Submitting Comments
- II. Background
 - A. Environmental Review—Current 10 CFR Part 51 Regulations
 - B. Rulemaking History
- III. Discussion
 - A. Proposed Amendments
 - B. Environmental Impacts to be Reviewed
 - C. Draft Revised Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants
 - D. Proposed Actions and Basis for Changes to 10 CFR Part 51
- IV. Availability of Guidance for Comment
- V. Section-by-Section Analysis
- VI. Regulatory Flexibility Certification
- VII. Regulatory Analysis
- VIII. Backfitting and Issue Finality
- IX. Cumulative Effects of Regulation
- X. Plain Writing
- XI. National Environmental Policy Act
- XII. Paperwork Reduction Act Statement
- XIII. Voluntary Consensus Standards
- XIV. Public Meetings
- XV. Availability of Documents

I. Obtaining Information and Submitting Comments

A. Obtaining Information

Please refer to Docket ID NRC-2018-0296 when contacting the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) about the availability of information for this action. You may obtain publicly available information related to this action by any of the following methods:

- **Federal Rulemaking Website:** Go to <https://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2018-0296.

- **NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System**

(ADAMS): You may obtain publicly available documents online in the ADAMS Public Documents collection at <https://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select "Begin Web-based ADAMS Search." For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, at 301-415-4737, or by email to PDR.Resource@nrc.gov. For the convenience of the reader, instructions about obtaining materials referenced in this document are provided in the "Availability of Documents" section.

- **NRC's PDR:** You may examine and purchase copies of public documents, by appointment, at the NRC's PDR, Room P1 B35, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852. To make an appointment to visit the PDR, please send an email to PDR.Resource@nrc.gov or call 1-800-397-4209 or 301-415-4737, between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. eastern time (ET), Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

- **Technical Library:** The Technical Library, which is located at Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852, is open by appointment only. Interested parties may make appointments to examine documents by contacting the NRC Technical Library by email at Library.Resource@nrc.gov between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. (ET), Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

B. Submitting Comments

The NRC encourages electronic comment submission through the **Federal rulemaking website** (<https://www.regulations.gov>). Please include Docket ID NRC-2018-0296 in your comment submission.

The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information that you do not want to be publicly disclosed in your comment submission. The NRC will post all comment submissions at <https://www.regulations.gov> as well as enter the comment submissions into ADAMS. The NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove identifying or contact information.

If you are requesting or aggregating comments from other persons for submission to the NRC, then you should inform those persons not to include identifying or contact information that they do not want to be publicly disclosed in their comment submission. Your request should state that the NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove such information before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment into ADAMS.

II. Background

NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants" (LR GEIS) is intended to streamline the NRC's license renewal environmental review by documenting a systematic approach that the NRC uses to evaluate the environmental impacts of renewing the operating licenses of commercial nuclear power plants. The LR GEIS also provides the technical basis for Table B-1, in appendix B to subpart A, and the Commission's other license renewal regulations in 10 CFR part 51, "Environmental Protection Regulations for Domestic Licensing and Related Regulatory Functions." This Background section provides an overview of the environmental review process and the rulemaking history related to the license renewal process under which a power reactor licensee may apply for a renewal of its operating license.

A. Environmental Review—Current 10 CFR Part 51 Regulations

As a Federal agency, the NRC must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) by assessing the potential environmental effects of a proposed agency action before approving or disapproving that proposed action. The regulations implementing the NRC's NEPA review are found in 10 CFR part 51.

Under NEPA, Federal agencies prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for any major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. In addition, the Commission has identified at § 51.20 certain categories of NRC proposed actions that require the preparation of an EIS, including the renewal of a license to operate a nuclear power reactor.² For each plant-specific review, the NRC prepares a supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) to the LR GEIS.

The NRC's provisions at § 51.53(c) require an applicant for renewal of a nuclear power plant license to submit with its application a separate document entitled "Applicant's Environmental Report—Operating License Renewal Stage" that describes in detail the affected environment around the plant, the modifications directly affecting the environment or any plant effluents and any planned refurbishment activities. In addition, the report must address the environmental impacts of alternatives and any other matters described in § 51.45, which include the following: (1) the impact of the proposed action on the environment, (2) any adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, (3) alternatives to the proposed action, (4) the relationship between local short-term uses of the environment and maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and (5) any irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources. Within its environmental

² The term *Nuclear reactor* is defined in § 50.2, "Definitions."

report, the applicant is required to include analyses of the environmental impacts of the proposed action, including the impacts of refurbishment activities, if any, associated with license renewal and the impacts of operation during the renewal term, for those issues identified as Category 2 issues in appendix B to subpart A of 10 CFR part 51.

Additionally, the applicant is required to provide any new and significant information of which it is aware in its environmental report. If there is no new and significant information for a Category 1 issue, the applicant can rely on that Category 1 generic finding and analyses in the LR GEIS. The applicant's environmental report informs the NRC's independent evaluation.

Before making a decision on a renewed license application for a nuclear power plant, the NRC is required to prepare and distribute, for public comment, a draft SEIS. The draft SEIS assesses the potential environmental impacts that may result from continued nuclear power plant operation and any proposed refurbishment activities during the renewal term (initial license renewal (initial LR) or subsequent license renewal (SLR)). In preparing the draft SEIS, the NRC staff will rely on the findings in Table B-1 for Category 1 issues and analyze the potential environmental impacts of the proposed action (license renewal) on the affected environment and specific environmental resources (e.g., groundwater) for Category 2 issues. Additionally, the NRC will consider any potentially new and significant information for Category 1 issues and for uncategorized issues. An environmental issue may remain uncategorized where the impact level remains unknown or uncertain, such as any activity or aspect associated with the nuclear power plant operations that can act upon the environment in a manner or an intensity not previously recognized and/or quantified. Within each environmental resource area, the NRC staff will analyze issues that correspond to specific, potential environmental impacts at the specific site (e.g., within the groundwater resource area,

groundwater quality degradation resulting from water withdrawals). In the draft SEIS, the NRC staff also will evaluate alternatives to the proposed action.

After analyzing the potential environmental impacts for each issue, the NRC assigns one of the following three significance levels to describe its evaluation of those impacts on that issue in either the LR GEIS or a plant-specific SEIS:

SMALL—The environmental effects are not detectable or are so minor that they will neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource. For the purposes of assessing radiological impacts, the Commission has concluded that those impacts that do not exceed permissible levels in the Commission's regulations are considered SMALL.

MODERATE—The environmental effects are sufficient to alter noticeably, but not to destabilize, important attributes of the resource.

LARGE—The environmental effects are clearly noticeable and are sufficient to destabilize important attributes of the resource.

In assessing the significance of environmental impacts for some environmental resources (e.g., federally protected ecological resources and historic properties that require interagency consultation with Federal agencies or Indian Tribes³), the NRC assigns the appropriate impact level (other than SMALL, MODERATE, or LARGE) in accordance with the terminology used in the relevant statutes and their implementing regulations.

³ Per 36 CFR 800.2(c)(2)(ii), the agency official will consult with any Indian Tribe or Native Hawaiian organization that attaches religious and cultural significance to historic properties that may be affected by an undertaking. The term "Indian Tribes" refers to Federally recognized Tribes as acknowledged by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a).

The NRC will document its environmental review and analysis through the preparation of a draft SEIS that will be published for public comment in the *Federal Register*, with a minimum 45-day comment period, under § 51.73. Further, as provided in § 51.74, the NRC will distribute the draft SEIS to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), other Federal agencies that have a special expertise or jurisdiction with respect to any potential environmental impact that may be relevant to the proposed action, the applicant, and appropriate State, Tribal, and local agencies and clearinghouses.

Deleted: in accordance with

Following the public comment period, the NRC will analyze any comments received, revise its environmental analyses as appropriate, and then prepare the final SEIS in accordance with the requirements of § 51.91. Under § 51.93, the NRC will distribute the final SEIS to many of the same entities as the draft SEIS and to each commenter. The NRC also will publish a notice of availability for the final SEIS in the *Federal Register*. As set forth in § 51.102 and following the preparation and distribution of the final SEIS, the NRC will prepare and issue the record of decision, which is a concise, publicly available statement that documents the agency's decision, as informed by the final SEIS and final safety evaluation report. The requirements for a record of decision are described in § 51.103, and include stating the NRC's decision (e.g., the approval or disapproval of the license renewal application), identifying the alternatives (including the proposed action) considered by the agency, and a statement as to whether the NRC has taken all practicable measures within its jurisdiction to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the alternative selected and if not, to explain why those measures were not adopted. Further, the record of the decision will include a determination by the NRC as to whether or not the adverse environmental impacts of license renewal are so great that preserving the option of license renewal for energy

Deleted: Pursuant to

planning decisionmakers would be unreasonable, which is the purpose and need of license renewal. To meet the § 51.102 requirement that the record of decision be a concise document, the NRC staff also will prepare a "Summary Record of Decision," signed by the NRC's Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, that summarizes the presiding officer's initial, or the Commission's final, decision.

B. Rulemaking History

In 1986, the NRC initiated a program to develop license renewal regulations and associated regulatory guidance in anticipation of receiving applications for the renewal of nuclear power plant operating licenses. In 1996, the NRC published a final rule that amended the environmental protection regulations in 10 CFR part 51 to include provisions for applicants seeking to renew an operating license for up to an additional 20 years (61 FR 28467; June 5, 1996). The 1996 final rule was based upon the analyses and findings of a May 1996 NRC environmental impact statement, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants," NUREG-1437 (the "1996 LR GEIS").

Based upon the findings of the 1996 LR GEIS, the 1996 final rule identified those license renewal environmental issues for which a generic analysis had been determined to be appropriate (Category 1 issues). Similarly, based upon the findings of the 1996 LR GEIS, the 1996 final rule identified those environmental impacts for which a site- or plant-specific analysis was required, both by the applicant in its environmental report and by the NRC in its SEIS (Category 2 issues). The 1996 final rule, among other amendments to 10 CFR part 51, added appendix B to subpart A of 10 CFR part 51, "Environmental Effect of Renewing the Operating License of a Nuclear Power Plant."

Appendix B included Table B-1 which summarized and codified the findings of the 1996 LR GEIS.

In preparing the 1996 LR GEIS, the Commission based its generic assessment on the following factors:

(1) License renewal will involve nuclear power plants for which the environmental impacts of operation are well understood as a result of lessons learned and knowledge gained from operating experience and completed license renewals.

(2) Activities associated with license renewal are expected to be within this range of operating experience; thus, environmental impacts can be reasonably predicted.

(3) Changes in the environment around nuclear power plants are gradual and predictable.

The 1996 LR GEIS improved the efficiency of the license renewal process in the following ways: (1) providing an evaluation of the types of environmental impacts that may occur from renewing commercial nuclear power plant operating licenses, (2) identifying and assessing impacts that are expected to be generic (i.e., the same or similar) at all nuclear power plants or plants with specified plant or site characteristics, and (3) defining the number and scope of environmental impacts that need to be addressed in plant-specific SEISs to the 1996 LR GEIS.

A Category 1 issue is an issue that meets the following criteria: (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 characteristic; (2) a single significance level (i.e., small, moderate, or large) has been assigned to the impacts (except for certain issues discussed below in more detail); and (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. A Category 2 issue is defined as an issue where one or more of Category 1 criteria cannot be met, and therefore, additional plant-specific review is required.

As stated in the 1996 final rule, the NRC recognized that environmental issues might change over time and that additional issues may need to be considered. As further stated in the introductory text to Table B-1, the NRC indicated that it intended to review the material in Table B-1 on a 10-year basis.

On December 18, 1996 (61 FR 66537), the NRC amended the 1996 final rule to incorporate minor clarifying and conforming changes and to add language omitted from Table B-1.

In 1999, the NRC amended 10 CFR part 51, including Table B-1, to expand the generic findings pertaining to the environmental impacts resulting from transportation of fuel and waste to and from a single nuclear power plant (64 FR 48496; September 3, 1999). This final rule also incorporated rule text consistent with the 1996 LR GEIS to address local traffic impacts attributable to the continued operations of a nuclear power plant during the license renewal term.

In 2013, the NRC completed the first 10-year review and update of the 1996 LR GEIS and published a final rule (78 FR 37281; June 20, 2013) that amended Table B-1 by updating the Commission's 1996 findings on the environmental impacts related to the renewal of nuclear power plant operating licenses and other NRC environmental protection regulations (e.g., 10 CFR 51.53, which sets forth the contents of the applicant's environmental report, 10 CFR 51.75, and 10 CFR 51.95). The 2013 final rule redefined the number and scope of the environmental issues that must be addressed by

the NRC and applicants during license renewal environmental reviews. These changes were primarily based on lessons learned and knowledge gained from license renewal environmental reviews conducted by the NRC since 1996. Together with the final rule, the NRC issued a revised LR GEIS, NUREG-1437 Revision 1 (the "2013 LR GEIS"), as well as Revision 1 of Regulatory Guide (RG) 4.2, Supplement 1, "Preparation of Environmental Reports for Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal Applications," and Revision 1 to NUREG-1555, Supplement 1, "Standard Review Plans for Environmental Reviews for Nuclear Power Plants: Operating License Renewal."

On July 31, 2013 (78 FR 46255), the NRC amended the 2013 final rule to incorporate minor clarifying and conforming changes and revise the statutory authority that was cited in the authority citation for the final rule.

In 2014, the NRC published a final rule titled "Continued Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel" that revised the generic determination regarding the environmental impacts of the continued storage of spent nuclear fuel beyond a reactor's licensed life for operation and prior to ultimate disposal (79 FR 56238; September 14, 2014). The continued storage final rule also made conforming amendments to the determinations of environmental effects of renewing the operating license of a nuclear power plant. These changes addressed issues related to the onsite storage of spent nuclear fuel, both for the license renewal term and for the period after the licensed life for reactor operations, and offsite radiological impacts of spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste disposal. Specifically, the continued storage final rule revised two environmental issues in Table B-1: (1) "Onsite storage of spent fuel" and (2) "Offsite radiological impacts of spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste disposal."

In August 2020, the NRC issued a notice of intent to review and potentially update the 2013 LR GEIS⁴ (i.e., the scoping notice) in the *Federal Register* (85 FR 47252; August 4, 2020). The comment period began in August 2020 and ended in November 2020. The scoping notice provided the public with an opportunity to submit comments and participate in the environmental scoping process, as defined in § 51.26. Specifically, the NRC invited the public to review the results of the NRC staff's preliminary review of the LR GEIS, including a proposal to address SLR in the LR GEIS, and asked the public to provide comments and suggestions for other areas that should be updated. The NRC conducted four webinars where the staff received comments from the public. All comments provided during the 2020 scoping period were considered in preparing the revised draft revised LR GEIS and are publicly available. The official transcripts and the scoping summary report are available as indicated in the "Availability of Documents" section of this proposed rule.

In July 2021, the staff submitted SECY-21-0066, "Rulemaking Plan for Renewing Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses – Environmental Review (RIN 3150-AK32; NRC-2018-0296)," to request Commission approval to initiate a rulemaking to amend Table B-1 and update the 2013 LR GEIS and associated guidance. The rulemaking plan also proposed to remove the word "initial" from § 51.53(c)(3), which, as described above, governs license renewal applicant's environmental reports; this change would have explicitly included applicants for SLR in the section's scope. The plan would have also made corresponding changes to the LR GEIS and the associated guidance.

⁴ Unless stated otherwise, references to the 2013 LR GEIS include the changes made to two environmental issues in Table B-1 as a part of the 2014 Continued Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel final rule. These changes are discussed in Section 1.7.2 of the draft revised LR GEIS.

In February 2022, the Commission issued SRM-SECY-21-0066, “Rulemaking Plan for Renewing Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses – Environmental Review (RIN 3150-AK32; NRC-2018-0296).” The Commission disapproved the staff’s recommendation and directed the staff to develop a rulemaking plan that aligned with the Commission Order CLI-22-03, and recent decisions in Turkey Point, CLI-22-02, and Peach Bottom, CLI-22-04, regarding the NEPA analysis of SLR applications. These orders concluded that the staff did not conduct an adequate NEPA analysis for the SLR period and further stated that the staff cannot exclusively rely on the LR GEIS for Category 1 issues in SLR environmental reviews. The SRM also directed the staff to include in the rulemaking plan a proposal to remove the word “initial” from § 51.53(c)(3) and to revise the LR GEIS and Table B-1 and associated guidance to fully support SLR. The SRM also directed the staff to provide options for a future rulemaking effort regarding the 10-year regulatory update.

In March 2022, the staff submitted SECY-22-0024, “Rulemaking Plan for Renewing Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses – Environmental Review (RIN 3150-AK32; NRC-2018-0296),” to request Commission approval to initiate a rulemaking that would align with the Commission Order CLI-22-03 and recent decisions in Orders CLI-22-02 and CLI-22-04 regarding the NEPA analysis of SLR applications, as well as to remove the word “initial” from § 51.53(c)(3) and to revise the LR GEIS and Table B-1 and associated guidance to fully support SLR. The staff also proposed to update the LR GEIS to consider new technical data from completed environmental reviews, changes to environmental laws and regulations, and other information.

In April 2022, the Commission issued SRM-SECY-22-0024, “Rulemaking Plan for Renewing Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses – Environmental Review (RIN 3150-

AK32; NRC-2018-0296),” approving the staff’s recommendation to proceed with rulemaking.

In April 2022, the staff submitted SECY-22-0036, “Rulemaking Plan for Renewing Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses—10-Year Environmental Regulatory Update (NRC-2022-0087)” that provided options for a future rulemaking effort to incorporate further changes to the LR GEIS as part of the 10-year regulatory update to amend Table B–1. Because the current rulemaking would address all necessary issues, the staff recommended that a future rulemaking for updating the LR GEIS and Table B–1 be deferred, to begin no sooner than FY 2031. The staff further recommended that the current update to the LR GEIS constitute the update for this review cycle.

In June 2022, the Commission issued SRM-SECY-22-0036 approving the staff’s recommendation.

III. Discussion

A. Proposed Amendments

The proposed amendments to 10 CFR part 51 would revise the existing requirements for environmental reviews of applications for a license renewal of operating nuclear power plants. The proposed amendments would codify the updated generic conclusions of the draft revised LR GEIS for those issues for which a generic conclusion regarding the potential environmental impacts of issuing an initial or subsequent renewed license for a nuclear power plant can be reached. These conclusions have been updated to specifically account for SLR as well as initial LR and other new information since the last LR GEIS update. These issues are identified as Category 1 issues in the draft revised LR GEIS. The Category 1 issues identified and described in the draft LR GEIS may be applied to any initial LR or SLR application for ~~operating~~

Deleted: an

nuclear power plants covered by the LR GEIS and have been determined to have a SMALL impact for all plants or a subset of plants. Table B-1 in appendix B to subpart A of 10 CFR part 51 summarizes and codifies the Commission's findings for all Category 1 issues. The revisions to Table B-1 account for SLR; reflect lessons learned, knowledge gained, and experience from license renewal environmental reviews performed since development of the 2013 LR GEIS; consider changes to applicable laws and regulations; and factor in new scientific data and methodology with respect to the assessment of potential environmental impacts of nuclear power plant license renewal. In addition, the proposed amendments include conforming changes to the provisions of § 51.53(c)(3) and § 51.95. These proposed changes are intended to maintain the relevance of the LR GEIS and ensure that future environmental reviews meet the "hard look" standard to fully account for the environmental impacts of initial LR and SLR, as documented in the draft revised LR GEIS.

Commented [EB1]: Edited to reflect that the current version of the LR GEIS does not cover Vogtle 3 & 4.

B. Environmental Impacts to be Reviewed

In the draft revised LR GEIS, the NRC reevaluated the Category 1 generic findings and determined that many of the environmental impacts of continued nuclear power plant operations and refurbishment during the renewal term (initial LR or SLR) would be SMALL. However, license renewal applicants in their environmental reports and the NRC staff in the SEIS would still need to evaluate whether new and significant information exists that would require a plant-specific analysis for that issue. See Section III.C of this document for a more detailed discussion of the process used in the draft revised LR GEIS.

In the draft revised LR GEIS, the NRC identified a total of 80 environmental issues that may be associated with operation and refurbishment during the renewal

term. Chapter 4 of the draft revised LR GEIS describes the impact findings and impact significance level of SMALL, MODERATE, or LARGE, or a range where applicable, for each Category 1 and Category 2 issue. Of the 80 issues, the NRC identified 59 environmental issues as Category 1 issues. Applicants and the NRC staff would be required to rely on the generic finding for each Category 1 issue as supported by the analysis in the draft revised LR GEIS, which would be codified in the proposed Table B-1.

The draft revised LR GEIS identifies 20 environmental issues as Category 2 issues. These issues cannot be evaluated generically and must be evaluated by the applicant, in its environmental report, and the NRC staff, in the draft SEIS, using plant-specific information. For example, for the issue, "Surface water use conflicts (plants with cooling ponds or cooling towers using makeup water from a river)," the staff found in the draft revised LR GEIS that impacts could be of small or moderate significance based on site-specific factors that exacerbate consumptive water use by a nuclear power plant. The factors include increased water demand due to population growth; changes in water demand by industrial, agricultural, or other users of the same water source; drought and river low-flow conditions, and reduced water availability over time due to climate change. Therefore, the potential for water use conflicts must be addressed on a plant-specific basis.

For one environmental issue, "Electromagnetic fields (EMF)," the draft revised LR GEIS identified the category as "N/A" (not applicable). Studies of 60-Hz EMFs have not uncovered consistent evidence linking harmful effects with field exposures. Because the state of the science is currently inadequate, no generic conclusion on human health impacts is possible. If, in the future, the Commission finds that a general agreement has been reached by appropriate Federal health agencies that there are adverse health

effects from EMFs, the Commission will then treat this issue in a manner similar to a Category 2 issue and require applicants to submit plant-specific reviews of these health effects in their environmental report. Until such time, applicants are not required to submit information on this issue.

C. Draft Revised Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants

This revision evaluates the environmental issues and findings of the 2013 LR GEIS and updates the analysis and assumptions to fully support both initial LR and SLR. Lessons learned, knowledge gained, and experience from license renewal environmental reviews performed by the NRC since development of the 2013 LR GEIS provided a significant source of new information for this assessment. This review included an examination of previous site-specific considerations of potential new and significant information for Category 1 issues. In addition, new scientific research, changes in environmental regulations and impact methodology, and other new information were considered in evaluating the significance of impacts associated with initial LR and SLR. Public comments on previous plant-specific license renewal reviews were analyzed to assess the existing environmental issues and identify new ones. The purpose of this evaluation was to review the findings presented in the 2013 LR GEIS and to ensure that the analysis and assumptions support SLR environmental reviews. In doing so, the NRC considered the need to modify, add to, or delete any of the 78 environmental issues in the 2013 LR GEIS and codified in Table B-1. After this evaluation, the staff identified 80 impact issues for detailed consideration in this draft LR GEIS revision. No environmental issues identified in Table B-1 and evaluated in the 2013 LR GEIS were eliminated, but certain issues were consolidated, and one issue was

subdivided into three separate issues. Two new Category 2 issues and one new Category 1 issue were added.

Environmental issues in the draft revised LR GEIS are arranged by resource area in the same manner as the 2013 LR GEIS. In the draft revised LR GEIS, the environmental impacts of continued nuclear power plant operations during the license renewal term (initial LR or SLR) and associated refurbishment activities are addressed in each resource area. This analysis provides the technical basis for the 80 identified environmental issues. Additionally, the NRC staff also considered a range of replacement energy alternatives to the proposed action (license renewal) as described in the draft revised LR GEIS. This discussion of potential alternatives will inform the site-specific alternatives analyses in the SEISs. The draft revised LR GEIS considers and evaluates the 80 environmental issues within the context of the following environmental resource (i.e., subject matter) areas: (1) land use and visual resources, (2) air quality and noise, (3) geologic environment, (4) water resources (surface water and groundwater resources), (5) ecological resources (terrestrial resources, aquatic resources, and federally protected ecological resources), (6) historic and cultural resources, (7) socioeconomics, (8) human health (radiological and nonradiological hazards and postulated accidents), (9) environmental justice, (10) waste management and pollution prevention (radioactive and nonradioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel), (11) greenhouse gas emissions and climate change, (12) cumulative effects, and (13) impacts common to all alternatives (uranium fuel cycle and termination of nuclear power plant operations and decommissioning). The proposed rule revises Table B-1 in appendix B to subpart A of 10 CFR part 51 to reflect the changes in the draft revised LR GEIS.

In the draft revised LR GEIS, the general analytical approach used by the NRC staff to evaluate potential environmental impacts was to: (1) describe the nuclear power plant activity or aspect of plant operations or refurbishment that could affect a resource; (2) identify the resource that is affected; (3) evaluate past license renewal reviews and other available information; (4) assess the nature and magnitude of the potential environmental impact on the affected resource for both initial LR and SLR; (5) characterize the significance of the effects; (6) determine whether the results of the analysis apply to all nuclear power plants or to a specific subset of plants—~~that is,~~ whether the impact issue is Category 1 (generic) or Category 2 (plant-specific); and (7) consider additional mitigation measures for adverse impacts. Identification of environmental impacts (or issues) was conducted in an iterative rather than a stepwise manner. For example, after information was collected and level of significance was reviewed, the staff reexamined impacts to determine if any issues should be removed, added, consolidated, or divided.

Deleted: i.e.,

The Commission would like to emphasize that in complying with the NRC's environmental regulations under § 51.53(c)(3)(iv), as required by NEPA, ~~an applicant is,~~ required to provide any new and significant information regarding the environmental impacts of license renewal of which the applicant is aware, including for Category 1 issues and for uncategorized issues. The proposed amendments would not change this requirement.

Deleted: s

Deleted: are

The draft revised LR GEIS retains the 2013 LR GEIS definitions for Category 1 and Category 2 issues. The draft revised LR GEIS discusses six major types of changes to the categorization of issues:

(1) *New Category 1 Issue*: This would be a Category 1 issue not previously listed in the 2013 LR GEIS. ~~An~~ applicant would not need to assess this issue in its

Commented [EB2]: Revised to provide a parallel discussion for the items in this list.

Deleted: The

environmental report. Under § 51.53(c)(3)(iv), however, the applicant is responsible for disclosing in the environmental report any “new and significant information” of which the applicant is aware. If the applicant is not aware of any new and significant information that would change the conclusion in the draft revised LR GEIS, the applicant would be required to state this determination in the environmental report. The NRC has addressed the environmental impacts of these Category 1 issues generally for all plants in the draft revised LR GEIS.

(2) *New Category 2 Issue*: This would be a Category 2 issue not previously listed in the 2013 LR GEIS. For the new Category 2 issue, an applicant would have to conduct an analysis of the potential environmental impacts related to that issue and include it in the environmental report. The analysis must include a discussion of (i) the possible actions to mitigate any adverse impacts associated with license renewal and (ii) the environmental impacts of alternatives to license renewal.

Deleted: the

(3) *Existing Issue Category Change from Category 2 to Category 1*: This would be an issue that was considered as Category 2 in the 2013 LR GEIS and would now be considered as Category 1 in the draft revised LR GEIS. An applicant would no longer be required to conduct a plant-specific analysis on the environmental impacts associated with this issue. Consistent with the requirements of § 51.53(c)(3)(iv), an applicant would only be required to describe in its environmental report any “new and significant information” of which it is aware.

(4) *Consolidation of an Existing Category 1 Issue into an Existing Category 2 issue*: This would be an issue where an existing Category 1 issue in the 2013 LR GEIS has a similar scope as an existing Category 2 issue and has been consolidated into the Category 2 issue. Therefore, for the new, consolidated Category 2 issue, an applicant would have to conduct a plant-specific analysis of the potential environmental impacts

Deleted: the

related to that issue and include it in the environmental report. The analysis must include a discussion of (i) the possible actions to mitigate any adverse impacts associated with license renewal and (ii) the environmental impacts of alternatives to license renewal.

(5) *Consolidation of One or More Existing Category 1 Issues into an Existing Category 1 Issue:* This would be an issue that was considered Category 1 in the 2013 LR GEIS and would remain so. The issue has been revised by consolidating similar aspects of one or more Category 1 issues, in whole or in part, into the existing Category 1 issue and which affect the same environmental resources. Consistent with the requirements of § 51.53(c)(3)(iv), an applicant would only be required to describe in its environmental report any “new and significant information” of which it is aware.

(6) *Subdividing an Existing Category 2 Issue into Multiple Category 2 Issues:* This would be an existing Category 2 issue in the 2013 LR GEIS that has been divided into multiple, new Category 2 issues in order to more clearly address specific categories of environmental resource impacts. For the new, separate Category 2 issues, ~~an~~ applicant would have to conduct analyses of the potential environmental impacts related to each separate issue, as applicable, and include it in the environmental report. The analyses must include a discussion of (i) the possible actions to mitigate any adverse impacts associated with license renewal and (ii) the environmental impacts of alternatives to license renewal.

Deleted: the

D. Proposed Actions and Basis for Changes to 10 CFR Part 51

Appendix B to Subpart A of 10 CFR Part 51

This proposed rule revises the introductory paragraph in appendix B to subpart A of 10 CFR part 51, to indicate the applicability to initial LR and SLR and to update the findings on environmental issues with the data supported by the analyses in the proposed NUREG-1437, Revision 2.

The proposed rule renames the title of Table B-1, “Summary of NEPA Issues for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants,” as “Summary of Findings on Environmental Issues for Initial and Subsequent License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants,” to spell out the applicability to initial LR and SLR environmental reviews.

The draft revised LR GEIS, which is being concurrently issued for public comment, provides a summary change table comparing the 78 environmental issues in the 2013 LR GEIS with the 80 environmental issues in the draft revised LR GEIS. The proposed rule amends Table B-1 to reflect the changes made in the draft revised LR GEIS. As documented in the draft revised LR GEIS, for each of the 80 environmental issues, the scope has been expanded to fully account for the impacts of continued nuclear power plant operations and any refurbishment encompassing the initial LR or SLR term. The changes to Table B-1 are described below:

(i) *Land Use*

(1) *Onsite Land Use*, (2) *Offsite Land Use*, and (3) *Offsite Land Use in Transmission Line Right-of-Ways (ROWS)*—“Onsite land use,” “Offsite land use,” and “Offsite Land Use in Transmission Line Right-of-Ways (ROWS)” are Category 1 issues. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for these issues.

(ii) *Visual Resources*

(4) *Aesthetic Impacts*—“Aesthetic impacts” is a Category 1 issue. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

(iii) *Air Quality*

(5) *Air Quality Impacts*—The proposed rule would rename “Air quality impacts (all plants)” as “Air quality impacts”; it is a Category 1 issue. The proposed rule makes minor clarifying changes and revisions to the order of the topics discussed in the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

Deleted: s

(6) *Air Quality Effects of Transmission Lines*—“Air Quality Effects of Transmission Lines” is a Category 1 issue. The proposed rule would make minor clarifying changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

Deleted: s

(iv) *Noise*

(7) *Noise Impacts*—“Noise impacts” is a Category 1 issue. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

(v) *Geologic Environment*

(8) *Geology and Soils*—“Geology and Soils” is a Category 1 issue. The proposed rule would make minor clarifying changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

Deleted: s

(vi) *Surface Water Resources*

(9) *Surface Water Use and Quality (Non-Cooling System Impacts)*, (10) *Altered Current Patterns at Intake and Discharge Structures*, (11) *Altered Salinity Gradients*, (12) *Altered Thermal Stratification of Lakes*, (13) *Scouring Caused by Discharged Cooling Water*, (14) *Discharge of Metals in Cooling System Effluent*, (15) *Discharge of Biocides, Sanitary Wastes, and Minor Chemical Spills*, and (16) *Surface Water Use Conflicts (Plants with Once-Through Cooling Systems)*—“Surface water use and quality (non-cooling system impacts),” “Altered current patterns at intake and discharge structures,” “Altered salinity gradients,” “Altered thermal stratification of lakes,” “Scouring caused by discharged cooling water,” “Discharge of metals in cooling system effluent,” “Discharge of biocides, sanitary wastes, and minor chemical spills,” and “Surface water use conflicts (plants with once-through cooling systems)” are Category 1 issues. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for these issues.

(17) *Surface Water Use Conflicts (Plants with Cooling Ponds or Cooling Towers Using Makeup Water from a River)*—“Surface water use conflicts (plants with cooling ponds or cooling towers using makeup water from a river)” is a Category 2 issue. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

(18) *Effects of Dredging on Surface Water Quality*—“Effects of dredging on surface water quality” is a Category 1 issue. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

(19) *Temperature Effects on Sediment Transport Capacity*—“Temperature effects on sediment transport capacity” is a Category 1 issue. The proposed rule would make minor clarifying changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

Deleted: s

(vii) *Groundwater Resources*

(20) *Groundwater Contamination and Use (Non-Cooling System Impacts)*—

“Groundwater contamination and use (non-cooling system impacts)” is a Category 1 issue. The proposed rule would make minor clarifying changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

Deleted: s

(21) *Groundwater Use Conflicts (Plants That Withdraw Less than 100 Gallons per Minute [gpm])*—“Groundwater use conflicts (plants that withdraw less than 100 gallons per minute [gpm])” is a Category 1 issue. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

(22) *Groundwater Use Conflicts (Plants That Withdraw More than 100 Gallons per Minute [gpm])* and (23) *Groundwater Use Conflicts (Plants with Closed-Cycle Cooling Systems That Withdraw Makeup Water from a River)*—“Groundwater use conflicts (plants that withdraw more than 100 gallons per minute [gpm])” and “Groundwater use conflicts (plants with closed-cycle cooling systems that withdraw makeup water from a river)” are Category 2 issues. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for these issues.

(24) *Groundwater Quality Degradation Resulting from Water Withdrawals*—

“Groundwater quality degradation resulting from water withdrawals” is a Category 1 issue. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

(25) *Groundwater Quality Degradation (Plants with Cooling Ponds)*—The

proposed rule would combine a Category 1 issue, “Groundwater quality degradation (cooling ponds in salt marshes),” and a Category 2 issue, “Groundwater quality degradation (cooling ponds at inland sites),” and name it “Groundwater quality degradation (plants with cooling ponds).” The combined issue is a Category 2 issue.

Deleted: s

Deleted: s

The two issues are combined because both issues consider the possibility of groundwater quality and beneficial use becoming degraded as a result of the migration of contaminants discharged to cooling ponds. Also, for the first issue, “Groundwater quality degradation (cooling ponds in salt marshes),” the NRC staff found that the issue was relevant to only two nuclear power plants. The combined issue reflects lessons learned and knowledge gained and new and significant information from the Turkey Point SLR review that showed that cooling ponds can impact groundwater and surface water in ways not previously considered. This combined issue also considers the environmental effects of saltwater intrusion and encroachment on adjacent surface water and groundwater quality.

As described in the draft revised LR GEIS, the NRC staff had previously determined that plants relying on cooling ponds in salt marsh settings were expected to have a small impact on groundwater quality. However, new information indicates that the impacts of groundwater quality degradation for plants using cooling ponds in either coastal (salt marsh) settings or at inland sites could be greater than small (i.e., small or moderate), depending on site-specific differences in the cooling pond’s construction and operation; water quality; site hydrogeologic conditions (including the interaction of surface water and groundwater); and the location, depth, and pump rate of any water supply wells contributing to or impacted by outflow or seepage from a cooling pond. Therefore, the combined issue is a Category 2 issue. The proposed rule revises the finding column of Table B-1 accordingly.

(26) *Radionuclides Released to Groundwater*—“Radionuclides released to groundwater” is a Category 2 issue. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

(viii) *Terrestrial Resources*

(27) *Non-Cooling System Impacts on Terrestrial Resources*—The proposed rule would rename “Effects on terrestrial resources (non-cooling system impacts)” as “Non-cooling system impacts on terrestrial resources.” The issue is a Category 2 issue. The proposed rule makes clarifying changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue to more precisely describe the scope of issues and resources considered and for consistency with other ecological resources (e.g., aquatic and terrestrial) issues.

Deleted: s

(28) *Exposure of Terrestrial Organisms to Radionuclides*—“Exposure of terrestrial organisms to radionuclides” is a Category 1 issue. The proposed rule would make minor clarifying changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

Deleted: s

(29) *Cooling System Impacts on Terrestrial Resources (Plants with Once-Through Cooling Systems or Cooling Ponds)*—“Cooling system impacts on terrestrial resources (plants with once-through cooling systems or cooling ponds)” is a Category 1 issue. This issue concerns the potential impacts of once-through cooling systems and cooling ponds at nuclear power plants on terrestrial resources during the license renewal term. Cooling system operation can alter the ecological environment in a manner that affects terrestrial resources. Such alterations may include thermal effluent additions to receiving water bodies; chemical effluent additions to surface water or groundwater; impingement of waterfowl; disturbance of terrestrial plants and wetlands associated with maintenance dredging; disposal of dredged material; and erosion of shoreline habitat.

Thermal effluents discharged from once-through cooling systems and cooling ponds can contribute to localized elevated water temperatures in receiving bodies that may affect the distributions of some terrestrial plants and animals in adjacent riparian or wetland habitats. Thermal effluents to waters of the United States are regulated through

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits to limit the effects of such discharges on the ecological environment. In addition, wetland and riparian plant communities present near nuclear power plants have been influenced by many years of facility operation, and these communities have acclimated to local conditions.

Along with thermal effluents, nonradiological chemical contaminants may be present in cooling system discharges. The NPDES permits also limit the allowable concentrations of contaminants in liquid effluent to minimize impacts on the ecological environment.

Groundwater quality can be degraded by nonradiological contaminants present in cooling ponds and cooling canals. The NRC staff found that this issue was identified only at one operating nuclear power plant, where the movement of hypersaline water did not have discernable ecological impacts.

The impingement of waterfowl at cooling water intakes has been observed at some nuclear power plants. These plants have changed operational procedures, such as periodically cleaning zebra mussels off intake structures, or have changed intake structure designs to minimize impacts on waterfowl.

Maintenance dredging near cooling system intakes or outfalls physically disturb or alter wetland or riparian habitats. Dredging and disposal of dredged material would likely require the nuclear power plant operator to obtain a Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; best management practices and conditions associated with these permits would minimize impacts on the ecological environment.

The NRC determined that the effects of once-through cooling systems and cooling ponds on terrestrial resources would be minor and would neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of populations of plants or animals during the

initial LR or SLR term. The proposed rule would revise the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue to more clearly describe the scope of issues and resources considered and for consistency with other ecological resource issues.

Deleted: s

(30) *Cooling Tower Impacts on Terrestrial Plants*—The proposed rule would rename “Cooling tower impacts on vegetation (plants with cooling towers)” as “Cooling tower impacts on terrestrial plants”; it is a Category 1 issue. This issue concerns the potential impacts of cooling tower operation on terrestrial plants during the license renewal term. Terrestrial habitats near cooling towers can be exposed to particulates, such as salt, and can experience increased humidity, which can deposit water droplets or ice on vegetation; these effects can lead to structural damage and changes in plant communities.

Deleted: s

The NRC determined that the effects of cooling towers on terrestrial plants would be minor and would neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of plant populations during the license renewal term (initial LR or SLR). The proposed rule would revise the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue to more clearly describe the scope of issues and resources considered and for consistency with other ecological resource issues.

Deleted: s

(31) *Bird Collisions with Plant Structures and Transmission Lines*—“Bird collisions with plant structures and transmission lines” is a Category 1 issue. This issue concerns the risk of birds colliding with plant structures and transmission lines during the license renewal term. Tall structures on nuclear power plant sites, such as cooling towers, meteorological towers, and transmission lines, create collision hazards for birds that can result in injury or death.

The NRC determined that the risk of bird collisions with site structures would remain the same for a given nuclear power plant during the license renewal term (initial

LR or SLR). Because the number of associated bird mortalities is small for any species, it is unlikely that losses would threaten the stability of local or migratory bird populations or result in a noticeable impairment of the function of a species within the ecosystem.

The proposed rule would revise the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue to more clearly describe the scope of issues and resources considered and for consistency with other ecological resource issues.

Deleted: s

(32) *Water Use Conflicts with Terrestrial Resources (Plants with Cooling Ponds or Cooling Towers Using Makeup Water from a River)*—"Water use conflicts with terrestrial resources (plants with cooling ponds or cooling towers using makeup water from a river)" is a Category 2 issue. This issue concerns water use conflicts that may arise at nuclear power plants with cooling ponds or cooling towers that withdraw makeup water from a river and how those conflicts could affect terrestrial resources during the license renewal term.

Nuclear power plant cooling systems may compete with other users relying on surface water resources, including downstream municipal, agricultural, or industrial users. For plants using cooling towers, while the volume of surface water withdrawn is substantially less than once-through systems for a similarly sized nuclear power plant, the makeup water needed to replenish the consumptive loss of water to evaporation can be significant. Cooling ponds also require makeup water. Water use conflicts with terrestrial resources, especially riparian communities, could occur when water that supports these resources is diminished by a combination of anthropogenic uses.

The NRC identified water use conflicts with terrestrial resources at only one nuclear power plant. That nuclear power plant operator developed and implemented a water level management plan, which effectively mitigated the effects that downstream riparian communities might experience from the plant's cooling water withdrawals.

The NRC determined that water use conflicts during the license renewal term (initial LR or SLR) depend on numerous site-specific factors, including the ecological setting of the plant; the consumptive use of other municipal, agricultural, or industrial water users; and the plants and animals present in the area. Water use conflicts with terrestrial resources would be small at most nuclear power plants with cooling ponds or cooling towers that withdraw makeup from a river but may be moderate or large at some plants.

The proposed rule would revise the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue to more clearly describe the scope of issues and resources considered and for consistency with other ecological resource issues.

Deleted: s

(33) *Transmission Line Right-Of-Way (ROW) Management Impacts on Terrestrial Resources*—"Transmission line right-of-way (ROW) management impacts on terrestrial resources" is a Category 1 issue. This issue concerns the effects of transmission line ROW management on terrestrial plants and animals during the license renewal term (initial LR or SLR).

Utilities maintain transmission line ROWs so that the ground cover is composed of low-growing herbaceous or shrubby vegetation and grasses. Noise and general human disturbance during ROW management can temporarily disturb wildlife and affect their behaviors. Most nuclear power plants maintain procedures to minimize or mitigate the potential impacts of ROW management. The scope of transmission lines relevant to license renewal include only the lines that connect the nuclear power plant to the first substation that feeds into the regional power distribution system. Typically, the first substation is located on the nuclear power plant property within the primary industrial-use area or other developed portion of the plant site. Therefore, effects on terrestrial plants and animals are generally negligible.

The proposed rule would revise the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue to more clearly describe the scope of issues and resources considered and for consistency with other ecological resource issues.

Deleted: s

(34) *Electromagnetic Field Effects on Terrestrial Plants and Animals*—The proposed rule would rename “Electromagnetic fields on flora and fauna (plants, agricultural crops, honeybees, wildlife, livestock)” as “Electromagnetic field effects on terrestrial plants and animals” for clarity; it is a Category 1 issue. This issue concerns the effects of electromagnetic fields (EMFs) generated by electric transmission lines at nuclear power plants on terrestrial plants and animals, including agricultural crops, honeybees, wildlife, and livestock, during the license renewal term (initial LR or SLR). Studies investigating the effects of EMFs produced by operating transmission lines up to 1,100 kV have generally not detected any ecologically significant impact on terrestrial plants and animals. Plants and animals near transmission lines have been exposed to many years of transmission line operation and associated EMFs. The scope of transmission lines relevant to license renewal include only the lines that connect the nuclear power plant to the first substation that feeds into the regional power distribution system. Therefore, the effects of EMFs on terrestrial plants and animals are generally negligible.

Deleted: s

The proposed rule would revise the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue to more clearly describe the scope of issues and resources considered and for consistency with other ecological resource issues.

Deleted: s

(ix) *Aquatic Resources*

(35) *Impingement Mortality and Entrainment of Aquatic Organisms (Plants with Once-Through Cooling Systems or Cooling Ponds)*—The proposed rule would combine a Category 2 issue, “Impingement and entrainment of aquatic organisms (plants with once-through cooling systems or cooling ponds)” and the impingement component of a Category 1 issue, “Losses from predation, parasitism, and disease among organisms exposed to sublethal stresses,” into one Category 2 issue, “Impingement mortality and entrainment of aquatic organisms (plants with once-through cooling systems or cooling ponds).” This issue pertains to impingement mortality and entrainment of finfish and shellfish at nuclear power plants with once-through cooling systems and cooling ponds during the license renewal term. This includes plants with helper cooling towers that are seasonally operated to reduce thermal load to the receiving water body, reduce entrainment during peak spawning periods, or reduce consumptive water use during periods of low river flow.

In the draft revised LR GEIS, the NRC renamed the issue to include impingement mortality, rather than simply impingement. This change is consistent with the EPA's 2014 CWA Section 316(b) regulations and the EPA's assessment that impingement reduction technology is available, feasible, and has been demonstrated to be effective. Additionally, the EPA's 2014 CWA Section 316(b) regulations establish best technology available (BTA) standards for impingement mortality based on the fact that survival is a more appropriate metric for determining environmental impact than simply looking at total impingement. Therefore, the draft revised LR GEIS also consolidates the impingement component of the “Losses from predation, parasitism, and disease among organisms exposed to sublethal stresses” issue, for plants with once-through cooling systems or cooling ponds, into this issue.

Deleted: s

As a result of the 2014 CWA Section 316(b) regulations, nuclear power plants must submit detailed information about their cooling water intake systems as part of NPDES permit renewal applications to inform the permitting authority's BTA determination. Some nuclear power plants have received final BTA determinations under the 2013 CWA Section 316(b) regulations. Many others have submitted the required information and are awaiting final determinations. The NRC expects that most operating nuclear power plants will have final BTA determinations within the next several years.

When available, the NRC relies on the expertise and authority of the NPDES permitting authority with respect to the impacts of impingement mortality and entrainment. Therefore, if the NPDES permitting authority has made BTA determinations for a nuclear power plant pursuant to CWA Section 316(b) and that plant has implemented any associated requirements or those requirements would be implemented before the license renewal period, then the NRC assumes that adverse impacts on the aquatic environment would be minimized. In such cases, the NRC concludes that the impacts of either impingement mortality, entrainment, or both would generally be small over the course of the initial LR or SLR term. In cases where the NPDES permitting authority has not made BTA determinations, the NRC analyzes the potential impacts of impingement mortality, entrainment, or both using a weight-of-evidence approach and determines the level of impact (small, moderate, or large) that the aquatic environment is likely to experience over the course of the license renewal term.

The potential effects of impingement mortality and entrainment during the license renewal term depend on numerous plant-specific factors, including the ecological setting of the plant; the characteristics of the cooling system; and the characteristics of the fish,

shellfish, and other aquatic organisms present in the area (e.g., life history, distribution, population trends, management objectives, etc.). Additionally, whether the NPDES permitting authority has made BTA determinations pursuant to CWA Section 316(b) and whether the nuclear power plant operator has implemented any associated requirements is also a relevant factor.

(36) *Impingement Mortality and Entrainment of Aquatic Organisms (Plants with Cooling Towers)*—The proposed rule would combine a Category 1 issue, “Impingement and entrainment of aquatic organisms (plants with cooling towers),” and the impingement component of a Category 1 issue, “Losses from predation, parasitism, and disease among organisms exposed to sublethal stresses,” into one Category 1 issue, “Impingement mortality and entrainment of aquatic organisms (plants with cooling towers).” The issue pertains to impingement mortality and entrainment of finfish and shellfish at nuclear power plants with cooling towers that operate on a fully closed-cycle mode.

In the draft revised LR GEIS, the NRC changed the title of this issue to include impingement mortality, rather than simply impingement. This change is consistent with the EPA’s 2014 CWA Section 316(b) regulations and because assessing survival of impinged organisms is a more appropriate metric for determining environmental impact than simply looking at total impingement. Therefore, this draft revised LR GEIS also consolidates into this issue the impingement component of the issue of “Losses from predation, parasitism, and disease among organisms exposed to sublethal stresses,” for plants with cooling towers.

In the 2013 LR GEIS, the NRC found that that impingement and entrainment of finfish and shellfish at plants with cooling towers operated in a fully closed-cycle mode did not result in noticeable effects on finfish or shellfish populations within source water

Deleted: s

bodies, and this impact was not expected to be an issue during the license renewal term. This finding is further supported by the EPA's 2014 CWA Section 316(b) regulations for existing facilities, which state that the operation of a closed-cycle recirculating system is an essentially preapproved technology for achieving impingement mortality BTA.

The 2013 LR GEIS considered that impingement may result in sublethal effects that could increase the susceptibility of fish or finfish to predation, disease, or parasitism. However, only once-through cooling systems were anticipated to be of concern for this issue as the lower volume of water required by nuclear power plants with cooling towers that operate in a fully closed-cycle mode would minimize this potential effect. The NRC does not expect secondary effects of impingement to be of concern during the license renewal term at nuclear power plants with cooling towers, and sublethal effects of entrainment do not apply.

In considering the effects of impingement mortality and entrainment of closed-cycle cooling systems on aquatic ecology, the NRC evaluated the same issues that were evaluated for nuclear power plants with once-through cooling systems or cooling ponds. No significant impacts on aquatic populations have been reported at any existing nuclear power plants with cooling towers operating in a closed-cycle mode. As part of obtaining BTA determinations under CWA 316(b), permitting authorities may require some nuclear power plant licensees to implement additional plant-specific controls to reduce impingement mortality and entrainment. Implementation of such controls would further reduce or mitigate impingement mortality and entrainment during the license renewal term. The NRC determined that the impacts of impingement mortality and entrainment on aquatic organisms during the license renewal term (initial LR or SLR) would be small for nuclear power plants with cooling towers operated in a fully closed-cycle mode.

Therefore, the combined issue is a Category 1 issue. The proposed rule would revise the finding column of Table B-1 accordingly.

Deleted: s

(37) *Entrainment of Phytoplankton and Zooplankton*—The proposed rule would rename “Entrainment of phytoplankton and zooplankton (all plants)” as “Entrainment of phytoplankton and zooplankton”; it is a Category 1 issue. The NRC found that the effects of entrainment of phytoplankton and zooplankton would be minor and would neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of populations of these organisms in source water bodies during the license renewal term (initial LR or SLR) of any nuclear power plants. As part of obtaining the BTA entrainment determinations under Section 316(b) of the CWA (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), permitting authorities may require some nuclear power plants to implement additional site-specific controls to reduce entrainment. Implementation of such controls would further reduce or mitigate entrainment of phytoplankton and zooplankton.

Deleted: s

Deleted: best technology available

The proposed rule would revise the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue to clarify the scope of issues and resources considered and indicate that the entrainment of phytoplankton and zooplankton would be mitigated through adherence to NPDES permit conditions established pursuant to CWA Section 316(b).

Deleted: s

(38) *Effects of Thermal Effluents on Aquatic Organisms (Plants with Once-Through Cooling Systems or Cooling Ponds)*—The proposed rule would rename “Thermal impacts on aquatic organisms (plants with once-through cooling systems or cooling ponds)” as “Effects of thermal effluents on aquatic organisms (plants with once-through cooling systems or cooling ponds)” for clarity and consistency with other ecological resource titles; it is a Category 2 issue.

Deleted: s

This issue pertains to acute, sublethal, and community-level effects of thermal effluents on finfish and shellfish from operation of nuclear power plants with once-

through cooling systems and cooling ponds during the license renewal term (initial LR or SLR). The NRC determined that the effects of thermal effluents on aquatic organisms would be small at many nuclear power plants with once-through cooling systems or ponds, but that these impacts could be moderate or large at some plants. The potential effects of thermal effluent discharges depend on numerous site-specific factors, including the ecological setting of the plant, the characteristics of the cooling system and effluent discharges, and the characteristics of the fish, shellfish, and other aquatic organisms present in the area. Additionally, whether the NPDES permitting authority has granted a CWA Section 316(a) variance is also a relevant factor.

The proposed rule would revise the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue to clarify the scope of issues and resources considered and for consistency with other ecological resources issues.

Deleted: s

(39) *Effects of Thermal Effluents on Aquatic Organisms (Plants with Cooling Towers)*—The proposed rule would rename “Thermal impacts on aquatic organisms (plants with cooling towers)” as “Effects of thermal effluents on aquatic organisms (plants with cooling towers)” for clarity and consistency with other ecological resource issue titles; it is a Category 1 issue.

Deleted: s

This issue pertains to acute, sublethal, and community-level effects of thermal effluents on finfish and shellfish from operation of nuclear power plants with cooling towers operated in a fully closed-cycle mode. The NRC found that the effects of thermal effluents on aquatic organisms at plants with cooling towers would be minor and would neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attributes of aquatic populations in receiving water bodies. As part of obtaining a variance under CWA Section 316(a), permitting authorities may impose conditions concerning thermal effluent discharges at

some nuclear power plants. Implementation of such conditions would further reduce or mitigate thermal impacts during the license renewal term (initial LR or SLR).

The proposed rule would revise the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue to clarify the scope of issues and resources considered and for consistency with other ecological resources issues.

Deleted: s

(40) *Infrequently Reported Effects of Thermal Effluents*—The proposed rule would combine two Category 1 issues, “Infrequently reported thermal impacts (all plants)” and “Effects of cooling water discharge on dissolved oxygen, gas supersaturation, and eutrophication,” with the thermal effluent component of a Category 1 issue, “Losses from predation, parasitism, and disease among organisms exposed to sublethal stresses,” into one Category 1 issue, “Infrequently reported effects of thermal effluents.” This issue pertains to interrelated and infrequently reported effects of thermal effluents, to include cold shock, thermal migration barriers, accelerated maturation of aquatic insects, and proliferated growth of aquatic nuisance species, as well as the effects of thermal effluents on dissolved oxygen, gas supersaturation, and eutrophication. This issue also considers sublethal stresses associated with thermal effluents that can increase the susceptibility of exposed organisms to predation, parasitism, or disease. As discussed below, these effects are not a concern for license renewal.

Deleted: s

At nuclear power plants, cold shock can occur during refueling outages, reductions in power generation level, or other situations that would quickly reduce the amount of cooling capacity required at the plant. The 1996 LR GEIS reported that cold shock events have only rarely occurred at nuclear power plants. No cold shock events have been reported since the events described in the 1996 LR GEIS occurred, and no

noticeable or detectable impacts on aquatic populations have been reported at any existing nuclear power plants.

Thermal effluents have the potential to create migration barriers if the thermal plume covers an extensive cross-sectional area of a river and temperatures within the plume exceed a species' physiological tolerance limit. This impact has been examined at several nuclear power plants, but it has not been determined to result in observable effects.

The 1996 and 2013 LR GEISs considered that the heated effluents of nuclear power plants could accelerate the maturation of aquatic insects in freshwater systems and cause premature emergence. The maturation and emergence of aquatic insects are often closely associated with water temperature regimes. To date, thermal effluents of nuclear power plants have resulted in no noticeable or detectable impacts on the life cycles of aquatic insects.

The 1996 and 2013 LR GEISs also considered that heated effluents could proliferate the growth of aquatic nuisance organisms. Aquatic nuisance species are organisms that disrupt the ecological stability of infested inland (e.g., rivers and lakes), estuarine, or marine waters. No noticeable or detectable impacts on aquatic populations have been reported at any existing nuclear power plants related to this issue. The NRC has identified no other concerns about nuisance aquatic organisms associated with nuclear power plant thermal effluents.

Aerobic organisms, such as fish, require oxygen, and the concentration of dissolved oxygen in a water body is one of the most important ecological water quality parameters. The thermal effluent discharges of nuclear power plants have the potential to stress aquatic organisms by simultaneously increasing these organisms' need for oxygen and decreasing oxygen availability. Although the thermal effluents of nuclear

power plants may contribute to reduced dissolved oxygen in the immediate vicinity of the discharge point, as the effluent disperses, diffusion and aeration from turbulent movement introduces additional oxygen into the water. No noticeable or detectable impacts on aquatic populations have been reported at any existing nuclear power plants related to oxygen availability.

Rapid heating of cooling water can also affect the solubility and saturation point of other dissolved gases, including nitrogen, resulting in a state where condenser cooling water becomes supersaturated with gases. Once the supersaturated water is discharged in the receiving water body, dissolved gas levels equilibrate as the effluent cools and mixes with ambient water. This process is of concern if aquatic organisms remain in the supersaturated effluent for a long enough period to become equilibrated to the increased pressure associated with the effluent. If these organisms then move into water of lower pressure too quickly when, for example, swimming out of the thermal effluent or diving to depths, the dissolved gases within the affected tissues may come out of solution and form embolisms (bubbles). The resulting condition is known as gas bubble disease, and fish mortality from gas bubble disease has been observed at one nuclear power plant. That nuclear power plant operator installed a barrier net to prevent fish from entering the discharge canal, and no such events occurred again following implementation of this mitigation. No noticeable or detectable impacts on aquatic populations have been reported at any other nuclear power plants related to gas supersaturation.

An early concern about nuclear power plant discharges was that thermal effluents would cause or speed eutrophication by stimulating biological productivity in receiving water bodies. Several nuclear power plants that conducted long-term

monitoring to investigate this potential effect did not detect any evidence of eutrophication.

Fish and shellfish that are exposed to the thermal effluent of a nuclear power plant may experience stunning, disorientation, or injury. These sublethal effects can subsequently affect an organism's susceptibility to predation, parasitism, or disease. Since the publication of the 2013 LR GEIS, the NRC has determined that thermal effects on aquatic organisms at four nuclear power plants could be small to moderate during the license renewal term. At three of the four plants (i.e., Braidwood, LaSalle, and Turkey Point), these impacts were limited to species confined to cooling pond environments. In the fourth example (Peach Bottom), the adverse effects were found to be confined to a narrow band of shallow water habitat downstream of the discharge canal during the summer months. However, increased susceptibility to predation, parasitism, or disease or predation resulting from exposure to thermal effluent was not found to be responsible for these small to moderate findings. Rather, these effects were attributed to other acute (i.e., heat shock) or community-level effects (i.e., reduced habitat availability or quality and reduced species diversity over time) of thermal effluents evaluated as part of the former Category 2 issue, "Thermal impacts on aquatic organisms (plants with once-through cooling systems or cooling ponds)," which ~~would be~~ renamed in this proposed rule.

As described in the draft revised LR GEIS, the NRC determined that the infrequently reported effects of thermal effluents would be minor and would neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of aquatic populations in receiving water bodies of any nuclear power plants during the license renewal term (initial LR or SLR). As part of obtaining a variance under CWA Section 316(a), permitting authorities may impose conditions through the NPDES permit process concerning thermal effluent

Deleted: has

Deleted: en

discharges at some nuclear power plants. Implementation of such conditions would further reduce or mitigate thermal impacts during the license renewal term. The NRC concluded that infrequently reported effects of thermal effluents during the license renewal term would be small for all nuclear power plants. Therefore, the combined issue is a Category 1 issue. The proposed rule would revise the finding column of Table B-1 accordingly.

Deleted: s

(41) *Effects of Nonradiological Contaminants on Aquatic Organisms*—“Effects of nonradiological contaminants on aquatic organisms” is a Category 1 issue. This issue concerns the potential effects of nonradiological contaminants on aquatic organisms that could occur as a result of nuclear power plant operations during the license renewal term (initial LR or SLR). This issue was originally of concern because some nuclear power plants used heavy metals in condenser tubing that could leach from the tubing and expose aquatic organisms to these contaminants. Heavy metals have not been found to be of concern other than a few instances of copper contamination, and in all cases, the nuclear power plants eliminated leaching by replacing the affected piping.

In addition to heavy metals, nuclear power plants often add biocides to cooling water to kill algae, bacteria, macroinvertebrates, and other organisms that could cause buildup in plant systems and structures. Nuclear power plants typically maintain site procedures that specify when and how to treat the cooling water system with such chemicals and best management practices to minimize impacts on the ecological environment. The NPDES permits mitigate potential effects of chemical effluents by limiting the allowable concentrations in effluent discharges to ensure the protection of the aquatic community within the receiving water body.

The NRC determined that the effects of nonradiological contaminants on aquatic organisms would be minor and would neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any

important attribute of populations of these organisms in source water bodies during license renewal terms of any nuclear power plants. Continued adherence of nuclear power plants to chemical effluent limitations established in NPDES permits would minimize the potential impacts of nonradiological contaminants on the aquatic environment. The proposed rule would revise the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue, to more clearly describe the scope of issues and resources considered and for consistency with other ecological resources issues.

Deleted: s

(42) *Exposure of Aquatic Organisms to Radionuclides*—“Exposure of aquatic organisms to radionuclides” is a Category 1 issue. The proposed rule would make minor clarifying changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

Deleted: s

(43) *Effects of Dredging on Aquatic Resources*—The proposed rule would rename “Effects of dredging on aquatic organisms” as “Effects of dredging on aquatic resources”; it is a Category 1 issue. This issue concerns the effects of dredging on aquatic resources conducted to maintain the function or reliability of plant cooling systems during the license renewal term (initial LR or SLR).

Deleted: s

Any dredging performed would be infrequent and would require the nuclear power plant operators to obtain permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under CWA Section 404. Best management practices and conditions associated with these permits would minimize impacts on the ecological environment.

The NRC determined that the effects of dredging on aquatic resources would be minor and would neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of the aquatic environment during license renewal term at any nuclear power plant. The NRC assumes that nuclear power plant operators would continue to implement site environmental procedures and would obtain any necessary permits for dredging activities. Implementation of such controls would further reduce or mitigate potential

effects. The proposed rule would revise the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue, to more clearly describe the scope of issues and resources considered and for consistency with other ecological resources issues.

Deleted: s

(44) *Water Use Conflicts with Aquatic Resources (Plants with Cooling Ponds or Cooling Towers Using Makeup Water from a River)*—"Water use conflicts with aquatic resources (plants with cooling ponds or cooling towers using makeup water from a river)" is a Category 2 issue. This issue concerns water use conflicts that may arise at nuclear power plants with cooling ponds or cooling towers that use makeup water from a river and how those conflicts could affect aquatic resources during the license renewal term (initial LR or SLR). This issue also applies to nuclear power plants with hybrid cooling systems.

Nuclear power plant cooling systems may compete with other users relying on surface water resources, including downstream municipal, agricultural, or industrial users. Water use conflicts with aquatic resources could occur when water that supports these resources is diminished by a combination of anthropogenic uses. To date, the NRC has identified water use conflicts with aquatic resources at only one nuclear power plant. The NRC concluded that water use conflicts would be small to moderate for this nuclear power plant. The plant operator developed and implemented a water level management plan which successfully mitigated water use conflicts. The NRC has identified no concerns about water use conflicts with aquatic resources at any other nuclear power plant with cooling ponds or cooling towers. The NRC concluded that water use conflicts with aquatic resources would be small at most nuclear power plants with cooling ponds or cooling towers that withdraw makeup water from a river but may be moderate at some plants.

Water use conflicts during the license renewal term (initial LR or SLR) would depend on numerous site-specific factors including the ecological setting of the nuclear power plant; the consumptive use of other municipal, agricultural, or industrial water users; and the aquatic resources present in the area. The proposed rule would revise the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue, to more clearly describe the scope of issues and resources considered and for consistency with other ecological resources issues.

Deleted: s

(45) *Non-Cooling System Impacts on Aquatic Resources*—The proposed rule would rename “Effects on aquatic resources (non-cooling system impacts)” as “Non-cooling system impacts on aquatic resources”; it is a Category 1 issue. This issue concerns the effects of nuclear power plant operations on aquatic resources that are unrelated to the operation of the cooling system. Such activities include landscape and grounds maintenance, stormwater management, and ground-disturbing activities that could directly disturb aquatic habitat or cause runoff or sedimentation.

Deleted: s

Many nuclear power plant operators have developed site or fleet-wide environmental review procedures that help workers identify and avoid impacts on the ecological environment when performing site activities. These procedures generally include checklists to help identify potential effects and required permits and best management practices to minimize the affected area. Proper implementation of environmental procedures and BMPs would minimize or mitigate potential effects on aquatic resources during the license renewal term. Many activities that could affect aquatic habitats would also require nuclear power plants to obtain Federal permits under CWA Section 404, which would include conditions to minimize or mitigate impacts on affected waterways.

The NRC determined that the effects of site activities unrelated to cooling system operation would be minor and would neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of the aquatic environment during the license renewal term of any nuclear power plants. The NRC assumes that nuclear power plants would continue to implement site environmental procedures and would obtain any necessary permits for activities that could affect waterways or aquatic features. The proposed rule would revise the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue, to more clearly describe the scope of issues and resources considered and for consistency with other ecological resources issues.

Deleted: s

(46) *Impacts of Transmission Line Right-Of-Way (ROW) Management on Aquatic Resources*—"Impacts of transmission line right-of-way (ROW) management on aquatic resources" is a Category 1 issue. This issue concerns the effects of transmission line ROW management on aquatic plants and animals during the license renewal term.

The transmission lines relevant to license renewal include only the lines that connect the nuclear power plant to the first substation that feeds into the regional power distribution system. Typically, the first substation is located on the nuclear power plant property within the primary industrial-use area and the in-scope transmission lines for license renewal tend to occupy only industrial-use or other developed portions of nuclear power plant sites. Therefore, effects on aquatic plants and animals are generally negligible.

Most nuclear power plants maintain procedures to minimize or mitigate the potential impacts of ROW management. The NRC determined that the transmission line ROW maintenance impacts on aquatic resources during the license renewal term (initial LR or SLR) would be small for all nuclear power plants. The proposed rule would revise the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue, to more clearly describe the scope of

Deleted: s

issues and resources considered and for consistency with other ecological resources issues.

(x) *Federally Protected Ecological Resources*

(47) *Endangered Species Act: Federally Listed Species and Critical Habitats*

Under U.S. Fish and Wildlife Jurisdiction—The proposed rule would divide a Category 2 issue, “Threatened, endangered, and protected species, critical habitat and essential fish habitat,” into three separate Category 2 issues, for clarity and consistency with the separate Federal statutes and interagency consultation requirements that the NRC must consider with respect to Federally protected ecological resources. When combined, the scope of the three issues is the same as the scope of the former “Threatened, endangered, and protected species, critical habitat and essential fish habitat” issue discussed in the 2013 LR GEIS.

The first of the three issues, “Endangered Species Act: federally listed species and critical habitats under U.S. Fish and Wildlife jurisdiction,” concerns the potential effects of continued nuclear power plant operation and any refurbishment during the license renewal term on federally listed species and critical habitats protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS).

Under the ESA, the FWS is responsible for listing and managing terrestrial and freshwater species and designating critical habitat for these species. Continued operation of a nuclear power plant during the license renewal term could affect these species and their habitat. Listed species are likely to occur near all operating nuclear power plants. However, the potential for a given species to occur in the action area of a

Deleted: s

specific nuclear power plant depends on the life history, habitat requirements, and distribution of the species and the ecological environment present on or near the plant site.

The NRC may be required to consult with FWS under ESA Section 7(a)(2); such consultations are required for license renewal actions that “may affect” federally listed species and critical habitats and to ensure that the actions do not jeopardize the continued existence of those species or destroy or adversely modify those habitats.

The potential effects of continued nuclear power plant operation and any refurbishment during the license renewal term depends upon numerous site-specific factors, including the ecological setting of the plant; the listed species and critical habitats present in the action area; and the plant-specific factors related to operations, including water withdrawal, effluent discharges, and refurbishment and other ground-disturbing activities. Listing status is not static, and FWS frequently issues new rules to list or delist species and designate or remove critical habitats. Therefore, a generic determination of potential impacts on listed species and critical habitats under FWS jurisdiction during a nuclear power plant’s license renewal term (initial LR or SLR) is not possible. The NRC would perform a plant-specific impact assessment for each license renewal environmental review to determine the potential effects on these resources and consult with the FWS, as appropriate. Consequently, this is a Category 2 issue.

(48) Endangered Species Act: Federally Listed Species and Critical Habitats Under National Marine Fisheries Service Jurisdiction—The second of the three issues from the prior Category 2 issue on federally protected species, “Endangered Species Act: federally listed species and critical habitats under National Marine Fisheries Service jurisdiction,” concerns the potential effects of continued nuclear power plant operation and any refurbishment during the license renewal term on federally listed

species and critical habitats protected under the ESA and under the jurisdiction of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).

Under the ESA, NMFS is responsible for listing and managing marine and anadromous species and designating critical habitat of these species. Continued operation of a nuclear power plant and any refurbishment during the license renewal term could affect these species and their habitat. The potential for a given species to occur in the action area of a specific nuclear power plant depends on the life history, habitat requirements, and distribution of that species and the ecological environment present on or near the power plant site. In general, listed species and critical habitats under NMFS jurisdiction are only of concern at nuclear power plants that withdraw or discharge from estuarine or marine waters. However, anadromous listed species under NMFS jurisdiction may be seasonally present in the action area of plants located within freshwater reaches of rivers well upstream of the saltwater interface.

The potential effects of continued nuclear power plant operation and any refurbishment during the license renewal term depend on numerous site-specific factors, including the ecological setting of the plant; the listed species and critical habitats present in the action area; and plant-specific factors related to operations, including water withdrawal, effluent discharges, and refurbishment and other ground-disturbing activities. Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA requires that Federal agencies consult with NMFS for actions that “may affect” federally listed species and critical habitats. Additionally, listing status is not static, and NMFS frequently issue new rules to list or delist species and designate or remove critical habitats. Therefore, a generic determination of potential impacts on listed species and critical habitats under NMFS jurisdiction during a nuclear power plant’s license renewal term (initial LR or SLR) is not possible. The NRC would perform a plant-specific impact assessment for each license renewal

environmental review to determine the potential effects on these resources and consult with NMFS, as appropriate. Consequently, this is a Category 2 issue.

(49) *Magnuson-Stevens Act: Essential Fish Habitat*—The last of the three issues from the prior Category 2 issue on federally protected species, “Magnuson-Stevens Act: essential fish habitat,” concerns the potential effects of continued nuclear power plant operation and any refurbishment during the license renewal term on essential fish habitat (EFH) protected under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (i.e., Magnuson-Stevens Act (MSA)).

Under the MSA, the Fishery Management Councils, in conjunction with NMFS, designate areas of EFH and manage marine resources within those areas. Within EFH, habitat areas of particular concern (HAPCs) may be designated if the area meets certain additional criteria. Continued operation of a nuclear power plant and any refurbishment during the license renewal term could affect EFH, including HAPCs. The NRC may be required to consult with NMFS under MSA Section 305(b). In cases where adverse effects on EFH are possible, the NRC has engaged NMFS in EFH consultation as part of the plant-specific license renewal environmental review and obtained EFH conservation recommendations.

The potential effects of continued nuclear power plant operation and any refurbishment during the license renewal term depends upon numerous site-specific factors, including the ecological setting of the plant; the EFH present in the action area, including HAPCs; and plant-specific factors related to operations, including water withdrawal, effluent discharges, and any other activities that may affect aquatic habitats during the license renewal term. Section 305(b) of the MSA requires that Federal agencies consult with NMFS for actions that may adversely affect EFH. Additionally, EFH status is not static. The NMFS and the Fishery Management Councils frequently

update management plans for EFH species and issue new rules to designate or modify EFH and HAPCs. Therefore, a generic determination of potential impacts on EFH during a nuclear power plant's license renewal term (initial LR or SLR) is not possible. The NRC would perform a plant-specific impact assessment as part of each license renewal environmental review to determine the potential effects on these resources and consult with NMFS, as appropriate. Consequently, this is a Category 2 issue.

(50) *National Marine Sanctuaries Act: Sanctuary Resources* ~~–~~ The proposed rule ~~would add this as a new Category 2 issue, “National Marine Sanctuaries Act: sanctuary resources,” to evaluate the concerns of the potential effects of continued nuclear power plant operation and any refurbishment during the license renewal term on sanctuary resources protected under the National Marine Sanctuaries Act (NMSA).~~

Under the NMSA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) designates and manages the National Marine Sanctuary System. Marine sanctuaries may occur near nuclear power plants located on or near marine waters as well as the Great Lakes. Currently, five operating nuclear power plants are located near designated or proposed national marine sanctuaries.

The potential impacts on marine sanctuaries are broad-ranging because such resources include any living or nonliving resource of a national marine sanctuary. With respect to ecological sanctuary resources, potential effects of particular concern include the following: (1) impingement (including entrapment) and entrainment, (2) thermal effects, (3) exposure to radionuclides and other contaminants, (4) reduction in available food resources due to impingement mortality and entrainment or thermal effects on prey species, and (5) effects associated with maintenance dredging. Additionally, the magnitude and significance of such impacts can be greater for sanctuary resources

Commented [EB3]: Edited to use an em dash without a space in place of an en dash with a space in order to be consistent with the rest of this list.

Deleted: –

Deleted: s

because—by virtue of being part of a national marine sanctuary—these resources are more sensitive to environmental stressors. Based on the foregoing, a generic determination of potential impacts on sanctuary resources during a nuclear power plant's license renewal term (initial LR or SLR) is not possible.

Depending on the NRC's effect determinations, the NRC may be required to consult with ONMS under NMSA Section 304(d). The NMSA consultation is required when a Federal agency determines that an action "is likely to destroy, cause the loss of, or injure" a sanctuary resource. Federal actions subject to consultation may be inside or outside the boundary of a national marine sanctuary.

In summary, the potential effects of continued nuclear power plant operation during the license renewal term depends upon numerous site-specific factors, including the ecological setting of the plant; the sanctuary resources present in the action area; and plant-specific factors related to operations, including water withdrawal, effluent discharges, and any other activities that may affect sanctuary resources during the license renewal term. Section 304(d) of the NMSA requires that Federal agencies consult with the ONMS for actions that may injure sanctuary resources. Additionally, national marine sanctuary status is not static. The geographic extent of existing sanctuaries may change or expand in the future, and NOAA is likely to designate new sanctuaries as additional areas of conservation need are identified and assessed. Therefore, a generic determination of potential impacts on sanctuary resources during a nuclear power plant's license renewal term (initial LR or SLR) is not possible. The NRC would perform a site-specific impact assessment as part of each license renewal environmental review to determine the potential effects on these resources and consult with NMFS, as appropriate. Consequently, this new issue is being established as a plant-specific, or Category 2, issue.

(xi) *Historic and Cultural Resources*

(51) *Historic and Cultural Resources*—“Historic and cultural resources” is a Category 2 issue. The proposed rule would revise the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue to make clarifying changes and include a discussion of impacts on cultural resources that are not eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places that would also need to be considered during plant-specific license renewal environmental reviews.

Deleted: s

(xii) *Socioeconomics*

(52) *Employment and Income, Recreation and Tourism*—“Employment and income, recreation and tourism” is a Category 1 issue. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

(53) *Tax Revenue*—The proposed rule would rename “Tax revenues” as “Tax revenue”; it is a Category 1 issue. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

Deleted: s

(54) *Community Services and Education*, (55) *Population and Housing*, and (56) *Transportation*—“Community services and education,” “Population and housing,” and “Transportation” are Category 1 issues. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for these issues.

(xiii) *Human Health*

(57) *Radiation Exposures to Plant Workers* and (58) *Radiation Exposures to the Public*—“Radiation exposures to plant workers” and “Radiation exposures to the public” are Category 1 issues. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for these issues.

(59) *Chemical Hazards*—The proposed rule would rename “Human health impact from chemicals” as “Chemical hazards” for clarity and to reflect the fact that chemicals can have environmental effects beyond human health. Chemical hazards can have immediate human health effects as well as potential environmental impacts from nuclear power plant discharges and chemical spills. This issue is a Category 1 issue. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

(60) *Microbiological Hazards to Plant Workers*—“Microbiological hazards to plant workers” is a Category 1 issue. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

(61) *Microbiological Hazards to the Public*—The proposed rule would rename “Microbiological hazards to the public (plants with cooling ponds or canals or cooling towers that discharge to a river)” as “Microbiological hazards to the public” because this issue is a concern wherever receiving waters are accessible to the public and as changes in microbial populations and in the public use of water bodies might occur over time. Specifically, members of the public could be exposed to microorganisms in thermal effluents at nuclear power plants that use cooling ponds, lakes, or canals and discharge to any waters of the United States accessible to the public. This issue is a Category 2 issue. The proposed rule would revise the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue for clarity and to indicate that thermophilic microorganisms are a concern wherever waters receiving thermal effluents are accessible to the public.

Deleted: s

Deleted: s

Deleted: s

(62) *Electromagnetic Fields (EMFs)*—The proposed rule would rename “Chronic effects of electromagnetic fields (EMFs)” as “Electromagnetic fields (EMFs)” for clarity because this issue considers effects beyond those that are chronic in nature. This issue is an uncategorized issue. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

Deleted: s

(63) *Physical Occupational Hazards*—“Physical occupational hazards” is a Category 1 issue. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

(64) *Electric Shock Hazards*—“Electric shock hazards” is a Category 2 issue. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

(xiv) *Postulated Accidents*

(65) *Design-Basis Accidents*—“Design-basis accidents” is a Category 1 issue. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

(66) *Severe Accidents*—The proposed rule would reclassify the Category 2 “Severe accidents” issue as a Category 1 issue. In the 2013 LR GEIS, the issue of severe accidents was classified as a Category 2 issue to the extent that only alternatives to mitigate severe accidents must be considered for all nuclear power plants where the licensee had not previously performed a severe accident mitigation alternatives (SAMA) analysis for the plant. In the draft revised LR GEIS, the NRC notes that this issue will be resolved generically for the vast majority, if not all, expected license renewal applicants because the applicants who will likely reference the LR GEIS have previously completed a SAMA analysis. The NRC provides a technical basis further supporting this conclusion in Appendix E of the draft revised LR GEIS. Although the NRC does not anticipate any

Deleted: ies

license renewal applications for nuclear power plants for which a previous severe accident mitigation design alternative or SAMA analysis has not been performed, alternatives to mitigate severe accidents must be considered for all plants that have not considered such alternatives.

In license renewal applications, both internal and external events were considered for impacts from reactor accidents at full power when assessing SAMAs. The impacts of all new information in the draft revised LR GEIS were found to not contribute sufficiently to the environmental impacts to warrant further SAMA analysis because the likelihood of finding cost-effective significant plant improvements is small. This further analysis confirms the Commission's expectation that further SAMA analysis would not be necessary for plants that have already completed one.

With regard to the severe accident impact finding, the NRC reviewed information from SEISs for both initial LR and SLR reviews completed since development of the 2013 LR GEIS and identified no new information or situations that would result in different impacts for this issue. The NRC's review of new information determined that the overall risk posed by severe accident is less than originally stated in the 1996 LR GEIS by a significant margin. Therefore, the NRC concluded that the probability-weighted consequences of severe accidents during the initial LR or SLR terms are small. The proposed rule revises the finding column in Table B-1 for this issue to reflect the fact that the probability-weighted consequences of severe accidents remain small.

(xv) *Environmental Justice*

(67) *Impacts on Minority Populations, Low-Income Populations, and Indian Tribes*—The proposed rule would rename “Minority and low-income populations” as

“Impacts on minority populations, low-income populations, and Indian Tribes”⁵ to reflect the scope of environmental justice concerns addressed in this issue. Continued reactor operations during the license renewal term and refurbishment activities at a nuclear power plant could affect land, air, water, and ecological resources, which could result in human health or environmental effects. Consequently, minority and low-income populations and Indian Tribes could be disproportionately affected. The environmental justice impact analysis determines whether human health or environmental effects from continued reactor operations and refurbishment activities at a nuclear power plant would disproportionately affect a minority population, low-income population, or Indian Tribe and whether these effects may be high and adverse.

The NRC determined that environmental justice impacts during the license renewal term (initial LR or SLR) are unique to each nuclear power plant. Therefore, the issue is a Category 2 issue. The proposed rule would revise the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue to add Indian Tribes and subsistence consumption to the scope of the finding and to make other minor clarifications.

Deleted: s

(xvi) *Waste Management*

(68) *Low-Level Waste Storage and Disposal*, (69) *Onsite Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel*, (70) *Offsite Radiological Impacts of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Waste Disposal*, (71) *Mixed-Waste Storage and Disposal*, and (72) *Nonradioactive*

⁵ The term “Indian Tribes” refers to Federally recognized Tribes as acknowledged by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a). Along with minority and low-income communities, environmental justice communities can include State-recognized Tribes, those that self-identify as Indian Tribes, and tribal members. Tribal members can be part of an environmental justice community that has different interests and concerns than a Tribal government.

Waste Storage and Disposal—“Low-level waste storage and disposal,” “Onsite storage of spent nuclear fuel,” “Offsite radiological impacts of spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste disposal,” “Mixed-waste storage and disposal,” and “Nonradioactive waste storage and disposal” are Category 1 issues. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for these issues.

(xvii) *Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change*

(73) *Greenhouse Gas Impacts on Climate Change*—The proposed rule would add a new Category 1 issue, “Greenhouse gas impacts on climate change,” that evaluates the greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts on climate change associated with continued operation and refurbishment. The issue of greenhouse gas emissions on climate change was not considered in the 2013 LR GEIS and is not listed in the current Table B-1. At the time of publication of the 2013 LR GEIS, insufficient data existed to support a classification of the contribution of nuclear power plant GHG emissions on climate change, either as a generic or site-specific issue. The 2013 LR GEIS, however, included a discussion summarizing the life cycle impacts of nuclear power plant GHG emissions and climate change. Furthermore, following the issuance of Commission Order CLI-09-21, the NRC began to evaluate the direct and cumulative effects of GHG emissions and their contribution to climate change in environmental reviews for license renewal applications.

Nuclear power plants, by their very nature, do not combust fossil fuels to generate electricity and, therefore, have inherently low GHG emissions. However, nuclear power plant operations do have some GHG emission sources including diesel generators, pumps, diesel engines, boilers, refrigeration systems, electrical transmission

Deleted: s

and distribution systems, as well as mobile sources (e.g., worker vehicles and delivery vehicles). Any refurbishment activities undertaken at the nuclear power plant site could also produce GHGs due to emissions from motorized equipment, construction vehicles, and worker vehicles. Collectively, these GHG emissions when compared to different GHG emission inventories for other facilities, are minor.

The NRC concluded that the impacts of GHG emissions on climate change from continued operation during the license renewal term (initial LR or SLR) and any refurbishment activities would be small for all nuclear power plants. Therefore, this is a new Category 1 issue.

(74) *Climate Change Impacts on Environmental Resources*—The proposed rule would add this new Category 2 issue, “Climate change impacts on environmental resources,” that evaluates the impacts of climate change on environmental resources that are affected by continued nuclear power plant operations and any refurbishment during the license renewal term. Climate change is an environmental trend (i.e., reflected in changes in climate indicators, such as precipitation, air and water temperature, sea level rise over time) that could result in changes in the affected environment, irrespective of license renewal. The issue of climate change impacts was not identified as either a generic or site-specific issue in the 2013 LR GEIS. However, the 2013 LR GEIS briefly described the environmental impacts that could occur on resources areas (land use, air quality, water resources, etc.) that may also be affected by license renewal. In site-specific initial LR and SLR SEISs prepared since development of the 2013 LR GEIS, the NRC considered climate change impacts for those resources that could be incrementally affected by license renewal as part of the cumulative impact analysis.

Deleted: s

As part of a comprehensive environmental review to meet its obligations under NEPA, the NRC must consider the impacts of climate change on environmental resource conditions that could also be affected by continued nuclear power plant operation and any refurbishment as a result of the proposed action (license renewal). License renewal environmental reviews conducted by the NRC have found that climate change effects on affected resources (e.g., water availability, sea level rise) can be equal to or greater than any direct effects associated with continued nuclear power plant operations during the license renewal term. Observed climate change has not been uniform across the United States. The accrued effects of climate change on environmental resource conditions can vary greatly based on site-specific conditions and thus are plant-specific rather than generic in nature. In support of safe plant operation and in conformance with environmental permitting requirements, nuclear power plant licensees maintain systems and collect meteorological, water temperature, and other data that can inform the NRC's environmental review with respect to the impacts of climate change on environmental resource conditions.

The impacts of climate change on environmental resources that are affected by continued nuclear power plant operations and refurbishment during the license renewal term (initial LR or SLR) are location-specific and cannot be evaluated generically. The effects of climate change can vary regionally and climate change information at the regional and local scale is necessary to assess the impacts on the human environment for a specific location. The NRC would need to perform a site-specific impact assessment as part of each license renewal environmental review. Therefore, this is a new Category 2 issue that cuts across multiple resource areas, similar to the cumulative effects issue, which is currently in Table B-1.

(xviii) *Cumulative Effects*

(75) *Cumulative Effects*—The proposed rule would rename “Cumulative impacts” as “Cumulative effects”; it is a Category 2 issue. The proposed rule would make minor editorial and clarification changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue to be consistent with the definition of cumulative effects as provided in the Council on Environmental Quality’s revised regulation at 40 CFR 1508.1(g)(3).

Deleted: s

Deleted: s

(xix) *Uranium Fuel Cycle*

(76) *Offsite Radiological Impacts—Individual Impacts from Other than the Disposal of Spent Fuel and High-Level Waste*, (77) *Offsite Radiological Impacts—Collective Impacts from Other than the Disposal of Spent Fuel and High-Level Waste*, (78) *Nonradiological Impacts of the Uranium Fuel Cycle*, and (79) *Transportation*—“Offsite radiological impacts—individual impacts from other than the disposal of spent fuel and high-level waste,” “Offsite radiological impacts—collective impacts from other than the disposal of spent fuel and high-level waste,” “Nonradiological impacts of the uranium fuel cycle,” and “Transportation” are Category 1 issues. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for these issues.

(xx) *Termination of Nuclear Power Plant Operations and Decommissioning*

(80) *Termination of Plant Operations and Decommissioning*—“Termination of plant operations and decommissioning” is a Category 1 issue. There are no changes to the finding column of Table B-1 for this issue.

The proposed rule would also revise the footnotes to Table B-1 as follows:

Deleted: s

Footnote 1 would be revised to update the reference to the current revision of the LR GEIS.

Deleted: is

Footnote 2 would be revised to indicate that for the "Offsite radiological impacts of spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste disposal" issue, there is no single significance level to the impact.

Deleted: is

Footnote 7 would be added to indicate that for the "Severe accidents" issue, alternatives to mitigate severe accidents must be considered for all plants that have not already considered such alternatives.

Deleted: is

Section 51.53(c)(3), "Postconstruction Environmental Reports"

The proposed rule would revise the introductory paragraph of Section 51.53(c)(3) to replace the words "an initial" with the word "a" to reflect that the regulation governing postconstruction environmental reports for license renewal applies to applicants seeking either an initial or subsequent renewed license following this update to the LR GEIS.

Deleted: s

Additionally, the proposed rule would revise the phrase "holding an operating license, construction permit, or combined license as of June 30, 1995" to read "for a nuclear power plant for which an operating license, construction permit, or combined license was issued as of June 30, 1995," in order to clarify that Watts Bar Nuclear Units 1 and 2, for which construction permits were issued by that date but are no longer held by the licensee, are within the scope of the LR GEIS. The revised phrasing more clearly indicates that holders of renewed licenses for nuclear power plants that previously held operating licenses, construction permits, or combined licenses within the scope of the LR GEIS remain within its scope during the LR period.

The proposed rule would revise Section 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(B) for clarity and consistency with the methodology in CWA Sections 316(a) and (b), including the 2014 CWA Section 316(b) regulations which establish the BTA criteria based on impingement mortality, rather than total impingement.

Deleted: s

The proposed rule would revise Section 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(D) to delete the words “is located at an inland site and,” to reflect the consolidation of two issues from the 2013 LR GEIS: “Groundwater quality degradation (plants with cooling ponds in salt marshes),” a Category 1 issue, and “Groundwater quality degradation (plants with cooling ponds at inland sites),” a Category 2 issue. The consolidated Category 2 issue in the draft revised LR GEIS, “Groundwater quality degradation (plants with cooling ponds)” reflects new information that cooling ponds can impact water quality at both inland and at coastal sites as a result of the migration of contaminants discharged to cooling ponds.

Deleted: s

The proposed rule would revise Section 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(E) for clarity and consistency with the proposed changes related to Federally protected ecological resources in Table B-1 and the draft revised LR GEIS. The changes in this paragraph correspond to the changes in Table B-1 where a Category 2 issue, “Threatened, endangered, and protected species, critical habitat and essential fish habitat” was divided into three issues, for clarity and consistency with the separate Federal statutes and interagency consultation requirements that the NRC must consider with respect to Federally protected ecological resources. Also included is a change reflecting the addition of a new Category 2 issue, “National Marine Sanctuaries Act: sanctuary resources,” which addresses the NRC consultation requirements under the Act.

Deleted: s

The proposed rule would revise Section 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(G) for consistency with proposed changes to the Category 2 issue, “Microbiological hazards to the public.” The updated finding for this issue states that public health is a concern wherever receiving

Deleted: s

waters associated with nuclear power plant thermal effluents are accessible to the public.

The proposed rule would revise Section 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(K) for clarity and consistency with the specific requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA, including the reference to NEPA, to reflect the requirement that Federal agencies must consider the potential effects of their actions on the affected human environment, which includes aesthetic, historic, and cultural resources.

Deleted: s

The proposed rule would revise Section 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(N) for clarity and consistency with the proposed changes in Table B-1 and the draft revised LR GEIS by adding consideration of Indian Tribes and revises the terminology to refine the scope of environmental justice concerns.

Deleted: s

The proposed rule would revise Section 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(O) for consistency with the revised terminology for “cumulative effects” provided by the Council on Environmental Quality.

Deleted: s

The proposed rule would add a new Section 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(Q), for consistency with the proposed changes in Table B-1 and the draft revised LR GEIS which includes the addition of a new Category 2 issue, “Climate change impacts on environmental resources.” The proposed change addresses the assessment of the effects of changes in climate on environmental resources areas and any mitigation measures implemented by the nuclear power plant operator to address climate change impacts. The new issue was identified to improve the efficiency of reviews, address lessons learned from plant-specific reviews and information provided in public comments, and to reflect analyses already being performed by the NRC staff in environmental reviews, consistent with the Commission direction provided in CLI-09-21.

Deleted: s

Section 51.95, "Postconstruction Environmental Impact Statements"

The proposed rule would revise Section 51.95(c), "Operating license renewal stage," to remove the date of issuance of NUREG-1437. This change is made for clarity and to ensure that the regulation refers to the latest revision of the LR GEIS.

Deleted: s

IV. Availability of Guidance for Comment

The NRC is issuing for comment two revised draft guidance documents, draft regulatory guide (DG), DG-4027, "Preparation of Environmental Reports for Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal Applications,"⁶ and draft NUREG-1555, Supplement 1, Revision 2, "Standard Review Plans for Environmental Reviews for Nuclear Power Plants, Supplement 1: Operating License Renewal," to support implementation of the requirements in this proposed rule. The guidance documents are available as indicated in the "Availability of Documents" section of this document. You may submit comments on the draft regulatory guidance by the methods outlined in the ADDRESSES section of this document.

The DG-4027 has been prepared as a revision to Regulatory Guide (RG) 4.2, Supplement 1, "Preparation of Environmental Reports for Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal Applications." The DG-4027 provides general procedures for the preparation of environmental reports that are submitted as part of an application for the renewal of a nuclear power plant operating license, including SLR, in accordance with 10 CFR part 54, "Requirements for Renewal of Operating Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants," including subsequent license renewals. The revision updates the content for

⁶ Unless stated otherwise, references to RG 4.2, Supplement 1, refer to DG-4027, the draft revision to RG 4.2, Supplement 1, which is being published at the same time as this notice.

environmental reports. The revision also updates the regulatory and technical bases and the criteria for required plant-specific analyses for Category 2 issues and other matters to be addressed in the environmental report, as specified in the proposed amendments to § 51.53(c)(3).

The draft revision of NUREG-1555, Supplement 1, Revision 2, provides guidance for the NRC staff when performing a 10 CFR part 51 environmental review of an application for the renewal of a nuclear power plant operating license, including SLR. The changes in the draft revision to the Standard Review Plan parallel the revisions in DG-4027. The primary purpose of the Standard Review Plan is to ensure that these reviews are focused on the significant environmental concerns associated with license renewal as described in 10 CFR part 51. Specifically, the Standard Review Plan provides guidance to the NRC staff about environmental issues that should be reviewed and provides acceptance criteria to help the reviewer evaluate the information submitted as part of the license renewal application. It is also the intent of this draft Standard Review Plan to make information about the regulatory process available and to improve communication between the NRC, interested members of the public, and the nuclear industry, thereby increasing understanding of the review process.

V. Section-by-Section Analysis

The following paragraphs describe the specific changes proposed by this rulemaking.

10 CFR 51.53, Postconstruction Environmental Reports.

In § 51.53(c)(3), this proposed rule would remove the words “an initial” and add in its place the word “a”, to indicate applicability to initial LR and SLR. Additionally, the proposed rule would revise the phrase “holding an operating license, construction permit, or combined license as of June 30, 1995” to read “for a nuclear power plant for which an operating license, construction permit, or combined license was issued as of June 30, 1995,” in order to clarify that Watts Bar Nuclear Units 1 and 2, for which construction permits were issued by that date but are no longer held by the licensee, are within the scope of the LR GEIS. The revised phrasing more clearly indicates that holders of renewed licenses for nuclear power plants that previously held operating licenses, construction permits, or combined licenses within the scope of the LR GEIS remain within its scope during the LR period.

This proposed rule would revise paragraph (c)(3)(ii)(B) for clarity and consistency with the methodology in Clean Water Act (CWA) Sections 316(a) and (b).

This proposed rule would revise paragraph (c)(3)(ii)(D) to remove the words “is located at an inland site and”, for consistency with proposed consolidation of two issues related to groundwater quality degradation and corresponding updates in Table B-1.

This proposed rule would revise paragraph (c)(3)(ii)(E) for clarity and consistency with proposed revisions to Table B-1.

This proposed rule would revise paragraph (c)(3)(ii)(G) for consistency with proposed revisions to Table B-1 related to the “Microbiological hazards to the public” issue.

This proposed rule would revise paragraph (c)(3)(ii)(K) for clarity and consistency with the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and NEPA.

This proposed rule would revise paragraph (c)(3)(ii)(N) for clarity and consistency with proposed revisions to Table B-1 related to the scope of environmental justice concerns.

This proposed rule would revise paragraph (c)(3)(ii)(O) for consistency with the revised terminology for “cumulative effects” provided by the Council on Environmental Quality.

This proposed rule would add new paragraph (c)(3)(ii)(Q) to include an assessment of the effects of climate change in postconstruction environmental reports.

Section 51.95, Postconstruction Environmental Impact Statements.

This proposed rule would revise paragraph (c) to remove the date “(June 2013)”, to clarify the reference to the current revision of NUREG-1437.

Appendix B to Subpart A—Environmental Effect of Renewing the Operating License of a Nuclear Power Plant

This proposed rule would revise appendix B to subpart A of 10 CFR part 51, to indicate the applicability to initial LR and SLR and to update the findings on environmental issues with the data supported by the analyses in the proposed NUREG-1437, Revision 2.

VI. Regulatory Flexibility Certification

As required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, 5 U.S.C. 605(b), the Commission certifies that this rule, if adopted, will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This proposed rule would only affect

nuclear power plant licensees filing for license renewal applications. The companies that own these plants do not fall within the scope of the definition of “small entities” set forth in the Regulatory Flexibility Act or the size standards established by the NRC (10 CFR 2.810).

VII. Regulatory Analysis

The NRC has prepared a draft regulatory analysis on this proposed regulation. The analysis examines the costs and benefits of the alternatives considered by the NRC. The NRC requests public comment on the draft regulatory analysis. The regulatory analysis is available as indicated in the “Availability of Documents” section of this document. Comments on the draft analysis may be submitted to the NRC as indicated under the ADDRESSES caption of this document.

VIII. Backfitting and Issue Finality

The proposed rule would codify in 10 CFR part 51 certain environmental issues identified in the draft revised LR GEIS. The proposed rule would also revise § 51.53(c)(3) to remove the word “initial.” The NRC has determined that the backfitting rule in § 50.109 and the issue finality provisions in 10 CFR part 52 do not apply to this proposed rule because this amendment does not involve any provision that would either constitute backfitting as that term is defined in 10 CFR chapter I or affect the issue finality of any approval issued under 10 CFR part 52.

IX. Cumulative Effects of Regulation

The NRC is following its cumulative effects of regulation (CER) process by engaging with external stakeholders throughout the rulemaking and related regulatory activities. Public involvement has included (1) the publication of notice announcing information gathering through the public scoping process to support the review to determine whether to update the LR GEIS on August 4, 2020 (85 FR 47252); and (2) four public meetings conducted on August 19, 2020, and August 27, 2020 (two meetings on each day), to receive comments on the scope of the LR GEIS.

The NRC is issuing draft guidance along with this proposed rule to support more informed external stakeholder understanding and feedback. The draft guidance is available as indicated in the “Availability of Documents” section of this document. Further, the NRC will continue to hold public meetings throughout the rulemaking process.

In addition to the questions on the implementation of this proposed rule presented in the “Specific Requests for Comments” section of this document, the NRC is requesting CER feedback on the following questions:

1. If CER challenges currently exist or are expected, what should be done to address them? Please explain your response.
2. Do other (NRC or other agency) regulatory actions (e.g., orders, generic communications, license amendment requests, inspection findings of a generic nature) influence the implementation of the proposed rule’s requirements? Please explain your response.
3. Are there unintended consequences? Does the proposed rule create conditions that would be contrary to the proposed rule’s purpose and objectives? If so, what are the unintended consequences, and how should they be addressed? Please explain your response.

4. Please comment on the NRC's cost and benefit estimates in the draft regulatory analysis that supports the proposed rule. The regulatory analysis is available as indicated in the "Availability of Documents" section of this document.

X. Plain Writing

The Plain Writing Act of 2010 (Pub. L. 111-274) requires Federal agencies to write documents in a clear, concise, and well-organized manner. The NRC has written this document to be consistent with the Plain Writing Act as well as the Presidential Memorandum, "Plain Language in Government Writing," published June 10, 1998 (63 FR 31883). The NRC requests comment on this document with respect to the clarity and effectiveness of the language used.

XI. National Environmental Policy Act

In support of the proposed revisions to 10 CFR part 51 concerning initial LR and SLRs, the NRC prepared draft Revision 2 to NUREG-1437, which is published for comment concurrent with this proposed rule. With regard to the corresponding changes in requirements for applications for initial LR or SLR, the NRC has determined that this is the type of action described in § 51.22(c)(3), an NRC categorical exclusion. Therefore, neither an environmental assessment nor an environmental impact statement has been prepared for this aspect of the proposed rule, as it is procedural in nature and pertains to the type of environmental information to be reviewed.

XII. Paperwork Reduction Act

This proposed rule contains new or amended collections of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C 3501 et seq). This proposed rule has been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for review and approval of the information collections.

Type of submission: Revision

The title of the information collection: 10 CFR Part 51, Renewing Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses – Environmental Review

The form number if applicable: Not applicable

How often the information is required or requested: On occasion.

Environmental Reports are required upon submittal of an application for an operating license renewal.

Who will be required or asked to respond: Applicants for renewal of nuclear power plant operating licenses

An estimate of the number of annual responses: 8.3

An estimated number of annual respondents: 8.3 (5 applicants for future subsequent license renewals and 3.3 applicants for near-term and submitted applications, and issued subsequent license renewals)

An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to comply with the information collection requirement or request: 71,067 hours

Abstract: The NRC is proposing to amend the regulations that govern the NRC's environmental reviews of operating license renewal applications. The NRC's regulations in § 51.53(c) require each applicant for renewal of a license to operate a nuclear power plant under 10 CFR part 54 to submit an environmental report which includes, among

other things, a description of the proposed action, including the applicant's plans to modify the facility or its administrative controls. This proposed rulemaking would codify the generic findings of the LR GEIS, which presents impact analyses for the environmental issues common to many or most of license renewal applications that can be addressed generically, thereby eliminating the need to repeatedly reproduce the same analyses each time a license renewal application is submitted. The NRC's regulations in § 51.53(c) require each applicant to prepare and submit a report entitled "Applicant's Environmental Report—Operating License Renewal Stage," with the applicant's license renewal application. The information provided by the applicant in the environmental report helps the NRC meet its regulatory obligations consistent with Section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended. The proposed rule would increase burden on an applicant because several proposed changes to Table B-1 (e.g., new Category 1 and 2 issues, consolidation of Category 1 issues into Category 2 issues, and dividing an existing Category 2 issue into multiple Category 2 issues) would require the applicant to evaluate such issues on a site-specific basis and provide this information in the environmental report.

The NRC is seeking public comment on the potential impact of the information collection contained in this proposed rule and on the following issues:

1. Is the proposed information collection necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the NRC, including whether the information will have practical utility? Please explain your response.

2. Is the estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection accurate? Please explain your response.

3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected? Please explain your response.

4. How can the burden of the proposed information collection on respondents be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology? Please explain your response.

A copy of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) clearance package and proposed rule is available in ADAMS under Accession No. ML22208A002 or may be obtained free of charge by contacting the NRC's Public Document Room reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, at 301-415-4737, or by email to PDR.Resource@nrc.gov. You may obtain information and comment submissions related to the OMB clearance package by searching on <https://www.regulations.gov> under Docket ID NRC-2018-0296.

You may submit comments on any aspect of these proposed information collections, including suggestions for reducing the burden and on the above issues, by the following methods:

- **Federal Rulemaking Website:** Go to <https://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID NRC-2018-0296.
- **Mail comments to:** FOIA, Library, and Information Collections Branch, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Mail Stop: T6-A10M, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001 or to the OMB reviewer at OMB Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150-0021), Attn: Desk Officer for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 725 17th Street NW, Washington, DC 20503; email: oir_submission@omb.eop.gov.

Submit comments by **[INSERT DATE 30 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE *FEDERAL REGISTER*]**. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but the NRC is able to ensure consideration only for comments received on or before this date.

Commented [EB4]: Staff should verify the accession number for this.

Deleted: 20

Deleted: 101

Public Protection Notification

The NRC may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless the document requesting or requiring the collection displays a currently valid OMB control number.

XIII. Voluntary Consensus Standards

The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995, Pub. L. 104-113, requires that Federal agencies use technical standards that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies unless the use of such a standard is inconsistent with applicable law or otherwise impractical. This proposed rule, which amends various provisions of 10 CFR part 51, does not constitute the establishment of a standard that contains generally applicable requirements.

XIV. Public Meetings

The NRC plans to hold public meetings to promote a full understanding of the proposed rule, the draft revised LR GEIS, and associated guidance documents, and to receive public comments.

The NRC will publish a notice of the location, time, and agenda of the meetings in the *Federal Register*, on Regulations.gov, and on the NRC's public meeting website within at least 10 calendar days before the meeting. Stakeholders should monitor the NRC's public meeting website for information about the public meeting at:

<https://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/public-meetings/index.cfm>.

XV. Availability of Documents

The documents identified in the following table are available to interested persons through one or more of the following methods, as indicated.

DOCUMENT	ADAMS ACCESSION NO. / FEDERAL REGISTER CITATION
Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants	
Draft NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants," Volume 1, Revision 2	ML22165A006
Draft NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants," Volume 2, Revision 2	ML22167A060
Draft Guidance Documents	
Draft NUREG-1555, Supplement 1, Revision 2, "Standard Review Plans for Environmental Reviews for Nuclear Power Plants, Supplement 1: Operating License Renewal"	ML22165A070
Draft Regulatory Guide DG-4027, "Preparation of Environmental Reports for Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal Applications" (also referenced as RG 4.2, Supplement 1)	ML22165A072
Proposed Rule Documents	
SECY-22-0109, "Proposed Rule: Renewing Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses – Environmental Review (RIN 3150-AK32; NRC-2018-0296)"	ML22165A004
Draft Regulatory Analysis for the 10 CFR Part 51, Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants	ML22165A008
Draft Supporting Statement for Information Collections Contained in the Renewing Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses – Environmental Review Proposed Rule	ML22208A002
Related Documents	
Revisions to Environmental Review for Renewal of Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses, Final Rule, June 20, 2013	78 FR 37281
Revisions to Environmental Review for Renewal of Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses; Correction, Final Rule, Correcting Amendment, July 31, 2013	78 FR 46255
Continued Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel, Final Rule, September 29, 2014	79 FR 56251

Deleted: XX

Deleted: XXXX

Corrected Transcript for Public Scoping Meeting to Discuss the Review and Potential Update of NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants," August 27, 2020, 1:30 p.m.	ML20296A270
Corrected Transcript for Public Scoping Meeting to Discuss the Review and Potential Update of NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants," August 27, 2020, 6:30 p.m.	ML20296A271
Corrected Transcript for Public Scoping Meeting to Discuss the Review and Potential Update of NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants," August 19, 2020, 1:30 p.m.	ML20296A272
Corrected Transcript for Public Scoping Meeting to Discuss the Review and Potential Update of NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants," August 19, 2020, 6:30 p.m.	ML20296A273
Environmental Impact Statement Scoping Process Summary Report, Review and Update of the Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants (NUREG-1437), June 2021	ML21039A576
Notice of Intent to Review and Update the Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants, August 4, 2020	85 FR 47252
NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants," Volume 1, dated May 1996	ML040690705
NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants," Volume 2, dated May 1996	ML040690738
NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants," Volume 1, Revision 1, dated June 2013	ML13106A241
NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants," Volume 2, Revision 1, dated June 2013	ML13106A242
NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants," Volume 3, Revision 1, dated June 2013	ML13106A244
NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants," Supplement 5, Second Renewal, Regarding Subsequent License Renewal for Turkey Point Nuclear Generating Unit Nos. 3 and 4, dated October 2019	ML19290H346

SECY-21-0066, "Rulemaking Plan for Renewing Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses – Environmental Review (RIN 3150-AK32, NRC-2018-0296)," dated July 22, 2021	ML20364A008
SECY-22-0024, "Rulemaking Plan for Renewing Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses – Environmental Review (RIN 3150-AK32, NRC-2018-0296)," dated March 25, 2022	ML22062B643
SECY-22-0036, "Rulemaking Plan for Renewing Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses – 10-Year Environmental Regulatory Update (NRC-2022-0087)," dated April 25, 2022	ML22083A149
SRM-SECY-21-0066, "Rulemaking Plan for Renewing Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses – Environmental Review (RIN 3150-AK32, NRC-2018-0296)," dated February 24, 2022	ML22053A308
SRM-SECY-22-0024, "Rulemaking Plan for Renewing Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses – Environmental Review (RIN 3150-AK32, NRC-2018-0296)," dated April 5, 2022	ML22096A035
SRM-SECY-22-0036, "Rulemaking Plan for Renewing Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses – 10-Year Environmental Regulatory Update (NRC-2022-0087)," dated June 17, 2022	ML22168A130
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Memorandum and Order CLI-09-21, dated November 9, 2009	ML093070690
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Memorandum and Order CLI-22-02, dated February 24, 2022	ML22055A496
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Memorandum and Order CLI-22-03, dated February 24, 2022	ML22055A521 ML22055A526 ML22055A527 ML22055A533 ML22055A554
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Memorandum and Order CLI-22-04, dated February 24, 2022	ML22055A557

The NRC may post materials related to this document, including public comments, on the Federal rulemaking website at <https://www.regulations.gov> under Docket ID NRC-2018-0296. In addition, the Federal rulemaking website allows members of the public to receive alerts when changes or additions occur in a docket folder. The following actions are needed to subscribe: 1) navigate to the docket folder

NRC-2018-0296, 2) click the “Subscribe” link, and 3) enter an email address and click on the “Subscribe” link.

List of Subjects in 10 CFR Part 51

Administrative practice and procedure, Environmental impact statements, Hazardous waste, Nuclear energy, Nuclear materials, Nuclear power plants and reactors, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

For the reasons set out in the preamble and under the authority of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended; and 5 U.S.C. 552 and 553, the NRC is proposing to amend 10 CFR part 51 as follows:

PART 51– ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION REGULATIONS FOR DOMESTIC LICENSING AND RELATED REGULATORY FUNCTIONS

1. The authority citation for part 51 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Atomic Energy Act of 1954, secs. 161, 193 (42 U.S.C. 2201, 2243); Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, secs. 201, 202 (42 U.S.C. 5841, 5842); National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332, 4334, 4335); Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, secs. 144(f), 121, 135, 141, 148 (42 U.S.C. 10134(f), 10141, 10155, 10161, 10168); 44 U.S.C. 3504 note.

Sections 51.20, 51.30, 51.60, 51.80, and 51.97 also issued under Nuclear Waste Policy Act secs. 135, 141, 148 (42 U.S.C. 10155, 10161, 10168).

Section 51.22 also issued under Atomic Energy Act sec. 274 (42 U.S.C. 2021) and under Nuclear Waste Policy Act sec. 121 (42 U.S.C. 10141).

Sections 51.43, 51.67, and 51.109 also issued under Nuclear Waste Policy Act sec. 114(f) (42 U.S.C. 10134(f)).

2. Amend § 51.53 by:

a. In paragraph (c)(3) introductory text, removing “an initial” and adding in its place “a”;

- b. Revising paragraph (c)(3)(ii)(B);
- c. In paragraph (c)(3)(ii)(D), removing “is located at an inland site and”;
- d. Revising paragraph (c)(3)(ii)(E);
- e. Revising paragraph (c)(3)(ii)(G);
- f. Revising paragraph (c)(3)(ii)(K);
- g. Revising paragraph (c)(3)(ii)(N);
- h. Revising paragraph (c)(3)(ii)(O); and
- i. Adding paragraph (c)(3)(ii)(Q).

Commented [EB5]: Staff should revise the phrase “holding an operating license, construction permit, or combined license as of June 30, 1995” to read “for a power plant for which an operating license, construction permit, or combined license was issued as of June 30, 1995,” in 10 CFR 51.53(c) in order to clearly scope in those licensees that held a construction permit on that date but were issued operating licenses after that date and therefore no longer hold those construction permits (Watts Bar Units 1 & 2). This will also align better with the Principle of Good Regulation of Clarity for the application of this paragraph in subsequent license renewal when the applicant will actually hold a renewed license rather than the expired operating license. Staff should determine whether this change should be accomplished by a revision providing the full text for this paragraph and make the appropriate modifications to the *Federal Register* Notice.

The revisions and additions read as follows:

§ 51.53 Postconstruction environmental reports.

(c) * * *

(3) * * *

(ii) * * *

(B) If the applicant's plant utilizes once-through cooling or cooling pond water intake and discharge systems, the applicant shall provide a copy of current Clean Water Act 316(b) Best Technology Available determinations and, if applicable, a 316(a) variance in accordance with 40 CFR part 125, or equivalent State permits and supporting documentation. If the applicant cannot provide these documents, it shall assess the impact of the proposed action on fish and shellfish resources resulting from impingement mortality and entrainment and thermal discharges.

* * * * *

(E) All license renewal applicants shall assess the impact of refurbishment, continued operations, and other license renewal-related construction activities on important plant and animal habitats. Additionally, the applicant shall assess the impact of the proposed action on federally protected ecological resources in accordance with Federal laws protecting such resources, including but not limited to, the Endangered Species Act, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, and the National Marine Sanctuaries Act.

* * * * *

(G) If the applicant's plant uses a cooling pond, lake, canal, or discharges into waters of the United States accessible to the public, an assessment of the impact of the proposed action on public health from thermophilic organisms in the affected water must be provided.

* * * * *

(K) All applicants shall identify any potentially affected historic and cultural resources and historic properties and assess whether future plant operations and any planned refurbishment activities would affect these resources in accordance with the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and in the context of the National Environmental Policy Act.

* * * * *

(N) Applicants shall provide information on the general demographic composition of minority and low-income populations and communities (by race and ethnicity) and Indian tribes in the vicinity of the nuclear power plant that could be disproportionately affected by license renewal, including continued reactor operations and refurbishment activities.

* * * * *

(O) Applicants shall provide information about other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions occurring in the vicinity of the nuclear power plant that may result in a cumulative effect.

* * * * *

(Q) Applicants shall include an assessment of the effects of any observed and projected changes in climate on environmental resource areas that are affected by license renewal, as well as any mitigation measures implemented at the applicant's plant to address climate change impacts.

* * * * *

§ 51.95 [Amended]

3. In § 51.95, in paragraph (c) introductory text, remove "(June 2013)".

4. Revise appendix B to subpart A of 10 CFR part 51 to read as follows:

Commented [EB6]: Staff should include a revision to paragraph 51.95(c) to change the first sentence from "In connection with the renewal of an operating license or combined license for ..." to read "In connection with the renewal of a license to operate" This will cure the inconsistency with the fact that during the period of extended operation an NPP would be operated under a renewed license rather than an operating license or combined license.

Appendix B to Subpart A of 10 CFR Part 51 – Environmental Effect of Renewing the Operating License of a Nuclear Power Plant

The Commission has assessed the environmental impacts associated with granting a renewed operating license to a licensee for a nuclear power plant for which either an operating license or construction permit was issued as of June 30, 1995. This assessment applies to applications for initial or subsequent license renewal. Table B-1 summarizes the Commission's findings on the scope and magnitude of environmental

Deleted: to a licensee who holds

Commented [EB7]: Edited to clarify that the scope of appendix B covers nuclear power plants for which either an operating license or construction permit was issued as of June 30, 1995, but are currently operated by a licensee holding a renewed license rather than the original operating license.

impacts of renewing the operating license for a nuclear power plant as required by section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended. Table B-1, subject to an evaluation of those issues identified in Category 2 as requiring further analysis and possible significant new information, represents the analysis of the environmental impacts associated with renewal of any operating license and is to be used in accordance with § 51.95(c). On a 10-year cycle, the Commission intends to review the material in this appendix and update it if necessary. A scoping notice must be published in the *Federal Register* indicating the results of the NRC's review and inviting public comments and proposals for other areas that should be updated.

Table B-1—Summary of Findings on Environmental Issues for Initial and Subsequent License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants¹

Issue	Category ²	Finding ³
Land Use		
Onsite land use	1	SMALL. Changes in onsite land use from continued operations and refurbishment associated with license renewal would be a small fraction of the nuclear power plant site and would involve only land that is controlled by the licensee.
Offsite land use	1	SMALL. Offsite land use would not be affected by continued operations and refurbishment associated with license renewal.
Offsite land use in transmission line right-of-ways (ROWs) ⁴	1	SMALL. Use of transmission line ROWs from continued operations and refurbishment associated with license renewal would continue with no change in land use restrictions.
Visual Resources		
Aesthetic impacts	1	SMALL. No important changes to the visual appearance of plant structures or transmission lines are expected from continued operations and refurbishment associated with license renewal.

Air Quality		
Air quality impacts	1	<p>SMALL. Air quality impacts from continued operations and refurbishment associated with license renewal are expected to be small at all plants. Emissions from emergency diesel generators and fire pumps and routine operations of boilers used for space heating are minor. Impacts from cooling tower particulate emissions have been small.</p> <p>Emissions resulting from refurbishment activities at locations in or near air quality nonattainment or maintenance areas would be short-lived and would cease after these activities are completed. Operating experience has shown that the scale of refurbishment activities has not resulted in exceedance of the <i>de minimis</i> thresholds for criteria pollutants, and best management practices, including fugitive dust controls and the imposition of permit conditions in State and local air emissions permits, would ensure conformance with applicable State or Tribal implementation plans.</p>
Air quality effects of transmission lines ⁴	1	<p>SMALL. Production of ozone and oxides of nitrogen from transmission lines is insignificant and does not contribute measurably to ambient levels of these gases.</p>
Noise		
Noise impacts	1	<p>SMALL. Noise levels would remain below regulatory guidelines for offsite receptors during continued operations and refurbishment associated with license renewal.</p>
Geologic Environment		
Geology and soils	1	<p>SMALL. The impact of continued operations and refurbishment activities on geology and soils would be small for all nuclear power plants and would not change appreciably during the license renewal term.</p>
Surface Water Resources		

Surface water use and quality (non-cooling system impacts)	1	SMALL. Impacts are expected to be small if best management practices are employed to control soil erosion and spills. Surface water use associated with continued operations and refurbishment associated with license renewal would not increase significantly or would be reduced if refurbishment occurs during a plant outage.
Altered current patterns at intake and discharge structures	1	SMALL. Altered current patterns would be limited to the area in the vicinity of the intake and discharge structures. These impacts have been small at operating nuclear power plants.
Altered salinity gradients	1	SMALL. Effects of salinity gradients would be limited to the area in the vicinity of the intake and discharge structures. These impacts have been small at operating nuclear power plants.
Altered thermal stratifications of lakes	1	SMALL. Effects on thermal stratification would be limited to the area in the vicinity of the intake and discharge structures. These impacts have been small at operating nuclear power plants.
Scouring caused by discharged cooling water	1	SMALL. Scouring effects would be limited to the area in the vicinity of the intake and discharge structures. These impacts have been small at operating nuclear power plants.
Discharge of metals in cooling system effluent	1	SMALL. Discharges of metals have not been found to be a problem at operating nuclear power plants with cooling-tower-based heat dissipation systems and have been satisfactorily mitigated at other plants. Discharges are monitored and controlled as part of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit process.
Discharge of biocides, sanitary wastes, and minor chemical spills	1	SMALL. The effects of these discharges are regulated by Federal and State environmental agencies. Discharges are monitored and controlled as part of the NPDES permit process. These impacts have been small at operating nuclear power plants.

Surface water use conflicts (plants with once-through cooling systems)	1	SMALL. These conflicts have not been found to be a problem at operating nuclear power plants with once-through heat dissipation systems.
Surface water use conflicts (plants with cooling ponds or cooling towers using makeup water from a river)	2	SMALL or MODERATE. Impacts could be of small or moderate significance, depending on makeup water requirements, water availability, and competing water demands.
Effects of dredging on surface water quality	1	SMALL. Dredging to remove accumulated sediments in the vicinity of intake and discharge structures and to maintain barge shipping has not been found to be a problem for surface water quality. Dredging is performed under permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and possibly, from other State or local agencies.
Temperature effects on sediment transport capacity	1	SMALL. These effects have not been found to be a problem at operating nuclear power plants and are not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.
Groundwater Resources		
Groundwater contamination and use (non-cooling system impacts)	1	SMALL. Extensive dewatering is not anticipated from continued operations and refurbishment associated with license renewal. Industrial practices involving the use of solvents, hydrocarbons, heavy metals, or other chemicals, and/or the use of wastewater ponds or lagoons have the potential to contaminate site groundwater, soil, and subsoil. Contamination is subject to State or U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulated cleanup and monitoring programs. The application of best management practices for handling any materials produced or used during these activities would reduce impacts.
Groundwater use conflicts (plants that withdraw less than 100 gallons per minute [gpm])	1	SMALL. Plants that withdraw less than 100 gpm are not expected to cause any groundwater use conflicts.
Groundwater use conflicts (plants that withdraw more than 100 gallons per minute [gpm])	2	SMALL, MODERATE, or LARGE. Plants that withdraw more than 100 gpm could cause groundwater use conflicts with nearby groundwater users.

Groundwater use conflicts (plants with closed-cycle cooling systems that withdraw makeup water from a river)	2	SMALL, MODERATE, or LARGE. Water use conflicts could result from water withdrawals from rivers during low-flow conditions, which may affect aquifer recharge. The significance of impacts would depend on makeup water requirements, water availability, and competing water demands.
Groundwater quality degradation resulting from water withdrawals	1	SMALL. Groundwater withdrawals at operating nuclear power plants would not contribute significantly to groundwater quality degradation.
Groundwater quality degradation (plants with cooling ponds)	2	SMALL or MODERATE. Sites with cooling ponds could degrade groundwater quality. The significance of the impact would depend on site-specific conditions including cooling pond water quality, site hydrogeologic conditions (including the interaction of surface water and groundwater), and the location, depth, and pump rate of water wells.
Radionuclides released to groundwater	2	SMALL or MODERATE. Leaks of radioactive liquids from plant components and pipes have occurred at numerous plants. Groundwater protection programs have been established at all operating nuclear power plants to minimize the potential impact from any inadvertent releases. The magnitude of impacts would depend on site-specific characteristics.
Terrestrial Resources		
Non-cooling system impacts on terrestrial resources	2	SMALL, MODERATE, or LARGE. The magnitude of effects of continued nuclear power plant operation and refurbishment, unrelated to operation of the cooling system, would depend on numerous site-specific factors, including ecological setting, planned activities during the license renewal term, and characteristics of the plants and animals present in the area. Application of best management practices and other conservation initiatives would reduce the potential for impacts.

Exposure of terrestrial organisms to radionuclides	1	SMALL. Doses to terrestrial organisms from continued nuclear power plant operation and refurbishment during the license renewal term would be expected to remain well below U.S. Department of Energy exposure guidelines developed to protect these organisms.
Cooling system impacts on terrestrial resources (plants with once-through cooling systems or cooling ponds)	1	SMALL. Continued operation of nuclear power plant cooling systems during license renewal could cause thermal effluent additions to receiving waterbodies; chemical effluent additions to surface water or groundwater, impingement of waterfowl, disturbance of terrestrial plants and wetlands from maintenance dredging, and erosion of shoreline habitat. However, plants where these impacts have occurred successfully mitigated the impact, and it is no longer of concern. These impacts are not expected to be significant issues during the license renewal term.
Cooling tower impacts on terrestrial plants	1	SMALL. Continued operation of nuclear power plant cooling towers could deposit particulates and water droplets or ice on vegetation and lead to structural damage or changes in terrestrial plant communities. However, nuclear power plants where these impacts occurred have successfully mitigated the impact. These impacts are not expected to be significant issues during the license renewal term.
Bird collisions with plant structures and transmission lines ⁴	1	SMALL. Bird mortalities from collisions with nuclear power plant structures and in-scope transmission lines would be negligible for any species and are unlikely to threaten the stability of local or migratory bird populations or result in noticeable impairment of the function of a species within the ecosystem. These impacts are not expected to be significant issues during the license renewal term.

Water use conflicts with terrestrial resources (plants with cooling ponds or cooling towers using makeup water from a river)	2	SMALL or MODERATE. Nuclear power plants could consume water at rates that cause occasional or intermittent water use conflicts with nearby and downstream terrestrial and riparian communities. Such impacts could noticeably affect riparian or wetland species or alter characteristics of the ecological environment during the license renewal term. The one plant where impacts have occurred successfully mitigated the impact. Impacts are expected to be small at most nuclear power plants but could be moderate at some.
Transmission line right-of-way (ROW) management impacts on terrestrial resources ⁴	1	SMALL. In-scope transmission lines tend to occupy only industrial-use or other developed portions of nuclear power plant sites and, therefore, effects of ROW maintenance on terrestrial plants and animals during the license renewal term would be negligible. Application of best management practices would reduce the potential for impacts.
Electromagnetic field effects on terrestrial plants and animals ⁴	1	SMALL. In-scope transmission lines tend to occupy only industrial-use or other developed portions of nuclear power plant sites and, therefore, effects of electromagnetic fields on terrestrial plants and animals during the license renewal term would be negligible.
Aquatic Resources		

Impingement mortality and entrainment of aquatic organisms (plants with once-through cooling systems or cooling ponds)	2	SMALL, MODERATE, or LARGE. The impacts of impingement mortality and entrainment would generally be small at nuclear power plants with once-through cooling systems or cooling ponds that have implemented best technology requirements for existing facilities under Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 316(b). For all other plants, impacts could be small, moderate, or large depending on characteristics of the cooling water intake system, results of impingement and entrainment studies performed at the plant, trends in local fish and shellfish populations, and implementation of mitigation measures.
Impingement mortality and entrainment of aquatic organisms (plants with cooling towers)	1	SMALL. No significant impacts on aquatic populations associated with impingement mortality and entrainment at nuclear power plants with cooling towers have been reported, including effects on fish and shellfish from direct mortality, injury, or other sublethal effects. Impacts during the license renewal term would be similar and small. Further, effects of these cooling water intake systems would be mitigated through adherence to NPDES permit conditions established pursuant to CWA Section 316(b).
Entrainment of phytoplankton and zooplankton	1	SMALL. Entrainment has not resulted in noticeable impacts on phytoplankton or zooplankton populations near operating nuclear power plants. Impacts during the license renewal term would be similar and small. Further, effects would be mitigated through adherence to NPDES permit conditions established pursuant to CWA Section 316(b).

Effects of thermal effluents on aquatic organisms (plants with once-through cooling systems or cooling ponds)	2	SMALL, MODERATE, or LARGE. Acute, sublethal, and community-level effects of thermal effluents on aquatic organisms would generally be small at nuclear power plants with once-through cooling systems or cooling ponds that adhere to State water quality criteria or that have and maintain a valid CWA Section 316(a) variance. For all other plants, impacts could be small, moderate, or large depending on site-specific factors, including ecological setting of the plant; characteristics of the cooling system and effluent discharges; and characteristics of the fish, shellfish, and other aquatic organisms present in the area.
Effects of thermal effluents on aquatic organisms (plants with cooling towers)	1	SMALL. Acute, sublethal, and community-level effects of thermal effluents have not resulted in noticeable impacts on aquatic communities at nuclear power plants with cooling towers. Impacts during the license renewal term would be similar and small. Further, effects would be mitigated through adherence to State water quality criteria or CWA Section 316(a) variances.
Infrequently reported effects of thermal effluents	1	SMALL. Continued operation of nuclear power plant cooling systems could result in certain infrequently reported thermal impacts, including cold shock, thermal migration barriers, accelerated maturation of aquatic insects, proliferation of aquatic nuisance organisms, depletion of dissolved oxygen, gas supersaturation, eutrophication, and increased susceptibility of exposed fish and shellfish to predation, parasitism, and disease. Most of these effects have not been reported at operating nuclear power plants. Plants that have experienced these impacts successfully mitigated the impact, and it is no longer of concern. Infrequently reported thermal impacts are not expected to be significant issues during the license renewal term.

Effects of nonradiological contaminants on aquatic organisms	1	SMALL. Heavy metal leaching from condenser tubes was an issue at several operating nuclear power plants. These plants successfully mitigated the issue, and it is no longer of concern. Cooling system effluents would be the primary source of nonradiological contaminants during the license renewal term. Implementation of best management practices and adherence to NPDES permit limitations would minimize the effects of these contaminants on the aquatic environment.
Exposure of aquatic organisms to radionuclides	1	SMALL. Doses to aquatic organisms from continued nuclear power plant operation and refurbishment during the license renewal term would be expected to remain well below U.S. Department of Energy exposure guidelines developed to protect these organisms.
Effects of dredging on aquatic resources	1	SMALL. Dredging at nuclear power plants is expected to occur infrequently, would be of relatively short duration, and would affect relatively small areas. Continued operation of many plants may not require any dredging. Adherence to best management practices and CWA Section 404 permit conditions would mitigate potential impacts at plants where dredging is necessary to maintain function or reliability of cooling systems. Dredging is not expected to be a significant issue during the license renewal term.
Water use conflicts with aquatic resources (plants with cooling ponds or cooling towers using makeup water from a river)	2	SMALL or MODERATE. Nuclear power plants could consume water at rates that cause occasional or intermittent water use conflicts with nearby and downstream aquatic communities. Such impacts could noticeably affect aquatic plants or animals or alter characteristics of the ecological environment during the license renewal term. The one plant where impacts have occurred successfully mitigated the impact. Impacts are expected to be small at most nuclear power plants but could be moderate at some.

Non-cooling system impacts on aquatic resources	1	SMALL. No significant impacts on aquatic resources associated with landscape and grounds maintenance, stormwater management, or ground-disturbing activities at operating nuclear power plants have been reported. Impacts from continued operation and refurbishment during the license renewal term would be similar and small. Application of best management practices and other conservation initiatives would reduce the potential for impacts.
Impacts of transmission line right-of-way (ROW) management on aquatic resources ⁴	1	SMALL. In-scope transmission lines tend to occupy only industrial-use or other developed portions of nuclear power plant sites and, therefore, the effects of ROW maintenance on aquatic plants and animals during the license renewal term would be negligible. Application of best management practices would reduce the potential for impacts.
Federally Protected Ecological Resources		
Endangered Species Act: federally listed species and critical habitats under U.S. Fish and Wildlife jurisdiction	2	The potential effects of continued nuclear power plant operation and refurbishment on federally listed species and critical habitats would depend on numerous site-specific factors, including the ecological setting; listed species and critical habitats present in the action area; and plant-specific factors related to operations, including water withdrawal, effluent discharges, and other ground-disturbing activities. Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under Endangered Species Act Section 7(a)(2) would be required if license renewal may affect listed species or critical habitats under this agency's jurisdiction.

Endangered Species Act: federally listed species and critical habitats under National Marine Fisheries Service jurisdiction	2	The potential effects of continued nuclear power plant operation and refurbishment on federally listed species and critical habitats would depend on numerous site-specific factors, including the ecological setting; listed species and critical habitats present in the action area; and plant-specific factors related to operations, including water withdrawal, effluent discharges, and other ground-disturbing activities. Consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service under Endangered Species Act Section 7(a)(2) would be required if license renewal may affect listed species or critical habitats under this agency's jurisdiction.
Magnuson-Stevens Act: essential fish habitat	2	The potential effects of continued nuclear power plant operation and refurbishment on essential fish habitat would depend on numerous site-specific factors, including the ecological setting; essential fish habitat present in the area, including habitats of particular concern; and plant-specific factors related to operations, including water withdrawal, effluent discharges, and other activities that may affect aquatic habitats. Consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service under Magnuson-Stevens Act Section 305(b) would be required if license renewal could result in adverse effects to essential fish habitat.
National Marine Sanctuaries Act: sanctuary resources	2	The potential effects of continued nuclear power plant operation and refurbishment on sanctuary resources would depend on numerous site-specific factors, including the ecological setting; national marine sanctuaries present in the area, and plant-specific factors related to operations, including water withdrawal, effluent discharges, and other activities that may affect aquatic habitats. Consultation with the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries under National Marine Sanctuaries Act Section 304(d) would be required if license renewal could destroy, cause the loss of, or injure sanctuary resources.

Historic and Cultural Resources		
Historic and cultural resources ⁴	2	Impacts from continued operations and refurbishment on historic and cultural resources located onsite and in the transmission line ROW are analyzed on a plant-specific basis. The NRC will perform a National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 review, in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800 which includes consultation with the State and Tribal Historic Preservation Officers, Indian Tribes, and other interested parties.
Socioeconomics		
Employment and income, recreation and tourism	1	SMALL. Although most nuclear plants have large numbers of employees with higher than average wages and salaries, employment, income, recreation, and tourism impacts from continued operations and refurbishment associated with license renewal are expected to be small.
Tax revenue	1	SMALL. Nuclear plants provide tax revenue to local jurisdictions in the form of property tax payments, payments in lieu of tax (PILOT), or tax payments on energy production. The amount of tax revenue paid during the license renewal term as a result of continued operations and refurbishment associated with license renewal is not expected to change.
Community services and education	1	SMALL. Changes resulting from continued operations and refurbishment associated with license renewal to local community and educational services would be small. With little or no change in employment at the licensee's plant, value of the power plant, payments on energy production, and PILOT payments expected during the license renewal term, community and educational services would not be affected by continued power plant operations.

Population and housing	1	SMALL. Changes resulting from continued operations and refurbishment associated with license renewal to regional population and housing availability and value would be small. With little or no change in employment at the licensee's plant expected during the license renewal term, population and housing availability and values would not be affected by continued power plant operations.
Transportation	1	SMALL. Changes resulting from continued operations and refurbishment associated with license renewal to traffic volumes would be small.
Human Health		
Radiation exposures to plant workers	1	SMALL. Occupational doses from continued operations and refurbishment associated with license renewal are expected to be within the range of doses experienced during the current license term, and would continue to be well below regulatory limits.
Radiation exposures to the public	1	SMALL. Radiation doses to the public from continued operations and refurbishment associated with license renewal are expected to continue at current levels and would be well below regulatory limits.
Chemical hazards	1	SMALL. Chemical hazards to plant workers resulting from continued operations and refurbishment associated with license renewal are expected to be minimized by the licensee implementing good industrial hygiene practices as required by permits and Federal and State regulations. Chemical releases to the environment and the potential for impacts to the public are expected to be minimized by adherence to discharge limitations of NPDES and other permits.
Microbiological hazards to plant workers	1	SMALL. Occupational health impacts are expected to be controlled by continued application of accepted industrial hygiene practices to minimize worker exposures as required by permits and Federal and State regulations.

Microbiological hazards to the public	2	SMALL, MODERATE, or LARGE. These microorganisms are not expected to be a problem at most operating plants except possibly at plants using cooling ponds, lakes, canals, or that discharge to waters of the United States accessible to the public. Impacts would depend on site-specific characteristics.
Electromagnetic fields (EMFs) ⁶	N/A ⁵	Uncertain impact. Studies of 60-Hz EMFs have not uncovered consistent evidence linking harmful effects with field exposures. EMFs are unlike other agents that have a toxic effect (e.g., toxic chemicals and ionizing radiation) in that dramatic acute effects cannot be forced and longer-term effects, if real, are subtle. Because the state of the science is currently inadequate, no generic conclusion on human health impacts is possible.
Physical occupational hazards	1	SMALL. Occupational safety and health hazards are generic to all types of electrical generating stations, including nuclear power plants, and are of small significance if the workers adhere to safety standards and use protective equipment as required by Federal and State regulations.
Electric shock hazards ⁴	2	SMALL, MODERATE, or LARGE. Electrical shock potential is of small significance for transmission lines that are operated in adherence with the National Electrical Safety Code (NESC). Without a review of conformance with NESC criteria of each nuclear power plant's in-scope transmission lines, it is not possible to determine the significance of the electrical shock potential.
Postulated Accidents		
Design-basis accidents	1	SMALL. The NRC staff has concluded that the environmental impacts of design-basis accidents are of small significance for all plants.

Severe accidents ⁷	1	SMALL. The probability-weighted consequences of atmospheric releases, fallout onto open bodies of water, releases to groundwater, and societal and economic impacts from severe accidents are small for all plants. Severe accident mitigation alternatives do not warrant further plant-specific analysis because the demonstrated reductions in population dose risk and continued severe accident regulatory improvements substantially reduce the likelihood of finding cost-effective significant plant improvements.
Environmental Justice		
Impacts on minority populations, low-income populations, and Indian tribes	2	Impacts on minority populations, low-income populations, Indian tribes, and subsistence consumption resulting from continued operations and refurbishment associated with license renewal will be addressed in nuclear plant-specific reviews. See "Policy Statement on the Treatment of Environmental Justice Matters in NRC Regulatory and Licensing Actions" (69 FR 52040; August 24, 2004).
Waste Management		
Low-level waste storage and disposal	1	SMALL. The comprehensive regulatory controls that are in place and the low public doses being achieved at reactors ensure that the radiological impacts on the environment would remain small during the license renewal term.

Onsite storage of spent nuclear fuel	1	<p>During the license renewal term, SMALL. The expected increase in the volume of spent fuel from an additional 20 years of operation can be safely accommodated onsite during the license renewal term with small environmental impacts through dry or pool storage at all plants.</p> <p>For the period after the licensed life for reactor operations, the impacts of onsite storage of spent nuclear fuel during the continued storage period are discussed in NUREG-2157 and as stated in § 51.23(b), shall be deemed incorporated into this issue.</p>
Offsite radiological impacts of spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste disposal	1	<p>For the high-level waste and spent-fuel disposal component of the fuel cycle, the EPA established a dose limit of 0.15 mSv (15 millirem) per year for the first 10,000 years and 1.0 mSv (100 millirem) per year between 10,000 years and 1 million years for offsite releases of radionuclides at the proposed repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada.</p> <p>The Commission concludes that the impacts would not be sufficiently large to require the NEPA conclusion, for any plant, that the option of extended operation under 10 CFR part 54 should be eliminated. Accordingly, while the Commission has not assigned a single level of significance for the impacts of spent fuel and high level waste disposal, this issue is considered Category 1.</p>

Mixed-waste storage and disposal	1	SMALL. The comprehensive regulatory controls and the facilities and procedures that are in place ensure proper handling and storage, as well as negligible doses and exposure to toxic materials for the public and the environment at all plants. License renewal would not increase the small, continuing risk to human health and the environment posed by mixed waste at all plants. The radiological and nonradiological environmental impacts of long-term disposal of mixed waste from any individual plant at licensed sites are small.
Nonradioactive waste storage and disposal	1	SMALL. No changes to systems that generate nonradioactive waste are anticipated during the license renewal term. Facilities and procedures are in place to ensure continued proper handling, storage, and disposal, as well as negligible exposure to toxic materials for the public and the environment at all plants.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change		
Greenhouse gas impacts on climate change	1	<p>SMALL. Greenhouse gas impacts on climate change from continued operations and refurbishment associated with license renewal are expected to be small at all plants. Greenhouse gas emissions from routine operations of nuclear power plants are typically very minor, because such plants, by their very nature, do not normally combust fossil fuels to generate electricity.</p> <p>Greenhouse gas emissions from construction vehicles and other motorized equipment for refurbishment activities would be intermittent and temporary, restricted to the refurbishment period. Worker vehicle greenhouse gas emissions for refurbishment would be similar to worker vehicle emissions from normal nuclear power plant operations.</p>

Climate change impacts on environmental resources	2	Climate change can have additive effects on environmental resource conditions that may also be directly impacted by continued operations and refurbishment during the license renewal term. The effects of climate change can vary regionally and climate change information at the regional and local scale is necessary to assess trends and the impacts on the human environment for a specific location. The impacts of climate change on environmental resources during the license renewal term are location-specific and cannot be evaluated generically.
Cumulative Effects		
Cumulative effects	2	Cumulative effects or impacts of continued operations and refurbishment associated with license renewal must be considered on a plant-specific basis. The effects depend on regional resource characteristics, the incremental resource-specific effects of license renewal, and the cumulative significance of other factors affecting the environmental resource.
Uranium Fuel Cycle		
Offsite radiological impacts—individual impacts from other than the disposal of spent fuel and high-level waste	1	SMALL. The impacts to the public from radiological exposures have been considered by the Commission in Table S-3 of this part. Based on information in the GEIS, impacts to individuals from radioactive gaseous and liquid releases, including radon-222 and technetium-99, would remain at or below the NRC's regulatory limits.

Offsite radiological impacts—collective impacts from other than the disposal of spent fuel and high-level waste	1	<p>There are no regulatory limits applicable to collective doses to the general public from fuel-cycle facilities. The practice of estimating health effects on the basis of collective doses may not be meaningful. All fuel-cycle facilities are designed and operated to meet the applicable regulatory limits and standards. The Commission concludes that the collective impacts are acceptable.</p> <p>The Commission concludes that the impacts would not be sufficiently large to require the NEPA conclusion, for any plant, that the option of extended operation under 10 CFR Part 54 should be eliminated. Accordingly, while the Commission has not assigned a single level of significance for the collective impacts of the uranium fuel cycle, this issue is considered Category 1.</p>
Nonradiological impacts of the uranium fuel cycle	1	SMALL. The nonradiological impacts of the uranium fuel cycle resulting from the renewal of an operating license for any plant would be small.
Transportation	1	SMALL. The impacts of transporting materials to and from uranium-fuel-cycle facilities on workers, the public, and the environment are expected to be small.
Termination of Nuclear Power Plant Operations and Decommissioning		
Termination of plant operations and decommissioning	1	SMALL. License renewal is expected to have a negligible effect on the impacts of terminating operations and decommissioning on all resources.

¹ Data supporting this table are contained in NUREG-1437, Revision 2, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants" (XX 20XX).

² The numerical entries in this column are based on the following category definitions:

Category 1: For the issue, the analysis reported in the Generic Environmental Impact Statement has shown:

(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 characteristic;

(2) A single significance level (i.e., small, moderate, or large) has been assigned to the impacts (except for offsite radiological impacts of spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste disposal and offsite radiological impacts—collective impacts from other than the disposal of spent fuel and high-level waste); and

(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.

The generic analysis of the issue may be adopted in each plant-specific review.

Category 2: For the issue, the analysis reported in the Generic Environmental Impact Statement has shown that one or more of the criteria of Category 1 cannot be met, and therefore additional plant-specific review is required.

³ The impact findings in this column are based on the definitions of three significance levels. Unless the significance level is identified as beneficial, the impact is adverse, or in the case of "small," may be negligible. The definitions of significance follow:

SMALL—For the issue, environmental effects are not detectable or are so minor that they will neither destabilize nor noticeably alter any important attribute of the resource. For the purposes of assessing radiological impacts, the Commission has concluded that those impacts that do not exceed permissible levels in the Commission's regulations are considered small as the term is used in this table.

MODERATE—For the issue, environmental effects are sufficient to alter noticeably, but not to destabilize, important attributes of the resource.

LARGE—For the issue, environmental effects are clearly noticeable and are sufficient to destabilize important attributes of the resource.

For issues where probability is a key consideration (i.e., accident consequences), probability was a factor in determining significance.

⁴ This issue applies only to the in-scope portion of electric power transmission lines, which are defined as transmission lines that connect the nuclear power plant to the substation where electricity is fed into the regional power distribution system and transmission lines that supply power to the nuclear plant from the grid.

⁵ NA (not applicable). The categorization and impact finding definitions do not apply to these issues.

⁶ If, in the future, the Commission finds that, contrary to current indications, a consensus has been reached by appropriate Federal health agencies that there are adverse health effects from electromagnetic fields, the Commission will require applicants to submit plant-specific reviews of these health effects as part of their license renewal applications. Until such time, applicants for license renewal are not required to submit information on this issue.

⁷ Although the NRC does not anticipate any license renewal applications for nuclear power plants for which a previous severe accident mitigation design alternative (SAMDA) or severe accident mitigation alternative (SAMA) analysis has not been performed, alternatives to mitigate severe accidents must be considered for all plants that have not considered such alternatives.

Dated: <Month XX, 2023>.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brooke P. Clark,

Secretary of the Commission.