

§51.124

10 CFR Ch. I (1-1-05 Edition)

State, regional, and metropolitan clearinghouses. When available NRC copies have been exhausted, the requester will be advised that the NRC will provide copies at the charges specified in §9.35 of this chapter.

(c) *Charges.* Charges for the reproduction of environmental documents by the NRC at locations other than the NRC Public Document Room located in Washington, DC vary according to location.

[50 FR 21037, May 22, 1985, as amended at 52 FR 31612, Aug. 21, 1987; 53 FR 43421, Oct. 27, 1988; 61 FR 9902, Mar. 12, 1996; 64 FR 48952, Sept. 9, 1999; 68 FR 58812, Oct. 10, 2003]

COMMENTING

§51.124 Commission duty to comment.

It is the policy of the Commission to comment on draft environmental impact statements prepared by other Federal agencies, consistent with the provisions of 40 CFR 1503.2 and 1503.3.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL

§51.125 Responsible official.

The Executive Director for Operations shall be responsible for overall review of NRC NEPA compliance, except for matters under the jurisdiction of a presiding officer, administrative judge, administrative law judge, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board, or the Commission acting as a collegial body.

APPENDIX A TO SUBPART A OF PART 51—
FORMAT FOR PRESENTATION OF MATERIAL IN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

- 1. General
2. Cover sheet
3. Summary
4. Purpose of and need for action
5. Alternatives including the proposed action
6. Affected environment
7. Environmental consequences and mitigating actions
8. List of preparers
9. Appendices

1. General.

(a) The Commission will use a format for environmental impact statements which will encourage good analysis and clear presentation of the alternatives including the proposed action. The following standard format

for environmental impact statements should be followed unless there is a compelling reason to do otherwise:

- (1) Cover sheet\*
(2) Summary\*
(3) Table of Contents
(4) Purpose of and Need for Action\*
(5) Alternatives including the proposed action\*
(6) Affected Environment\*
(7) Environmental Consequences and Mitigating Actions\*
(8) List of Preparers\*
(9) List of Agencies, Organizations and Persons to Whom Copies of the Statement are Sent
(10) Substantive Comments Received and NRC Staff Responses
(11) Index
(12) Appendices (if any)\*

If a different format is used, it shall include paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (8), (9), (10), and (11) of this section and shall include the substance of paragraphs (4), (5), (6), (7), and (12) of this section, in any appropriate format.

Additional guidance on the presentation of material under the format headings identified by an asterisk is set out in sections 2.-9. of this appendix.

(b) The techniques of tiering and incorporation by reference described respectively in 40 CFR 1502.20 and 1508.28 and 40 CFR 1502.21<sup>1</sup> of CEQ's NEPA regulations may be used as appropriate to aid in the presentation of issues, eliminate repetition or reduce the size of an environmental impact statement. In appropriate circumstances, draft or final environmental impact statements prepared by other Federal agencies may be adopted in whole or in part in accordance with the procedures outlined in 40 CFR 1506.3<sup>2</sup> of CEQ's NEPA regulations. In final environmental impact statements, material under the following format headings will normally be presented in less than 150 pages: Purpose of and Need for Action, Alternatives Including the Proposed Action, Affected Environment, and Environmental Consequences and Mitigating Actions. For proposals of unusual scope or complexity, the material presented under these format headings may extend to 300 pages.

2. Cover sheet.

The cover sheet will not exceed one page. It will include:

- (a) The name of the NRC office responsible for preparing the statement and a list of any cooperating agencies.
(b) The title of the proposed action that is the subject of the statement with a list of the states, counties or municipalities where

<sup>1</sup> Tiering—40 CFR 1502.20, 40 CFR 1508.28; Incorporation by reference—40 CFR 1502.21.

<sup>2</sup> Adoption—40 CFR 1506.3.

## Nuclear Regulatory Commission

## Pt. 51, Subpt. A, App. A

the facility or other subject of the action is located, as appropriate.

(c) The name, address, and telephone number of the individual in NRC who can supply further information.

(d) A designation of the statement as a draft or final statement, or a draft or final supplement.

(e) A one paragraph abstract of the statement.

(f) For draft environmental impact statements, the date by which comments must be received. This date may be specified in the form of the following or a substantially similar statement:

“Comments should be filed no later than <sup>3</sup> days after the date on which the Environmental Protection Agency notice stating that the draft environmental impact statement has been filed with EPA is published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. Comments received after the expiration of the comment period will be considered if it is practical to do so but assurance of consideration of late comments cannot be given.”

### 3. Summary.

Each environmental impact statement will contain a summary which adequately and accurately summarizes the statement. The summary will stress the major issues considered. The summary will discuss the areas of controversy, will identify any remaining issues to be resolved, and will present the major conclusions and recommendations. The summary will normally not exceed 15 pages.

### 4. Purpose of and need for action.

The statement will briefly describe and specify the need for the proposed action. The alternative of no action will be discussed. In the case of nuclear power plant construction or siting, consideration will be given to the potential impact of conservation measures in determining the demand for power and consequent need for additional generating capacity.

### 5. Alternatives including the proposed action.

This section is the heart of the environmental impact statement. It will present the environmental impacts of the proposal and the alternatives in comparative form. Where important to the comparative evaluation of alternatives, appropriate mitigating measures of the alternatives will be discussed. All reasonable alternatives will be identified. The range of alternatives discussed will encompass those proposed to be considered by the ultimate decisionmaker. An otherwise reasonable alternative will not be excluded

<sup>3</sup>The number of days in the comment period should be inserted. The minimum comment period is 45 days (see §51.73.)

from discussion solely on the ground that it is not within the jurisdiction of the NRC.<sup>4</sup> The discussion of alternatives will take into accounts, without duplicating, the environmental information and analyses included in sections, 4., 6. and 7. of this appendix.

In the draft environmental impact statement, this section will either include a preliminary recommendation on the action to be taken, or identify the alternatives under consideration.

In the final environmental impact statement, this section will include a final recommendation on the action to be taken.

### 6. Affected environment.

The environmental impact statement will succinctly describe the environment to be affected by the proposed action. Data and analyses in the statement will be commensurate with the importance of the impact, with less important material summarized, consolidated, or simply referenced. Effort and attention will be concentrated on important issues; useless bulk will be eliminated.

### 7. Environmental consequences and mitigating actions.

This section discusses the environmental consequences of alternatives, including the proposed actions and any mitigating actions which may be taken. Alternatives eliminated from detailed study will be identified and a discussion of those alternatives will be confined to a brief statement of the reasons why the alternatives were eliminated. The level of information for each alternative considered in detail will reflect the depth of analysis required for sound decisionmaking.

The discussion will include any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the alternative be implemented, the relationship between short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and any irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the alternative should it be implemented. This section will include discussions of:

(a) Direct effects and their significance.

(b) Indirect effects and their significance.

(c) Possible conflicts between the alternative and the objectives of Federal, regional, State, and local (and in the case of a reservation, Indian tribe) land use plans, policies and controls for the area concerned.

(d) Means to mitigate adverse environmental impacts.

<sup>4</sup>With respect to limitations on NRC's NEPA authority and responsibility imposed by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, see §§51.10(c), 51.22(c)(17) and 51.71(d).

8. *List of preparers.*

The environmental impact statement will list the names and qualifications (expertise, experience, professional disciplines), of the persons who were primarily responsible for preparing the environmental impact statement or significant background papers. Persons responsible for making an independent evaluation of information submitted by the applicant or petitioner for rulemaking or others will be included in the list. Where possible, the persons who are responsible for a particular analysis, including analyses in background papers, will be identified.

9. *Appendices.*

An appendix to an environmental impact statement will:

- (a) Consist of material prepared in connection with an environmental impact statement (as distinct from material which is not so prepared and which is incorporated by reference (40 CFR 1502.21)).
- (b) Normally consist of material which substantiates any analysis fundamental to the impact statement. Discussion of methodology used may be placed in an appendix.
- (c) Normally be analytic.
- (d) Be relevant to the decision to be made.
- (e) Be circulated with the environmental impact statement or be readily available on request.

## Discussion of Footnotes

1. *Tiering.*

40 CFR 1502.20 states:

“Agencies are encouraged to tier their environmental impact statements to eliminate repetitive discussions of the same issues and to focus on the actual issues ripe for decision at each level of environmental review (§1508.28). Whenever a broad environmental impact statement has been prepared (such as a program or policy statement) and a subsequent statement or environmental assessment is then prepared on an action included within the entire program or policy (such as a site specific action) the subsequent statement or environmental assessment need only summarize the issues discussed in the broader statement and incorporate discussions from the broader statement by reference and shall concentrate on the issues specific to the subsequent action. The subsequent document shall state where the earlier document is available. Tiering may also be appropriate for different stages of actions. (Sec. 1508.28).”

40 CFR 1508.28 states:

“‘Tiering’ refers to the coverage of general matters in broader environmental impact statements (such as national program or policy statements) with subsequent narrower statements or environmental analyses (such as regional or basinwide program statements or ultimately site-specific statements) incor-

porating by reference the general discussions and concentrating solely on the issues specific to the statement subsequently prepared. Tiering is appropriate when the sequence of statements or analyses is:

“(a) From a program, plan, or policy environmental impact statement to a program, plan, or policy statement or analysis of lesser scope or to a site-specific statement or analysis.

“(b) From an environmental impact statement on a specific action at an early stage (such as need and site selection) to a supplement (which is preferred) or a subsequent statement or analysis at a later stage (such as environmental mitigation). Tiering in such cases is appropriate when it helps the lead agency to focus on the issues which are ripe for decision and exclude from consideration issues already decided or not yet ripe.”

*Incorporation by reference.* 40 CFR 1502.21 states:

“Agencies shall incorporate material into an environmental impact statement by reference when the effect will be to cut down on bulk without impeding agency and public review of the action. The incorporated material shall be cited in the statement and its content briefly described. No material may be incorporated by reference unless it is reasonably available for inspection by potentially interested persons within the time allowed for comment. Material based on proprietary data which is itself not available for review and comment shall not be incorporated by reference.”

2. *Adoption.*

40 CFR 1506.3 states:

“(a) An agency may adopt a Federal draft or final environmental impact statement or portion thereof provided that the statement or portion thereof meets the standards for an adequate statement under these regulations.

“(b) If the actions covered by the original environmental impact statement and the proposed action are substantially the same, the agency adopting another agency’s statement is not required to recirculate it except as a final statement. Otherwise the adopting agency shall treat the statement as a draft and recirculate it (except as provided in paragraph (c) of this section).

“(c) A cooperating agency may adopt without recirculating the environmental impact statement of a lead agency when, after an independent review of the statement, the cooperating agency concludes that its comments and suggestions have been satisfied.

“(d) When an agency adopts a statement which is not final within the agency that prepared it, or when the action it assesses is the subject of a referral under part 1504, or

**Nuclear Regulatory Commission**

**Pt. 51, Subpt. A, App. B**

when the statement's adequacy is the subject of a judicial action which is not final, the agency shall so specify."

[49 FR 9381, Mar. 12, 1984, as amended at 61 FR 28490, June 5, 1996; 61 FR 66546, Dec. 18, 1996]

**APPENDIX B TO SUBPART A OF 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 for a nuclear power plant to a licensee who holds either an operating license or construction permit as of June 30, 1995. Table B-1 summarizes the

Commission's findings on the scope and magnitude of environmental 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 NEPA ISSUES FOR LICENSE RENEWAL OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS<sup>1</sup>**

Issue	Category <sup>2</sup>	Findings <sup>3</sup>
<b>Surface Water Quality, Hydrology, and Use (for all plants)</b>		
Impacts of refurbishment on surface water quality.	1	SMALL. Impacts are expected to be negligible during refurbishment because best management practices are expected to be employed to control soil erosion and spills.
Impacts of refurbishment on surface water use.	1	SMALL. Water use during refurbishment will not increase appreciably or will be reduced during plant outage.
Altered current patterns at intake and discharge structures.	1	SMALL. Altered current patterns 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.
Altered salinity gradients .....	1	SMALL. Salinity gradients 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.
Altered thermal stratification of lakes	1	SMALL. Generally, lake stratification has not been found to be a problem at operating nuclear power plants and is not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.
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.
Scouring caused by discharged cooling water.	1	SMALL. Scouring has not been found to be a problem at most operating nuclear power plants and has caused only localized effects at a few plants. It is not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.
Eutrophication .....	1	SMALL. Eutrophication has not been found to be a problem at operating nuclear power plants and is not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.
Discharge of chlorine or other biocides.	1	SMALL. Effects are not a concern among regulatory and resource agencies, and are not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.
Discharge of sanitary wastes and minor chemical spills.	1	SMALL. Effects are readily controlled through NPDES permit and periodic modifications, if needed, and are not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.
Discharge of other metals in waste water.	1	SMALL. These discharges 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. They are not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.
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.
Water use conflicts (plants with cooling ponds or cooling towers using make-up water from a small river with low flow).	2	SMALL OR MODERATE. The issue has been a concern at nuclear power plants with cooling ponds and at plants with cooling towers. Impacts on instream and riparian communities near these plants could be of moderate significance in some situations. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(A).
<b>Aquatic Ecology (for all plants)</b>		
Refurbishment .....	1	SMALL. During plant shutdown and refurbishment there will be negligible effects on aquatic biota because of a reduction of entrainment and impingement of organisms or a reduced release of chemicals.

TABLE B–1—SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON NEPA ISSUES FOR LICENSE RENEWAL OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS <sup>1</sup>—Continued

Issue	Category <sup>2</sup>	Findings <sup>3</sup>
Accumulation of contaminants in sediments or biota.	1	SMALL. Accumulation of contaminants has been a concern at a few nuclear power plants but has been satisfactorily mitigated by replacing copper alloy condenser tubes with those of another metal. It is not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.
Entrainment of phytoplankton and zooplankton.	1	SMALL. Entrainment of phytoplankton and zooplankton has not been found to be a problem at operating nuclear power plants and is not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.
Cold shock .....	1	SMALL. Cold shock has been satisfactorily mitigated at operating nuclear power plants with once-through cooling systems, has not endangered fish populations or been found to be a problem at operating nuclear power plants with cooling towers or cooling ponds, and is not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.
Thermal plume barrier to migrating fish.	1	SMALL. Thermal plumes 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.
Distribution of aquatic organisms .....	1	SMALL. Thermal discharge may have localized effects but is not expected to effect the larger geographical distribution of aquatic organisms.
Premature emergence of aquatic insects.	1	SMALL. Premature emergence has been found to be a localized effect at some operating nuclear power plants but has not been a problem and is not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.
Gas supersaturation (gas bubble disease).	1	SMALL. Gas supersaturation was a concern at a small number of operating nuclear power plants with once-through cooling systems but has been satisfactorily mitigated. It has not been found to be a problem at operating nuclear power plants with cooling towers or cooling ponds and is not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.
Low dissolved oxygen in the discharge.	1	SMALL. Low dissolved oxygen has been a concern at one nuclear power plant with a once-through cooling system but has been effectively mitigated. It has not been found to be a problem at operating nuclear power plants with cooling towers or cooling ponds and is not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.
Losses from predation, parasitism, and disease among organisms exposed to sublethal stresses.	1	SMALL. These types of losses 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.
Stimulation of nuisance organisms (e.g., shipworms).	1	SMALL. Stimulation of nuisance organisms has been satisfactorily mitigated at the single nuclear power plant with a once-through cooling system where previously it was a problem. It has not been found to be a problem at operating nuclear power plants with cooling towers or cooling ponds and is not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.
<b>Aquatic Ecology (for plants with once-through and cooling pond heat dissipation systems)</b>		
Entrainment of fish and shellfish in early life stages.	2	SMALL, MODERATE, OR LARGE. The impacts of entrainment are small at many plants but may be moderate or even large at a few plants with once-through and cooling-pond cooling systems. Further, ongoing efforts in the vicinity of these plants to restore fish populations may increase the numbers of fish susceptible to intake effects during the license renewal period, such that entrainment studies conducted in support of the original license may no longer be valid. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(B).
Impingement of fish and shellfish .....	2	SMALL, MODERATE, OR LARGE. The impacts of impingement are small at many plants but may be moderate or even large at a few plants with once-through and cooling-pond cooling systems. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(B).
Heat shock .....	2	SMALL, MODERATE, OR LARGE. Because of continuing concerns about heat shock and the possible need to modify thermal discharges in response to changing environmental conditions, the impacts may be of moderate or large significance at some plants. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(B).
<b>Aquatic Ecology (for plants with cooling-tower-based heat dissipation systems)</b>		
Entrainment of fish and shellfish in early life stages.	1	SMALL. Entrainment of fish has not been found to be a problem at operating nuclear power plants with this type of cooling system and is not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.
Impingement of fish and shellfish .....	1	SMALL. The impingement has not been found to be a problem at operating nuclear power plants with this type of cooling system and is not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.
Heat shock .....	1	SMALL. Heat shock has not been found to be a problem at operating nuclear power plants with this type of cooling system and is not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.

TABLE B-1—SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON NEPA ISSUES FOR LICENSE RENEWAL OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS<sup>1</sup>—Continued

Issue	Category <sup>2</sup>	Findings <sup>3</sup>
<b>Ground-water Use and Quality</b>		
Impacts of refurbishment on ground-water use and quality.	1	SMALL. Extensive dewatering during the original construction on some sites will not be repeated during refurbishment on any sites. Any plant wastes produced during refurbishment will be handled in the same manner as in current operating practices and are not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.
Ground-water use conflicts (potable and service water; plants that use <100 gpm).	1	SMALL. Plants using less than 100 gpm are not expected to cause any ground-water use conflicts.
Ground-water use conflicts (potable and service water, and dewatering; plants that use >100 gpm).	2	SMALL, MODERATE, OR LARGE. Plants that use more than 100 gpm may cause ground-water use conflicts with nearby ground-water users. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(C).
Ground-water use conflicts (plants using cooling towers withdrawing make-up water from a small river).	2	SMALL, MODERATE, OR LARGE. Water use conflicts may result from surface water withdrawals from small water bodies during low flow conditions which may affect aquifer recharge, especially if other ground-water or upstream surface water users come on line before the time of license renewal. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(A).
Ground-water use conflicts (Ranney wells).	2	SMALL, MODERATE, OR LARGE. Ranney wells can result in potential ground-water depression beyond the site boundary. Impacts of large ground-water withdrawal for cooling tower makeup at nuclear power plants using Ranney wells must be evaluated at the time of application for license renewal. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(C).
Ground-water quality degradation (Ranney wells).	1	SMALL. Ground-water quality at river sites may be degraded by induced infiltration of poor-quality river water into an aquifer that supplies large quantities of reactor cooling water. However, the lower quality infiltrating water would not preclude the current uses of ground water and is not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.
Ground-water quality degradation (saltwater intrusion).	1	SMALL. Nuclear power plants do not contribute significantly to saltwater intrusion.
Ground-water quality degradation (cooling ponds in salt marshes).	1	SMALL. Sites with closed-cycle cooling ponds may degrade ground-water quality. Because water in salt marshes is brackish, this is not a concern for plants located in salt marshes.
Ground-water quality degradation (cooling ponds at inland sites).	2	SMALL, MODERATE, OR LARGE. Sites with closed-cycle cooling ponds may degrade ground-water quality. For plants located inland, the quality of the ground water in the vicinity of the ponds must be shown to be adequate to allow continuation of current uses. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(D).
<b>Terrestrial Resources</b>		
Refurbishment impacts .....	2	SMALL, MODERATE, OR LARGE. Refurbishment impacts are insignificant if no loss of important plant and animal habitat occurs. However, it cannot be known whether important plant and animal communities may be affected until the specific proposal is presented with the license renewal application. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(E).
Cooling tower impacts on crops and ornamental vegetation.	1	SMALL. Impacts from salt drift, icing, fogging, or increased humidity associated with cooling tower operation 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.
Cooling tower impacts on native plants.	1	SMALL. Impacts from salt drift, icing, fogging, or increased humidity associated with cooling tower operation 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.
Bird collisions with cooling towers ...	1	SMALL. These collisions 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.
Cooling pond impacts on terrestrial resources.	1	SMALL. Impacts of cooling ponds on terrestrial ecological resources are considered to be of small significance at all sites.
Power line right-of-way management (cutting and herbicide application).	1	SMALL. The impacts of right-of-way maintenance on wildlife are expected to be of small significance at all sites.
Bird collision with power lines .....	1	SMALL. Impacts are expected to be of small significance at all sites.
Impacts of electromagnetic fields on flora and fauna (plants, agricultural crops, honeybees, wildlife, livestock).	1	SMALL. No significant impacts of electromagnetic fields on terrestrial flora and fauna have been identified. Such effects are not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term.
Floodplains and wetland on power line right of way.	1	SMALL. Periodic vegetation control is necessary in forested wetlands underneath power lines and can be achieved with minimal damage to the wetland. No significant impact is expected at any nuclear power plant during the license renewal term.

TABLE B–1—SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON NEPA ISSUES FOR LICENSE RENEWAL OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS <sup>1</sup>—Continued

Issue	Category <sup>2</sup>	Findings <sup>3</sup>
<b>Threatened or Endangered Species (for all plants)</b>		
Threatened or endangered species ..	2	SMALL, MODERATE, OR LARGE. Generally, plant refurbishment and continued operation are not expected to adversely affect threatened or endangered species. However, consultation with appropriate agencies would be needed at the time of license renewal to determine whether threatened or endangered species are present and whether they would be adversely affected. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(E).
<b>Air Quality</b>		
Air quality during refurbishment (non-attainment and maintenance areas).	2	SMALL, MODERATE, OR LARGE. Air quality impacts from plant refurbishment associated with license renewal are expected to be small. However, vehicle exhaust emissions could be cause for concern at locations in or near nonattainment or maintenance areas. The significance of the potential impact cannot be determined without considering the compliance status of each site and the numbers of workers expected to be employed during the outage. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(F).
Air quality effects of transmission lines.	1	SMALL. Production of ozone and oxides of nitrogen is insignificant and does not contribute measurably to ambient levels of these gases.
<b>Land Use</b>		
Onsite land use .....	1	SMALL. Projected onsite land use changes required during refurbishment and the renewal period would be a small fraction of any nuclear power plant site and would involve land that is controlled by the applicant.
Power line right of way .....	1	SMALL. Ongoing use of power line right of ways would continue with no change in restrictions. The effects of these restrictions are of small significance.
<b>Human Health</b>		
Radiation exposures to the public during refurbishment.	1	SMALL. During refurbishment, the gaseous effluents would result in doses that are similar to those from current operation. Applicable regulatory dose limits to the public are not expected to be exceeded.
Occupational radiation exposures during refurbishment.	1	SMALL. Occupational doses from refurbishment are expected to be within the range of annual average collective doses experienced for pressurized-water reactors and boiling-water reactors. Occupational mortality risk from all causes including radiation is in the mid-range for industrial settings.
Microbiological organisms (occupational health).	1	SMALL. Occupational health impacts are expected to be controlled by continued application of accepted industrial hygiene practices to minimize worker exposures.
Microbiological organisms (public health)(plants using lakes or canals, or cooling towers or cooling ponds that discharge to a small river).	2	SMALL, MODERATE, OR LARGE. These organisms are not expected to be a problem at most operating plants except possibly at plants using cooling ponds, lakes, or canals that discharge to small rivers. Without site-specific data, it is not possible to predict the effects generically. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(G).
Noise .....	1	SMALL. Noise has not been found to be a problem at operating plants and is not expected to be a problem at any plant during the license renewal term.
Electromagnetic fields, acute effects (electric shock).	2	SMALL, MODERATE, OR LARGE. Electrical shock resulting from direct access to energized conductors or from induced charges in metallic structures have not been found to be a problem at most operating plants and generally are not expected to be a problem during the license renewal term. However, site-specific review is required to determine the significance of the electric shock potential at the site. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(H).
Electromagnetic fields, chronic effects <sup>5</sup> .	4 NA	UNCERTAIN. Biological and physical studies of 60–Hz electromagnetic fields have not found consistent evidence linking harmful effects with field exposures. However, research is continuing in this area and a consensus scientific view has not been reached. <sup>5</sup>
Radiation exposures to public (license renewal term).	1	SMALL. Radiation doses to the public will continue at current levels associated with normal operations.
Occupational radiation exposures (license renewal term).	1	SMALL. Projected maximum occupational doses during the license renewal term are within the range of doses experienced during normal operations and normal maintenance outages, and would be well below regulatory limits.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Pt. 51, Subpt. A, App. B

TABLE B-1—SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON NEPA ISSUES FOR LICENSE RENEWAL OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS <sup>1</sup>—Continued

Issue	Category <sup>2</sup>	Findings <sup>3</sup>
<b>Socioeconomics</b>		
Housing impacts .....	2	SMALL, MODERATE, OR LARGE. Housing impacts are expected to be of small significance at plants located in a medium or high population area and not in an area where growth control measures that limit housing development are in effect. Moderate or large housing impacts of the workforce associated with refurbishment may be associated with plants located in sparsely populated areas or in areas with growth control measures that limit housing development. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(I).
Public services: public safety, social services, and tourism and recreation.	1	SMALL. Impacts to public safety, social services, and tourism and recreation are expected to be of small significance at all sites.
Public services: public utilities .....	2	SMALL OR MODERATE. An increased problem with water shortages at some sites may lead to impacts of moderate significance on public water supply availability. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(I).
Public services, education (refurbishment).	2	SMALL, MODERATE, OR LARGE. Most sites would experience impacts of small significance but larger impacts are possible depending on site- and project-specific factors. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(I).
Public services, education (license renewal term).	1	SMALL. Only impacts of small significance are expected.
Offsite land use (refurbishment) .....	2	SMALL OR MODERATE. Impacts may be of moderate significance at plants in low population areas. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(I).
Offsite land use (license renewal term).	2	SMALL, MODERATE, OR LARGE. Significant changes in land use may be associated with population and tax revenue changes resulting from license renewal. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(I).
Public services, Transportation .....	2	SMALL, MODERATE, OR LARGE. Transportation impacts (level of service) of highway traffic generated during plant refurbishment and during the term of the renewed license are generally expected to be of small significance. However, the increase in traffic associated with additional workers and the local road and traffic control conditions may lead to impacts of moderate or large significance at some sites. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(J).
Historic and archaeological resources.	2	SMALL, MODERATE, OR LARGE. Generally, plant refurbishment and continued operation are expected to have no more than small adverse impacts on historic and archaeological resources. However, the National Historic Preservation Act requires the Federal agency to consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer to determine whether there are properties present that require protection. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(K).
Aesthetic impacts (refurbishment) .....	1	SMALL. No significant impacts are expected during refurbishment.
Aesthetic impacts (license renewal term).	1	SMALL. No significant impacts are expected during the license renewal term.
Aesthetic impacts of transmission lines (license renewal term).	1	SMALL. No significant impacts are expected during the license renewal term.
<b>Postulated Accidents</b>		
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 .....	2	SMALL. The probability weighted consequences of atmospheric releases, fallout onto open bodies of water, releases to ground water, and societal and economic impacts from severe accidents are small for all plants. However, alternatives to mitigate severe accidents must be considered for all plants that have not considered such alternatives. See § 51.53(c)(3)(ii)(L).
<b>Uranium Fuel Cycle and Waste Management</b>		
Offsite radiological impacts (individual effects from other than the disposal of spent fuel and high level waste).	1	SMALL. Off-site impacts of the uranium fuel cycle have been considered by the Commission in Table S-3 of this part. Based on information in the GEIS, impacts on individuals from radioactive gaseous and liquid releases including radon-222 and technetium-99 are small.

TABLE B–1—SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON NEPA ISSUES FOR LICENSE RENEWAL OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS <sup>1</sup>—Continued

Issue	Category <sup>2</sup>	Findings <sup>3</sup>
Offsite radiological impacts (collective effects).	1	<p>The 100 year environmental dose commitment to the U.S. population from the fuel cycle, high level waste and spent fuel disposal excepted, is calculated to be about 14,800 person rem, or 12 cancer fatalities, for each additional 20-year power reactor operating term. Much of this, especially the contribution of radon releases from mines and tailing piles, consists of tiny doses summed over large populations. This same dose calculation can theoretically be extended to include many tiny doses over additional thousands of years as well as doses outside the U. S. The result of such a calculation would be thousands of cancer fatalities from the fuel cycle, but this result assumes that even tiny doses have some statistical adverse health effect which will not ever be mitigated (for example no cancer cure in the next thousand years), and that these doses projected over thousands of years are meaningful. However, these assumptions are questionable. In particular, science cannot rule out the possibility that there will be no cancer fatalities from these tiny doses. For perspective, the doses are very small fractions of regulatory limits, and even smaller fractions of natural background exposure to the same populations.</p> <p>Nevertheless, despite all the uncertainty, some judgement as to the regulatory NEPA implications of these matters should be made and it makes no sense to repeat the same judgement in every case. Even taking the uncertainties into account, the Commission concludes that these impacts are acceptable in that these 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 effects of the fuel cycle, this issue is considered Category 1.</p>
Offsite radiological impacts (spent fuel and high level waste disposal).	1	<p>For the high level waste and spent fuel disposal component of the fuel cycle, there are no current regulatory limits for offsite releases of radionuclides for the current candidate repository site. However, if we assume that limits are developed along the lines of the 1995 National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report, "Technical Bases for Yucca Mountain Standards," and that in accordance with the Commission's Waste Confidence Decision, 10 CFR 51.23, a repository can and likely will be developed at some site which will comply with such limits, peak doses to virtually all individuals will be 100 millirem per year or less. However, while the Commission has reasonable confidence that these assumptions will prove correct, there is considerable uncertainty since the limits are yet to be developed, no repository application has been completed or reviewed, and uncertainty is inherent in the models used to evaluate possible pathways to the human environment. The NAS report indicated that 100 millirem per year should be considered as a starting point for limits for individual doses, but notes that some measure of consensus exists among national and international bodies that the limits should be a fraction of the 100 millirem per year. The lifetime individual risk from 100 millirem annual dose limit is about <math>3 \times 10^{-3}</math>.</p>

TABLE B-1—SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON NEPA ISSUES FOR LICENSE RENEWAL OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS <sup>1</sup>—Continued

Issue	Category <sup>2</sup>	Findings <sup>3</sup>
		<p>Estimating cumulative doses to populations over thousands of years is more problematic. The likelihood and consequences of events that could seriously compromise the integrity of a deep geologic repository were evaluated by the Department of Energy in the "Final Environmental Impact Statement: Management of Commercially Generated Radioactive Waste," October 1980. The evaluation estimated the 70-year whole-body dose commitment to the maximum individual and to the regional population resulting from several modes of breaching a reference repository in the year of closure, after 1,000 years, after 100,000 years, and after 100,000,000 years. Subsequently, the NRC and other federal agencies have expended considerable effort to develop models for the design and for the licensing of a high level waste repository, especially for the candidate repository at Yucca Mountain. More meaningful estimates of doses to population may be possible in the future as more is understood about the performance of the proposed Yucca Mountain repository. Such estimates would involve very great uncertainty, especially with respect to cumulative population doses over thousands of years. The standard proposed by the NAS is a limit on maximum individual dose. The relationship of potential new regulatory requirements, based on the NAS report, and cumulative population impacts has not been determined, although the report articulates the view that protection of individuals will adequately protect the population for a repository at Yucca Mountain. However, EPA's generic repository standards in 40 CFR part 191 generally provide an indication of the order of magnitude of cumulative risk to population that could result from the licensing of a Yucca Mountain repository, assuming the ultimate standards will be within the range of standards now under consideration. The standards in 40 CFR part 191 protect the population by imposing "containment requirements" that limit the cumulative amount of radioactive material released over 10,000 years. Reporting performance standards that will be required by EPA are expected to result in releases and associated health consequences in the range between 10 and 100 premature cancer deaths with an upper limit of 1,000 premature cancer deaths worldwide for a 100,000 metric tonne (MTHM) repository.</p> <p>Nevertheless, despite all the uncertainty, some judgement as to the regulatory NEPA implications of these matters should be made and it makes no sense to repeat the same judgement in every case. Even taking the uncertainties into account, the Commission concludes that these impacts are acceptable in that these 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>
<p>Nonradiological impacts of the uranium fuel cycle.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>SMALL. The nonradiological impacts of the uranium fuel cycle resulting from the renewal of an operating license for any plant are found to be small.</p>
<p>Low-level waste storage and disposal.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>SMALL. The comprehensive regulatory controls that are in place and the low public doses being achieved at reactors ensure that the radiological impacts to the environment will remain small during the term of a renewed license. The maximum additional on-site land that may be required for low-level waste storage during the term of a renewed license and associated impacts will be small. Nonradiological impacts on air and water will be negligible. The radiological and nonradiological environmental impacts of long-term disposal of low-level waste from any individual plant at licensed sites are small. In addition, the Commission concludes that there is reasonable assurance that sufficient low-level waste disposal capacity will be made available when needed for facilities to be decommissioned consistent with NRC decommissioning requirements.</p>

TABLE B–1—SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON NEPA ISSUES FOR LICENSE RENEWAL OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS <sup>1</sup>—Continued

Issue	Category <sup>2</sup>	Findings <sup>3</sup>
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 will 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. In addition, the Commission concludes that there is reasonable assurance that sufficient mixed waste disposal capacity will be made available when needed for facilities to be decommissioned consistent with NRC decommissioning requirements.
On-site spent fuel .....	1	SMALL. The expected increase in the volume of spent fuel from an additional 20 years of operation can be safely accommodated on site with small environmental effects through dry or pool storage at all plants if a permanent repository or monitored retrievable storage is not available.
Nonradiological waste .....	1	SMALL. No changes to generating systems are anticipated for license renewal. Facilities and procedures are in place to ensure continued proper handling and disposal at all plants.
Transportation .....	1	SMALL. The impacts of transporting spent fuel enriched up to 5 percent uranium-235 with average burnup for the peak rod to current levels approved by NRC up to 62,000 MWD/MTU and the cumulative impacts of transporting high-level waste to a single repository, such as Yucca Mountain, Nevada are found to be consistent with the impact values contained in 10 CFR 51.52(c), Summary Table S–4—Environmental Impact of Transportation of Fuel and Waste to and from One Light-Water-Cooled Nuclear Power Reactor. If fuel enrichment or burnup conditions are not met, the applicant must submit an assessment of the implications for the environmental impact values reported in §51.52.
<b>Decommissioning</b>		
Radiation doses .....	1	SMALL. Doses to the public will be well below applicable regulatory standards regardless of which decommissioning method is used. Occupational doses would increase no more than 1 man-rem caused by buildup of long-lived radionuclides during the license renewal term.
Waste management .....	1	SMALL. Decommissioning at the end of a 20-year license renewal period would generate no more solid wastes than at the end of the current license term. No increase in the quantities of Class C or greater than Class C wastes would be expected.
Air quality .....	1	SMALL. Air quality impacts of decommissioning are expected to be negligible either at the end of the current operating term or at the end of the license renewal term.
Water quality .....	1	SMALL. The potential for significant water quality impacts from erosion or spills is no greater whether decommissioning occurs after a 20-year license renewal period or after the original 40-year operation period, and measures are readily available to avoid such impacts.
Ecological resources .....	1	SMALL. Decommissioning after either the initial operating period or after a 20-year license renewal period is not expected to have any direct ecological impacts.
Socioeconomic impacts .....	1	SMALL. Decommissioning would have some short-term socioeconomic impacts. The impacts would not be increased by delaying decommissioning until the end of a 20-year relicense period, but they might be decreased by population and economic growth.
<b>Environmental Justice</b>		
Environmental justice <sup>6</sup> .....	4 NA	NONE. The need for and the content of an analysis of environmental justice will be addressed in plant-specific reviews. <sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Data supporting this table are contained in NUREG–1437, “Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants” (May 1996) and NUREG–1437, Vol. 1, Addendum 1, “Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants: Main Report Section 6.3—Transportation,” Table 9.1 ‘Summary of findings on NEPA issues for license renewal of nuclear power plants,’ Final Report” (August 1999).

<sup>2</sup> 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 collective off site radiological impacts from the fuel cycle and from high level waste and spent fuel disposal); 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 likely not 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.

<sup>3</sup>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.

<sup>4</sup>NA (not applicable). The categorization and impact finding definitions do not apply to these issues.

<sup>5</sup>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.

<sup>6</sup>Environmental Justice was not addressed in NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants," because guidance for implementing Executive Order 12898 issued on February 11, 1994, was not available prior to completion of NUREG-1437. This issue will be addressed in individual license renewal reviews.

[61 FR 66546, Dec. 18, 1996, as amended at 62 FR 59276, Nov. 3, 1997; 64 FR 48507, Sept. 3, 1999; 66 FR 39278, July 30, 2001]

**PART 52—EARLY SITE PERMITS; STANDARD DESIGN CERTIFICATIONS; AND COMBINED LICENSES FOR NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS**

**GENERAL PROVISIONS**

Sec.

- 52.1 Scope.
- 52.3 Definitions.
- 52.5 Interpretations.
- 52.8 Information collection requirements: OMB approval.
- 52.9 Deliberate misconduct.

**Subpart A—Early Site Permits**

- 52.11 Scope of subpart.
- 52.13 Relationship to subpart F of 10 CFR part 2 and appendix Q of this part.
- 52.15 Filing of applications.
- 52.17 Contents of applications.
- 52.18 Standards for review of applications.
- 52.19 Permit and renewal fees.
- 52.21 Hearings.
- 52.23 Referral to the ACRS.
- 52.24 Issuance of early site permit.
- 52.25 Extent of activities permitted.
- 52.27 Duration of permit.
- 52.29 Application for renewal.
- 52.31 Criteria for renewal.
- 52.33 Duration of renewal.
- 52.35 Use of site for other purposes.
- 52.37 Reporting of defects and noncompliance; revocation, suspension, modification of permits for cause.
- 52.39 Finality of early site permit determinations.

**Subpart B—Standard Design Certifications**

- 52.41 Scope of subpart.

- 52.43 Relationship to appendices M, N, and O of this part.
- 52.45 Filing of applications.
- 52.47 Contents of applications.
- 52.48 Standards for review of applications.
- 52.49 Fees for review of applications.
- 52.51 Administrative review of applications.
- 52.53 Referral to the ACRS.
- 52.54 Issuance of standard design certification.
- 52.55 Duration of certification.
- 52.57 Application for renewal.
- 52.59 Criteria for renewal.
- 52.61 Duration of renewal.
- 52.63 Finality of standard design certifications.

**Subpart C—Combined Licenses**

- 52.71 Scope of subpart.
- 52.73 Relationship to subparts A and B.
- 52.75 Filing of applications.
- 52.77 Contents of applications; general information.
- 52.78 Contents of applications; training and qualification of nuclear power plant personnel.
- 52.79 Contents of applications; technical information.
- 52.81 Standards for review of applications.
- 52.83 Applicability of part 50 provisions.
- 52.85 Administrative review of applications.
- 52.87 Referral to the ACRS.
- 52.89 Environmental review.
- 52.91 Authorization to conduct site activities.
- 52.93 Exemptions and variances.
- 52.97 Issuance of combined licenses.
- 52.99 Inspection during construction.
- 52.103 Operation under a combined license.

**Subpart D—Violations**

- 52.111 Violations.
- 52.113 Criminal penalties.