

Environmental Scoping Summary Report

St. Lucie Units 1 and 2

St Lucie County, Florida

June 2002

Docket Nos. 50-335 and 50-389

**U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Rockville, Maryland**

Introduction

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) received an application from Florida Power & Light Company (FPL) dated November 29, 2001, for renewal of the operating licenses of St. Lucie Units 1 and 2. The St. Lucie units are located on Hutchinson Island in St. Lucie County, Florida. As part of the application, FPL submitted an environmental report (ER) prepared in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Part 51. 10 CFR Part 51 contains the NRC requirements for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and the implementing regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). Section 51.53 outlines requirements for preparation and submittal of environmental reports to the NRC.

Section 51.53(c)(3) was based upon the findings documented in NUREG-1437, *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants* (GEIS). The GEIS, in which the staff identified and evaluated the environmental impacts associated with license renewal, was first issued as a draft for public comment. The staff received input from Federal and State agencies, public organizations, and private citizens before developing the final document. As a result of the assessments in the GEIS, a number of impacts were determined to be generic to all nuclear power plants. These were designated as Category 1 impacts. An applicant for license renewal may adopt the conclusions contained in the GEIS for Category 1 impacts, in the absence of new and significant information that may cause the conclusions to fall outside those of the GEIS. Category 2 impacts are those impacts that have been determined to be plant-specific and are required to be evaluated in the applicant's ER.

The Commission determined that the NRC does not have a role in energy planning decision-making for existing plants, which should be left to State regulators and utility officials. Therefore, an applicant for license renewal need not provide an analysis of the need for power, or the economic costs and economic benefits of the proposed action. Additionally, the Commission determined in 10 CFR 51.23 (the Waste Confidence Rule) that the ER need not discuss any aspect of storage of spent fuel for the facility that is within the scope of the generic determination in 10 CFR 51.23(a). This determination was based on the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982.

On February 28, 2002, the NRC published a Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* (67 FR 9333) to notify the public of the staff's intent to prepare a plant-specific supplement to the GEIS to support the renewal application for the operating licenses for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2. The plant-specific supplement to the GEIS will be prepared in accordance with NEPA, CEQ guidelines, and 10 CFR Part 51. As outlined by NEPA, the NRC initiated the scoping process with the issuance of the *Federal Register* Notice. The NRC invited the applicant; Federal, State, and local government agencies; local organizations; and individuals to participate in the scoping process by providing oral comments at the scheduled public meetings and/or submitting written suggestions and comments no later than April 30, 2002. The scoping process included two public scoping meetings, which were held at the Council Chambers in

Scoping Comment Report

Port St. Lucie, Florida, on April 3, 2002. The NRC announced the meetings in local newspapers (The Palm Beach Post, The Port St. Lucie News, The Fort Pierce Tribune, and The Stuart News), issued press releases, and distributed flyers locally. There were approximately 30 members of the public at each of the meetings. Both sessions began with NRC staff members providing a brief overview of the license renewal process and the NEPA process. Following the NRC's prepared statements, the meetings were open for public comments. Forty-five (45) attendees provided either oral comments or written statements that were recorded and transcribed by a certified court reporter. The transcripts of the meetings and the meeting summary were issued on May 7, 2002. The meeting summary and transcripts are available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly Available Records System (PARS) component of NRC's document system (ADAMS) under accession numbers ML021160265, ML021160237, and ML021300604. ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm.html> (the Public Electronic Reading Room) (Note that the URL is case-sensitive).

The scoping process provides an opportunity for public participation to identify issues to be addressed in the plant-specific supplement to the GEIS and highlight public concerns and issues. The Notice of Intent identified the following objectives of the scoping process:

- Define the proposed action.
- Determine the scope of the supplement to the GEIS and identify significant issues to be analyzed in depth.
- Identify and eliminate peripheral issues.
- Identify any environmental assessments and other environmental impact statements being prepared that are related to the supplement to the GEIS.
- Identify other environmental review and consultation requirements.
- Indicate the schedule for preparation of the supplement to the GEIS.

- Identify any cooperating agencies.
- Describe how the supplement to the GEIS will be prepared.

At the conclusion of the scoping period, the NRC staff and its contractor reviewed the transcripts and all written material received, and identified individual comments. Five letters and seven e-mail messages containing comments were also received during the scoping period. All comments and suggestions received orally during the scoping meetings or in writing were considered. Each set of comments from a given commenter was given a unique alphabetical identifier (Commenter ID letter), allowing each set of comments from a commenter to be traced back to the transcript, letter, or e-mail in which the comments were submitted. Several commenters submitted comments through multiple sources (e.g., afternoon and evening scoping meetings, letters and e-mail).

Table 1 identifies the individuals providing comments and the Commenter ID letter associated with each person's set(s) of comments. The Commenter ID letter is preceded by SL (short for St. Lucie). For oral comments, the individuals are listed in the order in which they spoke at the public meeting. Accession numbers indicate the location of the written comments in the ADAMS.

Table 1. Individuals Providing Comments During Scoping Comment Period

Commenters			Comment Source and
ID	Commenter	Affiliation (If Stated)	ADAMS Accession Number
SL-A	Anderson	St. Lucie County	Afternoon Public Meeting ^(a)
SL-B	Mascara	St. Lucie County	Afternoon Public Meeting
SL-C	Minsky		Afternoon Public Meeting
SL-D	Hall		Afternoon Public Meeting
SL-E	Sizemore	St. Lucie County	Afternoon Public Meeting
SL-F	Campbell	Martin County Emergency Services	Afternoon Public Meeting
SL-G	Miller		Afternoon Public Meeting
SL-H	Jernigan	Florida Power & Light Company	Afternoon Public Meeting
SL-I	Abbatiello	Florida Power & Light Company	Afternoon Public Meeting
SL-J	Bangert	Conservation Alliance of St. Lucie County	Afternoon Public Meeting
SL-K	Brown	United Way	Afternoon Public Meeting
SL-L	Leslie		Afternoon Public Meeting
SL-M	Grande	The President's Council of Hutchinson Island	Afternoon Public Meeting
SL-N	Perry		Afternoon Public Meeting
SL-O	Oncavage		Afternoon Public Meeting
SL-P	Root	St. Lucie County Economic Development Council	Afternoon Public Meeting
SL-Q	Thompson	System Council U-4	Afternoon Public Meeting
SL-R	Smilen		Afternoon Public Meeting
SL-S	Egan	Marine Resources Council	Afternoon Public Meeting

Scoping Comment Report

Table 1. (contd)

Commenters			Comment Source and
ID	Commenter	Affiliation (If Stated)	ADAMS Accession Number
SL-T	Doyle		Afternoon Public Meeting
SL-U	Jernigan	Florida Power & Light Company	Evening Public Meeting ^(b)
SL-V	Abbatiello	Florida Power & Light Company	Evening Public Meeting
SL-W	O'Keefe	American Association of University Women	Evening Public Meeting
SL-X	Hiott	St. Lucie Council of Social Agencies	Evening Public Meeting
SL-Y	Rowley		Evening Public Meeting
SL-Z	Barry		Evening Public Meeting
SL-AA	Vojcsik	United Way of Martin County	Evening Public Meeting
SL-AB	Baldwin	Soroptimists International of St. Lucie County	Evening Public Meeting
SL-AC	Davis	St. Lucie County Chamber of Commerce	Evening Public Meeting
SL-AD	Theodore		Evening Public Meeting
SL-AE	Doyle		Evening Public Meeting
SL-AF	Vogel	The School Board of St. Lucie County	Letter ML021330021
SL-AG	Southard	Board of County Commissioners	Letter ML021330016
SL-AH	Oncavage		E-Mail ML021260597
SL-AI	Smilan		Letter by Fax ML021260542
SL-AJ	Case	Broward Sierra Club	E-Mail ML021260520
SL-AK	Ziring		E-Mail ML021260528
SL-AL	Smilan		E-mail ML021260502
SL-AM	Woodfin		Letter ML021330006
SL-AN	Woodfin		E-Mail ML021330078
SL-AO	Oncavage		E-Mail ML021330074
SL-AP	Leslie		E-Mail ML021330038
SL-AQ	Oncavage	The Florida Chapter of the Sierra Club	Letter ML021490145

(a) The afternoon transcript can be found under accession number ML021160237.

(b) The evening transcript can be found under accession number ML021160265.

Comments were consolidated and categorized according to the topic within the proposed supplement to the GEIS or according to the general topic if outside the scope of the GEIS. Comments with similar specific objectives were combined to capture the common essential issues that had been raised in the source comments. Once comments were grouped

according to subject area, the staff and contractor determined the appropriate action for the comment. The staff made a determination on each comment that it was one of the following:

- A comment that was actually a question and introduces no new information
- A comment that was either related to support or opposition of license renewal in general (or specifically, St. Lucie) or that makes a general statement about the licensing renewal process. It may make only a general statement regarding Category 1 and/or Category 2 issues. In addition, it provides no new information and does not pertain to 10 CFR Part 54.
- A comment about a Category 1 issue that
 - provided new information that required evaluation during the review
 - provided no new information.
- A comment about a Category 2 issue that
 - provided information that required evaluation during the review
 - provided no such information.
- A comment regarding alternatives to the proposed action
- A comment that raised an environmental issue that was not addressed in the GEIS
- A comment outside the scope of license renewal (not related to 10 CFR Parts 51 or 54), which includes
 - a comment regarding the need for power
 - a comment on safety issues pertaining to 10 CFR Part 54.

Each comment is summarized in the following pages. For reference, the unique identifier for each comment (Commenter ID letter listed in Table A.1 plus the comment number) is provided. In cases where no new information was provided by the commenter, no further evaluation will be performed.

Scoping Comment Report

The preparation of the plant-specific supplement to the GEIS (which is the SEIS) will take into account all the relevant issues raised during the scoping process. The SEIS will address both Category 1 and 2 issues, along with any new information identified as a result of scoping. The SEIS will rely on conclusions supported by information in the GEIS for Category 1 issues, and will include the analysis of Category 2 issues and any new and significant information. The draft plant-specific supplement to the GEIS will be made available for public comment. The comment period will offer the next opportunity for the applicant; interested Federal, State, and local government agencies; local organizations; and members of the public to provide input to the NRC's environmental review process. The comments received on the draft SEIS will be considered in the preparation of the final SEIS. The final SEIS, along with the staff's Safety Evaluation Report (SER), will provide much of the basis for the NRC's decision on the St. Lucie license renewal.

The following pages summarize the comments and suggestions received as part of the scoping process, and discuss their disposition. Parenthetical numbers after each comment refer to the Commenters ID letter and the comment number. Comments can be tracked to the commenter and the source document through the ID letter and comment number listed in Table 1.

Comments are grouped by category. The categories are as follows:

1. General Comments in Support of License Renewal and its Processes, or Specifically St. Lucie, Units 1 and 2
2. General Comments in Opposition to License Renewal and its Processes, or Specifically St. Lucie, Units 1 and 2
3. Comments Concerning Socioeconomic Issues
4. Comments Concerning Air Quality Issues
5. Comments Concerning Human Health Issues
6. Comments Concerning Aquatic Ecology Issues
7. Comments Concerning Terrestrial Resource Issues
8. Comments Concerning Uranium Fuel Cycle and Waste Management Issues
9. Comments Concerning Threatened and Endangered Species Issues
10. Comments Concerning Alternatives to the Proposed Action
11. Comments Concerning Issues Outside the Scope of License Renewal: Operational Safety, Aging Management, Need for Power, and Other Issues

1. General Comments in Support of License Renewal and its Processes, or Specifically St. Lucie Units 1 and 2

Comment: It is also comforting to know that the electricity that is being generated, is being generated using the cleanest, the safest fuel on earth, nuclear power. It is my understanding that nuclear power poses no air pollution problems and minimal ecological impact during its use. (SL-Z-3)

Comment: And I'm out in the community and I talk to a lot of people. And most of the people realize that nuclear energy is clean. (SL-W-1)

Comment: We (FPL) are committed to safely and reliably operating the St. Lucie Plant in an environmentally responsible manner long into the future, to meet the energy need of Florida. (SL-V-15) (SL-I-15)

Comment: Our (FPL) employees want to remain a part of this community and obtaining renewed licenses is a necessary step to ensure we are able to continue as active and beneficial neighbors in this community. (SL-V-1) (SL-I-1)

Comment: FP&L has been a dependable steward of our resources in St. Lucie County and have always tried to balance the manufacture of power with the protection of the beautiful environment treasures that we are so blessed with in St. Lucie County. (SL-J-2)

Comment: I want you to know that it was my decision to come here today in support of the license renewal of the St. Lucie Plant. (SL-D-1)

Comment: We studied the alternatives for generating electricity and renewing the operating licenses of St. Lucie Plant continues to make sense. St. Lucie Plant's license renewal has the least environmental impact for providing electricity to this region. (SL-I-13) (SL-V-13)

Comment: I'm equally proud of the work we do to preserve and protect the environment. FPL has made a long-standing commitment to the protection of Florida's environment. (SL-V-7) (SL-I-7)

Comment: In February of this year, FPL joined the EPA's new Voluntary Climate Leader's Program as a charter partner. This program is aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions. (SL-V-8) (SL-I-8)

Comment: In regard to the total property controlled by FP&L in this area, the power plant takes up a relatively small percentage. The balance is maintained in its natural state. They have a nature trail where residents and visitors alike can learn more about the plants and animals that make their home in our area. They even supplied biologists to take groups to view nesting sea

Scoping Comment Report

turtles and learn more about them. (SL-J-5)

Comment: I believe FP&L has demonstrated through their actions over the past twenty years, their commitment to provide best in class electric service, while at the same time preserving our environment. (SL-J-6)

Comment: I sincerely recommend the renewal of their (FPL) license for an additional twenty years. (SL-J-7)

Comment: Our people have spoken to more than two thousand individuals at at least 75 meetings and gatherings. And the information that we have received showed very strong support for the re-licensing of the St. Lucie Plant to ensure its continued safe operation and maintain it as a member of this community. (SL-H-10) (SL-U-10)

Comment: St. Lucie Power Plant remains a very cost-effective supplier of electricity. (SL-H-8) (SL-U-8)

Comment: I'm here today on behalf of our United Way and on behalf of myself as a resident, to support the renewal of the Florida Power and Light licensing. (SL-K-4)

Comment: St. Lucie is one of the top performing plants in the country and supplies a source of safe, clean, reliable, and low-cost power to the people of the Treasure Coast. (SL-H-1) (SL-U-1)

Comment: I believe that the renewal of the St. Lucie Plant licenses is the preferred option for meeting the growing energy needs in this area. (SL-H-11) (SL-U-11)

Comment: Over the years, St. Lucie Plant has demonstrated both high levels of safety and reliability. (SL-H-6) (SL-U-6)

Comment: St. Lucie Plant also provides an economical source of electricity for our neighbors and friends on the Treasure Coast. (SL-H-7) (SL-U-7)

Comment: They did a study of my home many years ago and found several ways that I could reduce the amount of electricity that I was using. Not only did they find ways of cutting my bills, they also helped me pay for the things that would do the job. To me, any company that shows me how to conserve energy and helps me to do it, is unheard of in our present day. (SL-J-1)

Comment: The preparation of a license renewal application is a major undertaking. Thousands of work hours have been used to generate the information and to verify that St.

Lucie will continue to be a safe, reliable, and environmentally beneficial plant in the future, a very profitable application and of the team that has developed it. (SL-H-9) (SL-U-9)

Comment: The environment seems to be considered. FP&L seems to be doing a great job in trying to protect the environment, doing programs for the community that help support the socioeconomic and also the ecological environment. (SL-AB-3)

Comment: It (St. Lucie) has a great effect on the citizens of St. Lucie County, and we need this plant. We need to have it re-licensed. I believe it's safe and it's cost effective. (SL-P-5)

Comment: I just wanted to make known to -- we had a presentation made to us by the power plant at the Council of Social Agencies, very well received by them, to be able to support the renewal through the process that they're going through now. (SL-X-1)

Comment: And these plants that we have here in St. Lucie and various other ones around this nation are monitored on an, almost daily basis, by somebody walking around and doing something. (SL-X-2)

Comment: I feel like it's a very positive note that we have this energy available to us and it's produced at a clean level, and also that the process here continues on, and to renew the plant's license when it comes due. (SL-X-4)

Comment: I support the renewal of the St. Lucie license for clean, affordable electricity. (SL-Y-3)

Comment: St. Lucie Plant means clean energy. Let us keep the plant that provides safe, clean, reliable electricity. (SL-Y-5)

Comment: I have not met one person who feels that the plant (St. Lucie) is not environmentally concerned or friendly. So I think they should get their license renewal. (SL-Y-6)

Comment: We would like to voice our support for the St. Lucie Plant license renewal. (SL-Z-1)

Comment: We have come to depend on Florida Power and Light, and the St. Lucie Nuclear Power Plant to provide a safe, clean, and economical electricity, in a dependable manner. (SL-Z-2)

Comment: Finally, my wife and I fully support renewing the license of the St. Lucie Nuclear Power Plant and we would like to see that it continues building on its record of excellence and its culture, that puts community health and safety above all else. We would like to see it continue for twenty years or more and far beyond. (SL-Z-9)

Scoping Comment Report

Comment: I'm speaking tonight on behalf of our organization in support of the license renewal for Florida Power and Light St. Lucie Nuclear Plant. (SL-AA-1)

Comment: I'm here to let you know that they have and they're continuing to do so each and every day, as being meticulously neat performances, standards set at the highest of quality levels. (SL-D-2)

Comment: I've been here for four years, enjoy the environment, and have never heard any concerns about the power plant. (SL-AB-1)

Comment: I think it's in the best interest of the community to renew the application. (SL-AB-4)

Comment: I've had a 25-year experience that has proven to me that this particular energy source is something that I have nothing to be concerned about. (SL-AC-1)

Comment: I highly recommend it and I fully recommend that the operational license be renewed, on a personal basis. (SL-AC-2)

Comment: With FP&L, they're just a part of the community, and a very valuable part of the community. (SL-AC-3)

Comment: We brought this to our own Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors, and had the full presentation, and had a unanimous support for the license renewal. (SL-AC-7)

Comment: Professionally and personally, I support the license renewal. (SL-AC-8)

Comment: When I first came down here and I got dispatched to go to work at St. Lucie, I thought I was working in a hospital. The place is extremely clean. You left there almost as clean as you went there, and we do some heavy construction work. (SL-AD-1)

Comment: But on behalf of the building trades and Carpenter's Local 130, security is always taken care of over there. The workers are taken care of. The environment and the public is always taken care of, and we endorse the extension of the re-licensing. (SL-AD-3)

Comment: St. Lucie Plant has a proven safety record that the employees can continue building on in the years to come. This agency supports the license renewal of St. Lucie Plant. (SL-AG-6)

Comment: This office receives reports on a quarterly basis that indicate that each and every day, St. Lucie Plant meets performance standards set at the highest quality levels. (SL-AG-2)

Comment: There are many reasons why the plant should continue operating, from its importance to the community, being a good neighbor and a good environmental record, just to name a few. But all these reasons would disappear if the plant didn't prove itself each and every day in the most important area of safety. (SL-AG-1)

Comment: I recommend the renewal of the operating license for Florida Power and Light's St. Lucie Plant. (SL-AF-1)

Comment: In conclusion, because the power plant is important to our community, it's a good neighbor, it has a good environmental track record and produces a viable source of low-cost electricity, cleanly and safely, we should keep this plant in operation for twenty more years, and we support the license renewals for the St. Lucie Power Plant. (SL-AA-6)

Comment: I'm asking that the license renewal for the St. Lucie nuclear facility be approved, so that we can keep this very valuable source of low-cost energy for the community for years to come. (SL-Q-7)

Comment: I definitely support and certainly speak for my friends and my neighbors for the license renewal at the St. Lucie Plant. (SL-D-7)

Comment: I personally feel very comfortable. I live within two miles of the plant, don't have a problem with that. As the Fire Chief in St. Lucie County, I don't have a problem with it. I don't have a problem with sending my employees into that plant. (SL-E-2)

Comment: We certainly, as the fire district, would support the re-licensing of the plant. (SL-E-3)

Comment: The people in the immediate vicinity of this plant really hope that the NRC will support the extension of these licenses. (SL-M-3)

Comment: They're (FPL) very dedicated to the protection of the environment there. (SL-N-1)

Scoping Comment Report

Comment: And those people that have been part of FP&L and part of that over the years, have really been dedicated to trying not only a survey and protectives, they began prior to even thinking about the plant opening in 1976 for Unit 1 coming on line. (SL-N-3)

Comment: And I've seen FP&L be not only conscious of safety standards and making quality their job, they've also made -- been good stewards of the environment over the years. (SL-N-4)

Comment: And I can say that over the years, in looking at them, that they (FPL) are a clean energy. (SL-N-5)

Comment: I think, in that aspect, we ought to continue to have FP&L as a neighbor that does provide good clean energy and also they are good stewards of their environment. (SL-N-7)

Comment: I'm here today to speak in favor of the twenty year license renewal of the St. Lucie facility and the continued operations. (SL-Q-1)

Comment: I believe the employees of the St. Lucie nuclear facility and Florida Power and Light have established themselves as good stewards for our environment. They have clearly demonstrated their commitment of managing and achieving a careful balance between the environment and producing a very cost-effective, clean, safe, and reliable source of electricity. (SL-Q-6)

Comment: One of the reasons why I came here to this particular meeting is because this particular facility that we're considering is probably a very good example of a facility that has gone beyond the call of duty to really do things for the community itself. It's been a very good neighbor to the county that it's in. It has a very good safety record. It has a very good record of efficiency. (SL-S-1)

Comment: We hold public workshops in this county every quarter and we allow the public to bring to us issues of concern. And basically we never really heard much grumbling about anything to do with this plant. (SL-S-2)

Comment: I think one of the places in which I feel that this particular facility and FPL as a whole has gone out of their way, has to do with education, education about energy efficiency as well as environmental education. (SL-S-3)

Response: The comments are noted. The comments are supportive of license renewal at St. Lucie, Units 1 and 2, and are general in nature. The comments provide no new information; therefore, the comments will not be evaluated further.

2. General Comments in Opposition to License Renewal and its Processes, or Specifically St. Lucie Units 1 and 2

Comment: The two at Turkey Point and the two up here at St. Lucie are the worst candidates for a license extension that you could possibly imagine. (SL-R-4)

Comment: I'd just like for them to consider that there's a bigger world out there also, it's a big state. And even if a lot of megawatts are generated that can benefit several hundred thousand homes, there's a lot more people out there and a lot more land, and, and animals that don't need to benefit from that, and that could be affected if anything does go wrong. (SL-AE-1)

Comment: I love my fellow humans. I had a great time out at the Olympics, and I really felt international vibes out there. And, but, so coming home, I just want to make sure everybody is safe and that we think about what we're doing in our communities. And I just don't want you to make any mistakes that we can't correct. (SL-AE-2)

Comment: By allowing NRC and FP&L to operate, we accept and condone the possibility of a nuclear catastrophe. (SL-AE-8)

Response: The comments are noted. The comments oppose license renewal and its processes at St. Lucie Units, 1 and 2, but do not provide new information. They do not raise any issues within the scope of this license renewal review. Therefore, the comments will not be evaluated further.

Comment: Charge people more percentage-wise, who use more electricity. Let's raise the rates. Hey, I'm all for it. I don't need nuclear power. I'll pay a little more. (SL-AE-6)

Response: The comment is noted. The comment opposes license renewal and its processes, particularly with regard to cost of replacement, but does not provide new information. It does not raise any issues within the scope of this license renewal review; therefore, it will not be evaluated further.

Comment: Bifurcated Process. The public's right to participate in evidentiary safety hearings under 10 CFR 2.714 is compromised before the draft SEIS is published. This reverse process undermines both public confidence and public safety in that evidentiary hearings with public participation are usually disallowed without the benefits of a draft SEIS being published. The unmistakable message from the NRC is that the public is not a stakeholder in the safety portion of the relicensing procedures. The draft SEIS and the draft Safety Evaluation Report need to

Scoping Comment Report

be published before public participation can be dismissed and evidentiary safety hearings disallowed. The letter and the spirit of the National Environmental Policy Act are being violated by the NRC with bifurcated relicensing procedures. (SL-AO-1) (SL-AQ-1)

Response: The comment is noted. The comment addresses the license renewal process with regard to the separation of the safety and environmental reviews in the relicensing evaluation process, which is defined in 10 CFR Parts 51 and 54. The comment provides no new information, and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.

Comment: The two plants here at St. Lucie, one of them cost 495 million dollars to build and the other came in at 1.4 billion dollars to build. They are still far less than what it would cost to build a state-of-the-art plant today. (SL-R-5)

Response: The comment is noted. The comment addresses the license renewal process with regard to St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 with regard to cost. The comment provides no new information, and does not pertain to the scope of license renewal as set forth in 10 CFR Part 51 and Part 54. Therefore, the comment will not be evaluated further.

Comment: As far as the local people getting involved, it's only voluntary. NRC or FP&L does not have a requirement where they have to meet with these people. It only identifies, quote/unquote, "the local people and officials," and says, quote, "that they," unquote, should be consulted. And it really should be the local infrastructure requesting the consultations with the regulators, who are the NRC and the promoters, who is the FP&L. (SL-T-2)

Comment: In order to comply with the legislative intent and mandates of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Nuclear Regulatory Commission should proceed slowly, reopen the re-licensing process, and offer the county and municipal governments in the five-county Southeast-Florida area further opportunity to become intervenors, appoint special counsel, and fund technical consultants. (SL-AJ-2) (SL-AI-1)

Comment: "Environmental Issues Scoping" should include the following: Implementing leadership and management techniques, currently in widespread industry use, to solicit public, state, county, and municipality input into the St. Lucie and Turkey Point re-licensing process. (SL-AI-2)

Comment: The local meetings I attended at St. Lucie and Turkey Point were conducted in a perfunctory manner — in regards to soliciting critical public input. The NRC failed to meet its Federal mandate under the National Environmental Act (NEPA) — as outlined in NRC's own guidelines handed out at St. Lucie. The NRC did not meet its burden of complying in full spirit with the: "NEPA prescribed PROCESS for preventing uninformed Federal Agency actions.

The “National Environmental Policy Act mandates that the NRC: “...Ensures that Federal Agencies will INFORM and INVOLVE the public....”

The NRC’s own guidelines quote the NEPA as defining and mandating: “INFORM the public of potential impacts to the environment; INVOLVE the public in the decision making process; and requires Federal Agencies to be candid in discussing impacts and mitigation and to be diligent in efforts to lessen damages to the environment.” The NRC did not INFORM and INVOLVE the public in sufficient manner to solicit critical “Public Comment.” The NRC was at best perfunctory in meeting its burden. (SL-AI-10)

Response: The comments are noted. The comments address the license renewal process with regard to public involvement in the relicensing process. The license renewal review process is being conducted under NRC’s environmental protection regulations in 10 CFR Part 51, which includes the format for public participation in the process. The comments provide no new information; therefore, the comment will not be evaluated further.

Comment: And what you’ve seen here today is good theater, and a wonderful presentation by a Fortune 500 company to bring forward people who will testify and provide testimonials about what a good neighbor FPL is. They’ve done a good job in public relations, but ladies and gentlemen, beware. You’ve got a problem on your hands. (SL-R-7)

Response: The comment is noted. The comment addresses the license renewal process with regard to St. Lucie Units 1 and 2. The comment provides no new information, and does not pertain to the scope of license renewal as set forth in 10 CFR Part 51 and Part 54. Therefore, it will not be evaluated further.

3. Comments Concerning Socioeconomic Issues

Comment: While at the same time, time and time again, it has been involved in a lot of very good efforts, both in terms of education and energy efficiency, and just in general, in terms of the plant and the employees in the plant, in terms of participating in local humanitarian type of efforts. (SL-S-7)

Comment: For the last five years on an average, they have been good corporate citizens and good employees. They have donated on an average of over \$103,000 a year for the last five years. Not only have they donated their time and money, but they have given of all of their energies to this community to make it a better place to live. (SL-K-3)

Comment: I can attest that FPL has been an outstanding partner to our school district. The plant’s Energy Encounter hosts thousands of visitors annually, including many students. In addition to providing hands-on science programs for schools, free workshops for teachers are offered. The plant donated computers and supplies to local schools, and FPL has made

Scoping Comment Report

substantial contributions to the Regional Sports Stadium and the St. Lucie County Marine Center. (SL-AF-2)

Comment: I am pleased to be a part of a group of FPL employees who contribute to local area agencies through the United Way. (SL-V-2) (SL-I-2)

Comment: The people of Hutchinson Island have asked me to let you know that the community in the immediate vicinity of the power plant views the plant as a good neighbor and a conscientious advocate and friend of the fragile barrier island environment. (SL-M-1)

Comment: Our (FPL) employees also mentor students and volunteer in local schools. We also support the St. Lucie County Education Foundation in its scholarship program. (SL-V-3) (SL-I-3)

Comment: FPL employees are also involved in helping the community through other organizations, such as Scouts, Little Leagues, civic groups, and church programs. (SL-V-4) (SL-I-4)

Comment: The Plant's (St. Lucie's) information center, called the Energy Encounter, hosts about 40,000 visitors each year, including 15,000 students who visit on educational field trips. (SL-V-5) (SL-I-5)

Comment: I have found them (FPL) to be a very good neighbor, three miles away. They are involved in the community. (SL-W-5)

Comment: The employees at the plant give very generously to local United Way campaigns here on the Treasure Coast. They contribute hundreds of thousands of dollars each year to local charitable organizations through their participation. (SL-AA-4)

Comment: But more importantly our people do more than just work at the power plant. They're involved in the community. They're part of this community. (SL-H-3) (SL-U-3)

Comment: The St. Lucie Power Plant is a good neighbor that participates or sponsors a number of educational, environmental, and civic activities. (SL-Z-4)

Comment: The St. Lucie Plant is a good neighbor. Speaking on behalf of the United Way of Martin County, I personally know many of the employees at the St. Lucie Plant and I know how they're involved in the community. And I know personally that they are involved with many organizations that are making a difference in our quality of life in the community. (SL-AA-3)

Comment: They're (FPL) good neighbors. Good neighbors always contribute the economy. (SL-Y-4)

Comment: Of course, many people spoke about how community-active they are. And I don't know as much about that, but I do know Rachel Scott and I do know her leadership for United Way here in St. Lucie County has been phenomenal this past year. (SL-AC-6)

Comment: I see all the good involvement they have in the social services in this community. United Way wouldn't be the same without them. Certainly our own personal experience at Big Brothers, Big Sisters would not be the same. They've worked for hundreds and thousands of people in this community every year. (SL-G-7)

Comment: I can tell you all the things they're involved in, in the school system, in education, the Energy Encounter plant that brings thousands of kids in each year to educate them about science and electricity. (SL-G-6)

Comment: That number of employees who have money and time participate actively in local charities and support our local PTAs and schools in a number of ways that we just don't see, but it happens all the time. (SL-F-2)

Comment: They (FPL) do build houses for habitat for low-income families. (SL-W-2)

Comment: I'm here to tell you about the good neighbor that I think that Florida Power and Light has been over all of the years I've been in the community. (SL-G-1)

Comment: FPL employees, led by Rachel Scott, External Affairs Manager, are active in the community and serve on various boards including the Education Foundation. (SL-AF-3)

Response: The comments are noted. The comments are supportive of license renewal for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2. Public services were evaluated in the GEIS and determined to be a Category 1 issue. Information regarding the impact on socioeconomic issues will be discussed in Chapter 4 of the SEIS.

Comment: Today I draw issues from an economic development point of view. St. Lucie Power Plant has a tremendous effect on St. Lucie County. (SL-P-1)

Comment: The plant is also one of the largest employers in our area, and it's very important to our local economy. A business of this size would be very difficult to replace. The plant's payroll, purchases and property taxes supply our local governments with revenue which we need to provide services on which we depend. (SL-AA-5)

Scoping Comment Report

Comment: The estimated economic impact of plant operation (St. Lucie) is more than 80 million dollars annually. (SL-I-14) (SL-V-14)

Comment: I'm here to speak about the economic health of St. Lucie County, of which the St. Lucie Power Plant is a key contributor. (SL-A- 1)

Response: The comments are noted. Effects on the local economy due to license renewal are considered as a Category 2 issue in the GEIS and are, therefore, examined on a site-specific basis in Chapters 2 and 4 of the supplement to the GEIS for St. Lucie license renewal.

Comment: Florida Power and Light is the second largest employer in the county, with more than 800 full-time workers and contributes more than 80 million to the local economy. (SL-AF-4)

Comment: We are one of the largest employers in the St. Lucie and Martin County areas, with over 800 full-time employees. (SL-H-2) (SL-U-2)

Comment: There are about 800 or more employees that work at the power plant. (SL-D-5)

Comment: FP&L is our, one of our major employers in this community. (SL-AC-4)

Comment: St. Lucie Power Plant employs approximately twelve hundred people. (SL-A-2)

Comment: There are 378 people at the plant who live in St. Lucie County and the payroll is about 23 million dollars. (SL-P-3)

Comment: If the St. Lucie Power Plant were to leave St. Lucie County, it would be difficult, we feel, to have those twelve hundred jobs absorbed into our community, and also our unemployment rate would start going back up, it would go back up. (SL-A-3)

Comment: FP&L has good paying jobs. (SL-A-4)

Comment: A clean industry that brings 800 or so paying, high paying jobs to the local economy, is just a phenomenal asset to have in this area. (SL-F-1)

Response: The comments are noted. Employment factors related to license renewal are considered as a Category 2 issue in the GEIS and are, therefore, examined on a site-specific basis in Chapters 2 and 4 of the supplement to the GEIS for St. Lucie license renewal.

Comment: FP&L on the tax rolls brings a billion eighty million dollars in assess valuation. That's the size of business that would be very hard to replace in St. Lucie County, not to mention the unemployment that could result if they were to leave. (SL-G-2)

Comment: Their investments in property and facilities provide extremely strong part of our tax base that drives our community. (SL-AC-5)

Comment: The taxes paid here due to the St. Lucie Plant is approximately 20 million dollars a year. (SL-P-2)

Response: The comments are noted. The comments are supportive of license renewal and relate to the socioeconomic benefits that the plant brings to the local communities. Effects on the tax base due to license renewal are considered as a Category 2 issue in the GEIS and are, therefore, examined on a site-specific basis in Chapters 2 and 4 of the supplement to the GEIS for St. Lucie license renewal.

4. Comments Concerning Air Quality Issues

Comment: The carbon emissions from the endless line of nuclear-laden security truck convoys will surely contribute a little something. (SL-T-4)

Comment: The St. Lucie Power Plant provides a source of clean energy. And it's through our operations that we avoid production of greenhouse gases, which many scientists believe contribute to global warming. (SL-U-4) (SL-H-4)

Comment: Another benefit in renewing the St. Lucie Plant licenses is our ability to continue providing clean energy without using additional land for new power plants. In fact, nuclear power plants prevent substantial amounts of carbon emissions and other pollutants from going into the air we breathe. The positive impact on air quality will continue during the period of extended operation. (SL-V-12) (SL-I-12)

Comment: When I look at the options that are out there, I'm looking for the kind of electricity that shows the least amount of pollution and I'm very, very pleased to be able to say that we have a nuclear power plant in St. Lucie County and that it's got the controls against pollution that it has. (SL-G-4)

Comment: But I have always felt that the clean air has been tested by the national people, by the state people. (SL-W-4)

Response: The comments are noted. Non-radiological air pollutant emissions are regulated through permits issued by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the State of Florida. Air quality will be discussed in Chapter 2 of the SEIS. The comments provide no new

information and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.

5. Comments Concerning Human Health Issues

Comment: I believe that the St. Lucie Site-Specific Environmental Impact Statement must include careful analysis of the following factors, fully considering their impact throughout the 20-year extension period: analysis of health and environmental effects of airborne and liquid radioactive waste the St. Lucie plant has released and is projected to release during its operating life. (SL-AN-11)

Comment: My death and the possible death of countless peoples is acceptable to NRC regulations and FP&L procedures. It's threatening and it's not worth it. (SL-AE-5)

Comment: The nuclear industry presents a catastrophic scenario never before imaginable, and, besides the usual number of injuries and deaths in the energy field. (SL-AE-4)

Comment: I do believe that all industries, coal-fired plants, oil burning plants, they all have their allowable deaths per million ratio, but nuclear power, by the very nature of it, it's acceptance and promulgation among the very few governing and regulatory bodies, we don't have a lot of people giving input on this, just the NRC and FP&L. (SL-AE-3)

Response: The comments are noted. Radiation exposure to the public and workers from routine releases were evaluated in the GEIS and determined to be a Category 1 issue. The comments provide no new information and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.

Comment: The company and outside agencies consistently monitor the air and water quality around the plant and surrounding communities, to ensure those strict environmental standards are not only maintained, but upheld. (SL-Q-5)

Comment: The company operates more than 30 different environmental monitoring stations that sample the air and the water, to ensure that they meet and do better than federal, state, and county standards. (SL-J-4)

Comment: The State of Florida, Department of Health, Bureau of Radiation and Control, independently monitors levels at locations surrounding Florida Power and Light's nuclear power plants and the agency also, they sample new plant soil and other water to confirm that they're testing their findings. (SL-D-6)

Comment: The State of Florida's Department of Health, Bureau of Radiation Control independently monitors and tests radiation levels at locations surrounding St. Lucie Plant.

Monitoring and testing includes sampling of air, water, shoreline sediment, fish, crustacea, broad leaf vegetation, and milk. These levels have consistently been comparable to those measured throughout the state for the last 25 years. (SL-AG-4)

Comment: The NRC has a terrible track record as far as really addressing the problems of contamination of the environment. (SL-R-2)

Comment: Plant Emissions. The Generic EIS for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants, NUREG-1437, fails to list the isotopes and isotopic concentrations for radioactive pollution released to the public in airborne and waterborne waste streams for St. Lucie Units 1 & 2. The draft SEIS needs to list this information for each of the previous 10 years and project radioactive pollution amounts for the 20 years of license extension. Since the GEIS was completed in April 1996, the calculated exposure rates and the calculated adverse health effects have become woefully outdated. At a public meeting sponsored by the NRC in Homestead, Florida, it was stated by a member of the NRC staff that the work on the GEIS began in 1992. The date of April 1996 for manuscript completion gives no assurance that the data and calculations were current as of April 1996. (SL-AO-12) (SL-AQ-12)

Comment: All studies on radiation health effects completed since April 1996 are being ignored. The draft SEIS needs to publish accurate historical data on St. Lucie radioactive emissions, year by year, isotope by isotope. This would give independent scientists as well as industry scientists an opportunity to use current data and calculations to improve the accuracy of findings of the outdated GEIS in time to be included in the final SEIS. By hiding this data from the public, the NRC fosters the perception that publishing isotopic emissions data is something to be feared and avoided at all costs. (SL-AO-13) (SL-AQ-13)

Response: The comments are noted. The requirements for monitoring and quantification of routine releases to the environment are beyond the scope of license renewal. The NRC requires the licensee routinely to conduct radiological monitoring of all plant effluents, as well as sample biota and locally grown foodstuffs. Additionally, the State of Florida independently monitors the environment around the nuclear plant for radioactive contamination. The NRC also communicates with permitting agencies that administer the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act, State radiological agencies, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and other organizations. Any potential noncompliance of monitoring requirements is an operational safety issue, handled through the inspection and reporting process and is not within the scope of license renewal. The comments provide no new information, and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.

6. Comments Concerning Aquatic Ecology Issues

Comment: The power plant itself has not been emitting pollutants of any kind that would have been damaging our marine resources. (SL-S-4)

Scoping Comment Report

Response: The comment is noted. The comment concerns a Category 1 issue: effects of plant releases on aquatic biota near St. Lucie Units 1 and 2. Aquatic ecology will be discussed in Chapter 2 and environmental impacts of operation will be discussed in Chapter 4 of the SEIS. The comment provides no new information and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.

Comment: I believe that the St. Lucie Site-Specific Environmental Impact Statement must include careful analysis of the following factors, fully considering their impact throughout the 20-year extension period: analysis of bioaccumulated radioactivity in marine life at the outfall pipe and projected additional accumulation during the extended operating period. (SL-AN-12)

Response: The comment is noted. The comment concerns accumulation of radioisotopes in aquatic biota, which was evaluated in the GEIS and determined to be a Category 1 issue. Aquatic ecology will be discussed in Chapter 2 and environmental impacts of operation will be discussed in Chapter 4 of the SEIS. The comments provide no new information and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.

7. Comments Concerning Terrestrial Resource Issues

Comment: And the fact that the plant takes up quite a bit of very prime real estate and leaves it in its natural state is a spectacular opportunity for us in terms of providing habitat that we could not afford to purchase these properties and maintain them in that natural state. (SL-S-5)

Response: The comment is noted and relates to terrestrial ecology Category 1 issues. The comment provides no new information; therefore, it will not be evaluated further.

8. Comments Concerning Uranium Fuel Cycle and Waste Management Issues

Comment: I believe that the St. Lucie Site-Specific Environmental Impact Statement must include careful analysis of the following factors, fully considering their impact throughout the 20-year extension period: Costs of safely and securely storing high level nuclear wastes on site for at least 20 more years. (SL-AN-9)

Comment: The cost impact analysis should include: Risks of accidental radiation release from a fuel transport and storage. (SL-AM-3)

Comment: I believe that the St. Lucie Site-Specific Environmental Impact Statement must include careful analysis of the following factors, fully considering their impact throughout the 20-year extension period: Long term storage and transportation hazards of high level nuclear wastes, including analysis of land routes for the transportation of new fuel and spent fuel through Florida. (SL-AN-10)

Comment: Why do you need a separate license for the pool expansion or dry cask storage? This should be planned along with the license to renew, to operate. (SL-T-3)

Response: Onsite storage of spent nuclear fuel is a Category 1 issue. The safety and environmental effects of a long-term storage of spent fuel onsite has been evaluated by the NRC and, as set forth in the Waste Confidence Rule, the NRC generically determined that such storage could be accomplished without significant environmental impact. In the Waste Confidence Rule, the Commission determined that spent fuel can be stored onsite for at least 30 years beyond the licensed operating life, which may include the term of a renewed license. At or before the end of that period, the fuel would be moved to a permanent repository. The *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants* (GEIS), NUREG-1437, is based upon the assumption that storage of the spent fuel onsite is not permanent. The plant-specific supplement to the GEIS that will be prepared regarding license renewal for the St. Lucie Units 1 and 2, will be based on the same assumption.

Likewise, the matter of processing and storage of low-level waste is considered a Category 1 issue. The conclusion regarding this issue in the GEIS included consideration of the long-term storage of low-level waste onsite during the license renewal term. The comments provide no new information; therefore the comments will not be evaluated further.

9. Comments Concerning Threatened and Endangered Species Issues

Comment: The St. Lucie Power Plant is not only a place that produces clean, safe, low cost electricity, it also is an environmentally friendly facility, that provides a home to dozens of rare, threatened or endangered birds and animals. (SL-Z-7)

Comment: The plant itself, it's been mentioned, the nuclear plant doesn't take up but a small portion of the total acreage on the barrier island site. So the rest of the acreage is left in its natural state and it's maintained in a natural state, in fact enhanced in some areas, by removing exotic vegetation such as Brazilian Pepper and Australian Pine, and does provide habitat for a tremendous diversity of life that's on the barrier island, associated with the coastal area, about a 180 or so species of plants and animals that are associated with the site, about 36 different endangered species there, or threatened species that are on the site, too. (SL-N-2)

Response: The comments are noted. Threatened or Endangered Species is a Category 2 issue, and will be addressed in Sections 2.2 and 4.6 of the supplemental EIS for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2.

Comment: The St. Lucie Plant, which looks out on the Atlantic Ocean, maintains a strong commitment to sea turtle protection. Our (FPL) sea turtle program involves around the clock efforts, including scientific research and data gathering, participation in the sea turtle stranding and salvage program, participation in the sea turtle beach nesting surveys and our free guided

Scoping Comment Report

turtle walks for the public. (SL-I-9) (SL-V-9)

Comment: The work they (FPL) do on local marine life and their specialized work with our sea turtle population fills a very important need for us. (SL-M-2)

Comment: There's also a great deal of care for some of our lagoon residents, such as the sea turtles, that could be killed or injured in water intakes and things of that nature. Every effort is made to protect them. (SL-S-6)

Comment: The Turtle Beach nature trail mentioned here earlier, is open to the public to enjoy Florida's natural beauty. The plant's beaches provide one of the best nesting sites for threatened or endangered sea turtles, and the overall facility itself is a place of quiet beauty. (SL-Z-8)

Response: The comments are noted. Sea turtles are protected under the Endangered Species Act, and are evaluated as Threatened or Endangered Species, which is a Category 2 issue. That analysis will be presented in Sections 2.2 and 4.6 of the supplemental EIS for St. Lucie, Units 1 and 2.

10. Comments Concerning Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Comment: I also feel that the NEPA, National Environmental Policy Act goes way back, too. That's all the way back to 1969. That's what a lot of this is being based on. I think it's a pro-nuclear bill. It's basically about the process to consider alternatives, which aiming right towards nuclear power. (SL-T-1)

Comment: If the application is not renewed, he said it would take ten years to create an alternate source of energy. And think about that. We'd have to take ten years to find alternate sources of energy. What is the cost going to be? Where is it going to come from? Is it going to be available? And now we have a plant we have to shut down. What's the cost of shutting the plant down? What's the cost going to be for jobs in the community if we have to shut the plant down? And what are the other environmental costs that it's going to take to get sources that probably aren't going to be in our own community? Our community will suffer. (SL-AB-2)

Comment: An environmental trade study comparing the estimated cost and pollution of various energy conversion plants should be a part of the renewal process. This should include the total cost per kW and total cost per kWh including any subsidies. These trades should include those sources that would be substituted if the renewal license were denied and other energy sources must be used in compensation. These should include coal, oil, natural gas, wind, solar, and other less likely forms such as biomass, wave and tidal energy. (SL-AP-1)

Response: The comments are noted. Impacts from reasonable alternatives for the St. Lucie license renewal will be evaluated in Section 8 of the SEIS.

Comment: The other aspect of what Florida has is biomass, and in spite of our state senator arguing for the burning of city waste and incinerator plants, using the heat form that to generate more energy, there are a lot of pollutants that are associated with human induced waste. The aspects of mercury, lead, various heavy metals that are within the incineration system and have to be removed, some remaining to go into the air and water. (SL-L-6)

Comment: There are aspects that should be compared for the non-license renewable aspect in the EIS scoping to include coal plants, oil fired plants, the natural gas plants that are far lower in pollution, but there's a lot of limit as to how much there is. It's all fossil fuel. (SL-L-3)

Comment: I read somewhere, on a scale comparing fossil fuel plants with nuclear plant, the fossil plants pollute at the rate of 30 to 45 percent and the nuclear plant, in comparison, about 3 percent. (SL-J-3)

Comment: They don't burn fossil fuel, although we are concerned about where that spent fuel is going to go and what's going to happen. There are other alternatives that always can be explored and looked at. (SL-N-6)

Response: The comments are noted. Impacts from reasonable alternatives, including alternative fuels, for the St. Lucie license renewal will be evaluated in Section 8 of the SEIS.

Comment: Nowhere here tonight did I hear that we must conserve. I think this is one of our greatest focuses that we must do. The electricity consumed per customer has to decrease. I hear that's been on the increase. (SL-AE-7)

Response: The comment is noted. Impacts from reasonable alternatives, including conservation, for the St. Lucie license renewal will be evaluated in Section 8 of the SEIS.

Comment: The other aspect of renewable energy is also very difficult. For Florida you'd think, well, it's the sunshine state, but we don't get as much as Arizona. We have sea breeze storms, cloud cover, roughly five hours on the average of sunlight, direct blue sky sunlight a day. That's quite a limitation. (SL-L-4)

Response: The comment is noted. Impacts from reasonable alternatives, including solar power generation, for the St. Lucie license renewal will be evaluated in Section 8 of the SEIS.

Comment: As much as I'm a wind energy fan, there's not a lot of wind in Florida. It's rated marginal by FP&L. (SL-L-5)

Scoping Comment Report

Response: The comment is noted. Impacts from reasonable alternatives, including wind power, for the St. Lucie license renewal will be evaluated in Section 8 of the SEIS.

11. Comments Concerning Issues Outside the Scope of License Renewal: Operational Safety, Aging Management, Need for Power, and Other Issues

Operational Safety

Comment: There are experienced and watchful inspectors from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that make certain that safety is always a priority and at the very top of the list for operations and that's done daily. (SL-D-3)

Comment: We have a phenomenal working relationship with emergency preparedness in the plant. They support both counties with money, with training, with personnel, with information, with all sorts of things that help our operations. (SL-F-3)

Comment: As far as environmental impact, the thing you're not being told about, is what happens in the event of an accident. (SL-R-1)

Comment: Environmentally, the plant must meet very strict and stringent radiation safety standards designed to protect the employees and ensure the community's health and safety. (SL-Q-4)

Comment: As a result of our efforts and true dedication to these rules, policies and procedures by the employees at St. Lucie Plant, the facility has consistently been recognized as being one of the safest and most reliable nuclear power plants, both in the United States and the world. (SL-Q-3)

Comment: The St. Lucie Plant team is made up of highly trained professionals who have a strong commitment to safely operating the plant. Our employees work hard and are dedicated to high standards of excellence and continuous improvement. (SL-I-6) (SL-V-6)

Comment: As business manager for the union, three of my most important values are safety, which includes the safety and well being of not only the employees, but the safety and well being of the public, training for our employees and the protection of the environment in which we all live, all three of which St. Lucie nuclear facility has regularly received the recognition of being one of the best performers in the nuclear industry by independent oversight organizations. (SL-Q-2)

Comment: FPL has always stressed, from day one that I was there, worker safety is paramount, public safety is paramount. (SL-AD-2)

Comment: We have mandatory training sessions every year for all of our employees dealing with the power plant on the island. We also do semi-annual training along with the power plant and it's overseen by the NRC. We just conducted one this year and passed with glowing reviews there. (SL-E-1)

Comment: We were also made aware of the vital role that you folks of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission play, to make sure that safety is at the forefront of all plant operations. (SL-Z-6)

Comment: Who doesn't have a computer, who doesn't have air conditioning, what would Florida be without air conditioning, and all of things and the reasons for electricity I want for myself, and I want for my family, and want for the community. But unless it's provided in a safe way and that the environment's protected, I kind of, you know, would still want it, but I'd have to have some reservations. (SL-W-3)

Comment: St. Lucie County or St. Lucie Plant, has been consistently evaluated with an excellent safety record. St. Lucie's safety inspection record has been rated as one of the most reliable nuclear power plants, not only in the U.S., but also in the world. All the St. Lucie Plant safety indicators on the top performance band. (SL-D-4)

Comment: So safety is their (FPL) concern. It's for our well being. (SL-X-3)

Comment: I feel that they (FPL) have a good safety record for 25 years, and I think they're going to go on for another 20 years, so I tell you I do support that they get their license renewal. (SL-W-7)

Comment: I feel very secure in the fact that knowing that that plant (St. Lucie) is secure and our children are secure. (SL-K-1)

Comment: FP&L have a wonderful evacuation plan for our children and for the people who lived and worked around the plant. (SL-K-2)

Comment: This plant (St. Lucie) is probably one of the safest and one of the best operating plants in the country. (SL-C-3)

Comment: And what you people should be concerned with here is what happens in the event of an accident. (SL-R-3)

Comment: 44 years ago, the Price Anderson was set in. That means that the industry can only be held accountable for 9 billion dollars worth of damage. That's slated to expire in August

Scoping Comment Report

of 2002. The 103 U.S. reactors now licensed are grandfathered under the law, which is pretty interesting. (SL-T-5)

Comment: Safety has always been the primary concern. And even back then when we didn't have all this sophisticated equipment out there, we were constantly checked on a yearly basis, to make sure that our security was in place. (SL-C-0)

Comment: It was here that we became aware of the ongoing training and testing that all operators and plant personnel are subjected to, of the written procedures that are in place for every operation, of the continuous preventative maintenance programs that are stringently applied, and of the quality control surveillance activities that confirm that all these safeguards are in place, working as planned, and documented. All of these efforts are directed to the assurance of an absolutely fail-safe operation. (SL-Z-5)

Comment: I believe that the St. Lucie Site-Specific Environmental Impact Statement must include careful analysis of the following factors, fully considering their impact throughout the 20-year extension period: Planning and updating infrastructure for prompt public evacuation from areas within a 50 mile radius of the plant. (SL-AN-8)

Comment: In February 2001, NRC re-licensed Arkansas 1 PWR for 20 years. It had to be shut down because of extensive cracking on the control rod drives and thermocouple nozzles entering the nuclear reactor. Where was serious NRC inspection before approval of license extension? (SL-AK-5)

Comment: In 1979 Three Mile Island, a PWR plant, had a partial meltdown. Where was the NRC? (SL-AK-2)

Comment: Given the potential of life-threatening danger to millions of Floridians as a result of malfunction, error or terrorism at Southeast Florida's St. Lucie and Turkey Point nuclear power plants, we believe it is incumbent upon the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to fully comply with both the letter and the spirit of all provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). With issues involving nuclear power, perfunctory minimum compliance is inadequate at best and a precursor to disaster at worst. (SL-AJ-1)

Comment: The February, 2000 radiation-releasing rupture at Indian Point promptly ended a 12-year delay in replacing known-faulty generators. (SL-AN-3)

Comment: The cost impact analysis should include: Risks of accidental radiation release from a nuclear energy facility. (AL-AM-2)

Comment: Currently, the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Plant (PWR) in Ohio is shut down,

narrowly avoiding a potential Chernobyl-like disaster. Five cracked control rod nozzles permitted acid to seep into the coolant bath. At one nozzle the acid ate through the 6-inch vessel head, fortunately stopped by a 3/8-inch stainless steel cap on the vessel head. This condition was discovered by chance during a routine refueling of the reactor. (SL-AK-6)

Comment: It is clearly evident that the employees of St. Lucie Plant are dedicated to making sure the plant is safe for, not only themselves, but for their families and neighbors. (SL-AG-0)

Comment: Safety is not just a slogan at St. Lucie Plant, it is a way of life. For example, this office receives timely briefings and correspondence regarding in place procedures and checks by an independent quality assurance organization, that ensure timely preventative maintenance is done. These reports show that St. Lucie Plant is committed to the safety of residents surrounding the plant. Most important, is their proactive involvement in on site as well as off sight emergency planning. Regular scheduled exercises ensure that coordination between on and off site agencies, should the need arise, can occur almost as a matter of routine. This training and exercising has resulted in this agency's receiving flawless Federal Emergency Management Agency evaluations ensuring the safety of citizens should an emergency occur. (SL-AG-3)

Comment: I believe that the St. Lucie Site-Specific Environmental Impact Statement must include careful analysis of the following factors, fully considering their impact throughout the 20-year extension period: Probability and potential impacts of terrorist attacks and nuclear accidents. (SL-AN-6)

Comment: Oconee 1 PWR in South Carolina, after recently receiving a 20-year license extension from the NRC, was shut down when 19 cracks were found in the reactor where control rods pass through to the nuclear core. Who were the NRC inspectors who approved license renewal? (SL-AK-4)

Comment: Indian Point PWR 2 years ago burst a steam generator tube, spilling radioactive coolant that sent radioactive steam into the atmosphere. Two months ago radioactive coolant was leaking from a steam generator. Where is effective NRC inspection? (SL-AK-3)

Comment: Shortly after the 20-year Oconee license extension, a cooling system leak was discovered that could have led to reactor overheating and a repeat of the 1979 Three Mile Island accident. (SL-AN-1)

Comment: While it will be expensive to safely certify 40-year-old systems for an additional 20 years, the expense is insignificant compared to the cost of an accident. (SL-AN-5)

Comment: The failing steam generator barrier between the primary coolant and the secondary coolant at St. Lucie may be responsible for radioactive emissions and adverse health effects far greater than the averages given in the GEIS. The SEIS needs to explain whether this barrier

Scoping Comment Report

will continue to deteriorate and what will be the resultant consequences to the community. (SL-AQ-14)

Comment: Davis- Bessie. The surprising consequences of the boric acid leak at the Davis-Bessie reactor demonstrates an accident causing mechanism previously unrecognized by the NRC in its severity. The SEIS needs to examine the possibility of the Davis-Bessie failure and its variations before extending the operating license of St. Lucie by 20 years. Will boric acid exposure always corrode carbon steel? Can cracked control rod tube guides cause extensive corrosion even if boron crystals do not appear on the reactor lid? Can cracked instrument rod ports cause extensive corrosion even if boron crystals do not appear on the reactor lid? Can any opening in the stainless steel lining of the reactor cause corrosion from boric acid exposure? Does this corrosive mechanism affect welding material as well as carbon steel? Are all locations in the primary coolant loop, where carbon steel is exposed to boric acid, subject to corrosion? Are there circumstances where boric acid corrosion can increase the chances or magnify the severity of a pressurized thermal shock accident? Should the reactor vessels and primary coolant pipes be x-rayed for corrosion cavities? What would be the consequences of a corrosion related reactor failure at the St. Lucie plant site? (SL-AQ-15)

Response: The comments are noted. Operational safety matters are outside the scope of the NRC's environmental review. An NRC safety review for the license renewal period is conducted separately.

Although this topic may not be within the scope of review for license renewal, the NRC is always concerned with protecting health and safety. Any matter potentially affecting safety can be addressed under processes currently available for an existing operating license in the absence of a license renewal application. The comments provide no new information and do not pertain to the scope of license renewal as set forth in 10 CFR Part 51 and Part 54. Therefore, the comments will not be evaluated further under this review. However, a copy of these comments will be provided to the project manager who oversees current operating and licensing activities for consideration.

Comment: Factor in the demographic make-up of the tri-county area: giving weight and consideration to the fact that the second largest Jewish population concentration in the US is situated in the tri-county area. (SL-AI-6)

Response: In a conversation with the commentor an NRC staff member was informed that the commentor is concerned that the presence of a large Jewish population in the tri-county area makes the region and the facility an attractive target for terrorists. Physical security issues related to nuclear plants is an ongoing operational issue and is outside the scope of license renewal. This issue, related to operational safety, will be provided to the project manager who oversees current operating and licensing activities for consideration. The comment will not be

evaluated further.

Comment: The tests are limited only to attacks on nuclear fuel in the reactor. No mock attacks have tested the security of nuclear fuel in the spent fuel pools which, potentially, is equally dangerous to the health and safety of the public. Spent fuel pools may be viewed by terrorists as softer targets. (SL-AO-8) (SL-AQ-8)

Comment: Security concerns related to the close proximity of the St. Lucie nuclear plants — with onsite storage of spent fuel rods containing plutonium — to International Airports at Miami, Fort Lauderdale, West Palm Beach, Orlando, Tampa, and Jacksonville, Florida. (SL-AI-7)

Comment: The tests have excluded nuclear plants that are permanently shut down yet still contain large amounts of nuclear fuel in the spent fuel pools. Apparently, these facilities have far less security yet are equally as dangerous to the health and safety of the public as operating plants. (SL-AO-9) (SL-AQ-9)

Comment: A statement in a technical study says, “Only during the first several years and in the most severe events, such as severe seismic events, heavy load drops and other dynamic events that cause the pool to fail, would the accident progress so rapidly that emergency response measures might not be implemented in a timely manner.”. This information also belongs in the Environmental Impact Statement. (SL-O-4) (SL-AH-4)

Response: The comments are noted. Operational safety matters are outside the scope of this review. An NRC safety review for the license renewal period is conducted separately. With regard to accidents in the spent fuel pool, each nuclear plant must have approved emergency and safeguards contingency plans, in accordance with 10 CFR Part 50, that are revised periodically. Emergency and safeguards planning are part of the current operating license and are outside the scope of the environmental analysis for license renewal. Any required changes to emergency and safeguards contingency plans that may be generated due to threats such as terrorism and sabotage will be incorporated and reviewed under the operating license.

Although a topic may not be within the scope of review for license renewal, the NRC is always concerned with protecting health and safety. Any matter potentially affecting safety can be addressed under processes currently available for an existing operating license in the absence of a license renewal application. Although the comments do not pertain to the scope of license renewal as set forth in 10 CFR Part 51 and Part 54, they will be provided to the project manager who oversees current operating and licensing activities for consideration.

Comment: An article in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists by Robert Alvarez says that the NRC knows of no practical method for extinguishing a zirconium fire. These issues need to be thoroughly researched and stated in the St. Lucie EIS. (SL-O-6) (SL-AH-6)

Comment: This document entitled, “A Safety and Regulatory Assessment of Generic BWR

Scoping Comment Report

and PWR Permanently Shut-Down Plants,” states that a generic worse code reactor -- worse case reactor melt-down can permanently contaminate 2,000 square miles of land and a generic worse case -- I’ll get it right yet -- zirconium fire can permanently contaminate 2,170 square miles of land. (SL-O-5) (SL-AH-5)

Comment: This technical study lists nine causes for a zirconium fire. The combined probability of these causes has been calculated by the NRC to be about one in 400,000 years per spent fuel pool, but the study was published the year before the terrorists attacked and destroyed the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center. The study does not include any sabotage or terrorism acts, so these probability numbers no longer have any meaning. (SL-O-2) (SL-AH-2)

Comment: The spent fuel rods in each of these pools needs to be forcibly cool for a number of years. If the force cooling is stopped, the internal heat from the radioactive material inside the fuel rods will boil off the cooling water. When the rods become uncovered, the internal heat will then set their zirconium casing on fire. Studies show that the zirconium fire in a spent fuel pool would have the consequences as catastrophic as a reactor melt down. (SL-O-1)

Comment: In October, 2000, the NRC published a document called, “A Technical Study of Spent Fuel Pool Accident Risk at Decommissioning Nuclear Power Plants.” The spent fuel rods in each of these pools needs to be forcibly cool for a number of years. If the force cooling is stopped, the internal heat from the radioactive material inside the fuel rods will boil off the cooling water. When the rods become uncovered, the internal heat will then set their zirconium casing on fire. Studies show that the zirconium fire in a spent fuel pool would have the consequences as catastrophic as a reactor melt down. (SL-AH-1)

Response: The comments are noted. Operational safety matters are outside the scope of this review. An NRC safety review for the license renewal period is conducted separately. With regard to zirconium fires in the spent fuel pool, each nuclear plant must have approved emergency and safeguards contingency plans, in accordance with 10 CFR Part 50, that are revised periodically. Emergency and safeguards planning are part of the current operating license and are outside the scope of the environmental analysis for license renewal. Any required changes to emergency and safeguards contingency plans that may be generated due to threats such as terrorism and sabotage will be incorporated and reviewed under the operating license.

Although a topic may not be within the scope of review for license renewal, the NRC is always concerned with protecting health and safety. Any matter potentially affecting safety can be addressed under processes currently available for the existing operating license in the absence of a license renewal application. Although the comments do not pertain to the scope of license renewal as set forth in 10 CFR Part 51 and Part 54, they will be provided to the project manager who oversees current operating and licensing activities for consideration.

Comment: Congressman Ed Markey recently released a report criticizing the lax approach the NRC has taken in regard to security measures since 9/11. I suggest that report be included in the Environmental Impact Statement for St. Lucie. (SL-O-8) (SL-AH-8)

Comment: Until the NRC demonstrates that spent fuel pools would not be successfully attacked by terrorists, a hardened category A containment building should be constructed around spent fuel pools. (SL-AH-7) (SL-O-7)

Comment: I asked him, if these plants have been certified to be able to withstand the impact of an airplane. And, ladies and gentlemen, probably 75 percent of the plants in this country are not certified to withstand the impact of an airplane. (SL-R-6)

Comment: Terrorism. The draft SEIS needs to examine the procedures and facilities for stopping an aircraft of any size from being intentionally crashed into nuclear reactors, control rooms, and spent fuel pools, as witnessed by the total destruction of the World Trade Center towers. If procedures and facilities are not overwhelmingly reassuring, then the draft SEIS needs to conclude that an intentional air crash is likely and all mitigation strategies need to be studied. (SL-AO-2) (SL-AQ-2)

Comment: The cost impact analysis should include: The potential of deliberate radiation release as a result of terrorist acts. (SL-AM-5)

Comment: Scoping for the Environmental Impact Statement must include probabilities and consequences for acts of sabotage and terrorism at St. Lucie. (SL-O-3) (SL-AH-3)

Comment: The test limits the mock attack to a small number of intruders being aided by only one insider. Realistically, there are situations where dozens of minimally screened temporary workers are on site and two or more insider terrorists may be authorized to be inside the restricted area. (SL-AO-5) (SL-AQ-5)

Comment: The test limits the attack to times of normal operation when multiple layers of reactor safety systems are in place. During outages there may be only a single reactor safety layer that is operational. The reactor may be much more vulnerable to failure if mock attacks or real attacks occur during times of operational shutdown. (SL-AO-7) (SL-AQ-7)

Comment: I'm here to tell you that before September 11th, Florida Power and Light and our nuclear power plant had avenues in place to address anything that could possibly face our power plant, including a terrorist attack. (SL-B-1)

Comment: The citizens of this county need to be proud that the power plant in their backyard is safe and even in the wake of a terrorist attack, we know what to do and how to address it. (SL-B-2)

Scoping Comment Report

Comment: Nuclear plants in the U. S. are not certified to withstand a high-speed impact from a fully fueled jumbo jet airliner. (SL-AI-8)

Comment: The procedures used in the mock attacks are not reassuring. The draft SEIS needs to study and evaluate all the additional security measures that may be needed to prevent a terrorist sabotage attack. (SL-AO-10) (SL-AQ-10)

Comment: Sabotage. The draft SEIS needs to examine nuclear plant personnel as well as procedures and facilities for stopping an armed attack of terrorists who intend to damage nuclear fuel from the reactor or the spent fuel pools. Mock attacks testing the security measures of nuclear plants have been unrealistically constrained. (SL-AO-4) (SL-AQ-4)

Comment: Truck Bombs. The draft SEIS needs to examine the procedures and facilities for stopping the detonation of a truck bomb at the plant site, at least the size of the truck bomb that destroyed the Mura [sic] Federal Building in Oklahoma City. If procedures and facilities are not overwhelmingly reassuring, then the draft SEIS needs to conclude that a truck bomb detonation is likely and all mitigation strategies need to be studied. (SL-AO-3) (SL-AQ-3)

Comment: Lax Security Measures. The NRC conducted mock attacks on nuclear plants from 1991 to 1998 with unrealistic limits placed on the mock attackers (noted in section 4). During this time, 57 of the 68 nuclear plant sites were tested. In 27 of 57 mock attacks (47%), the attackers were successful. This massive failure of nuclear plant security demonstrates the inability of the NRC to adequately protect the health and safety of the public. The draft SEIS needs to study and evaluate all of the measures which may be needed to rigorously strengthen the poor record of nuclear plant security. Lest we forget, America is at war with international terrorism. (SL-AO-11) (SL-AQ-11)

Comment: The test limits the insider to a passive function, which means the insider can only provide information to the terrorist intruders, not participate. This is a naïve and dangerous limitation. The insider(s) can easily become armed and actively participate. (SL-AO-6) (SL-AQ-6)

Response: The comments are noted. Each nuclear plant must have approved emergency and safeguards contingency plans, in accordance with 10 CFR Part 50, that are revised periodically. Emergency and safeguards planning, which includes responses to threats of terrorism and sabotage, are part of the current operating license and are outside the scope of the environmental analysis for license renewal. Any required changes to emergency and safeguards contingency plans related to terrorism and sabotage will be incorporated and reviewed under the operating license.

Although this topic is not within the scope of review for license renewal, the NRC is always

concerned with protecting health and safety. Any matter potentially affecting safety can be addressed under processes currently available for existing operating license in the absence of a license renewal application. Although the comments do not pertain to the scope of license renewal as set forth in 10 CFR Part 51 and Part 54, the comments will be provided to the project manager who oversees current operating and licensing activities for consideration.

Aging Management

Comment: All the above plants are older PWR facilities built about 25 years ago. St. Lucie and Turkey Point are PWR nuclear plants in the same age group. An unrecognized or overlooked problem at any nuclear power plant, at any given moment, can mean fatalities, latent cancers, and genetic defects to tens of thousands of innocent citizens and their progeny. This is no joke! The possibilities are real. The break-down record surrounding plants similar in style and age to St. Lucie and Turkey Point should lead to a prudent decision that a 20-year license extension is not worth the gamble. Playing Chernobyl Russian Roulette with the Florida public as chips is not an acceptable game to be played with NRC rules. (SL-AK-7)

Comment: Recent events at many nuclear power plants suggest that they have already entered a period of higher maintenance and failure risks. When you consider extending the St. Lucie nuclear facility's license, I hope you will insist on a thorough accounting of the potential costs of safely maintaining this aging facility for 20 more years. (SL-AM-1)

Comment: A diligent study of the record regarding the operation of Nuclear Power Plants in the United States, results in a troubling conclusion as to the diligence of NRC oversight. Restrained NRC reports can show that at older Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) nuclear power plants, the equipment is prone to corrosion, "embrittlement," and the leaking of radioactive coolants. Worn-out equipment has caused more than 50 fires, radiation or steam leaks, and the shutdown of the nuclear reactor due to other serious hazards. (SL-AK-1)

Comment: The cost impact analysis should include: Additional age-related risks due to materials corrosion, fatigue, and embrittlement. (SL-AM-4)

Comment: The recent discovery of extremely dangerous corrosion damage at Toledo's Davis-Besse reactor raises new safety concerns about all 69 pressurized water reactors in the U.S. (SL-AN-2)

Comment: I believe that the St. Lucie Site-Specific Environmental Impact Statement must include careful analysis of the following factors, fully considering their impact throughout the 20-year extension period: Safety considerations for corrosion, fatigue, and embrittlement of the reactor components. (SL-AN-7)

Comment: The number of age-related problems that have caused shutdowns of various US reactors within the past 2 years suggest that potential corrosion, fatigue, and embrittlement

Scoping Comment Report

problems require serious attention. (SL-AN-4)

Response: The comments are noted. Safety matters related to aging are outside the scope of the environmental review. An NRC safety review for the license renewal period is conducted separately. The comments provide no new information and will not be evaluated further in the context of the environmental review. However, the comments will be forwarded to the project manager for the license renewal safety review for consideration.

Need for Power

Comment: At full power, this power plant produces about 1,700,000 watts of electricity. That is more than enough electricity to meet the annual needs of more than 500,000 homes. (SL-H-5) (SL-U-5)

Comment: I really feel that if you can get the — you can provide the energy for the people — and you know, Florida's energy needs are growing at two percent annually, and I think as Tom or Don said, that over a half a million homes could be supplied with electricity, but it's got to be done safely. (SL-W-6)

Comment: The license extensions proceeding for St. Lucie Units 1 & 2, should consider the population explosion projected for the Southeast Florida Treasure Coast. (SL-AI-4)

Comment: There is a continuing population influx into the state; Florida's growing. More and more people wanting more power, wanting dependable power, and wanting clean power. Well, if they don't go ahead and do the license extension, then some other form of power will be needed. Where do we turn for that? (SL-L-2)

Comment: Planning for the future means renewing the St. Lucie license. There is no need to reinvent the wheel, we have it. We have a very important community partner in St. Lucie Power Plant. Let's do the right thing and use an existing source to meet our needs. (SL-Y-2)

Comment: I'm here to particularly address the aspects of secondary environmental effects. What happens if the null action is chosen and the plant license is not extended? I'm concerned about the alternative power that will be needed, far more power than what's needed right now. (SL-L-1)

Comment: The power plant is an important source of energy for our community. Demands for energy in communities in the Treasure Coast of Florida are growing annually, and we need the power from the St. Lucie Plant to meet our needs for electricity. The plant supplies us with an available source of low-cost electricity and the plant's already here, and we can use it as a resource to meet our community's energy needs. (SL-AA-2)

Comment: Electricity consumed per customer has also increased. FPL must provide power plants to meet the growing demand for energy. It's also important that power plants be close to where the electricity is needed, to ensure the quality of power and the stability of the system. (SL-I-11) (SL-V-11)

Comment: The renewal of the St. Lucie Plant licenses is important to meeting the energy needs of Florida's population. (SL-I-10) (SL-V-10)

Comment: I'm also looking for safe and affordable electricity and to me, you know, as a 27-year member of St. Lucie County as a resident, I really believe they provided that. (SL-G-5)

Comment: The phenomenal growth that's taken place over the last several years here, particularly in Port St. Lucie. And when you have growth like that, you know you need electricity. You have to have it. (SL-G-3)

Comment: We need electricity, as the good doctor said before she left. As we have seen in other parts of great country, there have been power shortages. This means we need power from St. Lucie Nuclear Plant. (SL-Y-1)

Comment: We all need energy and we all use energy, and let's hope that we can come together and see the truth. (SL-T-6)

Comment: It's important to have electric power. (SL-C-2)

Comment: I'm also here to talk to you about the fact that I believe nuclear power is essential as a part of our national energy policy. I think that nuclear power is safe. I think it's reliable and I think it's extremely cost effective. (SL-P-4)

Response: The comments are noted. The need for power is specifically directed to be outside the scope of license renewal in 10 CFR 51.95(c)(2). The comments provide no new information and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.

Other Issues

Comment: Please enter this message into the same NRC record cited above, for the purpose of my correcting a misstatement about dosages received by personnel aboard the U.S.S. Biroka in 1954. The correct figures that Navy personnel received when working topside, involved in decontamination efforts, should have been 100-roentgens of exposure — and not 100 miliroentgens [sic] as I stated at the St. Lucie meeting and perhaps the Turkey Point meeting I attended.

I distinctly recall my initial impression upon reading the Defense Department documents I referred to: that some of the sailors had received what I recognized as twenty times the

Scoping Comment Report

allowable exposure. And, furthermore that they had received Beta burns.

I subsequently, learned that there were Japanese fishing vessels that received fallout from the blast. Also, I personally went ashore at the Rongelap Atoll, where there had been radioactive fallout several weeks before from the same detonation. The native population had been evacuated from Rongelap, prior to my arrival at that atoll as the officer in charge of a two-man survey detail. We had been flown in by a Navy PBY - Catalina and landed in the lagoon. (SL-AL-1)

Response: The comment is noted. The comment provides no new information, and does not pertain to the scope of license renewal as set forth in 10 CFR Part 51 and Part 54. Therefore, it will not be evaluated further.

Comment: Florida Power and Light should guarantee that St. Lucie Units 1 & 2 will not use multi-oxide (MOX) fuel containing plutonium; and will not engage in transporting or storing MOX fuel on site. (SL-AI-9)

Comment: The NRC bifurcated the license extension and multi-oxide issues. However, the two issues are inextricably intertwined in the St. Lucie and Turkey Point proceedings; because, FPL opened the MOX issue in FPL's press release related to the ENTERGY merger; FPL announced a strategy to reprocess its spent fuel rods into multi-oxide (MOX) fuel in France and Belgium. (SL-AI-3)

Response: The comments are noted. The potential use of mixed-oxide fuel has not been identified by Florida Power and Light as an action that will be taken during the relicensing period. Should the licensee, at some future date, decide to utilize mixed oxide fuel at the St. Lucie Plant, the NRC staff would conduct a safety and environmental review of the proposal. The environmental review would require an environmental assessment. Until then, it will not be evaluated further.

Comment: The siting permit for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 should be revisited and reviewed. (SL-AI-5)

Response: The comment is noted. Siting of the St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 was evaluated prior to construction of the plants. The comment is not appropriate for relicensing and provides no new information, and does not pertain to the scope of license renewal as set forth in 10 CFR Part 51 and Part 54. Therefore, it will not be evaluated further.

Summary

The preparation of the plant-specific supplement to the GEIS (called a SEIS) for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 will take into account all the relevant environmental issues raised during the scoping process that are described above. The draft SEIS will be made available for public comment. Interested Federal, State, and local government agencies, local organizations, and members of the public will be given the opportunity to provide comments to be considered during the development of the final SEIS. Concerns identified that are outside the scope of the staff's environmental review have been or will be forwarded to the appropriate NRC program manager for consideration.