

March 30, 2004

Mr. L. M. Stinson
Vice President
Southern Nuclear Operating Company
Post Office Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING SUMMARY REPORT
ASSOCIATED WITH THE STAFF'S REVIEW OF THE APPLICATION BY
SOUTHERN NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY FOR RENEWAL OF THE
OPERATING LICENSES FOR THE JOSEPH M. FARLEY NUCLEAR PLANT,
UNITS 1 AND 2

Dear Mr. Stinson:

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) conducted a scoping process, from December 5, 2003, through February 6, 2004, to determine the scope of the NRC staff's environmental review of the application for renewal of the operating licenses for the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2. As part of the scoping process, the NRC staff held two public environmental scoping meetings in Dothan, Alabama on January 8, 2004, to solicit public input regarding the scope of the review. The scoping process is the first step in the development of a plant-specific supplement to NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants (GEIS)," for the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant.

The NRC staff has prepared the enclosed environmental scoping summary report identifying comments received at the January 8, 2004, license renewal environmental scoping meetings, by letter and electronic mail. In accordance with 10 CFR 51.29(b), you are being provided a copy of the scoping summary report. The transcripts of the meetings can be found as an attachment to the meeting summary issued on February 5, 2004. The meeting summary is available for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room (PDR) located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville Maryland or electronically from the Publicly Available Records (PARS) component of NRC's document system (ADAMS) under Accession Number ML040370553. 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). Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS should contact the NRC's PDR staff at 1-800-397-4209, or 301-415-4737, or by e-mail at pdr@nrc.gov.

L.M. Stinson

2

The next step in the environmental review process is the issuance of a draft supplement to the GEIS scheduled for August 2004. Notice of the availability of the draft supplement to the GEIS and the procedures for providing comments will be published in an upcoming *Federal Register* notice. If there are any questions concerning this matter, please contact me at (301) 415-1424.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Jack Cushing, Project Manager
Environmental Section
License Renewal and Environmental Impacts Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos.: 50-348 and 50-364

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

The next step in the environmental review process is the issuance of a draft supplement to the GEIS scheduled for August 2004. Notice of the availability of the draft supplement to the GEIS and the procedures for providing comments will be published in an upcoming *Federal Register* notice. If there are any questions concerning this matter, please contact me at (301) 415-1424.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Jack Cushing, Project Manager
Environmental Section
License Renewal and Environmental Impacts Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos.: 50-348 and 50-364

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

Accession no.: ML040900537

Document name: C:\ORPCheckout\FileNET\ML040900537.wpd

| | | | | | | |
|--------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|----------|
| OFFICE | PM:RLEP | GS:RLEP | LA:RLEP | SC:RLEP | OGC | PD:RLEP |
| NAME | JCushing | JDavis | YEdmonds | JTappert | AFernandez | PTKuo |
| DATE | 03/8/04 | 03/18/04 | 03/8/04 | 03/26/04 | 03/15/04 | 03/30/04 |

OFFICIAL AGENCY RECORD

Accession no.: ML040900537

Hard Copy

RLEP/Environmental R/F

E-Mail

F. Cameron

OPA

RidsOgcMailCenter

ACRS/ACNW

M. Kotzalas

B. Sheron

W. Borchardt

D. Matthews/F. Gillespie

J. Tappert

P.T.Kuo

J. Davis

J. Cushing

T. Liu

F. Rinaldi

RIDSRgn2MailCenter

T. Johnson, RII

K. Clark, RII

C. Patterson, RII

B. Bonser, RII

C. Quinly (LLNL)

RidsNrrAdpt

T. Combs, OCA

J. M. Farley

Southern Nuclear Operating Company

cc:

Mr. Don E. Grissette
General Manager - Plant Manager
Southern Nuclear Operating Company
Post Office Box 470
Ashford, Alabama 36312

Resident Inspector
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
7388 N. State Highway 95
Columbia, AL 36319

Mr. B. D. McKinney
Licensing Manager
Southern Nuclear Operating Company
40 Inverness Center Parkway
Post Office Box 1295
Birmingham, Alabama 35201-1295

Mr. Lonice C. Barrett
State Historic Preservation Officer/DNR
156 Trinity Avenue, SW, Suite 101
Atlanta, GA 30303-3600

Mr. Stanford M. Blanton, esq.
Balch and Bingham Law Firm
Post Office Box 306
1710 Sixth Avenue North
Birmingham, Alabama 35201

Mr. William D. Oldfield
SAER Supervisor
Southern Nuclear Operating Company
Post Office Box 470
Ashford, AL 36312

Mr. J. B. Beasley, Jr.
Executive Vice President
Southern Nuclear Operating Company
40 Inverness Center Parkway
Post Office Box 1295
Birmingham, AL 35201

Mr. Charles R. Pierce
Manager - License Renewal
Southern Nuclear Operating Company
40 Inverness Center Parkway
Post Office Box 1295
Birmingham, AL 35201

Mr. J. D. Woodard
Executive Vice President
Southern Nuclear Operating Company
Post Office Box 1295
Birmingham, AL 35201

Mr. Fred Emerson
Nuclear Energy Institute
1776 I Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006-3708

Dr. D. E. Williamson
State Health Officer
Alabama Department of Public Health
The RSA Tower
201 Monroe Street, Suite 1500
Montgomery, AL 36130-1701

Ms. Betty Forbus
Director
Houston Love Memorial Library
212 West Burdeshaw Street
Dothan, AL 36303

Chairman
Houston County Commission
Post Office Box 6406
Dothan, AL 36302

Ms. Barbara Crawford
The Lucy Maddox Memorial Library
11880 Columbia Street
Blakely, GA 39823

Ms. Crystal Quinly
Task Leader
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
Mail Code L-654
P.O. Box 808
Livermore, CA 94550

J. M. Farley

Southern Nuclear Operating Company

cc:

Dr. Lee Warner
State Historic Preservation Officer
Alabama Historical Commission
468 South Perry Street
Montgomery, AL 36130-0900

Dr. Dennis Hardin
Forest Ecologist
Division of Forest Management
3125 Conner Blvd. C-25
Tallahassee FL. 32399-1650

Mr. Larry Goldman
Field Supervisor
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Daphne Field Office
P.O. Drawer 1190
Daphne, AL 36526

Mr. Bob Hendrix
P.O. Box 8765
Dothan, AL 36304

Mr. Matt Parker
P.O. Box 368
Dothan, AL 36302

The Honorable R. Perry Beaver, Principal
Chief
Muscogee (Creek) Nation
P.O. Box 580
Okmulgee, OK 74447

Mr. Steve Turkoski
P.O. Box 638
Dothan, AL 36302

The Honorable Eddie Tullis, Chairman
Poarch Band of Creek Nation
5811 Jack Springs Road
Atmore, AL 36502

Ms. Diane Geeslin
109 Edinburgh Way
Dothan, AL 36305

The Honorable Mitchell Cypress, Chairman
Seminole Tribe of Florida
6300 Stirling Road
Hollywood, FL 33024

Mr. Mike Schmitz
901 S. Oates Street
Dothan, AL 36301

Mr. W. J. Johnson, Jr.
P. O. Box 462
Waynesboro, GA 30830

Mr. Jon Hornsby
Alabama Department of Conservation and
Natural Resources
Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries Division
64 North Union Street Suite 567
Montgomery, AL 36104

Ms. Beth Thomas
1400 Northfield Circle
Dothan, AL 36303

Mr. Greg Krakow
Data Manager
Georgia Department of Natural Resources
Wildlife Resources Division
Georgia Natural Heritage Program
2117 U.S. Hwy. 278 S.E., Social Circle
GA 30025-4714

Mr. Chadwick Taylor
4209 Buckland Trail
Greenwood, FL 32443

Mr. Steven Kornegay
178 Allen Wells Road
Dothan, AL 36301

Mr. Selden Bailey
P. O. Box 1106
Dothan, AL 36302

Mr. Charles Finway
P.O. Box 6406
Dothan, AL 36302

Ms. Shelby Womack
EMA P.O. Drawer
Dothan, AL 36302

Mr. Paul Brown
P.O. Box 636
Abbeville, AL 36310

Mr. Charlie Nesbitt
34 Hampton Way
Dothan, AL 36305

Mr. Dave Hendrix
City of Dothan
P.O. Box 2128
Dothan, AL 36302

Mr. James H. Phillips
Chattahoochee Riverkeeper
P.O. Box 1492
Columbus, GA 31902

Ms. Barbara Alford
Troy State University Dothan
P.O. Box 8368
Dothan, AL 36304

Mr. Steve Mashburn
102 Sandy Springs Road
Dothan, AL 36303

Mr. Tim Pitchford
Sweetwater Apartments, Apt #109
Dothan, AL 36302

Ms. Rebecca Martin
Tri Rivers Association
P.O. Box 2232
Dothan, AL 36302

Ms. Michele Buck
3703 Brookside Drive
Dothan, AL 36303

Mr. Brad Moore
1925 Powell Trail
Abbeville, AL 36310

Ms. Lana Smitherman
P.O. Box 2128
Dothan, AL 36302

Mr. John Hornsby
AL Department of Conservation
Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries Division
64 N. Union Street
Montgomery, AL 363130

Mr. Clint Ludlam
729 Hatton Road
Dothan, AL 36301

Mr. Rich Lopez
1231 West Main Street
Dothan, AL 36301

Ms. Sara Barczak, Safe Energy Director
Southern Alliance for Clean Energy (SACE)
3025 Bull Street, Suite 101
Savannah, GA 31405

**Environmental Impact Statement
Scoping Process**

Summary Report

**Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant
Units 1 & 2
Houston County, Alabama**

January 2004



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

Introduction

On September 15, 2003, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) received an application from Southern Nuclear Operating Company (SNC) dated September 12, 2003, for renewal of the operating licenses of Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant (FNP), Units 1 and 2. The FNP units are located in Houston County, Alabama. As part of the application, SNC 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 small and 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, absent 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 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) and in accordance with 10 CFR 51.23(b). This determination was based on the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and the Commission's Waste Confidence Rule, 10 CFR 51.23.

On December 5, 2003, the NRC published a Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* (68 FR 68125), 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 FNP operating licenses. 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 February 6, 2004. The scoping process included two public scoping meetings, which were held at the Quality Inn in Dothan, Alabama, on January 8, 2004. The NRC issued press releases, and distributed flyers locally. Approximately 80 members of the public attended 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. Sixteen (16) attendees provided either oral comments or written statements that were recorded and transcribed by a certified court reporter. The transcripts of the meetings can be found as an attachment to the meeting summary, which was issued on February 5, 2004. The meeting

summary is available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly Available Records (PARS) component of NRC's document system (ADAMS) under accession number ML040370553. 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. Twenty-four (24) letters, emails, or documents 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 alpha identifier (Commenter ID letter), allowing each set of comments from a commenter to be traced back to the transcript, letter, or email in which the comments were submitted. Several commenters submitted comments through multiple sources (e.g., letter and afternoon or evening scoping meetings).

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.

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 FS (short for Farley Nuclear Plant scoping). 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 ADAMS.

The subject areas the comments were grouped into are as follows:

1. Support of License Renewal at Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2
2. Category 1 Water Quality and Use Issues
3. Category 2 Water Quality and Use Issues
4. Category 1 Aquatic Ecology Issues
5. Category 2 Terrestrial Resource Issues
6. Category 1 Air Quality Issues
7. Category 1 Socioeconomic Issues
8. Category 2 Socioeconomic Issues
9. Alternatives
10. Issues Outside the Scope of License Renewal

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

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 FNP license renewal application.

TABLE 1 - Individuals Providing Comments During Scoping Comment Period

| Commenters ID | Commenter | Affiliation (If Stated) | Comment Source and ADAMS Accession Number^(a) |
|----------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| FS-A | Jim Phillips | Chattahoochee Riverkeeper | Afternoon Scoping Meeting |
| FS-B | Selden Bailey | | Afternoon Scoping Meeting |
| FS-C | Mark Culver | Houston County Commission | Afternoon Scoping Meeting |
| FS-D | Jack Manley | City of Headland | Afternoon Scoping Meeting |
| FS-E | Mike Stinson | Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant | Afternoon Scoping Meeting |
| FS-F | Don Grissette | Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant | Afternoon Scoping Meeting |
| FS-G | Steve Turkoski | Dothan Area Chamber of Commerce | Afternoon Scoping Meeting |
| FS-H | Kaye Barbaree | Houston County | Afternoon Scoping Meeting |
| FS-I | Bob Hendrix | Convention and Visitor's Bureau | Afternoon Scoping Meeting |
| FS-J | Walter Hill | Wiregrass United Way | Afternoon Scoping Meeting |
| FS-K | David Hendrix | City of Dothan | Afternoon Scoping Meeting |
| FS-L | Steve Mashburn | Troy State University Dothan | Evening Scoping Meeting |
| FS-M | Tim Pritchard | Houston County High School | Evening Scoping Meeting |
| FS-N | Barbara Alford | Troy State University Dothan | Evening Scoping Meeting |
| FS-O | Cindy Huff | Teacher | Evening Scoping Meeting |
| FS-P | Jack Kale | Citizen | Evening Scoping Meeting |
| FS-Q | R. Lawson Bryan | First United Methodist Church | Letter (ML033580670) |
| FS-R | | Dothan Area Chamber of Commerce | Letter (ML033430559) |
| FS-S | Pat Dalbey | WTVY News 4 | Letter (ML033500400) |
| FS-T | Billy Davis | Henry County Board of Education | Letter (ML033381197) |
| FS-U | David Hanks | Wiregrass Area United Way Food Bank | Letter (ML033570387) |
| FS-V | Donald Smith | City of Headland | Letter (ML033360580) |
| FS-W | Edward Jackson | Twentieth Judicial Circuit of Alabama | Letter (ML033570382) |
| FS-X | Kenneth Lord | Houston County Schools | Letter (ML033570388) |
| FS-Y | Clark Matthews | Dothan/Houston County EMA | Letter (ML033300346) |
| FS-Z | William Parker | Headland Industrial Development Board | Letter (ML033570385) |
| FS-AA | Dr. Coy Poitevint | Veterinarian | Letter (ML033570381) |
| FS-AB | Dennis Rubin | City of Dothan | Letter (ML033250320) |
| FS-AC | Don Clements | City of Dothan | Letter (ML033250552) |
| FS-AD | Amos Newsome | City of Dothan | Letter (ML033250316) |
| FS-AE | James Reading | City of Dothan | Letter (ML033250325) |
| FS-AF | Jason Rudd | City of Dothan | Letter (ML033250311) |
| FS-AG | Pat Thomas | City of Dothan | Letter (ML033250288) |
| FS-AH | Phillip Tidwell | City of Dothan | Letter (ML033250298) |
| FS-AI | Ronald Owen | Southeast Alabama Medical Center | Letter (ML040060643) |
| FS-AJ | Bruce McNeal | Southeast Alabama Medical Center | Letter (ML033640623) |
| FS-AK | Steven Mashburn | Troy State University Dothan | Letter (ML033640576) |
| FS-AL | Selden Bailey | Financial Service Company of Dothan | Letter (ML040060632) |
| FS-AM | Barbara Alford | Troy State University Dothan | Letter (ML033430381) |
| FS-AN | Starla Moss Matthews | Houston County Revenue Commissioner | Letter (ML040210786) |

(a) The afternoon and evening transcripts can be found under accession number ML040370553.

**Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant (FNP), Units 1 and 2
Public Scoping Meeting
Comments and Responses**

The comments and suggestions received as part of the scoping process are discussed below. Parenthetical numbers after each comment refer to the Commenter's 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.

1. Comments in Support of License Renewal at Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2

Comment: Our Commission [Houston County Commission] has adopted a resolution and passed and sent forward a resolution in support of the relicensing. We feel very strongly on behalf of the community and its citizens that this needs to take place and move forward, not only of that, but one day down the road, I've got plans to add another generator and do some additional things.
(FS-C-1)

Comment: So I say to you both from a human aspect and from an environmental natural aspect, Farley is an asset to our community.
(FS-C-7)

Comment: We also lie about the same distance west of the Farley plant as the City of Dothan does, and on behalf of the Mayor and the governing body of Headland, we want to encourage the NRC to renew the license for Farley Plants 1 and 2.
(FS-D-1)

Comment: We have a lot of farming in Henry County, which is just across the county line. I think there's more concern about what's in the fertilizer and the defoliants for the peanuts and the cotton than there is the Farley Plant.
(FS-D-2)

Comment: Our history of safe and reliable operation, our strong environmental commitment, our reputation as a good neighbor and the potential for this to continue through the extended 20 year license period makes Plant Farley a strong candidate for license renewal.
(FS-E-1)

Comment: We've always tried to be a very good neighbor in our community and we, therefore, fully support and appreciate the open nature of the NRC's license renewal process.
(FS-F-1)

Comment: And I really hope that Farley is always a part of our community because it does wonderful things for us, both environmentally and economically, and brings the best people in the world.
(FS-H-2)

Comment: I don't want to belabor the points that have been made other than to say or to communicate to the NRC the City's support of the application to renew the operating license for the Farley Nuclear Plant.
(FS-K-1)

Comment: I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you this evening and express my support of the Farley Nuclear Plant relicensing project.
(FS-L-1)

Comment: Plant Farley is not only a critical participant in university development and in economic development for our county, it's also an exemplary community partner and one that we earnestly desire to keep here to continue building a great future for our region for just as long as the NRC can possibly see fit to let us have them.
(FS-N-3)

Comment: And even more so, I was impressed by the safety, the redundancy of the systems, the tight security, the community support, all the many, many things that make Farley Nuclear Plant a plant that is safe, that is caring for the community and that provides us with necessary service.
(FS-O-1)

Comment: So as a citizen and as one who tries to stay informed and abreast of the situation and have a good knowledge of things, I would like to assure you that Farley Nuclear Plant is top notch, grade A, well run and it deserved to be relicensed because there will never be a problem out there.
(FS-O-2)

Comment: So I think you have to consider seriously the environmental impact of all the other decisions that will have to be made, not just what operating the plant will do, yes or no; but what other things will happen if you don't. And pick the best alternative from among all these choices. I think you can probably guess what mine is. I may be rare, but I'm a pro-nuclear environmentalist. I got into nuclear for environmental reasons and it has always baffled me that more environmentalists weren't pro-nuclear.
(FS-P-3)

Comment: I am fully supportive of Plant Farley's request for renewal of licenses and my sense is that my position is widely shared throughout this region.
(FS-Q-3)

Comment: Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Directors of the Dothan Area Chamber of Commerce as follows: Section 1. That the Board of Directors of the Dothan Area Chamber of Commerce supports extending the operating licenses for Plant Farley Units 1 and 2 for an additional 20 years.
(FS-R-4)

Comment: In closing, let me say that your renewal of Farley Nuclear Plant's operating license is strongly supported by the vast majority of this community. Farley is an important asset to our area and I personally encourage you to grant a renewal of their operating license in the most expedient manner possible. (FS-S-4)

Comment: I very much support Farley's renewal application. The plant is an outstanding corporate citizen. (FS-T-3)

Comment: The Wiregrass Area United Way Food Bank would like to express its support for the license renewal of the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant.
(FS-U-1)

Comment: The Plant Farley owned by Alabama Power Company and operated by Southern Nuclear is seeking renewal of their license for Farley Units 1 and 2 for twenty additional years. We, the Mayor and Council of the City of Headland, ask that their license be renewed per their application.
(FS-V-1)

Comment: The Farley-Plant has continued to be a good corporate citizen supporting the surrounding communities and adding value to our area. We appreciate their efforts and the efforts of the NRC to provide us with safe and dependable power.
(FS-V-4)

Comment: This letter is in support of the Renewal Application filed by Southern Nuclear Operating Company regarding Plant Farley in Houston County, Alabama. The contributions of Plant Farley and the Alabama Power Company employees there to our community over the past years have been great and are greatly appreciated.
(FS-W-1)

Comment: Please count Houston County Schools as being in full support of Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant in obtaining a license renewal as superintendent I feel this is vital to the continued success not only of our school system, but our county as well.
(FS-X-4)

Comment: The Dothan/Houston County area is a great place to live and raise a family. Plant Farley and their employees have certainly been a major player in our community. I think their past history of protecting the environment and being a community partner should be recognized by all as a job well done.
(FS-Y-2)

Comment: This application has my full and unqualified support. I have lived in the neighborhood of the Farley Plant since its existence. I know of no negative impact it has caused during this time. There have been no adverse safety or environmental problems of which I am aware.
(FS-Z-1)

Comment: I believe the Farley Plant owners have been exemplary corporate citizens. I doubt another nuclear operating plant in the U. S. can match their record. I trust the commission will grant the renewal of this operating license.
(FS-Z-3)

Comment: I would like to express my support in renewing the license for 20 additional years at Plant Farley in Columbia, Alabama. I know that Plant Farley is definitely an asset to Houston County. I have practiced veterinarian medicine since 1943 and seen the benefits from the plant. (FS-AA-1)

Comment: It is with great pride I recommend the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant located in Houston County, Alabama, just outside of Dothan, be reissued a license to operate Farley Units 1 and 2 for an additional 20 years. For 25 years, Plant Farley has provided reliable, safe, emission-free electricity to the people of Alabama. (FS-AB through AH-1)

Comment: In closing, I strongly support Plant Farley's effort to renew their operating license. Your decision to continue operations will keep one of the community's best neighbors. (FS-AB through AH-4)

Comment: As a final statement, the 2400 employees that make up Southeast Alabama Medical Center certainly enjoy an improved quality of life because Plant Farley provides our community with safe, reliable and affordable electrical power. Because of this, we fully support Southern Nuclear Operating Company's effort to re-license Plant Farley for an additional 20 years. (FS-AI-4)

Comment: Finally let me say that we as an organization of 2,400 employees feel very confident that Plant Farley provides the citizens of our community with safe reliable electricity. We fully stand behind Southern Nuclear Operating Company's effort to re-license Plant Farley for an additional 20 years. (FS-AJ-4)

Comment: I strongly endorse the renewal of this exemplary plant's operating license. Plant Farley is an irreplaceable asset to our community, state, and southeastern portion of our nation. (FS-AK-1)

Comment: Past and present levels of performance and reliability speak strongly for the continuance of operations at Farley. I urge you to approve license renewal for Plant Farley. It is an asset that our community, state, and nation cannot afford to lose. (FS-AK-8)

Comment: The Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant Management has been a good citizen of Southeast Alabama and has enhanced the social, cultural, educational, and economic level of the tri-state section of Alabama, Georgia, and Florida. For twenty Years I was volunteer secretary/treasurer of the Industrial Development Board of the City of Dothan, and personally not seen a more responsible industrial management group, and encourage your honorable body to concur in this licensing of the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant for the twenty years applied for. (FS-AL-4)

Comment: This letter is written in enthusiastic support of the renewal application filed by Southern Nuclear Operating Company on behalf of Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Alabama. (FS-AM-1)

Comment: I strongly encourage the Commission's renewal of the application for Farley Nuclear Plant. This facility and its employees have become an integral part of our lives in Houston County, and we look forward to a brighter future with them in the picture.
(FS-AM-4)

Comment: I am writing in support of the renewal of the license for Plant Farley. Farley is a vital part of the community in Houston County.
(FS-AN-1)

Comment: Plant Farley is greatly appreciated and means so much to the local economy. Farley is not just an asset to our community it is part of the community that I would like to see continue.(FS-AN-3)

Response: *The comments are noted. The comments are general in nature. The comments provide no new information therefore, the comments will not be evaluated further.*

2. Comments Concerning Category 1 Water Quality and Use Issues

As stated in 10 CFR Part 51, Table B-1, Category 1 water quality issues are:

- Altered current patterns at intake and discharge structures
- Altered salinity gradients
- Altered thermal stratification of lakes
- Temperature effects on sediment transport capacity
- Scouring caused by discharged cooling water
- Eutrophication
- Discharge of chlorine or other biocide
- Discharge of sanitary wastes and minor chemical spills
- Discharge of other metals in waste water

Comment: I think the paper mill is being run just as well and just like Farley, but at that time I'm positive that they promised that the water that went back into the river would be of the same temperature and would not disturb that water. And I have not heard any fishermen's complaints over this period of time. Now I have not been on that river fishing below the Farley Plant perhaps in the last 20 years, but fishing still goes on over there and I don't know that there's been any discharge there of any consequence at all that stopped anybody from putting their boats in down at Gordon.
(FS-B-1)

Comment: Our environmental review of the water shows that Plant Farley is a very good steward of the valuable resource and has no significant impact on the flow and the habitat in the Chattahoochee River.
(FS-F-2)

Response: *The comments are noted. Altered current patterns at intake and discharge structures and other water quality issues were evaluated in the GEIS and determined to be Category 1 issues. The comments provide no new information on water quality and will, therefore, not be evaluated further. Water quality will be discussed in Chapters 2 and 4 of the SEIS.*

3. Comments Concerning Category 2 Water Quality and Use Issues

As stated in 10 CFR Part 51, Table B-1, Category 2 water quality and use issues are:

- Water use conflicts (plants with cooling ponds or cooling towers using make-up water from a small river with low flow)
- Water use conflicts (plants using cooling towers withdrawing make-up water from a small river)

Comment: The other is more logistics and that relates to the fact that this river is one of the arteries that's vital for Plant Farley, not only do you have connections via rail and highway but you've also got river connections. And river connections, of course, can be important as regards incoming materials or incoming equipment, and the scheduling of access to the plant is problematic only because the Apalachicola River south of us is severely stressed in the sense of its depth, it's hard to get up and down this river with barges. And so we hope that whatever is done here will have reflection of some of those realities on the river as regards navigation; in other words, access of the plant for equipment, supplies, whatever may be needed for the plant. (FS-A-2)

Response: *The comment is noted. Water use conflicts will be discussed in Chapter 4 of the SEIS.*

4. Comments Concerning Category 1 Aquatic Ecology Issues

As stated in 10 CFR Part 51, Table B-1, Category 1 aquatic ecology issues are:

- Accumulation of contaminants in sediments or biota
- Entrainment of phytoplankton and zooplankton
- Cold Shock
- Thermal plume barrier to migrating fish
- Distribution of aquatic organisms
- Premature emergence of aquatic insects
- Gas supersaturation (gas bubble disease)
- Low dissolved oxygen in the discharge
- Losses from predation, parasitism, and disease among organisms exposed to sublethal stresses
- Stimulation of nuisance organisms
- Entrainment of fish and shellfish in early life stages (cooling-tower based)
- Impingement of fish and shellfish (cooling-tower based)
- Heat shock (cooling-tower based)

Comment: And because of that stress, we have the environmental concerns about the river, one of which is thermal history in terms of any releases to the river. I've discussed with some of the representatives here earlier some of our questions about thermal releases and I'm confident that I'm going to get the data that is needed to answer any questions about the history of the plant. (FS-A-1)

Response: *The comment is noted. Aquatic ecology issues such as cold shock and thermal plume barriers were evaluated in the GEIS and determined to be Category 1 issues. The comments provide no new information on aquatic ecology and will, therefore, not be evaluated further. Aquatic ecology will be discussed in Chapters 2 and 4 of the SEIS.*

5. Comments Concerning Category 2 Terrestrial Resource Issues

As stated in 10 CFR Part 51, Table B-1, Category 2 terrestrial resource issues are:

- Refurbishment impacts to terrestrial resources
- Threatened or endangered species

Comment: License renewal will not result in any modification of the plant or transmission lines. We have concluded that the extended operation due to license renewal will have no adverse impact or threaten any endangered or threatened species living in or near Plant Farley.
(FS-F-3)

Comment: Because of our habitat and wildlife protection efforts, the National Wildlife Council has certified Farley as a wildlife habitat. The Wildlife Habitat Enhancement Council has twice recognized Plant Farley for its wildlife and land management stewardship.
(FS-F-7)

Comment: Another major area that Farley impacts greatly in our community is in our environment and our local habitats. Farley is classified as a certified wildlife habitat. I think Don mentioned this earlier. They implement strict land management practices and they provide a safe, healthy community for our local flora and fauna. They set up nesting boxes for many, many species of birds.
(FS-L-4)

Comment: Plant Farley also plays an active role in environmental protection. It constantly monitors key factors in the local biome, both on-site and off. Through wildlife and land management efforts, the plant site has been designated as a Certified Wildlife Habitat.
(FS-AK-6)

Response: *The comments are noted. The comments relate to terrestrial resource issues and will be discussed in Chapter 4 of the SEIS.*

6. Comments Concerning Category 1 Air Quality Issues

As stated in 10 CFR Part 51, Table B-1, Category 1 air quality issues include air quality effects of transmission lines.

Comment: For the past 26 years, the operation of Plant Farley has not had any adverse impact on the quality of air in this area. In fact, the operation of Plant Farley prevents about 10 million tons of carbon dioxide and other pollutants every year from going into the air that we breathe and entering the environment.
(FS-F-4)

Response: *The comment is noted. Air quality issues were evaluated in the GEIS and determined to be Category 1 issues. The comments provide no new information on air quality and will, therefore, not be evaluated further.*

7. Comments Concerning Category 1 Socioeconomic Issues

As stated in 10 CFR Part 51, Table B-1, Category 1 socioeconomic issues are:

- Public services: public safety, social services, and tourism and recreation
- Public services: education (license renewal term)
- Aesthetic impacts (refurbishment)
- Aesthetic impacts (license renewal term)
- Aesthetic impacts of transmission lines (license renewal term)

Comment: Just north of the plant, the county owns a park that's open to children and families and people come in and out with boats and we have never had one incident there of anybody complaining about anything environmentally.
(FS-C-6)

Comment: We're a strong contributor to educating the State's children. Our community outreach programs reach about 10,000 children each year.
(FS-E-5)

Comment: Tourism in the Dothan area employs indirectly and directly 2877 people. That is a Hyundai plant. So we're proud of our tourism industry and Farley is a great proponent of that and a big building block in our tourism industry and we want to keep them here. So we want Farley to stay.
(FS-I-2)

Comment: We are completing our 2004 campaign right now and Farley, with their corporate donation and their employees' donations, pledge \$151,335. And out of the \$2.2 million budget, that is very important to us and to the 35 agencies that will receive those funds.
(FS-J-1)

Comment: So you can tell that the nonprofit organizations in the Wiregrass, and especially in Houston County that provide much needed programs and services, are very, very dependent on Farley.
(FS-J-2)

Comment: I would also echo the comments made by many who have noted the contributions that employees have made and in ways that you can quantify such as the contribution to the United Way, but also in ways that are very difficult to quantify and yet are very important.
(FS-K-2)

Comment: The first of these is the impact that Plant Farley has upon the local educational community. The plant has been an exceedingly strong supporter of education over the past many years in our tri-state area. The economic impact that Farley has had on educational institutions in this county since its inception is really immeasurable.
(FS-L-2)

Comment: When many systems throughout the State have been taken over by the State Department of Education and suffered drastic cuts that eliminated a lot of basic education service for the children of our state, the schools in Houston County have been able to garner enough local support, largely through tax base that is provided by Farley Nuclear Plant, to provide our children with strong educational programs.

(FS-L-3)

Comment: Farley professionals and Farley executives actively and enthusiastically participate on our advisory board in arts and sciences, in business administration, and on my community advisory board for the college at large.

(FS-N-1)

Comment: Farley not only assists TSUD [Troy State University-Dothan] in growing our campus and our curriculum, it helps us to ensure that we become the economic development asset for this community.

(FS-N-2)

Comment: The Henry County schools have directly benefitted as a result of donations from Farley through local employees. I have personally carried students on field trips to visit Farley when I was a classroom teacher. The educational involvement of the plant and its employees is tremendous.

(FS-T-2)

Comment: We are dependent on the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant for a number of reasons. Financially speaking it would be almost impossible for us to operate without the tax revenue from ad-valorem taxes paid by Plant Farley. Over one half of all local ad-valorem taxes come from this one source. Considering that Alabama ranks dead last in funding for public schools puts this in an even clearer perspective.

(FS-X-1)

Comment: Plant Farley is also notably recognized for the working relationships between area elementary schools on environmental protection concerns and the enhancement of wildlife.

(FS-AB through AH-3)

Comment: With the current crisis in public education funding within the state of Alabama, many of our local schools would suffer extensive budget shortfalls without the tax income generated by Plant Farley.

(FS-AK-3)

Comment: As a long-time member of the educational community, I have worked on a large number of projects in which Farley played a critical role. Through workshops, seminars, in-school presentations, fund-raising efforts, teacher education projects, and many other avenues, the plant has consistently worked to better educate our children as well as adults.

(FS-AK-4)

Comment: The Farley Management has supported the public school system by being open to the graduation classes as potential employees and career development.

(FS-AL-3)

Comment: The leadership of Plant Farley has been instrumental in the growth and development of this university and in our ability to fulfill our educational mission. Farley professionals have been and continue to be primary participants on the advisory boards and task forces that guide the institution, including the design of our strategic plans. In addition, Farley has been a key player in the development and delivery of science institutes for teachers within a tri-state region, dramatically impacting the K-12 science curricula and student achievements. (FS-AM-3)

Response: *The comments are noted. Public services involving education and recreation were evaluated in the GEIS and were determined to be Category 1 issues. The comments provide no new information on these public service issues, and therefore, will not be evaluated further.*

8. Comments Concerning Category 2 Socioeconomic Issues

As stated in 10 CFR Part 51, Table B-1, Category 2 socioeconomic issues are:

- Housing
- Public services: public utilities
- Public services, education (refurbishment)
- Offsite land use (refurbishment)
- Offsite land use (license renewal term)
- Public services, transportation
- Historic and archaeological resources.

Comment: It's that important to us -- a tremendous portion of our budget and we thank Farley and Southern Nuclear and Alabama Power for the millions of dollars that they put into our economy and tax base. (FS-C-3)

Comment: We just were notified that we are the -- our tax base this year, our sales tax increases are up eight percent over last year. Well, you know, we have a lot of in-shopping, but a lot of it is because of people like the employees that we have at Farley that are tremendous community citizens, that live here and stay here and raise families here. (FS-C-4)

Comment: In addition, Farley impacts the community in out-sourcing. I know Mark Sellers, for example, one friend of mine, that has a company here in town that works directly with Farley, and there are many, many, many other organizations that feed off of Farley, although they're not actually working with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or with Southern Nuclear. (FS-C-5)

Comment: The economic impact of the Farley plant, there's no doubt is tremendous in the Wiregrass or the state. (FS-D-3)

Comment: Plant Farley is also an important part of the local economy. With some 900 employees, the plant has an annual payroll of over \$50 million. The plant pays annual property taxes of some \$8 million.

(FS-E-6)

Comment: License renewal will not require additional land usage and our activities will remain within the existing site boundary. Based upon these evaluations, we determined that the renewal of the Plant Farley license will not impact historic, archeological or land resources on the site or in the community.

(FS-F-5)

Comment: With Farley's \$50 million payroll and using a modest 2.5 turnover rate on the dollar, we estimate the impact to the economy is \$125 million annually.

(FS-G-1)

Comment: Since the location of Farley in the 1970s, Dothan has emerged and grown with a diversified manufacturing base tied to aviation, automotive, electronics, distribution, fabricated metals as well as a strong healthcare service and retail businesses. Plant Farley's influence in all of these areas cannot be over-estimated.

(FS-G-2)

Comment: Farley pays \$8.12 million in property taxes, which is the largest single payment in the county. Of this amount, \$2,500,000 goes to education.

(FS-G-4)

Comment: If in fact the plant was not renewed, the loss of 900 jobs with the multiplier would include an effect of basically 2250 lost jobs. The lost of \$50 million in payroll with the turnover value of these dollars would result in the loss of \$125 million. The loss of over \$8 million tax infusion into the county would leave a substantial hole in the county's budget.

(FS-G-5)

Comment: I represent the 26 hotels that are in the Dothan area and our hotels love Farley, because every 12 to 18 months, we have something called a refueling outage and when they have a refueling outage, they bring in many workers and engineers for many, many, many days that stay in the Dothan area and in our hotels and eat in our restaurants and shop in our stores.

(FS-I-1)

Comment: I followed one of your Farley Nuclear employees as chairman of the Houston County Board of Directors for the Wiregrass Humanity, and I would simply say that if we lost these people, yes, there would be a real monetary loss, a great tax base loss, but the civic and community life of Dothan and Houston County and the surrounding Wiregrass area would suffer a loss that would be, in my mind, even greater than those quantifiable financial losses.

(FS-K-3)

Comment: And finally, Plant Farley has had and continues to have a major economic impact on our community, our state and the entire southeastern United States.

(FS-L-9)

Comment: And I say that to say this, that that's just one example of thousands of people in this area who have, because of the employment opportunities at Farley, have achieved their goals and lived -- fulfilled their life long goals because of those opportunities.

(FS-M-1)

Comment: Professionally, echoing Steve's comments, as an educator and as a principal of a local school, I shudder where we would be without the seven or eight million dollars of local tax revenue that's created by Plant Farley, during these tough times.
(FS-M-2)

Comment: As one of the largest employers in its region, Plant Farley's economic impact is huge (some 900 plant jobs and \$8 million in tax revenue).
(FS-Q-1)

Comment: Whereas, Plant Farley provides jobs for some 900 citizens of the Wiregrass...
(FS-R-2)

Comment: Whereas, Plant Farley provides extensive support for the quality of life and the infrastructure needs in the Wiregrass as the county's largest taxpayer.
(FS-R-3)

Comment: Farley management and employees are excellent corporate citizens in helping to improve our city through economic development, educational outreach, community service, charitable donations, and so much more.
(FS-S-1)

Comment: Farley Management has also been extremely supportive of the Chambers efforts to recruit new businesses and jobs to our area, and in many cases, they have been a key to our success.
(FS-S-2)

Comment: Because Farley is located in our area, I am very familiar with the impact of this fine facility owned by Alabama Power Company. The economic impact from the large number of employees on our county and the entire area is enormous.
(FS-T-1)

Comment: The Farley Plant has an obvious economic impact on the Wiregrass Area through the taxes paid and the retail impact of its employees; the Food Bank would like to bring attention to the impact of the Farley employees that might go unnoticed.
(FS-U-2)

Comment: The Farley plant has a positive economic impact on our community by improving our quality of life. We are fortunate to have a number of Farley employees living in Headland, whom not only contribute in the buying of homes and shopping with local merchants, but whom serve in volunteer capacities for charitable organizations, local churches, and the city's recreational programs.
(FS-V-2)

Comment: Plant Farley provides a stable source of jobs for many of our parents. This gives us a unique blend of local parents and parents bringing with them different ideas and a strong work ethic. There is not a community in our county that has not reaped the benefits of employment at Plant Farley.
(FS-X-2)

Comment: The economic impact of normal purchases for its operation and the payroll of some 900 employees is substantial. It is one of the largest contributors to our local economy.
(FS-Z-2)

Comment: It supports the economy with 900+ jobs and presently \$8 million in tax revenue. I provide housing to several of the contractors that work outages at Plant Farley and I hear them discuss their jobs. I hear only positive comments from the employees and the public as well. Plant Farley supports various community activities and emphasizes safety first.
(FS-AA-2)

Comment: As one of the area's largest employers, with more than 900 local residents working at the plant, substantial contributions are made each year by Plant Farley and its employees to the local economy through property and sales taxes. Additionally, the present \$7 million generated in local revenue by the plant help pay for a variety of services in the community such as schools, police and fire protection, and road improvements.
(FS-AB through AH-2)

Comment: Plant Farley, along with its employees, is a good neighbor to the Wiregrass area. We are fully aware of Farley's positive economic impact within our community.
(FS-AI, -AJ-3)

Comment: Plant Farley has a tremendous impact upon the local and state economy. It employs more than 900 people and provides upwards of \$7 million in tax revenues. Such revenues provide a basis for support of many local initiatives and services, especially public schools throughout the area.
(FS-AK-2)

Comment: The annual payment of the property tax to Houston County has always been timely and the management attitude is they are gracious and pleased to make those payments. The Plant Management and employees participate in the business and social activities of Houston County and are open to participate in events of the area communities.
(FS-AL-2)

Comment: Undoubtedly, the Commission will receive many letters attesting to the critical impact that Plant Farley has on the overall economy and quality of life in our region. Thanks to Southern Nuclear, 900 area citizens are employed in well-paying, prestigious jobs that elevate the business profile of our county and have a tremendous effect on the upward mobility of families. Our community, specifically Houston County and Houston County Schools, benefits greatly from the \$7 million in tax revenue that makes possible everything from infrastructure improvements to enhanced classroom learning for children.
(FS-AM-2)

Comment: The impact that the plant has on the economy is tremendous. It currently provides over 8 million annually in tax revenue and provides quality jobs for over 900 employees.
(FS-AN-2)

Response: *The comments are noted. Socioeconomic issues specific to the plant are Category 2 issues and will be addressed in Chapter 4 of the SEIS.*

9. Comments Concerning Alternatives

Comment: It is an undeniable fact that fossil fuel-based plants produce thousands of tons of harmful emissions each year. For example, coal-fired plants release harmful particulates that emit both alpha and beta radiation into the atmosphere. Nuclear power plants such as Farley do not emit these harmful particulates. Nuclear power plants also do not emit carbon dioxide, they do not emit sulfur compounds, they do not emit any kind of nitrogen oxides and therefore, they don't influence the greenhouse effect and they don't contribute to global warming like many of our petroleum-based or fossil-based plants do.

(FS-L-6)

Comment: If you choose not to renew that license, you need to examine some other things -- what are the environmental impacts of not renewing the license? Well, if we don't renew the license and we go without the generation, we'll make the grid less stable. The northeast United States can tell you about the environmental and social impact of a less stable grid.

(FS-P-1)

Comment: Or maybe we say well, we'll generate the electricity somewhere else and bring it in. Now you've got the environmental impact of running additional power lines into the area to supply this area because there's no other major local generation and this plant was put here to control the voltage in this area.

(FS-P-2)

Response: *The comments are noted. Impacts from reasonable alternatives for the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2 license renewal will be evaluated in Chapter 8 of the SEIS.*

10. Comments Concerning Issues Outside the Scope of License Renewal

Comment: Houston County, through our EMA office, and our EMA staff is here today, is an integral part of the safety plan for Farley. In return, Farley has been a tremendous asset to us and our EMA office.

(FS-C-2)

Comment: I believe this experience has given me the knowledge and insight to stand before you today and say with the highest of confidence that Plant Farley can safely and reliably continue to serve the people of Alabama for an additional 20 years beyond its original license.

(FS-E-2)

Comment: In 2000, Plant Farley employees set a record by working seven million work hours without a lost time accident. I believe this is just one statistic that demonstrates our employees' professionalism and their focus on operating our plant safely.

(FS-E-4)

Comment: We are committed to protecting the health and the safety of the public as well as protecting the health and safety of our employees.

(FS-F-6)

Comment: Every year we drill to make sure that Farley is able to meet the emergency capabilities if something happened, and all of a sudden, I knew how much they cared. It wasn't how are we going to react if we have a disaster as much as it was a proactive how can we keep it from happening.

(FS-H-1)

Comment: Second, Farley has an exemplary safety record. It is as good or better than any in the United States. In my opinion, Plant Farley is a world class plant. You won't find one any better anywhere.

(FS-L-8)

Comment: I have seen first-hand something of the extreme measures to which Plant Farley goes in order to operate in a manner that ensures the safety of all who live in the surrounding communities.

(FS-Q-2)

Comment: Whereas, Plant Farley has a history of sound maintenance and safe operation, safely generating more than 200 billion kilowatt hours of electricity since 1977 and providing electricity for 1 in 5 Alabama Power customers...

(FS-R-1)

Comment: The stories that we have done over the years have served our community well by explaining the extensive precautions that Farley undertakes to protect their operations, our community and the environment.

(FS-S-3)

Comment: Our citizens appreciate the public awareness programs and utilization of media outlets to keep them informed of Farley's efforts and they feel safe with a nuclear plant nearby.

(FS-V-3)

Comment: A concern with any nuclear facility is one of safety. It is reassuring to know the priority placed on safety by Plant Farley. Our school system in conjunction with Houston County Emergency Management Association constantly modifies safety procedures that apply to any situation. The support and training from Plant Farley is more than adequate to keep us well prepared.

(FS-X-3)

Comment: I have found that this is not the case with the safety personnel and management at Plant Farley. They have worked closely with the Dothan/Houston County Emergency Management Agency and others to put in place a solid response plan. Plant Farley takes protection of their employees and community seriously. They support the emergency responders with expertise, recommendations and, most importantly to the emergency responders, the funds to support the plan.

(FS-Y-1)

Comment: One area of positive relationship is in disaster management. While the Medical Center serves as a vital resource for Farley in the event of a radiological disaster, we also depend on Farley's expertise to support our response to radiological community events. Farley personnel provide continued support all of our radiation drill activities, as well as many training components.

(FS-AI, -AJ-1)

Comment: Through our interaction with the Dothan Houston County Emergency Management Agency, we have witnessed a committed effort by Farley to provide a high level of confidence within the community regarding safety.

(FS-AI, -AJ-2)

Comment: Farley sets and maintains the highest standards in the nuclear power industry. The plant has one of the highest safety ratings and histories in the nation. Farley employees are highly qualified, competent, well trained and committed to excellence. Recent developments in the arena of terrorism and safety have been of great concern to Farley and they have developed and implemented strict procedures regarding site security, training, and safety.

(FS-AK-5)

Comment: There has been announcements from the Plant Management giving information as to the procedures taking place to describe any activity at the plant outside the routine of plant operations. Test of safety procedures which might have alarmed the public has been given advanced notice to the public.

(FS-AL-1)

Response: *The comments are noted. Operational safety is outside the scope of evaluation under 10 CFR Part 51 and 54. The comments provide no new information and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.*

Need for Power

Comment: As a matter of fact, Plant Farley provides about 20 percent of Alabama Power's electricity. Since commercial operation of the first unit began in 1977, Plant Farley has generated more than 232 billion kilowatts of electricity for the people of Alabama. That's enough generation to supply every Alabama residential customer with electricity for 14 years. This makes Plant Farley a vital economic engine for all Alabamians, providing safe, reliable and low-cost electricity to the state's homes, businesses, hospitals, schools and factories.

(FS-E-3)

Comment: It's clear that Americans understand and support the continued role nuclear plants, including Plant Farley, should continue to play in meeting the electricity needs of our state and country.

(FS-E-7)

Comment: Perhaps the single greatest significant factor that supports the relicensing effort for Farley is that they provide a safe, reliable means of generating electricity for the southeastern United States. They produce clean electricity. That is to say, Farley produces a steady supply of power, without harming the world in which we live.

(FS-L-5)

Comment: First of all, Farley provides a safe, reliable means of electricity, one that does not harm our environment, and makes us less dependent upon foreign petroleum and waning coal reserves.
(FS-L-7)

Comment: We appreciate the consideration of renewing the license for Plant Farley and look forward to seeing continuous growth from the plant. I hope to see the plant expand and provide energy to more territory than it does at present.
(FS-AA-3)

Comment: Perhaps the most significant reason for license renewal is that Plant Farley provides us with a safe, dependable, affordable, and clean source of electrical power. It offers us an alternative to inefficient coal-fired plants which produce tons of harmful emissions and petroleum based plants which, again, produce emissions and are dependent upon limited petroleum supplies. With the current situation in the Middle East, no one can make reliable predictions regarding the price and/or availability of petroleum over the next 20 years. It is vital to our nation that we have reliable sources of electrical power in place - Farley is such a source.
(FS-AK-7)

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 are interpreted as expressing support for license renewal at Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, however, they provide no new information and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.*

Cost of Power

Comment: Due to Farley's low-cost production of electricity and the sheer volume of electricity it produces for Alabama Power, which is 20 percent of the total, it allows Alabama Power Company to have electricity rates among the lowest in the nation. Utility rates are always one of the key factors in determining site selection for business and industry.
(FS-G-3)

Response: *The comment is noted. The economic costs and benefits of renewing an operating license are 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.*

Summary

The preparation of the plant-specific supplement to the GEIS (called a SEIS) for the Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, 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.