

May 11, 2004

Mr. William A. Eaton, Vice President  
System Energy Resources, Inc.  
Entergy Operations, M-ECH-38  
1340 Echelon Parkway  
Jackson, MS 39213

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING SUMMARY REPORT  
ASSOCIATED WITH THE STAFF'S REVIEW OF THE APPLICATION BY  
SYSTEM ENERGY RESOURCES, INC. (SERI) ENTERGY FOR AN EARLY  
SITE PERMIT FOR THE GRAND GULF ESP SITE

Dear Mr. Eaton:

From December 31, 2003, through February 12, 2004, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff conducted a scoping process to determine the scope of the NRC staff's environmental review of the application for an early site permit (ESP) for the Grand Gulf ESP site, submitted by System Energy Resources, Inc. (SERI) by letter dated October 16, 2003. As part of the scoping process, the NRC staff held a public environmental scoping meeting in Port Gibson, Mississippi on January 21, 2004, to solicit public input regarding the scope of the staff's review. The scoping process is the first step in the development of an environmental impact statement for an ESP at the Grand Gulf site.

The NRC staff has prepared the enclosed Environmental Scoping Summary Report identifying comments received at the January 21, 2004, environmental scoping meeting and by letters and electronic mail. In accordance with Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* Part 51.29(b), you are being provided a copy of the scoping summary report. The transcript of the meeting can be found as an attachment to the meeting summary issued on February 18, 2004. The meeting summary is available for public inspection by local residents at the Harriette Person Memorial Library in Port Gibson, Mississippi. The meeting summary is also available in the NRC Public Document Room located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland or electronically from the Publicly Available Records component of NRC's document management system (ADAMS) under Accession Number ML040510288. ADAMS is accessible at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>, which provides access through the NRC's Public Electronic Reading Room (PERR) link. 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 Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, or 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to [pdr@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr@nrc.gov).

W. Eaton

- 2-

The next step in the environmental review process is the issuance of the draft environmental impact statement scheduled for December 2004. Notice of the availability of the draft environmental impact statement 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) 415-1108.

Sincerely,

**/RA/**

James H. Wilson, Senior Project Manager  
License Renewal and Environmental Impacts Program  
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 52-009

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

W. Eaton

- 2 -

The next step in the environmental review process is the issuance of the draft environmental impact statement scheduled for December 2004. Notice of the availability of the draft environmental impact statement 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) 415-1108.

Sincerely,

**/RA/**

James H. Wilson, Senior Project Manager  
License Renewal and Environmental Impacts Program  
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 52-009

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC

Environmental R/F	DMatthews/FGillespie
PTKuo	JTappert
JHWilson	CGuerrero
TKenyon	RAnand, RNRP
VDricks, RIV	CPaulk, RIV
OGC	CBrandt (PNNL)
BMiller (PNNL)	RIDSRgn4MailCenter

Accession nos.: **ML041330230**

Document Name:C:\ORPCheckout\FileNET\ML041330230.wpd

OFFICE	RLEP	LA:RLEP	PM:RLEP	SC:RLEP	OGC	PD:RLEP
NAME	CGuerrero	YEdmonds	JHWilson	JTappert	TSmith	PTKuo
DATE	0429/04	04/29/04	04/29/04	04/30/04	5/11/04	5/11/04

OFFICIAL AGENCY RECORD

Grand Gulf Early Site Permit - Environmental Review

cc:

Executive Vice President  
& Chief Operating Officer  
Entergy Operations, Inc.  
P. O. Box 31995  
Jackson, MS 39286-1995

Wise, Carter, Child & Caraway  
P. O. Box 651  
Jackson, MS 39205

Winston & Strawn  
1400 L Street, N.W. - 12th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3502

Chief  
Energy and Transportation Branch  
Environmental Compliance and  
Enforcement Division  
Mississippi Department of Environmental  
Quality  
P. O. Box 10385  
Jackson, MS 39289-0385

President  
Claiborne County  
Board of Supervisors  
P. O. Box 339  
Port Gibson, MS 39150

Regional Administrator, Region IV  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 1000  
Arlington, TX 76011

Senior Resident Inspector  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
P. O. Box 399  
Port Gibson, MS 39150

General Manager, GGNS  
Entergy Operations, Inc.  
P. O. Box 756  
Port Gibson, MS 39150

Attorney General  
Department of Justice  
State of Louisiana  
P. O. Box 94005  
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9005

State Health Officer  
State Board of Health  
P. O. Box 1700  
Jackson, MS 39205

Office of the Governor  
State of Mississippi  
Jackson, MS 39201

Attorney General  
Asst. Attorney General  
State of Mississippi  
P. O. Box 22947  
Jackson, MS 39225

Vice President, Operations Support  
Entergy Operations, Inc.  
P.O. Box 31995  
Jackson, MS 39286-1995

Director  
Nuclear Safety Assurance  
Entergy Operations, Inc.  
P.O. Box 756  
Port Gibson, MS 39150

Charles Paulk, Region IV  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 400  
Arlington, TX 76011

Nancy Butler  
Harriette Person Memorial Library  
606 Main St.  
Port Gibson, MS 39150

Expanded distribution list: Grand Gulf ESP

Alexander C. Martin  
P. O. Box 396  
Port Gibson, MS 39150

Brenda Hyde  
P. O. Box 2450  
Jackson, MS 39225

Patricia Campbell  
Winston & Strawn LLP  
1400 L St, NW  
Washington, DC 20005

Kathryn Suito  
Winston & Strawn LLP  
1400 L St, NW  
Washington, DC 20005

Jim Gasser  
Sierra Club  
136 Jamison Ct.  
Brandon, MS 39042

Ann Somers  
Sierra Club  
1606 Pinevale St.  
Jackson, MS 39211

Ellie Neal  
611 Vondeuenter St  
Port Gibson, MS 39150

Robert Burnett  
Entergy Employee  
Idlewild, Idlewild Dr.  
Port Gibson, ms 39154

David G. Newell  
Plumber & Pipefitter 619  
1014 Newell Ln  
Union Church, MS 39668

James Windham  
Plumbers & Pipefitters  
3203 N. Frontage Rd  
Vicksburg, MS 39181

Bob Kochtitzky  
Miss. 2020 Network Inc.  
Box 13506  
Jackson, MS 39236

Ruth Pullen  
P. O. Box 720415  
Byram, MS 39272

DeMarco Morgan  
WJTV-Jackson  
1820 TV Road  
Jackson, MS 39204

Kelle Barfield  
Entergy  
1340 Echelon Pkwy  
Jackson, MS 39213

George Ross  
P. O. Box 2450  
Jackson, MS 39225

J. B. Davis  
1039 Holt Dr  
Port Gibson, MS 39150

J. Gilbert Buck  
P. O. Box 245  
Pattison, MS 39194

Johnnie M. Rockingham  
1069 Moore Rd  
Port Gibson, MS 39150

Janice W. Gray  
P. O. Box 105  
Port Gibson, MS 39150

Emma Chislyn  
P. O. box 1002  
Port Gibson, MS 39150

Eddie Walls Jr.  
P. O. Box 239  
Port Gibson, MS

Phil Segrest  
P. O. Box 147  
Port Gibson, MS 39150

Amelda Arnold, Mayor  
City of Port Gibson  
P. O. Box 607  
Port Gibson, MS 39150

Minor Ferris  
851 Fort Hill Dr.  
Vicksburg, MS 39183

Eddie Jones  
17132 Hwy 547  
Pattison, MS 39144

Sarah A. Dave  
ACORN  
17132 Hwy 547  
Pattison, MS 39144-9699

Jessie Barrett  
2080 Shannon Rd  
Pattison, MS 39144

Mike Withrow  
Entergy  
114 Tower Drive  
Vicksburg, MS 39180

Greg Broadbent  
Entergy  
P. O. Box 820591  
Vicksburg, MS 39182

Martha Lott  
Board of Supervisors  
P. O. Box 274  
Port Gibson, MS 39150

Robert W. Evans  
Enoscon Services, Inc.  
12850 Middlebrook Rd.  
Suite 108  
Germantown, MD 20874

**Environmental Impact Statement  
Scoping Process**

**Summary Report**

**Grand Gulf Early Site Permit  
Claiborne County, Mississippi**

**May 2004**



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

## Introduction

On October 16, 2003, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) received an application from System Energy Resources, Inc. (SERI) for an early site permit (ESP) for a location identified as the Grand Gulf ESP site and adjacent to the Grand Gulf Nuclear Station Unit 1. The site is located in Claiborne County in southwestern Mississippi, approximately 40 km (25 mi) south of Vicksburg, Mississippi. An early site permit is an approval of a location for the siting of one or more nuclear power facilities, separate from the filing of an application for a construction permit or combined license for such a facility. As a result, an early site permit application may refer to characteristics of one or more reactors rather than to a detailed reactor design.

As part of the application, SERI submitted an environmental report (ER) prepared in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Part 51 (*Environmental Protection Regulations for Domestic Licensing and Related Regulatory Functions*) and 10 CFR Part 52 (*Early Site Permits, Standard Design Certifications, and Combined Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants*). The 10 CFR Part 51, Subpart A, contains the NRC requirements for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, and the implementing regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). The 10 CFR Part 52, Subpart A, contains NRC regulations related to early site permits. The ER must focus on the environmental effects that would be created by construction and operation of a reactor or reactors that have characteristics that fall within the postulated site parameters. It must also include an evaluation of alternative sites to determine if there is an obviously superior alternative to the proposed site. The NRC staff is preparing an environmental impact statement (EIS) that will include an evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposed action, the environmental impacts of alternatives to the proposed action, and alternatives available for reducing or avoiding adverse environmental effects. While the proposed action is approval of the Grand Gulf ESP site for one or more nuclear facilities, the Commission has determined, as set forth in 10 CFR 52.18, that the EIS will focus on the construction and operation of a reactor or reactors which have characteristics that fall within the postulated site parameters.

In addition, if an ESP application contains a site redress plan, the permit holder may perform certain activities described in 10 CFR 50.10(e)(1) (*Domestic Licensing of Production and Utilization Facilities*) without further authorization if the EIS documents that there is reasonable assurance that the activities would not result in any significant environmental impact that cannot be redressed. The SERI's ER did not include any activities described in 10 CFR 50.10(e) for Grand Gulf site; therefore, no site redress plan is included in this review.

In accordance with 10 CFR Part 52, an applicant for an ESP need not provide an analysis of the need for power or the benefits of the proposed action. Additionally, the Commission determined that the ER need not discuss any aspect of storage of spent fuel in reactor facility storage pools or independent spent fuel storage installations. This determination was based on the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and the Commission's Waste Confidence Decision, as codified in 10 CFR 51.23. Finally, the Commission has determined that an application for an ESP need not address alternative energy options. This determination is documented in a June 2, 2003, letter from the NRC to Dominion (ADAMS Accession Number ML031480470), and in proposed changes to Part 52 published in the *Federal Register* on July 3, 2003 (68 FR 40025).

The staff is conducting its review of the Grand Gulf ESP in accordance with review standard RS-002, *Processing Applications for Early Site Permits: Draft for Interim Use and Public Comment*. The review standard draws from the previously published NUREG-0800, *Standard Review Plans for the Review of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants*, and NUREG-1555, *Standard Review Plans for Environmental Reviews for Nuclear Power Plants*. NRC's regulations regarding the scoping process for an EIS are contained in 10 CFR 51.29.

On December 31, 2003, in accordance with 10 CFR 51.26, the NRC initiated the scoping process by publishing a Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* (68 FR 75656) that notified the public of the staff's intent to prepare an EIS for the ESP application for the Grand Gulf ESP site. Through the notice, the NRC also invited the applicant; Federal, Tribal, State, and local government agencies; local organizations; and individuals to participate in the scoping process by providing oral comments at a scheduled public meeting and/or submitting written suggestions and comments no later than February 12, 2004.

The public scoping meeting was held at the Port Gibson City Hall in Port Gibson, Mississippi, on January 21, 2004. The NRC announced the meeting in local newspapers (*The Clarion-Ledger* and the *Port Gibson Reveille*), issued press releases, and distributed flyers locally. Approximately 68 members of the public attended the meeting. This session began with NRC staff members providing a brief overview of the ESP process and the NEPA process. Following the NRC's prepared statements, the meeting was opened for public comments. Eighteen (18) attendees provided either oral comments or written statements that were recorded and transcribed by a certified court reporter. The transcript of the meeting can be found as an attachment to the meeting summary, which was issued on February 18, 2004. The meeting summary is available for public inspection by local residents at the Harriette Person Memorial Library. The meeting summary is also available in the NRC Public Document Room or electronically from the Publicly Available Records (PARS) component of NRC's document system (ADAMS) under accession number ML0040510288. ADAMS is accessible from the NRC website at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.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 EIS and highlight public concerns and issues. The Notice of Intent identified the objectives of the scoping process, as required by 10 CFR 51.29. These are to:

- Define the proposed action which is to be the subject of the EIS.
- Determine the scope of the EIS and identify significant issues to be analyzed in depth.
- Identify and eliminate from detailed study those issues that are peripheral or that are not significant.
- Identify any environmental assessments and other EISes that are being prepared or will be prepared that are related to, but not part of, the scope of the EIS being considered.
- Identify other environmental review and consultation requirements related to the proposed action.

- Indicate the relationship between the timing of the preparation of the environmental analyses and the Commission's tentative planning and decision-making schedule.
- Identify any cooperating agencies and, as appropriate, allocate assignments for preparation and schedules for completing the EIS to the NRC and any cooperating agencies.
- Describe how the EIS will be prepared, and include any contractor assistance to be used.

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. Forty-seven (47) emails containing comments were also received during the scoping period. All comments and suggestions received orally during the scoping meeting 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.

This document presents a summary of comments received and the staff's determinations and conclusions regarding those comments as required by 10 CFR 51.29(b). Table 1 identifies the individuals providing comments and the Commenter ID letter associated with each person's set(s) of comments. 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.

Comments were consolidated and categorized according to the topic within the proposed EIS or according to the general topic if outside the scope of the EIS. Once comments were categorized, the staff and contractor determined the appropriate response for each comment. Each comment was assigned a unique identifier (consisting of the Commenter ID letter listed in Table 1 plus the comment number).

The preparation of the EIS will take into account all the relevant issues raised during the scoping process. The draft EIS will be made available for public comment in February 2005. The comment period for the draft EIS will offer the next opportunity for the applicant; interested Federal, Tribal, 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 EIS will be considered in the preparation of the final EIS. The final EIS, along with the staff's Safety Evaluation Report (SER), will provide much of the basis for NRC's decision on the Grand Gulf early site permit.

**Table 1 - Individuals Providing Comments During Scoping Comment Period**

<b>Commenter ID</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Affiliation (if stated)</b>	<b>Comment Source and ADAMS Accession #</b>
A	George A. Williams	Entergy	Public Meeting Transcript (ML040360176)
B	Curtis James	US Fish and Wildlife Service	Public Meeting Transcript (ML040360176)
C	Landon Huey	Concerned Citizen	Public Meeting Transcript (ML040360176)
D	Paul Gunter	Nuclear Information Resource Service	Public Meeting Transcript (ML040360176)
E	A.C. Garner	Claiborne County Chapter, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People	Public Meeting Transcript (ML040360176)
F	Soloman Wilson	Concerned Citizen	Public Meeting Transcript (ML040360176)
G	Rose Johnson	Mississippi Chapter Sierra Club	Public Meeting Transcript (ML040360176)
H	Evan Doss, Jr.	Concerned Citizen	Public Meeting Transcript (ML040360176)
I	Nathalie Walker	Advocates for Environmental Human Rights	Public Meeting Transcript (ML040360176)
J	Alexander Martin	Concerned Citizen	Public Meeting Transcript (ML040360176)
K	Becky Gillette	Mississippi Chapter Sierra Club	Public Meeting Transcript (ML040360176)
L	Martha Ferris	Concerned Citizen	Public Meeting Transcript (ML040360176)
M	J. Scott Peterson	Nuclear Energy Institute	Public Meeting Transcript (ML040360176)
N	Phil Segrest	Concerned Citizen	Public Meeting Transcript (ML040360176)
O	Monique Harden	Advocates for Environmental Human Rights	Public Meeting Transcript (ML040360176)
P	Jerry Landrum	Concerned Citizen	Public Meeting Transcript (ML040360176)
Q	Ruth Pullen	Concerned Citizen	Public Meeting Transcript (ML040360176)

**Table 1. (continued)**

<b>Commenter ID</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Affiliation (if stated)</b>	<b>Comment Source and ADAMS Accession #</b>
R	David Ritter	Public Citizen/Critical Mass	Public Meeting Transcript (ML040360176)
S	Claiborne County Chapter, NAACP	Concerned Citizen	Attachment to Transcript (ML040360176)
T	J. Scott Peterson	Nuclear Energy Institute	Attachment to Transcript (ML040360176)
U	Cheryl Catranbone	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540768)
V	Barbara Powell	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540776)
W	Edward A. Mainland	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540774)
X	Ned Ford	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540772)
Y	Gilbert Woolley	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540766)
Z	Reilly Morse	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540765)
AA	Lorraine Kitman	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540755)
AB	Jane W. Lusk	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540857)
AC	Tony Bland	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540758)
AD	Cynthia Sarthou	Gulf Restoration Network	E-Mail (ML040540753)
AE	Mark M. Gonzalez	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540787)
AF	Julianna Padgett	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540783)
AG	Micah Walker Parkin	Alliance for Affordable Energy	E-Mail (ML040540795)
AH	Wendy King	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540793)
AI	Leonard Levine	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540791)
AJ	Paula Vassey	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540797)
AK	Videojan	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540799)
AL	Paul Gunter	Nuclear Information and Resource Service	E-Mail (ML040540801)
AM	Ruth Pullen	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540802)
AN	Chris Holly	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540812)
AO	Tom Pullen	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540805)
AP	Tiffany Elyce Crane	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540821)

**Table 1. (continued)**

<b>Commenter ID</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Affiliation (if stated)</b>	<b>Comment Source and ADAMS Accession #</b>
AQ	Charlie Brenner	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540826)
AR	Susan Hall	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540827)
AS	Marianne Hill	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540829)
AT	Ginnette Lolli	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540831)
AU	Betty Daugherty	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540834)
AV	Tom Mann	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540836)
AW	Alex Major	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540839)
AX	K. Brad Ott	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540843)
AZ	J. Scott Peterson	Nuclear Energy Institute	E-Mail (ML040540761)
BA	Solomon S. Wilson	Claiborne County Hospital	E-Mail (ML040780554)
BB	Patricia Neveleff	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540780)
BC	Davis Mounger	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540782)
BD	Martha Ferris	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540786)
BE	William Ferris	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540792)
BF	Takasha Lewis	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540798)
BG	Michael Berk	Mississippi State University	E-Mail (ML040540751)
BH	Bob Kochitzky	Mississippi 2020 Network	E-Mail (ML040540752)
BI	Sallie E. Davis	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540760)
BJ	Becky Gillette	Mississippi Chapter Sierra Club	E-Mail (ML040540764)
BK	Judy Treichel	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540769)
BL	Arthur D. Unger	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540773)
BM	Christine Blair	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540799)
BN	Lavaree Jones	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540845)
BO	Christine Murphey	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540853)
BP	Katherine B. Senter	Concerned Citizen	E-Mail (ML040540861)

## **Grand Gulf Early Site Permit Public Scoping Meeting Comments and Responses**

The following pages present the comments received as part of the scoping process and indicate their disposition. Parenthetical numbers after each comment refer to the commenters' ID and the comment number. Comments can be tracked to the commenter and the source document through the commenter's ID listed in Table 1. Comments are grouped by category. The categories are as follows:

1.	Support for Nuclear Power .....	9
2.	Opposition to Nuclear Power .....	10
3.	Support for NRC's ESP Process .....	11
4.	Opposition to NRC's ESP Process .....	12
5.	Support for the Grand Gulf ESP .....	12
6.	Opposition to the Grand Gulf ESP .....	13
7.	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Administrative Process .....	19
8.	NEPA Compliance .....	20
9.	Air Quality .....	20
10.	Surface Water Use and Quality .....	20
11.	Aquatic Ecology .....	22
12.	Threatened or Endangered Species .....	22
13.	Socioeconomics .....	23
14.	Environmental Justice .....	30
15.	Radiological Impacts .....	35
16.	Uranium Fuel Cycle and Waste Management .....	39
17.	Decommissioning .....	45
18.	Cumulative Impacts .....	45
19.	Alternative Energy Sources and Conservation .....	46

20.	Site Safety Review .....	50
21.	Safeguards and Security .....	53
22.	Emergency Preparedness .....	59
23.	Operational Safety .....	62
24.	Cost of Power .....	63
25.	Need for Power .....	64

## Comments

### 1. Support for Nuclear Power

**Comment:** On the issue of stopping construction on nuclear plants. Mr. Wilson, I think you raised this, in the '70s. A couple of factors at play there. There was the construction of nuclear plants that were stopped, and more construction of coal plants were stopped at the same time. More than 100 coal plants were stopped; for two-fold reasons; the inflationary period of the 1970s that drove our economy in the tank, and electricity growth stopped. So all of a sudden there was an electricity curve going like this, and it went like that. So just about every large nuclear power plant in this country, no matter what the fuel source, was canceled, and we are now just getting to the point where we need to start looking again at bringing large power plants back on line to serve our electricity needs of the future. (M-10)

**Comment:** There has been a lot of talk about alternative fuels, and there is a lot of talk right now about fuel cells being one of the alternative fuels. Fuel cells is what blew up Apollo 13, and so like the gentleman before me said, there are inherent dangers in everything that we try, and we just have to be able to manage the risk, and I think that as you look back at the nuclear industry in the United States, we have been highly regulated. (N-4)

**Comment:** Don't try to compare apples to a slice of bread like people have done, where they have brought up [Chernobyl] in the Soviet Union, an entirely different setting, other than it is an isotope. (N-5)

**Comment:** All radioactive material is not bad. In fact, none of it is bad if we harness it and use it properly. (N-6)

**Comment:** I have seen the nuclear energy industry in the U.S. compile an excellent record of efficiency and safety matched by few other industries. (T-1)

**Comment:** Given these benefits, it should come as no surprise that our nation's leaders value nuclear energy as an electricity source for today ... and for the future. President Bush, congressional leaders ... business leaders like Sun Microsystems CEO Scott McNealy and Intel CEO Craig Barrett ... and Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan ... support nuclear energy because of its affordable, reliable and it protects our environment. (T-5) (AZ-5)

**Comment:** I have seen the nuclear energy industry in the U.S. compile an excellent record of efficiency and safety matched by few other industries. (AZ-1)

**Response:** *These comments provide only general information in support of nuclear power. They provide no information related to the scope of the EIS and will not be considered further in the staff's environmental review.*

## 2. Opposition to Nuclear Power

**Comment:** I think that all nuclear plants should be closed and stand as a monument to human stupidity. (C-2)

**Comment:** The Sierra Club opposes nuclear power because it is the most dangerous and environmentally harmful way to produce electricity that exists. (G-1)

**Comment:** And so when we are talking tonight, we are talking more than just about one new site. We are talking about reviving an entire industry that has been basically dead, or as far as new permits has been dead for decades. And so I think when we look at that, I think you would have to look at these issues about from the cradle to the grave, and the impact that this industry has all the way through the chain. (K-1)

**Comment:** We are talking about something that is toxic for so very long that we really can't even imagine the amount of time that it is, and it is simply irresponsible of us to take this path when there are other known and safer methods to generate power. The Native Americans believe that you should take no action that is going to harm the seventh generation, and when they are looking at their actions, they are looking at seven generations down the road. We are doing things right here today that are affecting this generation with the nuclear power, and that simply is not acceptable. We do not need a resurgence of this industry. (K-6)

**Comment:** And this brings me to an MIT report, a 2003 study done by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the future of nuclear power, and the global growth scenario for nuclear power necessary to have any impact on greenhouse gas production would require the construction and operation of 1,000 to 1,500 reactors of 1,000 megawatt capacity each by 2050, in addition to the 444 reactors currently operating worldwide. By MIT's account, this would mean locating and building additional geological nuclear waste sites like Yucca Mountain, the proposed Yucca Mountain, every 3 to 4 years, and equivalent to the Yucca Mountain size. (R-7)

**Comment:** Although I am far from the proposed site, and do not expect to have direct exposure to the problems created by any nuclear plants that are eventually built in Mississippi, I am a U.S. citizen and have grave concerns about the stability of our economy which has been undermined by mismanagement and corruption by the power industry, particularly the nuclear industry. Current examples of this corruption are the extension of the Price Anderson waiver of liability, the refusal of the industry to pay the Federal Government for fuel processing costs, and the assumption by wheelers and dealers that accumulated ratepayer funding of plant [decommissioning] costs can be claimed as private property if instead of [decommissioning], the plant is simply entombed and left for future generations to deal with. Congress may be supporting nuclear power, but that doesn't make it morally legitimate to subsidize a technology which cannot possibly stand on its own, especially when that technology poses safety threats. (X-6)

**Comment:** I would be very strongly opposed to the building of a nuclear power plant. Here or anywhere else for that matter. There are other ways of providing energy that are much safer and sustainable. (AB-1)

**Comment:** The nuclear industry would not survive absent significant governmental input and risk buffering; it is long past time to redirect this funding into development of much more environmentally friendly and safer energy sources. (AV-2)

**Comment:** The track record of nuclear facilities as a whole is dismal. (BC-2)

**Comment:** IT'S ABOUT THE BUSH ENERGY PLAN There hasn't been a nuclear reactor built since the Three Mile Island nuclear disaster in 1979. However, the Bush administration seeks new nuclear reactors as part of its National Energy Plan. Vice-President Dick Cheney publicly explained that the Bush Energy Plan calls for the construction of 1,300 new power plants, or one every week for 20 years, which would include new nuclear reactors. (BG-7)

**Comment:** Nuclear power plants have always been inherently dangerous because of the possibility of accidents and because there is no way to safely store the waste for thousands of years. (BP-2)

**Response:** *These comments provide only general information in opposition to nuclear power. They provide no information related to the scope of this EIS and will not be considered further in the staff's environmental review.*

### **3. Support for NRC's ESP Process**

**Comment:** In the old licensing process—dating back to the 1960s—safety issues were not fully resolved until after construction was virtually complete. With the new licensing process, the public has more opportunities to comment on licensing and safety issues, and much earlier in the process, as here with the early site permit process. (T-6)

**Comment:** Significantly, this is just one of many opportunities for the public to participate in the new licensing process. For example, if Entergy actually were to decide to build a plant, there would be several public meetings, as well as opportunities to submit written comments. This approach benefits the public, as well as a company seeking to develop energy supplies for the future. This process allows for prudent business decision-making on how to serve growing consumer electricity demand, and it provides for sound investment decisions to be made to fund a plant's construction. Tonight's meeting is an important part of the new licensing process. This process that will assess the future viability of this site for a possible new nuclear plant—an affordable, environmentally responsible energy source for our nation's future. (T-7)

**Comment:** The pioneering companies pursuing early site permits are helping shape a more open and predictable means for building new nuclear plants. In the old licensing process—dating back to the 1960s—safety issues were not fully resolved until after construction was virtually complete. With the new licensing process, the public has more opportunities to comment on licensing and safety issues, and much earlier in the process, as here with the early site permit process. (AZ-6)

**Response:** *These comments provide only general information in support of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's early site permit process. They provide no information related to the scope of this EIS and will not be considered further in the staff's environmental review.*

#### 4. Opposition to NRC's ESP Process

**Comment:** I believe that the NRC must consider all of these impacts, and not piecemeal these impacts in these little cubby holes and these categories of, well, this is for safety, and this is for environment, and this is for health. It is about people's lives in this area, and all of these impacts are all important. And it can't be treated in this bureaucratic fashion of slicing and dicing these priority impacts, because they are all important. (O-7)

**Comment:** One, I am a little bit alarmed at this cozy relationship that appears to exist between industry and the regulatory agency again, and I see that a lot. Ike warned us about the military industrial complex, and I see sort of an industrial government complex at work here, and with this funding arrangement, that sounds sort of Arthur Anderson-ish a little bit. (P-1)

**Comment:** We will hope that the proponents of these plants will be required to operate in a truly competitive mode, but that of course won't happen until Price-Anderson is repealed, and Congress stops handing out gifts to proponents of this technology. In the mean time, the existence of a new expedited permit process does not mean that an expedited permit is a responsible thing to approve. (X-10)

**Response:** *The mission of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is to ensure the safe use of nuclear materials in commercial applications. This includes the regulation of the nation's commercial nuclear power plants. NRC does not promote nuclear power and does not fund the applicants' activities. The NRC decision will be whether to grant the ESP by focusing on the environmental effects of construction and operation of one or more reactors which have characteristics that fall within the postulated site parameters. However, even if the ESP is approved, SERI is still required to obtain all other necessary permits from the State and other Federal agencies before it can proceed with any pre-construction activities. These comments provide only information in opposition to the NRC's ESP process. They provide no information related to the scope of the EIS and will not be considered further in the staff's environmental review.*

#### 5. Support for the Grand Gulf ESP

**Comment:** Grand Gulf did file for an early site permit back in October of last year, and really the important piece of that is that it allows us the option in the future that if we decide to build another unit at Grand Gulf Station, and it at least gets the process started. It doesn't mean that we have any plans to go forth with building a nuclear unit. But it does allow us the option. What it does do for us is that if we actually get approval for the early site permitting process, it does allow you to get a lot of the engineering and environmental studies out of the way, such that really shortens the lead time for actually constructing a nuclear power plant. And what it does is that it reduces it from about a lead time of about 8 years down to about 5 years for this plant. And it is very important for Entergy to do this, because like other utility operators, you want to make sure that you preserve your future. (A-2)

**Comment:** But the main thing that we wanted to do was just to preserve the option that down the road if we wanted to build a next-generation nuclear power plant that will allow us the

possibility of doing that. If that is not, then give us permission to go forward and build a plant at this time. So I wanted to clear that up, and with that, instead of me talking a lot, I would like to be able to answer your questions, and I may not be able to answer all your questions. (A-7)

**Comment:** That is good land management in my book, okay? This land is already being used for a power plant, and it has additional land available to maximize the resources that we have, and the power lines are there, and the transmission is set up. All we have to do is add another reactor there, and that is good land management, rather than taking it to a whole new site, and building another facility. (M-4)

**Comment:** First off, I would like to say that I don't know of anyone in this community, be it directly or indirectly, who has not benefitted from the Grand Gulf Nuclear Plant. We are far better off with it than without it. (N-1)

**Comment:** Technology changes, the computers that did all the checkouts for the Apollo spacecraft, the launch of the Apollo spacecraft, fill up a room about 10 times this size. Each one of them being a tower taller than I am, and each one of those towers now is superseded in power by the laptop that is sitting in front of the young lady here at the table that is putting on the Powerpoint. So lesser controls doesn't mean lesser capacity or lesser capabilities. (N-3)

**Comment:** Entergy's record is among the very best over that time. The talent and dedication of Entergy's nuclear personnel gives me – and should give you – every confidence that Entergy could construct and operate a nuclear plant that would provide its customers with reliable, affordable and clean energy for decades to come. (T-2)

**Comment:** Entergy's record is among the very best over that time. The talent and dedication of Entergy's nuclear personnel gives me – and should give you – every confidence that Entergy could construct and operate a nuclear plant that would provide its customers with reliable, affordable and clean energy for decades to come. (AZ-2)

**Comment:** Significantly, this is just one of many opportunities for the public to participate in the new licensing process. For example, if Entergy actually were to decide to build a plant, there would be several public meetings, as well as opportunities to submit written comments. This approach benefits the public, as well as a company seeking to develop energy supplies for the future. This process allows for prudent business decision-making on how to serve growing consumer electricity demand, and it provides for sound investment decisions to be made to fund a plant's construction. Tonight's meeting is an important part of the new licensing process. This process that will assess the future viability of this site for a possible new nuclear plant—an affordable, environmentally responsible energy source for our nation's future. (AZ-7)

**Response:** *These comments provide only general information in support of the Grand Gulf early site permit. They provide no information related to the scope of this EIS and will not be considered further in the staff's environmental review.*

## 6. Opposition to the Grand Gulf ESP

**Comment:** Also, if we talk about concerns the existing facility, clearly the existing facility and the potential impact on a new facility, is of concern. And they are designed to basically in a stripped-down version of what is currently out there on the market. For example, the designs that we have seen, and the designs that have been verified before the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and in my discussions with the Union of Concerned Scientists Nuclear Engineering, indicate that the control rooms at these new designs have far less protection than the control room at this existing facility here at Grand Gulf. So when you put a facility that has been pretty much stripped down, at least as these new certified designs would indicate, next to an existing facility, it does raise questions with regard to how that existing facility, if there were an accident there, could potentially impact this new and stripped down facility. (D-3)

**Comment:** We take the position that we cannot at this time support a second unit until our issues, some of them anyway, are cleared up; whereas that some things would take place as far as Grand Gulf Nuclear 1 is concerned. (E-4)

**Comment:** But I concur with the comments of -- you know, the opponents that have gathered here tonight, and the organizations and individuals that are opposing the early site permit at Grand Gulf, and Public Citizen will be filing a petition for intervention regarding this early site permit. (R-1)

**Comment:** And it brings to mind something that is called the Stockholm Syndrome, which is I guess a psychological phenomena, where hostages are actually sympathizing with their captors, and I would caution this community to see other options rather than sacrifice their own health and the risks that come with nuclear plants, and of course future generations that could be jeopardized. (R-13)

**Comment:** Be It So Resolved that the Claiborne County Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is opposed to the expansion of the Grand Gulf nuclear power plant site in Port Gibson, Mississippi pending complete and total satisfactory resolution of the aforesaid issues. (S-11)

**Comment:** Please deny this request for an early site permit for expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (U-4)

**Comment:** I am writing to express my objections to the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, Miss. (U-5)

**Comment:** Please deny this request for an early site permit for expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (V-3)

**Comment:** I urge you not to permit the expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant near Port Gibson, Mississippi. (V-4)

**Comment:** You are respectfully requested to reject this request for an early site permit for expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (W-4)

**Comment:** I am writing to express my objections to the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, Miss. (X-11)

**Comment:** Please deny this request for an early site permit for expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (X-14)

**Comment:** I urge you to deny this request for an early site permit for expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (AA-4)

**Comment:** I strongly urge you to oppose the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, Miss. (AA-5)

**Comment:** This is a ridiculous idea that can only cause a great deal of damage as has been proven in several cases in the past. Please register my objection to this dangerous plan both in MS and elsewhere. (AB-4)

**Comment:** I am writing to express my objections to the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, Miss. I am opposed not only to this plant but to the principle of using nuclear power. (AC-1)

**Comment:** The GRN opposes the current permit under consideration for the proposed expansion of the permit for the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, Mississippi. (AD-1)

**Comment:** The GRN would assert that issuance of the proposed permit is inappropriate. Accordingly, we request that the proposed application be denied. (AD-6)

**Comment:** I am writing to express my objections to the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, Miss. (AE-1)

**Comment:** Please deny this request for an early site permit for expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (AE-5)

**Comment:** I object to the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, Mississippi for several reasons. (AF-1)

**Comment:** For the sake of saving human lives and promoting strategic economic/energy decisions, please deny the request for an early site permit for expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (AF-8)

**Comment:** Based on all of the above factors, we ask that you deny this request for an early site permit for expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear facility. (AG-5)

**Comment:** We wish to express our sincere concerns and objections to the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, Miss. (AG-6)

**Comment:** Please deny this request for an early site permit for expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (AH-5)

**Comment:** I oppose the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, Miss. (AH-6)

**Comment:** Please deny this request for an early site permit for expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (AI-5)

**Comment:** I want to express my strong objections to the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, Miss. (AI-6)

**Comment:** I am opposed to the permitting of a new nuclear power reactor at Port Gibson, Mississippi. Another nuclear reactor is unneeded, unnecessary, unwanted and dangerous. It is an unfair and dangerous burden on taxpayers who can least afford it. (AJ-1)

**Comment:** The cumulative effects past, present, and future, unneeded, unnecessary, known and unknown dangers of high-level nuclear toxic waste should not be visited on the State of Mississippi, especially in Port Gibson! (AJ-13)

**Comment:** PLEASE DENY THIS PERMIT SO THE PEOPLE OF MISSISSIPPI DO NOT HAVE TO BE AFRAID!! (AJ-18)

**Comment:** Please deny this request for an early site permit for the expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (AM-7)

**Comment:** I am outraged that the nuclear power industry is thinking of opening another plant here in my home. (AN-1)

**Comment:** Please deny this request for an early site permit for the expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (AO-6)

**Comment:** Please deny this request for an early site permit for expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear and alleviate the possibility of compounding those risks. (AP-7)

**Comment:** Please deny this request for an early site permit for the expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (AQ-7)

**Comment:** I oppose an early site permit for this plant. (AR-1)

**Comment:** Please reject this request for an early site permit for the expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (AR-7)

**Comment:** Our relatively weak attempts to develop alternative energy technologies, or to find safe means of disposing of nuclear waste, show a lack of commitment to a sustainable economy -- that is, to a way of doing things that would ensure that our grandchildren can enjoy safe and sufficient energy resources and a clean environment. In that spirit, I am opposed to the Early Site Permit for an additional nuclear reactor at Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant, Port Gibson, Miss. (AS-1)

**Comment:** I ask that you deny this request for an early site permit for the expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (AS-9)

**Comment:** I am writing to encourage you to deny this request for an early site permit for the expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant near Port Gibson. (AT-1)

**Comment:** Please deny this request for an early site permit for the expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (AT-5)

**Comment:** I am opposed to the proposed plant for many reasons the most important is environmental. Suffice to say I am opposed. (AU-1)

**Comment:** I am writing to express my objections to the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, MS. I oppose a permit for this plant. (AW-1)

**Comment:** Please deny this request for an early site permit for the expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (AW-8)

**Comment:** I am writing to state my opposition to the proposed addition to the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Station near Port Gibson, Mississippi. (AX-1)

**Comment:** Please deny the request for an early site permit for the expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear plant. (AX-4)

**Comment:** I strongly object to the proposed expansion of the Gulf Nuclear Power Plant on grounds [too numerous] to list. (BB-1)

**Comment:** I am a Mississippian who opposes the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear facility. This is not a sustainable or safe method of delivering power to the region. (BC-1)

**Comment:** I request that this proposal not happen. (BC-5)

**Comment:** I am writing to express my objections to the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, Miss. (BD-1)

**Comment:** Please deny this request for an early site permit for expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (BD-9)

**Comment:** I am writing to express my objections to the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, Miss. (BE-1)

**Comment:** Please deny this request for an early site permit for expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (BE-5)

**Comment:** I am writing to express heartfelt objections to the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, Miss, which is one hour from my hometown. I oppose a permit for this plant because of site characteristics that pose an undue risk. (BF-1)

**Comment:** Please deny this request for an early site permit for expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear, for the sake of health, well-being, and future of Mississippi. Its about time someone started using wisdom to care for our often over looked state. (BF-6)

**Comment:** I CANNOT BELIEVE THAT THE NRC BELIEVES THAT THIS TYPE OF NUCLEAR POWER GENERATION IS EITHER EFFICIENT, SAFE, ECONOMICAL, OR SUSTAINABLE!!!!!!! This proposal is flawed, and 'scientifically or morally' cannot be justified. (BG-1)

**Comment:** Please deny this request for an early site permit for expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (BH-5)

**Comment:** I am writing to express my objections to the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, Miss. (BH-6)

**Comment:** We are writing on behalf of the 1,400 members of Sierra Club in Mississippi to express objections to the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, Miss. (BJ-1)

**Comment:** This early site permit should be denied. (BJ-6)

**Comment:** I object to the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, Miss. (BL-1)

**Comment:** Please reconsider, and deny any attempt to bring a nuclear power plant to Port Gibson, to Mississippi, to the Gulf of Mexico. (BM-2)

**Comment:** I am writing to express my objections to the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, MS. (BN-1)

**Comment:** Please deny this request for an early site permit for the expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (BN-8)

**Comment:** Please deny this request for an early site permit for expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (BO-4)

**Comment:** I write in opposition to the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, Miss. (BO-5)

**Comment:** I am writing to object to the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant in Mississippi. (BP-1)

**Response:** *The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission will carefully review the application against its regulations that are intended to protect public health and safety and the environment. These comments provide no information related to the scope of this EIS and will not be considered further in the staff's environmental review.*

## **7. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Administrative Process**

**Comment:** Another thing that I have here is that the liaison with the community that they are asking for is very important, and they have not been over the period of the 20 years of the first site that even the people from the site have even come to this community and sit down in a town hall meeting that we can intelligently ask and discuss our questions about the site. This is very important if we are going to consider a second site that something that should be instilled in this process for the suitability of this site that they be required to come here, and sit down with or in town hall meetings, and explain and hear our concerns as well. (H-3)

**Comment:** Mr. Tappert, you said earlier tonight that this process, this early site process, and this step of the process that public involvement was integral and important to it. I wondered in light of that why this meeting in a small Southern town, knowing that you want to involve the public, would be held on a Wednesday night when most people are in church. I also wondered at the visuals that we were shown tonight, which you described as cartoons would simplify a process that is extremely complicated, and that we deserve much more intense and regulatory explanations about. I am not interested in generic findings. I am interested in hearing from people like Mr. Wilson, who has come back after 25 years, and there are no longer creepy crawleys under the rocks that he is picking up. I am interested in hearing stories of people who go fishing and are finding fish belly up. (L-1)

**Response:** *The process for this proposed action will provide several opportunities for public participation. The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission will hold a public meeting on the draft EIS where concerns can be expressed. There will also be a public hearing on the Grand Gulf ESP, as well as other meetings on the safety reviews.*

**Comment:** It is a pleasure to see so many people here participating in this process, because part of the value of the early site permitting process, and in fact the entire new regulatory process for building new plants in this country is that there is meaningful public participation that is frontloaded in the process, and that will continue throughout the process. So that the public can be informed and the public can participate, and make decisions on their own based on facts, and I just wanted to thank everybody for being here tonight. (M-1)

**Response:** *This comment provides no information related to the scope of this EIS and will therefore not be considered further in the staff's environmental review.*

**Comment:** I question at this point in time the NRC's commitment to upholding its own decision in this environmental justice case, because if the staff of the NRC were truly serious about identifying the effects of Entergy's proposed nuclear reactor facility, it wouldn't hold this meeting on a Wednesday night when many of the residents in Port Gibson and Claiborne County are busy with all of the daily obligations and responsibilities that they have. And therefore are precluded from coming and presenting their Comments at this meeting. (O-2)

**Response:** *The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission chose the meeting date to accommodate as many potential commenters as possible. Scoping comments submitted by letter or email were also accepted. There will also be a future opportunity to comment orally and in writing on the draft environmental impact statement.*

## **8. NEPA Compliance**

**Comment:** NEPA or National Environmental Policy Act, basically is an action-forcing provision and procedure designed to assure that all Federal agencies plan and work together to provide a healthy and balanced environment, and that is what we are all interested in tonight. (D-1)

**Comment:** All of these burdens must also be adequately analyzed as costs, as part of the cost benefit analysis that NEPA also requires. (I-8)

**Response:** *The benefits of an early site permit (ESP) will not be discussed in the environmental impact statement (EIS) prepared in conjunction with the ESP application (see 10 CFR 52.18). However, if SERI elects at some future time to submit an application for a construction permit or a combined license, the benefits will be discussed in the EIS prepared in conjunction with any such future application and will be compared to the associated costs.*

## **9. Air Quality**

**Comment:** Nuclear power is clean, and it is emission-free. You can easily get a lot of large generation with one unit. (A-4)

**Comment:** Today, nuclear energy provides electricity to power one out of every five U.S. homes and businesses. It is the only large-scale, emission-free electricity source that can be readily expanded. Nuclear power plants do not produce sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides or the major greenhouse gas, carbon dioxide. I can see every day that we will need more electricity – and we will also need clean air. With nuclear energy, we can have both. Entergy's Grand Gulf Station generates about one-fifth of this state's power. In 2002, operation of Grand Gulf avoided the emission of nearly 50,000 tons of sulfur dioxide and more than 20,000 tons of nitrogen oxide to the state's atmosphere, compared to what would have been emitted by fossil electric generating plants. (T-4)

**Comment:** Today, nuclear energy provides electricity to power one out of every five U.S. homes and businesses. It is the only large-scale, emission-free electricity source that can be readily expanded. Nuclear power plants do not produce sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides or the major greenhouse gas, carbon dioxide. (AZ-4)

**Response:** *The impacts on air quality resulting from construction and operation of proposed units at Grand Gulf will be discussed in Chapter 4 of the environmental impact statement.*

## **10. Surface Water Use and Quality**

**Comment:** The impacts on the Mississippi River arising from any increased intake of cooling water for the operation of any new proposed nuclear power units should be included. Now, Grand Gulf right now operates on a cooling tower, and that does provide some reduced impact

on the Mississippi as it were -- and like most other units draw directly from the water source, and they discharge directly into the water source. But we don't know for a fact that this new design won't in fact use a once-through cooling system, which might be taking in as much as 2-1/2 billion gallons of water a day out of the Mississippi River. And because we are not being provided with a specific design, we don't really know what the water intake is. So in fact again all the potential impacts on the Mississippi River arising from that need to be incorporated into this environmental impact statement. Also, all the impacts associated with the possibility of flooding of the Mississippi River on the safe operation of this proposed facility, as well as the existing facility, but clearly we have seen indications that the flooding and the river itself can change. So clearly an environmental impact statement needs to take into account and closely study how changes in the Mississippi River might affect future operation. (D-5)

**Response:** *The impact from any cooling system using the parameters identified in the plant parameter envelope (PPE) will be reviewed in accordance with the environmental standard review plan (NUREG-1555) and discussed in the EIS in Section 4.1.2.7. At this time, the applicant has indicated that a closed cooling system employing a cooling tower will be used and not a once-through cooling system. Therefore, the early site permit will not consider once-through cooling. If the applicant were subsequently to decide that they were interested in once-through designs it would require a new application. The particular cooling system ultimately chosen by the applicant will have to fall within the PPE submitted by the applicant. The impact associated with the possibility of flooding of the Mississippi River on the safe operation of the existing facility is outside the scope of this EIS. The impact associated with the possibility of flooding of the Mississippi River on the safe operation of this proposed facility will be reviewed as part of the Site Safety Analysis Report per 10 CFR 52.17 and the NRC's Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation Review Standard RS-002 Section 2.4, and will be presented in the Safety Evaluation Report Section 2.4. This topic also is outside the scope of this EIS.*

**Comment:** The EIS for the Grand Gulf nuclear power station is therefore required to address all of the following. All impacts on the Mississippi River arising from any increased intake of reactor cooling water for the operation of any proposed new nuclear power units. (AL-1)

**Response:** *Impact on the Mississippi River arising from any increased intake of reactor cooling water for the operation of any proposed new nuclear power units will be reviewed in accordance with the environmental standard review plan (NUREG-1555, Section 5.2) and discussed in the EIS in Section 4.1.2.3.*

**Comment:** The EIS for the Grand Gulf nuclear power station is therefore required to address all of the following. All impacts on the Mississippi River arising from the increase in the routine discharge of chemicals, heavy metals, cleaning solvents, biocides and radioactive isotopes into the Mississippi River arising from the operation of additional nuclear power units. (AL-4) (D-8)

**Response:** *Impact on the Mississippi River arising from the increase in the routine discharge of chemicals, heavy metals, cleaning solvents, and biocides into the Mississippi River arising from the operation of additional nuclear power units will be reviewed in accordance with the environmental standard review plan (NUREG-1555, Section 5.2) and discussed in the EIS in Section 4.1.2.3. Impact on the Mississippi River arising from the radioactive isotopes released*

*into the Mississippi River from the operation of additional nuclear power units will be reviewed in accordance with the environmental standard review plan (NUREG-1555) and discussed in the EIS in Section 4.1.2.7.*

## **11. Aquatic Ecology**

**Comment:** Well, wetlands, and I don't even know if wetlands, since it is on this site, would even be involved, but that would be a concern to the Fish and Wildlife Service. (B-1)

**Comment:** All impacts on the aquatic environment of the Mississippi River arising out of any increase in thermal discharge into the river from cooling water need to be addressed from these additional units. (D-6)

**Comment:** All impacts on the Mississippi River arising from the increased impingement and entrainment, or the sucking in and pinning of fish or fish spawn, or other aquatic life and nutrients arising out of increased reactor cooling water intake. (D-7)

**Comment:** When I was a child, I would go to that creek and I would kick over rocks, and I would walk it, and I would fish out of it. So when I got back, I went to the creek again. And I went down and I picked up a rock. Now, years ago when I picked up a nice-sized rock, I would find nice little crawly things under it. Sometimes just little crawling things under it. But when I came back this time, I picked up a rock, and I looked, and there was nothing there. And then I thought that nuclear power plant. (F-1)

**Comment:** I would like to emphasize the need to truly look at all those things, and then as you do the impact study, to make sure that we are informed in a very meaningful way on whether or not when I catch a fish over there in Louisiana that has a funny look on it, and got a little growth on it, I think nuclear power plant, and I need to know that it is not. (F-3)

**Comment:** All impacts on the aquatic environment of Mississippi River arising from any increase in thermal discharge of reactor cooling water as result of the operation of additional nuclear power units. (AL-2)

**Comment:** All impacts on Mississippi River arising from the increased impingement and entrainment of fish, fish spawn, other aquatic life and nutrients arising from the increased reactor cooling water intake for any proposed additional nuclear power units. (AL-3)

**Comment:** All impacts on the Mississippi River arising from any increased intake of reactor cooling water for the operation of any proposed new nuclear power units. (AL-20)

**Response:** *The impacts on aquatic ecology resulting from construction and operation of proposed units at Grand Gulf will be discussed in Chapter 4 of the EIS.*

## **12. Threatened or Endangered Species**

**Comment:** Federally-listed species, and those would include the endangered Interior least tern, the endangered pallid sturgeon found in the lower Mississippi River. The threatened

Bayou darter, and I am not saying -- I am saying that these would be species that we would be concerned with and inform the NRC. The threatened bald eagle, and the Federally-listed threatened Louisiana black bears. Particularly secondary impacts to threatened and endangered species. (B-2)

**Response:** Pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) will initiate informal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). During informal consultation, the NRC will request a list of Federal threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species that are known to occur, or that potentially could occur, on the Grand Gulf site or in the vicinity (and on or in the vicinity of the alternate sites) and that could thus be impacted by activities that are the subject of the EIS for the Grand Gulf early site permit. During informal consultation, the NRC will also request from USFWS a statement of concerns regarding such species. NRC will evaluate the impact, both direct and indirect, to such species in consideration of the concerns expressed by the USFWS and undertake further consultation where necessary. NRC will present these results in Chapter 4 of the EIS.

### 13. Socioeconomics

**Comment:** Shame on you, [Entergy], trying to hold the Claiborne County residents hostage because of job shortages. (G-6)

**Comment:** But back to the tax issue. The money was divvied up by the Legislature to the other counties, and their rationale was that the people from the other counties were paying an electric bill that came from Grand Gulf, and therefore they ought to benefit some back from it. Well, I think that we ought to take that same thing and I think we ought to challenge our political leaders in the county here, and in the city, to go back to the Legislature and say our people go to the gaming facilities in Vicksburg, and we want our share of that money. (N-2)

**Comment:** We have talked about the poverty level, and the poverty level here is because we don't have enough industry, and that's why I say can anybody really say that we have not all benefitted from what Grand Gulf has brought to this county. I would hate to think where we are now or where we would be now if we had not had the benefits from Grand Gulf. So we need to address education and how our money is being spent, more than how much more money we need, although I do agree that we need more. (N-8)

**Response:** Basis of these comments is not clear. Existing socioeconomic conditions, including tax payments, will be covered in Chapter 2 of the EIS and the potential impact of new plants in Chapter 4.

**Comment:** Due to a lack of adequate distribution of local tax revenue from the plant, local government and emergency services are prevented from being fully prepared to protect the public health and safety and provide an adequate emergency plan. (S-12)

**Comment:** One major concern is inadequate emergency planning and infrastructure in Claiborne County and beyond. Due to the Mississippi Legislature's decision to take away \$200 million in tax revenues generated from Grand Gulf and give them to other counties in the state, Claiborne County's emergency planning infrastructure is woefully underfunded to deal

with the present nuclear plant—let alone a new plant. There is not adequate money available to fund the Sheriff's Department, Civil Defense or the Fire Department. There is only one fire station in the rural county, and the hospital in Port Gibson is not open 24 hours per day. The radiological emergency plan relies heavily on teachers to shelter and evacuate school children without obtaining adequately informed consent or any statutory authority. There are significant impediments to emergency planning to safeguard area residents in case of an accident or act of terrorism at the facility. (U-7)

**Comment:** One major concern is inadequate emergency planning and infrastructure in Claiborne County and beyond. Due to the Mississippi Legislature's decision to take away \$200 million in tax revenues generated from Grand Gulf and give them to other counties in the state, Claiborne County's emergency planning infrastructure is woefully underfunded to deal with the present nuclear plant-let alone a new plant. There is not adequate money available to fund the Sheriff's Department, Civil Defense or the Fire Department. There is only one fire station in the rural county, and the hospital in Port Gibson is not open 24 hours per day. The radiological emergency plan relies heavily on teachers to shelter and evacuate school children without obtaining adequately informed consent or any statutory authority. (X-12) (AE-8) (BE-8) (BF-8) (BH-8) (BJ-9)

**Comment:** Another important concern is inadequate emergency planning and infrastructure in Claiborne County and beyond. Claiborne County's emergency planning infrastructure is woefully underfunded to deal with the present nuclear plant—let alone a new plant, because the Mississippi Legislature took away \$200 million in tax revenues generated from Grand Gulf and give it to other counties in the state. There is not adequate money available to fund the Sheriff's Department, Civil Defense or the Fire Department. There is only one fire station in the rural county, and the hospital in Port Gibson is not open 24 hours per day. The radiological emergency plan relies heavily on teachers to shelter and evacuate school children without obtaining adequately informed consent or any statutory authority. (Z-6)

**Comment:** Not unlike other nuclear power plant sites, a major concern is inadequate emergency planning and infrastructure. Specifically though, due to the Mississippi Legislature's decision to take away \$200 million in tax revenues generated from Grand Gulf from Claiborne County and give them to other counties in the state, Claiborne County's emergency planning infrastructure is woefully underfunded to deal with the present nuclear plant - let alone a new plant. There is not adequate money available to fund the Sheriff's Department, Civil Defense or the Fire Department. There is only one fire station in the rural county, and the hospital in Port Gibson is not open 24 hours per day. The radiological emergency plan relies heavily on teachers to shelter and evacuate school children without obtaining adequately informed consent or any statutory authority. Obviously, there are significant impediments to emergency planning to safeguard area residents in case of an accident or act of terrorism at the facility. (AA-7)

**Comment:** Moreover, Claiborne County's emergency planning infrastructure is woefully underfunded and could not adequately deal with any incident at the present nuclear plant—let alone a new plant. Sadly, existing emergency planning and infrastructure in Claiborne County and beyond are simply inadequate to address a potential incident. (AD-8)

**Comment:** There has been little emergency planning to safeguard area residents and there does not appear to be resources for emergency planning for a new plant, in case of an accident or act of terrorism at the facility. (AF-10)

**Comment:** Another major concern is inadequate emergency planning and infrastructure in Claiborne County and beyond. Money that should be available for this planning, has been distributed to other counties in Mississippi. This has left Claiborne County's emergency planning infrastructure extremely underfunded to deal with the present nuclear plant and unable to add a new plant. If we look at all the related services, it can be seen that there is not adequate money available to fund the Sheriff's Department, Civil Defense or the Fire Department. There is only one fire station in the rural county, and the hospital in Port Gibson is not open 24 hours per day. Unfortunately, the emergency plan relies heavily on teachers to shelter and evacuate school children, even though the teachers may not have obtained consent from parents and guardians. This heavy burden should not be born just by the teachers. There needs to be a coordinated system of emergency services. (AF-11)

**Comment:** Another major concern is information we have received regarding inadequate emergency planning and infrastructure in Claiborne County. The Mississippi Legislature's decision to take away \$200 million in tax revenues generated from Grand Gulf and give them to other counties in the state has crippled Claiborne County's emergency planning infrastructure leaving it underfunded and unprepared to deal with the present nuclear plant, much less a new plant. It has been brought to our attention that there is not adequate money available to fund the Sheriff's Department, Civil Defense or the Fire Department, there is only one fire station in the rural county, the hospital in Port Gibson is not open 24 hours per day, and the radiological emergency plan relies heavily on teachers to shelter and evacuate school children without obtaining adequately informed consent or any statutory authority. This is far from the ideal scenario should the worst occur. (AG-7)

**Comment:** One of my major concerns about your permitting this nuclear power plant is inadequate emergency planning and infrastructure in Claiborne County and beyond. Due to the Mississippi Legislature's decision to take away \$200 million in tax revenues generated from Grand Gulf and give them to other counties in the state, Claiborne County's emergency planning infrastructure is woefully underfunded to deal with the present nuclear plant, let alone a new plant. There is not adequate money available to fund the Sheriff's Department, Civil Defense or the Fire Department. There is only one fire station in the rural county, and the hospital in Port Gibson is not open 24 hours per day. The radiological emergency plan relies heavily on teachers to shelter and evacuate school children without obtaining adequately informed consent or any statutory authority. (AH-8)

**Comment:** One primary concern is inadequate emergency planning and infrastructure in Claiborne County and beyond. Due to the Mississippi Legislature's decision to take away \$200 million in tax revenues generated from Grand Gulf and give them to other counties in the state, Claiborne County's emergency planning infrastructure is woefully underfunded to deal with the present nuclear plant—let alone a new plant. There is not enough money to fund the Sheriff's Department, Civil Defense or the Fire Department. There is only one fire station in the rural county, and the hospital in Port Gibson is not open 24/7. The radiological emergency plan relies heavily on teachers to shelter and evacuate school children without obtaining adequately informed consent or any statutory authority. (AI-8)

**Comment:** I am also concerned about the inadequate emergency planning and infrastructure in Claiborne County and beyond. Claiborne County's emergency planning infrastructure is too under-funded to deal with the present nuclear plant—let alone a new plant. There is not adequate money available to fund the Sheriff's Department, Civil Defense or the Fire Department. There is only one fire station in the rural county, and the hospital in Port Gibson is not open 24 hours per day. (AM-8) (AQ-8) (AS-11) (AW-9) (BN-10)

**Comment:** I am also concerned about the inadequate emergency planning and infrastructure in Claiborne County and beyond. Claiborne County's emergency planning infrastructure is too under-funded to deal with the present nuclear plant—let alone a new plant. (AO-7)

**Comment:** Another major concern is that of inadequate emergency planning and infrastructure in Claiborne County and beyond. Claiborne County's emergency planning infrastructure is woefully under funded and currently, the county cannot even support the present nuclear plant, let alone a new facility. There is only one fire station in the rural county, and the hospital in Port Gibson is not open 24 hours per day. The radiological emergency plan relies heavily on teachers to shelter and evacuate school children without obtaining adequately informed consent or any statutory authority. There are significant impediments to emergency planning, thus providing no safeguard to area residents in case of an accident or act of terrorism. (AP-8)

**Comment:** I am also concerned for security reasons since the infra structure in Claiborne County is under funded and not developed. (AU-4)

**Comment:** New Orleans has no evacuation plan for hurricanes. What's the point? There's no way out! If the area can't handle mother nature, how are we suddenly going to become savvy in emergency planning and infrastructure compensation in case of a nuclear power plant breakdown? Claiborne County in Mississippi, the site of the plant, lost \$200 million in tax revenues generated from Grand Gulf due to a state legislative redistribution. The County is underfunded to deal with the present nuclear plant-let alone a new plant. There is only one fire station in the county! Not only is the proposal life-threatening to the community, it is socially irresponsible as well. (BO-6)

**Response:** *The economic consequences of implementing the emergency preparedness plan from proposed construction and operation of the Grand Gulf units will be addressed in Chapter 4 of the EIS.*

**Comment:** All impacts on public health and safety arising out of a severe accident, including the impacts of the accident itself, sheltering, evacuation, radiation exposure, treatment, and reoccupation, or relocation of populations, entire communities, and as we have seen in the accident that happened at the [Chernobyl] Power Station. (D-11)

**Comment:** Claiborne County was receiving all of the tax monies that came to this county. Well, sometime during that particular period, it was decided that the monies needed to be redistributed, okay? And what happened was that Claiborne County ended up receiving just a small portion, and the rest of it was distributed to other counties. (E-2)

**Comment:** With respect to the tax revenues generated by the facility, and you have heard a little bit about that already tonight, and I understand that could be a huge issue. And if you are getting huge tax benefits and you want to take the attendant risks, I am not here to judge you. But that is not the situation that you are in. Claiborne County receives a very small portion of the tax revenues generated by the facility. That was not true at first, but soon after the facility began operating, it all changed. So that there are now 48 counties that share the tax revenues generated by the facility. The facility is not in 48 counties, It is in this county, and since that change happened, we are basically talking about somewhere in the neighborhood of \$200 million that should have come to this county. (I-3)

**Comment:** One cost that you have to look at is the Gulf of Mexico. If there is an accident at this plant, and it goes down the Mississippi River, you will destroy the seafood industry that now creates hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue and food for people to eat. (K-4)

**Comment:** There are tax benefits here even though the tax money, a large portion of it, was taken away from the county, and I think that Mr. Doss, who was a tax collector here and assessor for a number of years, could attest to this. (N-7)

**Comment:** And I guess the main thing that I wanted to talk about that some people have kind of referred to, but I would like to go into a little more detail, is the issue of the contamination of the Mississippi River in the case of catastrophic accident or a high release of nuclear waste. I think Becky addressed the issue of the fisheries, but if this river was contaminated many of the communities the length of the river from here down depends on the river for water, and there is an industrial corridor from Baton Rouge to New Orleans that depends on the river water for all their industrial usage. New Orleans itself depends on the river for drinking water, and there is also the issue of wetlands, which have been used for water purification and hurricane mitigation. There is the fisheries, and also the current could potentially carry this waste from Florida to Texas. So you are talking about just incomprehensible damage if this whole area was contaminated, and I think that is something that really needs to be considered. (Q-2)

**Comment:** Benefits to this area briefly with 11 percent unemployment for Claiborne County, and I guess within the last decade or so there has been a loss of population to the county, this is not typically interpreted as something as signs of a prosperous area when you are losing population, and you have unemployment rates like that. (R-10)

**Comment:** The deeper one digs into the past and present practices of the nuclear industry, the less supportable it becomes. I understand this plant is to be sited in a community with little economic resources, and there will probably be promised of riches to be had in the form of property tax relief, or new schools and hospitals, or the other similar bribes that have been offered to similar communities in the past. Well, in Ohio, we cannot point to a single person who has died from radioactive exposure from the nuclear plants here. However, as much of the State has experienced the loss of billions of dollars in the form of disproportionate rate increases for a modest amount of power, it is inevitable that thousands of lives have been lost and will be lost because of the degradation of public services, personal and corporate wealth and the other impacts of draining a few percentage points of the entire local economy have accrued. (X-9)

**Comment:** All potential socio-economic impacts from the elevated national security requirements and countermeasures to protect a larger target of terrorism with the expansion of the nuclear power station site including the indefinite and possibly permanent closure of Mississippi River to public access for commercial, sporting, recreation and other means of economic livelihood. (AL-21)

**Response:** *Distribution of tax monies for the existing plants will be described in Chapter 2 of the EIS. The impact on government finances of construction and operation of the proposed plants will be described in Chapter 4.*

**Comment:** The distribution of tax revenues, and who bears the risks, and who reaps the benefits; and existence and/or adequacy of the emergency evacuation plans; and environmental justice issues, and this is huge, and class and race issues and they must be addressed. (R-2)

**Response:** *U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff will analyze both socioeconomic and environmental impact from an environmental justice perspective in Chapter 4 of the EIS.*

**Comment:** Terrorist sabotage or accidents could poison the Mississippi River, New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico. Damage could affect seafood industries that bring in millions of dollars of benefits to the state economy. (W-5)

**Comment:** All socio-economic impacts arising out of a severe nuclear accident at an expanded Grand Gulf site on the including commerce on the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico fishing industry. (AL-8)

**Comment:** It is also near an area of the River that would allow easy access for terrorists, particularly from a boat or barge. An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its stored nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. This would be disastrous to the communities downstream that depend on the River for drinking water. Also, the extensive industrial corridor between Baton Rouge and New Orleans depends on the River water for processing. These industries would have to be shut down. Contamination of vital wetlands that provide 'nurseries' for larval and other developmental stages of fish, for shrimp, oysters, etc., could devastate the seafood industry. Certainly the tourist industries in Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas would be affected. We are talking potentially billions of dollars and innumerable lives lost or changed because of an accident at this plant. (AM-9)

**Comment:** An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its stored nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. This would be disastrous to the communities downstream that depend on the River for drinking water. Also, the extensive industrial corridor between Baton Rouge and New Orleans depends on the River water for processing. These industries would have to be shut down and shipping on the MS River curtailed. Contamination of vital wetlands that provide 'nurseries' for larval and other developmental stages of fish, shrimp, oysters, etc., could devastate the seafood industry. Additionally, the tourist industries in Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas would be affected. We are talking potentially billions of dollars and innumerable lives lost or changed because of an accident at this plant. (AO-8)

**Comment:** An increased threat to human health is not the only serious risk that this facility will pose, it can also be devastating economically. If the environment becomes contaminated, we can lose the very foundation upon which we depend for sustenance. Most areas along the river are agricultural, supplying the nation with food crops for human consumption and animal feed. Those crops not directly consumed by people will eventually be consumed through the foodweb. Other industries such as gaming (hunting and fishing) and seafood harvest could be destroyed. Economic collapse would be inevitable and billions of dollars lost. (AP-5)

**Comment:** An increased threat to human health is not the only serious risk that this facility will pose, it can also be devastating economically. If the environment becomes contaminated, we can lose the very foundation upon which we depend for sustenance. Most areas along the river are agricultural, supplying the nation with food crops for human consumption and animal feed. Those crops not directly consumed by people will eventually be consumed through the foodweb. Other industries such as gaming (hunting and fishing) and seafood harvest could be destroyed. Economic collapse would be inevitable and billions of dollars lost. (AP-9)

**Comment:** It is also near an area of the River that would allow easy access for terrorists, particularly from a boat or barge. An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its stored nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. This would be disastrous to the communities downstream that depend on the River for drinking water. Also, the extensive industrial corridor between Baton Rouge and New Orleans depends on the River water for processing. These industries would have to be shut down. Contamination of vital wetlands that provide 'nurseries' for larval and other developmental stages of fish, for shrimp, oysters, etc., could devastate the seafood industry. Certainly the tourist industries in Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas would be affected. We are talking potentially billions of dollars and innumerable lives lost or changed because of an accident at this plant. (AQ-10)

**Comment:** It is also near an area of the River that would allow easy access for terrorists, particularly from a boat or barge. An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its stored nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. This would be disastrous to the communities downstream that depend on the River for drinking water. Also, the extensive industrial corridor between Baton Rouge and New Orleans depends on the River water for processing. These industries would have to be shut down. Contamination of vital wetlands that provide 'nurseries' for larval and other developmental stages of fish, for shrimp, oysters, etc., could devastate the seafood industry. Certainly the tourist industries in Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas would be affected. We are talking potentially billions of dollars and innumerable lives lost or changed because of an accident at this plant. (AW-10)

**Comment:** Before NRC considers granting this preliminary permit, it should answer a number of questions: How would a release of radiation affect the seafood industry and agriculture in the area? (BI-6)

**Response:** *The economic impact of postulated accidents will be evaluated, and the results will be presented in Chapter 4 of the EIS.*

**Comment:** There are very few Port Gibson residents that have jobs at that facility. It is a small percentage, and it is a small portion. (I-2)

**Response:** *The geographic distribution of current Grand Gulf employment will be covered in Chapter 2 of the EIS and the impact of new plants on the employment in the area in Chapter 4.*

**Comment:** You hear a lot about the jobs, and that is an issue that can't be avoided by anyone that wants to take the issue seriously whether a new plant makes sense or not. But I did appreciate the comments from Rose Johnson that it is a false choice or a bad choice when a community needs to choose between their health and future generation's health, and being able to have some kind of job to put the food on the table and a roof over one's head. (R-12)

**Comment:** It is hard to persuade other needed businesses to come to small towns, much less to come and locate next to a nuclear reactor facility, that is knowingly storing onsite, cancer causing toxic nuclear waste. In effect the permitting board is sentencing a community to die or become ill. (AJ-7)

**Comment:** As a historically poor state Mississippi has [lagged] behind in industrial and commercial [development]. Some might believe that we are behind the curve, I would argue that this has given us the opportunity to see how industrial and commercial [development] has affected the areas this type [development] have been implemented. At this time, Mississippi is trying to catch up and bring in new development and jobs. As a long time resident of this state I believe it is time we start looking at the consequences of such decisions, learn from what has happened and use that information to put ourselves ahead of the game. I do not believe that this plant will put us ahead of the game and make us more attractive to future [business] and [development]. (AT-3)

**Response:** *These comments on future business development opportunities facing the local community are not within the scope of the EIS. They will not be considered further in the staff's environmental review.*

**Comment:** How can we even consider adding another nuclear reactor when Entergy has failed to deliver on its 25 or so year old promise of job creation in this area. What happened, and why is there now double-digit unemployment in this area, which is one of the highest in the State of Mississippi. And in addition to the unemployment, you have to add to that is the situation that you have a situation where the young people who work here move away. Why? Because they don't have the kinds of job opportunities that they would be interested in pursuing and they work elsewhere. (O-6)

**Comment:** Grand Gulf has been less than responsible to the surrounding community, specifically Claiborne County, in hiring, training, and promoting its citizens in that the majority of Grand Gulf's permanent workforce do not live in Claiborne County. (S-6)

**Response:** *These comments on actions not taken and not required of the applicant by any regulatory body are not within the scope of the EIS. They will not be considered further in the staff's environmental review.*

## 14. Environmental Justice

**Comment:** The comment about the racism and where nuclear power plants are located. With 103 reactors that are in the country, a large percentage, and I would say greater than 90 percent, are located in non-minority areas. And I know that a lot of people are thinking that this is a race issue, we just need to make sure that we get the information correct, and I would say that if at all that I felt that the issue of potentially building another unit at Grand Gulf was potentially racial in nature that I would not be standing here tonight, and that is one thing that I can tell you for sure. (A-11)

**Comment:** And finally all of the above need to be considered as environmental justice issues given that the risks and the hazards associated with Grand Gulf site expansion disproportionately impact the people of Claiborne County, given that the county is 84 percent African-American, with 34 percent living under the poverty line, with a per capita income of \$11,000 annually, and that is from the Census data from 2000. (D-12)

**Comment:** Once again in Mississippi, low income African-Americans are being placed at the greatest risk of harm so a greedy corporation can make big profits. To place another nuclear reactor in Claiborne County doesn't make any sense when there is already concerns about the present plant. This is a crime and blatant example of environmental racism. Claiborne County is 84 percent African-American, with 34 percent living below the poverty line. (G-2)

**Comment:** And chief among these enormously important issues that have got to be considered in the NEPA process is certainly environmental justice. With this project once again we are talking about an African-Community that is basically going to receive all of the burdens of this proposed project, and very few of the benefits. And that is environmental racism. (I-1)

**Comment:** And as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission held in the Louisiana Energy Services case just a few years ago, which I did litigate, environmental justice is used such as these have to be considered as part of the NEPA process. (I-7)

**Comment:** I want to echo the sentiments of the local people who talked about environmental racism. That is a genuine issue that must be considered when this application is being reviewed, and why Claiborne County, Mississippi, and why Grand Gulf Nuclear Station. As our African-American population continues to thrive, and our caucasian population diminishes, 20 years from now what will the population be. As we study demographics across the Nation, we already know that we can project what the population in this community will be, and we just reiterate those comments regarding environmental racism. And I call upon the governing body of this county tonight to be ever mindful of the tax inequity that exists, and I don't know if this is an NRC problem, or a State of Mississippi problem, or what. But there is a tremendous tax inequity that currently exists with regard to the distribution of tax dollars. And this should not be about money, and I hope that we don't sit down and say that if all of the tax dollars could come here, then we should be for the approval of this permit. But certainly the reverse is that why should we assume the risk and distribute those funds, those resources, across the State of Mississippi to people who are less at risk than we are. Let's keep that in mind, and I direct those comments specifically to the residents of Claiborne County, and ask that we constantly

call upon our elected officials to do everything possible to see that the NRC and this application process is taken seriously, and to see that those tax dollars are returned to Claiborne County if there is going to be a second site here. (J-1)

**Comment:** I wanted to begin my comments by focusing on the Louisiana Energy Services case. It was in this case that two African-American communities in Louisiana, the communities of Forest Grove and Cedar Springs, were successful in stopping the licensing of a uranium enrichment facility on environmental justice grounds, and the decision maker was the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. In that case the Nuclear Regulatory Commission was compelled to set up a very important national environmental justice precedent, and in that decision I quote the Nuclear Regulatory Commission held, and I quote, that this great impact analysis is our principal tool for advancing environmental justice under the National Environmental Policy Act. The NRC's goal is to identify and adequately weigh and mitigate the effects on low income and minority communities that become apparent only by considering factors peculiar to those communities. (O-1)

**Comment:** The risk to public health, safety, and security associated with building more atomic power plants at the Grand Gulf site is disproportionately placed on the people of Claiborne County and the surrounding communities. (S-10)

**Comment:** Entergy wants to dump yet another dangerous facility on the mostly African American residents who live in Claiborne County, which is 82 percent African American. This is a clear case of environmental racism. (U-3) (X-13) (AE-3) (AH-3) (AI-3) (BD-7) (BE-3) (BF-4) (BH-3)

**Comment:** Claiborne County, where this dangerous facility will be dumped, is 82 percent African American, which unfortunately evokes the issue of environmental racism. (W-3)

**Comment:** A third important concern is environmental racism. Entergy wants to dump yet another dangerous facility on the mostly African American residents who live in Claiborne County, which is 82 percent African American. The adverse impacts from this project will disproportionately impact a racial minority group with weak political and economic means to advocate on it behalf. This is a clear case of environmental racism. Please deny this request for an early site permit for expansion of Grand Gulf Nuclear. (Z-3)

**Comment:** Entergy wants another nuclear facility in the backyards of the mostly African American residents who live in Claiborne County, which is 82 percent African American. This is a clear case of environmental racism. (AA-3)

**Comment:** In addition, and specific to the Port Gibson facility, I object to yet another "undesirable" facility being located in a predominately African-American community. (AC-4)

**Comment:** Additionally, this proposal raises significant environmental justice issues. Claiborne County is 82 percent African American. The placement of this facility within Claiborne County would, therefore, have a disproportionate effect on African American communities. (AD-5)

**Comment:** 82 percent of Claiborne County is African American, making the proposal to put another dangerous facility in this community a clear case of environmental racism. (AF-4)

**Comment:** The community surrounding the facility is 82 percent African American, which makes this proposal ring of environmental racism. (AG-3)

**Comment:** The nuclear facility is located in a small town, mostly minority, low income, residential community, called Port Gibson, Mississippi. (AJ-2)

**Comment:** There is and will be a disproportionately high and adverse impact on low income or minority populations. (AJ-12)

**Comment:** The time is past for the people and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to allow (permit) facilities that generate vast amounts of toxic air pollution, soil contamination, water pollution and toxic radioactive wastes that has to be stored onsite or disposed of in some other community that doesn't want it. This could be considered another Environmental Justice issue! President Bill Clinton's Executive Order 12898 in it's ruling "To the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law... each federal agency shall make [achieving] Environmental Justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health, or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low income populations in the United States." The last time I checked Port Gibson, Mississippi is still in the United States, therefore why would the commission even consider permitting this facility in a low income minority community? Companies, industries and others should be ashamed of themselves and not be allowed to bribe or coerce the citizens desperate for jobs into acceptance of (with the offer of good paying jobs, positive economic impact or other incentives) or exchange for industries that spew toxic pollution on the people! (AJ-16)

**Comment:** All of the above need to be considered as environmental justices issues given that the risks and hazards associated with the Grand Gulf site expansion disproportionately impact the people of Claiborne County given that the county is 84% African American with 34% living under the poverty line at a per capita income of \$11,000 annually. (AL-13)

**Comment:** I have heard much discussion of environmental racism and also believe this is a relevant issue. Claiborne county is largely minority in population- I don't believe this plant would be considered in a wealthier, more affluent area. (AM-4) (AQ-4) (AW-5)

**Comment:** I have heard much discussion of environmental racism and also believe this is a relevant issue. (AS-8)

**Comment:** IT'S ABOUT JUSTICE Entergy wants to dump yet another dangerous facility on the mostly African American residents who live in Port Gibson. This is a clear case of environmental racism. Why do Entergy and other polluting companies promise only dangerous and dirty jobs to African Americans and other people of color? (BG-8)

**Comment:** Before NRC considers granting this preliminary permit, it should answer a number of questions: Will this facility affect communities of color more than other communities? (BI-7)

**Comment:** This may be a siting decision now, but the considerations range far beyond geological stability and availability of plentiful cooling water. This is a decision to saddle an

economically depressed county with greater risk in order to produce electricity by one of the most expensive and environmentally unsound methods that exists today. (BI-9)

**Comment:** Entergy wants to dump yet another dangerous facility on the mostly African American residents who live in Claiborne County, which is 82 percent African American. This is a clear case of environmental racism that ignores significant impediments to emergency planning to safeguard area residents in case of an accident or act of terrorism at the facility. We believe it is no accident that low-income African Americans in Mississippi are being placed at the greatest risk of harm so a large corporation can make big profits. Entergy would not be trying to build the first new nuclear plant in decades in the U.S. in predominantly white Madison or Ridgeland, Miss. Just like you don't have hog factories, creosote waste sites and chemical plants located next to these affluent, white communities. This is another example of environmental racism in a state where African Americans are already bearing the brunt of the pollution burden. African American women in Mississippi have the worst health of any population group in the U.S. Adding additional sources of dangerous pollution is simply unacceptable. It is a blatant case of environmental racism to expect this community to accept the risk from building another nuclear power plant considering concerns about health impacts from the present plant and the threat of terrorist attacks. This would simply make the terrorist target bigger. (BJ-3)

**Comment:** Here in California, we site hazardous waste facilities in poor Hispanic areas. I guess in Mississippi one uses poor black areas. I am told Claiborne County, is 82 percent African American; do many of low income minority persons live near the proposed Power Plant? (BL-3)

**Comment:** I have heard much discussion of environmental racism and also believe this is a relevant issue. Claiborne county is largely minority in population - I don't believe that this plant would be considered in a more affluent area. (BN-4)

**Comment:** 82 percent of it population is African American. This is a clear case of environmental racism. (BO-3)

**Comment:** Justifying permit because of the economic benefits they provide is disgusting. Projects should not be allowed to destroy the public health safety, and welfare of any community, especially a low income, minority community that does not have the political clout, financial clout or resources to fight these terrifying nuclear reactor projects! By not having the resources available to fight this situation, this could be an Environmental Justice issue in itself! I sincerely believe this to be an Environmental Justice problem and hope that some health organization or environmental group will be notified of this project and join together to fight against this project and be prepared to file lawsuits challenging this permit request. Why do these types of projects never request to be located in densely populated upper class (white-Caucasian) communities, such as Madison, Clinton or North Jackson? (AJ-14)

**Response:** *Environmental justice analysis in a U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) EIS deals with disproportionate environmental impact on low income and minority communities, including socioeconomic impact. NRC staff will analyze socioeconomic impacts from an environmental justice perspective in Chapter 4 of the EIS.*

**Comment:** Before NRC considers granting this preliminary permit, it should answer a number of questions: Would the benefits from any jobs related to the construction and operation of a second nuclear facility be fairly distributed. That is, will this project mean good jobs with good benefits to the African American residents of Claiborne County? (BI-8)

**Response:** *Whether current or future Claiborne County residents will be hired for construction and operations jobs would depend on a number of factors, including job requirements, occupational skills of the local workforce, and availability of training programs. The geographic distribution of current Grand Gulf employment will be covered in Chapter 2 of the EIS and the impact of any new plant(s) on the employment in the area in Chapter 4. Issues with the equity of hiring practices and equal employment opportunity is the responsibility of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and will not be considered further in the staff's environmental review.*

**Comment:** I attended an environmental justice workshop that was put on by the government, ATSDR, and other agencies, in Weblin, Mississippi. At that meeting, there were chiefs of some Indian nations that came to speak about the contamination of their sacred lands by uranium mining. They talked about how difficult it was to tell their people to not eat the fish out of the stream. Do not eat the deer. They are contaminated. Well, these are their sacred lands, and these are the lands that have supported them for many generations, and now they can't use them anymore. (K-2)

**Response:** *The impacts of the uranium fuel cycle including the onsite storage and eventual disposal of the spent fuel will be considered in the environmental impact statement. Guidance on the approach the staff will take in its review is provided in the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission environmental standard review plan (NUREG-1555, Section 5.7).*

**Comment:** It doesn't have to be that way, and we showed them in Louisiana that we can stop licensing of dangerous and hazardous facilities in our African-American communities, and we will show them again. (O-8)

**Response:** *This comment provides only general information in opposition to the Grand Gulf early site permit and will not be considered further in the staff's environmental review.*

## 15. Radiological Impacts

**Comment:** Impacts on plant and animal life, and the fish in the Mississippi, and everything that is revolving in that biosphere surrounding Grand Gulf and that biosphere generally and we humans that live in it. (R-4)

**Comment:** We need to build on our [resources] and enhance our state. One of our largest resources in the state of Mississippi is our natural environment. The river, the forests, the land. By building a power plant we risk destroying and or [polluting] these resources. It is time for the state of Mississippi to start protecting and preserving its natural resources before it is too late. I believe that by allowing Grand Gulf Nuclear to expand its facilities, we are expanding our potential to harm our natural resources and citizens. (AT-4)

**Response:** *The impact on the Mississippi River arising from the release of radioactive materials into the Mississippi River from the operation of additional nuclear power units will be reviewed in accordance with the environmental standard review plan (NUREG-1555) and discussed in the EIS in Section 4.1.2.7.*

**Comment:** The Claiborne County residents want what any other community desires; their god-given right to breath clean air, and drink clean water. (G-7)

**Response:** *The comment provides only a general statement and will not be considered further in the staff's environmental review.*

**Comment:** All impacts on public health and environment arising out of the increase in routine or accidental releases of radioactive gas, and particulate to the air and to our water as it settles on to our land and our agricultural soil as the result of the operation of additional units. Clearly, this analysis should be taken in the most vulnerable of our population, not the most robust, and so we need to be looking at the impact of increased bioconcentration of radioactive isotopes. So while they say that the impact is small, and the releases are minute, we need to realize that there are isotopes that are being routinely released by this plant, like Cesium 135, that has a half-life of over 2 million years. So every day that that plant operates, and that one isotope, and dozens of isotopes gets out in the environment, it is going to persist in the environment for -- well, an effective half-life. And if you want to really get rid of all the hazardous life, you multiply that half-life figure by 10, and that will give you some idea of how long that isotope can be accumulating in the environment, and biomagnifying up through the food chain, and getting through mother's milk, or through the uterus, or in any other number of ways and accumulate. And so all this environmental impact statement needs to be looking at is all and new published data that looks at the epidemiological impact of the routine and accidental emissions. (D-10)

**Response:** *The early site permit process is designed to determine if the site is suitable for one or more nuclear power reactors. According to 10 CFR 52.17(a)(1), the assessment will contain an analysis and evaluation of components of the facility relating to the potential radiological consequences. Chapter 4 of the EIS will address health impacts.*

**Comment:** From an environmentalist standpoint for us to build a second site in close proximity of the first unit, and we are talking about over a period of years; whereas, beginning from day one some 20 years ago when Entergy first built the site, they have refused to put one penny into a study to even conduct studies in terms of any help related that perhaps may have come from that site. I don't see us getting into without some kind of commitment based upon some studies here for the local residents, and here with an increase in cancer, or the increase in other various kinds of disease that could have been related to the site, and without any of that, I don't see us proceeding with a second Grant Gulf unit here. (H-1)

**Comment:** And at the reactor site and the area surrounding it, people are concerned about cancer, and the growing rates of cancer, and what we know that it is a scientific fact that nuclear radiation causes cancer, period. And Entergy's nuclear reactor, the proposed one that we are now talking about, would definitely increase radiation levels as part of its routine operation. (O-4)

**Comment:** There is a lack of an adequate epidemiological study of the health effects of radiation releases on the residents of Claiborne County from the routine operation of Grand Gulf atomic power plant and any new reactors. (S-7)

**Comment:** Concerns about elevated cancer rates and the failure of state health authorities to conduct epidemiological studies of the surrounding population. (BD-6)

**Response:** *As required by 10 CFR 52.17(a)(1), the impact analysis will contain an analysis and evaluation of components of the facility relating to the potential radiological consequences. Chapter 4 of the EIS will address the health impacts; however, epidemiological studies are outside the scope of the EIS.*

**Comment:** So I am saying that this is not just a local issue. It is a global issue. [Chernobyl] gave off radiation 2,000 miles away, and so anything that happens here could contaminate a good portion of the world. (K-3)

**Comment:** As nuclear power proliferates, the availability of highly radioactive building materials which can be used deliberately or accidentally to injure individuals and groups of people increases. Do we all have to buy our own personal geiger counters so that a handful of corporate executives can enjoy the satisfaction of propping up a failed industry? (X-8)

**Comment:** The electricity generated at this facility would be sold to other states, why should my state be polluted and Mississippians be exposed to harmful toxic radioactive waste so others can have electricity? The Nuclear Regulatory Commission should permit nuclear reactor facilities to be located where the people receive the benefits and the toxic exposures. (AJ-10)

**Comment:** The nuclear power industry has historically evaded environmental regulations and shown disregard for the public health, safety, and welfare of nearby or far residents. Please remember towns like Anniston Alabama and PCB pollution, millions of dollars do not replace or pay for good health! (AJ-17)

**Response:** *These comments refer to health impacts. As required by 10 CFR 52.17(a)(1), the impact analysis will contain an analysis and evaluation of components of the facility relating to the potential radiological consequences. Chapter 4 of the EIS will address health impacts.*

**Comment:** When I passed by the nuclear power plant, I seen the steam coming up, and I noticed the storage there, and I wondered if I was going to get zapped going by here today or not. In my community here, I am talking to people sometimes, and they have an ailment, and a lot of them went to a lawyer, and you know, I didn't have all these things happening, you know, and I wonder if it is that nuclear power plant. (F-2)

**Comment:** But the fact is that it is not safe. Radioactive release remains very toxic to all life for thousands, to millions, of years. (G-5)

**Comment:** Residents of Port Gibson are exposed to radiation from the existing facility, and obviously now more exposure is proposed, because we are talking about another facility, another facility that has in fact the capacity for 2 or 3 reactors, and that is possible. Nobody can

deny that scientists have documented that radiation exposure increases the risk of cancer and all kinds of serious health problems; birth defects, still births, and the science is there, absolutely. (I-5)

**Comment:** You would not have to wait for a catastrophe to happen at the reactor to have radiation emissions. These reactors are not as was said earlier emission free, and as part of their daily routine operations, they are leaking and emitting radioactivity into our air, land, and water. (O-5)

**Comment:** I hear this at every NRC meeting that I go to practically, even if it is not about reactors, because I deal a lot with low level nuclear waste, and not the stuff that will kill you in like 5 minutes if you were next to it, and it wouldn't be in the water, but the stuff that would give you cancer within 10 years or 30 years, and so forth. And that is about radiation and how it is a fact of daily life. We have heard a lot about how the NRC has deemed that the routine releases from plants are safe and pose no substantial health risks to humans. We are told that we live with radiation all around us every day, and that radiation is just another fact of life, but an important distinction to make here is that between radiation exposures that people can't reasonably avoid, unless a person becomes a very desired lifestyle, and wants to avoid the sun completely, and never fly in an airplane to visit relatives on the other side of the world, it is true that there is a lot of radiation out there in nature that is difficult to avoid. But ionizing radiation that comes from a nuclear reactor is an entirely different matter, and that has to do with activities of mankind and how we deal with technology. So it creates a whole other issue that needs to be addressed and if you have exposure to radioisotopes that are in your drinking water, and in the soil, and in the air, that is a whole other matter than a little bit of radiation that may be in a banana. So I just think that it is time to put that to rest, and the whole idea that it is a radioactive world and so let's just throw some more into it. It is time for -- you know, that is kind of absurd. (R-5)

**Comment:** All impacts on the public health and environment arising out of the increase in routine and accidental radioactive emissions to the air and to the water as the result of the operation of additional nuclear power units. The analysis should consider work by Dr. John Gofman, showing that low-level radiation, at levels considered to be safe for medical use, is a significant contributor to deaths from heart disease and cancer. See Radiation from Medical Procedures in the Pathogenesis of Cancer and Ischemic Heart Disease (Committee for Nuclear Responsibility: 1999). (AL-6)

**Comment:** IT'S ABOUT HEALTH The daily operation of nuclear reactors release radioactivity into our air, water, and soil that can damage human health. It is scientifically established that being exposed to radiation increases your risk of cancer and other severe health problems. Health studies have linked nuclear reactors to increased cancers, leukemia, reproductive damage, still births, and birth defects. (BG-3)

**Comment:** IT'S ABOUT A CLEAN ENVIRONMENT. Entergy admits that it wants to build a nuclear reactor that would have the capacity equal to two very large reactors. If licensed, this reactor would generate harmful, radioactive waste, daily pollute the air, water, and soil with radiation, and threaten the lives of people with the potential for a nuclear catastrophe. (BG-4)

**Response:** *The purpose of regulatory limits are to protect workers and the public from the harmful health effects of radiation on humans. The limits, including effluent release limits, are*

*based on the recommendations of standards-setting organizations. Radiation standards reflect extensive ongoing study by national and international organizations (International Commission on Radiological Protection [ICRP], National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, and National Academy of Sciences) and are conservative to ensure that the public and workers at nuclear power plants are protected. The NRC radiation exposure standards are presented in 10 CFR Part 20, "Standards for Protection Against Radiation," and are based on the recommendations in ICRP 26 and 30. In addition, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has established a whole body dose limit of 25 millirem per year (see 40 CFR Part 190). Finally, Appendix I in 10 CFR Part 50 provides dose design objectives for exposure of the public to radioactive effluents from nuclear reactors. Numerous scientifically designed, peer-reviewed studies of personnel exposed to occupational levels of radiation (versus life-threatening accident doses or medical therapeutic levels) have shown minimal effect to human health, and any effect was from exposures well above the exposure levels of the typical member of the public from normal operation of a nuclear power plant. Regarding health effects to populations around nuclear power plants, NRC relies on the studies performed by the National Cancer Institute (NCI). NCI conducted a study in 1990, "Cancer in Populations Living Near Nuclear Facilities," to look at cancer mortality rates around 52 nuclear power plants, nine U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) facilities, and one former commercial fuel reprocessing facility. The NCI study concluded from the evidence available that there is no suggestion that nuclear facilities may be linked causally with excess deaths from leukemia or from other cancers in populations living nearby. Additionally, the American Cancer Society had concluded that although reports about cancer case clusters in such communities have raised public concern, studies show that clusters do not occur more often near nuclear plants than they do by chance elsewhere in the population. The issue of radioactive effluents and their impacts on human health will be evaluated in Chapter 4 of the EIS.*

## **16. Uranium Fuel Cycle and Waste Management**

**Comment:** In addition, there is substantial doubt about the ability to develop a large amount of nuclear power without a complete reconstruction of the U.S. Department of Energy nuclear fuel refining process, an expense which should not be borne by the taxpayer in a deregulating electric market, and which cannot be borne by the utility industry if new nuclear plants are to pass the laugh test. (X-5)

**Response:** *The comment is noted. Restructuring of the U.S. Department of Energy is outside the scope of this environmental review. The impact of the uranium fuel cycle, including the onsite storage and eventual disposal of the spent fuel, will be considered in the environmental impact statement. Related U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff review guidance is provided in the NRC environmental standard review plan (NUREG-1555, Section 5.7).*

**Comment:** I guess there was one question about spent fuel capacity. The spent fuel capacity at Grand Gulf is capable of storing fuel in the spent fuel up until 2007. Now, what happens after that, and this technology has already been used at several of our sites, and across the company, utilities have moved towards dry cask storage. That is a technology that has been used for the low radiation fuel bundles, bundles that have been out of the reactor for a significant period of time, such that the dose is relatively low. And these bundles can be safely stored in a dry cache storage facility on the site. It is still on the site location, and many utilities use that already. But with that technology, we can store fuel for as long as it takes to have an alternate main storage for fuel elsewhere, such as Yucca Mountain. (A-8)

**Comment:** I first would like to say that one of our major concerns here is that we have been talking about nuclear waste, and I know that is a big issue. If I recall, there were 3,500 assemblies, and 800 pounds per assembly. That is over a thousand tons there at Grand Gulf sitting in that pool with an uncertain future. And now we are talking about increasing the amount of nuclear waste that could be generated there. And it will be where it is if there is no other place for it to go, and you should be considering that, and certainly the environmental impact statement that we are talking about here is to address that. We also want to know about all impacts arising from the additional accumulation of high level radioactive waste generated and indefinitely stored on the Grand Gulf nuclear site as I originally discussed. (D-2)

**Comment:** Nuclear power produces extremely hazardous waste from the cradle to the grave. There is dangerous radiation waste from mining uranium, from processing it into fuel, and then from waste material left over after it is used to make power. (G-3)

**Comment:** One point that I wanted to make on used fuel management. There has been a lot of discussion about can I stand in a room with spent fuel, and is it dangerous. What was not said about used fuel. I have been in a room with used fuel several times. I have taken tours of reporters and policy makers into a used fuel storage room. The fuel is under 30 feet of water, which is a shielding agent for the radiation, and so you can go in this room with the appropriate radiation monitors on, and you can stand in there and look at the pool. You don't want to stand in there a long time, but you are perfectly safe to go into this facility and look at the fuel. The same thing with the dry storage containers that Mr. Williams referenced. These containers are safe, and they are approved by the NRC as safe. You can walk up to one and stand there, and you will not get any health impacts by standing next to one of these containers. About 28 companies already have gone from using pool fuel storage to these dry storage containers. They are made of concrete and steel, and as one speaker said, you take the oldest fuel out of your fuel pools, and put it in these containers, and you store these on-site with security added to that facility. (M-9)

**Comment:** The waste issue would be dealt with in this current EIS based on the life of the plant, the life of the nuclear facility, which I am not sure now, but it used to be 20 years, and maybe it is 40 years now. And I don't believe that at that point that there will be a facility to store this waste, and concrete and metal dry casks do not last tens of thousands of years. So I think there is a lot of considerations that need to be dealt with. (Q-3)

**Comment:** And the best solution found for the waste being just throwing it in a hole in the ground is disturbing. Let's see. The myth that nuclear is a clean air energy, and there is a lot to say here, but the proponent of nuclear energy would like us to believe that uranium fuel rods simply and magically appear in a nuclear reactor's core. This is not the case, and the process is neither simple nor magic. From the front end to the back end of the uranium fuel cycle, there is a considerable reliance on fossil fuels. Uranium mining and uranium milling, processing, and fuel fabrication, all require fossil fuel use in order to deliver fuel rods to the reactor. And, of course, this does not even begin to cover the unfathomable amounts of energy to create a Yucca Mountain, and/or to ship the nation's high level waste from the reactors across the country to the site, or in this case to the sites if we need more than one. (R-6)

**Comment:** The Grand Gulf site is already accumulating highly radioactive waste without an approved and scientifically valid long-term nuclear waste management site and more atomic power plants would make the radioactive waste problem for Claiborne County worse. (S-1)

**Comment:** No one knows what to do with the spent nuclear fuel that we have right now. Why generate any more? (AB-3)

**Comment:** The radioactive waste issue. I am not satisfied with the current means of disposal of nuclear waste. I have heard of no method of disposal of such waste that I consider acceptable. (AC-3)

**Comment:** Entergy has publicly admitted that by the year 2007 it will no longer have the capacity to store on-site the radioactive waste generated by the current Grand Gulf reactor. Additionally, it is well known that Yucca Mountain when fully operational will not possess sufficient capacity to receive existing waste. Thus, allowing expansion of the proposed expansion will only exacerbate current problems associated with storage and/or disposal of radioactive waste generated at the Port Gibson facility. (AD-2)

**Comment:** I have been told that the Grand Gulf Nuclear Reactor facility at Port Gibson has publicly stated as of the year 2007, it would no longer have storage capacity onsite for the toxic radioactive waste it is already generating. Where will the old waste and the expected new waste go in the future? To quote the Utah Governor Mike Leavitt who is adamantly opposed to the dumping of toxic waste, "It's pretty clear that utilities are willing to spend billions to move spent fuel out of their backyard into ours"... (AJ-11)

**Comment:** All impacts arising from the additional accumulation of high-level nuclear waste generated and indefinitely stored on-site at the Grand Gulf nuclear power station as the result of the operation of additional nuclear power reactors. This discussion is required, given that the Waste Confidence Rule applies only to waste generated by "existing facility licenses." 55 Fed. Reg. 38,474 (September 18, 1990). (AL-5)

**Comment:** In the past, contractors have not met specifications in building plants, unexpected accidents have occurred, and there is still no safe way of disposing of nuclear waste -- I expect the plans are for it to stay by the MS River until opposition to the waste being shipped across the country ends. (AS-4)

**Comment:** Most of my concern is over the continued inability of the nuclear industry to safely dispose of its waste. The bottom line is that there is no safe, long-term, economically viable way to manage this "output". The much-touted "input-output" claims of the industry, which is that the public gets more benefits to cost than from other fuel sources, is not true, when all the real expenses are added in. This means construction, maintenance, use of water and other "inputs", as well as the byproducts (waste) and the collection, storage, transfer, etc. Of course, radiation is a problem that lasts for thousands of years, and is a cumulative effect that no number-crunching can tally. (BC-4)

**Comment:** While a plant like Grand Gulf may be staffed by competent people and enjoy a commendable safety record, the ugly fact of nuclear waste (48 tons produced annually at the plant) cannot go ignored. A plant official at the recent NRC environmental scoping meeting in Port Gibson stated that on site nuclear waste storage would reach capacity by 2007! To propose construction of new reactors creating even more deadly waste that will still be around thousands of years from now is not just folly, it is the height of arrogance. (BD-3)

**Comment:** Through a company called "System Energy Resources, Inc.," the Entergy Corp. is seeking a permit that would allow it to build one or more large nuclear reactors next to Entergy's Grand Gulf nuclear reactor in Port Gibson, MS. Entergy publicly admits that by the year 2007 it will no longer have the capacity to store on-site the radioactive waste generated by the current Grand Gulf reactor. Entergy's plans for new nuclear reactors will create more dangerous radioactive waste, and further threaten the health and lives of people who live, work, and attend school in Port Gibson. Here are some important facts. (BG-2)

**Response:** *The impact of the uranium fuel cycle, including the onsite storage and eventual disposal of the spent fuel, will be considered in Chapter 4 of the EIS. Related U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff review guidance is provided in the NRC environmental standard review plan (NUREG-1555, Section 5.7).*

**Comment:** I cried, because I was so sad that there is a possibility that we are going to be adding another nuclear plant. It's like let's double the amount of poison that we are going to give to our children as their inheritance. Yucca Mountain, that's a dream. That is something that is not going to happen. If it does happen, it will be a disaster. (C-1)

**Comment:** There is another burden. All of the tons of toxic radioactive waste that have been produced at Grand Gulf are sitting right here on the site. A lot of people don't know that everywhere the county that if you have a nuclear reactor, you have got all of the tons, and tons, and tons of waste that they have produced right there on site, and that is not going to change. It is not going to change. The proposed Yucca Mountain repository for all this nuclear waste that has been talked about for years, and years, and years, and years, is not going to be available for years, and years, and years, if at all. There are well respected scientists who have been weighing in on Yucca Mountain saying that in essence, in layman's terms, what, are you nuts? You can't put nuclear waste there. And let's just assume for a minute that Yucca Mountain ever becomes a reality, what you all need to know in this community is that Yucca Mountain would already be full when the current Grand Gulf facility reactor reaches the end of its operating life. So this pipe dream out there about Yucca Mountain, which I think is a total pipe dream, and if you don't want to believe the pipe dream, fine. But even if it is not a pipe dream, it is not going to be available for the waste from what you have here now, and any additional waste that you get in the future. (I-4)

**Comment:** And one is that I just absolutely believe that no more nuclear waste should be generated, and if that is not supposed to be dealt with at this point in the process, then it shouldn't be, because I don't think when you generate these deadly wastes that are going to be around for tens of thousands of years, that that is an issue that should be dealt with before anything else is considered. I mean, we have billions of dollars in superfund sites now that have not been cleaned up, and in decades have yet to be cleaned up, and we are depending on the government for that, and they aren't funding it, and I think that this is the same kind of situation. If you can't deal with it, and if you can't store it, and if you can't get rid of it, then you shouldn't produce it. (Q-1)

**Comment:** I am writing to remind you of the experience in Massachusetts when one of our two nuclear plants was closed down some years ago. It has become, to all intents and purposes, a nuclear waste dump. Despite decades of effort by the federal government there is still no approved site to store spent radio active fuel rods and reactor parts, which will be radio active for hundreds of years. You know that the state of New Mexico is still fighting a partially

completed underground storage facility and the state may well succeed. The fact is that even the most pro-nuclear power proponents want a nuclear waste facility in their neighborhood. Surely, the licensing of new nuclear facilities should be held back until there is available a secure site for spent fuel rods. (Y-1)

**Comment:** Also, since there is nowhere in the country to dispose of, or better yet, recycle these highly toxic, long-lived wastes, I believe that no permits should be granted for future nuclear power plants. (AM-6)

**Comment:** Also, since there is nowhere in the country to dispose of, or better yet, recycle highly toxic, long-lived nuclear wastes, I believe that no permits should be granted for future nuclear power plants. (AO-5)

**Comment:** Also, since there is nowhere in the country to dispose of, or better yet, recycle these highly toxic, long-lived wastes, I believe that no permits should be granted for future nuclear power plants. (AQ-6)

**Comment:** We have not come up with solutions to dispose of the waste safely. (AU-2)

**Comment:** Also, since there is nowhere in the country to dispose of, or better yet, recycle these highly toxic, long-lived wastes, I believe that no permits should be granted for future nuclear power plants. (AW-7)

**Comment:** Beyond concerns I have about nuclear power plants operations, I am opposed to the construction of new nuclear facilities until the government [satisfactorily] deals with the nuclear waste these facilities already create. (AX-2)

**Comment:** It is madness to expect future generations for thousands of years to live with the extremely long-lived and hazardous waste that results from nuclear power production. Once fossil fuels run out in a hundred years or so, there could be wide ranging economic disruption that would make it extremely difficult to continue to safeguard nuclear waste. It is a sin against future generations to leave this legacy of poison as the most lasting hallmark of our generation. (BJ-5)

**Comment:** As a person in Nevada who is deeply concerned about the Yucca Mountain project and the fairness of the NRC licensing process in regard to that project, I am worried about the Commission's consideration of permits for new reactors. The license application has not yet been written for Yucca Mountain so NRC should certainly have no reason to believe that there will be a disposal site for any waste produced by new reactors. Indeed, even if Yucca Mountain were to be licensed, it's legal limit would be reached before any waste from new generation was disposed. (BK-1)

**Comment:** The people of Nevada are worried that the process will be tilted to the benefit of the Department of Energy and the commercial nuclear industry when the NRC evaluates a license application and determines whether or not Yucca Mountain should be granted a license. Right now there are magnitudes of uncertainty about the ability of Yucca Mountain to isolate waste and no justification for approval of new waste production. (BK-2)

**Comment:** Also, since there is nowhere in the country to dispose of, or better yet, recycle these highly toxic, long-lived wastes, I believe that no permits should be granted for future nuclear power plants. (BN-7)

**Comment:** In addition to the inherent risks to the environment of nuclear power, including disposal of low and high-level radioactive waste, and in addition to the high cost of decommissioning nuclear facilities, I oppose this permit for the undue risk it poses to the communities in its shadow and to the residents of New Orleans in the even of a severe accident. (BI-2)

**Response:** *The environmental impacts of postulated accidents will be evaluated and the results of the staff's analysis will be presented in Chapter 4 of the EIS.*

## 17. Decommissioning

**Comment:** Whether existing reactors or looking at new ones, but what about when the plants shut down and eventually that has got to happen at all of these, even if they do the 40 years, plus the additional 20 that nearly all of them are applying for. They have got to shut them down at some point, and it will only make sense for them to shut them down instead of continuing to make repairs. You have decommissioning, and the enormous costs of that, and there was a recent GAO report that indicated that a lot of nuclear plant owner/operators were not doing their best at maintaining the funds that they needed to have built up in order to do a proper decommissioning, which of course has a lot to do with environmental issues. Once they leave, are they going to leave behind a clean site that people would feel comfortable getting close to, or having a park on, or you name it. Is it going to be a green site some day. (R-11)

**Response:** *The environmental impact from decommissioning a permanently shutdown commercial nuclear power reactor will be discussed in Chapter 4 of the EIS. In addition, Supplement 1 to NUREG-0586, Generic Environmental Impact Statement on Decommissioning of Nuclear Facilities, which was published in 2002, may provide information on expected impacts from decommissioning.*

## 18. Cumulative Impacts

**Comment:** A cumulative impacts analysis is a fundamental and critical part of NEPA, and it can't be trumped by any agency or commission. (I-9)

**Comment:** All impacts arising from the simultaneous operation of the existing and aging Grand Gulf nuclear power reactor in close proximity to any new proposed advanced reactor design, including the possibility of multiple, simultaneous accidents, whether related (e.g. by fire or natural disaster) or unrelated. (AL-9)

**Response:** *The cumulative impact associated with the construction and operation of the proposed nuclear power plants will be evaluated in the EIS.*

**Comment:** The issue for the NRC is not to look at this proposed reactor in a vacuum. It has got to look at this reactor and connection with the existing reactor that is in Port Gibson here. (O-3)

**Response:** *The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's EIS will discuss the cumulative impacts associated with the construction and operation of any new nuclear power plants at a site with existing nuclear power plants.*

**Comment:** All impacts on public health and safety arising out of a severe accident, including the impacts of the accident itself, sheltering, evacuation, radiation exposure treatment and reoccupation or relocation of entire communities in the event of an accident at an expanded Grand Gulf site. (AL-7)

**Response:** *As part of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's site safety review, the staff will consider whether the site characteristics are suitable for the addition of one or more additional nuclear power reactors. The environmental impacts of postulated accidents will be evaluated, and the results of this analysis will be presented in Chapter 4 of the EIS.*

## **19. Alternative Energy Sources and Conservation**

**Comment:** A fourth concern is the need and the existence of feasible alternatives for power generation. The existing Grand Gulf facility involved significant cost overruns and there is a genuine question whether it has been a cost effective operation. Before expanding this facility further the NRC should require a compelling case of public need for [additional] energy generation in this service area. (Z-4)

**Comment:** According to Entergy, energy from the plant is not needed at this time. I believe the Site Permit should be denied because there are more viable alternatives to nuclear power and that the money spent on nuclear issues would better be spent developing these alternatives in the state. (AM-5)

**Comment:** According to Entergy, energy from the plant is not needed at this time. I believe the Site Permit should be denied because there are more viable alternatives to nuclear power and that the money spent on nuclear issues would better be spent developing these alternatives and in promoting energy conservation in the state. (AO-4)

**Response:** *In accordance with 10 CFR 52.18, the environmental impact statement prepared by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) in conjunction with the early site permit application will not include a discussion of the need for power. NRC practice regarding need for power assessments is consistent with judicial precedent. As part of NRC's compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, need for power is addressed in connection with the construction of a new nuclear power plant so NRC may weigh the likely benefits (for example, electrical power) against the environmental impact of constructing and operating a nuclear power reactor. In considering the need for power, the NRC does not supplant the states that have traditionally been responsible for assessing the need for power facilities and their economic feasibility and for regulating rates and services.*

**Comment:** Hydro is being torn down. That leaves nuclear as the only other emission-free source of electricity generation that we have to meet our growing economy. ...the only other option we have is an expansion of nuclear energy using advanced technologies. The smart

way to approach that, and this is what Entergy is looking at, and this is what Virginia power, Dominion Energy is looking at in Virginia, and it is what Exelon in Illinois is looking at, is maximizing the value of sites that we have today. (M-3)

**Comment:** All of our electricity sources have environmental impacts. Every single one of them. The chemicals that they use in the solar industry are toxic, and arsenic is one of them. It never goes away. So they all have drawbacks, every single one of them. Nuclear and wind, when you look at the total lifecycle of these facilities, have the least environmental impact, and they are right there together. There have been studies done in Europe, and there have been studies down in Japan, and when you look at the cradle-to-grave application of nuclear and wind, they are by far the lowest. We have those independent studies on our website if you would like to see them. It is [www.nei.org](http://www.nei.org). (M-7)

**Comment:** The impact of that is rising natural gas prices, both for industries that use natural gas as a feed stock -- the chemical industry, the fertilizer industry -- and our home heating bills for those of us who use natural gas for heating. So there is an impact, a secondary impact, to an over-reliance on any single fuel source. We are blessed in this country with diversity of fuel supply options for electricity, and we have to continue to use all of them. (M-8)

**Comment:** But if the Federal Government and the Department of Energy have finally gotten the idea of global warming and the concerns of that, then I think that is great. As to which is the most noxious (inaudible) effects, they brought in fossil fuels, or the nuclear energy, I am not sure. They are both pretty bad. (P-2)

**Comment:** What I would like to suggest, and which has not been brought out, was to put in a plug for energy conservation. They have these sprinkle replacement light bulbs that you can screw in and replace a 60 watt light bulb and it gives just as much light on about 13 watts, and it costs about two bucks a piece now, \$2 to \$3, and it pays for itself in about a month in just the energy saving there. But it is even more so in the summer time because I have to have air-conditioning to pump out all of that extra heat that is given off of it, and so that is just one of many. And the Federal Government sponsored this energy star program, and we need to have more of that, and it is a great program, and the new freezers and refrigerators are much thicker and you can save a lot of energy there. (P-3)

**Comment:** I don't think that the Mississippi Power Company has the arrangement yet to where they will buy electricity back from a small time producer, and that needs to be in place, because that way you use the grid as the battery to store the excess off of, and I really believe -- and I think we could also alter our consumption in about half, and you are talking about a 42 percent increase, and I think just energy saving and doing things that don't really hurt your standard of living that much. (P-4)

**Comment:** Alternative energy, the gentleman that spoke before me I thought raised a lot of good points. But there are also a lot of studies that show that we could go now to viable alternative energy and produce, and satisfy all of our energy needs. And I agree that every energy source has its advantages and disadvantages, but I think those kinds of things should definitely be considered. (Q-4)

**Comment:** The other thing, also architectural standards, and there is lots of things that you could do with conservation that have not been dealt with. (Q-5)

**Comment:** But we all have to be responsible in our energy use. I mean, which would you rather have, cut down a little bit on your energy usage, or have Grand Gulf, and you are talking about people that maybe -- I don't know how far the grid here goes, but you are talking about people that have an insatiable appetite for energy that are not going to be affected if there is a discharge that is at Grand Gulf. It is the people in Claiborne County and the people down river that are going to be affected. (Q-6)

**Comment:** Energy efficiency. Regarding our own shared insatiable use of energy, and I wouldn't put all the brunt on Mr. Peterson's kids. I think that we all bear some responsibility here, and we should share that responsibility. (R-8)

**Comment:** The merits of wind energy, and I guess there is something on NEI's site about that, but additional benefits of wind, particularly compared to nuclear plants, include that windmills would make pretty awful terrorist targets. You are not going to scare or kill many people that way, or harm them with radioisotopes, or whatever other pollutants that we are talking about, toxins. Windmills don't create tons of nuclear waste every year, and they do not require a 10-mile radius evacuation zone and plan, of which I guess the one for Grand Gulf is of questionable use and value. (R-9)

**Comment:** Although proponents of nuclear power will claim that this technology will reduce global warming, a substantial amount of warming is already committed to by past emissions, and nuclear power is an unrealistic alternative to global warming because of the many cheaper alternatives. The most important alternative to fossil fuel emissions is energy efficiency, and while some parts of the nation have had strong efficiency programs in place and operating for several decades, Mississippi has had nothing of significance. Since efficiency is available in massive quantity and cheaper than the cost of operating a conventional power plant of any sort (the operating cost alone, not including the capital cost of a new plant), the need for the proposed nuclear plants is a fragile assumption. (X-4)

**Comment:** There are other ways of providing energy that are much safer and sustainable. (AB-2)

**Comment:** There are too many other ways to generate energy to go this dangerous route. The U.S. needs to invest in sustainable sources of energy production - nuclear power is not a safe or economically viable means. (AF-5)

**Comment:** The U.S. has given little consideration and investment of alternative sources for energy production. (AF-7)

**Comment:** There are many alternative sources of energy; such as solar power, wind power, incineration of recyclables, or renewable sources of energy (which could all use million dollar grants). None of these produce toxic nuclear waste. These sources would also produce energy, jobs and economic benefit, but a lot less cost to the taxpayer. (AJ-15)

**Comment:** Whether effects on the environment would be reduced if Entergy alternatively implemented more applications of energy efficiency technologies and energy conservation rather than the development of additional nuclear power capacity at the Grand Gulf site. The Renewable Energy Policy Project has demonstrated that innovative and well-managed efficiency programs would reduce annual increases in electric growth by 61%, substantially reducing demand over a twenty-year period. (AL-14)

**Comment:** Whether effects on the environment would be reduced if Entergy alternatively implemented use of passive solar, photovoltaic, wind turbines and hybrid renewable energy systems rather than the development of additional nuclear power capacity at the Grand Gulf site. (AL-15)

**Comment:** Whether effects on the environment would be reduced if Entergy alternatively implemented greater use of natural gas energy rather than the development of additional nuclear power capacity at the Grand Gulf site. (AL-16)

**Comment:** Whether effects on the environment would be reduced if Entergy alternatively implemented broader applications of the above mentioned resources as distributed power systems rather than increased reliance on an increasingly vulnerable electrical grid system connecting any additional new power capacity at the Grand Gulf site. (AL-17)

**Comment:** According to Entergy, energy from the plant is not needed at this time. I believe the Site Permit should be denied because there are more viable alternatives to nuclear power and that the money spent on nuclear issues would better be spent developing these alternatives in the state. (AQ-5)

**Comment:** The Site Permit should be denied. Viable alternatives to nuclear power should be developed as alternatives in the state. (AR-3)

**Comment:** There are more viable alternatives to nuclear power and that the money would better be spent developing these alternatives in the state. (AS-3)

**Comment:** As a concerned citizen, I have to believe that there are more viable, environmentally friendly solutions for power production. (AT-2)

**Comment:** According to Entergy, energy from the plant is not needed at this time. I believe the Site Permit should be denied because there are more viable alternatives to nuclear power and that the money spent on nuclear issues would better be spent developing these alternatives in the state. (AW-6)

**Comment:** Although Grand Gulf has not been as notorious as say, Watts Barr in Tennessee, the nuclear option as a power source is not proving to be sustainable. (BC-3)

**Comment:** At a time when renewable energy is within our grasp, this proposal is a major step backward. (BI-3)

**Comment:** Instead of granting this permit, the government should focus on major, well-funded efforts to encourage energy conservation and development of alternative, sustainable energy such as solar and wind. (BJ-4)

**Comment:** It would be better to spend our resources conserving energy. I write this from a house lighted almost entirely by [fluorescent] bulbs. The house is at 58 degrees F.; I am comfortable in a watch cap, imitation fleece slippers and a heavy "miracle fabric" house coat from Sears. I drive high mileage cars. Please let me know if you want more about all the heroic things I do to help you refuse to litter the earth with the wastes from another nuclear plant. America should set an example for France and other generators of nuclear wastes. (BL-4)

**Comment:** I believe the Site Permit should be denied because there are more viable alternatives to nuclear power and that the money spent on nuclear issues would better be spent developing these alternatives in the state. (BN-6)

**Comment:** Our energy policy should be aimed at developing safe renewable sources of energy. (BP-4)

**Response:** *The EIS will be prepared in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 52.18 and 10 CFR 51, which will include analyses of conservation and alternative energy sources.*

**Comment:** Whether effects on the environment would be reduced if Entergy alternatively implemented some or all of the above-mentioned applications as security countermeasures to any act of terrorism that would seek to target an expanded nuclear power station site for the purpose of creating widespread radiological catastrophe. (AL-18)

**Response:** *The EIS will be prepared in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 52.18 and 10 CFR 51, which will include analysis of alternative energy sources. For the current application, the NRC decision will be on whether to grant the early site permit – meaning, whether this site is deemed suitable for one or more new nuclear plants. As part of its evaluation of the application, NRC staff will document in a safety evaluation report whether the site characteristics are such that adequate security plans and measures can be developed (see 10 CFR 100.21). If SERI eventually applies for a construction permit or combined license for the Grand Gulf site, it would have to supply a safeguards contingency plan for NRC staff review in accordance with 10 CFR 50.34.*

## **20. Site Safety Review**

**Comment:** Regarding the site, this is on the Mississippi River. We know now that global warming is a real phenomena, and that one of the consequences of that is increased storm events, severity of hurricanes, and flooding. (K-5)

**Comment:** I oppose a permit for this plant because of site characteristics that pose an undue risk. This facility is located on the Mississippi River in an area prone to damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (U-6)

**Comment:** The area is very near the Mississippi River. Mississippi has a history of severe tornadoes and hurricanes. The cooling tower of the current facility was hit by a tornado before construction was even finished. Any accidental contamination would be carried not only by air but by water with the densely populated city of New Orleans right in its path. (V-1)

**Comment:** Please put me on record as opposing the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant near Port Gibson, Miss. Site parameters pose unwarranted risk. The riverine area is vulnerable to hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (W-1)

**Comment:** Other respondents to this hearing will address the questionable wisdom of siting a new nuclear plant in an area exposed to extreme weather events. I would like to add that a recent public policy forum item in the January 9th issue of Science Magazine by David King, the Chief Scientific Advisor to the British Government, Office of Science and Technology, observed that even the very modest observed sea level rise due to increased global mean temperature over the last century has caused significant increases in the tidal and fluvial events requiring closure of the Thames Barrier to protect London from flooding. Expected sea level changes in the next century are likely to be substantially greater than those in the past century. (X-3)

**Comment:** I oppose a permit for this plant because of site characteristics that pose an undue risk. This facility is located on the Mississippi River in an area prone to damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (X-16)

**Comment:** A site specific reason to not issue a permit is that the facility is located on the Mississippi River in an area prone to damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (Y-3)

**Comment:** I submit the following objections to the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, Miss. The facility is located on the Mississippi River in an area prone to damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (Z-5)

**Comment:** The permit for this plant should be denied because of site characteristics that as I understand it pose an undue risk. This facility is located on the Mississippi River in an area prone to damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (AA-6)

**Comment:** Additionally, the current proposal for expansion would locate a new plant along the Mississippi River in an area prone to damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (AD-7)

**Comment:** I oppose a permit for this plant because of site characteristics that pose an undue risk. This facility is located on the Mississippi River in an area prone to damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (AE-6)

**Comment:** This facility is located on the Mississippi River, a link to areas through Mississippi, New Orleans, Louisiana, and the Gulf of Mexico. As a life long resident, I know that is in an area prone to damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (AF-9)

**Comment:** I oppose a permit for this plant because its site characteristics pose an undue risk. This facility is located on the Mississippi River in an area prone to damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (AH-7)

**Comment:** I oppose a permit for this plant because of site characteristics that pose an undue risk. This facility is located on the Mississippi River in an area vulnerable to serious damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (AI-7)

**Comment:** The location of this facility is not a suitable location. The Mississippi River is nearby and is one of our greatest natural resources, it should be protected when possible. In case of natural disasters, (hurricanes, tornadoes, floods ), accidents, terrorism, or acts of sabotage the Mississippi River would easily spread toxic nuclear waste. Not only would it be in the air and soils it would also be in the waters. This would have a devastating effect on the people and the economic viability of Mississippi. (AJ-6)

**Comment:** The facility is located on the Mississippi River in an area prone to damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (AM-1)

**Comment:** The facility is located on the Mississippi River in an area subject to damage from numerous natural events. It is also near an unprotected area of the River that would allow easy access for terrorists, particularly from a boat or barge. (AO-1)

**Comment:** As a citizen living at the downstream end of the Mississippi River, I would like to express my concerns and objections to the proposed expansion of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant located near Port Gibson, Miss. There are several characteristics of the site that pose an undue risk to the human and ecological communities surrounding the site, in addition to those downstream. Because this facility is located on the Mississippi River in an area prone to hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding, an accident caused by natural disaster would be a very real possibility. (AP-2)

**Comment:** The facility is located on the Mississippi River in an area prone to damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (AQ-1)

**Comment:** The facility is located on the Mississippi River where storms and flooding are frequent disasters. (AR-4)

**Comment:** In addition, there are problems with the location of the facility -- on the Mississippi River in an area prone to damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (AS-5)

**Comment:** In addition, there are problems with the location of the facility -- on the Mississippi River in an area prone to damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (AS-10)

**Comment:** The facility is located on the Mississippi River in an area prone to damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (AW-2)

**Comment:** I oppose a permit for this plant because of site characteristics that pose an undue risk to the population of the county and the region. (BD-2)

**Comment:** I oppose a permit for this plant because of site characteristics that pose an undue risk. This facility is located on the Mississippi River in an area prone to damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (BE-6)

**Comment:** This facility is located on the Mississippi River in an area prone to damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (BF-7)

**Comment:** I oppose a permit for this plant because of site characteristics that pose an undue risk. This facility is located on the Mississippi River in an area prone to damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (BH-7)

**Comment:** We oppose a permit for this plant because of site characteristics that pose an undue risk. This facility is located on the Mississippi River in an area prone to damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (BJ-7)

**Comment:** I am gravely concerned with a nuclear power plant proposal in Port Gibson. This is an area prone to tornados, hurricanes, and flooding. These very acts of nature are a danger to the plant. (BM-3)

**Comment:** The facility is located on the Mississippi River in an area prone to damage from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. (BN-9)

**Comment:** The Mississippi River location is insane! The spot is vulnerable to hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding-even more so with rapid loss of wetlands and barrier islands. (BO-6)

**Response:** *As part of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's site safety review, the staff will consider whether, taking into consideration the site criteria in 10 CFR Part 100, such a reactor or reactors can be constructed and operated at the proposed site without undue risk to the health and safety of the public. The environmental impacts of postulated accidents will be evaluated and the results of the staff's analysis will be presented in Chapter 4 of the EIS.*

**Comment:** All impacts arising from any seismic hazards posed to the Grand Gulf site expansion. (AL-12)

**Response:** *As part of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's site safety review, the staff will consider the site characteristics, including seismic considerations. This issue is not within the scope the EIS and will not be considered further in the staff's environmental review.*

## **21. Safeguards and Security**

**Comment:** And this is clearly a concern from a security point of view as it becomes a more and more attractive target in this new day of the potential of terrorism that is intent on causing catastrophic horror to our nation. (D-9)

**Comment:** We are concerned about terrorism, and we are concerned about security, and we are concerned about safety, and we are concerned about protection. (E-1)

**Comment:** 9/11 is a reality that we have to deal with. Now, the Grand Gulf proposal that we are considering tonight is going to make the Port or going to make the existing facility an even bigger terrorist target. It is not me saying it. Your government and the Office of Homeland Security has said, whoa, nuclear facilities are a big target, and we are talking about a nuclear facility that is in a pretty remote area, and now we are making it huge. So if you wanted to

attack a nuclear facility, why not pick a really big one in a really remote area. That is an incredible burden. And this facility site is not really remote. I mean, it is really easily accessible, especially from the river. (I-6)

**Comment:** Someone mentioned something about a big target in a rural area. Terrorism thrives on fear, and you can't create fear by killing a few people. You have got to kill a lot of people, and that is why 9/11 was so effective. They hit a big target in a big city, with a lot of people. They hit other targets, and fortunately that they didn't hit. But there again I am not saying that Grand Gulf couldn't be a target. It certainly could, but it is something that is lesser a target here than say a nuclear plant in a populated New England area. I think that is probably enough. (N-9)

**Comment:** Whereas, the threat from acts of terrorism against domestic atomic power plants has already been acknowledged by the Federal Government including a State of the Union Address by President George W. Bush. (S-2)

**Comment:** Whereas, the risks and consequences of an act of terrorism or a catastrophic accident are increased by building more atomic power plants at the Grand Gulf site. (S-3)

**Comment:** An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its growing inventory of nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River, New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico. It could be devastating to everyone downstream and downwind including seafood industries that produce economic benefits each year totaling many millions of dollars. (U-1)

**Comment:** In the era of terrorist scares, it might serve to think for a minute about the issues raised by nuclear plants. It is not just the plant that amounts to a giant invitation to terrorist acts, but the transported fuel, the spent fuel, the waste materials from the plant, and more. (X-7)

**Comment:** An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its growing inventory of nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River, New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico. It could be devastating to everyone downstream and downwind including seafood industries that produce economic benefits each year totaling many millions of dollars. (X-17)

**Comment:** An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its growing inventory of nuclear waste would contaminate the Mississippi River, New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico. Whatever benefits the reactor is claimed to provide, it is just not worth the risk to the people who live downstream and the seafood industry. (Y-2)

**Comment:** An accident or act of sabotage at this facility would contaminate the Mississippi River, New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico. It would be devastating to everyone downstream and downwind including seafood industries that produce economic benefits each year totaling many millions of dollars. (Z-1)

**Comment:** An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its growing inventory of nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River, New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico. It could be devastating to everyone downstream and downwind including seafood industries that produce economic benefits each year totaling many millions of dollars. (AA-1)

**Comment:** The safety issue. While I understand that great precautions are made to make nuclear power safe and the record of the industry is good, the consequences of an accident or sabotage are simply too great to be worth the risk, although that risk is small. (AC-2)

**Comment:** The safety issue. While I understand that great precautions are made to make nuclear power safe and the record of the industry is good, the consequences of an accident or sabotage are simply too great to be worth the risk, although that risk is small. (AC-5)

**Comment:** An accident or act of sabotage at this facility, and its growing inventory of nuclear waste, could contaminate the Mississippi River, New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico. Such an event would be devastating to everyone living downstream and downwind. (AD-3)

**Comment:** An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its growing inventory of nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River, New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico. It could be devastating to everyone downstream and downwind including seafood industries that produce economic benefits each year totaling many millions of dollars. (AE-7)

**Comment:** An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its growing inventory of nuclear waste could contaminate and be devastating to everyone downstream and downwind, such as me and my family! It also could devastate the seafood industries that produce economic benefits each year totaling many millions of dollars to this area and the United States. (AF-2)

**Comment:** The site of the proposed expansion, located on the Mississippi River, carries with it unacceptable risks from hurricanes, tornadoes and flooding. Any accident or act of sabotage at this facility could contaminate the Mississippi River, New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico, devastating the health, environment and economy of this area. (AG-1)

**Comment:** An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its growing inventory of nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River, New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico. It could be devastating to everyone downstream and downwind including seafood industries that produce economic benefits each year totaling many millions of dollars. (AH-1)

**Comment:** An accident or act of terrorism at this facility and its growing inventory of nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River, New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico. It could be devastating to everyone downstream and downwind including Louisiana's seafood industries that produce economic benefits each year totaling many millions of dollars. (AI-1)

**Comment:** It is near two historic communities, and the Mississippi River, an accident or sabotage here would devastate the surrounding areas, physically and economically. (AJ-3)

**Comment:** I believe are unnecessarily being exposed to threats of attacks, and cumulative effects of toxic nuclear radiation exposure. Only because the residents need jobs and lack the education, knowledge, political clout and financial clout to divert or fight projects like this horrible nuclear reactor project are they being subjected to this threat. (AJ-5)

**Comment:** A disaster, accidental or deliberate at this nuclear reactor facility could easily shut down and destroy a major portion of Mississippi. There are more suitable locations (not close

to people, cities or natural resources of economic importance) in the United States for these types of facilities! The people of Mississippi are one of our greatest resources and deserve the protection of all permitting agencies. (AJ-8)

**Comment:** All impacts arising from increased security risks and tasks associated with the proposed site expansion of the Grand Gulf nuclear power station given the federal government's acknowledgement that threats to nuclear power stations by acts of terrorism can be delivered in part or in combination from the air, the water and by land. (AL-10)

**Comment:** All potential socio-economic impacts from the elevated national security requirements and countermeasures to protect a larger target of terrorism with the expansion of the nuclear power station site including the indefinite and possibly permanent closure of Mississippi River to public access for commercial, sporting, recreation and other means of economic livelihood. (AL-11)

**Comment:** It is also near an area of the River that would allow easy access for terrorists, particularly from a boat or barge. An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its stored nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. This would be disastrous to the communities downstream that depend on the River for drinking water. Also, the extensive industrial corridor between Baton Rouge and New Orleans depends on the River water for processing. These industries would have to be shut down. Contamination of vital wetlands that provide 'nurseries' for larval and other developmental stages of fish, for shrimp, oysters, etc., could devastate the seafood industry. Certainly the tourist industries in Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas would be affected. We are talking potentially billions of dollars and innumerable lives lost or changed because of an accident at this plant. (AM-2)

**Comment:** An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its stored nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. This would be disastrous to the communities downstream that depend on the River for drinking water. Also, the extensive industrial corridor between Baton Rouge and New Orleans depends on the River water for processing. These industries would have to be shut down and shipping on the MS River curtailed. Contamination of vital wetlands that provide 'nurseries' for larval and other developmental stages of fish, shrimp, oysters, etc., could devastate the seafood industry. Additionally, the tourist industries in Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas would be affected. We are talking potentially billions of dollars and innumerable lives lost or changed because of an accident at this plant. (AO-2)

**Comment:** Acts of sabotage would be of concern as well, especially in this time of heightened aggressive activities. Any of the aforementioned problems/accidents at this facility with its growing inventory of nuclear waste could contaminate the river and all points down-stream from the facility. (AP-4)

**Comment:** It is also near an area of the River that would allow easy access for terrorists, particularly from a boat or barge. An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its stored nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. This would be disastrous to the communities downstream that depend on the River for drinking water. Also, the extensive industrial corridor between Baton Rouge and New Orleans depends on the River water for processing. These industries would have to be shut down. Contamination of vital wetlands that provide 'nurseries' for larval and other developmental stages of fish, for shrimp,

oysters, etc., could devastate the seafood industry. Certainly the tourist industries in Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas would be affected. We are talking potentially billions of dollars and innumerable lives lost or changed because of an accident at this plant. (AQ-2)

**Comment:** An act of sabotage at this facility and its stored nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. This would be a huge problem for communities downstream regarding drinking water. (AR-5)

**Comment:** Terrorism is a valid concern. An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its stored nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. This would be disastrous to the communities downstream that depend on the River for drinking water. Also, the extensive industrial corridor between Baton Rouge and New Orleans depends on the River water for processing. These industries would have to be shut down. Contamination of vital wetlands that provide 'nurseries' for larval and other developmental stages of fish, for shrimp, oysters, etc., could devastate the seafood industry. Certainly the tourist industries in Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas would be affected. We are talking potentially billions of dollars and innumerable lives lost or changed because of an accident at this plant. (AS-6)

**Comment:** The placement of a facility with such an enormous and enduring capacity for environmental contamination, should things go awry, immediately adjacent to one of the world's largest rivers is a particularly breath-taking example of the hubris of engineers, and the general inclination of most of the rest of us to discount the future. Granted, the plant is already in place, and the difference between the consequences of some hypothetical disaster scenario, whether caused by a plant malfunction, an act of God, or an act of terrorism, at the current facility as compared to an expanded facility is one of degree and not kind. But given the consequences of a significant breach of containment vessels, a difference of degree is one of major significance. (AV-1)

**Comment:** It is also near an area of the River that would allow easy access for terrorists, particularly from a boat or barge. An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its stored nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. This would be disastrous to the communities downstream that depend on the River for drinking water. Also, the extensive industrial corridor between Baton Rouge and New Orleans depends on the River water for processing. These industries would have to be shut down. Contamination of vital wetlands that provide 'nurseries' for larval and other developmental stages of fish, for shrimp, oysters, etc., could devastate the seafood industry. Certainly the tourist industries in Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas would be affected. We are talking potentially billions of dollars and innumerable lives lost or changed because of an accident at this plant. (AW-3)

**Comment:** I am further concerned that current nuclear facilities are not properly protected in the event of an act of terrorism. (AX-3)

**Comment:** But one objection that touches us all, because radiation spreads far and wide, is the fact that none of the nuclear power plants in this country have proper security to protect them against terrorist attacks. They are on ground bombs waiting to be lit. (BB-2)

**Comment:** Concerns about terrorism when we have what amounts to an arsenal of weapons of mass destruction sitting at Grand Gulf. (BD-4)

**Comment:** An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its growing inventory of nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River, New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico. It could be devastating to everyone downstream and downwind including seafood industries that produce economic benefits each year totaling many millions of dollars. (BE-7)

**Comment:** An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its growing inventory of nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River, New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico, all treasured locations for Missippians. It could be devastating to everyone downstream and downwind including seafood industries that produce economic benefits each year totaling many millions of dollars. (BF-2)

**Comment:** IT'S ABOUT SAFETY. The U.S. Department of Homeland Security and the FBI have warned about "Al Qaeda operatives hijacking cargo jets and flying them into this country to attack nuclear power plants...." A new nuclear reactor would make Port Gibson an even bigger target for terrorism and nuclear catastrophes. (BG-5)

**Comment:** An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its growing inventory of nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River, New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico. It could be devastating to everyone downstream and downwind including seafood industries that produce economic benefits each year totaling many millions of dollars. (BH-1)

**Comment:** An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its growing inventory of nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River, New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico. It could be devastating to everyone downstream and downwind including seafood industries that produce economic benefits each year totaling many millions of dollars. (BJ-8)

**Comment:** This plant could discharge radioactive wastes into the Mississippi River if there were an accident, sabotage or natural disaster. This would impact people's health in a wide local area and diminish my supply of seafood. (BL-2)

**Comment:** Other factors that pose a danger are a lack of infrastructure to handle a potential disaster from such a plant, and with concern over terrorist activities a plant located in Port Gibson could be open to attack destroying many industries Mississippi and [Louisiana] depend upon. An attack or a nuclear accident would destroy the fishing industry, contaminate the Gulf of Mexico, and leave citizens exposed in an area ill-prepared for such events. We would be left in a extremely vulnerable and [volatile] situation. (BM-1)

**Comment:** It is also near an area of the River that would allow easy access for terrorists, particularly from a boat or barge. An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its stored nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. This would be disastrous to the communities downstream that depend on the River for drinking water. Also, the extensive industrial corridor between Baton Rouge and New Orleans depends on the River water for processing. These industries would have to be shut down. Contamination of vital wetlands that provide 'nurseries' for larval and other developmental stages of fish, for shrimp, oysters, etc., could devastate the seafood industry. Certainly the tourist industries in Florida,

Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas would be affected. We are talking potentially billions of dollars and innumerable lives lost or changed because of an accident at this plant. (BN-2)

**Comment:** An accident or act of [terrorism] at this facility and its nuclear waste sites could contaminate the Mississippi River, New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico. It could be devastating to everyone downstream and downwind including seafood industries that produce economic benefits each year totaling many millions of dollars. (BO-1)

**Comment:** Now with the threat of terrorist attacks we should be shutting down existing plants because they are prime targets. We definitely should not build new ones. (BP-3)

**Response:** *These comments are outside the scope of the staff's environmental review and will not be discussed in the EIS. The purpose of an EIS is to inform the decisionmaking agency and the public of the broad range of environmental impacts that will result, with a fair degree of likelihood, from a proposed project, rather than to speculate about worst-case scenarios and how to prevent them. See Private Fuel Storage (Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation), CLI-02-25, 56 NRC 340, 347 (December 18, 2002). The Safety Evaluation Report will document whether the site characteristics are such that adequate security plans and measures can be developed (see 10 CFR 100.21). Additional information about the NRC staff's actions regarding physical security since September 11, 2001 can be found on the NRC's public web site ([www.nrc.gov](http://www.nrc.gov)).*

## 22. Emergency Preparedness

**Comment:** We have in this county fire stations in every district, and right now Claiborne County can only afford to operate one fire station. That is something that I think we should be concerned about. For example, the Sheriff's Department has the responsibilities of taking care of law enforcement throughout Claiborne County, and if there is an incident or accident at Grand Gulf, it is the responsibility of the Sheriff's Department to take care of certain things. If there is terrorism there, it is their responsibility to go there, arrest, protect, or what have you, that needs to be done there, okay? And right now if you talk to the Sheriff, and here in Claiborne County, he will tell you that he does not have enough personnel, that he do not have enough vehicles. So therefore the protection factor falls, okay? And that is one of the reasons why we are concerned about some of the things that has taken place. The redistribution of funds to something that Grand Gulf in a sense initiated, not only initiated, but supported the redistribution of funds. (E-3)

**Comment:** Planning is weak for emergencies in Claiborne County and beyond. The underfunded infrastructure can't properly cope even with the present atomic facility, never mind a new one. Money appears to be lacking for Sheriff's Department, Civil Defense or the Fire Department. There is reportedly only one county fire station and the hospital in Port Gibson is alleged not to be open 24 hours per day. The radiological emergency plan relies heavily on teachers to shelter and evacuate school children without obtaining adequately informed consent or any statutory authority. (W-2)

**Comment:** There are flaws in emergency planning to safeguard area residents in case of an accident or act of terrorism at the facility. (W-4)

**Comment:** Just like another town (Anniston, Alabama) uninformed, untrained school teachers are expected to protect the children in case of accident, sabotage or natural disasters. This should not be an acceptable solution to protecting our children from toxic nuclear waste! (AJ-9)

**Comment:** There is inadequate emergency planning and infrastructure in Claiborne County, and Mississippi generally. There is one fire station in the rural county, and the hospital in Port Gibson has limited resources to serve the area in normal operations. It is not even open 24 hours per day. (AR-6)

**Comment:** We are talking about an emergency plan that can be impacted from the environment if we have to evacuate the area. What if the local plan does not go through? What plan does the system or SERI have from the standpoint of that plant out there in evacuating people. I don't know of one that they have. They totally rely upon the local community to evacuate here, and our big concern here would be what plan would they have to put in effect to do that. I certainly would think what is important is establishing a better communication with SERI in terms of this with the local community. (H-4)

**Comment:** I think another thing that I wanted to mention in terms of emergency preparedness, which I believe is an environmental issue, and I think that everything is an environmental issue. But the whole notion of emergency preparedness is a big issue in a town where cell phones don't generally pick up; and where the hospital is not fully staffed 24 hours a day. (L-2)

**Comment:** There is no confidence that the emergency plan for Claiborne County and other counties surrounding the Grand Gulf site is adequate to protect public health and safety. (S-4)

**Comment:** It is also one of the poorer areas of the state without the infrastructure or organization to take care of emergencies of the magnitude needed for a nuclear facility. (V-2)

**Comment:** There are significant impediments to emergency planning to safeguard area residents in case of an accident or act of terrorism at the facility. (X-15) (AE-4) (AG-4) (AH-4) (AI-4) (BD-8) (BE-4) (BF-5) (BH-4)

**Comment:** I understand there is little in the way of fire protection, emergency response teams, police protection, police enforcement, and hospital care is lacking in case of major accidents, natural disasters, terrorism or sabotage. (AJ-4)

**Comment:** In light of recent terrorist threats regarding WMDs and in particular those weapons which are radioactive, and the repeated diversion and cancellation of air flights to various destinations in the US, I ask that you STOP all permitting or expansion of nuclear plant sites in Mississippi until full protection and total disaster and evacuation management plans are implemented and tested with citizens and communities for the plants which currently exist in our state. We are NOT ready for the defense and evacuation and decontamination of the plants we already have in operation. Until we have achieved a DEMONSTRATED level of safety and security for existing sites there is GRAVE DANGER TO THE PUBLIC AND THE FUTURE OF OUR STATE IN ADDING MORE NUCLEAR PLANTS. (AK-1)

**Comment:** The Claiborne County Hospital is responsible for providing care in the event of accidents at the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant. Please study the overall hospital facility, and procedures for its current and potential future responsibility to provide care in the event of nuclear accidents. (BA-1)

**Comment:** The facility in Port Gibson is highly unprotected as there is just one fire department and infrastructure is greatly underfunded. (BB-3)

**Comment:** Concerns about emergency preparedness should an event occur. How can you have faith in an evacuation plan in a county where there is often no cell phone reception, there is no full service fire or police department, and the local hospital is minimally staffed? (BD-5)

**Comment:** As a resident of Louisiana who lives just downriver from a nuclear power facility, I am deeply aware of the problems associated with evacuation for communities located along the Mississippi. That is why I was concerned to see that Grand Gulf is proposing an expansion near Port Gibson, Miss. (BI-1)

**Comment:** Before NRC considers granting this preliminary permit, it should answer a number of questions: What are the plans in the event of a nuclear emergency at Grand Gulf? (BI-4)

**Comment:** Before NRC considers granting this preliminary permit, it should answer a number of questions: Is the infrastructure near the site adequate for sheltering or evacuating the people? (BI-5)

**Response:** *The comments on emergency planning are outside the scope of the EIS and will not be considered further in the staff's environmental review. An evaluation of emergency planning issues will be part of the safety evaluation report (see 10 CFR 52.18). In addition, the staff will document in the Safety Evaluation Report whether the site characteristics are such that adequate security plans and measures can be developed (see 10 CFR 100.21).*

## 23. Operational Safety

**Comment:** Although the NRC may not feel this hearing obligates a consideration of safety, I will point out that the recent failure of the First Energy corporation to observe an acid leak in the reactor core at the Davis Besse plant, which must have taken a number of years to develop, indicates that the current practices of the NRC in overseeing nuclear plant management are undemonstrated, if you have changed practices at all. You will note that what the public deserves and demands is actual change, not the change in printed rules, which we know has occurred in the wake of the second nearly-catastrophic accident at Davis Besse since it opened. (X-2)

**Response:** *In addition to the environmental review for an early site permit, a site safety review is conducted to determine if the site is suitable from a safety perspective. However, changes in rules or implementation of the rules are not part of the early site permit process. This issue is not within the scope of the environmental review.*

**Comment:** Grand Gulf has a tremendous operating record. The plant has been here for almost 20 years, and Grand Gulf has a tremendous reputation in the industry, and that is

because of operating the plant soundly, and if you were to talk to anyone that actually knows about plant operations, and they were to tell you what is one of the better plants in the industry, they would reference Grand Gulf. (A-6)

**Response:** *The comment is noted. The operating history of the currently operating unit will be reviewed in terms of the environmental impact that may be related to the construction and operation of new nuclear facilities at the Grand Gulf early site permit site.*

**Comment:** SERI is asking the NRC to provide no significant impact, setting aside the Grand Gulf site. There has got to be incidents that have already happened, and I would like to incorporate by requesting that the NRC raise those issues in terms of the new comparison of the new site. And also make those documents available to the local citizens here as well. (H-2)

**Response:** *The early site permit process is designed to determine if the site is suitable for one or more nuclear power reactors. The operating history of the currently operating unit will be reviewed in terms of the environmental impact that may be related to the construction and operation of new nuclear facilities at the Grand Gulf early site permit (ESP) site. Information regarding the environmental review process for the Grand Gulf ESP is publicly available through the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) which is the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's electronic record keeping system that maintains the official records of the agency.*

**Comment:** Other human-induced accidents could yield similar results. Malfunctions of equipment and/or employee negligence causing accidents could be disastrous. (AP-3)

**Response:** *The environmental impact of postulated accidents will be evaluated, and the results of this analysis will be presented in Chapter 4 of the EIS.*

**Comment:** And primarily that stripping down as I understand is to make the construction more affordable, and this is one of the ways that the industry and the Federal agency are thinking about making it more affordable. (D-4)

**Comment:** Another speaker raised the issue of advanced reactor designs, and I think called them stripped-down versions of today's designs. I would look at that in another way. We have got the best engineers in the country, really globally, and in some joint partnerships with other countries, looking at new reactor designs. They are smaller, the same way that our computer mainframes that used to fit in this room now fit in a box. You have got technological advances, and you have got the use of gravity rather than pumps. So that there is less mechanical failures, or at least the chance of mechanical failures, in these designs. So it is not stripped-down and it is the using of advanced technology that like everything else in our world is getting smaller, and smaller, and smaller. (M-6)

**Response:** *The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) decision will be whether to grant the early site permit – meaning, whether the site is deemed suitable for one or more nuclear plants. The applicant has prepared the environmental report to address the environmental impact of construction and operation of one or more nuclear units at the Grand Gulf ESP site. There are several new reactor designs that have been certified for licensing by the NRC, and other designs are in the certification process or are being considered by the applicant. The ER does not address any particular type of nuclear plant but uses the “plant parameter envelope” to*

*describe the operation of the possible nuclear plant and the impact from the nuclear plant's operation. At the construction and operating license stage, the actual design of the reactor(s) will be addressed.*

## **24. Cost of Power**

**Comment:** And early someone asked us why Grand Gulf. If you are going to build a nuclear power plant, you want to make sure that you can do it as cheaply as possible. One of the things that it does provide for is that it is in an area where energy is needed. You have immediate access to transmission, and so you don't have to build new transmission, which is very costly. (A-5)

**Comment:** The cost for more electricity from new atomic power plants at Grand Gulf is unknown and speculative. (S-9)

**Comment:** I urge you to reject the application for new nuclear plants at Grand Gulf near Port Gibson, Miss. In Ohio, our economy has been crippled for decades by the costs imposed by the two completed nuclear plants and the one failed project, which nonetheless required rate increases far in excess of those needed for new plants of other technologies. Although I personally offered testimony to the Zimmer plant relicensing hearing before the Army Corps of Engineers, and Army Corps rules specifically obligate them to consider evidence to the availability of less expensive, intrusive or damaging alternatives, this evidence was ignored, and the plant was converted, even though nearby utilities had excess capacity in excess of that which Zimmer was to provide, already built and operating. Although a new coal plant built from scratch would have cost around \$1,000 per KW of capacity, the Zimmer plant cost over \$2,600 per KW of capacity. Although there have been no nuclear plants built in the U.S. for several decades, it is clear from costs of nuclear plants in other countries that nuclear power is still more expensive than coal, natural gas, or wind power, including the cost of fuel and the typical availability of the wind facility, when measured on the basis of cost per KWH. This is true even considering the large price increases in natural gas fuel in the last three years. (X-1)

**Comment:** IT'S ABOUT ECONOMICS Entergy knows that the electricity generated by its proposed nuclear reactor would not be used in Port Gibson, but instead sold out of state. Entergy will seek millions in taxpayer dollars to fund the construction and operation of additional nuclear reactors. Forbes, a national business magazine, called the nuclear power industry "the largest managerial disaster in U.S. business history." (BG-6)

**Response:** *As discussed in Appendix A of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's environmental standard review plan (NUREG-1555), the cost of the proposed action need not be considered in an early site permit. If SERI should apply for a construction permit or combined license (construction and operating license) at some time in the future, the issue of the cost of power will be evaluated at that time. The review of that application will include the development of another EIS and the opportunity for a hearing.*

## 25. Need for Power

**Comment:** It is projected that the generation is going to grow significantly by the year 2020, and you can either wait until that sneaks up on you, and you don't have any real options to serve your customer, or meet the energy needs. (A-3)

**Comment:** One point that is very important is that this nuclear plant is not needed to produce electricity for Mississippi. The State already has far more capacity to produce electricity than is needed now. (G-4)

**Comment:** Really global warming and climate change -- and this, in part, answers your question also, Mr. Wilson -- is one of the reasons why not only the United States, but nations all around the globe, are looking at nuclear energy again. We are looking at here in the United States at a 45-percent increase in the demand of electricity that we will need between now and 2020. That is a lot of electricity when you stop and think about how much electricity we use in this country. At the same time that we try to meet that demand for electricity, and trying to balance all the fuel sources that we use, whether it is nuclear, coal, hydro, renewables to nuclear, we have an imperative to future generations to preserve the air quality that we have and the environment from global warming. The only ways to do that in the electricity industry are nuclear energy, renewables, and hydro. That's it. Everything else produces emissions. (M-2)

**Comment:** To add nuclear energy to meet that emission-free portfolio in 2020, we need 50,000 more megawatts of nuclear energy to add to that, doubling your renewables. So that is about 50 large plants by 2020. We are not going to get there. We simply could not build that many nuclear plants in that short a time in this country, but we need to start, and that is the kind of prudent decision-making that Entergy and those other companies are looking at now; how to best serve their customers with low cost, reliable energy, that at the same time protects the environment. (M-5)

**Comment:** Whereas, the need for more electricity from new atomic power plants at Grand Gulf is questionable at best. (S-8)

**Comment:** Let me emphasize that none of the three companies pursuing early site permits has made a decision to build a new reactor. Like any company entrusted with meeting a basic public need, these companies are taking prudent steps to plan ahead, looking at the options for providing their customers with energy for the future. (T-3) (AZ-3)

**Comment:** All impacts associated with an evaluation of the need for power and whether effects on the environment would be reduced if no action were taken to increase nuclear generating capacity. (AL-19)

**Comment:** According to Entergy, energy from the plant is not needed. (AR-2)

**Comment:** Entergy has said that energy from the plant is not needed at this time. (AS-2)

**Comment:** According to Entergy, energy from the plant is not needed at this time. (BN-5)

**Response:** *The EIS will be prepared in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 52.18 and 10 CFR Part 51. The application did not discuss the need for power in the ER and the need for power will not be addressed at this time. If SERI should apply for a construction permit or combined license (construction and operating license) at some time in the future, the issue of the need for power will be evaluated at that time.*

## Summary

The preparation of the EIS for the Grand Gulf ESP will take into account all the relevant environmental issues raised during the scoping process that are described above. The draft EIS will be made available for public comment. Interested Federal, Tribal, 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 EIS.

Sonny Harpole  
Clairborne County Citizen  
2020 Grand Gulf Rd  
Port Gibson, MS 39150

Evan Doss, Jr.  
P.O. Box 653  
Port Gibson, MS 39150

Jerry Landrum  
5278 Menge Ave.  
Pass Christian, MS 39571

Soloman S. Wilson  
1948 Bessie Weathers Rd.  
Port Gibsn, MS 39150

A. C. Garner  
NAACP  
P.O. Box 121  
Port Gibson, MS 39150

Becky Gillette  
Sierra Club  
34 Davis Bayou Cir.  
Ocean Springs, MS 39564