

June 3, 2004

Mr. Mano K. Nazar
Senior Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer
Indiana Michigan Power Company
500 Circle Drive
Buchanan, Michigan 49107

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING SUMMARY REPORT
ASSOCIATED WITH THE STAFF'S REVIEW OF THE APPLICATION BY
INDIANA MICHIGAN POWER COMPANY FOR RENEWAL OF THE
OPERATING LICENSES FOR THE DONALD C. COOK NUCLEAR PLANT,
UNITS 1 AND 2

Dear Mr. Nazar:

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

The NRC staff has prepared the enclosed environmental scoping summary report identifying comments received at the March 8, 2004, license renewal environmental scoping meetings, by letter and by electronic mail. In accordance with Section 51.29(b) of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, you are being provided a copy of the environmental scoping summary report. The transcripts of the meetings can be found as an attachment to the meeting summary issued on April 9, 2004. The meeting summary is available for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room (PDR) located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville Maryland or electronically from the Publicly Available Records (PARS) component of NRC's document system (ADAMS) under Accession Number ML041030066. ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm.html> (the Public Electronic Reading Room) (Note that the URL is case-sensitive). Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS should contact the NRC's PDR staff at 1-800-397-4209, or 301-415-4737, or by e-mail at pdr@nrc.gov.

M. Nazar

- 2 -

The next step in the environmental review process is the issuance of a draft supplement to the GEIS scheduled for September 2004. Notice of the availability of the draft supplement to the GEIS and the procedures for providing comments will be published in an upcoming *Federal Register* notice. If there are any questions concerning this matter, please contact me at (301) 415-1312.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Robert G. Schaaf, Project Manager
Environmental Section
License Renewal and Environmental Impacts Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos.: 50-315 and 50-316

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

M. Nazar

- 2 -

The next step in the environmental review process is the issuance of a draft supplement to the GEIS scheduled for September 2004. Notice of the availability of the draft supplement to the GEIS and the procedures for providing comments will be published in an upcoming *Federal Register* notice. If there are any questions concerning this matter, please contact me at (301) 415-1312.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Robert G. Schaaf, Project Manager
Environmental Section
License Renewal and Environmental Impacts Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos.: 50-315 and 50-316

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

Accession no.: ML041560360

Document name: C:\ORPCheckout\FileNET\ML041560360.wpd

OFFICE	PM:RLEP	LA:RLEP	SC:RLEP	OGC (NLO w/comments/edits)	PD:RLEP
NAME	RSchaaf	YEdmonds	JTappert	TSmith	PTKuo
DATE	5/28 /04	5/26/04	6/2/04	6/3/04	6/3/04

OFFICIAL AGENCY RECORD

DISTRIBUTION: Scoping Summary Report Re: DCCook, Dated: June 3, 2004

Accession no.: ML041560360

Hard Copy

RLEP/Environmental R/F

E-Mail

F. Cameron

L. Rakovan

OPA

RidsOgcMailCenter

ACRS/ACNW

M. Kotzalas

B. Sheron

W. Borchardt

D. Matthews/F. Gillespie

J. Tappert

P.T.Kuo

R. Schaaf

W. Dam

T. Terry

J. Eads

J. Lamb

RIDSRgn2MailCenter

E. Duncan, RIII

J. Strasma, RIII

B. Kemker, SRI

K. LaGory (ANL)

RidsNrrAdpt

T. Combs, OCA

Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2

cc:

Regional Administrator, Region III
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
2443 Warrenville Road, Suite 210
Lisle, IL 60532-4352

Attorney General
Department of Attorney General
525 West Ottawa Street
Lansing, MI 48913

Township Supervisor
Lake Township Hall
P.O. Box 818
Bridgman, MI 49106

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Resident Inspector's Office
7700 Red Arrow Highway
Stevensville, MI 49127

David W. Jenkins, Esquire
Indiana Michigan Power Company
One Cook Place
Bridgman, MI 49106

Mayor, City of Bridgman
P.O. Box 366
Bridgman, MI 49106

Special Assistant to the Governor
Room 1 - State Capitol
Lansing, MI 48909

Michael J. Finissi
Plant Manager
Indiana Michigan Power Company
Nuclear Generation Group
One Cook Place
Bridgman, MI 49106

Joseph N. Jensen
Site Vice President
Indiana Michigan Power Company
Nuclear Generation Group
One Cook Place
Bridgman, MI 49106

Mr. John A. Zwolinski
Director, Design Engineering and
Regulatory Affairs
Indiana Michigan Power Company
Nuclear Generation Group
500 Circle Drive
Buchanan, MI 49107

Michigan Department of Environmental
Quality
Waste and Hazardous Materials Div.
Hazardous Waste & Radiological
Protection Section
Nuclear Facilities Unit
Constitution Hall, Lower-Level North
525 West Allegan Street
P. O. Box 30241
Lansing, MI 48909-7741

David A. Lochbaum
Nuclear Safety Engineer
Union of Concerned Scientists
1707 H Street NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036

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

Richard J. Grumbir
Project Manager, License Renewal
Indiana Michigan Power Company
Nuclear Generation Group
500 Circle Drive
Buchanan, MI 49107

Ms. Carol Richardson, Director
Bridgman Public Library
4460 Lake Street
Bridgman, MI 49106

Ms. Mary Kynast, Director
Maud Preston Palenske Memorial Library
500 Market Street
St. Joseph, MI 4908

Mr. Craig Czarnecki
Field Supervisor
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
East Lansing Field Office
2651 Coolidge Road, Suite 101
East Lansing, MI 48823

Mr. Scott Pruitt
Field Supervisor
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Bloomington Ecological Services Field
Office
620 South Walker Street
Bloomington, IN 47403

Mr. Brian Conway
Michigan State Historic Preservation Office
Michigan Historical Center
PO Box 30740
717 West Allegan Street
Lansing, MI 48909

Mr. Don Klima, Director
Office of Federal Agency Programs
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Old Post Office Building
1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 809
Washington, DC 20004

The Honorable John A. Barrett, Jr.
Chairperson
Citizen Potawatomi Nation
1601 South Gordon Cooper Drive
Shawnee, OK 74801

The Honorable Robert Kewaygoshkum
Chairperson
Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and
Chippewa Indians
2605 N.W. Bayshore Dr.
Suttons Bay, MI 49682

The Honorable Kenneth Meshigaud
Chairperson
Hannahville Indian Community Council
N14911 Hannahville B1 Road
Wilson, MI 49896-9728

The Honorable Laura Spurr, Chairperson
Nottawaseppi Huron Pottawatomi
2221 1½ Mile Road
Fulton, MI 49052

The Honorable Lee Sprague, Ogema
Little River Band of Ottawa Indians
375 River Street
Manistee, MI 49660

The Honorable Frank Ettawageshik
President
Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians
7500 Odawa Circle
Harbor Springs, MI 49740

The Honorable David K. Sprague
Chairperson
Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of
Pottawatomi Indians
P.O. Box 218
1743 142nd Avenue
Dorr, MI 48323

The Honorable Floyd E. Leonard, Chief
Miami Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 1326
Miami, OK 74355

The Honorable Charles Todd, Chief
Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma
P.O. Box 110
Miami, OK 74355

The Honorable John Miller, Chairperson
Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians
of Michigan
P.O. Box 180
58620 Sink Road
Dowagiac, MI 49047

The Honorable Audrey Falcon, Chief
Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan
7070 East Broadway Road
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48858

Craig Massey
Emergency Services Coordinator
Berrien County Health Department
P.O. Box 706
Benton Harbor, MI 49023

John P. Carlson
Environmental Manager
American Electric Power
Cook Nuclear Plant
One Cook Place
Bridgman, MI 49106

Alan E. Gaulke
American Electric Power
P.O. Box 16631
Columbus, OH 43221-6631

The Honorable Ron Jelinek
Michigan State Senate
21st District
P.O. Box 30036
Lansing, MI 48909-7536

Bill Downey, Program Strategist
Perry Ballard Inc.
526 Upton Drive East
P.O. Box 240
St. Joseph, MI 49085

Kenneth A. Westlake, Chief
Environmental Planning and
Evaluation Branch
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
77 W. Jackson Boulevard
Mailstop B-19J
Chicago, IL 60604-3590

Richard Gallagher
Dominion Resources Services, Inc
Rope Ferry Road
Waterford, CT 06385

Steven J. Connor
Tetra Tech
900 Trail Ridge Road
Aiken, SC 29803

Bret Witkowski
Berrien County Commissioners
701 Main Street
St. Joseph, MI 49085

Mike Poluhanycz
2932 East Napier Ave
Benton Harbor, MI 49022-9611

Willie Mays, Lieutenant
Michigan State Police
1600 Silverbrook Ave
Niles, MI 49120

Paul Bailey, Sheriff
Berrien County Sheriff's Department
919 Port Street
St. Joseph, MI 49085

Aaron Anthony
City of Bridgman
P.O. Box 366
Bridgman, MI 49106

Jeff Knowles
Cornerstone Chamber of Commerce
38 W. Wall Street
P.O. Box 428
Benton Harbor, MI 49023

Cindy LaGrow, Executive Director
County of Berrien
Economic Development
Berrien County Administration Center
701 Main Street
St. Joseph, MI 49085

Larry Wozniak, General Manager
Park Inn Hotel
4290 Red Arrow Hwy
Stevensville, MI 49127

Gerry L. Blasko
Assistant Superintendent Business &
Auxillary Services
Berrien County Intermediate
School District
711 St. Joseph Avenue
Berrien Springs, MI 49103

Kevin Ivers, Superintendent
Bridgman Public Schools
9964 Gast Road
Bridgman, MI 49106

Michael Green, Executive Director
Harbor Habitat for Humanity
785 East Main Street
Benton Harbor, MI 49022

**Environmental Impact Statement
Scoping Process**

Summary Report

**Donald C. Nuclear Plant
Units 1 & 2
Berrien County, Michigan**

June 2004



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

Introduction

On November 3, 2003, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) received an application from Indiana Michigan Power Company (I&M) dated October 31, 2003, for renewal of the operating licenses of Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant (CNP), Units 1 and 2. The CNP units are located in Berrien County, Michigan. As part of the application, I&M submitted an environmental report (ER) prepared in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Part 51. The Title 10 *Code of Federal Regulations* Part 51 (10 CFR Part 51) contains the NRC requirements for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and the implementing regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). Section 51.53 outlines requirements for preparation and submittal of environmental reports to the NRC.

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

The Commission has determined that the NRC does not have a role in energy-planning decision-making for existing plants. Therefore, an applicant for license renewal need not provide an analysis of the need for power, or the economic costs and economic benefits of the proposed action. Additionally, the Commission has determined that the ER need not discuss any aspect of storage of spent fuel for the facility that is within the scope of the generic determination in 10 CFR 51.23(a) and in accordance with 10 CFR 51.23(b).

On February 6, 2004, the NRC published a Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* (69 FR 5880), to notify the public of the staff's intent to prepare a plant-specific supplement to the GEIS to support the renewal application for the CNP operating licenses. The plant-specific supplement to the GEIS will be prepared in accordance with NEPA, CEQ guidelines, and 10 CFR Part 51. As outlined by NEPA, the NRC initiated the scoping process with the issuance of the *Federal Register* Notice. The NRC invited the applicant, Federal, State, Tribal, and local government agencies, local organizations, and individuals to participate in the scoping process by providing oral comments at the scheduled public meetings and/or submitting written suggestions and comments no later than April 6, 2004. The scoping process included two public scoping meetings, which were held at the Lake Charter Township Hall in Bridgman, Michigan, on March 8, 2004. The NRC issued press releases and distributed flyers locally. Approximately 35 members of the public attended the meetings. Both sessions began with NRC staff members providing a brief overview of the license renewal process and the NEPA process. Following the NRC's prepared statements, the meetings were open for public comments. Seventeen attendees provided oral comments that were recorded and transcribed by a certified court reporter. The transcripts of the meetings can be found as an attachment to the meeting summary, which was issued on April 9, 2004. The meeting summary is available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly

Available Records (PARS) component of NRC's document system (ADAMS) under accession number ML041030060. ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm.html> (the Public Electronic Reading Room) (Note that the URL is case-sensitive).

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

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

At the conclusion of the scoping period, the NRC staff and its contractor reviewed the transcripts and all written material received and identified individual comments. In addition to the comments received during the public meetings, three comment letters were received by the NRC in response to the Notice of Intent. All comments and suggestions received orally during the scoping meetings or in writing were considered. Each set of comments from a given commenter was given a unique alpha identifier (Commenter ID letter), allowing each set of comments from a commenter to be traced back to the transcript, letter, or email in which the comments were submitted. Several commenters submitted comments through multiple sources (e.g., letter and afternoon or evening scoping meetings).

Comments were consolidated and categorized according to the topic within the proposed supplement to the GEIS or according to the general topic if outside the scope of the GEIS. Comments with similar specific objectives were combined to capture the common essential issues that had been raised in the source comments. Once comments were grouped according to subject area, the staff and contractor determined the appropriate action for the comment.

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

The comments received were grouped into categories as follows:

1. Support of License Renewal at Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2
2. Aquatic Ecology
3. Terrestrial Resources
4. Air Quality
5. Human Health
6. Socioeconomics
7. Uranium Fuel Cycle and Waste Management
8. License Renewal Process
9. Issues Outside the Scope of License Renewal

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

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

TABLE 1 - Individuals Providing Comments During Scoping Comment Period

Commenter ID	Commenter	Affiliation (If Stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession Number
CS-A	John Gast	Supervisor, Lake Charter Township	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
CS-B	Chris Siebenmark	State Senator Ron Jelinek's Office	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
CS-C	Mano Nazar	American Electric Power (AEP)	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
CS-D	Michael J. Finissi	AEP	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
CS-E	Richard Grumbir	AEP	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
CS-F	Paul Bailey	Berrien County Sheriff Dept.	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
CS-G	F/LT. Willie Mays	Michigan State Police	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
CS-H	Aaron Anthony	City of Bridgman	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
CS-I	Craig Massey	Berrien County Health Department	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
CS-J	Kevin Ivers	Bridgman Public School	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
CS-K	Jeff Knowles	Cornerstone Chamber of Commerce	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
CS-L	Bill Downey	Perry Ballard	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
CS-M	Martin Golob	United Way of Southwest Michigan	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
CS-N	Larry Wozniak	Park Inn Hotel	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
CS-O	Mike Green	Harbor Habitat for Humanity	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
CS-P	Bret Witkowski	Berrien County Board of Commissioners	Evening Scoping Meeting
CS-Q	Joseph N. Jensen	AEP	Evening Scoping Meeting
CS-R	Michael J. Finissi	AEP	Evening Scoping Meeting
CS-S	Richard Grumbir	AEP	Evening Scoping Meeting
CS-T	Ron Jelinek	Michigan State Senate	Comment Letter (ML040980507)
CS-U	Fred Upton	U.S. House of Representatives	Comment Letter (ML041040389)
CS-V	Kenneth A. Westlake	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Comment Letter (ML041120441)

(a) The afternoon and evening transcripts can be found under accession number ML041030060.

Comments and Responses

The comments and suggestions received as part of the scoping process are discussed below. Parenthetical numbers after each comment refer to the Commenter's ID letter and the comment number. Comments can be tracked to the commenter and the source document through the ID letter and comment number listed in Table 1.

1. Comments in Support of License Renewal at Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2

Comment: I'm here today in support of the relicensing of the Cook nuclear facility. I'm a lifelong resident of the community of Lake Township and currently hold the position of Township supervisor. I retired from a law enforcement career of 26 years, which my work was mainly in Lake Township. I worked closely with Cook plant personnel over the years. The plant and its employees and management have been great community partners and supported many of the non-profit organizations in our area.

(CS-A-1)

Comment: The power plant owners have always promoted safety, and AEP is no exception, operating with safety of the public as a top priority and being stewards of our local environment. I personally had no communications concerning the relicensing of this facility well into the years of 2034 and 2037.

(CS-A-4)

Comment: I would like to thank American Electric Power for its commitment to the economic and social welfare of Senate District 21 of the State of Michigan. I applaud its decision to pursue extension of the operating licenses for Cook Nuclear Plant, Bridgman, Michigan, for 20 additional years beyond their expiration dates, (Unit 1: 2014 and Unit 2: 2017). Since Cook Plant began commercial operations in 1975, it has proven itself to be an excellent corporate citizen.

(CS-B-1)

Comment: The AEP Cook Nuclear Plant is a valued and desired corporation in our district. I ask that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission give every consideration to the 20-year license extensions of AEP Cook Nuclear Plant -- if AEP Cook Nuclear Plant meets or exceeds the NRC's safety, technical and environmental criteria pursuant to continued operation.

(CS-B-11)

Comment: What does 20 years of additional operation mean? It means diverse energy supply; it means environmental balance; it means a source of jobs and tax revenue for the community, as you heard from some of our colleagues.

(CS-C-3)

Comment: In conclusion, I believe our submittal was thorough and is accurate. Also, I believe that license renewal is good for the community. It will enable the Cook Nuclear Power Plant to provide low-cost, clean energy for many years to come.

(CS-D-4, CS-R-4)

Comment: As sheriff, I recommend that you approve their licenses so that they continue business here in Berrien County.
(CS-F-2)

Comment: So, I'm in support of D.C. Cook to be relicensed for the following years to come.
(CS-G-2)

Comment: The city, obviously, on those bases, would endorse and encourage the license renewal.
(CS-H-2)

Comment: So, in view of -- again, from my limited opinion, of AEP's very professional emergency management program personnel, they are at least one of the many reasons why this application should be favorably considered.
(CS-I-2)

Comment: As the superintendent of Bridgman Public Schools, I would like to recommend that the application for the renewal for the D.C. Cook Power Plant be approved.
(CS-J-1)

Comment: We view the D.C. Cook Plant and AEP as good neighbors, and we support their application for license renewal.
(CS-J-4)

Comment: The 163,000 people, are definitely enriched by the Cook Nuclear Plant. So, we are, obviously, in favor of the relicensing for all of those well-known economic and tax base and job reasons.
(CS-K-1)

Comment: Unofficially, speaking as more of public citizen, I'm here to support the Cook nuclear facility.
(CS-L-1)

Comment: On a professional note, I've also been involved with a number of the people at Cook for the past six years, working for Perry Ballard, Incorporated; and I know that the people there are extraordinary people, and I would heartily support them for license renewal in that regard, as well.
(CS-L-3)

Comment: So, I would, again, heartily encourage the 20-year extension being proposed for today.
(CS-M-3)

Comment: The employees and the staff at the Cook plant have been very instrumental in our success, and I just want to come and say a few words in support of them.
(CS-O-1)

Comment: So, I just wanted to come here in support of the employees and the people of AEP and the Cook plant. It's just been a marvelous partnership, and look forward to continuing that in years to come.
(CS-O-3)

Comment: Now therefore be it hereby resolved the Berrien County Board of Commissioners supports and encourages the continuing licensing of AEP/Cook Nuclear Plant until 2037.
(CS-P-4)

Comment: I would like to take this opportunity to offer my support and endorsement for the American Electric Power Cook Nuclear Plant license renewal.
(CS-T-1)

Comment: Without question, AEP Cook Nuclear Plant is a valued member of our community. I can see no reason why they should be denied this license renewal. I hope that after you read all the support letters and examine their record that you too will find they are deserving of the continuation of their license.
(CS-T-6)

Comment: It is my understanding that American Electric Power has applied for two operating licenses (Unit 1:2014 and Unit 2:2017) to extend operations 20 years beyond their current expiration dates. I strongly support their application.
(CS-U-1)

Comment: The AEP Cook Nuclear Plant is a valuable asset to our community. If they meet or exceed the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's safety, technical, and environmental criteria, which I believe they will, there is no reason not to extend their licenses. I would strongly encourage you to do so.
(CS-U-5)

Response: *The comments are supportive of license renewal at CNP and are general in nature. The comments provide no new information, and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.*

2. Comments Concerning Aquatic Ecology Issues

As stated in 10 CFR Part 51, Table B-1, Category 1 and 2 aquatic ecology issues include:

Category 1

- Accumulation of contaminants in sediment
- Entrainment of phytoplankton and zooplankton
- Cold shock
- Thermal plume barrier to migrating fish
- Distribution of aquatic organisms
- Premature emergence of aquatic insects
- Gas supersaturation (gas bubble disease)
- Low dissolved oxygen in the discharge
- Losses from predation, parasitism, and disease among organisms exposed to sublethal stresses
- Stimulation of nuisance organisms

Category 2

- Entrainment of fish and shellfish in early life stages
- Impingement of fish and shellfish
- Heat shock

Comment: We are concerned about the amount of organisms pinned against or drawn into D.C. Cook's cooling water systems. Under a final rule signed by U.S. EPA [Environmental Protection Agency] on February 16, 2004, certain power plants with cooling water systems are required to (1) reduce the number of organisms pinned against water intake screens by 80 to 95 percent, and (2) reduce the number of organisms which are sucked into the cooling water system by 60 to 90 percent. The draft SEIS should indicate the applicability of the final rule to D.C. Cook, and the modifications planned by the applicant to comply with the rule. (CS-V-2)

Response: *The final rule issued by EPA on February 16, 2004, commonly referred to as the 316(b) Phase II regulations, establishes requirements to minimize adverse effects to fish and shellfish from cooling water intake structures at large power plants. Facilities will have several compliance alternatives to meet the performance standards defined in the final rule. The alternatives include demonstrating that the existing cooling water intake configuration provides adequate protection, selecting additional fish protection technologies (such as screens with fish return systems), and using restoration measures. Additional information regarding the rule can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/waterscience/316b/>.*

The rule becomes effective sixty (60) days after the date of its publication in the Federal Register (as of May 27, 2004, the final rule had not been published). The rule provides a period of up to approximately 4 years from the effective date of the regulation for facilities to determine the compliance alternative to be pursued, and to complete studies or facility modifications, as necessary. CNP will be subject to the provisions of the final rule and is expected to determine which of the compliance alternatives it will be pursuing following publication of the final rule in the Federal Register.

The comment relates to Category 2 aquatic ecology issues and will be considered in the preparation of the SEIS.

3. Comments Concerning Terrestrial Resource Issues

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

- Power line right-of-way management (cutting and herbicide application)
- Bird collisions with power lines
- Impacts of electromagnetic fields on flora and fauna (plants, agricultural crops, honeybees, wildlife, livestock)
- Floodplains and wetlands on power line right of way

Comment: Cook Nuclear Plant occupies only 20 percent of AEP's 650 acres of property and uses the rest of the land as sanctuary for hundreds of birds, plants and wildlife, including threatened species.
(CS-B-7)

Comment: Extending the life of a current plant will not have a new impact on the environment. In fact, much of the plants surrounding property is comprised of dunes, forest and wetlands.
(CS-U-4)

Response: *The comments relate to Category 1 terrestrial resources issues. The comments provide no new information; therefore, the comments will not be evaluated further.*

4. Comments Concerning Air Quality Issues

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

Comment: Cook Nuclear Plant operates emitting no greenhouse gasses, minimizing air pollution, and helping our region achieve its air quality goals with the EPA and Michigan Department of Environmental Quality.
(CS-B-5)

Comment: Nuclear energy assists the county in achieving the best air quality goals with the EPA and Michigan Department of Environmental Quality.
(CS-P-3)

Comment: Air pollution is minimized and they emit no greenhouse gases, thus helping to reach the EPA and Michigan Department of Environmental Quality standards.
(CS-T-4)

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

5. Comments Concerning Human Health Issues

As stated in 10 CFR Part 51, Table B-1, Category 1 and 2 human health issues include:

Category 1

- Noise
- Radiation exposures to public (license renewal term)
- Occupational radiation exposures (license renewal term)

Category 2

- Electromagnetic fields, acute effects (electric shock)

Comment: Cook Nuclear Plant continuously samples the air, soil, foliage, surface and groundwater at over 20 different monitoring stations to ensure Cook Plant meets or exceeds environmental standards.
(CS-B-8)

Response: *The comment is related to Category 1 human health issues and provides no new information, and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.*

Comment: The draft SEIS should include adequate information about radiological impacts. During the March 9, 2004 site audit, American Electric Power, the applicant for the operating licenses, provided information from its radiological environmental monitoring program (REMP) for D.C. Cook. As we understand it, the REMP is used to monitor and document radiological impacts to workers, the public, and the environment. Summary information about radiation emissions and emission pathways from D.C. Cook is relevant in determining radiological impacts from the plant's continued operation. Therefore, we suggest that the draft SEIS include current annual summary radiological impact information from the REMP.
(CS-V-1)

Response: *Radiological impacts on human health (both to the public and to plant workers) are Category 1 issues.*

As stated in the GEIS, radiation doses to members of the public from current operation of nuclear power plants have been examined from a variety of perspectives, and the impacts were found to be well within design objectives and regulations in each instance. Because there is no reason to expect effluents to increase in the period after license renewal, effluent levels during continued operation during the renewal term are expected to be well within regulatory limits. The NRC staff concluded in the GEIS that the significance of radiation exposures to the public attributable to operation after license renewal will be small at all sites and that this is a Category 1 issue.

Occupational doses attributable to normal operation during the license renewal term were also examined from several different perspectives. In the GEIS, an estimate of a 5-8 percent increase in doses for the typical plant worker for the renewal period was made based on the slight increase in radioactive inventories that occurs as a plant ages. Even with this increase, the anticipated doses turn out to be well below the regulatory limits. Therefore, occupational radiation exposure during the renewed license period meets the standard of small significance and thus is a Category 1 issue.

NRC licensees are required to submit annual reports of the results of their radioactive effluent releases and radiological environmental monitoring programs. I&M submitted its annual radiological environmental operating report for 2003 on April 30, 2004. The report includes a description of the CNP radiological environmental monitoring program, results of environmental sampling for the reporting period, and an evaluation of potential offsite dose consequences resulting from station operation. Copies of the report (accession no. ML041320632) are available through the NRC's Public Document Room, and can also be obtained by accessing the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>.

The comment relates to Category 1 human health issues. The comment provides no new information, and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.

Comment: The SEIS should discuss any planned power uprates at D.C. Cook, and the estimated resulting increases in radiological emissions, spent fuel, and other emissions. Although U.S. NRC's regulations (10 CFR §. 51.53(c)(2)) state that an applicant's environmental report need not discuss the demand for power, we think that planned power uprates are reasonably foreseeable actions that contribute to a cumulative radiological impact, under 40 CFR § 1508.7, and therefore should be discussed in U.S. NRC's SEIS. (CS-V-3)

Response: *The NRC groups nuclear plant power uprates into 3 categories: (1) "measurement uncertainty recapture" uprates, typically up to about 1.7 percent, (2) "stretch" uprates, typically up to about 7 percent, and (3) "extended" uprates, up to approximately 20 percent. Measurement uncertainty recapture uprates were approved for CNP Unit 1 in 2002 and CNP Unit 2 in 2003. While the NRC staff believes that many licensees will consider power uprates in the future, to date the applicant has not announced any further plans for additional uprating of CNP Units 1 and 2.*

Should I&M pursue further power uprates at CNP, the staff would prepare an environmental assessment and, if determined to be necessary, a supplemental environmental impact statement to evaluate the impacts of the requested uprate. The staff would ensure, as part of that review, that effluent levels during operation at uprated power levels would remain well within regulatory limits. As noted in the response to the previous comment, if effluent levels are maintained within regulatory limits, the significance of radiation exposures to the public attributable to operation during the renewal term are expected to be small.

The comment relates to Category 1 human health issues. The comment provides no new information, and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.

6. Comments Concerning Socioeconomic Issues

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

Category 1

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

Category 2

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

Comment: Before 9/11 events, Cook Nuclear Visitor's Center for years was one of the Township's destination spots for visitors in educational opportunities. The facility was a showcase for our community.
(CS-A-3)

Comment: Cook Nuclear contributes approximately \$200,000 annually to United Way, with 50 percent matching donations from AEP.
(CS-B-10)

Comment: As far as our environmental stewardship, the plant was built, what I call, to blend into the surrounding environment. We do not have cooling towers, and we do not have containment domes which stick up above the sand dunes.
(CS-D-2, CS-R-2)

Comment: As mentioned earlier, we built a nature trail which is tied to our Visitor's Center, which allows the community to go and be one with nature. It's actually a unique experience. Our recycling program, we work with the local Gateway Group, which is a benefit for us in that we recycle paper, and also we benefit the community, as well.
(CS-D-3, CS-R-3)

Comment: I also want to share that not only are we committed to local environmental, such as the Visitor's Center, supporting the Chikaming Park Township, where we assisted in purchasing some land, but we also do environmental or experimental work with wind generators. And we're also involved in the Bolivia and Belize forest preservation projects.
(CS-E-2, CS-S-1)

Comment: AEP and D.C. Cook have been partners with the schools for over 30 years. Prior to the 9/11 incident, our students regularly visited the plant, they learned about nuclear power, and they walked the nature trails. We used the Visitor's Center and conference rooms to hold Board of Education retreats and many student recognition events.
(CS-J-2)

Comment: I'd also like to say they're a cultural leader. Look at Mano. What we find is that of 1,400 employees, you have representatives that come from all across the globe and different parts and different regions of our country. And that cultural impact that you have in our community is critical. Because this is a community that is embracing diverse inclusion, and Cook Nuclear is definitely a leader in that area.
(CS-K-3)

Comment: We also would like to say that you're a social leader. It's not enough to give money, to give to charitable organizations, but it's employees who lead those organizations who really do truly enhance our quality of life. They're the coaches who made a difference on my son; they are the leaders of churches who bring their accounting skills and their engineering skills to do the right kind of planning. So it's not just the money, but it's the real influx of your talent and your people that make such a world of difference in this area.

(CS-K-4)

Comment: I think a lot of the success of -- and the support of Cook is due to the Visitor's Center and what it has brought to the area and a lot of the outreach in the community. Much has been said by the other speakers here. But speaking very personally as a family guy, knowing that we have such a facility here, and people who are willing to go out and educate our children about power and about engineering and about all of those things that are available out in the world today, I'm very proud to be a supporter of the Cook Center.

(CS-L-2)

Comment: I can say unequivocally I've never seen a corporate citizen of the caliber of AEP and the D.C. Cook Plant and the participation in the community. I think it's core that not only do they involve themselves as a corporation philanthropically in many aspects of our community, but they support their employees' involvement, as well, on boards, and as we've heard spoken of earlier today, in the churches, in the teams, in the events in the community. So we see their employees encouraged to participate in the community.

(CS-M-1)

Comment: And the other thing is, the Welcome Center, it's been talked about a lot. We miss that Welcome Center. They had the trade shows, you know, the different shows every month or so. The vendors would come in from out of town and stay at the hotel. Sometimes out-of-town guests would be there just for the show itself. But it was also a fantastic tourist attraction.

(CS-N-2)

Comment: We have been the benefactors of their good will. Many of the employees from the Cook Plant have come and helped us construct houses. In fact, on our board of directors our current president is an employee for AEP, and we just appreciate what they've done. In the beginning, 1996, provided some heat pumps for us for our families who needed housing. And then over the years, the plant and the employees have actually helped to construct houses for us, fully funding them.

In fact, our current office is located at 785 East Main Street in downtown Benton Harbor, and that structure was fully funded by AEP. And we appreciate the employees who came out and helped us build it because it created a presence for us in our community. We want to make a statement that we were going to be in town for the long haul, and credibility is really important in Benton Harbor when you create a non-profit organization. You have to do what you say you're going to do, and we basically needed to gain that credibility over time by constructing houses and being successful at that, and we have done that to date. We've built 22 houses. And I apologize I didn't get the numbers together, but each year AEP has supported us.

(CS-O-2)

Comment: American Electric Power/Cook Nuclear Plant has continuously been a good corporate partner with Berrien County since 1975 when it began commercial operations.
(CS-P-1)

Comment: More importantly, the employees of this company have made a strong commitment to their community. In addition to donations of money to charitable and community organizations, employees donate blood and provide many hours of service with the volunteer time they provide to community events, organizations and charities.
(CS-T-5)

Response: *The comments relate to Category 1 socioeconomic issues and are supportive of license renewal for CNP Units 1 and 2. The comments provide no new information, and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.*

Comment: The economic impact of the Cook facility and -- afforded the citizens of this community a stable economic background and growth, as well as the Township's single largest employer. The Township enjoys municipal water, sanitary, water utilities throughout the Township, and one of the lowest millages in the area. Township residents also enjoy a wide range of services provided at no additional cost.
(CS-A-2)

Comment: Today the Cook Nuclear Plant generates 2.1 million kilowatts of electricity for residences and businesses. It is the third largest employer in Berrien County, providing almost 1,400 AEP and contract jobs, supporting our local, state and national economies with \$90 million in total wages. Cook is a major contributor to our tax base to the tune of almost \$14 million in 2001.
(CS-B-3)

Comment: Although Cook is not directly located within the jurisdiction of the city of Bridgman, its effects are felt in several ways, particularly there through jobs, job development, support for the service industry with restaurants and service stations and all of that. In addition to those particular items, we were lucky enough to have, after about a 150 loss, when a company moved out of town, to have AEP come in and put their material center within the City of Bridgman. So, in almost every facet of the economic development side of the City of Bridgman, the effect of Cook and AEP can be felt. You've already heard that they're a major employer in the county. Well, if you look at their employment figures, and then you look at our town of 2,400, 2,500 folks, not all of them work there, and I wouldn't mind, by the way, if you had those kind of jobs open, but several of them do, and so we get the support, as well, for the citizens here in the city.
(CS-H-1)

Comment: Last March we asked our community taxpayers to help support a recreational millage to help fund our community pool. When we first had that idea, we met with representatives from the Cook plant, and they were in support of this millage, and we were very fortunate that it passed. Without their financial support, we would not be able to provide the level of education that we currently offer to our students.
(CS-J-3)

Comment: With over 1,400 employees, those individuals have partners and spouses, who bring such great skill sets to this area. There are teachers, there are business managers, they work in our hospitals. So, Cook Nuclear supports more than just the direct job base that exists right in this area. The influx of the skills that you have are oftentimes needed and too often overlooked. About a year ago we had a windstorm and lots of trees were blown over, and some of the horticultural engineering staff here at Cook Nuclear gave advice to residents and neighbors about how to wrap the seedlings so you didn't have to cut them up, you could replant them. And today I think we have more mature trees in the area as a result of one tiny skill set that this facility brings to our area.
(CS-K-2)

Comment: And from the Chamber of Commerce standpoint, I would close by offering the following thought: Everyone in "Michigan's Great Southwest" embraces this facility, because if you look at development that has occurred since you opened, the quality of development is gravitating towards the Cook Nuclear and not away from it. And so, as a result, people have spoken with their pocketbooks by saying the new golf courses, the new residential areas, the new shopping locations are all there and all invested because they embrace and support and are looking forward to the licensing renewal for the Cook Nuclear facility.
(CS-K-5)

Comment: We've seen AEP get involved regionally on many levels, most recently with Benton Harbor area schools and rebirth and regrowth program for that community in their education base. As a major employer, yes, they do contribute over \$200,000 to the United Way of Southwest Michigan annually, and that is just a portion of the economic impact that they have on the health and human services in our community.
(CS-M-3)

Comment: I just want to talk about the economic development part of the Cook plant and nuclear plant here. For the last 10 years that our hotel alone, which is the Park Inn in Stevensville, we have taken in income over \$800,000 from nuclear plant employees. So, a lot of people who live in town who are permanent residents here, but there's lots of transient business who comes in for the plant. Forty percent of that money is the contractors that come in. The Framatome, guys like that, come in and work from other companies who were hired here. So it's a lot of money spent at hotels, and I'm just one of currently 20 hotels in the area, and that's about 10 percent of our business over the last 10 years. So, it's definitely a good chunk of our business, and we appreciate that tremendously. Also, the hotels that are here, they also have to do -- they're eating and they're buying their gas. They don't eat a whole lot of time when they're here working now, they don't do much tourism-type things, but they are spending money other places, too. So, the restaurants also benefit, as well as the gas stations, I know for sure, and the movie theater, maybe on their day off or something like that.
(CS-N-1)

Comment: The Nuclear Energy Institute research says every nuclear plant job creates one additional job in the surrounding community, and the Cook Plant today generates 2.1 million kilowatts of electricity for millions of people, their residences and businesses, and Cook plant is the third largest employer in Berrien County, providing almost 1,400 AEP and contract jobs, and the Cook plant supports our local, state and national economies with \$90 million in total wages and tax payments over approximately \$14 million.
(CS-P-2)

Comment: Renewing this license is beneficial in many ways to our community. In addition to the amount of electricity the plant generates, it is a major employer in Berrien County. The Plant not only generates 2.1 million kilowatts of electricity, they also support our local school district as well as benefitting our local, state and national economies with \$90 million dollars in wages paid.

(CS-T-2)

Comment: Since the Cook plant opened in 1975, it has served an important function in our community by providing clean power and good jobs to the community and the region. Today, Cook Nuclear plant generates 2.1 million kilowatts of electricity and is the third largest employer in Berrien County, providing nearly 1400 plant and contract jobs. This makes them a huge contributor to the local economy and tax base. During a time when many other industries have struggled to make ends meet and have laid off hundreds of workers, the Cook Nuclear Plant has provided steady employment to hundreds of families who really need it.

(CS-U-2)

Response: *The comments relate to Category 2 socioeconomic issues and will be considered in the preparation of the SEIS.*

7. Uranium Fuel Cycle and Waste Management

As stated in 10 CFR Part 51, Table B-1, Category 1 uranium fuel cycle and waste management issues include:

- Offsite radiological impacts (individual effects from other than the disposal of spent fuel and high level waste)
- Offsite radiological impacts (collective effects)
- Offsite radiological impacts (spent fuel and high level waste disposal)
- Nonradiological impacts of the uranium fuel cycle
- Low-level waste storage and disposal
- Mixed waste storage and disposal
- On-site spent fuel
- Nonradiological waste
- Transportation

Comment: Cook Nuclear Plant safely stores its used fuels in a highly secure location on Cook Plant property.

(CS-B-9)

Response: *Uranium fuel cycle and waste management issues were evaluated in the GEIS and determined to be Category 1 issues. The comments provide no new information and will, therefore, not be evaluated further in the SEIS.*

8. License Renewal Process

Comment: AEP has committed more than \$20 million to start this process and apply for license renewal, and there are going to be millions more in looking forward to continue getting ready for the license renewal. License renewal, obviously, is a major milestone for AEP, Cook, and the community, as you've heard some of the local officials mention.

(CS-C-2, CS-Q-2)

Comment: License renewal is all about prevention and detection. And it's not any different than the original license process that was granted for -- operate the facility for 40 years. This process includes the careful examination and analysis of the programs to monitor the structures and equipment, to ensure that we prevent failures and take the appropriate action as far as to the failures. That's what the prevention is all about.

(CS-C-4, CS-Q-3)

Comment: The application is very thorough. We solicited some input from our environmental experts working at the station, as well as hired an outside firm that is experienced with a lot of applications throughout the industry. We spent a lot of time looking at our existing environmental compliance, Department of Environmental Quality for Michigan, the Department of Natural Resources, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and the report was put together and is supporting the application for continuing operation.

(CS-E-1)

Comment: To date with the application, we've had three on-site audits from the NRC, as they're doing the environmental -- I'm sorry, not the environmental, but the safety review. And we -- As Bob indicated, we are looking forward to tomorrow where we are starting the environmental site visit. We're prepared to support the NRC in the review, provide whatever information is necessary to assist them in that review, respond to any questions, and we are looking forward to going through this review process and being here for another 20 years.

(CS-E-3)

Comment: Our application included an environmental report, which was developed by Cook staff, some of our environmental experts, and we sought the expertise from a third party, nationally known contract firm that provides a lot of support for other utilities.

This report basically did a review to see how Cook's existing environmental and compliance programs placed in with Michigan's Department of Environmental Quality, Department of Natural Resources, U.S. Fish & Wildlife, and EPA. In terms of supporting the NRC review, to date there have been three on-site audits. And the fourth one, basically, is going to start tomorrow as part of the environmental site audit. We're prepared to provide that support. We're prepared by making whatever information is available, available to the NRC to support the audit teams and whatever their needs might be so that they can complete this review.

(CS-S-2)

Response: *The comments relate to the overall license renewal process. The comments provide no new information and will, therefore, not be evaluated further in the SEIS.*

9. Comments Concerning Issues Outside the Scope of License Renewal

Safety and Security

Comment: Cook Nuclear operates with high safety and security standards to protect its employees, property, the environment, and the citizens of our state.
(CS-B-4)

Comment: We have commitment, as AEP and my personal commitment, to the safe operation and support of the community. Our mission is to operate the facility the safest possible while we are caring for employees, our employees, community, and environment.
(CS-C-5, CS-Q-4)

Comment: My number one duty is safety. Safety to protect our children, our community, our employees. An example, last year, we had an inconsequential steam leak on the plant. We could have possibly fixed the steam leak online in one of our components; we elected to go ahead and shut the plant down because that's the safest thing for our employees.
(CS-D-1, CS-R-1)

Comment: Since my arrival here at this position in December of '02, I've worked regularly on a monthly basis or better, in fact, more recently it's been almost on a daily basis, with AEP's local emergency management group. And I can safely say without any qualification that their positive attitude and technical proficiency has favorably impressed me. And they also lend credence to AEP's overall emergency management program.
(CS-I-1)

Comment: Further, this plant has operated with high safety and security standards in order to protect their employees, property, the environment and our country.
(CS-T-3)

Comment: The plant operates with a good safety and environmental record and provides an important alternative energy source in a time when new plants are not being built.
(CS-U-3)

Comment: We work very closely with them during the years, since 1975. Since the first reactor was in operation at the Cook Plant, the Sheriff's Department has been there to assist to make sure that all safety issues are taken care of properly, and we have done that through the Sheriff's Department and the Michigan State Police and all the local departments in the county. We have a good working relationship. There's 23 police departments in Berrien County, so I feel very confident as sheriff, if something happened, that we could provide protection for our citizens. And we train very well with the personnel at the Cook plant, be it their supervisor of security; and their security officers are a true team that does regular training down there yearly with the plant security, and we have a good working relationship.
(CS-F-1)

Comment: Just to build off what the Sheriff has said, our relationship has grown so strong over the years. I've watched the security at D.C. Cook go from an intrusion team to a containment team, now to a protection team. Our law enforcement agencies all over the county get along very well with the Cook security group. And it's really -- unusually, I've worked at

several parts of the State where I've had the opportunity to train at most -- at several nuclear plants, but I found with Cook, they're open for suggestions all the time. And if you mention that suggestion to them, when you come back to another meeting, you can see that already been implemented, and whatever program you say that you can see that they could better their security is already a done deal.

And we can appreciate that in law enforcement and the thing is, now things are being coordinated. When somebody mentioned earlier about having to shut down one of the plants, one of the reactors, I got a call at home to be advised of that, so the communication system -- and since 9/11, we have grown so much stronger since then. As law enforcement, you can really appreciate that. We do all our training there; they're very open and, also, the thing is, that information that they gave us and put out, sometimes the information they receive before we do, and it's kind of unusual, but when they do, they share that information.
(CS-G-1)

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

Need for Power

Comment: Cook Plant contributes to the nearly 20 percent of electricity generated by commercial nuclear plants in the United States. By not burning fossil fuels, it helps our nation conserve valuable resources and balance our energy mix. Such conservation is imperative, as the U.S. Department of Energy projects our country will need 50 percent more electricity by the year 2020. Cook Nuclear Plant, with one of the nation's largest generating capacities, could play a vital role in meeting the energy needs of our country and district in the future.
(CS-B-2)

Comment: Cook Nuclear Plant has minimized the need to build additional fossil fuel power facilities on our district's valuable green space to meet our citizen's growing electric power needs.
(CS-B-6)

Comment: As you know, AEP is one of the largest utilities in the United States that generates more than 40,000 megawatts nationally. And Cook is a very important source of energy, major resource of energy for AEP.
(CS-C-1, CS-Q-1)

Response: *The need for power is specifically directed to be outside the scope of license renewal in 10 CFR 51.95(c)(2). The comments are interpreted as expressing support for license renewal at Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, however, they provide no new information and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.*

Summary

The preparation of the plant-specific supplement to the GEIS (called a SEIS) for the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, will take into account all the relevant environmental issues raised during the scoping process that are described above. The draft SEIS will be made available for public comment. Interested Federal, State, Tribal, and local government agencies, local organizations, and members of the public will be given the opportunity to provide comments to be considered during the development of the final SEIS.