

September 3, 2004

Mr. Dennis L. Koehl
Site Vice President
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
Nuclear Management Company, LLC
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, WI 54241

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING SUMMARY REPORT
ASSOCIATED WITH THE STAFF'S REVIEW OF THE APPLICATION BY
NUCLEAR MANAGEMENT COMPANY FOR RENEWAL OF THE OPERATING
LICENSES FOR POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2

Dear Mr. Koehl:

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) conducted a scoping process from May 13, 2004, through July 14, 2004, to determine the scope of the NRC staff's environmental review of the application for renewal of the operating licenses for Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2 (PBNP). As part of the scoping process, the NRC staff held two public environmental scoping meetings in Mishicot, Wisconsin on June 15, 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 PBNP.

The NRC staff has prepared the enclosed Environmental Scoping Summary Report identifying comments received at the June 15, 2004, license renewal environmental scoping meetings, 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 transcripts of the meetings can be found as an attachment to the meeting summary issued on July 8, 2004. The meeting summary is available for public inspection 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 ML041960121. ADAMS is accessible from the NRC's Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>, which provides access through the NRC's Public Electronic Reading Room (PERR) link (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 Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, or 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to pdr@nrc.gov.

D. Koehl

-2-

The next step in the environmental review process is the issuance of the draft supplement to the GEIS scheduled for January 2005. 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 301-415-2462 or email sxf@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

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

Docket Nos.: 50-266 and 50-301

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

D. Koehl

-2-

The next step in the environmental review process is the issuance of the draft supplement to the GEIS scheduled for January 2005. 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 301-415-2462 or email sxf@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

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

Docket Nos.: 50-266 and 50-301

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC

Environmental R/F	DMatthews/FGillespie
PTKuo	JTappert
SImboden	CGuerrero
REmch	HChernoff
MMorgan	FCameron
KCozens	TVegel, RIII
LKozak, RIII	OPA
VMitlyng, RIII	PKrohn, RIII
OGC	PSchumann (schumannp@lanl.gov)
APratt (pratt_a@lanl.gov)	OCA
RIDSRgn3MailCenter	ACRS/ACNW

ADAMS Accession no.: **ML042510283**

Document Name:C:\ORPCheckout\FileNET\ML042510283.wpd

OFFICE	GS:RLEP	LA:RLEP	PM:RLEP	SC:RLEP	OGC	PD:RLEP
NAME	CGuerrero	MJenkins	SImboden	JTappert	SZipkin	PTKuo Slee for
DATE	8/20/04	08/20/04	08/20/04	08/23/04	09/01/04	09/03/04

OFFICIAL AGENCY RECORD

**Environmental Impact Statement
Scoping Process**

Summary Report

**Point Beach Nuclear Plant
Units 1 & 2
Manitowoc County, Wisconsin**

September 2004



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

Introduction

On February 26, 2004, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) received an application from Nuclear Management Company, LLC (NMC) dated February 25, 2004, for renewal of the operating licenses of Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2 (PBNP). The PBNP units are located in Manitowoc County, Wisconsin. As part of the application, NMC submitted an environmental report (ER) prepared in accordance with the requirements of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 51 (10 CFR Part 51). 10 CFR Part 51 contains the NRC requirements for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and the implementing regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). Section 51.53 outlines requirements for preparation and submittal of environmental reports to the NRC.

Section 51.53(c)(3) was based upon the findings documented in NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants," (GEIS). The GEIS, in which the staff identified and evaluated the environmental impacts associated with license renewal, was first issued as a draft for public comment. The staff received input from Federal and State agencies, public organizations, and private citizens before developing the final document. As a result of the assessments in the GEIS, a number of impacts were determined to be generic to all nuclear power plants. These were designated as Category 1 impacts. An applicant for license renewal may adopt the conclusions contained in the GEIS for Category 1 impacts, 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. That role should be left to State regulators and utility officials. Therefore, an applicant for license renewal need not provide an analysis of the need for power, or the economic costs and economic benefits of the proposed action. Additionally, the Commission 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). This determination was based on the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and the Commission's Waste Confidence Rule, 10 CFR 51.23.

On May 13, 2004, the NRC published a Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* (69 FR 26624), 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 PBNP 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 July 14, 2004. The scoping process included two public scoping meetings, which were held at the Fox Hills Convention Center in Two Rivers, Wisconsin, on June 15, 2004. The NRC issued press releases, placed newspaper ads in the Manitowoc Herald Times Reporter, and distributed flyers locally. Approximately 60 people attended the meetings including the NRC environmental review team, members of the public, representatives of NMC and We Energies, and representatives from State and local government agencies. Both sessions began with NRC staff members providing a brief

Scoping Summary Report

overview of the license renewal process and the NEPA process. Following the NRC's prepared statements, the meetings were open for public comments. Eighteen attendees provided either oral comments or written statements that were recorded and transcribed by a certified court reporter. The transcripts of the meetings can be found as an attachment to the meeting summary, which was issued on July 8, 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 Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) under accession number ML041960121. 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. Forty-one letters, emails, or documents containing comments were also received during the scoping period. All comments and suggestions received orally during the scoping meetings or in writing were considered. Each set of comments from a given commenter was given a unique alpha identifier (Commenter ID letter), allowing each set of comments from a commenter to be traced back to the transcript, letter, or email in which the comments were submitted. Several commenters submitted comments through multiple sources (e.g., letter and afternoon or evening scoping meetings).

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

Scoping Summary Report

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 PB (short for Pt. Beach Nuclear Plant scoping). For oral comments, the individuals are listed in the order in which they spoke at the public meeting. Accession numbers indicate the location of the written comments in ADAMS.

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

1. Comments in Support of License Renewal at Pt. Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2
2. Comments in Opposition of License Renewal at Pt. Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2
3. Comments Concerning Terrestrial Resource Issues
4. Comments Concerning Aquatic Ecology Issues
5. Comments Concerning Water Quality Issues
6. Comments Concerning Air Quality Issues
7. Comments Concerning Socioeconomic Issues
8. Comments Concerning Human Health Issues
9. Comments Concerning Uranium Fuel Cycle and Waste Management
10. Comments Concerning Alternatives
11. Comments Concerning 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 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, or 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 PBNP license renewal application.

TABLE 1 - Individuals Providing Comments During Scoping Comment Period

Commenter ID	Commenter	Affiliation (If Stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession Number^(a)
PB-A	Mr. Frank Lasee	(Local) State Representative	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
PB-B	Mr. Ken Petersen	Manitowoc County Sheriff	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
PB-C	Mr. Greg Buckley	Two Rivers, WI City Manager	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
PB-D	Mr. Meyer	Village of Mishicot, Board Representative	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
PB-E	Mr. Rick Kuester	President & CEO of WE Energies Generation Group	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
PB-F	Mr. Jim Shaw	Pt. Beach Plant Manager	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
PB-G	Mr. Curt Andersen	Clean Water Action Council	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
PB-H	Mr. Roger Hirst	Citizen	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
PB-I	Mr. Tim Schroeder	Secretary/Treasurer, Two Rivers Business Association	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
PB-J	Mr. David Jurss	Vice-Chairman, Unit 2, Local 2150 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (Pt. Beach)	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
PB-K	Mr. Mike Zimmer	Executive Director, Two Rivers Main Street Program	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
PB-L	Mr. Tom Kocourek	Executive Director, Big Brothers/Big Sisters of Manitowoc County	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
PB-M	Mr. Robert Hermann	Sheriff's Department, Manitowoc County	Evening Scoping Meeting
PB-N	Mr. Dan Pawlitzke	Economic Development Supervisor, City of Two Rivers, Wisconsin	Evening Scoping Meeting
PB-O	Mr. Rick Kuester	President & CEO of WE Energies Generation Group	Evening Scoping Meeting
PB-P	Mr. Jim Shaw	Pt. Beach Plant Manager	Evening Scoping Meeting
PB-Q	Mr. Dan Rahlf	Community Member	Evening Scoping Meeting
PB-R	Mr. John Nikolai	Citizen	Evening Scoping Meeting
PB-S	Mr. John Busby	Miller Compressing Company	Letter (ML041600105)
PB-T	Mr. Kelly S. Jackson	Lac Du Flambeau Band, Lake Superior Chippewa Nation	Letter (ML041620343)
PB-U	Mr. Robert Domrois	Wisconsin Paperboard Corp.	Letter (ML041620340)
PB-V	Mr. Mark R. Honadel	Wisconsin State Assembly	Letter (ML041750351)

Scoping Summary Report

Commenter ID	Commenter	Affiliation (If Stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession Number^(a)
PB-W	D. H. Tredwell	Citizen	Letter (ML041750352)
PB-X	C. W. Fay	Citizen	Letter (ML041750353)
PB-Y	Mr. Dale Scherbert	Director, Community Memorial Hospital	Letter (ML041750356)
PB-Z	Mr. Robert Reynolds	ORBIS Corporation	Letter (ML041750358)
PB-AA	Ms. Kathryn L. Smith	Citizen	Letter (ML041750360)
PB-AB	Ms. Cheryl Brocher	Citizen	Letter (ML041750361)
PB-AC	Mr. Richard Wagner	Trega Foods	Letter (ML041750364)
PB-AD	Mr. Kenneth J. Petersen	Sheriff, Manitowoc County	Letter (ML041750365)
PB-AE	J. A. Mellowes	Charter Mfg. Co.	Letter (ML041750366)
PB-AF	Mr. Richard W. Wanta	Wisconsin Underground Contractors Association	Letter (ML041750367)
PB-AG	Mr. David J. Jenkins	Wisconsin Federation of Cooperatives	Letter (ML041750369)
PB-AH	Mr. Chad E. Cordle	Cellu Tissue Neenah	Letter (ML041830247)
PB-AI	Mr. William J. Welch	Fox Cities Chamber of Commerce and Industry	Letter (ML041830250)
PB-AJ	Mr. Zach Pahmahmie	Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation	Letter (ML041890189)
PB-AK	Mr. Steve Bongers	Outokumpu Copper Valleycast	Letter (ML041940367)
PB-AL	Mr. John H. Goetsch	Citizen	Letter (ML041940378)
PB-AM	Mr. Earl Gustafson	Wisconsin Paper Council	Letter (ML041980016)
PB-AN	Mr. James J. Graf	Alderman, City of Sheboygan	Letter (ML041980024)
PB-AO	Mr. Herman Viets	Milwaukee School of Engineering	Letter (ML041980026)
PB-AP	Mr. R. J. Pirlot	Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce	Letter (ML042010179)
PB-AQ	Mr. John H. Meinke	Neenah Technical Center	Letter (ML041970655)
PB-AR	Mr. Donald Kaye	Citizen	Letter (ML041970654)

Scoping Summary Report

Commenter ID	Commenter	Affiliation (If Stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession Number^(a)
PB-AS	Mr. Orville Krueger	Citizen	Letter (ML041970650)
PB-AT	Mr. Bob DeKoch	The Boldt Company	Letter (ML041980013)
PB-AU	Mr. Joseph H. Pomeroy	Mercury Marine	Letter (ML041980021)
PB-AV	Mr. Allen J. Prochnow	Concordia University	Letter (ML042010181)
PB-AW	Mr. Daniel J. Sutheimer	Pierce Manufacturing	Letter (ML042170122)
PB-AX	Mr. Kenneth Westlake	U. S. EPA	Letter (ML041910394)
PB-AY	Mr. Don C. Markwardt	Chair, Legislative Review Committee Manitowoc County Board of Supervisors	Letter (ML042150282)
PB-AZ	Mr. Joe Leibham	Wisconsin State Senator, 9 th Senate District	Letter (ML042170106)
PB-BA	Mr. George P. Brown	Regional Director, Humana, Inc.	Letter (ML042170114)
PB-BB	Mr. Carl Otter	Citizen	Letter (ML042170117)
PB-BC	Ms. Carol Roessler	Wisconsin State Senator, 18 th Senate District	Letter (ML042170118)
PB-BD	Dr. John G. Gonis	Dental Associates, Ltd.	Letter (ML042170119)
PB-BE	Mr. Edward J. Zore	President and Chief Executive Officer, Northwestern Mutual	Letter (ML042170120)
PB-BF	Mr. Jeffrey S. Mason	Chief Executive Officer, BayCare Health Systems, LLC	Letter (ML042170121)
PB-BG	Mr. Steve Bongers	Outokumpu Copper Valleycast	Letter (ML041970658)

(a) The afternoon and evening transcripts can be found under accession number ML041960121.

**Point Beach Nuclear Plant (PBNP), Units 1 and 2
Public Scoping Meeting
Comments and Responses**

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

1. Comments in Support of License Renewal at Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2

Comment: ... I'm not only here for myself in support, but I think the majority of the people I represent are also supportive of the continued operation of the nuclear power plant here at Point Beach.
(PB-A-1)

Comment: So it brings people to the area, provides good jobs as well as providing a large amount of electricity and right now, low cost provision of electricity and hopefully it will be low cost in the future.
(PB-A-2)

Comment: We'd like you to renew and we'd like them to renew their license and put in new generation when theirs expire now.
(PB-A-5)

Comment: Point Beach has proven to be a good neighbor and an asset to the Manitowoc County community. We look forward to a lasting relationship and encourage license renewal.
(PB-B-3)

Comment: I would consider them to be an excellent neighbor. My reasons are my observations over the last 24 years about how they react to us with our concerns. The lines of communication are open. But what's more important, they listen. And I do believe that they truly do care about the people of Manitowoc County.
(PB-B-7)

Comment: I'm here today representing the city of Two Rivers, as directed by our City Council, to deliver a resolution unanimously adopted by our City Council in April endorsing the license renewal for Point Beach Units 1 and 2. I would echo the Sheriff's comments in the Point Beach Plant has been a good neighbor to our community for over 30 years.
(PB-C-1)

Comment: So we're certainly mindful and respectful of the role that the NRC has to play in terms of the issues of plant security, safety and environmental impact. But I guess the message I'd like to get out from our community is we have great faith in that process and the capabilities of the NRC and in the capabilities of our friends and neighbors at WE Energies and the Point Beach Nuclear Plant to address those issues, because this is their home as well.
(PB-C-4)

Scoping Summary Report

Comment: And I would comment that in my nine years as the Chief Appointed Officer in our community I have never yet had a call from a citizen or heard input from a citizen of our area at a local public meeting expressing concerns about the plant and its impact on our area.

(PB-C-5)

Comment: This plant's a great neighbor and we look forward to seeing another 20 years if not more of continued safe economical operation, and we thank you.

(PB-C-8)

Comment: But, as Mr. Buckley, from the City of Two Rivers had said, we and the citizens of the Village of Mishicot truly respect the power plant economically for our area and we just hope that it continues for the next 20, 30, 40 years.

(PB-D-1)

Comment: At Point Beach our number one priority is always the health and safety of the public. Point Beach has operated safely and reliably for over 30 years. We are committed to maintaining the high standards of safety and environmental excellence required to operate an additional 20 years.

(PB-E-1)

Comment: Our key values include being both a good neighbor and an advocate of the environment that we operate in.

(PB-F-2)

Comment: In conclusion, the Nuclear Management Company remains committed to operating Point Beach safely, reliably, economically, and will remain focused on being a good neighbor and a strong advocate of our environment. I and the rest of the employees at Point Beach look forward to serving you and meeting the needs of our community for many years to come.

(PB-F-11)

Comment: I'm in favor of extending the license for 20 years or 30 or 40.

(PB-H-1)

Comment: And I wrote a letter which I'm also going to submit and it's, the Two Rivers Business Association is very much in favor of extending the license of Point Beach Nuclear Plant.

(PB-I-1)

Comment: So if they live in our community and feel that Point Beach is safe and environmentally safe and safe in all other regards, then I feel that it's safe for me also.

(PB-I-2)

Comment: The Union would like to comment in favor of license renewal at Point Beach. Local 2150 believes Point Beach is an asset to the community and state of Wisconsin. The Union consistently works with Point Beach management to ensure the continued safe operation of Point Beach. Point Beach is operated with nuclear safety as the highest priority and I believe continued

Scoping Summary Report

operation of Point Beach would be a positive for the State of Wisconsin and Manitowoc County.
(PB-J-1)

Comment: I'm here in an official capacity. The Board of Directors of the Two Rivers Main Street, Incorporated has voted a resolution supporting the license renewal for Point Beach Nuclear Plant. We feel that Point Beach is not only a valuable neighbor, but a valuable employer who provides a livelihood for a great many citizens. They are a good corporate citizen to the folks in Two Rivers.

(PB-K-1)

Comment: I'm speaking today in favor of relicensing of the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant for 20, 30 or 40 years, whatever.

(PB-L-1)

Comment: The nuclear power plant has been a good neighbor to the residents that live around it. It's been a good neighbor to the local government that interacts with it. And it's been a good neighbor to all different types of emergency services in Manitowoc County.

(PB-L-3)

Comment: I would urge the people in charge in the decision making area of the relicensing procedure to support that relicensing and to continue the operation of the plant.

(PB-L-6)

Comment: "Point Beach has proven to be a good neighbor and an asset to the Manitowoc County community. We look forward to a lasting relationship and encourage license renewal. Sincerely, Kenneth J. Peterson, Sheriff, Manitowoc County."

(PB-M-2)

Comment: Basically, the City of Two Rivers offers its support for Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant license renewal for Unit No. 1 which needs to be renewed as indicated before October 5th, 2010, and Unit 2 which needs to be renewed by March 8th, 2013.

(PB-N-1)

Comment: This process of license renewal is not new for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. As the Doctor had indicated before, Point Beach Nuclear Power is one of 19 active license renewals. As a matter of fact, 23 have already been approved by the NRC. Our experience indicates that Point Beach Nuclear Power is an excellent candidate for license renewal.

(PB-N-8)

Comment: We urge the NRC to approve the license renewal for Point Beach Nuclear Power in order that all stakeholders can share in the win-win-win relationship.

(PB-N-11)

Comment: Part of that application included an environmental report, and we will continue to provide additional information as part of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's process to evaluate the environmental effects of operating Point Beach for an additional 20 years. The NRC

Scoping Summary Report

will use the information that we and others provide to develop an environmental impact statement for Point Beach.

(PB-O-1)

Comment: At Point Beach, our number one priority is always the health and safety of the public. Point Beach has operated safely and reliably for over 30 years. We are committed to maintaining the high standards of safety and environmental excellence required to operate an additional 20 years.

(PB-O-2)

Comment: Our key values include being both a good neighbor and being a strong advocate of the environment in which we operate.

(PB-P-2)

Comment: NMC remains committed to operating Point Beach safely, reliably and economically and will remain focused on being a good neighbor and a strong advocate of our environment. I and the rest of the employees at Point Beach look forward to serving you and meeting the needs of the community for many years to come.

(PB-P-11)

Comment: We've been producing safe, reliable, environmentally friendly power for 30 years now, and I believe the right thing to do is have a license extension.

(PB-Q-1)

Comment: I think it's necessary that we maintain this plant.

(PB-R-2)

Comment: This letter is written in support of the Nuclear Management Company's application with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which seeks License Renewal for the two units at Point Beach Nuclear Plant.

(PB-S-1)

Comment: This letter is in support of the license renewal for the two units at the Point Beach nuclear plant.

(PB-U -1)

Comment: In addition, the two units at Point Beach are safe and environmentally friendly.

(PB-U-3)

Comment: As a Wisconsin State Representative, and also a member of the Wisconsin assembly committee on Energy & Utilities, I write you today to urge the license renewal of the two nuclear reactors at Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant, located in Two Creeks, Wisconsin.

(PB-V-1)

Comment: Whatever it takes to extend the operating permit, nuclear power is the only source of electric power that doesn't deplete resources or pollute (*sic*). We need more Point Beaches.

(PB-W-1)

Scoping Summary Report

Comment: As a director responsible for the energy expenses of a significant business I wish to offer my support for the license renewal for Point Beach nuclear plants 1 & 2.
(PB-Y-1)

Comment: Please accept this letter as endorsement for the relicensure of the Point Beach facility.
(PB-Z-3)

Comment: I would like to see Point Beach stay open. I've worked for the plant for almost 7 years now.
(PB-AA-1)

Comment: Please consider extending our license, for everyone's sake.
(PB-AB-1)

Comment: We herein desire to register our support of the Point Beach license renewal
(PB-AC-1)

Comment: The power plant has provided needed equipment and allowed access to facilities for training. Point Beach has proven to be a good neighbor and an asset to the Manitowoc County Community. We look forward to a lasting relationship and encourage license renewal.
(PB-AD-1)

Comment: Charter Steel is a member of the Wisconsin Coalition of Energy Consumers (WCEC) and a Charter Steel representative serves as a co-chair for this group. This group of large energy consumers has publicly supported the need to relicense Point Beach. WCEC will be a supportive intervener in the proceedings to make sure the re-licensing is done in a cost effective manner, the rate of return for We Energies is reasonable and in the best interest of the ratepayers.
(PB-AE-5)

Comment: The Wisconsin Underground Contractors Association (WUCA) supports We Energies License Renewal of Point Beach.
(PB-AF-1)

Comment: Though none of our members has a wholesale power contract with We Energies, the continued operation of both units at Point Beach are beneficial to us and to all electric consumers in the state.
(PB-AG-1)

Comment: We strongly urge and respectfully request that the Commission renew the licenses at both Point Beach Units.
(PB-AG-6)

Comment: I am in favor of the license renewal for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant.
(PB-AH-1)

Scoping Summary Report

Comment: I am writing to express our support for the license renewal of Units 1 and 2 of the Point Beach Nuclear facilities located at Two Creeks, Wisconsin.
(PB-AI-1)

Comment: The Fox Cities Chamber of Commerce and Industry supports license renewal for Point Beach because it believes nuclear power can meet the economic requirement of a deregulated market.
(PB-AI-6)

Comment: We have no objections to the following project(s): US Nuclear Regulatory Commission Review of Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2 License Renewal Application.
(PB-AJ-1)

Comment: This letter is being written in support of the application submitted by Nuclear Management Company (NMC) on behalf of We Energies to renew the operating license for the two nuclear reactors at the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant in Two Creeks, WI.
(PB-AK-1, PB-BG-1)

Comment: Again, we urge your approval of their application.
(PB-AK-4, PB-BG-4)

Comment: This is to express my support for the request recently filed by Nuclear Management Company to extend the operating licenses for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant.
(PB-AL-1)

Comment: The Wisconsin Paper Council supports license renewal for the Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant, owned by Wisconsin Energy Corporation, and operated by the Nuclear Management Corporation.
(PB-AM-1)

Comment: I am writing to encourage you to renew Point Beach's Unit One and Two licenses so Wisconsin Residents and businesses can benefit from 20 more years of clean, efficient and affordable nuclear power.
(PB-AN-1, PB-AR-1, PB-AT-1, PB-AU-1, PB-AZ-1, PB-BA-1, PB-BB-1, PB-BC-1, PB-BD-1, PB-BF-1)

Comment: I am pleased to write in support of the WE Energies Point Beach license renewal.
(PB-AO-1)

Comment: WMC supports the License Renewal applications for the Point Beach reactors for critical reasons of electric energy supply reliability, electricity affordability for Wisconsin consumers, and environmental factors. Point Beach has been a vital part of Wisconsin's electric generation portfolio for over three decades. The plant has delivered inexpensive, reliable baseload electric generation safely, consistently and with few incidents in its long life of service to Wisconsin utilities and their customers.
(PB-AP-1)

Scoping Summary Report

Comment: I am writing this letter in support of The Nuclear Management Company which has filed an application with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, on behalf of We Energies, seeking license renewal for the two units at Point Beach Nuclear Plant.
(PB-AQ-1)

Comment: I see no reason not to extend the license of Units One and Two at Point Beach.
(PB-AS-1)

Comment: I'm writing in support of the We Energies' Point Beach license renewal application.
(PB-AV-1, PB-BE-1)

Comment: I am writing this letter in support of the license renewal for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant.
(PB-AW-1)

Comment: The Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant has been a good neighbor to the communities within Manitowoc County for over three decades.
(PB-AY-4)

Comment: NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitowoc County Board of Supervisors supports the renewal of the licenses for the nuclear generation facilities at Point Beach.
(PB-AY-5)

Comment: I ask that you grant approval for Point Beach's application for license renewal.
(PB-AN-6, PB-AR-6, PB-AT-6, PB-AU-6, PB-AZ-6, PB-BA-6, PB-BB-6, PB-BC-6, PB-BD-6, PB-BF-6)

Response: *The comments are noted. The comments are supportive of license renewal and are general in nature. The comments did not provide significant, new information and therefore, they will not be evaluated further.*

2. Comments in Opposition of License Renewal at Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2

Comment: Two people have testified at least, maybe three or four here, about the low cost of the nuclear power. And that is true if you don't take into the account the subsidies for all sorts of things which would include the lack of care at numerous facilities around. Someone said that the majority of Wisconsin, or this area, supports the plant. I'm sorry, but I have never seen evidence to that. That's just a statement made without any factual basis.
(PB-G-1)

Comment: So I am not in favor of renewing the permit at all, let alone 20 years.
(PB-G-7)

Response: *The comments are noted. The comments oppose license renewal and are general in nature. The comments do not provide significant, new information and therefore, they will not*

be evaluated further.

3. Comments Concerning Terrestrial Resource Issues

Comment: We take great strides in our daily activities to ensure that the environment is well protected. Our employees feel fortunate that the location of Point Beach is along Lake Michigan and reaches to within the Point Beach State Park area. The site is home to numerous wildlife, aquatic species and plant life. Our efforts have made Point Beach a safe and sound habitat for many years and it's our commitment to maintain that habitat for years to come.
(PB-F-9)

Comment: The trees, the flowers, the weeds and grass, they're still growing, growing good.
(PB-H-5)

Comment: We take great strides in our daily activities to ensure that the environment is well protected. Our employees feel fortunate that Point Beach is located on the shores of Lake Michigan. The site is home to numerous wildlife, aquatic species and plant life. Our efforts have made Point Beach a safe and sound habitat for many years and it is our commitment to maintain that habitat for many years to come.
(PB-P-9)

Response: *Terrestrial resource issues were evaluated in the GEIS and determined to be Category 1 issues. The comments do not provide significant, new information and therefore, they will not be evaluated further.*

4. Comments Concerning Aquatic Ecology Issues

Comment: We expect the draft SEIS to discuss the effects of thermal discharge on the lake and fish communities. Currently, the State of Wisconsin does not have active thermal water quality standards, though an advisory group is in the process of developing new standards. The new standards may be in place, or exist in draft form, by the time of license renewal. The draft SEIS should address the applicability of the upcoming State standards to Point Beach. Regardless of permit conditions, however, temperature effects from plant operation should be included in the draft SEIS, as part of assessing impacts to the environment.
(PB-AX-3)

Comment: During the plant audit tour it was mentioned that Point Beach will need to comply with the newly revised Clean Water Act Section 316(b), which regulates impacts of cooling water intakes. The draft SEIS should indicate modifications planned by the applicant to comply with the rule.
(PB-AX-4)

Response: *The comments relate to aquatic ecology issues and will be discussed in Chapters 2 and 4 of the SEIS.*

5. Comments Concerning Water Quality Issues

Comment: As part of describing site hydrogeology, the draft SEIS should discuss the on-site drinking water wells, drinking water quality, and treatment of the drinking water. In addition, we believe the potential for ground water contamination should be described in the draft SEIS, especially with regard to the abandoned settling pond.
(PB-AX-5)

Response: *The comment is noted. Water quality, water use, and other water issues were evaluated in the GEIS and determined to be Category 1 issues. The comment provides no significant, new information on water quality; therefore, the comment will not be evaluated further. Water quality will be discussed in Chapters 2 and 4 of the SEIS.*

6. Comments Concerning Air Quality Issues

Comment: It's protected the environment by not having any CO2 going into the air or mercury or sulfur dioxide.
(PB-H-3)

Comment: With respect to environmental concerns, it is significant that the southeast area of Wisconsin has been and remains a closely watched non-attainment area for purposes of federal Clean Air Act enforcement. As a result, all new sources of monitored emissions will carry added burdens of expensive remediation measures which are not required for the commensurate amount of nuclear generation produced at Point Beach. While these costs are known in some cases, as in the instance of sulfur dioxide, other remediation expenses, such as those for nitrogen oxide and mercury emissions are evolving in their estimates and could prove prohibitively expensive for new coal generation sources. The picture gets murkier when regional ozone transport issues and fine particulate emissions regulation are added. It is thus vital for Wisconsin's future air quality to keep a non-emitting source of generation the size of Point Beach in its generation portfolio.
(PB-AP-4)

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

7. Comments Concerning Socioeconomic Issues

Comment: Now, going back 24 years we, the Sheriff's Department formed what was called an Emergency Response Unit or SWAT Team. At that point, Point Beach was their force. We needed support financially and assist with training in order to get that unit off the ground.
(PB-B-4)

Comment: The Energy Information Center has provided educational programs for more than 300,000 of these visitors. Most of these are school groups that have made our energy center a

Scoping Summary Report

staple in their curriculum. We continue to host school groups and other organizations through reservation at this point.

(PB-F-10)

Comment: And when you go around the plant, you can't get in it anymore, there used to be some good fishing there. The fishermen are gone due to security problems. But the fish are still there.

(PB-H-4)

Comment: Point Beach itself, as a plant, is very friendly to our community. It supports a lot of our events. One of our biggest events and services is our ethnic festival and they're one of the major sponsors of that event.

(PB-I-3)

Comment: And additionally, my newest position as executive for Big Brothers/Big Sisters, I can attest that Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant has been very supportive of local non-profit service agencies as well. Without the support of the local community these service agencies could not exist and do the good work that they do for our communities.

(PB-L-4)

Comment: All previous companies relocated to Mexico, or in Hamilton's case has a potential to leave for Mexico. Power companies do not have the luxury of leaving for Mexico. They are here for the long haul. Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant has been a good corporate citizen by annually contributing to the excellent quality of life for the families right here in Two Rivers.

(PB-N-6)

Comment: The Energy Information Center has provided educational programs for more than 300,000 of these visitors. Most of these are school groups, most of them are local school groups that have made our energy center a staple in their curriculum. We continue to host school groups and other organizations through reservations.

(PB-P-10)

Comment: We also know that when you look at socioeconomic factors that the Point Beach Plant is a huge factor in our local economy with approximately 700 high quality jobs having a significant economic impact in the communities of Two Rivers, Manitowoc and, as Representative Lasee noted, throughout northeast Wisconsin. That's in addition to the significant impact of the many contractors employed at the facility and extensive purchases of goods and services throughout the area.

(PB-C-3)

Comment: Point Beach also generates significant economic benefits to the local and state economy. Point Beach provides over 700 full time family supporting jobs. Those families purchase goods and services from local businesses, pay taxes in area communities and contribute to local charities and community organizations. Point Beach is committed to being a good neighbor and fostering continued economic growth in the region.

(PB-E-10)

Scoping Summary Report

Comment: Regardless of where power is being shipped right now, we believe that power generation is crucial to the future of Wisconsin, to attracting new industries, to attracting the kind of jobs that we need to rebuild from the industries that have left over the last 10 years or so. Point Beach has always provided safe, clean nuclear power to Wisconsin and wherever else that it ships it along the grid.

(PB-K-2)

Comment: And as previously stated, they employ 700 people in good quality jobs which are desperately needed in the Manitowoc County area.

(PB-L-5)

Comment: Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant started in 1969 and brought 100 employees and has seen a 700 percent increase in its workforce to the existing 700 employees in 2004. Energy production is a significant employer in our community now and hopefully will be well into the future. These are high quality jobs that are hard to find in today's economy.

(PB-N-2)

Comment: The economic impact of the 700 employees at Point Beach Nuclear Power can be felt in the local communities where they live. 69 percent of Point Beach Nuclear Plant employees live in Manitowoc County.

(PB-N-5)

Comment: Finally and in conclusion, the license renewal of Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant presents a unique opportunity to create a win-win-win scenario for the rate payers, taxpayers, the state and our community by: ...(2) preserving hundreds of well-paying jobs that help attract young, successful people to Wisconsin and the Lake Shore area.

(PB-N-10)

Comment: Point Beach also generates significant economic benefits to the local and state economy. Point Beach provides over 700 full-time family supporting jobs. These families purchase goods and services from local businesses, pay taxes in local communities and contribute to local charities and community organizations. Point Beach is committed to being a good neighbor and fostering continued economic growth in the region.

(PB-O-10)

Comment: The continued operation of Point Beach is vital to meeting Wisconsin's energy needs. It's important to the local economy and important to more than 700 employees who keep it running everyday safely.

(PB-E-11, PB-O-11)

Comment: Finally, Wisconsin benefits from the economic benefit of Point Beach and the 700 family supporting jobs that these nuclear facilities provide.

(PB-S-3)

Comment: In response to your letter dated May 14, 2004, the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians would like to express **NO CONCERNS** with any impacts to historic properties located within the project area of potential effect for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant,

Scoping Summary Report

located on the western shore of Lake Michigan in Two Rivers, Wisconsin.
(PB-T-1)

Comment: Fortunately through both the business and environmental stewardship of WE-Energies, Wisconsin continues to be a state that supports manufacturing jobs through energy management and growth.
(PB-Z-2)

Comment: I see this as a positive item for the community. With all the manufacturing leaving this area, we are about the only place left that is a big contributor to the local economy.
(PB-AA-2)

Comment: Another important reason for Point Beach to stay is our economy. We have lost so many industrial jobs in the county. We need the jobs that Point Beach provides. Without it, our county would really be in bad shape.
(PB-AB-4)

Comment: In addition, the plant employs over 700 family supporting jobs, while providing significant economic benefits to the state and the local economy.
(PB-AE-4)

Comment: Lastly, the Point Beach Nuclear Plant provides 700 family supporting jobs in addition to other significant economic benefits to the State of Wisconsin and the local economy.
(PB-AF-3)

Comment: At this time, we are unaware of any historical cultural resources in the proposed development area. However, we do request to be immediately contacted if any inadvertent discoveries are uncovered at anytime throughout the various phases of the project.
(PB-AJ-2)

Comment: The continued operation of its two units for another 20 years will be a significant benefit to Wisconsin's economy.
(PB-AM-4)

Comment: Located in Two Creeks, the Point Beach facility employs approximately 730 area residents with family-sustaining jobs.
(PB-AN-2, PB-AR-2, PB-AT-2, PB-AU-2, PB-AZ-2, PB-BB-2, PB-BC-2, PB-BD-2, PB-BF-2)

Comment: It's significant contribution to Wisconsin's energy generation is priceless to the economic development of our region and quality of life of our residents.
(PB-AN-4, PB-AR-4, PB-AT-4, PB-AU-4, PB-AZ-4, PB-BA-4, PB-BB-4, PB-BC-4, PB-BD-4, PB-BF-4)

Comment: The stability of energy availability has been absolutely essential to the growth of my institution and the growth of the business partners who support this institution. Any interruption of these energy sources will have dire consequences, particularly for existing businesses in the area and for Wisconsin's ability to build and attract new business. It is essential to the economic

Scoping Summary Report

success of this region to have the Point Beach Nuclear Plant's license renewed.
(PB-AO-3)

Comment: Continued operation of the Point Beach plant is key to providing an overall climate of economic health and growth in the local area as well as throughout the state.
(PB-AQ-3)

Comment: If nuclear power is no longer part of that energy mix, businesses throughout the state will be faced with serious economic issues and the potential for new businesses coming into the area will be limited.
(PB-AV-5)

Comment: The Point Beach Nuclear plant is an important part of keeping Wisconsin business competitive in the nation and around the world.
(PB-AW-4)

Comment: The 700 permanent jobs at Point Beach and the extensive use of contracts for ongoing maintenance and special projects are recognized as vitally important to the economy of Manitowoc County and Northeast Wisconsin.
(PB-AY-3)

Comment: While the Point Beach facility employees approximately 730 area residents with family-sustaining jobs, clean, reliable, and efficient energy is critical to many businesses affecting many thousands of jobs.
(PB-BA-2)

Comment: If nuclear power is no longer part of that energy mix, business throughout the state could be faced with serious economic issues and the potential for new businesses coming into the area will be limited.
(PB-BE-4)

Response: *Public services involving education, social services, and recreation were evaluated in the GEIS and were determined to be Category 1 issues. Those comments related to these public service issues provide no significant, new information and therefore, those comments will not be evaluated further. Socioeconomic issues specific to Point Beach are Category 2 issues and will be addressed in Chapters 2 and 4 of the SEIS.*

8. Comments Concerning Human Health Issues

Comment: But I have some very, very serious concerns about public health.
(PB-G-5)

Comment: The draft SEIS should discuss planned or potential power uprates at Point Beach 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 consider power uprates to be 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 draft SEIS.
(PB-AX-1)

Response: *Human health issues were evaluated in the GEIS and were determined to be Category 1 issues. The comments provide no significant, new information on these issues, and therefore, will not be evaluated further. Human health issues will be addressed in Chapter 4 of the SEIS.*

9. Comments Concerning Uranium Fuel Cycle and Waste Management

Comment: Some people will say that nuclear waste is an issue and I've been to Yucca Mountain and looked at it quite a bit and I'm not a science expert, although I can read things and take a good hard look at it. And I think that's a good place to put spent fuel.
(PB-A-3)

Comment: So I view Yucca Mountain, unlike the government does, the government I think views it as a permanent repository. I view it as a much more short term repository until we find a better use for that waste that we're generating here and storing on-site. And I would urge the federal government to get going so we can move some of that stuff out of here and take it to Yucca Mountain.
(PB-A-4)

Comment: That goes to operational issues, that goes to the dry cask storage issue which we realize is still an interim fix and we want to frankly keep our federal politician's feet to the fire on a permanent solution to that issue which our rate payers have paid for.
(PB-C-6)

Comment: So the solution to the waste? It looks like it could be Wisconsin, right in our area, and the Canadian Shield, the Wolf River -- which is nice and solid. It doesn't have any earthquake problems and I don't like the idea of our area being turned into a nuclear waste repository.
(PB-G-3)

Comment: Like all nuclear reactors, Point Beach produces spent fuel. The overwhelming majority of both houses of Congress have expressed their will that the spent fuel storage repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, be made operational.
(PB-AG-4)

Comment: In addition, the draft SEIS should discuss spent fuel storage capacity and spent fuel transportation issues that may arise from power uprates.
(PB-AX-2)

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

10. Comments Concerning Alternatives

Comment: Nuclear power is the way to go. We won't be here, but oil won't last forever, neither will coal.
(PB-H-2)

Comment: And I asked him what he thought about nuclear power. And he feels that nuclear power is the safest, most practical form of energy that we can have, outside of solar energy and wind power. Much more practical, much safer than coal, oil or any other forms of energy.
(PB-I-4)

Comment: If Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant's license is not renewed, its electrical generation capacity would have to be replaced. The likely replacement is some sort of fossil fuel. As air quality becomes more and more of an issue in Wisconsin, especially along the Lake Shore which sees much of its pollution, air pollution that is imported, the license renewal of Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant can serve to help protect our local environment.
(PB-N-7)

Comment: New coal plants are being proposed for southeast Wisconsin but are vigorously opposed by local residents. Wind generators are also planned but nowhere near 1000 megawatts. New natural gas plants are under construction. However, these are presumably peaking plants not base-load as is Point Beach. Further, an article in the June 14 Wall Street Journal points out that not only is natural gas becoming very expensive but that the availability is in question. To quote: "The underlying demand from the power sector is such that you are always going to be strained to meet the demand on the supply side." The Wisconsin transmission system is generally considered inadequate to import large amounts of power and new lines are planned but are also opposed by many residents.
(PB-X-2)

Comment: To replace this power production today would not only mean a large capital investment but either the environmental damage of a (sic) burning coal or the use of precious natural gas which is needed for heating our homes. Nuclear plants still represent the most environmentally sound form of energy production we have available to us and keeping this plant operational as long as possible is critical to Wisconsin's economy and environment.
(PB-Y-3)

Comment: We don't need any more polluted air. Clean production of electricity is crucial to our environment.
(PB-AB-2)

Comment: Continued operation of this particular nuclear plant as such will enable our utility to have time to obtain newer nuclear technology as it becomes available. Continued operation of this particular nuclear plant as such will enable our utility to have some breathing room and transition time as they explore and act to bring much more renewable energy supplies on line.
(PB-AC-3)

Scoping Summary Report

Comment: Technically, nuclear energy output comes without any of the environmental impacts to the atmosphere that coal, natural gas, or other fuels have.
(PB-AC-5)

Comment: The current trend in the electric industry is to rely more heavily on natural gas-fired plants. We have seen the cost of natural gas for summer rise from \$ 3.00/dth to over \$ 6.00/dth over the last several years. Siting and constructing of new power plants is expensive and difficult. With consideration to the projected maintenance cost, usually the best investment is to maintain existing facilities.
(PB-AE-2)

Comment: Point Beach is a zero-emissions resource. Only hydroelectric and some (not all) renewable resources have zero emissions. This is especially beneficial in an area of the state which has close proximity to Lake Michigan and urban areas such as Milwaukee.
(PB-AG-3)

Comment: License renewal is expected to cost \$22 million which Wisconsin Energy projects to be \$474 million more economical than other options, such as building a new fossil fuel plant or purchasing replacement power.
(PB-AM-5)

Comment: Nuclear power also represents, and will continue to represent, the most cost-effective electricity to produce in Wisconsin and nationwide. Recent data provided by the Nuclear Energy Institute show nuclear energy surpassing coal in overall fuel production cost effectiveness, with none of the attendant emissions-related concerns of coal-fired generation. In contrast, the alternative generation construction required to replace the output of Point Beach, in the event of an untimely retirement, would necessarily rely upon natural gas or coal. Natural gas prices have reached nearly historic levels of expense and volatility, with further use in electricity production likely to cause further price flux and supply displacement for manufacturing and home heating needs. Coal generation carries very large capital costs, long construction cycles and protracted public opposition. None of these alternatives to Point Beach represent good choices for Wisconsin ratepayers, who already face sizable rate increases once currently pending generation and transmission upgrades begin commercial operation.
(PB-AP-3)

Response: *The GEIS included an extensive discussion of alternative energy sources. Environmental impacts from reasonable alternatives to renewal of the operating licenses for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2 will be evaluated in Chapter 8 of the SEIS.*

11. Comments Concerning Issues Outside the Scope of License Renewal

General Statement Issues

Comment: In addition to cost effective energy sources, we also must consider the state's transmission infrastructure. Wisconsin's transmission system is severely constrained in its ability

Scoping Summary Report

to transport power into and move power within the state. The geographic location of Point Beach and the load support it provides are critical to maintaining a stable, reliable power supply to northeast Wisconsin.

(PB-E-9)

Comment: Nuclear energy in general, and Point Beach in particular, have proven to be safe, efficient and an economical source of electricity.

(PB-N-3)

Comment: Getting on to the present, the city fathers who are the leaders, the decision makers of the community find that Point Beach Nuclear Power has operated safely and efficiently and provides clean, affordable nuclear generated electrical power to our homes, businesses and factories.

(PB-N-4)

Comment: In addition to cost effective energy sources, we must also consider the state's transmission infrastructure. Wisconsin's transmission infrastructure is severely constrained in its ability to transport power into the state and move power within the state. The geographic location of Point Beach and the load support it supplies in this part of the state are critical to maintaining a stable, reliable power supply to Northeast Wisconsin.

(PB-O-9)

Comment: As a large user of electricity in Southeastern Wisconsin, we believe nuclear power is a necessary safe, reliable and affordable energy source. Nuclear power is an important, integral and necessary component to meeting the future electrical needs of Wisconsin.

(PB-S-2)

Comment: The renewal of these licenses is vital not only for the continued operation of the plant, but also for the future of the state of Wisconsin and indeed the entire Midwest.

(PB-V-2)

Comment: The nuclear plant at Point Beach currently provides approximately one-sixth of all electrical power in Wisconsin. To take this plant offline would force massive purchases of power from other states or the construction of new baseload generating plants, which both would be devastating to the ratepayers of Wisconsin, and could possibly place a huge burden on the transmission grid in the Midwest causing it to become unstable.

(PB-V-3)

Comment: Point Beach has provided over 20% of the electrical power for Wisconsin Electric Power Company since the early 1970s. If the licenses are NOT extended, it will be almost impossible to replace that generating capacity by the end of the present licenses.

(PB-X-1)

Comment: Point Beach is a reliable electricity resource. Because of Wisconsin's severe transmission constraints, more pressure than usual is placed on the reliable operation of the state's indigenous electric generators. Point Beach has reliably contributed about one-sixth of the state's electricity supply and nearly 25% of We Energies generation capability. This is

Scoping Summary Report

extremely important for all utilities in Wisconsin. Instability or outages at Point Beach can affect the entire state. Having a reliable baseload plant in its present location is very important to the stability of the state's transmission system.

(PB-AG-5)

Comment: Sustaining the economic future of our state will require that we are capable of meeting the demand for electricity. We must insure we can meet our future energy requirements by providing a reliable and affordable generating and distribution system to serve the state.

(PB-AI-2)

Comment: Clearly, our strategy will need to depend upon a variety of generating sources; coal, nuclear, hydroelectric, wind, solar, and natural gas all need to be a part of the equation. We believe that extending the license of nuclear facilities like Point Beach is a key component of the strategy we need to employ. During the period 2000 to 2015 a total of 47 U. S. nuclear power plants are scheduled to reach the end of their 40 year operating licenses. Those 47 plants represent a net electric generating capacity of 34.5 GWe, approximately 35% of installed nuclear generation.

(PB-AI-3)

Comment: In Wisconsin, Point Beach produces about one-sixth of all electrical power in the state, and approximately 24 percent of We Energies' total generation. The base-load energy produced at Point Beach is needed to meet the current customer demands. As the state's energy demand continues to grow at a rate of 2.5 to 3 percent annually, reliance on clean, affordable, and safe nuclear power is critical.

(PB-AI-4)

Comment: This is especially true if performance continues to improve. License renewal can pay for itself by increasing plant performance over the short term, and reducing maintenance costs in the long term.

(PB-AI-7)

Comment: These reactors supply about one-sixth of all of Wisconsin's electrical power and roughly 24% of all We Energies total generation. Outokumpu Copper Valley LLC (OCV.) is the largest electrical user in this area and obviously relies heavily upon We Energies ability to consistently and reliably deliver electrical power to support our operations.

(PB-AK-2, PB-BG-2)

Comment: Information provided to us by Wisconsin Energy, and data that are available through various public records, highlight the importance of license renewable for this major electricity-generating facility. Rated at 1,036 megawatts, it represents approximately 24% of the output of Wisconsin Electric Power Company' - which is Wisconsin Energy's regulated electric utility - and approximately 16% of the total electrical output by all utilities in the state.

(PB-AM-2)

Comment: The plant has been a safe, consistent producer of economical power for the utility's customers.

(PB-AM-3)

Scoping Summary Report

Comment: Additionally, Wisconsin is addressing serious electric reliability challenges - both in generation and transmission - at the same time that developments related to the Midwest Independent System Operator are causing substantial concerns about the ability of the state to access reliable, affordable electricity in coming years. Point Beach's output thus will be vital to the state in meeting in-state demand and supporting the grid during this critical period for retail customers in Wisconsin.
(PB-AM-6)

Comment: Approval of this application is one way we can ensure Wisconsin residents are not faced with an unnecessary energy shortage, and that Wisconsin's economic recovery is not curtailed.
(PB-AN-5, PB-AR-5, PB-AT-5, PB-AU-5, PB-AZ-5, PB-BA-5, PB-BB-5, PB-BC-5, PB-BD-5, PB-BF-5)

Comment: While there is great sentimental interest in alternate sources of energy, the truth is we are absolutely dependent upon nuclear energy. Nuclear energy is affordable and reliable and our modern society could not exist without this steady source. The energy produced at the Point Beach Nuclear Plant is an essential part of Wisconsin's energy portfolio. We cannot hope to meet our current energy needs without the nuclear component. As we look to the future, additional energy will be needed and a portion of these new plants will need to be nuclear. We cannot hope to meet current energy demands, let alone future demands, without nuclear plants, specifically, the Point Beach Nuclear Plant.
(PB-AO-2)

Comment: Continued supply of reliable and affordable energy for our facility, the Neenah Technical Center, is critical for the operation of this facility for years to come.
(PB-AQ-2)

Comment: The site is a beautiful addition to the electrical grid which serves our nation.
(PB-AS-2)

Comment: I believe that the energy produced at Point Beach Nuclear Plant must remain a part of the state's balanced energy portfolio.
(PB-AV-4)

Comment: If this license renewal is not approved approximately one-sixth of the states' currently generated electrical power will be lost and a higher priced alternative will need to be used in its place. By maintaining a diverse portfolio with nuclear energy as part of Wisconsin's energy supply we can continue to create a reliable product at a reasonable rate. Please support We Energies and the state of Wisconsin industry by supporting a diverse use of resources in the production of electrical energy.
(PB-AW-3)

Comment: Point Beach has operated safely and efficiently for over 30 years, generated a record 8.1 million megawatt hours of electricity in 2003, and its 1036 megawatts of electrical generating capacity remain vital to Wisconsin's economy.
(PB-AY-1)

Scoping Summary Report

Comment: Wisconsin Energy Corporation has continually reinvested in the Point Beach facility to assure the continued safe, efficient, and economical production of electricity for Wisconsin's homes, businesses, and factories.

(PB-AY-2)

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

Operational Security

Comment: Since late 1979 the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department has worked to develop a close working relationship with Point Beach Nuclear Plant staff. This came about as the world changed and the need for law enforcement and security to work for a common goal was identified.

(PB-B-1)

Comment: In the following years we identified needs of the plant relating to security with plant personnel. The system was fine tuned to meet the needs of the operation supporting each other as our resources have allowed. We have shared numerous training activities, equipment, and provided extra patrol both on land and in the water. The power plant has provided needed equipment and allowed access to the facilities for training.

(PB-B-2)

Comment: We did work jointly with Point Beach and the security force. We have, as their response units were formed, we did make it available to them so they could also belong to the state association and receive the same training that law enforcement receives.

(PB-B-5)

Comment: Over the years Point Beach has sponsored training at no cost to law enforcement to have training personnel from the Sheriff's Department, Two Rivers Police Department, Manitowoc Police Department.

(PB-B-6)

Comment: Security has intensified since the tragic events of September 11, 2001.

(PB-E-4)

Comment: As previously stated, security at nuclear plants across the nation has received increased emphasis and scrutiny since the events of September 11, 2001. Security at Point Beach is no exception. We've taken extensive precautions and implemented new policies and procedures to ensure that the safety and well being of both the community and our employees is maintained.

(PB-F-7)

Comment: Someone said that they wanted to find a solution to the waste and that the waste should go up to the, that the waste should go to the, this spot in Utah or Nevada, Yucca

Mountain. Anyhow, this presents a lot of terrorist targets.
(PB-G-2)

Comment: Since late 1979, the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Department has worked to develop a close working relationship with Point Beach Nuclear Plant staff. This came about as the world changed and a need for law enforcement and security to work for a common goal was identified.
(PB-M-1)

Comment: And my personal experience with the nuclear plant has been very positive. I have participated in numerous joint training exercises there and just had great cooperation. We've assisted a lot as far as providing additional law enforcement to the plant in their times of need and the cooperation has been great.
(PB-M-3)

Comment: Security has intensified since the tragic events of September 11th, 2001.
(PB-O-4)

Comment: Security at nuclear plants across the nation has received increased emphasis and scrutiny since the events of September 11th, 2001. Security at Point Beach is no exception to this and we've taken extensive cautions and implemented new policies and procedures to ensure that the safety and well being of the community and our employees is maintained.
(PB-P-7)

Comment: Since late 1979 the Manitowoc County Sheriff's Dept. has worked to develop a close working relationship with Point Beach Nuclear Plant staff. This came about as the world changed and a need for law enforcement and security to work for a common goal was identified.
(PB-AD-2)

Comment: In the following years, we identified needs of the plant relating to security. With plant personnel, the system was fine tuned to meet the needs of the operation. Supporting each other as our resources have allowed, we have shared in numerous training activities, equipment, and provided extra patrol both on land and in the water.
(PB-AD-3)

Response: *The comments are related to security and terrorism.*

The Commission has determined that issues related to terrorism are beyond the scope of the NRC staff's safety review under the Atomic Energy Act. NRC and other Federal agencies have heightened vigilance and implemented initiatives to evaluate and respond to possible threats posed by terrorists, including the use of aircraft against commercial nuclear power plants and Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installations (ISFSI). In addition, the Commission has determined that malevolent acts remain speculative and beyond the scope of a NEPA review. NRC routinely assesses threats and other information provided to them by other Federal agencies and sources. NRC also ensures that licensees meet appropriate security levels. NRC will continue to focus on prevention of terrorist acts for all nuclear facilities.

The NRC has taken a number of actions to respond to the events of September 11, 2001, and

Scoping Summary Report

plans to take additional measures. However, the issue of security and acts of terrorism at nuclear power plants is not unique to facilities that have requested a renewal to their license; therefore, security and terrorism will not be addressed within the scope of this SEIS. The comments did not provide significant, new information and do not fall within the scope of license renewal as set forth in 10 CFR Parts 51 and 54; therefore, they will not be evaluated further.

Emergency Preparedness

Comment: Our emergency response procedures and drills, for example, examine how our employees would react in the event of a real emergency. The emergency plan has only one focus and that focus is safety. Safety of the public, safety of our employees and safety of the plant. Emergency response drills are conducted several times a year to test our abilities and carefully examine areas in which we can improve and prevent situations based on a formal plan which is thoroughly reviewed and monitored by federal agencies.
(PB-F-5)

Comment: I worked very closely with their security staff at the nuclear power plant and I must say that close working relationship was instrumental in developing good emergency response plans for many different entities of emergency services in Manitowoc County.
(PB-L-2)

Comment: In that, our emergency response procedures and drills for example examine just how our employees would react in the event of a real emergency. The emergency plan has only one focus, and that's safety. Safety of the public, safety of our employees and safety of the plant. Emergency response drills are conducted several times a year to test our abilities and carefully examine areas in which we can improve and prevent situations based on a formal plan which is thoroughly reviewed and monitored by federal agencies.
(PB-P-5)

Response: *The comments are related to emergency preparedness. Emergency preparedness is an ongoing process at all plants, including Point Beach. Each nuclear plant must have an approved emergency plan, as required by 10 CFR Part 50, that is revised periodically and required to be updated. Licensees are required to frequently test the effectiveness of the plans by conducting emergency response exercises. Emergency planning is part of the current operating license and is outside the scope of the environmental analysis for license renewal. The comments did not provide significant, new information and do not fall within the scope of license renewal as set forth in 10 CFR Parts 51 and 54; therefore, the comments will not be evaluated further.*

Operational Safety

Comment: We were working very closely with Nuclear Management Company and NRC to address the issues raised by the supplemental NRC inspection conducted during the summer of 2003 and subsequent discussions.
(PB-E-2)

Comment: Since Point Beach began operating in 1970 there have been many changes that

Scoping Summary Report

showed the dedication and commitment to safety and security in the nuclear industry. The nuclear industry has not been satisfied with the status quo. The industry's standards and regulations we abide by and are held accountable to have become more stringent and the inspections more rigorous over that 30 year period.

(PB-E-3)

Comment: Of course, safely operating a nuclear plant is not one person's job. It can be achieved only by the dedication that our employees show every time they walk through the plant gates.

(PB-E-5)

Comment: The mission of everyone, both supporters and employees at Point Beach, is clear, safe, reliable and economic operation with primary focus on the safety and health of the public and our employees.

(PB-F-1)

Comment: All of our employees go through rigorous training and learn new procedures and information. Absolutely no one is exempt from this training or testing to ensure the entire work force is always at its best.

(PB-F-3)

Comment: We also have extensive processes and detailed procedures that are continuously reviewed and modified to cover every aspect of plant operations. There are over 8800 procedures that cover operations, maintenance, training, engineering and the emergency response scenarios.

(PB-F-4)

Comment: Every 18 months we perform a reviewing and maintenance outage in which we typically carry out over 2200 individual maintenance and inspection activities. This is in addition to the normal day to day activities of testing that we perform during the period which the plant is operating at full power.

(PB-F-6)

Comment: Just last year we set, and this is what Rick just talked about, set a record for the most megawatt hours of electrical power produced since the plant began operation in 1970. That's attributed to improved efficiencies, improved procedures and the due diligence of the employees.

(PB-F-8)

Comment: But in the past when I testified last time, it had the worst safety record in the nation and occasionally danced up to second worst. So, I'm glad that the new manager is doing a better job than the old manager was.

(PB-G-4)

Comment: We also have the NRC to oversee to make sure that any problems are corrected and are corrected quickly. I think that that shows a great responsibility on the part of the operators.

(PB-K-3)

Scoping Summary Report

Comment: We were working very closely with Nuclear Management Company and NRC to address the issues raised by the supplemental NRC inspection conducted during the summer of 2003 and other subsequent discussions.

(PB-O-3)

Comment: Safely operating a nuclear plant is not one person's job. It can only be achieved by the dedications that our employees show everyday when they walk through that plant gate.

(PB-O-5)

Comment: The mission of everyone who works at and supports Point Beach is clear. That mission is safe, reliable and economical operation of the plant, the safety and health of the public and our employees being the number one priority.

(PB-P-1)

Comment: All of our employees go through rigorous training and testing sessions to continuously hone their skills and learn new procedures and information. Absolutely no one is exempt from this process.

(PB-P-3)

Comment: We also have extensive processes and detailed procedures that are continuously reviewed and modified to cover every aspect of our operation. There are over 8,800 procedures that cover operations, maintenance, engineering, training, security and emergency response scenarios.

(PB-P-4)

Comment: In addition to emergency planning, we also conduct extensive maintenance for the plant. Every 18 months, we undergo a refuel and maintenance outage in which we typically carry out over 2,200 individual inspections and maintenance activities. This is in addition to the ongoing maintenance inspection and testing activities that are performed during the period when the plant is operating at full power.

(PB-P-6)

Comment: Just last year we set a record and this is what Mr. Kuester was talking about, and the reason I'm saying it again is we're really proud of this. We set a record for most megawatt hours of electrical power produced by the plant since it began operation in 1970. That's not only attributed to improved processes and efficiencies but to the plant employees themselves.

(PB-P-8)

Comment: I live in the city of Two Rivers and I'm very confident that the employees at Point Beach are committed to producing safe, reliable electricity. I wouldn't live or work here if I thought differently.

(PB-AB-3)

Comment: But for me the bottom line is safety. My children and grandchildren also live here. I am confident that for Point Beach and We Energies, safety is their number one priority.

(PB-AB-5)

Scoping Summary Report

Comment: Point Beach has operated safely and well for the past 30- plus years and I believe it can do so well into the future.

(PB-AL-2)

Comment: It's 20-year record of safe operations warrants license renewal.

(PB-AN-3, PB-AR-3, PB-AT-3, PB-AU-3, PB-AZ-3, PB-BA-3, PB-BB-3, PB-BC-3, PB-BD-3, PB-BF-3)

Response: *The comments are related to operational safety. Operational safety is outside the scope of the environmental review. An NRC safety review for the license renewal period is conducted separately. Although a topic may not be within the scope of review for license renewal, NRC is always concerned with protecting health and safety. Any matter potentially affecting safety can be addressed under processes currently available for existing operating licenses absent a license renewal application. The comments did not provide significant, new information and do not fall within the scope of license renewal as set forth in 10 CFR Part 51; therefore, the comments will not be evaluated further.*

Need for Power Issues

Comment: We know it's a vital part of Wisconsin's base load generating capacity. Over 1000 megawatts of clean, economical, reliable energy that's been produced for over 30 years out of that facility, about a sixth of Wisconsin's electric generating capacity.

(PB-C-2)

Comment: And also recognizing that I think as a lot of us feel here in communities that live near nuclear plants that nuclear has to be a vital part of the country's energy future.

(PB-C-7)

Comment: So as I'm well aware that Wisconsin apparently is going to need power from something. I don't know why-- there are no new automobile factories being built in our area. There are no new canning factories. Everything is moving out of Wisconsin. I don't know where the power's going to go except for my air conditioner as long as I still have a job. But I would like to know where all this power is going to go.

(PB-G-6)

Comment: The bottom line is that unless the Point Beach operating licenses are extended, a significant power shortage will result in Wisconsin.

(PB-X-3)

Comment: Also, the state of Wisconsin continues to need the 1000-plus megawatts of power this plant generates both cleanly and efficiently.

(PB-AL-3)

Comment: Point Beach accounts for nearly one-sixth of the electric generation produced in Wisconsin, and represents nearly one-quarter of the generation portfolio of its owner, We Energies. With load growth estimated at approximately 2.5 percent to 3.0 percent annually in Wisconsin, nuclear power generally and Point Beach in particular will continue to meet vital demand needs now, and in the future in Wisconsin.
(PB-AP-2)

Comment: ...a reliable source of energy is vital to our business and its growth here in Wisconsin. If industrial companies of Wisconsin are going to continue to grow, the demands for both electricity and natural gas will continue to increase.
(PB-AW-2)

Comment: As planning continues for meeting future energy needs, I believe that the energy produced at Point Beach Nuclear Plant should remain part of the state's balanced energy portfolio.
(PB-BE-3)

Response: *The need for power is specifically directed to be outside the scope of license renewal in 10 CFR 51.95(c)(2). The purpose and need for the proposed action (renewal of an operating license) is to provide an option that allows for power generation capability beyond the term of a current nuclear power plant operating license to meet future system generating needs, as such needs may be determined by State, utility, and where authorized, Federal (other than NRC) decisionmakers. The comments do not provide significant, new information and they do not fall within the scope of license renewal as set forth in 10 CFR Parts 51 and 54; therefore, they will not be evaluated further.*

Cost of Power Issues

Comment: One of my primary responsibilities is to ensure our customers have the safe, reliable and affordable energy they need.
(PB-E-6, PB-O-6)

Comment: We believe that a reliable and cost effective power supply is best met by maintaining a diverse fuel mix that includes nuclear. Studies show that keeping Point Beach in our diverse energy mix will save customers \$475 million dollars in today's dollars over the next 20 years as compared with replacement options. If we do not build new generation and transmission as well as maintain our existing facilities, the supply of affordable, reliable electricity will be at risk.
(PB-E-7, PB-O-7)

Comment: License renewal will allow WE Energies' customers to benefit fully from the efficient power generated by Point Beach for years to come. Access to economical and reliable generation continues to be a front and center priority for Wisconsin's economic growth.
(PB-E-8)

Comment: I feel that they're doing a great job, a wonderful job, that's safe, clean, hopefully affordable for the future. Keep that affordable in mind.
(PB-K-4)

Scoping Summary Report

Comment: Finally and in conclusion, the license renewal of Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant presents a unique opportunity to create a win-win-win scenario for the rate payers, taxpayers, the state and our community by: (1) continuously producing less expensive base load electrical power for all use in an environmentally clean and responsible manner.

(PB-N-9)

Comment: License renewal will allow WE Energies customers to benefit fully from the efficient power generated by Point Beach for years to come. Access to economical and reliable generation continues to be a front and center issue for the State of Wisconsin.

(PB-O-8)

Comment: And I think that the history of available electricity in the United States in the last five or six years to me strongly indicates that if you have to buy electricity from brokers, your cost is just going to skyrocket. And I've seen some of the instances and when you look at California and you look at sometimes even Wisconsin, we had to buy that electricity, our cost just didn't go up here ten percent. That went up like 30, 40, 50 percent from brokers.

(PB-R-1)

Comment: Wisconsin's Paper Mills require dependable and affordable energy. The two units at Point Beach are an integral part of WE Energies energy mix and the energy mix of the entire state and are key to meeting these energy requirements. The current increases in the price of oil and natural gas are proof that base load generating plants must operate on stable, dependable and low cost fuels. Nuclear fuel meets this requirement.

(PB-U-2)

Comment: Energy costs for businesses in Wisconsin represent a large overhead cost that is difficult to pass on to our customer base. Rising health care costs in Wisconsin can only be brought under control by reduction of overhead. Energy is one of the largest expenses our industry faces. We are very fortunate to have a well maintained, fully amortized nuclear plant producing a percentage of our energy to help control these costs.

(PB-Y-2)

Comment: ...(h)aving inexpensive and reliable power is critical to our ongoing success.

(PB-Z-1)

Comment: We anticipate that continued operation of the Point Beach facility as a nuclear plant will help keep our electric rates as low as possible given the current uptrend in natural gas prices. We need rates to be as low as possible, of course, in order to continue to compete with dairy manufacturing companies throughout the U. S., North America, and even the entire world. We are part of a truly worldwide and very competitive dairy economy.

(PB-AC-2)

Comment: Nuclear power will, no doubt, continue to be an important part of a mix of energy sources which our utility (WE Energies) will need in their portfolio to help us as their customer to remain competitive in the future.

(PB-AC-4)

Scoping Summary Report

Comment: Our total electric load is approximately 70 MW, which makes us one of We Energies largest customers. We Energies represent 16% of all of our purchases. They are one of our largest suppliers. Our concern for future steel production is making sure that reliable and affordable electricity is available for our facility. Wisconsin currently has a mix of electric generation facilities that have allowed the State to have average, if not somewhat lower prices for electricity. A large contributing factor to maintaining these prices is the Point Beach Nuclear Plant.

(PB-AE-1)

Comment: As the demand for safe, reliable and affordable energy in our state continues to grow, nuclear power should remain an integral component of the generation mix. We Energies have indicated that the continued operation of Point Beach will save customers approximately \$474 million in today's dollars compared to other options. Currently, Point Beach contributes to our diverse energy mix by providing approximately 24% of the energy generated by We Energies.

(PB-AE-3)

Comment: We believe as the demand for safe, reliable and affordable energy in our state continues to grow, nuclear power must remain a component to meeting our power supply needs. Point Beach Nuclear plant contributes to the fuel diversity energy mix by providing approximately 24% of the energy generated by We Energies, and we must maintain this diverse mix if we are to have affordable energy prices in the future. Further, Point Beach plant will save customers approximately \$474 million in today's dollars compared to other replacement options.

(PB-AF-2)

Comment: Point Beach is a low-cost resource. The more low-cost electric resources there are in the state, the less pressure is placed on wholesale electricity costs, which all utilities at one time or another, must access. No conceivable replacement for Point Beach would be able to produce power at its current production costs.

(PB-AG-2)

Comment: It is imparitive (sic) that energy costs are kept to a minimum, and energy supply levels are such that buying power from outside the state is not needed. Energy costs are a large portion of our companies daily manufacturing expenses. Every penny counts and can make the difference of making money, loosing (sic) money and getting new orders.

(PB-AH-2)

Comment: The most economical and responsible energy choice for We Energies customers is to seek license renewal of the Point Beach Nuclear Plant. Initial studies have shown that the continued operation of this facility would save customers approximately \$474 million in today's dollars compared to other options.

(PB-AI-5)

Comment: OCV requires also that the electrical power be at an economical price to allow us to compete with foreign competition. We are concerned that without this license renewal, the consistency, reliability, and economic price of the electrical power will be very difficult to deliver, and will put our operations in jeopardy.

(PB-AK-3, PB-BG-3)

Scoping Summary Report

Comment: Electricity accounts for 15 percent to 20 percent of the average pulp and paper manufacturer's energy needs, and generally is utilized in process and environmental protection applications for which there is no practical alternative. At the same time, Wisconsin's papermakers have experienced the most intense period of regional and worldwide market competition, simultaneous with the worst economic downturn, in the industry's 156 year history in the state. Those conditions emphasize the importance of the Point Beach nuclear power plant in helping Wisconsin's paper industry meet its electric load requirements. The Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant is a reliable, low-cost generator of electricity.
(PB-AM-7)

Comment: As economic and environmental issues continue to be in the forefront of today's electric power needs, we believe the success of our organization is greatly dependent on the continued cooperation of affordable and reliable nuclear energy.
(PB-AV-2)

Comment: With the energy demand in Wisconsin continuing to grow at a steady rate of 2.5 to 3 percent, it is critical to our organization that we continue to meet our energy needs by utilizing the most economical and responsible energy sources available.
(PB-AV-3)

Comment: ...we believe the success of our business and our operations are dependent on the continued operation of affordable and reliable energy.
(PB-BE-2)

Response: *The comments are noted. The economic costs and benefits of renewing an operating license are specifically directed to be outside the scope of license renewal in 10 CFR 51.95(c)(2). The comments provide no significant, 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 Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, will take into account all the relevant environmental issues raised during the scoping process that are described above. The draft SEIS will be made available for public comment. Interested Federal, State, and local government agencies, local organizations, and members of the public will be given the opportunity to provide comments to be considered during the development of the final SEIS. Concerns identified that are outside the scope of the staff's environmental review have been or will be forwarded to the appropriate NRC program manager for consideration.

Point Beach Units 1 and 2

Jonathan Rogoff, Esq.
Vice President, Counsel & Secretary
Nuclear Management Company, LLC
700 First Street
Hudson, WI 54016

Mr. F. D. Kuester
President and Chief Operating Officer
WE Generation
231 West Michigan Street
Milwaukee, WI 53201

Regulatory Affairs Manager
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
Nuclear Management Company, LLC
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, WI 54241

Mr. Ken Duveneck
Town Chairman
Town of Two Creeks
13017 State Highway 42
Mishicot, WI 54228

Chairman
Public Service Commission
of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7854
Madison, WI 53707-7854

Regional Administrator, Region III
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
801 Warrenville Road
Lisle, IL 60532-4351

Resident Inspector's Office
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
6612 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, WI 54241

Mr. Jeffrey Kitsembel
Electric Division
Public Service Commission of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7854
Madison, WI 53707-7854

Nuclear Asset Manager
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
231 West Michigan Street
Milwaukee, WI 53201

John Paul Cowan
Executive Vice President & Chief Nuclear
Officer
Nuclear Management Company, LLC
700 First Street
Hudson, WI 54016

Douglas E. Cooper
Senior Vice President - Group Operations
Palisades Nuclear Plant
Nuclear Management Company, LLC
27780 Blue Star Memorial Highway
Covert, MI 49043

Site Director of Operations
Nuclear Management Company, LLC
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, WI 54241

Mr. Dennis L. Koehl
Site Vice President
Point Beach Nuclear Plant
Nuclear Management Company, LLC
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, WI 54241

Mr. Kenneth Westlake
Chief, Environmental Planning and
Evaluation Branch
U.S. EPA Mail Code B-195
77 W. Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, IL 60604

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

Mr. James E. Knorr
6610 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, WI 54241

Mr. Nick Niederlander
Lester Public Library
1001 Adams Street
Two Rivers, WI 54241

Ms. Cassandra Dixon
3579 County Road G
Wisconsin Dells, WI 53965

C.W. Fay
1685 Horns Corners Road
Cedarburg, WI 53012

Ms. Cheryl Brocher
1814 29th Street
Two Rivers, WI 54241

Mr. Curt Andersen
Clean Water Action Council
2942 Jack Pine Lane
Green Bay, WI 54313

Mr. David Jurss
3027 10th Street
Two Rivers, WI 54241

Mr. Roger Hirst
1308 Vliet Street
Kewaunee, WI 54216

Representative Frank Lasee
State of Wisconsin
1601 Riverbend Terrace
Green Bay, WI 54311

Mr. Clarence Meyer
P.O. Box 257
Mishicot, WI 54228-0257

Mr. Greg Buckley
1717 East Park
Two Rivers, WI 54241

Ms. Tanya Holler
We Energies
231 W. Michigan P346
Milwaukee, WI 53202

Mr. Roger Newton
3623 Nagawicka Shores Drive
Hartland, WI 53029

Mr. Douglas Johnson
500 W. Bradley Road
Apt. A-318
Fox Point, WI 53217

Mr. John G. Thorgersen
NMC
1628 Diamond Drive
Green Bay, WI 54311

Mr. John Nikolai
12291 Schulz Lane
Cato, WI 54230

Ms. Mary Ann Chervenif
5711 Nuclear Road
Two Rivers, WI 54241

Ms. Anne Lovell
TetraTech NUS
900 Trail Ridge Road
Aiken, SC 29803

Mr. Barry McNulty
We Energies
231 W. Michigan Street
Room P346
Milwaukee, WI 53201

Mr. Norbert L. Pitterlo
3610 Glenwood Street
Two Rivers, WI 54241-1425

Mr. Dan Pawlitzke
City of Two Rivers
P.O. Box 87
1717 East Park Street
Two Rivers, WI 54241-0087

Mr. Robert Hermann
Manitowoc County Sheriff's Dept.
1025 South 9th Street
Manitowoc, WI 54220

Mr. Dan Rahlf
E. 2508 Nuclear Road
Denmark, WI 54208

Mr. David J. Jenkins, Manager
Electric Division
Wisconsin Federation of Cooperatives
131 West Wilson St., Suite 400
Madison, WI 53703-3269

Mr. John H. Goetsch
2301 West Brantwood Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53209

Mr. Earl Gustafson
Wisconsin Paper Council
250 North Green Bay Road (54956)
P.O. Box 718
Neenah, WI 54957-0718

Mr. Hermann Viets, President
Milwaukee School of Engineering
1025 N. Broadway St.
Milwaukee, WI 53202

R. J. Pirlot
Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce
501 East Washington Avenue
Madison, WI 53703

Mr. Carl Otter
1440 S. 22nd Street
Sheboygan, WI 53081