

May 24, 2005

Mr. Cornelius J. Gannon, Vice President
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant
Carolina Power & Light Company
Post Office Box 10429
Southport, NC 28461-0429

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING SUMMARY REPORT
ASSOCIATED WITH THE STAFF'S REVIEW OF THE APPLICATIONS BY
CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY, INC (CP&L) FOR RENEWAL OF
THE OPERATING LICENSES FOR BRUNSWICK STEAM ELECTRIC PLANT,
UNITS 1 AND 2 (TAC NOS. MC4641 AND MC4642)

Dear Mr. Gannon:

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) conducted a scoping process January 12, 2005, through March 11, 2005, to determine the scope of the NRC staff's environmental review of the applications for renewal of the operating licenses for Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2 (BSEP). As part of the scoping process, the NRC staff held two public environmental scoping meetings in Southport, North Carolina, on January 27, 2005, 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 BSEP.

The NRC staff has prepared the enclosed Environmental Scoping Summary Report identifying comments received at the January 27, 2005, license renewal environmental scoping meetings. No comments were received by letter or electronic mail. In accordance with Section 51.29(b) of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR 51.29(b)), you are being provided a copy of the scoping summary report. The transcripts of the meetings can be found as an attachment to the meeting summary issued on March 11, 2005. 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 (PARs) component of NRC's document management system (ADAMS) under Accession Number ML050730184. 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.

C. Gannon

-2-

The next step in the environmental review process is the issuance of the draft supplement to the GEIS scheduled for September 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 301-415-1590 or via e-mail at rle@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Richard L. Emch, Jr., Senior Project Manager
Environmental Section
License Renewal and Environmental Impacts Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos.: 50-325 and 50-324

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

C. Gannon

-2-

The next step in the environmental review process is the issuance of the draft supplement to the GEIS scheduled for September 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 301-415-1590 or via e-mail at rle@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,
/RA/
Richard L. Emch, Jr., Senior Project Manager
Environmental Section
License Renewal and Environmental Impacts Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos.: 50-325 and 50-324

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

ADAMS Accession nos.: ML051440479
1. Letter w/Summary Report, Svc. List

Document Name:E:\Filenet\ML051440479.wpd

OFFICE	RLEP:DRIP:GE	RLEP:DRIP:LA	RLEP:DRIP:PM	RLEP:DRIP:SC:ES
NAME	C. Guerrero	M. Jenkins	R. Emch	A. Kugler
DATE	05/09/05	05/06/05	05/24/05	05/24/05

OFFICE	OGC
NAME	M. Lemoncelli
DATE	05/18/05

OFFICIAL AGENCY COPY

DISTRIBUTION: Ltr. To C. Gannon, Issuance of Environmental Scoping Summary Report, Re: Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units, 1 and 2, Dated: May 24, 2005

Adams accession no.: ML051440479

PUBLIC

Hard Copy

RLEP/Environmental R/F

E-Mail

F. Cameron

OPA

RidsOgcMailCenter

ACRS/ACNW

W. Borchardt

D. Matthews/F. Gillespie

A. Kugler

P.T. Kuo

J. Wilson

C. Guerrero

S. Hernandez

R. Emch

S. Mitra

B. Mozafari

RIDSRgn2MailCenter

M. Lemoncelli, OGC

RidsNrrAdpt

P. Fredrickson, R II

R. Hannah, R II

E. DiPaolo, SRI

J. Austin, RI

M. Parkhurst (PNNL)

RidsNrrAdpt

B. Keeling, OCA

Brunswick Steam Electric Plant
Units 1 and 2

cc:

Mr. Steven R. Carr
Associate General Counsel - Legal
Department
Progress Energy Service Company, LLC
Post Office Box 1551
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602-1551

Mr. David R. Sandifer, Chairperson
Brunswick County Board of Commissioners
Post Office Box 249
Bolivia, North Carolina 28422

Resident Inspector
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
8470 River Road
Southport, North Carolina 28461

Mr. John H. O'Neill, Jr.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
2300 N Street NW
Washington, DC 20037-1128

Ms. Beverly Hall, Section Chief
Radiation Protection Section,
Division of Natural Resources
N.C. Department of Environment
and Natural Resources
3825 Barrett Dr.
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609-7721

Mr. David H. Hinds
Plant General Manager
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant
Carolina Power & Light Company
Post Office Box 10429
Southport, North Carolina 28461-0429

Public Service Commission
State of South Carolina
Post Office Drawer 11649
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Ms. Margaret A. Force
Assistant Attorney General
State of North Carolina
Post Office Box 629
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Mr. Robert P. Gruber
Executive Director
Public Staff - NCUC
4326 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-4326

Mr. T. P. Cleary
Director - Site Operations
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant
Progress Energy Carolinas, Inc.
Post Office Box 10429
Southport, North Carolina 28461-0429

Mr. Norman R. Holden, Mayor
City of Southport
201 East Moore Street
Southport, North Carolina 28461

Mr. Warren Lee
Emergency Management Director
New Hanover County Department of
Emergency Management
Post Office Box 1525
Wilmington, North Carolina 28402-1525

Mr. Chris L. Burton, Manager
Performance Evaluation and
Regulatory Affairs PEB 7
Progress Energy
Post Office Box 1551
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602-1551

Mr. Edward T. O'Neill
Manager - Support Services
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant
Carolina Power & Light Company
Post Office Box 10429
Southport, North Carolina 28461

Brunswick Steam Electric Plant
Units 1 and 2

-2-

Mr. Allen K. Brittain
Superintendent, Security
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant
Progress Energy Carolinas, Inc.
P.O. Box 10429
Southport, North Carolina 28461-0429

Ms. Vicki Soltis
5134 Minnesota Dr.
Southport, NC 28461

Ms. Pat Woods
3700 Players Club Drive
Southport, NC 28461

Mr. Michael Heath
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant
P.O. Box 10429
Southport, North Carolina 28461-0429

Mr. Joe Woods
3700 Players Club Drive
Southport, NC 28461

Mr. Talmage B. Clements
Manager - License Renewal
Progress Energy
P. O. Box 1551
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Mr. Rob Gandy, City Manager
City of Southport
201 E Moore Street
Southport, NC 28461

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

Mr. Jerry Thrift, Vice President
Brunswick Community College
P.O. Box 30
Supply, NC 28462-0030

Ms. Ilene Brown
NCUW
William Randall Library
601 S. College Rd.
Wilmington, NC 28403-5616

Mr. J. Steven Johnson, Director
Brunswick County Economic Development
Commission
Post Office Box 158
25 Courthouse Drive NE
Bolivia, NC 28422

Ms. Cynthia Tart
3404 E. Yacht Dr.
Oak Island, NC 28468

Mr. J. Leslie Bell, AICP, Director
Brunswick County Planning Department
P.O. Box 249
Bolivia, NC 28422

Ms. May Moore, Commissioner
Brunswick County
P.O. Box 249
Bolivia, NC 28422
Ms. Hilary Snow
The State Port Pilot
114 E. Moore
Southport 28461

Mr. Pete Benjamin
Ecological Services Supervisor
Raleigh Field Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Post Office Box 33726
Raleigh, NC 27636-3726

Mr. Ken Raber
North Carolina Eastern Municipal
Power Agency
P.O. Box 29513
Raleigh, NC 27626

**Environmental Impact Statement
Scoping Process**

Summary Report

**Brunswick Steam Electric Plant,
Units 1 and 2
Southport, North Carolina**

May 2005



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

Introduction

On October 18, 2004, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) received an application dated October 20, 2004, from the applicant, Carolina Power and Light (CP&L) (doing business as Progress Energy Carolinas, Inc.) for renewal of the operating licenses for Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2. The Brunswick plant is located in southeastern North Carolina, approximately 2.5 miles north of Southport near the mouth of the Cape Fear River. As part of the application, CP&L 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. Section 51.53 outlines requirements for preparation and submittal of environmental reports to the NRC.

Section 51.53(c)(3) was based on 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 issued for public comment. The staff received input from Federal and State agencies, public organizations, and private citizens. As a result of the assessments in the GEIS, a number of impacts were determined to be generic to all nuclear power plants. These were designated as Category 1 impacts. An applicant for license renewal may adopt the conclusions contained in the GEIS for Category 1 impacts in the absence of new and significant information that may cause the conclusions to fall outside those of the GEIS. Category 2 impacts are those impacts that have been determined to be plant-specific and are required to be addressed in the applicant's ER.

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

On January 12, 2005, the NRC published a Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* (70 FR 2188), to notify the public of the NRC's intent to prepare a plant-specific supplement to the GEIS to support the review of the renewal application for the Brunswick operating licenses. The plant-specific supplement to the GEIS will be prepared in accordance with NEPA 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 March 11, 2005. The scoping process included two public scoping meetings held on Thursday, January 27, 2005 at the Southport City Hall in Southport, North Carolina. The NRC announced the meetings in local newspapers (The Wilmington Star-News, and the State Port Pilot), issued press releases, and distributed flyers locally. Both sessions began with NRC staff members providing a brief overview of the license renewal process and the NEPA process. Following the NRC's prepared statements, the meetings were open for public comments. Seven (7) commenters provided oral statements

that were recorded and transcribed. There were no comment letters (related to the license renewal application) received by the NRC. The meeting transcripts for the afternoon and evening meetings (accession numbers ML050730221 and ML0050730231, respectively) are available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly Available Records (PARS) component of NRC's document system (ADAMS). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm.html> (the Public Electronic Reading Room).

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 identified individual comments. All comments and suggestions received orally during the scoping meetings 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.

Table 1 identifies the individuals providing comments and the Commenter ID letter associated with each person's set(s) of comments. The individuals are listed in the order in which they spoke at the public meeting.

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

- a comment that was either related to support or opposition of license renewal in general, or

to Brunswick specifically, or that makes a general statement about the license renewal process. It may make only a general statement regarding Category 1 and/or Category 2 issues. In addition, it provides no new information and does not pertain to 10 CFR Part 54 (requirements for renewal of operating licenses for nuclear power plants).

- a comment about a Category 1 issue that
 - provided new information that required evaluation during the review, or
 - provided no new information
- a comment about a Category 2 issue that
 - provided information that required evaluation during the review, or
 - provided no such information
- a comment that raised an environmental issue that was not addressed in the GEIS,
- a comment regarding Alternatives to the proposed action,
- a comment regarding safety issues within the scope of 10 CFR Part 54, but out of the scope of 10 CFR Part 51,
- a comment outside the scope of license renewal (not related to 10 CFR Parts 51 or 54), regarding
 - emergency response and planning
 - operational safety issues
 - terrorism
- a comment that was actually a question and introduces no new information.

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 information was provided by the commenter, no further evaluation will be performed.

The preparation of the plant-specific supplement to the GEIS (which is the SEIS) will take into account all the relevant issues raised during the scoping process. The SEIS will address both Category 1 and 2 issues, along with any new information identified as a result of scoping. The SEIS will rely on conclusions supported by information in the GEIS for Category 1 issues, and will include the analysis of Category 2 issues and any new and significant information. The draft plant-specific supplement to the GEIS will be 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 the basis for the NRC's decision on the Brunswick license renewal.

TABLE 1 - Individuals Providing Comments During Scoping Comment Period

Commenter ID	Commenter	Affiliation (If Stated)	Comment Source
A	Norman Holden	Mayor, City of Southport	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
B	Paul Fisher	Alderman, City of Southport	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
C	Mike Reaves	President, Brunswick Community College	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
D	Connie Majure-Rhett	Greater Wilmington Chamber of Commerce	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
E	Karen Sphar	Southport-Oak Island Chamber of Commerce	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
F	May Moore	Brunswick County Commissioner	Evening Scoping Meeting
G	Cynthia Tart	Director of Communities and Schools in Brunswick County, Chairman of County Parks and Recreation Board	Evening Scoping Meeting

**Brunswick Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2
Public Scoping Meeting
Comments and Responses**

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

1. General Support of Nuclear Power
2. Questions about the License Renewal Process
3. General Support of License Renewal at Brunswick Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2
4. Comments Concerning the Environment
5. Comments Concerning Socioeconomics
6. Comments Concerning Plant Operations and Safety
7. Comments Concerning Waste Management

Comments

1. General Support of Nuclear Power

Comment: I firmly believe that the future generation of electricity should be geared towards nuclear plants. (B-5)

Response: *This comment is supportive of nuclear power and is general in nature. The comment provides no new information; therefore, it will not be evaluated further.*

2. Questions about the License Renewal Process

Comment: I think the one question that we all would ask is assuming that the license is renewed in 14 and 16, 20 years down the road, what happens next? Do you renew again, or do you have to mothball this plant? And I think the area would be very concerned about where that would leave us. (F-4)

Response: *If the licensee desires, based on a variety of economic and structural factors, current regulations do allow the opportunity to renew the operating license again for another 20 years. The decision to apply would be up to the licensee, and could be made up to 20 years before the end of the licenses, which in this situation would be around 2016 and 2014 for Units 1 and 2, respectively, if the current licenses are renewed. This comment requests information about the license renewal process, and provides no new information; therefore, it will not be evaluated further.*

3. General Support of License Renewal at Brunswick Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2

Comment: [T]he plant means so much to the City of Southport, and we really need to see it relicensed. ...But ladies and gentlemen, you are the ones that make the decision. I'm up here, and I would get on my knees if I could get back up, to beg for you to please relicense the Brunswick nuclear plant. (A-1)

Comment: I strongly recommend that you renew the license for the Brunswick plant. By doing that, I think you'll go into a win-win situation. (B-4)

Comment: I'm here today to support the Brunswick nuclear plant and their application for license renewal. ...I strongly encourage you to support their [Brunswick] application. (C-1)

Comment: On behalf of the 1,650 companies that are members of the Greater Wilmington Chamber of Commerce, I would like to voice my very strong support for the processes, products and people of Progress Energy's Brunswick Nuclear Plant. ...Without a doubt, this facility and this company is an impressive one. Relicensing should be an obvious outcome of your work. (D-1)

Comment: [T]hank you for the opportunity to speak favorably about the license renewal application for Progress Energy's Brunswick plant. ...We are grateful to have the plant and

Progress Energy as part of our community. We encourage the NRC to look favorably on this license renewal. (E-1)

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

4. Comments Concerning the Environment

Comment: Environmentally, the plant has contributed to the ongoing study of marine life in our area, and they take great pride in the protection of that marine life. (E-3)

Comment: The nuclear power plant is environmentally clean. ...We have good fish. We have good birds. We have clean water. We have clean air. We'd like to keep it that way, and we feel that Progress Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission have worked to make this happen for us, and it's been a big help for us. (F-4)

Response: *These comments are supportive of the impact of Brunswick on the environment and are general in nature. The comments provide no new information; therefore, they will not be evaluated further.*

5. Comments Concerning Socioeconomics

Comment: [The plant means so much] Not only to Southport, Southeastern North Carolina, but for the whole state of North Carolina because all of you are aware of the economy. ...But when the nuclear plant came to Southport, things really began to prosper. (A-2)

Comment: This plant has a huge impact on our local economy – \$901 million in 2003, 14 percent of our region's economic output. Economies don't start and stop at county lines, but if you go a few miles up the river to New Hanover County where my office is, the impact is still huge. ...Then there are the contributions this company makes that are harder to quantify but equally valuable to this region. (D-3)

Comment: [T]he plant has an overwhelming economic impact on the economy of our area. ...Not only has the plant been good for the economy, the employees of the plant are active in our community. (E-2)

Comment: This plant provides stable and excellent paying jobs to that workforce. (E-4)

Comment: They have done an enormous thing for our tax base since the '70s when the power plant began being constructed. ...It's not as an enormous a part of our tax base as it was in 1970 or '75, obviously, but it's still quite a large part of the money that both the town of Southport and the County of Brunswick counts on, so that is an issue. (F-2)

Response: *These comments are supportive of the impact of Brunswick on the local economy and are general in nature. The comments provide no new information; therefore, they will not be evaluated further.*

Comment: And we have a great relationship with Progress Energy and the Brunswick plant here for community relations. ...It's a definite asset to the community. We have an outstanding relationship, in my opinion, with the plant out there and Progress Energy. (B-2)

Comment: [T]hey have been and continue to be a good corporate partner with the college. ... We also in the past have had a wonderful relationship with them in providing education, both there on the site as well as having students from there coming on our campus. (C-2)

Comment: Without a doubt, Progress Energy is among the best corporate citizens I have ever had the pleasure of working with. But as important as that is, the human capital invested in our region by employees of Progress Energy. ...Our community is better because of these corporate and individual efforts. (D-4)

Comment: I'm delighted to be here on behalf of Progress Energy. They've been a wonderful corporate neighbor in Brunswick County. ...They've worked with us on fire and rescue and security, which is important. ...Progress Energy lets us use their media center. They work with us on school programs. They're a source of employment of many friends and neighbors of mine, so it's been an excellent neighbor and a great addition to the county. (F-1)

Comment: [I]n a partnership with a lease agreement with Progress Energy, we now have a park here in the Southport/Oak Island area, and without the partnership with Progress Energy, that would not be possible. (G-2)

Response: *These comments are supportive of the relationship of Brunswick with the community and are general in nature. The comments provide no new information; therefore, they will not be evaluated further.*

Comment: They [Brunswick] have enabled vast improvement to our school system. (F-3)

Comment: I've been here for 35 years, and I've seen, as May has said, what an impact the company has had on the community, the jobs it's provided, the educational resources it's provided in the schools. (G-1)

Comment: And if I could mention something as a plea ...The plant sitting here has so many resources as far as education for our children, and they are our future. ...[I]f we had some of those resources in the schools working with our science teachers, you know, what could we be teaching our children, our future, about nuclear plants in their area, about their future, about jobs that are there? So I would encourage just the connection there, to -- to work on it and to strengthen it to better educate our children and just join forces with 'em. (G-3)

Response: *These comments refer to the supportive relationship of Brunswick with the local schools, encourage additional support, and are general in nature. The comments provide no new information; therefore, they will not be evaluated further.*

6. Comments Concerning Plant Operations and Safety

Comment: I think if you look at the operations of the Brunswick plant, you'll find why we talk about operations. It's always something nice to talk about because it's always way up here. They are the world leaders and that's documented. (B-1)

Comment: [I]n the City of Southport we're very comfortable with the nuclear plant out here, and we're proud of their operating record and safety record. (B-3)

Comment: I have personally visited the plant on several occasions and have confidence in the personnel that work there. ...I view the Brunswick nuclear plant as a clean and safe industry, one that is sensitive to the environment. They do an excellent job of keeping the public informed about drills and other safety issues. (C-3)

Comment: The plant is a safe, well-run, efficient facility. (D-2)

Response: *These comments address the Brunswick's operational safety record and are general in nature. The comments provide no new information and do not pertain to the scope of license renewal as set forth in 10 CFR Parts 51 and 54; therefore, they will not be evaluated further.*

7. Comments Concerning Waste Management

Comment: I am completely comfortable with the safety of how we store spent fuel. However, I urge the federal government to get along with the Yucca Mountain project. (B-6)

Response: *This comment is in support of how spent fuel is handled at Brunswick and encourages completion of a permanent waste storage facility. The comment provides no new information and does not pertain to the scope of license renewal as set forth in 10 CFR Parts 51 and 54; therefore will not be evaluated further.*

Summary

The preparation of the plant-specific supplement to the GEIS takes into account all the relevant issues, if any, raised during the scoping process that are described above. The comments received were supportive of the renewal of the Brunswick operating licenses. Concerns related to the environmental license renewal review of Brunswick are considered during the development of the draft SEIS for Brunswick Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2. The draft SEIS will be 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.