RDB Received 8/11/05

From: "William T. Smith" <handts@ev1.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 5:48 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

William T. Smith
7107 Cart Gate Ct
Houston, TX 77095-3545

4/28/05
70 FR 22155
214

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete
Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

William T. Smith
281-463-3200

Mail Envelope Properties (42D43AA2.B14 : 14 : 2836)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 5:48 PM
From: "William T. Smith" <handts@ev1.net>

Created By: handts@ev1.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4981	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 5:48 PM
Mime.822	6031	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Received
8/11/05

From: "Jane Childers" <jchilders@everestkc.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 7:33 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

4/28/05
70FR 22155

215

Jane Childers
6023 W 124th Street
Overland Park, KS 66209

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS= ADM-03
Add= J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Gyuchuro (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete
Template= ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Jane Childers

Mail Envelope Properties (42D4533D.24B : 11 : 4683)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 7:33 PM
From: "Jane Childers" <jchilders@everestkc.net>

Created By: jchilders@everestkc.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	**Route**
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	4965	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 7:33 PM
Mime.822	6018	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received 8/11/05

From: "nici edwards" <politics@cardcarryingprogressive.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 7:26 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

nici edwards
po box 2708
camarillo, ca 93011

4/28/05
70FR 22155

(216)

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete
Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

nici

Mail Envelope Properties (42D451A8.1BE : 20 : 4542)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 7:26 PM
From: "nici edwards" <politics@cardcarryingprogressive.com>

Created By: politics@cardcarryingprogressive.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4943	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 7:26 PM
Mime.822	6008	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Received
8/11/05

From: "Erin James" <erindjames@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 5:25 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Erin James
913 Ontario
Oak Park, il 60302

4/28/05
70FR 22155

July 12, 2005

217

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Gwaltney (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Erin D James

Mail Envelope Properties (42D43540.8C5 : 23 : 2245)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 5:24 PM
From: "Erin James" <erindjames@yahoo.com>

Created By: erindjames@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4948	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 5:24 PM
Mime.822	5995	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB Received 8/11/05

From: "Jason Straub" <jstraub1@comcast.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 6:03 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Jason Straub
1311 Whitpain Hills
Blue Bell, PA 19422

4/28/05
70FR 22155

July 12, 2005

(28)

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Jason Straub

Mail Envelope Properties (42D43E2F.C55 : 10 : 3157)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 6:03 PM
From: "Jason Straub" <jstraub1@comcast.net>

Created By: jstraub1@comcast.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4959	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 6:03 PM
Mime.822	6007	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

6/11/05 RDB received

From: "linda speel" <rlspeel@comcast.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 6:54 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

linda speel
120 west payran st
petaluma, ca 94952

4/28/05
70FR 22155

July 12, 2005

219

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template - ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Linda Speel

Mail Envelope Properties (42D44A20.FC7 : 17 : 4039)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 6:54 PM
From: "linda speel" <rlspeel@comcast.net>

Created By: rlspeel@comcast.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4955	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 6:54 PM
Mime.822	6001	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05.
RDB received

From: "Jaime Rodriguez" <tlrodriguez5@msn.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 3:24 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Jaime Rodriguez
2070 King Ave #8
Des Moines, IA 50320

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

220

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add= J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (AXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Jaime Rodriguez Espinosa

Mail Envelope Properties (42D418D2.B73 : 13 : 64371)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 3:23 PM
From: "Jaime Rodriguez" <tlrodriguez5@msn.com>

Created By: tlrodriguez5@msn.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4973	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 3:23 PM
Mime.822	6025	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 RDB received

From: "Azel Beckner" <azelb@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 7:25 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Azel Beckner
312C Graham Drive
Bowling Green, KY 42101

4/28/05
70FR 22155
221

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template - ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Azel Beckner
2707823258

Mail Envelope Properties (42D45169.1AD : 3 : 4525)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 7:25 PM
From: "Azel Beckner" <azelb@yahoo.com>

Created By: azelb@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4972	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 7:25 PM
Mime.822	6018	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received 8/11/05

From: "joseph Dangelo" <jumpinjoeydee@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 6:59 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

joseph Dangelo
6 kenilworth dr
east northport, ny 11731

4/28/05
70FR 22155

222

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

EAFDS = ADM-03
Add = C. Guerrero (CXG3
J. Wilson (JHW1)

SFSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

joseph Dangelo

Mail Envelope Properties (42D44B3B.017 : 22 : 4119)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 6:58 PM
From: "joseph Dangelo" <jumpinjoeydee@yahoo.com>

Created By: jumpinjoeydee@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4965	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 6:58 PM
Mime.822	6018	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB - Received

8/11/05

From: "harvey Schaktman" <schaktman@comcast.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 4:38 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

harvey Schaktman
22 Bridge Street
Shelburne Falls, MA 01370

4/28/05

70 FR 22155

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

223

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = C. Guerrero (CXG3)
J. Wilson (JHW1)

STSP Review Complete

Template ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Harvey Schaktman
(413) 625-6177

Mail Envelope Properties (42D42A27.3E3 : 23 : 995)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 4:37 PM
From: "harvey Schaktman" <schaktman@comcast.net>

Created By: schaktman@comcast.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4985	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 4:37 PM
Mime.822	6040	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received 8/11/05

From: "Michele Zalopany" <zalo1@earthlink.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 4:32 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Michele Zalopany
222 W. 23rd St.
New York, NY 10011

4/28/05
70 FR 22155
22H

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS= ADM-03
Add= J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Michele Zalopany

Mail Envelope Properties (42D428EC.34D : 23 : 845)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 4:32 PM
From: "Michele Zalopany" <zalo1@earthlink.net>

Created By: zalo1@earthlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4962	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 4:32 PM
Mime.822	6015	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

BDB received 8/11/05

From: "Jason Slipp" <jasonslipp@hotmail.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 3:49 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Jason Slipp
624 Lechauweki Ave
Bethlehem, PA 18015

4/28/05
70 FR 22155
225

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
SISP Review Complete
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (CXG3)
Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Jason Slipp

Mail Envelope Properties (42D41EB6.E79 : 12 : 65145)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 3:48 PM
From: "Jason Slipp" <jasonslipp@hotmail.com>

Created By: jasonslipp@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4956	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 3:48 PM
Mime.822	6006	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
8/11/05

From: "Linda Kirk" <raifordgirl@alltel.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 3:46 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Linda Kirk
13095 N.E. 235th Court
Raiford, Fl 32083

4/28/05
70FR 22155
226

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SFSP Review Complete

E-RIDS=ADM-03
add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (AXG3)

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Linda Kirk

Mail Envelope Properties (42D41E1A.E3D : 2 : 65085)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 3:46 PM
From: "Linda Kirk" <raifordgirl@alltel.net>

Created By: raifordgirl@alltel.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4956	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 3:46 PM
Mime.822	6005	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
8/11/05

From: Mooey Muey <moogal57@yahoo.com>
To: <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 3:28 PM
Subject: No Grand Gulf Expansion

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

207

Hello,

I hear that the deadline to get comments in on the planned expansion of the Grand Gulf nuclear (pronounced nu-cle-are, rather than nu-cu-ler:~) expansion is coming soon. I'd like to be on record as requesting that this expansion request be denied. I think we are foolhardy in this country to expand nuclear power plants when we have no idea (regarding safe disposal) what we are doing with waste, transporting waste, and safeguarding plants, to say nothing of the fact that this plant is upriver from New Orleans. New Orleans depends on the Mississippi to supply its drinking water (scary, but true). So far, none of us have figured out how to live with the Mississippi River contaminated with radiation. Also, do you remember the movie, "The China Syndrome?" That almost happened at Three Mile Island (no, I'm not too young to remember that, as most pro-nuclear folks are hoping) and we can't guarantee it won't happen again. None of these plants can be made foolproof because of HUMAN ER!
ROR.

So, to summarize, let's not build more nuclear power plants or expand existing plants. Let's get on the sustainable bandwagon, as European countries are - let's develop safe forms of energy, such as solar and wind. All the energy in the world ain't gonna help us if it's radioactive.

Thank you,

Vicky Marshall-Beasley
New Orleans

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
http://mail.yahoo.com

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add= J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete
Template=ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (42D419CD.BE1 : 23 : 64481)

Subject: No Grand Gulf Expansion
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 3:27 PM
From: Mooey Muey <moogal57@yahoo.com>

Created By: moogal57@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	1499	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 3:27 PM
TEXT.htm	1672	
Mime.822	4656	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received 8/11/05

From: "Don Mutchler" <z42dkm@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 4:47 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Don Mutchler
4200 Spanish Bit, NE
Albuquerque, NM 87111

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

July 12, 2005

228

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS= ADM-03
add= J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

STSP Review Complete

Template= ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Don K. Mutchler
505-296-2942

Mail Envelope Properties (42D42C5A.4BA : 13 : 1210)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 4:47 PM
From: "Don Mutchler" <z42dkm@yahoo.com>

Created By: z42dkm@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4978	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 4:47 PM
Mime.822	6023	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 BDB Received

From: "Jessica Shupe" <zeldamay23@hotmail.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 1:45 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Jessica Shupe
414 Broadway
Santa Monica, CA 90401

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

July 12, 2005

229

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SESP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Jessica Shupe

Mail Envelope Properties (42D401CA.BCE : 8 : 60366)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 1:45 PM
From: "Jessica Shupe" <zeldamay23@hotmail.com>

Created By: zeldamay23@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4957	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 1:45 PM
Mime.822	6008	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/15 BDB received

From: "Charles Connors" <cowboyinaf@aol.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 1:37 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Charles Connors
75-212 Aloha Kona Drive
Kailua Kona, HI 96740

4/28/15
70FR 22155

230

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (AXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Charles Connors

Mail Envelope Properties (42D3FFB4.942 : 6 : 59714)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81; pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 1:36 PM
From: "Charles Connors" <cowboyinaf@aol.com>

Created By: cowboyinaf@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4971	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 1:36 PM
Mime.822	6022	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 Received

From: "Mark Feldman" <happeemark@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 1:19 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

4/28/05
70FR 22155

231

Mark Feldman
137 Winchester Dr
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to STRONGLY OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = C. Guerrero (CXG3)
J. Wilson (JHW1)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Mark Feldman

Mail Envelope Properties (42D3FBB3.6D7 : 12 : 59095)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 1:19 PM
From: "Mark Feldman" <happeemark@yahoo.com>

Created By: happeemark@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	**Route**
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	4967	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 1:19 PM
Mime.822	6018	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

RDB received
8/11/05

From: "ron peterson" <2hip@charter.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 1:37 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

70FR 22155
4/28/05

ron peterson
po box 142
gasquet, ca 95543

232

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03

GISP Review Complete

Cc = C. Guerrero (CXG3)
J. Wilson (JHW1)

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

ron peterson

Mail Envelope Properties (42D3FFB4.938 : 21 : 59704)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 1:36 PM
From: "ron peterson" <2hip@charter.net>

Created By: 2hip@charter.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4948	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 1:36 PM
Mime.822	5994	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Mary Celeste Reese" <nativeroots@earthlink.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 1:18 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Mary Celeste Reese
1775 Sessms Circle
Starkville, MS 39759

4/28/05
70FR 22155

233

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03

SISP Review Complete

Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Gwaltney (CXG3)

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Mary Celeste Reese

Mail Envelope Properties (42D3FB73.6B3 : 1 : 59059)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 1:18 PM
From: "Mary Celeste Reese" <nativeroots@earthlink.net>

Created By: nativeroots@earthlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4971	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 1:18 PM
Mime.822	6031	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 RDB received

From: "melanie cordell" <sweetbeats@blackjaguars.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 1:10 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

melanie cordell
234 bushnell
san antonio, tx 72812

4/28/05

70FR 22155

July 12, 2005

234

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I oppose Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and sloppy. I'm sick of the "risk assessment" mentality. Nuclear plants are dangerous.

As always, here is environmental racism, with the EIS acknowledgement of a high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf.

The "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public" is too much, besides which the danger of a nuclear accident isn't even addressed.

Econonomic development is no excuse for this either, since, according to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons."

Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Nuclear energy is too risky for everyone. Storage of the radioactive waste is another whole can of worms. Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

Big business gets what big business wants, so I really don't expect either of my elected representatives to do the right thing, but this is how I feel.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

melanie cordell
2107366852

Mail Envelope Properties (42D3F992.575 : 8 : 58741)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 1:10 PM
From: "melanie cordell" <sweetbeats@blackjaguars.net>

Created By: sweetbeats@blackjaguars.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2770	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 1:10 PM
Mime.822	3810	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 RDB received

From: "Mailie La Zarr" <Llazrose@aol.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 3:20 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Mailie La Zarr
2805 Yosemite Blvd. #178
Modesto, CA 95354

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

235

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (SHW1)
C. Guerrero (QX93)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Mailie La Zarr
209 571-8461

Mail Envelope Properties (42D41814.AF6 : 13 : 64246)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 3:20 PM
From: "Mailie La Zarr" <Llazrose@aol.com>

Created By: Llazrose@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4979	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 3:20 PM
Mime.822	6029	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
BDB received

From: "Megan Ahearn" <Ahearnm@kenyon.edu>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 3:20 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Megan Ahearn
po box 0852
gambier, oh 43022

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

July 12, 2005

236

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to express my stong OPPOSITION to Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Megan Ahearn

Mail Envelope Properties (42D417F5.AF2 : 9 : 64242)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 3:20 PM
From: "Megan Ahearn" <Ahearnm@kenyon.edu>

Created By: Ahearnm@kenyon.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4973	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 3:20 PM
Mime.822	6021	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
BDB received

From: "Bruce Jenkins" <btzjenk@webtv.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 3:02 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Bruce Jenkins
907 Tanager Ct
Sunnyvale, Ca 94087-1570

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

237

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Bruce Jenkins
408-738-1408

Mail Envelope Properties (42D413CC.844 : 23 : 63556)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 3:02 PM
From: "Bruce Jenkins" <btzjenk@webtv.net>

Created By: btzjenk@webtv.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	**Route**
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	4974	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 3:02 PM
Mime.822	6023	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Nick Mastro" <electric88keys@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 2:29 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Nick Mastro
2642 Manning Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90064

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

238

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SFSP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Nick Mastro
310 490 1364

Mail Envelope Properties (42D40C18.21F : 0 : 61983)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 2:29 PM
From: "Nick Mastro" <electric88keys@yahoo.com>

Created By: electric88keys@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4969	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 2:29 PM
Mime.822	6021	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Judy Allen" <judyallen@suscom.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 2:15 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Judy Allen
24 Seifert Lane
Putnam Valley, NY 10579

4/28/05
70 FR 22155
239

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RFDS= ADM-03
Add= J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SFSP Review Complete

Template= ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

Why do I care about a nuclear plant in Mississippi? Because Entergy also owns and runs Indian Point in Buchanan, NY, and its management of that plant has been problematic, at best. Both in New York and Mississippi, too many issues remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Judy Allen

Mail Envelope Properties (42D408C2.011 : 24 : 61457)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 2:14 PM
From: "Judy Allen" <judyallen@suscom.net>

Created By: judyallen@suscom.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	**Route**
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	5155	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 2:14 PM
Mime.822	6203	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 RDB received

From: "clyde r. chamberlain" <beachbmz@hevanet.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 2:01 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

clyde r. chamberlain
6210 n.e. alton st.
portland, or 97213

7/28/05
70 FR 22155
240

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013
E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

clyde r. chamberlain

Mail Envelope Properties (42D40587.E3F : 8 : 60991)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 2:01 PM
From: "clyde r. chamberlain" <beachbmz@hevanet.com>

Created By: beachbmz@hevanet.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4974	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 2:01 PM
Mime.822	6032	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
BDB received

From: "Sue Lundin" <slundin4429@charter.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 11:03 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Sue Lundin
428 Town Hill Road
New Hartford, Ct 06057

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

July 12, 2005

(247)

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add= J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete.
Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Sue Lundin

Mail Envelope Properties (42D48493.D46 : 22 : 7494)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 11:03 PM
From: "Sue Lundin" <slundin4429@charter.net>

Created By: slundin4429@charter.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4957	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 11:03 PM
Mime.822	6006	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 BDB received

From: "Vera Cousins" <vcousins@iowatelecom.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 9:57 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Vera Cousins
903 16th Ave.
Grinnell, IA 50112

4/28/05
70FR 22155

July 12, 2005

242

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (axg3)

SISP Review Complete
Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Vera Cousins

Mail Envelope Properties (42D47518.A71 : 22 : 6769)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 9:57 PM
From: "Vera Cousins" <vcousins@iowatelecom.net>

Created By: vcousins@iowatelecom.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4952	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 9:57 PM
Mime.822	6004	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
BDB received

From: "Kent Minault" <getkent@adelphia.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 10:43 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Kent Minault
13214 Magnolia Blvd.
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423

4/28/05

70FR 22155

243

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete
Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Kent Minault

Mail Envelope Properties (42D47FB1.C67 : 24 : 7271)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 10:42 PM
From: "Kent Minault" <getkent@adelphia.net>

Created By: getkent@adelphia.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4963	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 10:42 PM
Mime.822	6012	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Linda Ferris" <slundin4429@charter.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 11:06 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Linda Ferris
428 Town Hill Road
New Hartford, Ct 06057

4/28/05
70FR 22155

July 12, 2005

244

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
Add=A. Guerrero (AXG3)

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Linda Ferris

Mail Envelope Properties (42D4850F.D56 : 13 : 7510)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 11:05 PM
From: "Linda Ferris" <slundin4429@charter.net>

Created By: slundin4429@charter.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4961	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 11:05 PM
Mime.822	6012	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
BDB received

From: "Irene Euchler" <ieuchler@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 11:55 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Irene Euchler
1335 Fleming Ave. #273
Ormond Beach, FL 32174

4/28/05

70FR 22155

245

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

I marched against Hanford in Washington state in the 70's because I had read and investagated what they were doing there and knew that the land around this facility would be worthless for generations to come. While they were denying releasing gases in the area we found out in the 90's that they were doing that and now the land around Hanford is worthless. I just don't trust that when humans are in control that accidents won't happen. Nuclear accidents are a horror that I don't ever want to see in America.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency

E-RIDS = ADM-03

SISP Review Complete

Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

Template = ADM-013

management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Irene Euchler
unlisted

Mail Envelope Properties (42D490B2.F29 : 5 : 7977)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 11:55 PM
From: "Irene Euchler" <ieuchler@yahoo.com>

Created By: ieuchler@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5495	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 11:55 PM
Mime.822	6553	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 RDB Received

From: "Sarah Lanzman" <lanzbrod@cstone.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 11:56 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Sarah Lanzman
8907 Dick Woods Rd.
Afton, VA 22920

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

July 12, 2005

246

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Sarah Lanzman

Mail Envelope Properties (42D490D1.F32 : 14 : 7986)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 11:55 PM
From: "Sarah Lanzman" <lanzbrod@cstone.net>

Created By: lanzbrod@cstone.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4957	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 11:55 PM
Mime.822	6006	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB Received

From: "Edward Schaechtel" <ed.schaechtel@gmail.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 8:46 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Edward Schaechtel
514 s.bond st. p.o.box 38131
baltimore, md 21231

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

July 12, 2005

247

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

ERIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (CXG3

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Edward Schaechtel
410-880-2577

Mail Envelope Properties (42D46458.618 : 9 : 5656)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 8:45 PM
From: "Edward Schaechtel" <ed.schaechtel@gmail.com>

Created By: ed.schaechtel@gmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4991	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 8:45 PM
Mime.822	6050	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Mha Atma S Khalsa" <ean@sbcglobal.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 8:54 PM
Subject: My Comments: NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Mha Atma S Khalsa
1536 Crest Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90035

4/28/05

70FR 22155

July 12, 2005

248

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

As a very concerned American citizen and taxpayer I strongly OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy

E-RIDS=ADM-03
add=J Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Mha Atma S. Khalsa

Mail Envelope Properties (42D46658.6B4 : 15 : 5812)

Subject: My Comments: NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 8:54 PM
From: "Mha Atma S Khalsa" <ean@sbcglobal.net>

Created By: ean@sbcglobal.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5013	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 8:54 PM
Mime.822	6068	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Country Maron" <nike06524@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 8:56 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Country Maron
PO Box 131
Bethany, CT 06524

4/28/05
70 FR 22155
249

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013
ERIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Country Maron

Mail Envelope Properties (42D466D7.6DD : 6 : 5853)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 8:56 PM
From: "Country Maron" <nike06524@yahoo.com>

Created By: nike06524@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4950	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 8:56 PM
Mime.822	5999	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05.
BDB received

From: "Jennifer Worrell" <jw327@hotmail.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 9:08 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Jennifer Worrell
6704 W. Albion Ave.
2
Niles, IL 60714

H/28/05
70 FR 22155

(250)

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Joel Wicklund
847 647-0386

Mail Envelope Properties (42D46969.78A : 4 : 6026)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 9:07 PM
From: "Jennifer Worrell" <jw327@hotmail.com>

Created By: jw327@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4978	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 9:07 PM
Mime.822	6031	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 RDB received

From: "Paul Stein" <pls47@hotmail.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 9:32 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Paul Stein
532 LaGuardia Pl
NY, NY 10012

4/28/05

70FR22155

July 12, 2005

251

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
add= J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template= ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Paul Stein

Mail Envelope Properties (42D46F2D.8D7 : 12 : 6359)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 9:31 PM
From: "Paul Stein" <pls47@hotmail.com>

Created By: pls47@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4945	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 9:31 PM
Mime.822	5990	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 BDB Received

From: "cliff staebler" <cstaebler@nyc.rr.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 8:36 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

cliff staebler
3324 junction blvd
jackson hts, nY 11372

4/26/05
70 FR 22155

(252)

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

cliff staebler
718-898-0999

Mail Envelope Properties (42D46204.580 : 7 : 5504)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 8:36 PM
From: "cliff staebler" <cstaebler@nyc.rr.com>

Created By: cstaebler@nyc.rr.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4977	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 8:36 PM
Mime.822	6029	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 RDB Received

From: "Sabrina Choi" <flyingcatps@hotmail.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 8:37 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Sabrina Choi
1680 Norwood Ave Apt. 510
Itasca, IL 60143

4/28/05
70 FR 22155
253

July 12, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
SFSP Review Complete
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)
Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Sabrina Choi

Mail Envelope Properties (42D46243.588 : 15 : 5512)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Tue, Jul 12, 2005 8:37 PM
From: "Sabrina Choi" <flyingcatps@hotmail.com>

Created By: flyingcatps@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4962	Tuesday, July 12, 2005 8:37 PM
Mime.822	6014	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 RDB received

From: "Paxus Calta" <paxuscalta@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 2:10 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Paxus Calta
138 Twin Oaks Rd
Louisa, VA 23093

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

(254)

July 13, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy?s application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only ?minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public.? Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county?s resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is ?not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons.? Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf ?from an environmental perspective.? Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is ?highly speculative? does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach?especially considering Grand Gulf?s location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Urgently

Paxus Calta

Mail Envelope Properties (42D55906.514 : 4 : 25876)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 2:10 PM
From: "Paxus Calta" <paxuscalta@yahoo.com>

Created By: paxuscalta@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4913	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 2:10 PM
Mime.822	5997	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "RASHID EL AMIN" <rashid_elamin@hotmail.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 2:25 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

RASHID EL AMIN
5757 NORTH SHERIDAN ROAD # 8F
CHICAGO, IL 60660

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

255

July 13, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

ESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (AXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

RASHID EL AMIN
773 784-6960

Mail Envelope Properties (42D55C82.6EE : 3 : 26350)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 2:25 PM
From: "RASHID EL AMIN" <rashid_elamin@hotmail.com>

Created By: rashid_elamin@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4984	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 2:25 PM
Mime.822	6040	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: paulette swartzfager <pswartz@loyno.edu>
To: <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 1:02 PM
Subject: Opposition to Grand Gulf Early Site Permit

I am adamantly opposed to any development or expansion of nuclear facilities Anywhere-- but in Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, Texas, and Florida especially.

1. The solution to the US energy problem is to reduce consumption and to rely on renewable energy (such as wind and solar energy).

2. The dangers of nuclear facilities (no matter how minimal) are simply unacceptable and unnecessary. The specific building of nuclear facilities in the South--where solar and wind resources are abundant--is particularly ridiculous.

My name is Paulette Swartzfager, 10555 Jefferson Hwy., River Ridge LA 70123, (AND I VOTE!)

4/28/05

70FR 22153

256

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Hunnicutt (CXG3)

Mail Envelope Properties (42D5492B.BBA : 10 : 23482)

Subject: Opposition to Grand Gulf Early Site Permit
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 1:01 PM
From: paulette swartzfager <pswartz@loyno.edu>

Created By: pswartz@loyno.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	632	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 1:01 PM
TEXT.htm	952	
Mime.822	2937	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
BDB received

From: "John Lischalk" <jbchalk@comcast.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 1:11 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

John Lischalk
PO Box 3467
Silverdale, WA 98383

4/28/05

July 13, 2005

70 FR 22155

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

257

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
O. Guerrero (OXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

John M Lischalk

Mail Envelope Properties (42D54B4D.CB6 : 12 : 23734)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 1:11 PM
From: "John Lischalk" <jbchalk@comcast.net>

Created By: jbchalk@comcast.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4956	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 1:11 PM
Mime.822	6005	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "S.M. Dixon" <smdixon@gmail.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 1:50 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

S.M. Dixon
943 E. Inca
Mesa, Az 85203

7/28/05
70 FR 22155

(258)

July 13, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = C. Guerrero (CXG3)
J. Wilson (JHW1)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

S.M. Dixon

Mail Envelope Properties (42D5546D.2AF : 16 : 25263)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 1:50 PM
From: "S.M. Dixon" <smdixon@gmail.com>

Created By: smdixon@gmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4942	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 1:50 PM
Mime.822	5984	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 RDB received

From: "Shelly Stern" <hopefull1@excite.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 1:56 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Shelly Stern
615 Bailey Road
Charlottesville, VA 22903

4/28/05

July 13, 2005

70FR 22155

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

259

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
O. Yoxsero (OXG3)

SISP Review Complete
Template - ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Shelly S. Stern
434-295-1388

Mail Envelope Properties (42D555CB.359 : 11 : 25433)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 1:56 PM
From: "Shelly Stern" <hopefull1@excite.com>

Created By: hopefull1@excite.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4977	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 1:56 PM
Mime.822	6027	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "John W Winningham" <williammanagementcompany@hotmail.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 9:13 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

John W Winningham
P.O. Box 54
Hoxie, AR 72433

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

July 13, 2005

260

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (SHW1)
C. Yuhas (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

John W. Winningham
870-573-7300

Mail Envelope Properties (42D51380.CB6 : 20 : 15542)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 9:13 AM
From: "John W Winningham" <williammanagementcompany@hotmail.com>

Created By: williammanagementcompany@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4971	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 9:13 AM
Mime.822	6044	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Eileen Chieco" <westport.auto.craft@snet.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 9:20 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Eileen Chieco
25 West Lane
South Salem, NY 10590

4/28/05

July 13, 2005

70 FR 22155

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

(2ed)

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03

SISP Review Complete

Cell = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Gwaltney (CXG3)

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Eileen Chieco
9145332440

Mail Envelope Properties (42D5150E.DB8 : 3 : 15800)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 9:19 AM
From: "Eileen Chieco" <westport.auto.craft@snet.net>

Created By: westport.auto.craft@snet.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4967	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 9:19 AM
Mime.822	6026	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
BDB received

From: "Danielle Cantin" <niellelou@hotmail.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 10:21 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Danielle Cantin
4400 Davlind Dr.
Holt, MI 48842

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

July 13, 2005

262

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Danielle Cantin

Mail Envelope Properties (42D5234C.535 : 20 : 17717)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 10:20 AM
From: "Danielle Cantin" <niellelou@hotmail.com>

Created By: niellelou@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4957	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 10:20 AM
Mime.822	6011	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB Received

From: "Justin Bernstein" <jpbssecretsnii@aol.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 10:10 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Justin Bernstein
119 East 96th Street apt 16
New York, NY 10128

4/28/05
70FR 22155

July 13, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

(263)

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Justin Bernstein

Mail Envelope Properties (42D520BA.406 : 17 : 17414)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 10:09 AM
From: "Justin Bernstein" <jpbssecretsnii@aol.com>

Created By: jpbssecretsnii@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4974	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 10:09 AM
Mime.822	6031	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
BDB received

From: "S H" <savannahCSW@hotmail.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 11:25 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

S H
W 43 St
NYC, NY 10036

4/28/05

70FR 22155

264

July 13, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template - ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

S H

Mail Envelope Properties (42D53264.E60 : 17 : 20064)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 11:24 AM
From: "S H" <savannahCSW@hotmail.com>

Created By: savannahCSW@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	**Route**
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	4923	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 11:24 AM
Mime.822	5967	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 BDB received

From: "Julia Burnette" <pixiebelle@charter.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 11:22 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Julia Burnette
6 Waterton Creek Ct.
Simpsonville, SC 29681

4/28/05
70 FR 22155
265

July 13, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Julia Burnette
864-676-2203

Mail Envelope Properties (42D531BF.E01 : 22 : 19969)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 11:22 AM
From: "Julia Burnette" <pixiebelle@charter.net>

Created By: pixiebelle@charter.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4980	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 11:22 AM
Mime.822	6034	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "robert critser" <mudman034@aol.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 11:56 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

robert critser
414 hampton ave
greenville, sc 29601

4/28/05
70FR 22155

July 13, 2005

(266)

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Robert Critser
864-907-5991

Mail Envelope Properties (42D53985.250 : 0 : 21072)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 11:55 AM
From: "robert critser" <mudman034@aol.com>

Created By: mudman034@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4973	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 11:55 AM
Mime.822	6023	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 BDB received

From: "Mike Ewall" <catalyst@actionpa.org>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 12:14 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Mike Ewall
1434 Elbridge St
Philadelphia, PA 19149

11/28/05
70 FR 22155

July 13, 2005

267

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03

SISP Review Complete

Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (AXG3)

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Mike Ewall
215-743-4884

Mail Envelope Properties (42D53DD4.4F5 : 2 : 21749)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 12:13 PM
From: "Mike Ewall" <catalyst@actionpa.org>

Created By: catalyst@actionpa.org

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4968	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 12:13 PM
Mime.822	6018	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Bruce Arkwright, Jr." <a-bruiexjr@lycos.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 8:40 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Bruce Arkwright, Jr.
620 W. 4th St. Apt.1
Erie, PA 16507

4/28/05

July 13, 2005

70 FR 22155

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

268

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

Your action are selfish and shows you really do not care about human-beings, workers of nukes, and the environment. A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

Template = ADM-013

sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Bruce Arkwright, Jr.
814 456 4095

Mail Envelope Properties (42D50BB5.964 : 20 : 14692)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 8:39 AM
From: "Bruce Arkwright, Jr." <a-bruiexjr@lycos.com>

Created By: a-bruiexjr@lycos.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5101	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 8:39 AM
Mime.822	6159	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Misha Fredericks" <mishakachina@usadatanet.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 7:44 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Misha Fredericks
222 Plutarch Rd
Highland, NY 12528

4/25/05
70FR 22155

July 13, 2005

269

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add= J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrier (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete
Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Misha Fredericks
8

Mail Envelope Properties (42D4FE95.4F3 : 8 : 13555)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 7:44 AM
From: "Misha Fredericks" <mishakachina@usadatanet.net>

Created By: mishakachina@usadatanet.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4964	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 7:44 AM
Mime.822	6024	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB Received

From: "Colette Wedding" <colette_weddin@hotmail.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 6:59 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Colette Wedding
18516 Woodbine
Fraser, MI 48026

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

(270)

July 13, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Colette Wedding
586-247-6929

Mail Envelope Properties (42D4F411.203 : 6 : 12803)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 6:59 AM
From: "Colette Wedding" <colette_weddin@hotmail.com>

Created By: colette_weddin@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4970	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 6:59 AM
Mime.822	6029	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Nicholle Wedding" <nicholleluvsnoah@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 6:58 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Nicholle Wedding
37087 Yorkshire
Sterling Heights, MI 48312

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

July 13, 2005

(271)

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilcox (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Nicholle Wedding
586-247-6929

Mail Envelope Properties (42D4F3B2.1EE : 10 : 12782)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 6:57 AM
From: "Nicholle Wedding" <nicholleluvsnoah@yahoo.com>

Created By: nicholleluvsnoah@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	**Route**
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	4983	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 6:57 AM
Mime.822	6043	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
DDB Receive

From: "Arthur Dronzkowski" <dronzkowski@hotmail.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 6:54 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Arthur Dronzkowski
43280 Polo Circle apt. #3
Sterling Heights, MI 48313

4/28/05

July 13, 2005

70 FR 22155

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

272

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

Isn't history going to trash you people enough already? I OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy

SESP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Cc = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Arthur Dronzkowski
586-247-6929

Mail Envelope Properties (42D4F2F5.1BE : 12 : 12734)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 6:54 AM
From: "Arthur Dronzkowski" <dronzkowski@hotmail.com>

Created By: dronzkowski@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5041	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 6:54 AM
Mime.822	6101	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB Received

From: "Cheryl Hines-Dronzkowski" <cherylruth2@hotmail.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 6:56 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Cheryl Hines-Dronzkowski
43280 Polo Circle apt. #3
Sterling Heights, MI 48313

4/28/05
70FR 22155
273

July 13, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Hines-Dronzkowski
586-247-6929

Mail Envelope Properties (42D4F354.1DB : 16 : 12763)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 6:56 AM
From: "Cheryl Hines-Dronzkowski" <cherylruth2@hotmail.com>

Created By: cherylruth2@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5009	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 6:56 AM
Mime.822	6074	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "renata dobryn" <namach@earthlink.ner>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 2:53 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

renata dobryn
6 Spruce Ln.
Montauk, NY 11954

4/28/05
70FR 22155
97H

July 13, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Gwyrna (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

renata dobryn

Mail Envelope Properties (42D5633F.A8C : 4 : 27276)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 2:53 PM
From: "renata dobryn" <namach@earthlink.ner>

Created By: namach@earthlink.ner

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4952	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 2:53 PM
Mime.822	6004	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RJB Received

From: "Aurora Hunter" <electriclady281@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 2:39 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Aurora Hunter
15711 Sandy Hill
Houston, TX 77084

4/28/05

70 FR 22155

July 13, 2005

275

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SFSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Gunter (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country and permitting requirements are too lax! Entergy doesn't have to explain what it will do with all the nuclear waste in the long term, nor is the company required to address security issues.

Sincerely,

Aurora E. Hunter
281-856-2182

Mail Envelope Properties (42D4B6FD.808 : 1 : 10248)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 2:38 AM
From: "Aurora Hunter" <electriclady281@yahoo.com>

Created By: electriclady281@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5166	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 2:38 AM
Mime.822	6227	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
ADD Maine

From: "Catherine Marciniak" <c_marciniak@conknet.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 12:32 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Catherine Marciniak
356 Stowe Mt Rd
Hillsboro, NH 03244

4/28/05
70FR 22155
276

July 13, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SESP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Catherine Marciniak

Mail Envelope Properties (42D49968.377 : 7 : 9079)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 12:32 AM
From: "Catherine Marciniak" <c_marciniak@conknet.com>

Created By: c_marciniak@conknet.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4969	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 12:32 AM
Mime.822	6028	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB Received

From: Wendy King <wking@tulane.edu>
To: <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 11:34 PM
Subject: Letter opposing Grand Gulf Plant

July 13, 2005

Chief, Rules and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington DC 20555-0001

4/28/05
70FR 22155
277

Dear Sir:

I am a Louisiana native, and oppose the proposed siting of the next Grand Gulf nuclear power plant in Port Gibson, Mississippi. This siting's permitting and licensing process has been handled with as little public input and comment as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has been able to get away with.

Your hearing in Mississippi was set up at a time and place when most prospective intervenors and concerned citizens would be unable to make the hearing, or would have to take time away from work and family to come in and testify. Many concerned residents of Louisiana, Mississippi, and surrounding areas had to stay in Mississippi at least overnight on July 5th, in order to attend the hearing and testify, and return home the next day.

Louisiana and Mississippi residents already have three nuclear power plants between them: River Bend, Waterford III, and Grand Gulf. Your agency's attempting to streamline the permitting and licensing process for this next nuclear power plant by curtailing public comment, by those who will be the most affected by this plant's operation, is unacceptable, and your decision to concentrate your permitting and licensing process in Washington, DC, puts any meaningful input into these decisions effectively out of reach for those who are unable to come to Washington, DC, due to their family or work responsibilities.

These nuclear power plants are no "cleaner" now, than they were decades ago. They still emit radiation, and the proposed waste disposal ideas leave highly radioactive fuel rods buried either underground or in giant pools, both of which are usually unguarded. These plants are easy targets for terrorists or thieves who can walk in through an unlocked gate, take the nuclear waste or fuel rods they need, and leave, without being either stopped or questioned by guards.

This nuclear power plant should not be permitted, sited, or licensed, unless and until the NRC can effectively address the security concerns posed by these plants, the problems with nuclear power's radioactive waste, and the agency's dismissive attitude towards those people whose lives will be the most adversely affected by this plant, and who have little political clout in keeping one of these plants out of their communities.

E-RIDS= ADM-03
Add= J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template= ADM-013

Sincerely,

Wendy King
2118 Audubon Street
New Orleans LA 70118

Mail Envelope Properties (42D5DD29.763 : 8 : 38755)

Subject: Letter opposing Grand Gulf Plant
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 11:34 PM
From: Wendy King <wking@tulane.edu>

Created By: wking@tulane.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2554	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 11:34 PM
TEXT.htm	3019	
Mime.822	7243	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB Received

From: "Ellen Jamieson" <ellen.jay@verizon.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 5:48 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Ellen Jamieson
402 Hillside Avenue
Leonia, NJ 07605

4/28/05

July 13, 2005

70 FR 22155

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

278

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is neither complete enough nor sufficient enough to form a basis for acceptance of the application. The information that is included in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could place an unfair burden on minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." This conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents if an additional reactor were to be constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide any economic benefit for the people of Claiborne County. In fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Another concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it fails to give a fair and thorough review of

SIS p Better Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

the potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Ellen Jamieson
201-947-0331

Mail Envelope Properties (42D58C41.E86 : 18 : 32390)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 5:48 PM
From: "Ellen Jamieson" <ellen.jay@verizon.net>

Created By: ellen.jay@verizon.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5001	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 5:48 PM
Mime.822	6055	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Robert Harrison" <rehelna@bellsouth.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 4:56 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Robert Harrison
5205 Kingston Hwy
Lenoir City,, tn 37771

4/28/05
70FR 22155
279

July 13, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS= ADM-03
Add= J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete
Template= ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Robert Harrison

Mail Envelope Properties (42D58010.9D1 : 13 : 31185)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 4:56 PM
From: "Robert Harrison" <rehelna@bellsouth.net>

Created By: rehelna@bellsouth.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4966	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 4:56 PM
Mime.822	6019	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Patricia Aguirre" <patriaciaaguirre@webtv.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 7:16 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Patricia Aguirre
4835 Buchanan St.
Los Angeles, CA 90042

4/28/05

70FR 22155

July 13, 2005

280

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Patricia Aguirre

Mail Envelope Properties (42D5A0A6.B99 : 15 : 35737)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 7:15 PM
From: "Patricia Aguirre" <patriaciaaguirre@webtv.net>

Created By: patriaciaaguirre@webtv.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4967	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 7:15 PM
Mime.822	6027	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
KDB received

From: "STEPHEN JACOBS" <mdsj@earthlink.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 9:02 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

STEPHEN JACOBS
1433 1/2 N HUDSON AVE
L.A., CA 90028

4/28/05

July 13, 2005

70FR 22155

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

281

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN JACOBS

Mail Envelope Properties (42D5B9A0.0E4 : 20 : 37092)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 9:01 PM
From: "STEPHEN JACOBS" <mdsj@earthlink.net>

Created By: mdsj@earthlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4960	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 9:01 PM
Mime.822	6010	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Robert Wilson" <bwilson10@knology.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 9:55 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Robert Wilson
105 McNaron Dr
Madison, AL 35758

4/28/05
70FR 22155

July 13, 2005

282

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete
Template=ADM-013

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Wilson
256 797 8525

Mail Envelope Properties (42D5C610.320 : 17 : 37664)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 9:54 PM
From: "Robert Wilson" <bwilson10@knology.net>

Created By: bwilson10@knology.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4970	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 9:54 PM
Mime.822	6022	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Merry McLoryd" <moocowmerry@hotmail.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 10:34 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Merry McLoryd
308Orchard drive
Monroe, ny 10950

4/28/05
70FR 22155

(283)

July 13, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SFSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS-ADM-03
add - J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Merry McLoryd

Mail Envelope Properties (42D5CF2E.4E0 : 15 : 38112)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 10:33 PM
From: "Merry McLoryd" <moocowmerry@hotmail.com>

Created By: moocowmerry@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4955	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 10:33 PM
Mime.822	6006	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Kathy Galligan" <jkhome1@optonline.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 3:07 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Kathy Galligan
4501 Patterson Street
Bridgewater, NJ 08807

4/08/05

70FR 22155

July 13, 2005

284

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Kathy Galligan

Mail Envelope Properties (42D56654.C07 : 8 : 27655)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 3:06 PM
From: "Kathy Galligan" <jkhome1@optonline.net>

Created By: jkhome1@optonline.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4967	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 3:06 PM
Mime.822	6020	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Marilyn Spivey" <maspiveyy@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 4:06 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Marilyn Spivey
415 Herondo Street
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254

4/28/05
70FR 22155
285

July 13, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add - J. Wilson (JHW1)
O. Yoseveo (OXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Marilyn A. Spivey
310-315-2224

Mail Envelope Properties (42D57442.48D : 15 : 29837)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 4:06 PM
From: "Marilyn Spivey" <maspiveyy@yahoo.com>

Created By: maspiveyy@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4982	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 4:06 PM
Mime.822	6033	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "James Causey" <jmcauseyj@aol.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 4:29 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

James Causey
12512 Thunder Chase Dr.
Reston, VA 20191

4/28/05
70FR 22155

286

July 13, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS - ADM-03
Add - J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template - ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

James Causey

Mail Envelope Properties (42D57998.6E6 : 16 : 30438)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 4:29 PM
From: "James Causey" <jmcauseyj@aol.com>

Created By: jmcauseyj@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4960	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 4:29 PM
Mime.822	6006	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "carol campbell" <carol_campbel68@hotmail.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 4:41 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

carol campbell
2218 plum road
starkville, MS 39759

287

July 13, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Ttoo many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Carol Campbell

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (42D57C51.81C : 1 : 30748)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 4:40 PM
From: "carol campbell" <carol_campbel68@hotmail.com>

Created By: carol_campbel68@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2007	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 4:40 PM
Mime.822	3047	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
BDB Incorrect

From: "sharon kansas" <srkansas@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 2:56 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

sharon kansas
Box 534
Dixon, NM 87527

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

July 13, 2005

(288)

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Goeckeler (CXG3)

STSP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

sharon kansas

Mail Envelope Properties (42D563F7.AD7 : 4 : 27351)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 2:56 PM
From: "sharon kansas" <srkansas@yahoo.com>

Created By: srkansas@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4945	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 2:56 PM
Mime.822	5992	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Charlie Brenner" <chbrenner@att.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 4:43 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Charlie Brenner
625 Patton Ave.
Jackson, MS 39216

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

July 13, 2005

(289)

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013
E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG8)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Respectfully

Charlie Brenner
601-366-7391

Mail Envelope Properties (42D57CF0.87C : 22 : 30844)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 4:43 PM
From: "Charlie Brenner" <chbrenner@att.net>

Created By: chbrenner@att.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4974	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 4:43 PM
Mime.822	6024	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB Received

From: <PrecursorS@aol.com>
To: <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 2:42 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

4/28/05

70FR 22155

290

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi.

The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application. Furthermore, for the ESP process to work, the DEIS would need to show a 20 year forecast for all conditions as a baseline condition atop which the proposed project would need to be an overlay.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons."

Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the potential of clean, sustainable energy. The draft EIS overstates the environmental impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply.

Energy efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite since Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over

ERIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilcox (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CKG3)

STSP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a significant benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Thank you for your consideration.

Aviv Goldsmith
6147 Hickory Ridge Road
Spotsylvania, VA 22553 USA

Mail Envelope Properties (42D56085.93A : 16 : 26938)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 2:41 PM
From: <PrecursorS@aol.com>

Created By: PrecursorS@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4633	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 2:41 PM
TEXT.htm	5551	
Mime.822	12098	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
BDB received

From: "Mary Perner" <maryqkontrary@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 3:02 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Mary Perner
3717 Carrigan Common
Livermore, CA 94551

4/28/05
70FR 22155

(291)

July 13, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Mary Perner

Mail Envelope Properties (42D56558.B8A : 8 : 27530)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Wed, Jul 13, 2005 3:02 PM
From: "Mary Perner" <maryqkontrary@yahoo.com>

Created By: maryqkontrary@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4958	Wednesday, July 13, 2005 3:02 PM
Mime.822	6010	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
ADB received

From: "martha ferris" <martha@vicksburg.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 6:34 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

martha ferris
9433 fisher ferry road
vicksburg, ms 39180-8295

11/28/05
70 FR 22155
(292)

July 14, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (AXG3)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Martha Ferris

Mail Envelope Properties (42D63FAC.A12 : 16 : 43538)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 6:33 AM
From: "martha ferris" <martha@vicksburg.com>

Created By: martha@vicksburg.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4969	Thursday, July 14, 2005 6:33 AM
Mime.822	6019	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: <m.thibodeaux@att.net>
To: <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 7:42 AM
Subject: Re-active Power

NRC must address and resolve the 300% demand for reactive power for Grand Gulf before considering any additional enviornmental requirements.
1) Identify problem sources
2) State proposed remedy
3) Public acceptance of the proposed solution for this explosive issue

CC: Julie D. Buckner <larenew1@hotmail.com>, Heather Borst-Persson <hborst@gmail.com>, Paul Gunter <pgunter@nirs.org>, Grand Gulf <GrandGulf@lists.nonewnukes.org>

4/28/05
70FR 22155

293

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
O. Yuchen (OXG3)

Mail Envelope Properties (42D64F82.E2C : 16 : 44588)

Subject: Re-active Power
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 7:41 AM
From: <m.thibodeaux@att.net>

Created By: m.thibodeaux@att.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

lists.nonewnukes.org
GrandGulf CC (Grand Gulf)

nirs.org
pgunter CC (Paul Gunter)

gmail.com
hborst CC (Heather Borst-Persson)

hotmail.com
larenew1 CC (Julie D. Buckner)

Post Office
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01

Route
nrc.gov
lists.nonewnukes.org
nirs.org
gmail.com
hotmail.com

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	266	Thursday, July 14, 2005 7:41 AM
TEXT.htm	490	
Mime.822	2254	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB Received

From: "Sandra Lindberg" <slindber@iwu.edu>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 12:20 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Sandra Lindberg
2009 E. Taylor St.
Bloomington, IL 61701

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

July 14, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

294

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add= J. Wilcox (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Sandra Lindberg

Mail Envelope Properties (42D690B0.1EC : 18 : 53740)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 12:19 PM
From: "Sandra Lindberg" <slindber@iwu.edu>

Created By: slindber@iwu.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4966	Thursday, July 14, 2005 12:19 PM
Mime.822	6013	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Noreen Kenny" <NoreenPK@aol.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 9:26 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Noreen Kenny
3730 Bill Downing Rd
Raymond, MS 39154

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

295

July 14, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy’s application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only “minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public.” Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county’s resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is “not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons.” Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Grieves (CXG3)

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf “from an environmental perspective.” Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is “highly speculative” does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf’s location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Noreen Kenny

Mail Envelope Properties (42D667E5.8B9 : 17 : 47289)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 9:25 AM
From: "Noreen Kenny" <NoreenPK@aol.com>

Created By: NoreenPK@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4994	Thursday, July 14, 2005 9:25 AM
Mime.822	6075	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 RDB received

From: "Seamus Allman" <seamus@twinoaks.org>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 10:32 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Seamus Allman
138 Twin Oaks Rd
Louisa, VA 23093

70FR 22155

(29)

July 14, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy’s application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only “minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public.” Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county’s resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is “not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons.” Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS= ADM-03
Add= J. Wilson (SHW1)
C. Guerrero (CRG5)

SISP Review Complete
Template= ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf “from an environmental perspective.” Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is “highly speculative” does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf’s location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Seamus Allman

Mail Envelope Properties (42D67773.23C : 2 : 49724)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 10:32 AM
From: "Seamus Allman" <seamus@twinoaks.org>

Created By: seamus@twinoaks.org

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4991	Thursday, July 14, 2005 10:32 AM
Mime.822	6076	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB Received

From: "mary lewis" <yinyam@earthlink.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 2:44 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

mary lewis
2340 semoran pl
pensacola, fl 32503

4/28/05
70 FR 22155
(297)

July 14, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

mary lewis
8504362193

Mail Envelope Properties (42D6B2A1.633 : 9 : 58931)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 2:44 PM
From: "mary lewis" <yinyam@earthlink.net>

Created By: yinyam@earthlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4962	Thursday, July 14, 2005 2:44 PM
Mime.822	6012	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Connie Schuett" <cosmicon@charter.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 12:04 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Connie Schuett
P.O. Box 7102
Reno, NV 89510

4/08/05
70 FR 22155

(298)

July 14, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Connie Schuett
775-425-2993

Mail Envelope Properties (42D68D0C.FBE : 10 : 53182)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 12:04 PM
From: "Connie Schuett" <cosmicon@charter.net>

Created By: cosmicon@charter.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4965	Thursday, July 14, 2005 12:04 PM
Mime.822	6018	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/4/05 RDB Received

From: "Sharon Lobert" <slobert@son.umsmed.edu>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 3:04 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Sharon Lobert
1330 Fontatine Dr.
Jackson, MS 39211

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

July 14, 2005

299

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. I would like to see a clearer statement of the impact on health and the economy of the area. I also am seriously concerned about additional security risks. Thank you for considering this letter.

Sincerely,

Sharon Lobert

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (42D6B73C.8FD : 23 : 59645)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 3:04 PM
From: "Sharon Lobert" <slobert@son.umsmed.edu>

Created By: slobert@son.umsmed.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	700	Thursday, July 14, 2005 3:04 PM
Mime.822	1716	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 RDB received

From: "Christine Wilson" <cwilson@mdah.state.ms.us>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 12:47 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Christine Wilson
905 Fairview
Jackson, MS 39202

4/28/05
70 FR 22155
300

July 14, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013
E-RFDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Christine Wilson

Mail Envelope Properties (42D69725.5D0 : 14 : 54736)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 12:47 PM
From: "Christine Wilson" <cwilson@mdah.state.ms.us>

Created By: cwilson@mdah.state.ms.us

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4958	Thursday, July 14, 2005 12:47 PM
Mime.822	6016	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
BDB received

From: "Christine Roane" <cmroane@cool-universe.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 5:10 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Christine Roane
120 Mooreland Street
Springfield, MA 01104

4/28/05
70FR 22155
301

July 14, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Christine M. Roane
413-733-3045

Mail Envelope Properties (42D6D4B4.AF8 : 1 : 64248)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 5:10 PM
From: "Christine Roane" <cmroane@cool-universe.com>

Created By: cmroane@cool-universe.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4984	Thursday, July 14, 2005 5:10 PM
Mime.822	6043	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 RDB received

From: "Kirk Butler" <its4kirk@earthlink.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 4:02 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Kirk Butler
2705 Armenia Court
Tampa, fl 33614

4/28/05

70 FR 22155

(302)

July 14, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03

Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Kirk Butler
813-915-1084

Mail Envelope Properties (42D6C4D0.0E0 : 17 : 61664)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 4:01 PM
From: "Kirk Butler" <its4kirk@earthlink.net>

Created By: its4kirk@earthlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4965	Thursday, July 14, 2005 4:01 PM
Mime.822	6015	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Richard Gilman" <richgilman@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 11:26 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Richard Gilman
2522 Sheffield
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

July 14, 2005

4/28/05
70FR 22155
303

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Richard Gilman

Mail Envelope Properties (42D68414.9D8 : 0 : 51672)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 11:25 AM
From: "Richard Gilman" <richgilman@yahoo.com>

Created By: richgilman@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4958	Thursday, July 14, 2005 11:25 AM
Mime.822	6011	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 RDB received

From: "Judi Misale" <jmisale@truman.edu>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 5:10 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Judi Misale
22210 Cloud Trail
Kirksville, MO 63501

4/28/05

July 14, 2005

70FR 22155

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

30+

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RFDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (AXG3)

SISP Review Complete
Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Judi Misale

Mail Envelope Properties (42D6D4B4.AF9 : 2 : 64249)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 5:10 PM
From: "Judi Misale" <jmisale@truman.edu>

Created By: jmisale@truman.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4956	Thursday, July 14, 2005 5:10 PM
Mime.822	6001	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "angela mccomb" <angela_mccomb@ccsn.nevada.edu>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 3:36 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

angela mccomb
1900 merze ave
henderson, nv 89015

July 14, 2005

4/28/05

70FR 22155

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

305

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

angela mccomb

Mail Envelope Properties (42D6BEA1.DCF : 7 : 60879)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 3:35 PM
From: "angela mccomb" <angela_mccomb@ccsn.nevada.edu>

Created By: angela_mccomb@ccsn.nevada.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4956	Thursday, July 14, 2005 3:35 PM
Mime.822	6014	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
BDB received

From: "Brian Lutenegger" <brian.lutenegger@gmail.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 3:37 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Brian Lutenegger
102 E. Gorham Street
Madison, WI 53703

4/28/05

70 FR 22155

306

July 14, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
All = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Yuverson (CXYB)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Brian J. Lutenegger

Mail Envelope Properties (42D6BEE0.DEE : 13 : 60910)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 3:36 PM
From: "Brian Lutenegger" <brian.lutenegger@gmail.com>

Created By: brian.lutenegger@gmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4969	Thursday, July 14, 2005 3:36 PM
Mime.822	6028	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Sharon Callahan" <sharon_callahan@excite.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 8:47 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Sharon Callahan
103 Quail Ridge Drive
Plainsboro, NJ 08536

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

July 14, 2005

307

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is incomplete and insufficient to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Sharon M. Callahan
609-275-5812

Mail Envelope Properties (42D707AE.9F8 : 16 : 2552)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 8:47 PM
From: "Sharon Callahan" <sharon_callahan@excite.com>

Created By: sharon_callahan@excite.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4977	Thursday, July 14, 2005 8:47 PM
Mime.822	6037	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
BDB received

From: "New Mississippian" <newmsian@hotmail.com>
To: <grandgulfeis@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 4:05 PM
Subject: Comments

Re NUREG-1817

4/08/05
70 FR 22155

308

I have read the comments submitted by Ruth Pullen of Jackson, MS, and want to second everything she has said and by reference incorporate her comments into mine. I was not able to open the DEIS online but did attend the June 28 meeting in Port Gibson.

I want to mention an additional aspect of safety concerns, especially for NRC readers who may not have driven past the GGNS. Since my first drive past the plant years ago through June 28, 2005, there has been an "evacuation route" sign not far beyond the plant (farther out in the country, toward the Mississippi River) which points evacuees BACK PAST THE PLANT in order to escape a disaster. This time I learned that the sign points that way because the road beyond the plant floods in heavy rains and cannot be used for evacuation to the main highway when flooded. Because GGNS tax revenues have been diverted by state law from Claiborne County to about 40 other counties, no money has been available to build a viable road and bridges to provide an arguably defensible escape route to the north instead of back past the plant. The tax diversion makes this an environmental justice issue as well. This site is not safe for one plant, never mind for two. (Two or three side roads are not marked as to whether they have an outlet to the main highway - a special danger to tourists unfamiliar with the area who might get caught at Grand Gulf Military Park, beyond the plant from Port Gibson.)

Aside from being near the Mississippi River, overflows from which could become problematic, the Grand Gulf plant and proposed GGII are on the New Madrid earthquake fault.

I am also concerned that the DEIS does not seem to have considered the fact that our environment includes all the people and things around us. The people of Entergy have not seen fit to employ African Americans or Claiborne County residents in representative numbers at GGNS. The people of Entergy have not seen fit to provide the training (itself or working with neighboring Alcorn State University) that would qualify additional African Americans or Claiborne County residents for technical or professional jobs at the plant. So even if GGNS were a safe place to work, given the waste and accident or terrorism issues, the human part of the GGNS environment is counterproductive to the welfare of the majority of the residents of the area and therefore to all.

I want to reiterate Ruth Pullen's statement about significant information missing from the DEIS, which is therefore incomplete and should not have been submitted in its current condition.

Jan Hillegas
P. O. Box 3234
Jackson, MS 39207

E-RFDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (SHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template - ADM-013

Mail Envelope Properties (42D6C572.14C : 0 : 61772)

Subject: Comments
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 4:04 PM
From: "New Mississippian" <newmsian@hotmail.com>

Created By: newmsian@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2679	Thursday, July 14, 2005 4:04 PM
Mime.822	3703	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
BDB received

From: "Sylvia Goldberg" <sylgold@excite.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 11:56 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Sylvia Goldberg
3073 Park Drive Ext.
McComb, MS 39648

4/25/05

70FR 22155

309

July 14, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Cal=C. Guerrero (CXG3)
J. Wilson (JHW1)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Goldberg

Mail Envelope Properties (42D68B19.E5C : 6 : 52828)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 11:55 AM
From: "Sylvia Goldberg" <sylgold@excite.com>

Created By: sylgold@excite.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4963	Thursday, July 14, 2005 11:55 AM
Mime.822	6015	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

C/11/05 RDB received

From: "sharon kansas" <srkansas@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 4:53 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

sharon kansas
Box 534
Dixon, NM 87527

July 14, 2005

H/28/05
70FR22155

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

(3P)

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Gwaltney (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

sharon kansas

Mail Envelope Properties (42D6D0AF.72D : 5 : 63277)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 4:52 PM
From: "sharon kansas" <srkansas@yahoo.com>

Created By: srkansas@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4945	Thursday, July 14, 2005 4:52 PM
Mime.822	5992	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 RDB Received

From: "Gregory Nerode" <nerode@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 5:03 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Gregory Nerode
406 Cayuga Heights Road
Ithaca, NY 14850

4/28/05
70FR 22155
(311)

July 14, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Gregory Nerode

Mail Envelope Properties (42D6D329.988 : 8 : 63880)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 5:03 PM
From: "Gregory Nerode" <nerode@yahoo.com>

Created By: nerode@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4964	Thursday, July 14, 2005 5:03 PM
Mime.822	6011	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 RDB received

From: "Kenyon Karl" <kenyon_karl@mail.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 9:05 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Kenyon Karl
17 Ephraim Page Rd
Wentworth, NH 03282

4/28/05
70FR22155
312

July 14, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013
E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Kenyon F. Karl

Mail Envelope Properties (42D70BF3.AFA : 24 : 2810)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 9:05 PM
From: "Kenyon Karl" <kenyon_karl@mail.com>

Created By: kenyon_karl@mail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4959	Thursday, July 14, 2005 9:05 PM
Mime.822	6008	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 RDB received

From: "David Sagers" <leosager@woh.rr.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 6:24 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

David Sagers
305 W. Jackson St.
New Carlisle, OH 45344

4/28/05
70FR 22155
313

July 14, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013
E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW2)
C. Gonzalez (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

David L. Sagers

Mail Envelope Properties (42D6E616.19D : 2 : 413)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 6:24 PM
From: "David Sagers" <leosager@woh.rr.com>

Created By: leosager@woh.rr.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4965	Thursday, July 14, 2005 6:24 PM
Mime.822	6013	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
BDB Received

From: "William N. Howald" <howald@foxinternet.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 5:51 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

William N. Howald
7319 227th St. SE
Woodinville, Wa 98072

4/28/05

70FR22155

July 14, 2005

(314)

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Goetzeo (OXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

William Howald
(425) 483-0746

Mail Envelope Properties (42D6DE5E.F08 : 16 : 65288)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 5:51 PM
From: "William N. Howald" <howald@foxinternet.com>

Created By: howald@foxinternet.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4982	Thursday, July 14, 2005 5:51 PM
Mime.822	6040	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/4/05 ADB Leavise

From: "Brigitte Leciejewski" <wizard@mailaka.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 6:53 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Brigitte Leciejewski
PO Box 432
Roxboro, NC 27573

4/08/05
70 FR 22155

July 14, 2005

315

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW2)
A. Guerrero (AXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Brigitte Leciejewski

Mail Envelope Properties (42D6ECC9.36C : 15 : 876)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 6:52 PM
From: "Brigitte Leciejewski" <wizard@mailaka.net>

Created By: wizard@mailaka.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4964	Thursday, July 14, 2005 6:52 PM
Mime.822	6019	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 RDB received

From: "Thomas Markham" <thomasrmarkham@earthlink.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 7:09 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Thomas Markham
540 23rd Street #210
Oakland, CA 94612

4/28/05
70FR 22155
(316)

July 14, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (AXG3)

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Thomas R. Markham
(510)839-0076

Mail Envelope Properties (42D6F0A9.448 : 10 : 1096)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 7:09 PM
From: "Thomas Markham" <thomasrmarkham@earthlink.net>

Created By: thomasrmarkham@earthlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4980	Thursday, July 14, 2005 7:09 PM
Mime.822	6040	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

9/11/05
RDB received

From: "Jacqueline Luck" <revluck@uujackson.org>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 11:33 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Jacqueline Luck
4047 Pine Hill Dr.
Jackson, MS 39206

11/28/05

July 14, 2005

70 FR 22155

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

317

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013
E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Rev. Jacqueline Luck

Mail Envelope Properties (42D72E8B.3F8 : 1 : 5112)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 11:33 PM
From: "Jacqueline Luck" <revluck@uujackson.org>

Created By: revluck@uujackson.org

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4967	Thursday, July 14, 2005 11:33 PM
Mime.822	6020	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 RDB received

From: "Jane Shelly" <JaneShelly@AOL.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2005 6:15 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Jane Shelly
32 Center Street
Stamford, CT 06906

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

(318)

July 15, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy’s application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only “minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public.” Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county’s resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is “not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons.” Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW)
C. Gratton (CXG3)

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf “from an environmental perspective.” Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is “highly speculative” does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf’s location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Jane L. Shelly

Mail Envelope Properties (42D78CCE.4B3 : 5 : 13491)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2005 6:15 AM
From: "Jane Shelly" <JaneShelly@AOL.com>

Created By: JaneShelly@AOL.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4992	Friday, July 15, 2005 6:15 AM
Mime.822	6074	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Karen Mitchell" <terpette@wildmail.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 9:09 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Karen Mitchell
11335 Little Patuxent Parkway #427
Columbia, MD 21044

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

July 14, 2005

319

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Ymuiero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

I recently visited Mississippi and fell in love with the Gulf Coast. My future husband lived there for several years. Please keep Mississippi safe!

Sincerely,

Karen Mitchell

Mail Envelope Properties (42D70CD3.B69 : 10 : 2921)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 9:09 PM
From: "Karen Mitchell" <terpette@wildmail.com>

Created By: terpette@wildmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5127	Thursday, July 14, 2005 9:09 PM
Mime.822	6182	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB Received

From: "Jacob Lyons" <jacobtlyons@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 10:08 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Jacob Lyons
2606 W. Clark Av.
Burbank, CA 91505

4/28/05
70 FR 22155
320

July 14, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilcox (JHW2)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SFSP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Jacob Lyons

Mail Envelope Properties (42D71A8C.F0E : 18 : 3854)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 10:07 PM
From: "Jacob Lyons" <jacobtlyons@yahoo.com>

Created By: jacobtlyons@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4953	Thursday, July 14, 2005 10:07 PM
Mime.822	6004	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 ADM received

From: "Georgia M. Pawlowski" <gmpawlowski@sbcglobal.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 10:15 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Georgia M. Pawlowski
425 Bettie St.
Akron, OH 44306

H/28/05
70FR 22155

July 14, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

321

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Georgia M. Pawlowski

Mail Envelope Properties (42D71C1D.F4B : 4 : 3915)

Subject:	Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date:	Thu, Jul 14, 2005 10:14 PM
From:	"Georgia M. Pawlowski" <gmpawlowski@sbcglobal.net>
Created By:	gmpawlowski@sbcglobal.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	**Route**
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	4967	Thursday, July 14, 2005 10:14 PM
Mime.822	6031	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "joe wright" <joee6828@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 11:17 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

joe wright
238 n. arbogast
griffith, in 46319

H/28/05
70 FR 22155

July 14, 2005

322

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

joe wright

Mail Envelope Properties (42D72AC6.318 : 2 : 4888)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 11:17 PM
From: "joe wright" <joee6828@yahoo.com>

Created By: joee6828@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4950	Thursday, July 14, 2005 11:17 PM
Mime.822	5995	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 RDB Received

From: "Robert Hardee" <Bobhardee99@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 9:37 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Robert Hardee
1923 Woodvalley Dr.
Columbia, SC 29201

H/28/05
70FR 22155

July 14, 2005

323

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

ESP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Huerred (AXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Bob Hardee
803 732 7502

Mail Envelope Properties (42D7134A.DDD : 13 : 3549)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 9:36 PM
From: "Robert Hardee" <Bobhardee99@yahoo.com>

Created By: Bobhardee99@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4970	Thursday, July 14, 2005 9:36 PM
Mime.822	6022	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Linda Ferris" <slundin4429@charter.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 6:26 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Linda Ferris
428 Town Hill Road
New Hartford, Ct 06057

4/28/05

70FR22155

324

July 14, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-013
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (AXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Linda Ferris

Mail Envelope Properties (42D6E695.1BE : 10 : 446)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 6:26 PM
From: "Linda Ferris" <slundin4429@charter.net>

Created By: slundin4429@charter.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4961	Thursday, July 14, 2005 6:26 PM
Mime.822	6012	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB Received

From: "JoAnn Witt" <jacwitt@kcnet.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Jul 16, 2005 12:19 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

JoAnn Witt
9237 Wyandotte St.
kansas city,, MO 64114

4/28/05
70FR 22155
325

July 15, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

When an energy product or any other product is developed, the way to dispose of any waste should be a part of the development plan. Unfortunately, this was not done when nuclear energy was developed. We don't have a save way to deal with nuclear waste; therefore, we should phase out nuclear energy instead of expanding it.

Sincerely,

JoAnn Witt

Mail Envelope Properties (42D93372.4C2 : 13 : 46274)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2005 10:01 PM
From: "JoAnn Witt" <jacwitt@kcnet.com>

Created By: jacwitt@kcnet.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5283	Friday, July 15, 2005 10:01 PM
Mime.822	6381	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

ADBkcuser
8/11/05

From: christopher toon <zelldeb@hotmail.com>
To: <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Sat, Jul 30, 2005 3:59 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

4/28/05
70 FR 22155

326

To Whom It May Concern:
I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy’s application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only “minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public.” Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county’s resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is “not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons.” Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf “from an environmental perspective.” Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is “highly speculative” does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf’s location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

christopher toon
rural route #2 box 210

bloomfield, IN 47424

Mail Envelope Properties (42EB3343.9FD : 8 : 63997)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Sat, Jul 30, 2005 3:56 AM
From: christopher toon <zelldeb@hotmail.com>

Created By: zelldeb@hotmail.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4668	Saturday, July 30, 2005 3:56 AM
Mime.822	5676	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Dean Foss" <agate@iowatelecom.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 9:41 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Dean Foss
104 East Green Street
Mount Pleasant, IA 52641

July 14, 2005

4/28/05
70 FR 22155
327

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
A. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Dean Foss

Mail Envelope Properties (42D71424.DFE : 21 : 3582)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2005 9:40 PM
From: "Dean Foss" <agate@iowatelecom.net>

Created By: agate@iowatelecom.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4960	Thursday, July 14, 2005 9:40 PM
Mime.822	6007	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Ruth Ann Dunn" <dunnru@msu.edu>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2005 4:39 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Ruth Ann Dunn
PO Box 1044
West Townshend, VT 05359

11/28/05

July 15, 2005

70 FR 22155

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

328

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Gurrord (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Ruth Ann Dunn

Mail Envelope Properties (42D81F13.4DF : 8 : 29919)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2005 4:39 PM
From: "Ruth Ann Dunn" <dunnru@msu.edu>

Created By: dunnru@msu.edu

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4958	Friday, July 15, 2005 4:39 PM
Mime.822	6002	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB Received

From: "nici edwards" <politics@cardcarryingprogressive.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2005 4:32 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

nici edwards
po box 2708
camarillo, ca 93011

July 15, 2005

4/28/05

70FR 22155

329

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

nici

Mail Envelope Properties (42D81D3C.44D : 12 : 29773)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2005 4:31 PM
From: "nici edwards" <politics@cardcarryingprogressive.com>

Created By: politics@cardcarryingprogressive.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4943	Friday, July 15, 2005 4:31 PM
Mime.822	6008	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
BDB Received

From: "Betty Gibson" <strix9493@aol.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2005 6:40 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Betty Gibson
2853 Pine Av
Mims, FL 32754

4/28/05

70FR22155

330

July 15, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilcox (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete
Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Betty Gibson
321-264-9622

Mail Envelope Properties (42D7929E.5EB : 17 : 13803)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2005 6:40 AM
From: "Betty Gibson" <strix9493@aol.com>

Created By: strix9493@aol.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4962	Friday, July 15, 2005 6:40 AM
Mime.822	6012	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
RDB received

From: "Katherine Jenkins-Murphy" <SnowLeopard44@webtv.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2005 11:02 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Katherine Jenkins-Murphy
208 S.E. Twig Ave.
Port St. Lucie, FL 34983

4/28/05

July 15, 2005

70 FR 22155

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

331

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (SHW1)
C. Gutierrez (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Katherine Jenkins-Murphy
772-336-8041

Mail Envelope Properties (42D7D00D.E4C : 8 : 20044)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2005 11:02 AM
From: "Katherine Jenkins-Murphy" <SnowLeopard44@webtv.net>

Created By: SnowLeopard44@webtv.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	**Route**
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	5001	Friday, July 15, 2005 11:02 AM
Mime.822	6067	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05 BDB received

From: "Amy Harlib" <aharlib@earthlink.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2005 11:40 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Amy Harlib
212 West 22nd St. #2N
New York, NY 10011

4/28/05

70 FR 22155

332

July 15, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

E-RIDS=ADM-03
Add=J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

SISP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Amy Harlib

Mail Envelope Properties (42D7D8BF.40F : 8 : 21519)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2005 11:39 AM
From: "Amy Harlib" <aharlib@earthlink.net>

Created By: aharlib@earthlink.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4959	Friday, July 15, 2005 11:39 AM
Mime.822	6008	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
BDB received

From: "D.Jackie Handel" <handelhaven@sbcglobal.net>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2005 11:40 AM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

D.Jackie Handel
19518 Whitewood Dr
Spring, tx 77373

July 15, 2005

4/28/05

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

70FR 22155

333

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy’s application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only “minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public.” Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county’s resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is “not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons.” Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SFSP Review Complete

Template = ADM-013

E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf “from an environmental perspective.” Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is “highly speculative” does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf’s location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

D.Jackie Handel
281 288 3347

Mail Envelope Properties (42D7D902.437 : 23 : 21559)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2005 11:40 AM
From: "D.Jackie Handel" <handelhaven@sbcglobal.net>

Created By: handelhaven@sbcglobal.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5010	Friday, July 15, 2005 11:40 AM
Mime.822	6104	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

8/11/05
BDB received

From: "Sandra Batey" <sandoided@yahoo.com>
To: "Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission" <GrandGulfEIS@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2005 1:34 PM
Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156

Sandra Batey
3052 Lower River Rd.
Grants Pass, OR 97526

4/28/05
70 FR 22155
334

July 15, 2005

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Administrative Services, Office of Administration
Mailstop T-6D59, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commissio
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Rules and Directives Bran Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing to OPPOSE Entergy's application for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf nuclear plant in Claiborne County, Mississippi. The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), is incomplete and insufficient so as to form a basis for acceptance of the application; further, the information that is contained in the document suggests that the peculiar economic situation faced by the host community makes it unlikely that an emergency at the plant can be addressed in the necessary manner.

A new reactor could unfairly burden minorities and low-income populations, which have a disproportionately high representation in Claiborne County. The draft EIS acknowledges the high concentration of minority and low-income persons around Grand Gulf and considers the possibility that a new reactor may not provide an economic benefit to the community, but ultimately concludes that operation of a new reactor would produce only "minimal negative and disproportionate health impacts on minority and low-income members of the public." Such a conclusion does not consider the increased risk of adverse health impacts from a nuclear accident at Grand Gulf that would be endured by the nearby residents were an additional reactor constructed.

It is not clear that a new reactor at Grand Gulf would provide an economic benefit to the people of Claiborne County; in fact, new development at Grand Gulf may prove to be a drain on the county's resources. According to findings in the draft EIS, it is "not clear whether Claiborne County would receive property taxes, sales, and use taxes, or other taxes and public monies commensurate with the costs of its additional emergency management and public services obligations. The net financial burden may fall on local residents and taxpayers, most of whom are minority and low-income persons." Local officials have testified to the fact that an additional reactor could overburden their already insufficient emergency preparedness resources.

Also of concern is the deficient consideration of renewable energy sources in the draft EIS. While the evaluation does consider renewable energy sources as an alternative, it not give a fair and thorough review of the

SIS & Review Complete
Template = ADM-013
E-RIDS = ADM-03
Add = J. Wilson (JHW1)
C. Guerrero (CXG3)

potential of clean, sustainable energy, and it relies partly on evaluations performed by SERI. The draft EIS overstates the impacts of clean energy alternatives and understates the impacts of nuclear power, wrongly concluding renewable energy sources would not be superior to a new nuclear unit at Grand Gulf "from an environmental perspective." Further, by considering only renewable energy deployment physically at the Grand Gulf site, it unfairly limits the scope of the review and the potential for renewable energy technologies to provide a meaningful contribution to the electric supply. Conservation and efficiency improvements are also unfairly dismissed.

The draft EIS fails to evaluate the environmental impacts and security threat of indefinitely storing the additional irradiated fuel that would be generated by the proposed additional nuclear unit onsite. Yucca Mountain in Nevada is far from a done deal. Numerous scientific questions remain about whether the site can safely store waste and recently a scandal has erupted over the possible falsification of scientific studies used to justify the geologic suitability of the site. The environmental impacts of indefinite storage must be thoroughly evaluated in the final EIS.

Nuclear power plants have known vulnerabilities to terrorist attack and sabotage. According to the 9/11 Commission Report, al Qaeda specifically discussed targeting U.S. nuclear plants. Fuel storage pools, dry storage facilities, and reactor control rooms are not designed to withstand the type attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. Ignoring the threat because it is "highly speculative" does not make the threat go away, and indicates one shortfall of using an exclusively risk-based approach—especially considering Grand Gulf's location on the Mississippi River, which could make it an attractive strategic target. An analysis in the draft EIS of the suitability of the site to place the reactor containment below-grade level should be done, which would require an in-depth analysis of geological and hydrological conditions at the site.

In conclusion, too many questions remain to conclude that more nuclear power at Grand Gulf offers a benefit to Port Gibson, the state of Mississippi, or this country.

Sincerely,

Sandra Batey

Mail Envelope Properties (42D7F392.F76 : 2 : 24438)

Subject: Comments on NUREG-1817, 70 FR 81, pp. 22155-22156
Creation Date: Fri, Jul 15, 2005 1:33 PM
From: "Sandra Batey" <sandoided@yahoo.com>

Created By: sandoided@yahoo.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
GrandGulfEIS

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	4962	Friday, July 15, 2005 1:33 PM
Mime.822	6008	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard