

**Environmental Impact Statement
Scoping Process**

Summary Report

**Calvert Cliffs Combined License
Calvert County, Maryland**

October 2008



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

Introduction

On July 13, 2007, UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC (UniStar), on behalf of Constellation Generation Group, LLC, and UniStar Nuclear Operating Services, LLC, submitted to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) the first part of its application for a combined construction permit and operating license (combined license or COL) for Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Plant Unit 3, to be located adjacent to the existing Calvert Cliffs Units 1 and 2 (ML071980294). The remainder of the application, which contained the safety evaluation, was received March 14, 2008 (ML081021118 and ML081021059). The Calvert Cliffs site is located in Calvert County, Maryland approximately 60 mi south of Baltimore.

As part of the application, UniStar submitted an environmental report (ER) prepared in accordance with the requirements of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 51 and 10 CFR Part 52. The ER focuses on potential environmental effects from the construction and operation of one new nuclear unit at the Calvert Cliffs site. It also includes an evaluation of the environmental consequences of alternatives, including the proposed actions and any mitigating actions that may be taken. NRC regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) are contained in 10 CFR Part 51, Subpart A. In addition, the NRC follows the Council on Environmental Quality regulations to the extent set forth in 10 CFR 51.10 and 10 CFR 51.14(b). NRC regulations related to the environmental review of COL applications are contained in 10 CFR Part 51 and 10 Part CFR 52, Subpart C.

In accordance with NUREG-1555, Standard Review Plans for Environmental Review for Nuclear Power Plants, the NRC staff is preparing an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the UniStar application. The proposed action is NRC approval of the UniStar application to build and operate one new base-load nuclear power generation facility (new unit), Calvert Cliffs Unit 3, to be located within the existing Calvert Cliffs site. The EIS will include an evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposed action, the environmental impacts of alternatives to the proposed action, including the no-action alternative; alternative energy sources; and alternatives related to the facility cooling and circulating water systems; and alternatives available for reducing or avoiding adverse environmental effects. Finally, the EIS will include an evaluation of alternative sites to determine if there is an obviously superior alternative to the proposed site.

In addition, the staff is conducting a safety review of the UniStar combined license application in accordance with NUREG-0800, *Standard Review Plan for the Review of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants*. The safety review is a separate process from the environmental review, although the two reviews are conducted concurrently.

On February 14, 2008, in accordance with 10 CFR 51.26, the NRC initiated the scoping process by publishing a Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and Conduct Scoping Process in the *Federal Register* (73 FR 8719) (ML080290572). The Notice of Intent notified the public of the staff's intent to prepare an EIS and conduct scoping for the COL application. Through the notice, the NRC also invited the applicant; Federal, Tribal, State, and local government agencies; local organizations; and individuals to participate in the scoping process by providing oral comments at the public meetings and/or submitting written suggestions and comments no later than April 14, 2008.

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

- Define the proposed action that is to be the subject of the EIS.
- Determine the scope of the EIS and identify significant issues to be analyzed in depth.
- Identify and eliminate from detailed study those issues that are peripheral or that are not significant.
- Identify any environmental assessments and other EISs that are being prepared or will be prepared that are related to, but not part of the scope of the EIS being considered.
- Identify other environmental review and consultation requirements related to the proposed action.
- Identify parties consulting with the NRC under the NHPA, as set forth in 36 CFR 800.8(c)(1)(i).
- Indicate the relationship between the timing of the preparation of the environmental analyses and the Commission's tentative planning and decision-making schedule.
- Identify any cooperating agencies and, as appropriate, allocate assignments for preparation and schedules for completing the EIS to the NRC and any cooperating agencies.
- Describe how the EIS will be prepared, and identify any contractor assistance to be used.

Two public scoping meetings were held at the Holiday Inn in Solomons, Maryland, on March 19, 2008. The NRC announced the meetings in local and regional newspapers (Calvert Independent, Calvert Recorder, Washington Post Southern Maryland Extra), issued press releases, and distributed flyers locally. Approximately 250 people attended the afternoon scoping meeting and approximately 225 attended the evening session. The scoping meetings began with NRC staff members providing a brief overview of NRC's review process for COL applications and the NEPA process. After the NRC's prepared statements, the meetings were opened for public comments. Twenty-seven (27) afternoon scoping meeting attendees and 21 evening scoping meeting attendees provided oral comments that were recorded and transcribed by a certified court reporter. Five written statements were received during the meeting. In addition to the oral and written statements provided at the public scoping meeting, 6 letters and 201 emails were received during the scoping period.

Transcripts for both afternoon and evening scoping meetings can be found in the NRC's Agency Document Access and Management System (ADAMS), under accession numbers ML081160460 and ML081160468 respectively. ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams/web-based.html> (in the Public Electronic Reading Room). (Note that the URL is case-sensitive). Meeting transcripts and a meeting summary memorandum (ML081270624) were issued May 8, 2008.

At the conclusion of the scoping period, the NRC staff and its contractor reviewed the scoping meeting transcripts and all written material received and identified individual comments. These comments were organized according to topic within the proposed EIS or according to the general topic if outside the scope of the EIS. After comments were grouped according to subject area, the staff prepared responses to the comments, identifying which were within the scope of the EIS.

Table 1 identifies in alphabetical order the individuals providing comments, their affiliation, if given, and the ADAMS accession number that can be used to locate the correspondence. The comment categories are listed in Table 2 in the order that they are presented in this document. Table 3 lists the comment categories in alphabetical order and commenter names and numbers for comments that were binned into each category. The balance of this document presents the comments with NRC staff responses organized by topic category.

Table 1. Individuals Providing Comments During the Comment Period

Commenter	Affiliation (if stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession #
Multiple	Various	Afternoon Transcript ML081160460
Multiple	Various	Evening Transcript ML081160468
Acevedo, NK	Self	Email (ML081510581)
Aitken, Keith	Self	Email (ML081510623)
Albright, Evan	Self	Email (ML081510692)
Andereson, David	Self	Email (ML081510716)
Arist, Phyllis	Self	Email (ML081510632)
Armas, Zoe	Self	Email (ML081510729)
Arndt, Gunter	Self	Email (ML081510518)
Avance, Kenneth	Self	Email (ML081510635)
Bainum, Meghan	Self	Email (ML081510728)
Bakalian, Craig	Self	Email (ML081510684)
Baldwin, Natylie	Self	Email (ML081510549)
Barr, Phillip	Self	Email (ML081510560)
Bartholomew, Alice	Self	Email (ML081510640)
Baumner, Thomas	Self	Email (ML081510546)
Be, Maya	Self	Email (ML081510776)
Becker, Rochelle	Self	Email (ML081510698)
Bedding, Gerhard	Self	Email (ML081510586)
Behabadi, Bardia	Self	Email (ML081510659)
Benton, Mike	Self	Meeting Transcript (ML081160460)
Bissonnette, Rick	Self	Email (ML081510714)
Black, Monica Latka	Self	Email (ML081510585)

Commenter	Affiliation (if stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession #
Blomstrom, Eric	Self	Email (ML081510525)
Borrowman, Ellen	Self	Email (ML081510711)
Boswell, William	Self	Email (ML081510521)
Boxwell, Bob	Self	Meeting Transcript (ML081160460)
Briggs, Ruth	Self	Email (ML081510673)
Brown, Jr., Edsel	NAACP of Calvert County	Email (ML081510736)
Buchanan, Bill	Self	Meeting Transcript (ML081160468)
Burton, Bob	Anne Arundel County Chamber of Commerce	Meeting Transcript (ML081160460)
C, Suzy [per email]	Self	Email (ML081510568)
Chambers, Bill	Self	Meeting Transcript (ML081160468)
Chinn, Jason	Self	Email (ML081510688)
Clark, Gerald	Board Of County Commissioners, Calvert County	Letter (ML081160363)
Clark, Kevin	Self	Email (ML081510783)
Clark, Lorelee	Self	Email (ML081510703)
Cleaver, Melissa	Self	Email (ML081510602)
Coster, Steven	Self	Email (ML081510519)
Cox, Duncan	Self	Email (ML081510667)
Crawley, Jackie	Self	Email (ML081510791)
Crocca, Carol	Self	Email (ML081510641)
Culp, Richard	Self	Email (ML081510672)
Curington, Diana	Self	Email (ML081510725)
Daddy, Big [per email]	Self	Email (ML081510784)
Darbyshire, David	Self	Email (ML081510792)
DesHarnais, Gaston	Self	Email (ML081510651)
Diaz, Lorenzo	Self	Email (ML081510638)
Dolly, William	Self	Email (ML081510637)
Donn, Marjory	Self	Letter (ML0808404265)
Dubois, Gwen	Physicians for Social Responsibility	Meeting Transcript (ML081160468)
Dufay, Frank	Self	Email (ML081510627)
Emmons, Cheryl	Self	Email (ML081510697)
Erdesohn, Cynthia	Self	Email (ML081510721)
Evans, Michael	Self	Email (ML081510628)
Faigle, Susan	Self	Email (ML081510609)
Fernow, Geoff	Self	Email (ML081510679)
Finnelli, Marilyn and	Self	Email (ML081510685)

Commenter	Affiliation (if stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession #
Tom		
Fisher, Allison	Self	Email (ML081510544)
Foppe, Paul	Self	Email (ML081510686)
Fuller, Alfred	Self	Email (ML081510539)
Futterer, Joe	Self	Email (ML081510524)
Gaffney-Smith, Margaret	Department of the Army	Letter (ML0811302781)
Gannaway, Gloria	Self	Email (ML081510526)
Garbato, Kelly	Self	Email (ML081510622)
Garner, Patrick	Self	Email (ML081510678)
Garrett, Nick	Calvert County Tourism Advisory Commission	Meeting Transcript (ML081160468)
Gilpin, John	Self	Email (ML081510709)
Good, Riana	Self	Email (ML081510528)
Goodrich, Anne	Self	Email (ML081510536)
Grad, Robert	Self	Email (ML081510582)
Grand, Robert	Self	Email (ML081510608)
Grassi, Rosemarie	Self	Email (ML081510796)
Gray, Susan	Maryland Department of Natural Resources	Letter (ML0811302840)
Green, Bonnie	Patuxent Partnership	Meeting Transcript (ML081160460)
Guay-Brezner, Colette	Self	Email (ML081510580)
Gunter, Paul	Nuclear Information and Research Service	Meeting Transcript (ML081160468)
Harberson, Laurie	Self	Email (ML081510639)
Hauck, Molly	Self	Email (ML081510587)
Hedlund, Cara	Self	Email (ML081510732)
Helvick, Steven	Self	Email (ML081510726)
Henderson, Sherry	Self	Email (ML081510777)
Hinton, Georgia	Self	Email (ML081510574)
Hodge, Gary	Tri-County Council for Southern Maryland	Letter (ML081130650)
Hoffman, Lilli	Self	Email (ML081510569)
Holzer, Frederick	Self	Email (ML081510664)
Hood, Marilyn	Self	Email (ML081510605)
Hooker, Betsy	Self	Email (ML081510778)
Huffman, Debbie	Self	Email (ML081510643)
Hughey, Patricia	Self	Email (ML081510648)
Hung, Shiu	Self	Email (ML081510541)
Hunter, Theresa	Self	Meeting Transcript (ML081160460)
Hutchinson, Richard	Self	Email (ML081510720)

Commenter	Affiliation (if stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession #
Ireland, John	Self	Email (ML081510694)
Johnston, Bill		Meeting Transcript (ML081160460)
Jones, Hollis	Self	Email (ML081510572)
Jones-Giampalo, Mary	Self	Email (ML081510702)
Joos, Sandra	Self	Email (ML081510530)
Jula, Patty	Self	Email (ML081510547)
Kaliski, Raymond	Self	Email (ML081510590)
Kamps, Kevin	Beyond Nuclear	Meeting Transcript (ML081160468)
Kanaley, Mike	Clean and Safe Energy Coalition	Meeting Transcript (ML081160468)
Kane, Donna	Self	Email (ML081510588)
Karbowsky, Brad	United Association of Plumbers, Steamfitters, and Sprinklerfitters	Meeting Transcript (ML081160468)
Katz, Shari	Self	Email (ML081510607)
Kelley, Linda	Calvert County Board of Commissioners	Letter (ML081160363)
Kjer, Timothy	Self	Email (ML081510520)
Klusman, Eric	Self	Email (ML081510534)
Knechel, David	Self	Email (ML081510550)
Kramer, Loren	Self	Email (ML081510657)
Kuintzle, Gaylene	Self	Email (ML081510738)
Lack, Robert	Self	Email (ML081510537)
Lallo, Patrick	Self	Email (ML081510680)
LaLumia, Anne Marie	Self	Email (ML081510567)
LaMonica, Francoise	Self	Email (ML081510592)
Latham, Rhonda	Self	Email (ML081510789)
LaVigne, Carole	Self	Email (ML081510625)
Lee, Angela	Self	Email (ML081510674)
Loew, Brenda	Self	Email (ML081510774)
Luczkowiak, Christopher	Self	Email (ML081510645)
M, Crystal [per email]	Self	Email (ML081510781)
Mackall, Kimberly	The Concerned Black Women of Calvert County, Inc.	Email (ML081510770)
MacNulty, Joy	Self	Email (ML081510675)
Magee, L	Self	Email (ML081510730)
Manske, Jill	Self	Email (ML081510646)
Marcus, Jack David	Self	Email (ML081510797)
Mariotte, Michael	Nuclear Information and Resource Service for Chesapeake Safe Energy Coalition	Meeting Transcript (ML081160460)

Commenter	Affiliation (if stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession #
Mariotte, Michael	Nuclear Information and Resource Service for Chesapeake Safe Energy Coalition	Email (ML081510772)
Marks, John	Self	Email (ML081510689)
Marsh, Rauni	Self	Email (ML081510603)
Martins, Darren	Calvert County Chamber of Commerce	Meeting Transcript (ML081160460)
Massey, Tom	Self	Email (ML081510671)
McAndrew-Benevides, Elizabeth	North American Young Generation of Nuclear	Meeting Transcript (ML081160468)
McArthur, Richard	Self	Email (ML081510676)
McClure, Matthew	Self	Email (ML081510647)
McCoy, Timothy	Self	Email (ML081510734)
McGarvey, Sean	Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO	Meeting Transcript (ML081160460)
McGough, Mike	Self	Meeting Transcript (ML081160460)
McKenna, Chris	Self	Email (ML081510611)
McKenna, Kathy	Self	Email (ML081510619)
McKenna, Lauren	Self	Email (ML081510614)
McKenna, Rick	Self	Email (ML081510615)
Meadow, Karen	Maryland Conservation Council	Meeting Transcript (ML081160460)
Meadow, Norman	Maryland Conservation Council	Email (ML081510706)
Metz, Richard	Self	Email (ML081510629)
Minault, Kent	Self	Email (ML081510690)
Miranda, Tina	Self	Email (ML081510687)
Moore, Kerry	Self	Email (ML081510773)
Mostov, Liz	Self	Email (ML081510696)
Munson, Clarence William	Self	Email (ML081510565)
Nagle, Thomas	Self	Email (ML081510691)
Nanfra, Freya	Self	Email (ML081510794)
Nash, James	Self	Email (ML081510583)
Nerode, Gregory	Self	Email (ML081510786)
Neumann, Johanna	Maryland Public Interest Group	Meeting Transcript (ML081160468)
Novick, Wesley	Self	Email (ML081510624)
Nunez, Albert	Self	Email (ML081510571)
Nunez, Carlos	Self	Email (ML081510559)
Oakes, Bonnie	Self	Email (ML081510561)
O'Donnell, Anthony	The Maryland House of Delegates	Letter (ML081160364)

Commenter	Affiliation (if stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession #
Olmstead, Harry	Self	Email (ML081510707)
O'Meara, Patrick	Self	Email (ML081510682)
Pacheco-Theard, Lauren	Self	Email (ML081510700)
Paquet, Kevin	Self	Email (ML081510633)
Parran, Wilson	Calvert County Board of Commissioners	Meeting Transcript (ML081160468)
Parsons, Barry	Self	Email (ML081510718)
Paul, Georgia	Self	Email (ML081510782)
Pedraza-Tucker, Liette	Self	Email (ML081510535)
Petkiewicz, Margaret	Self	Email (ML081510553)
Phipps, Donald	Self	Email (ML081510548)
Piner, Lisa	Self	Email (ML081510542)
Piser, Daniel	Self	Email (ML081510538)
Polya, Lance	Self	Email (ML081510681)
Pope, Nate	Calvert County Economic Development Commission	Meeting Transcript (ML081160468)
Pretto-Simmons, Nancy	Self	Meeting Transcript (ML081160460)
Putney, Louis	Self	Email (ML081510564)
Rader, Nancy	Self	Email (ML081510555)
Radford Jr., Roger	Self	Email (ML081510556)
Raines, Mary	Self	Email (ML081510636)
Ramstrom, Eric G and Shirley S	Self	Email (ML081510658)
Randall, David	Self	Email (ML081510665)
Rankin, Susan	Self	Email (ML081510670)
Reidenbach, Gregory	Self	Email (ML081510790)
Rosenblum, Stephen	Self	Email (ML081510699)
Ross, Anne	Self	Email (ML081510788)
Rudy, Mike	Self	Email (ML081510522)
Russell, Jack	St. Mary's County Commissioners	Meeting Transcript (ML081160460)
Sather, Alice	Self	Email (ML081510708)
Sauer, Elizabeth	Self	Email (ML081510563)
Scarafia, Bill	St. Mary's County Chamber of Commerce	Meeting Transcript (ML081160460)
Schlager, Robert	Calvert Memorial Hospital	Meeting Transcript (ML081160468)
Schmidt, Jason	Self	Email (ML081510531)
Schopp, Ricky	Self	Email (ML081510787)

Commenter	Affiliation (if stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession #
Schwarz, Walter	Self	Email (ML081510626)
See, Bud	Self	Email (ML081510660)
Shafer, Scott	Self	Email (ML081510606)
Shannahan, Brittany	Self	Email (ML081510545)
Shashani, Linda	Self	Email (ML081510662)
Shaw, Susan	Board of County Commissioners, Calvert County	Letter (ML081160363)
Sherrow, Sarah	Self	Email (ML081510655)
Shively, Daniel	Self	Email (ML081510731)
Siecke, Martin	Self	Email (ML081510557)
Simila, Owen	Self	Email (ML081510653)
Sinclair, Jim	Self	Meeting Transcript (ML081160460)
Skercevic, Maria	Self	Email (ML081510558)
Smith, Enoch	Self	Email (ML081510552)
Smith, Martha	Self	Email (ML081510656)
Snowden, Patricia	Self	Email (ML081510570)
Sorin, Susanna	Self	Email (ML081510597)
Soroos, Marvin S	Self	Email (ML081510663)
Soto, Yvonne	Self	Email (ML081510733)
Stevens, Denise	Self	Email (ML081510723)
Stilwell, Lisa	Self	Email (ML081510722)
Stinnett, Barbara	Board of County Commissioners, Calvert County	Letter (ML081160363)
Strange, Linda	Self	Email (ML081510540)
Tarhan, Diane	Solomons Business Association	Meeting Transcript (ML081160460)
Theil, Tony	Self	Email (ML081510620)
Thiele, Abhaya	Self	Email (ML081510576)
Tornatore, James	Self	Email (ML081510683)
Trenholme, Art	Self	Email (ML081510669)
Tucker, Dawn	Calvert County Minority Business Alliance	Email (ML081510768)
Turner, Tamisha	Self	Email (ML081510589)
Valliere, Cliff	Self	Email (ML081510737)
Vanderheyden, George	Unistar Nuclear Energy	Meeting Transcript (ML081160468)
VanEtten, Margot	Self	Email (ML081510701)
Vieg, Jeannette	Self	Email (ML081510573)
Voeller, Estelle	Self	Email (ML081510577)
Vogt, Peter	Self	Email (ML081510516)
Wadkins, Melanie	Self	Email (ML081510551)
Waldman, Sam	Self	Email (ML081510529)

Commenter	Affiliation (if stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession #
Walker-Meere, Susan	Self	Email (ML081510724)
Walsh, Donald	Self	Email (ML081510533)
Walters, Betty	Self	Email (ML081510719)
Walther, Robert	Clean and Safe Energy Coalition	Meeting Transcript (ML081160460)
Wanner, Gabrielle	Self	Email (ML081510523)
Ward, John	Self	Email (ML081510727)
Welch, Irene	Self	Email (ML081510775)
Wilkins, Paul	Self	Email (ML081510584)
Willoughby, CaraLea	Self	Email (ML081510566)
Wilson, Deb	Self	Email (ML081510710)
Yeatts, Jordan	Self	Email (ML081510780)
Zahniser, Albert	Self	Letter (ML081160362)
Zastawecky, Margaret	Self	Email (ML081510769)
Zelikson, Linda	Self	Email (ML081510644)

Table 2. Comment Categories

Topic	Page #
1. COL Process	31
2. Site Layout and Design	34
3. Land Use – Site and Vicinity	36
4. Land Use – Transmission Lines	36
5. Meteorology and Air Quality	37
6. Geology	38
7. Water Resources	38
8. Ecology	39
9. Socioeconomics	40
10. Historic and Cultural Resources	43
11. Environmental Justice	44
12. Health – Radiological	44
13. Accidents	46
14. The Uranium Fuel Cycle	49
15. Transportation	55
16. Cumulative Impacts	57
17. The Need for Power	57
18. Alternatives – No Action	60
19. Alternatives – Energy	60
20. Benefit – Cost Balance	66
21. General Comments in Support of the Licensing Action	68
22. General Comments in Support of the Licensing Process	72
23. General Comments of Support of Nuclear Power	73
24. General Comments in Support of the Existing Plant	76
25. General Comments in Opposition of the Licensing Action	79
26. General Comments in Opposition of Nuclear Power	80
27. Issues Outside Scope – Emergency Preparedness	80
28. Issues Outside of Scope – Miscellaneous	83
29. Issues Outside Scope – NRC Oversight	86
30. Issues Outside Scope – Safety	87
31. Issues Outside Scope – Security and Terrorism	88

Table 3. Comment Categories

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
Accidents	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Acevedo, NK (0008-3)• Aitken, Keith (0008-3)• Albright, Evan (0008-3)• Andereson, David (0008-3)• Arist, Phyllis (0008-3)• Armas, Zoe (0008-3)• Avance, Kenneth (0008-3)• Bainum, Meghan (0008-3)• Bakalian, Craig (0008-3)• Baldwin, Natylie (0008-3)• Barr, Phillip (0008-3)• Bartholomew, Alice (0008-3)• Be, Maya (0008-3)• Becker, Rochelle (0008-3)• Bedding, Gerhard (0008-3)• Behabadi, Bardia (0008-3)• Bissonnette, Rick (0008-3)• Black, Monica Latka (0008-3)• Blomstrom, Eric (0008-3)• Borrowman, Ellen (0008-3)• Briggs, Ruth (0008-3)• C, Suzy (0008-3)• Chinn, Jason (0008-3)• Clark, Kevin (0008-3)• Clark, Lorelee (0008-3)• Cleaver, Melissa (0008-3)• Cox, Duncan (0008-3)• Crawley, Jackie (0008-3)• Crocca, Carol (0008-3)• Culp, Richard (0008-3)• Curington, Diana (0008-3)• Daddy, Big (0008-3)• Darbyshire, David (0008-3)• DesHarnais, Gaston (0008-3)• Diaz, Lorenzo (0008-3)• Dolly, William (0008-3)• Emmons, Cheryl (0008-3)• Erdesohn, Cynthia (0008-3)• Evans, Michael (0008-3)• Faigle, Susan (0008-3)• Fernow, Geoff (0008-3)• Finnelli, Marilyn and Tom (0008-3)• Fisher, Allison (0008-3)• Foppe, Paul (0008-3)• Fuller, Alfred (0008-3)• Futterer, Joe (0008-3)• Gannaway, Gloria (0008-3)

Comment Category**Commenter (Comment ID)**

- Garbato, Kelly (0008-3)
- Garner, Patrick (0008-3)
- Gilpin, John (0008-3)
- Good, Riana (0008-3)
- Goodrich, Anne (0008-3)
- Grad, Robert (0008-3)
- Grand, Robert (0008-3)
- Grassi, Rosemarie (0008-3)
- Guay-Brezner, Colette (0008-3)
- Harberson, Laurie (0008-3)
- Hauck, Molly (0008-3)
- Hedlund, Cara (0008-3)
- Helvick, Steven (0008-3)
- Henderson, Sherry (0008-3)
- Hinton, Georgia (0008-3)
- Hoffman, Lilli (0008-3)
- Holzer, Frederick (0008-3)
- Hood, Marilyn (0008-3)
- Hooker, Betsy (0008-3)
- Huffman, Debbie (0008-3)
- Hughey, Patricia (0008-3)
- Hung, Shiu (0008-3)
- Hutchinson, Richard (0008-3)
- Jones, Hollis (0008-3)
- Jones-Giampalo, Mary (0008-3)
- Joos, Sandra (0008-3)
- Jula, Patty (0008-3)
- Kaliski, Raymond (0008-3)
- Kamps, Kevin (0024-76) (0024-77) (0024-79) (0024-84)
- Kane, Donna (0008-3)
- Katz, Shari (0008-3)
- Klusman, Eric (0008-3)
- Knechel, David (0008-3)
- Kramer, Loren (0008-3)
- Kuintzle, Gaylene (0008-3)
- Lack, Robert (0008-3)
- Lallo, Patrick (0008-3)
- LaLumia, Anne Marie (0008-3)
- LaMonica, Françoise (0008-3)
- Latham, Rhonda (0008-3)
- LaVigne, Carole (0008-3)
- Lee, Angela (0008-3)
- Loew, Brenda (0008-3)
- Luczkowiak, Christopher (0008-3)
- M, Crystal (0008-3)
- Mackall, Kimberly (0018-1) (0018-9)
- MacNulty, Joy (0008-3)
- Magee, L (0008-3)
- Manske, Jill (0008-3)
- Marcus, Jack David (0008-3)

Comment Category**Commenter (Comment ID)**

- Mariotte, Michael (0019-7) (0019-8)
- Mariotte, Michael (0019-18) (0019-19) (0019-23) (0025-43)
- Marks, John (0008-3)
- Marsh, Rauni (0008-3) (0026-3)
- Massey, Tom (0008-3)
- McArthur, Richard (0008-3)
- McClure, Matthew (0008-3)
- McCoy, Timothy (0008-3)
- McKenna, Chris (0008-3)
- McKenna, Kathy (0008-3)
- McKenna, Lauren (0008-3)
- McKenna, Rick (0008-3)
- Metz, Richard (0008-3)
- Minault, Kent (0008-3)
- Miranda, Tina (0008-3)
- Moore, Kerry (0008-3)
- Mostov, Liz (0008-3)
- Munson, Clarence William (0008-3)
- Nagle, Thomas (0008-3)
- Nanfra, Freya (0008-3)
- Nash, James (0008-3)
- Nerode, Gregory (0008-3)
- Novick, Wesley (0008-3)
- Nunez, Albert (0008-3)
- Nunez, Carlos (0008-3)
- Oakes, Bonnie (0008-3)
- Olmstead, Harry (0008-3)
- O'Meara, Patrick (0008-3)
- Pacheco-Theard, Lauren (0008-3)
- Paquet, Kevin (0008-3)
- Parsons, Barry (0008-3)
- Paul, Georgia (0008-3)
- Pedraza-Tucker, Liette (0008-3)
- Petkiewicz, Margaret (0008-3)
- Phipps, Donald (0008-3)
- Piner, Lisa (0008-3)
- Piser, Daniel (0008-3)
- Putney, Louis (0008-3)
- Rader, Nancy (0008-3)
- Radford Jr., Roger (0008-3)
- Raines, Mary (0008-3)
- Ramstrom, Eric G and Shirley S (0008-3)
- Randall, David (0008-3)
- Rankin, Susan (0008-3)
- Reidenbach, Gregory (0008-3)
- Rosenblum, Stephen (0008-3)
- Ross, Anne (0008-3)
- Sather, Alice (0008-3)
- Sauer, Elizabeth (0008-3)
- Schmidt, Jason (0008-3)

Comment Category**Commenter (Comment ID)**

-
- Schopp, Ricky (0008-3)
 - Schwarz, Walter (0008-3)
 - See, Bud (0008-3)
 - Shafer, Scott (0008-3)
 - Shashani, Linda (0008-3)
 - Sherrow, Sarah (0008-3)
 - Shively, Daniel (0008-3)
 - Siecke, Martin (0008-3)
 - Simila, Owen (0008-3)
 - Skercevic, Maria (0008-3)
 - Smith, Enoch (0008-3)
 - Smith, Martha (0008-3)
 - Snowden, Patricia (0008-3)
 - Sorin, Susanna (0008-3)
 - Soroos, Marvin S (0008-3)
 - Soto, Yvonne (0008-3)
 - Stevens, Denise (0008-3)
 - Stilwell, Lisa (0008-3)
 - Strange, Linda (0008-3)
 - Theil, Tony (0008-3)
 - Thiele, Abhaya (0008-3)
 - Tornatore, James (0008-3)
 - Trenholme, Art (0008-3)
 - Turner, Tamisha (0008-3)
 - Valliere, Cliff (0008-3)
 - VanEtten, Margot (0008-3)
 - Vieg, Jeannette (0008-3)
 - Voeller, Estelle (0008-3)
 - Wadkins, Melanie (0008-3)
 - Waldman, Sam (0008-3)
 - Walker-Meere, Susan (0008-3)
 - Walsh, Donald (0008-3)
 - Walters, Betty (0008-3)
 - Wanner, Gabrielle (0008-3)
 - Ward, John (0008-3)
 - Welch, Irene (0008-3)
 - Wilkins, Paul (0008-3)
 - Willoughby, CaraLea (0008-3)
 - Wilson, Deb (0008-3)
 - Yeatts, Jordan (0008-3)
 - Zastawecky, Margaret (0008-3)
 - Zelikson, Linda (0008-3)

Alternatives-Energy

- Donn, Marjory (0020-1) (0020-8)
- Dubois, Gwen (0024-60)
- Hunter, Theresa (0025-160) (0025-161)
- Johnston, Bill (0025-109) (0025-110) (0025-113)
- Kamps, Kevin (0024-80) (0024-81) (0024-82)
- Kanaley, Mike (0024-22)

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mariotte, Michael (0019-4) • Marsh, Rauni (0026-2) (0026-5) • McGarvey, Sean (0025-145) • Meadow, Karen (0025-65) (0025-67) (0025-68) (0025-69) (0025-70) (0025-71) (0025-72) (0025-73) • Meadow, Norman (0028-1) (0028-4) (0028-6) (0028-7) (0028-9) (0028-10) (0028-11) (0028-12) (0028-13) (0028-14) (0028-15) (0028-16) (0028-17) (0028-18) (0028-19) (0028-20) (0028-21) (0028-34) • Neumann, Johanna (0024-34) (0024-36) • Parran, Wilson (0024-9) (0024-10) (0025-11) (0025-12) • Shannahan, Brittany (0007-5) • Sinclair, Jim (0025-140) (0025-141) • Vogt, Peter (0005-19) (0005-23) (0005-25) (0005-26) (0005-27) (0005-29) • Walther, Robert (0025-120)
Alternatives-No-Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mariotte, Michael (0019-5) (0025-47) • McGarvey, Sean (0025-146) (0025-147)
Benefit-Cost Balance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donn, Marjory (0020-3) • Fisher, Allison (0025-91) • Kamps, Kevin (0024-78) (0024-89) (0024-90) • Mariotte, Michael (0019-1) (0019-2) (0019-3) (0025-48) (0025-49) • Meadow, Karen (0025-66) • Meadow, Norman (0028-26) (0028-27) • Neumann, Johanna (0024-37) • Vanderheyden, George (0024-116) • Vogt, Peter (0005-28)
Cumulative Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buchanan, Bill (0024-109)
Ecology-Terrestrial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meadow, Norm (0025-59) (0028-2) • Vogt, Peter (0005-13)
Environmental Justice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mackall, Kimberly (0018-2) (0018-3)
Geology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mariotte, Michael (0019-35)
Health-Radiological	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dubois, Gwen (0024-68)

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mackall, Kimberly (0018-10) • Mariotte, Michael (0019-17) (0019-22) (0025-53) • Meadow, Norm (0025-57) (0025-58) (0028-5) (0028-28) (0028-29) (0028-30) (0028-31) (0028-32) (0028-33) • Shannahan, Brittany (0007-3)
Historic and Cultural Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisher, Allison (0025-94)
Hydrology-Surface Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baummer, Thomas (0006-4) (0006-7) • Buchanan, Bill (0024-110) (0024-110) • Fisher, Allison (0025-93)
Land Use-Site and vicinity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baummer, Thomas (0006-8)
Land Use-Transmission lines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clark, Gerald (0014-2) • Kelley, Linda (0014-2) • Parran, Wilson (0014-2) (0024-4) (0025-5) • Shaw, Susan (0014-2) • Stinnett, Barbara (0014-2) • Vogt, Peter (0005-14) (0005-15) (0005-16) (0005-17)
Meteorology and Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baummer, Thomas (0006-5) (0006-6) • Mariotte, Michael (0019-29) (0019-30) (0019-31) (0025-45) (0025-46)
Need for Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arndt, Gunter (0004-3) • Burton, Bob (0025-32) • Clark, Gerald (0014-3) • Green, Bonnie (0025-128) • Green, Joseph (0025-86) • Hodge, Gary (0023-3) • Hunter, Theresa (0025-162) • Kanaley, Mike (0024-21) • Kelley, Linda (0014-3) • Meadow, Karen (0025-74) (0025-75) (0028-8) • Meadow, Norman (0028-22) (0028-23) (0028-24) • O'Donnell, Anthony (0015-2) • Parran, Wilson (0014-3) (0024-8) (0025-7) (0025-10) • Pretto-Simmons, Nancy (0025-166) • Russell, Jack (0025-22) • Scarafia, Bill (0025-83) • Shaw, Susan (0014-3)

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sinclair, Jim (0025-139) • Stinnett, Barbara (0014-3) • Vogt, Peter (0005-20) (0005-21) (0005-22) • Walther, Robert (0025-118) (0025-119) • Zahniser, Albert (0016-3)
Opposition-Licensing Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donn, Marjory (0020-4) • Dubois, Gwen (0024-61) (0024-70) • Dufay, Frank (0027-2) • Hunter, Theresa (0025-163) (0025-164) • Mariotte, Michael (0025-42) • Neumann, Johanna (0024-33) • Shannahan, Brittany (0007-1) • Vogt, Peter (0005-30)
Opposition-Nuclear Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be, Maya (0029-1) • Dubois, Gwen (0024-58) (0024-59) • Dufay, Frank (0027-1) • Johnston, Bill (0025-112) • Shannahan, Brittany (0007-4)
Outside Scope-Emergency Preparedness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boswell, William (0002-1) (0002-3) • Boxwell, Bob (0025-156) (0025-157) (0025-158) • Brown, Jr., Edsel (0017-5) (0017-6) (0017-8) • Burton, Bob (0025-39) • Dubois, Gwen (0024-65) (0024-66) (0024-67) (0024-69) (0024-71) • Kamps, Kevin (0024-83) (0024-87) • Mackall, Kimberly (0018-5) • Mariotte, Michael (0019-24) (0019-25) (0019-26) (0019-27) (0019-28) (0025-54) • Parran, Wilson (0024-5) (0025-6) • Russell, Jack (0025-19) (0025-20) • Schlager, Robert (0024-45) (0024-46) (0024-47) • Vogt, Peter (0005-7)
Outside Scope-Miscellaneous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brown, Jr., Edsel (0017-10) (0017-11) (0017-12) • Fisher, Allison (0018-6) (0018-8) • Mackall, Kimberly (0018-11) (0018-12) (0018-13) • McGarvey, Sean (0025-146) (0025-147) • Parran, Wilson (0025-4) • Tucker, Dawn (0013-1) (0013-2) (0013-3) • Vogt, Peter (0005-24)

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
Outside Scope-NRC Oversight	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dubois, Gwen (0024-62) (0024-63) • Fisher, Allison (0025-92)
Outside Scope-Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arndt, Gunter (0004-1) • Brown, Jr., Edsel (0017-3) • Dubois, Gwen (0024-64) (0024-72) • Karbowsky, Brad (0024-105) (0025-79) • Mackall, Kimberly (0018-7) • Mariotte, Michael (0019-32) (0019-34) (0025-44) • Parran, Wilson L. (0024-55) • Tucker, Dawn (0013-4) • Vanderheyden, George (0024-120) (0025-170) • Vogt, Peter (0005-1) (0005-2)
Outside Scope-Security and terrorism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brown, Jr., Edsel (0017-4) • Donn, Marjory (0020-7) • Gunter, Paul (0024-98) (0024-99) (0024-100) (0024-101) (0025-148) (0025-149) (0025-150) (0025-151) (0025-152) (0025-153) • Kamps, Kevin (0024-91) (0025-97) (0025-99) • Mariotte, Michael (0019-11) (0019-21) (0019-33) • Meadow, Norm (0025-60) • Neumann, Johanna (0024-35) • Vanderheyden, George (0024-112) (0024-114) (0005-3) (0005-5) • Vogt, Peter (0005-18)
Process-ESP-COL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baummer, Thomas (0006-2) (0006-3) • Brown, Jr., Edsel (0017-1) • Coster, Steven (0003-1) • Fisher, Allison (0025-88) (0025-89) (0025-90) • Gaffney-Smith, Margaret (0021-1) (0021-2) • Gray, Susan (0022-1) • Hodge, Gary (0024-15) (0025-107) • Kamps, Kevin (0024-88) • Kjer, Timothy (0003-1) • Mackall, Kimberly (0018-14) • Mariotte, Michael (0019-20) (0025-41) • Martins, Darren (0025-26) (0024-3) (0024-13) (0025-3) (0025-17) • Shannahan, Brittany (0003-1)
Site Layout and Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parran, Wilson (0024-2) (0025-2) • Scarafia, Bill (0024-96) • Sinclair, Jim (0025-133) • Vanderheyden, George (0024-113) (0024-115) (0024-118) (0024-119)

Comment Category**Commenter (Comment ID)**

(0025-168) (0025-169) (0025-171) (0025-172) (0025-173)

Socioeconomics

- Boswell, William (0002-2)
- Brown, Jr., Edsel (0017-7) (0017-9)
- Burton, Bob (0025-35) (0025-36) (0025-37) (0025-38)
- Chambers, Bill (0024-42) (0024-43) (0024-44)
- Kanaley, Mike (0024-26)
- Karbowsky, Brad (0024-107) (0025-78) (0025-80)
- McClure, Deborah (0024-29)
- O'Donnell, Anthony (0015-5)
- Parran, Wilson L. (0024-56)
- Scarafia, Bill (0024-93) (0024-94) (0025-82)
- Sinclair, Jim (0025-137) (0025-138)
- Tarhan, Diane (0025-175) (0005-4) (0005-6) (0005-8) (0005-9)
- Vogt, Peter (0005-10) (0005-11) (0005-12)
- Walther, Robert (0025-123)

**Support-Licensing
Action**

- Arndt, Gunter (0004-4)
- Baummer, Thomas (0006-1)
- Benton, Mike (0025-154) (0025-155)
- Buchanan, Bill (0024-108)
- Burton, Bob (0025-31)
- Chambers, Bill (0024-40)
- Chambers, Kelly (0025-103)
- Clark, Gerald (0014-1) (0014-6) (0014-7)
- Garrett, Nick (0024-49) (0024-53)
- Green, Bonnie (0025-127) (0025-131)
- Green, Joseph (0025-85)
- Hodge, Gary (0023-4) (0024-14) (0025-105) (0025-106)
- Kanaley, Mike (0024-28)
- Karbowsky, Brad (0025-76)
- Kelley, Linda (0014-1) (0014-6) (0014-7) (0024-16) (0024-18)
- Martins, Darren (0025-24) (0025-27)
- McAndrew-Benevides, Elizabeth (0024-39)
- McClure, Deborah (0024-32)
- McGarvey, Sean (0025-144)
- McGough, Mike (0025-114)
- Meadow, Karen (0025-64)
- Meadow, Norm (0025-55)
- O'Donnell, Anthony (0015-1) (0015-4)
- Parran, Wilson (0014-1) (0014-6) (0014-7) (0024-1) (0024-12) (0025-1) (0025-16)
- Parran, Wilson L. (0024-57)
- Pretto-Simmons, Nancy (0025-165)
- Rudy, Mike (0001-1) (0001-3)
- Russell, Jack (0025-18) (0025-23)
- Scarafia, Bill (0024-95) (0024-97) (0025-84)

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shaw, Susan (0014-1) (0014-6) (0014-7) • Sinclair, Jim (0025-132) (0025-135) (0025-143) • Stinnett, Barbara (0014-1) (0014-6) (0014-7) • Walther, Robert (0025-126) • Zahniser, Albert (0016-2)
Support-Licensing Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chambers, Bill (0024-41) • Garrett, Nick (0024-50) (0024-51)
Support-Nuclear Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burton, Bob (0025-33) (0025-40) • Clark, Gerald (0014-4) (0014-5) • Garrett, Nick (0024-54) • Green, Bonnie (0025-129) (0025-130) • Green, Joseph (0025-87) • Hodge, Gary (0023-2) • Kanaley, Mike (0024-20) (0024-23) (0024-24) (0024-25) • Karbowsky, Brad (0024-106) (0025-77) • Kelley, Linda (0014-4) (0014-5) • Martins, Darren (0025-28) • McAndrew-Benevides, Elizabeth (0024-38) • McGough, Mike (0024-104) (0025-115) (0025-116) • Meadow, Norm (0025-56) (0028-3) • Meadow, Norman (0028-25) • O'Donnell, Anthony (0015-3) • Parran, Wilson (0014-4) (0014-5) (0024-6) (0024-7) (0025-8) (0025-9) (0025-13) • Pope, Nate (0024-75) • Rudy, Mike (0001-2) • Russell, Jack (0025-21) • Shaw, Susan (0014-4) (0014-5) • Sinclair, Jim (0025-142) • Stinnett, Barbara (0014-4) (0014-5) • Vanderheyden, George (0024-111) (0024-117) George (0025-167) • Walther, Robert (0025-117) (0025-121) (0025-122)
Support-Plant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arndt, Gunter (0004-2) • Burton, Bob (0025-34) • Chambers, Kelly (0025-104) • Garrett, Nick (0024-52) • Hodge, Gary (0023-1) (0025-108) • Kanaley, Mike (0024-27) • Kelley, Linda (0024-17) (0024-19) • Martins, Darren (0025-25) (0025-29) (0025-30) • McClure, Deborah (0024-30) (0024-31) • McGough, Mike (0024-102)

Comment Category**Commenter (Comment ID)**

-
- Parran, Wilson (0024-11) (0025-14) (0025-15)
 - Pope, Nate (0024-73) (0024-74)
 - Scarafia, Bill (0024-92) (0025-81)
 - Schlager, Robert (0024-48)
 - Sinclair, Jim (0025-134) (0025-136)
 - Tarhan, Diane (0025-174)
 - Walther, Robert (0025-124) (0025-125)
 - Zahniser, Albert (0016-1)

Transportation

- Acevedo, NK (0008-5)
- Aitken, Keith (0008-5)
- Albright, Evan (0008-5)
- Andereson, David (0008-5)
- Arist, Phyllis (0008-5)
- Armas, Zoe (0008-5)
- Avance, Kenneth (0008-5)
- Bainum, Meghan (0008-5)
- Bakalian, Craig (0008-5)
- Baldwin, Natylie (0008-5)
- Barr, Phillip (0008-5)
- Bartholomew, Alice (0008-5)
- Be, Maya (0008-5)
- Becker, Rochelle (0008-5)
- Bedding, Gerhard (0008-5)
- Behabadi, Bardia (0008-5)
- Bissonnette, Rick (0008-5)
- Black, Monica Latka (0008-5)
- Blomstrom, Eric (0008-5)
- Borrowman, Ellen (0008-5)
- Briggs, Ruth (0008-5)
- Brown, Jr., Edsel (0017-2)
- C, Suzy (0008-5)
- Chinn, Jason (0008-5)
- Clark, Kevin (0008-5)
- Clark, Lorelee (0008-5)
- Cleaver, Melissa (0008-5)
- Cox, Duncan (0008-5)
- Crawley, Jackie (0008-5)
- Crocca, Carol (0008-5)
- Culp, Richard (0008-5)
- Curington, Diana (0008-5)
- Daddy, Big (0008-5)
- Darbyshire, David (0008-5)
- DesHarnais, Gaston (0008-5)
- Diaz, Lorenzo (0008-5)
- Dolly, William (0008-5)
- Donn, Marjory (0020-6)
- Emmons, Cheryl (0008-5)
- Erdesohn, Cynthia (0008-5)

Comment Category**Commenter (Comment ID)**

- Evans, Michael (0008-5)
- Faigle, Susan (0008-5)
- Fernow, Geoff (0008-5)
- Finnelli, Marilyn and Tom (0008-5)
- Fisher, Allison (0008-5)
- Foppe, Paul (0008-5)
- Fuller, Alfred (0008-5)
- Futterer, Joe (0008-5)
- Gannaway, Gloria (0008-5)
- Garbato, Kelly (0008-5)
- Garner, Patrick (0008-5)
- Gilpin, John (0008-5)
- Good, Riana (0008-5)
- Goodrich, Anne (0008-5)
- Grad, Robert (0008-5)
- Grand, Robert (0008-5)
- Grassi, Rosemarie (0008-5)
- Guay-Brezner, Colette (0008-5)
- Harberson, Laurie (0008-5)
- Hauck, Molly (0008-5)
- Hedlund, Cara (0008-5)
- Helvick, Steven (0008-5)
- Henderson, Sherry (0008-5)
- Hinton, Georgia (0008-5)
- Hoffman, Lilli (0008-5)
- Holzer, Frederick (0008-5)
- Hood, Marilyn (0008-5)
- Hooker, Betsy (0008-5)
- Huffman, Debbie (0008-5)
- Hughey, Patricia (0008-5)
- Hung, Shiu (0008-5)
- Hutchinson, Richard (0008-5)
- Jones, Hollis (0008-5)
- Jones-Giampalo, Mary (0008-5)
- Joos, Sandra (0008-5)
- Jula, Patty (0008-5)
- Kaliski, Raymond (0008-5)
- Kamps, Kevin (0025-100) (0025-101) (0025-102)
- Kane, Donna (0008-5)
- Katz, Shari (0008-5)
- Klusman, Eric (0008-5)
- Knechel, David (0008-5)
- Kramer, Loren (0008-5)
- Kuintzle, Gaylene (0008-5)
- Lack, Robert (0008-5)
- Lallo, Patrick (0008-5)
- LaLumia, Anne Marie (0008-5)
- LaMonica, Françoise (0008-5)
- Latham, Rhonda (0008-5)
- LaVigne, Carole (0008-5)

Comment Category**Commenter (Comment ID)**

- Lee, Angela (0008-5)
- Loew, Brenda (0008-5)
- Luczkowiak, Christopher (0008-5)
- M, Crystal (0008-5)
- MacNulty, Joy (0008-5)
- Magee, L (0008-5)
- Manske, Jill (0008-5)
- Marcus, Jack David (0008-5)
- Mariotte, Michael (0019-10) (0019-12)
- Marks, John (0008-5)
- Marsh, Rauni (0008-5)
- Massey, Tom (0008-5)
- McArthur, Richard (0008-5)
- McClure, Matthew (0008-5)
- McCoy, Timothy (0008-5)
- McKenna, Chris (0008-5)
- McKenna, Kathy (0008-5)
- McKenna, Lauren (0008-5)
- McKenna, Rick (0008-5)
- Meadow, Norm (0025-63)
- Meadow, Norman (0028-37) (0028-38)
- Metz, Richard (0008-5)
- Minault, Kent (0008-5)
- Miranda, Tina (0008-5)
- Moore, Kerry (0008-5)
- Mostov, Liz (0008-5)
- Munson, Clarence William (0008-5)
- Nagle, Thomas (0008-5)
- Nanfra, Freya (0008-5)
- Nash, James (0008-5)
- Nerode, Gregory (0008-5)
- Novick, Wesley (0008-5)
- Nunez, Albert (0008-5)
- Nunez, Carlos (0008-5)
- Oakes, Bonnie (0008-5)
- Olmstead, Harry (0008-5)
- O'Meara, Patrick (0008-5)
- Pacheco-Theard, Lauren (0008-5)
- Paquet, Kevin (0008-5)
- Parsons, Barry (0008-5)
- Paul, Georgia (0008-5)
- Pedraza-Tucker, Liette (0008-5)
- Petkiewicz, Margaret (0008-5)
- Phipps, Donald (0008-5)
- Piner, Lisa (0008-5)
- Piser, Daniel (0008-5)
- Putney, Louis (0008-5)
- Rader, Nancy (0008-5)
- Radford Jr., Roger (0008-5)
- Raines, Mary (0008-5)

Comment Category**Commenter (Comment ID)**

- Ramstrom, Eric G and Shirley S (0008-5)
- Randall, David (0008-5)
- Rankin, Susan (0008-5)
- Reidenbach, Gregory (0008-5)
- Rosenblum, Stephen (0008-5)
- Ross, Anne (0008-5)
- Sather, Alice (0008-5)
- Sauer, Elizabeth (0008-5)
- Schmidt, Jason (0008-5)
- Schopp, Ricky (0008-5)
- Schwarz, Walter (0008-5)
- See, Bud (0008-5)
- Shafer, Scott (0008-5)
- Shashani, Linda (0008-5)
- Sherrow, Sarah (0008-5)
- Shively, Daniel (0008-5)
- Siecke, Martin (0008-5)
- Simila, Owen (0008-5)
- Skercevic, Maria (0008-5)
- Smith, Enoch (0008-5)
- Smith, Martha (0008-5)
- Snowden, Patricia (0008-5)
- Sorin, Susanna (0008-5)
- Soroos, Marvin S (0008-5)
- Soto, Yvonne (0008-5)
- Stevens, Denise (0008-5)
- Stilwell, Lisa (0008-5)
- Strange, Linda (0008-5)
- Theil, Tony (0008-5)
- Thiele, Abhaya (0008-5)
- Tornatore, James (0008-5)
- Trenholme, Art (0008-5)
- Turner, Tamisha (0008-5)
- Valliere, Cliff (0008-5)
- VanEtten, Margot (0008-5)
- Vieg, Jeannette (0008-5)
- Voeller, Estelle (0008-5)
- Wadkins, Melanie (0008-5)
- Waldman, Sam (0008-5)
- Walker-Meere, Susan (0008-5)
- Walsh, Donald (0008-5)
- Walters, Betty (0008-5)
- Wanner, Gabrielle (0008-5)
- Ward, John (0008-5)
- Welch, Irene (0008-5)
- Wilkins, Paul (0008-5)
- Willoughby, CaraLea (0008-5)
- Wilson, Deb (0008-5)
- Yeatts, Jordan (0008-5)
- Zastawecky, Margaret (0008-5)

Comment Category**Commenter (Comment ID)**

-
- Zelikson, Linda (0008-5)

Uranium Fuel Cycle

- Acevedo, NK (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Aitken, Keith (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Albright, Evan (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Andereson, David (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Arist, Phyllis (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Armas, Zoe (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Arndt, Gunter (0004-5)
- Avance, Kenneth (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Bainum, Meghan (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Bakalian, Craig (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Baldwin, Natylie (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Barr, Phillip (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Bartholomew, Alice (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Be, Maya (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Becker, Rochelle (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Bedding, Gerhard (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Behabadi, Bardia (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Bissonnette, Rick (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Black, Monica Latka (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Blomstrom, Eric (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Borrowman, Ellen (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Boxwell, Bob (0025-159)
- Briggs, Ruth (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- C, Suzy (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Chinn, Jason (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Clark, Kevin (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Clark, Loralee (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Cleaver, Melissa (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Cox, Duncan (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Crawley, Jackie (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Crocca, Carol (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Culp, Richard (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Curington, Diana (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Daddy, Big (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Darbyshire, David (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- DesHarnais, Gaston (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Diaz, Lorenzo (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Dolly, William (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Donn, Marjory (0020-2) (0020-5)
- Emmons, Cheryl (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Erdesohn, Cynthia (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Evans, Michael (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Faigle, Susan (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Fernow, Geoff (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Finnelli, Marilyn and Tom (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Fisher, Allison (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Foppe, Paul (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)

Comment Category**Commenter (Comment ID)**

- Fuller, Alfred (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Futterer, Joe (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Gannaway, Gloria (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Garbato, Kelly (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Garner, Patrick (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Gilpin, John (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Good, Riana (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Goodrich, Anne (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Grad, Robert (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Grand, Robert (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Grassi, Rosemarie (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Guay-Brezner, Colette (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Harberson, Laurie (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Hauck, Molly (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Hedlund, Cara (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Helvick, Steven (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Henderson, Sherry (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Hinton, Georgia (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Hoffman, Lilli (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Holzer, Frederick (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Hood, Marilyn (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Hooker, Betsy (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Huffman, Debbie (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Hughey, Patricia (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Hung, Shiu (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Hutchinson, Richard (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Ireland, John (0012-1)
- Johnston, Bill (0025-111)
- Jones, Hollis (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Jones-Giampalo, Mary (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Joos, Sandra (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Jula, Patty (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Kaliski, Raymond (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Kamps, Kevin (0024-85) (0024-86) (0025-95) (0025-96) (0025-98)
- Kane, Donna (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Katz, Shari (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Klusman, Eric (0008-1) Eric (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Knechel, David (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Kramer, Loren (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Kuintzle, Gaylene (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Lack, Robert (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Lallo, Patrick (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- LaLumia, Anne Marie (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- LaMonica, Françoise (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Latham, Rhonda (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- LaVigne, Carole (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Lee, Angela (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Loew, Brenda (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- Luczkowiak, Christopher (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
- M, Crystal (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)

Comment Category**Commenter (Comment ID)**

-
- Mackall, Kimberly (0018-4)
 - MacNulty, Joy (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Magee, L (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Manske, Jill (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Marcus, Jack David (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6) (0019-6)
 - Mariotte, Michael (0019-9) (0019-13) (0019-14) (0019-15) (0019-16) (0025-50) (0025-51) (0025-52)
 - Marks, John (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Marsh, Rauni (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6) (0026-1) (0026-4)
 - Massey, Tom (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - McArthur, Richard (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - McClure, Matthew (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - McCoy, Timothy (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - McGough, Mike (0024-103)
 - McKenna, Chris (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - McKenna, Kathy (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - McKenna, Lauren (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - McKenna, Rick (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Meadow, Norm (0025-61) (0025-62)
 - Meadow, Norman (0028-35) (0028-36)
 - Metz, Richard (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Minault, Kent (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Miranda, Tina (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Moore, Kerry (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Mostov, Liz (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Munson, Clarence William (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Nagle, Thomas (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Nanfra, Freya (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Nash, James (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Nerode, Gregory (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Novick, Wesley (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Nunez, Albert (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Nunez, Carlos (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Oakes, Bonnie (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Olmstead, Harry (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - O'Meara, Patrick (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Pacheco-Theard, Lauren (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Paquet, Kevin (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Parsons, Barry (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Paul, Georgia (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Pedraza-Tucker, Liette (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Petkiewicz, Margaret (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Phipps, Donald (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Piner, Lisa (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Piser, Daniel (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Polya, Lance (0010-1)
 - Putney, Louis (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Rader, Nancy (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Radford Jr., Roger (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Raines, Mary (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)

Comment Category**Commenter (Comment ID)**

-
- Ramstrom, Eric G and Shirley S (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Randall, David (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Rankin, Susan (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Reidenbach, Gregory (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Rosenblum, Stephen (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Ross, Anne (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Sather, Alice (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Sauer, Elizabeth (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Schmidt, Jason (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Schopp, Ricky (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Schwarz, Walter (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - See, Bud (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Shafer, Scott (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Shannahan, Brittany (0007-2)
 - Shashani, Linda (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Sherrow, Sarah (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Shively, Daniel (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Siecke, Martin (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Simila, Owen (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Skercevic, Maria (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Smith, Enoch (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Smith, Martha (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Snowden, Patricia (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Sorin, Susanna (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Soroos, Marvin S (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Soto, Yvonne (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Stevens, Denise (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Stilwell, Lisa (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Strange, Linda (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Theil, Tony (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Thiele, Abhaya (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6) (0009-1)
 - Tornatore, James (0008-1) (0008-2)
 - Tornatore, James (0008-4)
 - Tornatore, James (0008-6)
 - Trenholme, Art (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6) (0011-1)
 - Turner, Tamisha (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Valliere, Cliff (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - VanEtten, Margot (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Vieg, Jeannette (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Voeller, Estelle (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Wadkins, Melanie (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Waldman, Sam (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Walker-Meere, Susan (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Walsh, Donald (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Walters, Betty (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Wanner, Gabrielle (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Ward, John (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Welch, Irene (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Wilkins, Paul (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Willoughby, CaraLea (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)

Comment Category**Commenter (Comment ID)**

- Wilson, Deb (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Yeatts, Jordan (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Zastawecky, Margaret (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
 - Zelikson, Linda (0008-1) (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-6)
-

Calvert Cliffs Combined Construction and Operating License Public Scoping Meeting Comments and Responses

The comments and suggestions received as part of the scoping process are summarized and discussed below. Parenthetical numbers after each comment refer to the Comment Identification (ID) number (document number-comment number) and the commenter name. Comments are grouped by category.

The draft EIS will take into account the relevant issues raised during the scoping process, and the draft EIS will be made available for public comment.

The comment period for the draft EIS will offer the next opportunity for the applicant; interested Federal, Tribal, State, and local government agencies; local organizations; and members of the public to provide input to the NRC's environmental review process. The comments received on the draft EIS will be considered in the preparation of the final EIS. The final EIS, along with the staff's Safety Evaluation Report (SER), will be considered in the NRC's decision on UniStar's COL application for the Calvert Cliffs site.

1. Comments Concerning the COL Process

Comment: The proposed project is located in the Chesapeake Bay and unnamed tributaries to the Chesapeake Bay, forested nontidal wetlands, Johns Creek and Goldstein Branch and their unnamed tributaries at Unistar's Calvert Cliffs site near Lusby, Calvert County, Maryland. The Corps is responsible for making decisions pursuant to Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. It is our understanding that the NRC final rule governing Limited Work Authorizations (LWA) for Nuclear Power Plants (10 CFR Parts 2, 50, 51, 52, and 100) allows certain construction activities on production and utilization facilities to commence before a construction permit or combined license is issued. We believe that because our authority to regulate work in jurisdictional waters of the U.S., including wetlands, is a smaller component of the overall project, that the NRC has greater Federal control, responsibility and expertise for evaluating the effects of this proposed action on the environment, and therefore it is appropriate that the NRC be the lead agency for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the proposed action. It would be inappropriate for the Corps to segment the limited infrastructure components associated with, the overall Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant Unit 3 expansion where the NRC possesses the expertise in determining the environmental consequences associated with the proposed construction of the AREVA EPR and has the ultimate approval/disapproval authority for the proposal. However, given our responsibility for regulating work which is proposed for the LWA and/or license, we request to serve as a cooperating agency in the preparation of the EIS for the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant Unit-3 project. (0021-1 [Gaffney-Smith, Margaret])

Comment: The Corps has the responsibility and authority to regulate portions of the proposal that affect waters of the U.S., including jurisdictional wetlands, and has the expertise necessary to assist the NRC with meeting its statutory requirements. Therefore, in accordance with the CEQ regulations we [the Corps of Engineers] are requesting to be designated as a cooperating agency for the EIS for this project. (0021-2 [Gaffney-Smith, Margaret])

Response: *The NRC received official notice of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' interest in becoming a cooperating agency for the Calvert Cliffs COL EIS. The NRC has agreed by letter dated June 11, 2008 (ML081570139), to invite the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to serve as a cooperating agency in the preparation of the EIS for this licensing action.*

Comment: The environmental impact statement scoping process should factor in long-term and short term impacts of the proposed new reactor at Calvert Cliffs. I urge NRC to include researching alternatives to a new reactor, a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis, a study of high and low level radioactive waste, safety and emergency planning into it's scoping process. (0003-1 [Coster, Steven] [Kjer, Timothy] [Shannahan, Brittany])

Response: *The NRC staff will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in accordance with its regulatory requirements. In its review, the staff will focus on the environmental effects of construction and operation of the proposed reactor and associated facilities and equipment. Alternative energy sources, a benefit-cost analysis, onsite treatment and handling of radiological waste, and short-term and long-term impacts are within the scope of this licensing action and will be addressed in the EIS. Safety and emergency planning are not within the scope of the EIS but are addressed in separate NRC reviews.*

Comment: I understand that the new NRC rules do not consider certain site-preparation activities as construction and therefore allow these activities to occur before the final Environmental Impact Study is issued. Nonetheless, I urge you to consider the impact of these activities in the EIS so that changes can be made to the work in progress if necessary. (0006-3 [Baummer, Thomas])

Comment: The NRC under a recently promulgated change to its regulations has redefined what the word "construction" means and effectively 90 percent of the construction of this new reactor, NRC no longer considers falling under the National Environmental Policy Act. They can do a lot of construction at the Calvert Cliffs 3 site without doing an environmental assessment of the environmental impacts, and I just ask how does that comport with protecting the coastline of the Chesapeake? (0024-88 [Kamps, Kevin])

Comment: [A]bout a year ago the nuclear industry was able to successfully convince the NRC to redefine, as Jim said, the word "construction." Redefining this word effectively circumvents the 1971 court decision. So while they are not technically violating this law, they are certainly violating the spirit of NEPA, the National Environmental Protection [Policy] Act, that mandates that they prepare an EIS. (0025-88 [Fisher, Allison])

Comment: I'd like you to consider the following for your EIS -- to assure that these [LWA construction] activities are being conducted in an environmentally responsible manner, and to restore the NRC's compliance responsibilities, not to mention to restore the appearance of being overseers rather than promoters of nuclear power. (0025-89 [Fisher, Allison])

Comment: You should consider all construction activities in the EIS, especially the before-mentioned, and withhold permission from Constellation, who is intending to take advantage of this new construction rule, until you have issued your final EIS. (0025-90 [Fisher, Allison])

Response: *These comments refer to the NRC's change in the definition of "construction" based on its regulatory authority. As authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, NRC is charged with protecting the public health and safety with regard to the civilian use of nuclear material. As defined in 10 CFR 51.4, construction now refers to building safety-related structures, systems, or components (SSCs) necessary for power plant construction.*

Construction also includes SSCs required to provide physical protection and onsite emergency planning. Activities such as clearing and grading, excavating, building transmission lines, and erecting support buildings that are not required for nuclear safety, physical protection, or emergency planning are now considered "preconstruction" activities. Most of these activities are regulated by other agencies and require permits to proceed. For example, the Maryland Power Plant Research Program conducts its own environmental review and makes recommendations for the issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. Activities affecting wetlands and navigable waters of the United States require permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Army Corps). The Army Corps will participate as a cooperating agency with the NRC in the preparation of the EIS. NRC will consider the environmental impacts of pre-construction activities in the context of cumulative impacts. These impacts will be evaluated in Chapter 4 of the EIS.

Comment: I am also a member of the local community and an advocate of the environment, so I want to ensure that the construction and operation of Unit 3 is done in a way that will have minimal impact on the environment. (0006-2 [Baummer, Thomas])

Comment: NAACPCCB [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Calverly County Branch] would like the NRC to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the potential environmental impact of a 3rd reactor at Calvert Cliffs. This impact study should not only consider the impact of the new reactor itself but the potential impact it will have in concert with the other two reactors. (0017-1 [Brown, Jr., Edsel])

Comment: [W]e again request that you continue to provide an open and transparent public process where everyone has an opportunity to ask questions, express their opinions and learn more about the regulatory process. (0024-13 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: We trust the NRC's open process and respectfully request that the NRC keep public comment for the draft environmental impact statement specific to the environmental report findings. (0024-15 [Hodge, Gary])

Comment: We understand that there will be environmental impacts during construction, several of which have been identified by Unistar. We ask that the NRC look into the identified impacts and during your independent review determine the most appropriate mitigation measures where needed. (0024-3 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: We encourage and trust the NRC's open process, and respectfully request that the NRC keep public comment for the draft environmental impact statement specific to the environmental report findings. (0025-107 [Hodge, Gary])

Comment: [W]e again request that you continue to provide an open, transparent public process where everyone has an opportunity to ask questions, express their opinions, and learn more about the regulatory process. (0025-17 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: Last August I asked that the NRC provide assurance that Calvert Cliffs and their partners be given fair regulatory treatment regardless of opposition. (0025-26 [Martins, Darren])

Comment: We ask that the NRC look into the identified impacts and, during your independent review, determine the most appropriate mitigation measures when needed. (0025-3 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: Any shortcomings and deficiencies in this EIS will be protested, will be litigated, and will be legislated. (0025-41 [Mariotte, Michael])

Response: *The NRC reviews the plans for construction and operation of a proposed unit and evaluates the impacts and mitigation measures. As part of the NRC process, it seeks public comment through the public scoping meetings and the scoping period. Impacts of construction and operation including cumulative impacts with the existing Units 1 and 2 will be described in the EIS.*

Comment: It is our expectation that all of the questions and concerns noted in this letter will be answered by the NRC and Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant. We hope that your desire is not just to build a nuclear reactor but assist in rebuilding the community and improving the quality of life for the people in the community. (0018-14 [Mackall, Kimberly])

Response: *NRC has an obligation under NEPA to identify and disclose the socioeconomic impacts of major Federal actions it undertakes. Socioeconomic impacts will be analyzed in the EIS. However, NRC's authority is limited to regulating the civilian use of nuclear materials. Community and quality of life issues that do not affect nuclear safety are more appropriately addressed by local authorities and the applicant.*

Comment: The Draft and Final EIS--as well as public hearings--must await certification of the EPR reactor design. (0019-20 [Mariotte, Michael])

Response: *The Design Certification Documentation for the AREVA U.S. Evolutionary Power Reactor proposed for the Calvert Cliffs Unit 3 was submitted to NRC in December 2007. The review of the design is ongoing. The submitted documentation provided sufficient details to evaluate issues relevant to the EIS. If substantive changes to the design are made as a result of the review, the changes will be evaluated to determine whether a supplement to the EIS will be needed.*

Comment: PPRP attended the NRC public scoping meeting on 19 March 2008, as well as portions of the site audit tour and meetings held on 17 and 18 March 2008. We appreciated the opportunity to meet the NRC staff and to share information about the State-level reviews taking place concurrently with the Federal-level evaluation. We look forward to a continuing open dialogue with the staff on issues important to Maryland. We have no specific input to the NRC's environmental impact statement (EIS) scoping process at this time. PPRP plans to thoroughly review the draft EIS when it is issued and will submit comments as appropriate. We welcome the opportunity to participate in the NRC licensing process for Calvert Cliffs Unit 3 and look forward to further interaction in the NRC's development of the EIS. (0022-1 [Gray, Susan])

Response: *NRC appreciates the opportunity to include the State of Maryland among the stakeholders participating in the licensing process for the proposed Unit 3 at the Calvert Cliffs facility.*

2. Comments Concerning Site Layout and Design

Comment: When Unistar Nuclear picked this design, we picked this design because of the two containments, the four safety trains, the amount of concrete and steel that is in this design. (0024-113 [Vanderheyden, George])

Comment: [O]ur design is being constructed all over the world. It has already been approved by two regulatory agencies in two different countries, Finland and France. Our hope is, is that,

as we go through this extensive open process with the NRC, that the U.S. Government and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission will be the third country and third regulatory agent to fully review and approve this design. (0024-115 [Vanderheyden, George])

Comment: This design that we will produce is also going to have a very small environmental impact. We're the ones that are going to build a cooling tower that's not 5[00] or 600 feet like most people are used to seeing in the press, I mean in pictures. It's a 168 feet. It's going to have plume abatement on the cooling towers which means that vapor trail that people see that goes up into the air, you won't see that from our power plant. (0024-118 [Vanderheyden, George])

Comment: [W]e're going to put a desalinization plant in. We're going to take a small amount of the Chesapeake Bay water, remove the salt, make fresh water with it and use it to provide the power plant systems. (0024-119 [Vanderheyden, George])

Comment: Unistar has taken several additional key steps to minimize the environmental impact by selecting a hybrid cooling tower designed much lower to the ground and one that will take in approximately 98 percent less water from the Chesapeake Bay than the existing Calvert Cliffs Units 1 and 2, and a desalination plant that eliminates the need to use area groundwater sources once the plant is operational. (0024-2 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: I trust that since this may be the first design of this type in the United States but it's not just being reviewed by the NRC, it's being reviewed by other nations as well. (0024-96 [Scarafia, Bill])

Comment: [W]e are the design that has the double containment building. The containment building, of course, is what houses the nuclear reactor subject to many of people's points. It is typically that four- to seven-foot thick concrete dome around it. Well, we have a second dome around ours. We have double containments. (0025-168 [Vanderheyden, George])

Comment: Our design -- and we will prove it in our safety analysis -- is capable of handling a direct impact from a military aircraft, a personal aircraft, and a large commercial aircraft. (0025-169 [Vanderheyden, George])

Comment: We are the design that will have 99 percent less heat input into the Chesapeake Bay. We will use 98 percent less cooling water than the existing two units use at Calvert Cliffs. We are going to do that through a new hybrid cooling tower. (0025-171 [Vanderheyden, George])

Comment: It's a low cooling tower, only 168 feet, not 600 feet that you see at many of these powerplants. And it's even going to have plume abatement on it, so you don't see that vapor trail going up into the sky. (0025-172 [Vanderheyden, George])

Comment: I am well aware of the concerns of the quality of our groundwater and the amount of groundwater we have left in our aquifers here because of the continued population growth we are all seeing. So we decided to spend an additional \$47 million to put a desalinization plant in, so that the plant will draw water from the Chesapeake, desalinate it, it turns out to be a small amount of water, and not use the groundwater. (0025-173 [Vanderheyden, George])

Comment: Unistar has taken several additional key steps to minimize the environmental impact by selecting a hybrid cooling tower designed much lower to the ground and one that will take in approximately 98 percent less water from the Chesapeake Bay than the existing Calvert Cliffs Units 1 and 2, and a desalination plant that eliminates the need to use area groundwater sources once the plant is operational. (0025-2 [Parran, Wilson])

Response: *These comments relate to UniStar's proposed plant design, cooling system, and plume abatement measures. Some, like the plan to build a desalination plant for cooling the reactor, relate to design measures intended to minimize resource use. The site layout, the reactor type, and the cooling water systems will be described in Chapter 3 of the EIS.*

Comment: I drive past the plant on Route 2/4 every day on my way back and forth to work. There are no visible clues that there is any kind of industrial activity there, except the signs at the entrance of the plant. No smokestacks, no smoke, no railway cars, no lines of trucks in and out, and no pipelines. (0025-133 [Sinclair, Jim])

Response: *This comment reflects the lack of visible indications of industrial activity when viewing the plant entrance and surrounding site from the highway. An aesthetics evaluation of the proposed plant siting will be discussed as part of the socioeconomics analysis in the EIS.*

3. Comments Concerning Land Use – Site and Vicinity

Comment: How will clearing of additional land and any changes to the shoreline and cliffs impact the environment immediately surrounding the plant? (0006-8 [Baummer, Thomas])

Response: *The land use and ecological impacts of constructing and operating the proposed new nuclear unit will be examined in Chapters 4 and 5 in the EIS.*

4. Comments Concerning Land Use – Transmission Lines

Comment: Constellation representatives have not to my knowledge explained to Calvert County how they will export the additional 1600 MW out of the County and into "the grid". Supporters of the new reactor seem to believe that Unistar will be able to upgrade the existing corridor, without having to condemn additional land from adjacent property owners. In contrast to Constellation/Unistar, representatives of the MAPP project have indicated that they do not intend to widen their 500 kV connector from Calvert Cliffs to Chalk Point-rather, they intend to upgrade the cables and towers. MAPP also plans to embed a 500 kV connector at shallow subbottom depth under the Chesapeake, thereby creating a connection with the Eastern Shore. (0005-14 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: [A]ny widening of the transmission corridor would have extremely negative effects on adjacent homeowners and on land owners who have gone the extra mile to preserve their land privately, thinking it would be 'in perpetuity'. Perhaps the worst impacts would fall on the large area of nature preserve in the watersheds of Parkers Creek and Governors Run. The environmental viability of this preserve area is already negatively impacted by the existing corridors, which fragment the forested preserve. (0005-15 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: The EIS needs to require any new reactor to export its power within the existing corridor. If necessary, pay the price of undergrounding--it's possible but costs more. (0005-16 [Vogt, Peter])

Response: *The possible need for any additional land for transmission will be addressed in Chapter 4 of the EIS. If new land is needed, associated environmental impacts will also be addressed in the EIS.*

Comment: [W]hen comparing the impact of generating new power at Calvert Cliffs vs. at other potential sites, the EIS needs to compare the lengths of transmission corridor required to get the

power into the grid. This would include the added line losses, transmission line and tower construction and maintenance costs for a longer corridor, as well as the environmental costs of keeping natural forest from reclaiming the corridors. (0005-17 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: We would like to make certain that our citizens understand one key construction fact: there are no new transmission corridors necessary to build Unit 3. It is important to note that Unit 3 not be confused with other proposed utility improvement projects in Calvert County. The 500kv transmission line currently serving Calvert Cliffs will accommodate the expansion with some upgrades to substations. (0014-2 [Clark, Gerald] [Kelley, Linda] [Parran, Wilson] [Shaw, Susan] [Stinnett, Barbara])

Comment: [N]o new transmission corridors are needed to build Unit 3. We note this because it is important not to confuse the construction of Unit 3 with the other proposed utility improvement projects in Calvert County and we have several other projects in Calvert County that are not related to the building of Unit 3. (0024-4 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: [I]t is important not to confuse the construction of the Unit 3 and other proposed utility improvement projects in Calvert County. The 500-kilovolt transmission line currently serving Calvert Cliffs will accommodate the expansion with some upgrades to the substation (0025-5 [Parran, Wilson])

Response: *The environmental impacts associated with transmitting power from the proposed new unit to the grid will be addressed in the EIS.*

5. Comments Concerning Meteorology and Air Quality

Comment: Will the water circulating in the cooling tower be raw bay water or treated or desalinated water? Any chemicals in this water, as well as salt and other minerals, are likely to be carried into the air and the local environment. The effect of this should be evaluated. (0006-5 [Baummer, Thomas])

Comment: Is the plume abatement system on the cooling tower likely to work effectively throughout the plant's life? Or will a certain level of effectiveness be required? Legionnaire's disease and particulate salt emissions (with its effects on the local ecology and on nearby cars and equipment through corrosion) are two significant concerns. (0006-6 [Baummer, Thomas])

Response: *The reactor cooling system including the water source and treatment and its operation will be discussed in Chapter 3 of the staff's EIS. The potential impacts of the cooling system operation will be addressed in several sections of Chapter 5 of the EIS. For example, impacts of drift on vegetation will be addressed in the section on terrestrial ecology; the potential impacts on human health will be addressed in the section on non-radiological health effects; and the aesthetics of cooling tower plumes will be addressed in the section on socioeconomic impacts.*

Comment: The EIS should fully examine the potential effects of climate change on the Calvert Cliffs 3 facility, including the possibility of severe weather-induced accidents. For example, tornados are occurring with greater frequency in the region and a strong tornado nearly hit the Calvert Cliffs site just a few years ago, whereas 30 years ago tornados were a rarity in the mid-Atlantic region. The EIS should consider the effect of stronger and more frequent tornados hitting the Calvert Cliffs site directly. (0019-29 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: The EIS should address the effects of larger and more frequent hurricanes directly hitting the Calvert Cliffs site. (0019-30 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: What is the effect of climate change on the operations of this plant? This plant would operate for at least 40 years, perhaps 60 years. It won't be online for another 10 years, so we are really projecting late this century the impacts of this plant. (0025-45 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: What are the effects of the increasing likelihood of increasingly strong storms, tornadoes, on this plant? Is this plant being built to accommodate that? (0025-46 [Mariotte, Michael])

Response: *The comments express concern over the effects of the environment on the operation of the plant. Evaluation of the design to withstand severe weather conditions is part of the licensing process, but outside the scope of the EIS. Wind loadings, tornados, and floods will be considered in the staff's safety evaluation report.*

Comment: The EIS should address the possible impacts of climate change on the Chesapeake Bay and the water supply for Calvert Cliffs-3. (0019-31 [Mariotte, Michael])

Response: *The comment expresses concern over the effects of the environment on the operation of the plant. Evaluation of the water requirements to maintain the plant in a safe condition is part of the licensing process, but outside the scope of the EIS. The capability of the water supply source to provide necessary cooling of the reactor and essential equipment will be evaluated in the staff's safety evaluation report.*

6. Comments Concerning Geology

Comment: Careful mapping of the Miocene-aged sediment layers outcropping along the Calvert Cliffs has been done and published subsequent to the construction of the existing power plant in the mid-1970s. This new mapping shows--more accurately than was known before-- the layers to be gently dipping (tilted) down to the southeast, and not disrupted by faults--except at one site, located about 1 mile south of the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, just north of Rocky Point. At this place along the cliffs, the layers appear to be offset a couple meters--that is, the layers are not continuous. The offset is such that the layers to the south are higher than those on the north. Detailed geological examination is needed to prove that the offset is not due to mapping errors--unlikely--, and, if a fault is indicated, boreholes will be needed to establish its strike (trend) and dip. (0019-35 [Mariotte, Michael])

Response: *The EIS will contain a short description of local geology. Geotechnical and seismic issues are addressed in Chapter 2.5 of the staff's Safety Evaluation Report.*

7. Comments Concerning Water Resources

Comment: What will be done with the salt and other minerals extracted by the desalination plant? Returning these to the bay will have a disturbing effect on the salinity and ecology of the area. (0006-4 [Baummer, Thomas])

Response: *Water quality impacts of operation of the plant will be evaluated by the staff and described in Chapter 5 of the EIS. This assessment will include consideration of the impacts of the effluents from the desalination system and its effect on aquatic ecology.*

Comment: How will sediment and chemical runoff be controlled during construction? (0006-7 [Baummer, Thomas])

Response: *Water quality issues associated with construction activities will be assessed by the staff and discussed in Chapters 4 and 7 of the EIS. Control of pollutants in runoff is regulated by the state.*

Comment: You should address what effect runoff from the pre-construction activities will have on the Bay. (0025-93 [Fisher, Allison])

Response: *The impacts of pre-construction activities will be considered in the staff's review of cumulative impacts. The assessment of cumulative impacts will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 7 of the EIS.*

Comment: [W]hat benchmarking can we do with regard to effluents to the Bay when we compare it to non-nuclear power plants that use the same water supply? (0024-110 [Buchanan, Bill])

Response: *It is unclear whether this question refers to general or radiological effluents. General effluents are largely related to the amount of water used in the cooling system, its temperatures, and any water treatment chemicals used. Liquid effluents are regulated through the facility's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Aside from the cooling system, the primary feature distinguishing the liquid effluents from a nuclear power plant with a non-nuclear power plant is that a nuclear plant discharges a small quantity of radionuclides into the normal effluent, and this quantity is limited by NRC regulation. Ambient radiological monitoring is conducted in the Bay to ensure its quality. Current surface water quality and proposed impacts to the surface water from construction and operation of a new unit will be discussed in the EIS.*

8. Comments Concerning Ecology

Comment: According to Constellation sources, ca. 300 acres will have to be cleared of forest for new reactor construction. This forest forms part of the two remaining Calvert County areas of relatively contiguous forest, which represent "bioreserves", for example for successful reproduction of numerous neotropical migrant bird species, whose populations have been steadily declining (at rates from ca. 1 to several % per year, depending on species) throughout the eastern US for some decades. One of the two areas extends from Flag Ponds Nature Park across through the Constellation forest buffer zone, and down into the Calvert Cliffs State Park and the buffer zone around the Dominion LNG terminal area. The Calvert Cliffs forest buffer zone, managed for wildlife under the WHIP program by the operator, is actually better for Forest Interior Dwelling species (FIDs) than parks opened to the public, which are more prone to disturbance. [The] 300 contiguous acres of forest lost to the new reactor would probably comprise the biggest single loss of contiguous forest (the ecologically valuable type) in Calvert County for decades, if not ever. The EIS needs to estimate the resulting loss of nesting sites etc. from the clearing of this 300 forested acres. (0005-13 [Vogt, Peter])

Response: *Impacts to terrestrial resources from construction of the proposed unit, including changes in the landscape, will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 7 of the EIS.*

Comment: [T]he damage to wildlife from small releases should be contrasted with the damage to habitat that would result from the construction of thousands of wind turbines, either on or

offshore, or the conversion of thousands of square miles of farm and forest to bioenergy production. (0025-59 [Meadow, Norm])

Response: *Impacts of the construction and operation of the proposed unit on environmental resources will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS. Impacts of alternative energy sources will be discussed in Chapter 9.*

Comment: [The EIS] must assign considerable importance to damage to habitat which diminishes both biological diversity and complexity. (0028-2 [Meadow, Norman])

Response: *A discussion of the impacts of construction and operation of the proposed units and their impact on the environment will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

9. Comments Concerning Socioeconomics

Comment: I've lived here in Calvert for 25 years. All the farms are gone. They want to build new schools. Subdivisions are everyw[h]ere. But I guess no one thought about that. Calvert County Commissioners are not for the quality of life for this county. All they can think of is the next dollar in their pocket. (0002-2 [Boswell, William])

Response: *Socioeconomic issues including existing land development and regional schools and changes resulting from the addition of the proposed new unit will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: The EIS needs to estimate the likely number of new children added to the school system as a result of a new reactor- and take into consideration that the new employees will likely be in their prime child-producing years. (0005-11 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: Your risk assessment must consider rapid population growth in the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power plant region. Calvert County itself has grown from ca. 20,000 when the first two units went online, to nearly 90,000 today. (0005-4 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: Constellation must demonstrate that its staff will have access to reasonable housing. Since Calvert County has limited apartment availability, plans must be established to ensure that the staff of the new reactor can acquire living quarters in the county. Over the last several years there have been major issues with healthcare, law enforcement, and other key professionals finding it difficult to acquire housing in the county. (0017-9 [Brown, Jr., Edsel])

Response: *Socioeconomic impacts such as impacts on population, schools, public services, and housing associated with the construction and operation of a new unit at Calvert Cliffs will be considered in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: EIS statisticians should be able to estimate, with some range of caveats/assumptions, the probable mean traffic delay imposed by reactor construction and operation, and what a mean 1 minute daily traffic delay would cost annually, as well as the likely number of additional accidents per year. Even neglecting the delays and cost due to increased accidents, I roughly estimate the total annual cost for every 1 min traffic delay at from \$5 million to \$50 million. It is unacceptable that this cost is ignored just because it is (like investor risk) dispersed among many thousands of people. (0005-10 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: Constellation states that the proposed third reactor would provide several thousand construction jobs and several hundred permanent jobs. Many of these new jobs, as well as

visitors, and delivery trucks, will add substantial traffic to MD 2/4, which at present is a congested and dangerous highway. (0005-6 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: Traffic on this highway has been increasing even faster than the population-and Calvert has been at or near the top of population growth rates among Maryland counties for decades: Your estimate needs to consider the trend when you estimate traffic impact when reactor construction might begin. (0005-8 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: MD 2/4 is currently near failure (categories D or worse), especially during rush hour. The counter near Prince Frederick has reached 40,000 vehicles per day, and much of the new reactor traffic would have to pass through Prince Frederick. Your assessment needs to acknowledge the 'stutter-step' response of infrastructure (e.g., roads, schools, airports, etc.) to growth. (0005-9 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: [With regard] to the potential impact on traffic patterns in Calvert County as a result of the new reactor. With increased staff, deliveries, and related businesses to support the site expansion, what plans are being put in place to assure that the expansion will have little or no impact on travel. (0017-7 [Brown, Jr., Edsel])

Response: *Socioeconomic impacts such as impacts on transportation and local infrastructure associated with the construction and operation of the Unit 3 will be considered in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: The EIS process should include impartial estimates showing a breakdown of job and pay categories, in terms of the % likely filled by county residents. (0005-12 [Vogt, Peter])

Response: *Socioeconomic impacts such as labor impacts associated with the construction and operation of Unit 3 will be considered in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: Calvert Cliffs has served the citizens of Calvert County well over the past decades as the leading employer in our county. Additionally, Calvert Cliffs has contributed sixteen million dollars annually in taxes, which accounts for nine percent of the county's total revenue. Calvert Cliffs has assisted the county in numerous donations to various organizations and countless students. I have seen many positive results from their presence in Southern Maryland. I can truly say that Calvert Cliffs has greatly enriched our county and allowed for a better quality of life while meeting the energy needs of Maryland. (0015-5 [O'Donnell, Anthony])

Comment: The reality of the fact is that nuclear power plants are going to be built in this country somewhere and at some time and there's no reason why this county and this region should not enjoy those economic benefits that I talked about earlier today and if it's job creation in this county that are good paying jobs with good benefits that aren't necessarily when we talk about the construction jobs as temporary jobs, those are not temporary jobs. They will afford -- with the rising costs of college education today many people will not be able to viably afford to go to college and our young people will have an opportunity to enter into the trade, learn a skill, get educated while they earn money and have a lifelong career with benefits, a defined benefit plan, and a health and welfare plan where they can take care of their needs. (0024-107 [Karbowsky, Brad])

Comment: [A] nuclear plant makes a good neighbor, as many people here tonight have already indicated. It supports high-paying jobs directly at the plant, generates additional jobs in the community where it is located, and contributes by helping build good schools, roads, and other civic improvements. (0024-26 [Kanaley, Mike])

Comment: We must seek and support development that will stimulate our economy, provide jobs, additional tax revenue, and new business opportunities. We have to be open-minded and flexible when considering what we're up against. We have to keep an eye on the important role that Calvert Cliffs plays in our economy. (0024-29 [McClure, Deborah])

Comment: I read a letter to the editor recently blasting this potential expansion as related to a number of items, including job growth, the limited availability of labor and the fact that most of the higher-paying jobs related to the plant expansion would be highly specialized, with the eligible employee pool mostly trained on Navy nuclear submarines. Not only is this not true, I couldn't disagree more with that premise. It is true that the Navy trains many, many nuclear workers, but the fact is that universities across the United States, almost 900 of them, offer fields of study in undergraduate nuclear energy programs. (0024-42 [Chambers, Bill])

Comment: [B]ecause job creation is critical here locally in Calvert County, an expanded Calvert Cliffs would be a huge economic and socioeconomic boon for Calvert County and the State of Maryland. (0024-43 [Chambers, Bill])

Comment: So I ask the NRC to review the impact an expanded Calvert Cliffs may have on education and this request is not meant to be negative at all. In fact, I'd like this raised because I believe that creating opportunity for our local youth will allow our children to live and work in the community in which they are raised. (0024-44 [Chambers, Bill])

Comment: The economy is in an area right now where we need jobs such as the third reactor coming to Calvert Cliffs. We as union employees are in a turmoil right now. That plant alone would bring most crafts back up to standards and that's what we are looking forward to. (0024-56 [Parran, Wilson L.])

Comment: When we look at the potential for this new facility and the 2,000 on up construction jobs, another economic benefit. When we look at the 400 potential permanent jobs after completion, high-paying technically advanced jobs. (0024-93 [Scarafia, Bill])

Comment: Our communities throughout Southern Maryland have all collaborated to build a feeder system throughout our public schools and our higher education in the areas of science, technology, engineering and math, what everybody in the country is calling STEM, so that our citizens will be able to produce the kind of workers that they will need and as one speaker said earlier, we will now have another opportunity for our local graduates to live and work here. (0024-94 [Scarafia, Bill])

Comment: A nuclear powerplant also makes a good neighbor. It supports high-paying jobs directly at the plant. It generates additional jobs in the community, and I have been told, and I have read, that for every job created at a plant three jobs are created in the community. And I believe it is 400 jobs that are going to be created, so that's 1,200 additional jobs in the community. (0025-123 [Walther, Robert])

Comment: The community will benefit from the many construction jobs created over the near term, and permanent jobs long into the future, once the plant becomes operational. (0025-137 [Sinclair, Jim])

Comment: The new plant will also make a significant contribution to the Calvert County tax base, which is already greatly supported by the existing units, reducing the burden on individual taxpayers. (0025-138 [Sinclair, Jim])

Comment: In these tough economic times, it is economic development like the construction of a third reactor at Calvert Cliffs that will help provide the socioeconomic push many of our small businesses need to stay afloat and prosper. Solomons Business Association welcomes that development and looks forward to the new jobs, new businesses, and new visitors that it will bring to our region. (0025-175 [Tarhan, Diane])

Comment: [T]he positive economic benefit that will come from the expansion and adding this third reactor at Calvert Cliffs, some \$20 million in new revenue resources that would come just to Calvert County alone. (0025-35 [Burton, Bob])

Comment: And let me just say that the environmental impact can be positive not only during and after the new reactor is put into place, but these additional monies that will come into Calvert County will be used to improve, upgrade, and expand infrastructure, public education, and public safety. (0025-36 [Burton, Bob])

Comment: [W]hen we have the opportunity in our local jurisdictions, and the funding, to be able to go in there and upgrade this infrastructure, it will have to meet the new environmental standards, which will help create a cleaner environment for our communities when we begin upgrading this infrastructure. (0025-37 [Burton, Bob])

Comment: When we begin putting additional monies into public education, we can expand the program offerings, as it was noted here earlier, in the area of math and science and engineering. (0025-38 [Burton, Bob])

Comment: [W]e are talking about an infusion of jobs to this region of 2,000 construction jobs, many of which whom the last time there was a construction plant built in this county stayed here, with high-paying jobs that have high paying benefits that do not take from the county and the region's government, but actually give back to those positions. (0025-78 [Karbowsky, Brad])

Comment: It brings forth the ability of our young people to enter into the construction trade, as an alternative to going to college, for those who can't go to college with the skyrocketing costs of college, and provide opportunities for our residents to have jobs and stay in this county and live in this county. (0025-80 [Karbowsky, Brad])

Comment: The estimated 2,000 to 4,000 construction jobs will be an economic boost to our region, but then the subsequent 400 permanent jobs will be well placed here, because in St. Mary's County and the rest of our region you will see that we have developed a huge technology base where people will be able to come with their expertise and blend and feel comfortable in this community. (0025-82 [Scarafia, Bill])

Response: *These comments generally express support for the Calvert Cliffs Unit 3, based on the potential positive socioeconomic impacts it would be expected to bring to the region. Socioeconomic impacts of construction and operation will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

10. Comments Concerning Historic and Cultural Resources

Comment: [I]n the environmental report submitted by Unistar, they identify parcels within the proposed project area that is potentially eligible for the national registry of historic places. Since they're a moderate to high potential for containing archaeological resources in this general area, what mitigation measures will be required in order to protect the integrity of these resources,

especially since they are no longer considered within the purview of the EIS? (0025-94 [Fisher, Allison])

Response: *The NRC will comply with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) through its normal NEPA process. Impacts to historical resources and possible mitigation measures will be discussed in chapters 4 and 5 of the Environmental Impact Statement. Then NHPA does not grant the authority to impose mitigation to the NRC. The applicant will need to work with the Maryland Historical Trust to identify any necessary mitigation measures.*

11. Comments Concerning Environmental Justice

Comment: African Americans make up about 13% of the population of Calvert County. A majority of African Americans live within 1 to 10 miles away from the nuclear power plant. There are several schools in close vicinity to the nuclear power plant and will be effected by the decision of the NRC. History tells us that prior to the new concepts of environmental justice and racism the African American neighborhoods have been recipients of toxic landfills and other hazardous materials. Due to the negative historical data throughout the country and potential of an emergency CBW would like to ask the following questions [all but the one below which are listed in the sections based on subject matter]. (0018-2 [Mackall, Kimberly])

Comment: How are you implementing Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898 at the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant? (0018-3 [Mackall, Kimberly])

Response: *The NRC Environmental Justice Policy is available in the NRC Electronic Reading Room at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/commission/policy/69fr52040.pdf>. The policy states that NRC will identify and disclose disproportionately high and adverse impacts that fall heavily on a particular community as a result of a proposed agency action. The NRC will perform its environmental justice analysis through its NEPA review process. Environmental justice is evaluated on a plant-specific basis and will be addressed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

12. Comments Concerning Health – Radiological

Comment: I took a course in the history of the nuclear industry at university, studying under one of the most respected academic specialists on the subject. He says that there is no real 'safe' level of radiation for humans to be exposed to. All radiation is damaging, no matter what the nuclear companies say. (0007-3 [Shannahan, Brittany])

Comment: What are your clean up standards? What are the standards for air quality and water quality? (0018-10 [Mackall, Kimberly])

Comment: The EIS should address the additional cumulative effects of routine radiation releases on nearby populations and on aquatic life in and around the Chesapeake Bay from Calvert Cliffs-3, given 11 nuclear reactors (Susquehanna 1 & 2, Three Mile Island 1, Peach Bottom 2& 3, Calvert Cliffs-1 & 2, North Anna 1& 2, Surry 1& 2) already releasing radiation into the Bay. (0019-22 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: [W]ith an accident at a nuclear power plant, it's, of course, different than an accident elsewhere. There is radioactive material that would be dispersed and citizens are at risk of ingestion and inhalation. Radioactive iodine can be a cause of thyroid cancer and then

the other radioactive material can be risk factors down the line for cancers in the future. (0024-68 [Dubois, Gwen])

Comment: [T]he scientific requirements for valid analysis of risk are clearly described in the publications of the National Research Council, known as the BEIR reports, B-E-I-R. And these should be carefully considered. The reports clearly state that the best estimates of risk are from studies for which there are data on individual dose, and for which an appropriate control population is available. (0025-57 [Meadow, Norm])

Comment: The scientific requirements for valid analysis of risk are clearly described in publications of the National Research Council known as the BEIR Reports, which should be considered carefully. These reports clearly state that the best estimates of risk are from studies for which there are data on individual dose, and for which appropriate control populations are available. (0028-28 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: When evaluating risk from accidents of the magnitude of that at Three Mile Island (TMI), the quality of the available studies should be evaluated by the criteria in the BEIR Reports. (0028-29 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: The results most often given to the public are from weak, ecological studies; the paper most frequently cited by opponents of nuclear power as demonstrating that the releases at TMI2 caused damage to health is an ecological study. Two other groups of qualified researchers have not found evidence of cancer caused by TMI. (0028-30 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: The rate of incidence of cancer proposed by Wing, et al. is inconsistently high when compared to the rates that have been reported from exposures that were orders of magnitude higher than those which occurred at TMI [Three Mile Island]. ... This is one of the more convincing pieces of evidence that caused the MCC to conclude that there is no credible evidence that accidents at water moderated reactors have caused harm to health. (0028-31 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: Virtually all oncologists believe that solid tumors do not become clinically manifest until at least 5 years, and more often at least 10 years after the event that turns a cell malignant. (0028-32 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: [W]e believe that the potential for harm from commercial water-moderated nuclear reactors has been unjustifiably exaggerated, and that there is no credible evidence for death or cancer attributable to their operation. (0028-5 [Meadow, Norman])

Response: *The NRC's regulatory limits for radiological protection are set to protect workers and the public from the harmful health effects of radiation on humans. These limits are presented in 10 CFR Part 20, "Standards for Protection Against Radiation" and are based on recommendations of national and international standards-setting organizations and the National Research Council's committee reports on the Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation (the BEIR reports). The effects on workers and the public and environment from cumulative radiological releases from the proposed Unit 3, including those from Calvert Cliffs Units 1 and 2, will be described in Chapter 7 of the EIS.*

Comment: [W]hen investigating the environmental consequences of an accident at the proposed reactor, the EIS should consider many reports on the effects of radioactivity on wildlife, some of which are from carefully controlled experiments. Humans appear to be among

the species most sensitive to radioactivity, which means that most other things out there are less sensitive. (0025-58 [Meadow, Norm])

Comment: When evaluating the environmental consequences of an accident (environmental in the context of the preservation of nature) at the proposed reactor, the EIS should consider many reports on the effects of radioactivity on wildlife [footnote 5] and not gratuitous statements that extrapolate exaggerated claims of health damage from humans to the rest of the biological world. Humans appear to be among the species most sensitive to radioactivity. (0028-33 [Meadow, Norman])

Response: *The radiological impacts of reactor operation, including impacts to biota, will be addressed in Chapter 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: The EIS must fully address the impact on flora and fauna in the Chesapeake Bay caused by Calvert Cliffs-3's planned release of 525,000 gallons per year of radioactive waste into the Bay, as indicated by Constellation Energy's Response to Question 1-13 of the Maryland Public Service Commission. (0019-17 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: [A]ccording to documents filed with the Maryland Public Service Commission, this plant is going to dump 525,000 gallons per year of liquid radioactive waste into the Chesapeake Bay. What are the effects on the flora and fauna of that dumping? That is something that has to be looked at in the EIS and addressed carefully. (0025-53 [Mariotte, Michael])

Response: *These comments concern the environmental impacts of liquid radioactive effluents on aquatic ecology during normal operations. The NRC staff will discuss such impacts in Chapter 5 of the EIS.*

13. Comments Concerning Accidents

Comment: While the nuclear reactor is said to stimulate the economy within Calvert County, CBW's [Concerned Black Women of Calvert County] primary concern is regarding the quality of life of the people who live near and are at risk if an accident occurs. CBW believes that the family is the foundation and core of the community. In order for the family to be viable the people must have the right to a clean, safe, just, healthy, and sustainable environment. (0018-1 [Mackall, Kimberly])

Comment: What is your worst case scenario for a potential accident? What preventative measures will you put in place? (0018-9 [Mackall, Kimberly])

Comment: I would even point out if an evacuation is carried out without a hitch, what does that mean if there's a major radioactivity release from Calvert Cliffs? That could mean that people can never come back. (0024-84 [Kamps, Kevin])

Comment: One melt down of one of those plants - it's sci fi horror films manifested! (0026-3 [Marsh, Rauni])

Response: *The staff's EIS will address the potential impacts of operation of the proposed reactor on public health and safety in Chapter 5. There will be sections on potential radiological and non-radiological impacts of normal reactor operation on public health. There will also be a section on the potential impacts of postulated reactor accidents on public health and the environment.*

Comment: The EIS should describe and address the potential consequences of a beyond design basis accident at Calvert Cliffs-3 and should address potential additional risks of its First-of-a-Kind reactor design. (0019-18 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: Because the scoping period of this EIS is occurring well in advance--literally, years in advance--of certification of the EPR design chosen for this reactor site, we have to defer additional comments on the safety issues related to this project. However, we fail to understand how the EIS can possibly address the fundamental issue of the environmental consequences of a severe accident without knowing the specific vulnerabilities of the chosen reactor design. (0019-19 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: This design does not exist anywhere in the world. There are no operating EPRs anywhere in the world. And one of the most important things that an EIS does is examine the potential environmental consequences of a severe accident. But until you know the design strengths and weaknesses, and how they will be implemented, you don't know what the potential accident is. (0025-43 [Mariotte, Michael])

Response: *The staff's EIS will address the potential environmental impacts of postulated design-basis and severe accidents in Chapter 5. The U.S. EPR was selected as the design for the proposed Calvert Cliffs Unit 3. In a separate action, the staff is evaluating the potential consequences of design-basis accidents and the probability and consequences of severe accidents for the U.S. EPR as part of its review of the application for certification of the reactor design. A detailed description of the design certification review is beyond the scope of the EIS. However, the staff uses well-established methods to analyze a new design to determine the potential consequences of accidents. The results of the certification review process will be compared to the results of the evaluation of the environmental impacts of potential radiological releases to assure consistency.*

Comment: The EIS should address the potential adverse environmental impacts of an accident involving a significant release of radiation from at Units 1 & 2 on the safe operation of the new co-located unit. (0019-23 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: The EIS must address possible consequences to Unit-3 of an accident at the Units 1 & 2 fuel pools and/or at their dry cask storage units. (0019-8 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: I just wanted to point out the risks that will come with having two old reactors at Calvert Cliffs combined with having a new reactor at Calvert Cliffs. (0024-76 [Kamps, Kevin])

Comment: The most recent such report that the agency has done way back in 1982, and the peak early fatalities that they estimated for Calvert Cliffs 1 and 2 were 5,600 peak early fatalities at each reactor in a major accident. The peak early injuries were 15,000 at each reactor. The peak cancer deaths were 23,000. So that's a lot of injuries and deaths. A grand total of 87,200 deaths and injuries if there's a major accident involving both reactors at that site right now. Adding a third reactor would add more risk there. (0024-77 [Kamps, Kevin])

Response: *In Chapter 5 of the EIS, the staff will address risks associated with both normal operation of the proposed reactor and postulated severe accidents. The staff will also address the cumulative risks of operation of the existing reactors and the proposed new reactor.*

Comment: The EIS should address potential consequences of a serious accident in the irradiated fuel pool at new sites and in other potential high-level radioactive waste storage facilities. (0008-3 [Acevedo, NK] [Aitken, Keith] [Albright, Evan] [Andereson, David] [Arist, Phyllis])

[Armas, Zoe] [Avance, Kenneth] [Bainum, Meghan] [Bakalian, Craig] [Baldwin, Natylie] [Barr, Phillip] [Bartholomew, Alice] [Becker, Rochelle] [Bedding, Gerhard] [Behabadi, Bardia] [Be, Maya] [Bissonnette, Rick] [Black, Monica Latka] [Blomstrom, Eric] [Borrowman, Ellen] [Briggs, Ruth] [Chinn, Jason] [Clark, Kevin] [Clark, Lorelee] [Cleaver, Melissa] [Cox, Duncan] [Crawley, Jackie] [Crocca, Carol] [C, Suzy] [Culp, Richard] [Curington, Diana] [Daddy, Big] [Darbyshire, David] [DesHarnais, Gaston] [Diaz, Lorenzo] [Dolly, William] [Emmons, Cheryl] [Erdesohn, Cynthia] [Evans, Michael] [Faigle, Susan] [Fernow, Geoff] [Finnelli, Marilyn and Tom] [Fisher, Allison] [Foppe, Paul] [Fuller, Alfred] [Futterer, Joe] [Gannaway, Gloria] [Garbato, Kelly] [Garner, Patrick] [Gilpin, John] [Good, Riana] [Goodrich, Anne] [Grad, Robert] [Grand, Robert] [Grassi, Rosemarie] [Guay-Brezner, Colette] [Harberson, Laurie] [Hauck, Molly] [Hedlund, Cara] [Helvick, Steven] [Henderson, Sherry] [Hinton, Georgia] [Hoffman, Lilli] [Holzer, Frederick] [Hood, Marilyn] [Hooker, Betsy] [Huffman, Debbie] [Hughey, Patricia] [Hung, Shiu] [Hutchinson, Richard] [Jones-Giampalo, Mary] [Jones, Hollis] [Joos, Sandra] [Jula, Patty] [Kaliski, Raymond] [Kane, Donna] [Katz, Shari] [Klusman, Eric] [Knechel, David] [Kramer, Loren] [Kuintzle, Gaylene] [Lack, Robert] [Lallo, Patrick] [LaLumia, Anne Marie] [LaMonica, Francoise] [Latham, Rhonda] [LaVigne, Carole] [Lee, Angela] [Loew, Brenda] [Luczkowiak, Christopher] [MacNulty, Joy] [Magee, L] [Manske, Jill] [Marcus, Jack David] [Marks, John] [Marsh, Rauni] [Massey, Tom] [McArthur, Richard] [McClure, Matthew] [McCoy, Timothy] [McKenna, Chris] [McKenna, Kathy] [McKenna, Lauren] [McKenna, Rick] [M, Crystal] [Metz, Richard] [Minault, Kent] [Miranda, Tina] [Moore, Kerry] [Mostov, Liz] [Munson, Clarence William] [Nagle, Thomas] [Nanfra, Freya] [Nash, James] [Nerode, Gregory] [Novick, Wesley] [Nunez, Albert] [Nunez, Carlos] [Oakes, Bonnie] [Olmstead, Harry] [O'Meara, Patrick] [Pacheco-Theard, Lauren] [Paquet, Kevin] [Parsons, Barry] [Paul, Georgia] [Pedraza-Tucker, Liette] [Petkiewicz, Margaret] [Phipps, Donald] [Piner, Lisa] [Piser, Daniel] [Putney, Louis] [Rader, Nancy] [Radford Jr., Roger] [Raines, Mary] [Ramstrom, Eric G and Shirley S] [Randall, David] [Rankin, Susan] [Reidenbach, Gregory] [Rosenblum, Stephen] [Ross, Anne] [Sather, Alice] [Sauer, Elizabeth] [Schmidt, Jason] [Schopp, Ricky] [Schwarz, Walter] [See, Bud] [Shafer, Scott] [Shashani, Linda] [Sherrow, Sarah] [Shively, Daniel] [Siecke, Martin] [Simila, Owen] [Skercevic, Maria] [Smith, Enoch] [Smith, Martha] [Snowden, Patricia] [Sorin, Susanna] [Soroos, Marvin S] [Soto, Yvonne] [Stevens, Denise] [Stilwell, Lisa] [Strange, Linda] [Theil, Tony] [Thiele, Abhaya] [Tornatore, James] [Trenholme, Art] [Turner, Tamisha] [Valliere, Cliff] [VanEtten, Margot] [Vieg, Jeannette] [Voeller, Estelle] [Wadkins, Melanie] [Waldman, Sam] [Walker-Meere, Susan] [Walsh, Donald] [Walters, Betty] [Wanner, Gabrielle] [Ward, John] [Welch, Irene] [Wilkins, Paul] [Willoughby, CaraLea] [Wilson, Deb] [Yeatts, Jordan] [Zastawecky, Margaret] [Zelikson, Linda]

Comment: The EIS must address potential consequences (on the Bay, on people, on flora and fauna in the region) of a serious accident in the irradiated fuel pool at Calvert Cliffs-3, and in other potential high-level radioactive waste storage facilities. (0019-7 [Mariotte, Michael])

Response: *The staff will assess the impacts of postulated fuel handling accidents in the spent fuel pool in Chapter 5 of the EIS. Evaluation of the consequences of postulated accidents at the Calvert Cliffs Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation, which is licensed separately, is outside the scope of the environmental review for the proposed reactors.*

Comment: I would point out that if there's an accident at Calvert Cliffs, even a minor one, that there will be radiological stigma associated with that. The NRC should consider that in its socioeconomic analysis. The impact on tourism, the impact on fisheries, the impact on all aspects of the economy in this region, if there's even a small accident at Calvert Cliffs, let alone a major one. (0024-79 [Kamps, Kevin])

Response: *The environmental review focuses on the radioactive material releases and radiation doses and risks to humans from postulated accidents. The results of the accident evaluation will be presented in Chapter 5 of the EIS. However, environmental impacts related to "radiological stigma" are outside the scope of the review.*

14. Comments Concerning the Uranium Fuel Cycle

Comment: Spent reactor fuel, which some call high level waste, is not a problem. It is easily sealed from the biosphere and stored. Do not succumb to rants and raves. Future generations will much more easily cope with stored spent fuel than with the consequences of global climate change. (0012-1 [Ireland, John])

Response: *This comment does not provide specific information relating to the environmental effects of the proposed action. It is outside the scope of the EIS and is listed to compile a complete record of the comments received.*

Comment: While I favor increased nuclear power development I am very concerned about the disposal or re-processing of waste. The best idea seems to me to be reprocessing it. We would need to repeal the presidential directive against this but the directive is very out of date with current technology. Be that as it may, we must deal with the waste disposal issue up front! (0011-1 [Trenholme, Art])

Comment: [T]he EIS should consider recent proposals that storage of spent fuel for several hundred years will reduce its radioactivity to the point where reprocessing will be far less difficult than if it were reprocessed a few years after removal from the reactor. Such intermediate term storage would eliminate the necessity for materials stored in Yucca Mountain to remain physically and chemically stable for hundreds of millennia. (0025-61 [Meadow, Norm]) (0028-36 [Meadow, Norman])

Response: *Federal policy no longer prohibits reprocessing. The Energy Policy Act of 2005, P.L. 109-58, authorized the DOE to conduct an advanced fuel recycling technology research and development program to evaluate proliferation-resistant fuel recycling and transmutation technologies that minimize environmental or public health and safety impacts. Additional work is needed before commercial reprocessing and recycling of spent fuel produced in the U.S. commercial nuclear power program is likely. Reprocessing as part of the fuel cycle and waste management will be discussed in Chapter 6.*

Comment: There is going to have to be a method obtained for storage of low-level waste or you are going to shut down a lot of very valuable medical diagnoses, because diagnostic procedures and therapeutic procedures all involve the production of what's known as low-level waste. (0025-62 [Meadow, Norm])

Response: *This comment expresses the concern for storage and disposal of medical low-level waste. Although waste disposal issues are similar, because medical waste is not generated from nuclear power production, this comment is outside the scope of this EIS.*

Comment: The EIS should address the possible effects of new reactors on existing dry cask irradiated fuel storage units at the plant, including their potential degradation over time as well as the potential impacts of a large expansion of the dry cask units to store high-level radioactive waste from new reactors. (0008-4 [Acevedo, NK] [Aitken, Keith] [Albright, Evan] [Andereson, David] [Arist, Phyllis] [Armas, Zoe] [Avance, Kenneth] [Bainum, Meghan] [Bakalian, Craig] [Baldwin, Natylie] [Barr, Phillip] [Bartholomew, Alice] [Becker, Rochelle] [Bedding, Gerhard] [Behabadi, Bardia] [Be, Maya] [Bissonnette, Rick] [Black, Monica Latka] [Blomstrom, Eric] [Borrowman, Ellen] [Briggs, Ruth] [Chinn, Jason] [Clark, Kevin] [Clark, Lorelee] [Cleaver, Melissa] [Cox, Duncan] [Crawley, Jackie] [Crocca, Carol] [C, Suzy] [Culp, Richard] [Curington, Diana] [Daddy, Big] [Darbyshire, David] [DesHarnais, Gaston] [Diaz, Lorenzo] [Dolly, William] [Emmons, Cheryl] [Erdesohn, Cynthia] [Evans, Michael] [Faigle, Susan] [Fernow, Geoff] [Finnelli, Marilyn and Tom] [Fisher, Allison] [Foppe, Paul] [Fuller, Alfred] [Futterer, Joe] [Gannaway,

Gloria] [Garbato, Kelly] [Garner, Patrick] [Gilpin, John] [Good, Riana] [Goodrich, Anne] [Grad, Robert] [Grand, Robert] [Grassi, Rosemarie] [Guay-Brezner, Colette] [Harberson, Laurie] [Hauck, Molly] [Hedlund, Cara] [Helvick, Steven] [Henderson, Sherry] [Hinton, Georgia] [Hoffman, Lilli] [Holzer, Frederick] [Hood, Marilyn] [Hooker, Betsy] [Huffman, Debbie] [Hughey, Patricia] [Hung, Shiu] [Hutchinson, Richard] [Jones-Giampalo, Mary] [Jones, Hollis] [Joos, Sandra] [Jula, Patty] [Kaliski, Raymond] [Kane, Donna] [Katz, Shari] [Klusman, Eric] [Knechel, David] [Kramer, Loren] [Kuintzle, Gaylene] [Lack, Robert] [Lallo, Patrick] [LaLumia, Anne Marie] [LaMonica, Francoise] [Latham, Rhonda] [LaVigne, Carole] [Lee, Angela] [Loew, Brenda] [Luczkowiak, Christopher] [MacNulty, Joy] [Magee, L] [Manske, Jill] [Marcus, Jack David] [Marks, John] [Marsh, Rauni] [Massey, Tom] [McArthur, Richard] [McClure, Matthew] [McCoy, Timothy] [McKenna, Chris] [McKenna, Kathy] [McKenna, Lauren] [McKenna, Rick] [M, Crystal] [Metz, Richard] [Minault, Kent] [Miranda, Tina] [Moore, Kerry] [Mostov, Liz] [Munson, Clarence William] [Nagle, Thomas] [Nanfra, Freya] [Nash, James] [Nerode, Gregory] [Novick, Wesley] [Nunez, Albert] [Nunez, Carlos] [Oakes, Bonnie] [Olmstead, Harry] [O'Meara, Patrick] [Pacheco-Theard, Lauren] [Paquet, Kevin] [Parsons, Barry] [Paul, Georgia] [Pedraza-Tucker, Liette] [Petkiewicz, Margaret] [Phipps, Donald] [Piner, Lisa] [Piser, Daniel] [Putney, Louis] [Rader, Nancy] [Radford Jr., Roger] [Raines, Mary] [Ramstrom, Eric G and Shirley S] [Randall, David] [Rankin, Susan] [Reidenbach, Gregory] [Rosenblum, Stephen] [Ross, Anne] [Sather, Alice] [Sauer, Elizabeth] [Schmidt, Jason] [Schopp, Ricky] [Schwarz, Walter] [See, Bud] [Shafer, Scott] [Shashani, Linda] [Sherrow, Sarah] [Shively, Daniel] [Siecke, Martin] [Simila, Owen] [Skercevic, Maria] [Smith, Enoch] [Smith, Martha] [Snowden, Patricia] [Sorin, Susanna] [Soroos, Marvin S] [Soto, Yvonne] [Stevens, Denise] [Stilwell, Lisa] [Strange, Linda] [Theil, Tony] [Thiele, Abhaya] [Tornatore, James] [Trenholme, Art] [Turner, Tamisha] [Valliere, Cliff] [VanEtten, Margot] [Vieg, Jeannette] [Voeller, Estelle] [Wadkins, Melanie] [Waldman, Sam] [Walker-Meere, Susan] [Walsh, Donald] [Walters, Betty] [Wanner, Gabrielle] [Ward, John] [Welch, Irene] [Wilkins, Paul] [Willoughby, CaraLea] [Wilson, Deb] [Yeatts, Jordan] [Zastawecky, Margaret] [Zelikson, Linda])

Comment: The EIS must address the possible effects of Calvert Cliffs-3 on the existing dry cask irradiated fuel storage units at the Calvert Cliffs site, including their potential degradation over time as well as the potential impacts of a large expansion of the dry cask units to store high-level radioactive waste from Calvert Cliffs-3. (0019-9 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: I just want to touch, before I close, on the risks that high-level radioactive waste presents to the Chesapeake Bay and to local residents and residents who live as far away as Prince George's County where I live. There is the risks of storage. The wastes are stored in the indoor pool and the outdoor dry casks. These wastes in the pool and in the dry casks are vulnerable to accidents, they are vulnerable to attacks. (0025-96 [Kamps, Kevin])

Comment: We are really looking at this dilemma of what to do. We're looking at a century or more of dry cask storage, and people should just remember that these containers are made out of concrete and steel, both of which deteriorate with age and with exposure to the elements. (0025-98 [Kamps, Kevin])

Comment: The MCC [Maryland Conservation Council] believes that current methods for on-site storage of spent fuel have proven adequate and safe for several decades. (0028-35 [Meadow, Norman])

Response: *The safety and environmental effects of long-term storage of spent fuel onsite has been evaluated by the NRC, and, as set forth in the Waste Confidence Rule, the NRC generically determined that such storage can be accomplished without significant environmental impact. In the Waste Confidence Rule, the Commission determined that spent fuel can be stored onsite for at least 30 years beyond the licensed operating life, which includes the term of a renewed license. The NRC has a certification process for casks, regulated by 10 CFR Part 72. Such wastes are under continual licensing control. The uranium fuel cycle will be discussed in Chapter 6 of the EIS.*

Comment: [T]o be more accepted by the US society, the nuclear industry must solve the nuclear waste disposal issue, its most prominent Achilles heel. Any attempt at renewing or expanding nuclear power as a source of electricity would be greatly advanced if this issue finally were settled after decades of debate without resolution. If the industry is to renew or expand, now is the time to finally settle the waste disposal issue, both technically and socially. (0004-5 [Arndt, Gunter])

Comment: Nuclear waste is dangerous and there is no permanent destination where it can be stored safely. Although nuclear power stations provide energy to millions of people in various countries worldwide, no one has come up with a clean and safe solution for what to do with nuclear waste. It will only build up, and should anything happen to it, it will be nightmarish for the local councils to deal with. (0007-2 [Shannahan, Brittany])

Comment: The Nuclear Waste Confidence Decision provides little solace to the nuclear waste management issue. In the nearly thirty years since the decision was issued we have gotten no closer to licensing a geologic repository. In the meanwhile, high-level radioactive waste is mounting up at 104 reactors sites throughout the country. If the nuclear industry wants to seriously consider moving forward with a new generation of nuclear reactors, then the true cost of waste issues must be evaluated accordingly. (0008-1 [Acevedo, NK] [Aitken, Keith] [Albright, Evan] [Andereson, David] [Arist, Phyllis] [Armas, Zoe] [Avance, Kenneth] [Bainum, Meghan] [Bakalian, Craig] [Baldwin, Natylie] [Barr, Phillip] [Bartholomew, Alice] [Becker, Rochelle] [Bedding, Gerhard] [Behabadi, Bardia] [Be, Maya] [Bissonnette, Rick] [Black, Monica Latka] [Blomstrom, Eric] [Borrowman, Ellen] [Briggs, Ruth] [Chinn, Jason] [Clark, Kevin] [Clark, Lorelee] [Cleaver, Melissa] [Cox, Duncan] [Crawley, Jackie] [Crocca, Carol] [C, Suzy] [Culp, Richard] [Curington, Diana] [Daddy, Big] [Darbyshire, David] [DesHarnais, Gaston] [Diaz, Lorenzo] [Dolly, William] [Emmons, Cheryl] [Erdesohn, Cynthia] [Evans, Michael] [Faigle, Susan] [Fernow, Geoff] [Finnelli, Marilyn and Tom] [Fisher, Allison] [Foppe, Paul] [Fuller, Alfred] [Futterer, Joe] [Gannaway, Gloria] [Garbato, Kelly] [Garner, Patrick] [Gilpin, John] [Good, Riana] [Goodrich, Anne] [Grad, Robert] [Grand, Robert] [Grassi, Rosemarie] [Guay-Brezner, Colette] [Harberson, Laurie] [Hauck, Molly] [Hedlund, Cara] [Helvick, Steven] [Henderson, Sherry] [Hinton, Georgia] [Hoffman, Lilli] [Holzer, Frederick] [Hood, Marilyn] [Hooker, Betsy] [Huffman, Debbie] [Hughey, Patricia] [Hung, Shiu] [Hutchinson, Richard] [Jones-Giampalo, Mary] [Jones, Hollis] [Joos, Sandra] [Jula, Patty] [Kaliski, Raymond] [Kane, Donna] [Katz, Shari] [Klusman, Eric] [Knechel, David] [Kramer, Loren] [Kuintzle, Gaylene] [Lack, Robert] [Lallo, Patrick] [LaLumia, Anne Marie] [LaMonica, Francoise] [Latham, Rhonda] [LaVigne, Carole] [Lee, Angela] [Loew, Brenda] [Luczkowiak, Christopher] [MacNulty, Joy] [Magee, L] [Manske, Jill] [Marcus, Jack David] [Marks, John] [Marsh, Rauni] [Massey, Tom] [McArthur, Richard] [McClure, Matthew] [McCoy, Timothy] [McKenna, Chris] [McKenna, Kathy] [McKenna, Lauren] [McKenna, Rick] [M, Crystal] [Metz, Richard] [Minault, Kent] [Miranda, Tina] [Moore, Kerry] [Mostov, Liz] [Munson, Clarence William] [Nagle, Thomas] [Nanfra, Freya] [Nash, James] [Nerode, Gregory] [Novick, Wesley] [Nunez, Albert] [Nunez, Carlos] [Oakes, Bonnie] [Olmstead, Harry] [O'Meara, Patrick] [Pacheco-Theard, Lauren] [Paquet, Kevin] [Parsons, Barry] [Paul, Georgia] [Pedraza-Tucker, Liette] [Petkiewicz, Margaret] [Phipps, Donald] [Piner, Lisa] [Piser, Daniel] [Putney, Louis] [Rader, Nancy] [Radford Jr., Roger] [Raines, Mary] [Ramstrom, Eric G and Shirley S] [Randall, David] [Rankin, Susan] [Reidenbach, Gregory] [Rosenblum, Stephen] [Ross, Anne] [Sather, Alice] [Sauer, Elizabeth] [Schmidt, Jason] [Schopp, Ricky] [Schwarz, Walter] [See, Bud] [Shafer, Scott] [Shashani, Linda] [Sherrow, Sarah] [Shively, Daniel] [Siecke, Martin] [Simila, Owen] [Skercevic, Maria] [Smith, Enoch] [Smith, Martha] [Snowden, Patricia] [Sorin, Susanna] [Soroos, Marvin S] [Soto, Yvonne] [Stevens, Denise] [Stilwell, Lisa] [Strange, Linda] [Theil, Tony] [Thiele, Abhaya] [Tornatore, James] [Trenholme, Art] [Turner, Tamisha] [Valliere, Cliff] [VanEtten, Margot] [Vieg, Jeannette] [Voeller, Estelle] [Wadkins, Melanie] [Waldman, Sam] [Walker-Meere, Susan] [Walsh, Donald] [Walters, Betty] [Wanner, Gabrielle] [Ward, John] [Welch, Irene] [Wilkins, Paul] [Willoughby, CaraLea] [Wilson, Deb] [Yeatts, Jordan] [Zastawecky, Margaret] [Zelikson, Linda])

Comment: The Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) should fully address the potential consequences of permanent storage of high-level radioactive waste. Because there is no permanent storage facility for high-level radioactive waste, and it appears increasingly unlikely

that there will be one during the lifetime of a new generation of reactors, the EIS should address how and where all of the high-level radioactive waste will be stored. (0008-2 [Acevedo, NK] [Aitken, Keith] [Albright, Evan] [Andereson, David] [Arist, Phyllis] [Armas, Zoe] [Avance, Kenneth] [Bainum, Meghan] [Bakalian, Craig] [Baldwin, Natylie] [Barr, Phillip] [Bartholomew, Alice] [Becker, Rochelle] [Bedding, Gerhard] [Behabadi, Bardia] [Be, Maya] [Bissonnette, Rick] [Black, Monica Latka] [Blomstrom, Eric] [Borrowman, Ellen] [Briggs, Ruth] [Chinn, Jason] [Clark, Kevin] [Clark, Lorelee] [Cleaver, Melissa] [Cox, Duncan] [Crawley, Jackie] [Crocca, Carol] [C, Suzy] [Culp, Richard] [Curington, Diana] [Daddy, Big] [Darbyshire, David] [DesHarnais, Gaston] [Diaz, Lorenzo] [Dolly, William] [Emmons, Cheryl] [Erdesohn, Cynthia] [Evans, Michael] [Faigle, Susan] [Fernow, Geoff] [Finnelli, Marilyn and Tom] [Fisher, Allison] [Foppe, Paul] [Fuller, Alfred] [Futterer, Joe] [Gannaway, Gloria] [Garbato, Kelly] [Garner, Patrick] [Gilpin, John] [Good, Riana] [Goodrich, Anne] [Grad, Robert] [Grand, Robert] [Grassi, Rosemarie] [Guay-Brezner, Colette] [Harberson, Laurie] [Hauck, Molly] [Hedlund, Cara] [Helvick, Steven] [Henderson, Sherry] [Hinton, Georgia] [Hoffman, Lilli] [Holzer, Frederick] [Hood, Marilyn] [Hooker, Betsy] [Huffman, Debbie] [Hughey, Patricia] [Hung, Shiu] [Hutchinson, Richard] [Jones-Giampalo, Mary] [Jones, Hollis] [Joos, Sandra] [Jula, Patty] [Kaliski, Raymond] [Kane, Donna] [Katz, Shari] [Klusman, Eric] [Knechel, David] [Kramer, Loren] [Kuintzle, Gaylene] [Lack, Robert] [Lallo, Patrick] [LaLumia, Anne Marie] [LaMonica, Francoise] [Latham, Rhonda] [LaVigne, Carole] [Lee, Angela] [Loew, Brenda] [Luczkowiak, Christopher] [MacNulty, Joy] [Magee, L] [Manske, Jill] [Marcus, Jack David] [Marks, John] [Marsh, Rauni] [Massey, Tom] [McArthur, Richard] [McClure, Matthew] [McCoy, Timothy] [McKenna, Chris] [McKenna, Kathy] [McKenna, Lauren] [McKenna, Rick] [M, Crystal] [Metz, Richard] [Minault, Kent] [Miranda, Tina] [Moore, Kerry] [Mostov, Liz] [Munson, Clarence William] [Nagle, Thomas] [Nanfra, Freya] [Nash, James] [Nerode, Gregory] [Novick, Wesley] [Nunez, Albert] [Nunez, Carlos] [Oakes, Bonnie] [Olmstead, Harry] [O'Meara, Patrick] [Pacheco-Theard, Lauren] [Paquet, Kevin] [Parsons, Barry] [Paul, Georgia] [Pedraza-Tucker, Liette] [Petkiewicz, Margaret] [Phipps, Donald] [Piner, Lisa] [Piser, Daniel] [Putney, Louis] [Rader, Nancy] [Radford Jr., Roger] [Raines, Mary] [Ramstrom, Eric G and Shirley S] [Randall, David] [Rankin, Susan] [Reidenbach, Gregory] [Rosenblum, Stephen] [Ross, Anne] [Sather, Alice] [Sauer, Elizabeth] [Schmidt, Jason] [Schopp, Ricky] [Schwarz, Walter] [See, Bud] [Shafer, Scott] [Shashani, Linda] [Sherrow, Sarah] [Shively, Daniel] [Siecke, Martin] [Simila, Owen] [Skercevic, Maria] [Smith, Enoch] [Smith, Martha] [Snowden, Patricia] [Sorin, Susanna] [Soroos, Marvin S] [Soto, Yvonne] [Stevens, Denise] [Stilwell, Lisa] [Strange, Linda] [Theil, Tony] [Thiele, Abhaya] [Tornatore, James] [Trenholme, Art] [Turner, Tamisha] [Valliere, Cliff] [VanEtten, Margot] [Vieg, Jeannette] [Voeller, Estelle] [Wadkins, Melanie] [Waldman, Sam] [Walker-Meere, Susan] [Walsh, Donald] [Walters, Betty] [Wanner, Gabrielle] [Ward, John] [Welch, Irene] [Wilkins, Paul] [Willoughby, CaraLea] [Wilson, Deb] [Yeatts, Jordan] [Zastawecky, Margaret] [Zelikson, Linda])

Comment: We cannot begin to consider the expansion of nuclear power, while the issues of the previous generation remain unresolved. (0008-6 [Acevedo, NK] [Aitken, Keith] [Albright, Evan] [Andereson, David] [Arist, Phyllis] [Armas, Zoe] [Avance, Kenneth] [Bainum, Meghan] [Bakalian, Craig] [Baldwin, Natylie] [Barr, Phillip] [Bartholomew, Alice] [Becker, Rochelle] [Bedding, Gerhard] [Behabadi, Bardia] [Be, Maya] [Bissonnette, Rick] [Black, Monica Latka] [Blomstrom, Eric] [Borrowman, Ellen] [Briggs, Ruth] [Chinn, Jason] [Clark, Kevin] [Clark, Lorelee] [Cleaver, Melissa] [Cox, Duncan] [Crawley, Jackie] [Crocca, Carol] [C, Suzy] [Culp, Richard] [Curington, Diana] [Daddy, Big] [Darbyshire, David] [DesHarnais, Gaston] [Diaz, Lorenzo] [Dolly, William] [Emmons, Cheryl] [Erdesohn, Cynthia] [Evans, Michael] [Faigle, Susan] [Fernow, Geoff] [Finnelli, Marilyn and Tom] [Fisher, Allison] [Foppe, Paul] [Fuller, Alfred] [Futterer, Joe] [Gannaway, Gloria] [Garbato, Kelly] [Garner, Patrick] [Gilpin, John] [Good, Riana] [Goodrich, Anne] [Grad, Robert] [Grand, Robert] [Grassi, Rosemarie] [Guay-Brezner, Colette] [Harberson, Laurie] [Hauck, Molly] [Hedlund, Cara] [Helvick, Steven] [Henderson, Sherry] [Hinton, Georgia] [Hoffman, Lilli] [Holzer, Frederick] [Hood, Marilyn] [Hooker, Betsy] [Huffman, Debbie] [Hughey, Patricia] [Hung, Shiu] [Hutchinson, Richard] [Jones-Giampalo, Mary] [Jones, Hollis] [Joos, Sandra] [Jula, Patty] [Kaliski, Raymond] [Kane, Donna] [Katz, Shari] [Klusman, Eric] [Knechel, David] [Kramer, Loren] [Kuintzle, Gaylene] [Lack, Robert] [Lallo, Patrick] [LaLumia, Anne Marie] [LaMonica, Francoise] [Latham, Rhonda] [LaVigne, Carole] [Lee, Angela] [Loew, Brenda] [Luczkowiak, Christopher] [MacNulty, Joy] [Magee, L] [Manske, Jill] [Marcus, Jack David] [Marks, John] [Marsh, Rauni] [Massey, Tom] [McArthur, Richard] [McClure, Matthew] [McCoy, Timothy] [McKenna, Chris] [McKenna, Kathy] [McKenna, Lauren] [McKenna, Rick] [M, Crystal] [Metz, Richard] [Minault, Kent] [Miranda, Tina] [Moore, Kerry] [Mostov, Liz] [Munson, Clarence William] [Nagle, Thomas] [Nanfra, Freya] [Nash, James] [Nerode, Gregory] [Novick, Wesley] [Nunez, Albert] [Nunez, Carlos] [Oakes, Bonnie] [Olmstead, Harry] [O'Meara, Patrick] [Pacheco-Theard,

Lauren] [Paquet, Kevin] [Parsons, Barry] [Paul, Georgia] [Pedraza-Tucker, Liette] [Petkiewicz, Margaret] [Phipps, Donald] [Piner, Lisa] [Piser, Daniel] [Putney, Louis] [Rader, Nancy] [Radford Jr., Roger] [Raines, Mary] [Ramstrom, Eric G and Shirley S] [Randall, David] [Rankin, Susan] [Reidenbach, Gregory] [Rosenblum, Stephen] [Ross, Anne] [Sather, Alice] [Sauer, Elizabeth] [Schmidt, Jason] [Schopp, Ricky] [Schwarz, Walter] [See, Bud] [Shafer, Scott] [Shashani, Linda] [Sherrow, Sarah] [Shively, Daniel] [Siecke, Martin] [Simila, Owen] [Skercevic, Maria] [Smith, Enoch] [Smith, Martha] [Snowden, Patricia] [Sorin, Susanna] [Soroos, Marvin S] [Soto, Yvonne] [Stevens, Denise] [Stilwell, Lisa] [Strange, Linda] [Theil, Tony] [Thiele, Abhaya] [Tornatore, James] [Trenholme, Art] [Turner, Tamisha] [Valliere, Cliff] [VanEtten, Margot] [Vieg, Jeannette] [Voeller, Estelle] [Wadkins, Melanie] [Waldman, Sam] [Walker-Meere, Susan] [Walsh, Donald] [Walters, Betty] [Wanner, Gabrielle] [Ward, John] [Welch, Irene] [Wilkins, Paul] [Willoughby, CaraLea] [Wilson, Deb] [Yeatts, Jordan] [Zastawecky, Margaret] [Zelikson, Linda]

Comment: The Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) should fully address the potential consequences of permanent storage of high-level radioactive waste. The EIS should address how and where all of the high-level radioactive waste will be stored. (0009-1 [Thiele, Abhaya])

Comment: The Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) should fully address the potential consequences of permanent storage of high-level radioactive waste. Because there is no permanent storage facility for high-level radioactive waste, and it appears increasingly unlikely that there will be one during the lifetime of a new generation of reactors, the EIS should address how and where all of the high-level radioactive waste will be stored. (0010-1 [Polya, Lance])

Comment: How and where will you dispose of hazardous waste material? Where do you currently dispose of waste? How will you manage debris from building the reactor? How much waste do you currently dispose and how much will this increase with the new reactor? What qualifies as hazardous by the regulatory committee? (0018-4 [Mackall, Kimberly])

Comment: The EIS must address how and where all of the "low-level" radioactive waste Calvert Cliffs-3 can be expected to generate during its lifetime will be stored. (0019-13 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: [T]he EIS should assume that all Class B and above "low-level" radioactive waste generated by Calvert Cliffs-3 will be stored on-site for its licensed lifetime and describe how this material will remain isolated from the environment in perpetuity. (0019-14 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: [T]he EIS should report the amount of "low-level" nuclear waste, in volume and radioactivity, that Calvert Cliffs' operators plan to treat as if not radioactive--that is, plan to send to facilities without specific licenses for nuclear waste. These include solid and hazardous treatment, processing and disposal facilities as well as recyclers whose materials are released for restricted or unrestricted use, and should be identified and the radiological impacts and risks identified. (0019-15 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: Since radioactive waste could remain onsite forever, the site should be evaluated under 10 CFR 61, which include NRC's regulations for the disposal of radioactive waste. (0019-16 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: The EIS must fully address the potential consequences of permanent storage of high-level radioactive waste adjacent to the Chesapeake Bay. There is no currently no permanent storage facility for high-level radioactive waste. Even if the proposed Yucca Mountain site opens during the operating lifetime of Calvert Cliffs-3, this reactor will, by law, not be eligible to have its high-level waste stored there. Thus, the EIS must assume that there will be no available high-level radioactive waste repository for the full operating lifetime (plus possible license extension) of this unit, and the EIS must fully address how and where all of the

high-level radioactive waste generated by Calvert Cliffs-3 will be stored on-site, and what measures will be taken to ensure that the radioactivity from this waste remains permanently isolated from the environment. (0019-6 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: [P]lease look carefully and impartially at the problems entailed in dealing with radioactive waste. (0020-2 [Donn, Marjory])

Comment: [W]e still do not have good ways to deal with the radioactive material that nuclear power produces. I do not believe there is any good way to store it, yet we keep on producing it, poisoning the earth that we will pass on to future generations. (0020-5 [Donn, Marjory])

Comment: It is true that the Barnwell facility in South Carolina will be closed to low-level waste from the State of Maryland scheduled for June of this year. However, a very large majority, I think it's upward of 75 percent, of the low-level waste generated at commercial nuclear plants in the United States are shipped and disposed of in Clive, Utah, near Salt Lake City. (0024-103 [McGough, Mike])

Comment: I would point out that Yucca Mountain is looking more and more likely to never open which means that Calvert Cliffs will sit on thousands of tons of radioactive waste if that dump never opens. It already has a thousand tons. It will double or triple or quadruple that amount as time goes on. (0024-85 [Kamps, Kevin])

Comment: [T]he place where Calvert Cliffs has for decades dumped its so-called low level wastes, Barnwell, South Carolina, is closing for business, at least to the State of Maryland, June 30th of this year. So not only is the high-level waste going to build but so will the low-level waste at Calvert Cliffs. A radioactive waste dilemma with no solution. (0024-86 [Kamps, Kevin])

Comment: I, as a resident of this state, don't want to be creating a waste product that has to be forced down the throats of the people in another state, especially if there is a reasonable alternative ... You know, we are just now becoming aware of the fact that we are releasing a lot of pollutants into the environment. We are changing the basic biochemistry and the biology and physics of the planet at an ever-accelerating rate, and we are starting to lose the species. (0025-111 [Johnston, Bill])

Comment: The storage of the radiation, that's an amazing amount of radiation that is already here, radioactive material that is already here. We're not even going to get to put it into Yucca; we're going to have to come up with another place. Think about this, people: this stuff is going to be here forever. (0025-159 [Boxwell, Bob])

Comment: [E]ven if the proposed Yucca Mountain, Nevada waste dump were to open, and that seems increasingly unlikely, Calvert Cliffs 3 would not be eligible to put its waste there. So the high-level waste from this plant has nowhere to go until and unless the United States builds not the first one, which it has been trying to do for 30 years, but a second radioactive waste dump. (0025-50 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: This EIS has to consider the very real possibility that the waste generated at this facility will stay on the shores of the Chesapeake Bay in perpetuity, and what are the environmental impacts of that. (0025-51 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: [C]urrently, Calvert Cliffs is allowed to send its low-level waste to Barnwell, South Carolina for disposal. That ends this June. Barnwell is closing to outside waste. There are no plans to build a low-level waste facility to handle Maryland's waste. That means the low-level

waste is going to have to stay onsite for the foreseeable future. The EIS has to look at the implications of 40, 60 years of generation of low level waste. Where is that going to go onsite? How is that going to be protected from the environment? (0025-52 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: [E]very pound of high-level waste that is generated by Calvert Cliffs 3 will be excess to Yucca's capacity. (0025-95 [Kamps, Kevin])

Comment: If you don't have an immediate solution to dealing with waste, then what makes you think one will be forthcoming in the future? (0026-1 [Marsh, Rauni])

Comment: Additionally, our plant in AZ has to store those waste rods in cool water until such time, that it's our turn to dispose of them. Water, Cool water, here in the Blatant hot dry desert. (0026-4 [Marsh, Rauni])

Response: *The NRC staff will evaluate the environmental impacts of the uranium fuel cycle including the impacts of fuel manufacturing, waste, transportation, and the onsite storage and eventual disposal of spent fuel. The results of this analysis will be presented in Chapter 6 of the EIS.*

15. Comments Concerning Transportation

Comment: The EIS should address possible effects of transportation of radioactive waste generated at the sites, in the unlikely event a waste repository ever will be built. This should include road, rail and barge transportation. (0008-5 [Acevedo, NK] [Aitken, Keith] [Albright, Evan] [Andereson, David] [Arist, Phyllis] [Armas, Zoe] [Avance, Kenneth] [Bainum, Meghan] [Bakalian, Craig] [Baldwin, Natylie] [Barr, Phillip] [Bartholomew, Alice] [Becker, Rochelle] [Bedding, Gerhard] [Behabadi, Bardia] [Be, Maya] [Bissonnette, Rick] [Black, Monica Latka] [Blomstrom, Eric] [Borrowman, Ellen] [Briggs, Ruth] [Chinn, Jason] [Clark, Kevin] [Clark, Lorelee] [Clever, Melissa] [Cox, Duncan] [Crawley, Jackie] [Crocca, Carol] [C, Suzy] [Culp, Richard] [Curington, Diana] [Daddy, Big] [Darbyshire, David] [DesHarnais, Gaston] [Diaz, Lorenzo] [Dolly, William] [Emmons, Cheryl] [Erdesohn, Cynthia] [Evans, Michael] [Faigle, Susan] [Fernow, Geoff] [Finnelli, Marilyn and Tom] [Fisher, Allison] [Foppe, Paul] [Fuller, Alfred] [Futterer, Joe] [Gannaway, Gloria] [Garbato, Kelly] [Garner, Patrick] [Gilpin, John] [Good, Riana] [Goodrich, Anne] [Grad, Robert] [Grand, Robert] [Grassi, Rosemarie] [Guay-Brezner, Colette] [Harberson, Laurie] [Hauck, Molly] [Hedlund, Cara] [Helvick, Steven] [Henderson, Sherry] [Hinton, Georgia] [Hoffman, Lilli] [Holzer, Frederick] [Hood, Marilyn] [Hooker, Betsy] [Huffman, Debbie] [Hughey, Patricia] [Hung, Shiu] [Hutchinson, Richard] [Jones-Giampalo, Mary] [Jones, Hollis] [Joos, Sandra] [Jula, Patty] [Kaliski, Raymond] [Kane, Donna] [Katz, Shari] [Klusman, Eric] [Knechel, David] [Kramer, Loren] [Kuintzle, Gaylene] [Lack, Robert] [Lallo, Patrick] [LaLumia, Anne Marie] [LaMonica, Françoise] [Latham, Rhonda] [LaVigne, Carole] [Lee, Angela] [Loew, Brenda] [Luczkowiak, Christopher] [MacNulty, Joy] [Magee, L] [Manske, Jill] [Marcus, Jack David] [Marks, John] [Marsh, Rauni] [Massey, Tom] [McArthur, Richard] [McClure, Matthew] [McCoy, Timothy] [McKenna, Chris] [McKenna, Kathy] [McKenna, Lauren] [McKenna, Rick] [M, Crystal] [Metz, Richard] [Minault, Kent] [Miranda, Tina] [Moore, Kerry] [Mostov, Liz] [Munson, Clarence William] [Nagle, Thomas] [Nanfra, Freya] [Nash, James] [Nerode, Gregory] [Novick, Wesley] [Nunez, Albert] [Nunez, Carlos] [Oakes, Bonnie] [Olmstead, Harry] [O'Meara, Patrick] [Pacheco-Theard, Lauren] [Paquet, Kevin] [Parsons, Barry] [Paul, Georgia] [Pedraza-Tucker, Liette] [Petkiewicz, Margaret] [Phipps, Donald] [Piner, Lisa] [Piser, Daniel] [Putney, Louis] [Rader, Nancy] [Radford Jr., Roger] [Raines, Mary] [Ramstrom, Eric G and Shirley S] [Randall, David] [Rankin, Susan] [Reidenbach, Gregory] [Rosenblum, Stephen] [Ross, Anne] [Sather, Alice] [Sauer, Elizabeth] [Schmidt, Jason] [Schopp, Ricky] [Schwarz, Walter] [See, Bud] [Shafer, Scott] [Shashani, Linda] [Sherron, Sarah] [Shively, Daniel] [Siecke, Martin] [Simila, Owen] [Skercevic, Maria] [Smith, Enoch] [Smith, Martha] [Snowden, Patricia] [Sorin, Susanna] [Soroos, Marvin S] [Soto, Yvonne] [Stevens, Denise] [Stilwell, Lisa] [Strange, Linda] [Theil, Tony] [Thiele, Abhaya] [Tornatore, James] [Trenholme, Art] [Turner, Tamisha] [Valliere, Cliff] [VanEtten, Margot] [Vieg, Jeannette] [Voeller, Estelle] [Wadkins, Melanie] [Waldman, Sam] [Walker-Meere, Susan])

[Walsh, Donald] [Walters, Betty] [Wanner, Gabrielle] [Ward, John] [Welch, Irene] [Wilkins, Paul] [Willoughby, CaraLea] [Wilson, Deb] [Yeatts, Jordan] [Zastawecky, Margaret] [Zelikson, Linda]

Comment: The EIS must address the possible effects of transportation of radioactive waste generated at Calvert Cliffs, in the unlikely event a waste repository ever will be built. This should include road, rail and barge transportation on the Chesapeake Bay into the Port of Baltimore. (0019-10 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: If barges are not used, then trucks or trains would be. The Baltimore train tunnel fire of 2001 could have killed thousands if high-level radioactive waste had been on board, and that route has been targeted by the Dept. of Energy in the past. DOE truck shipment routes criss-cross the State of Maryland. (0019-12 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: I hope your process includes careful inspection of the dry cask irradiated fuel storage units at Calvert Cliffs as well as the problems involved in transporting this waste to another site. Have the casks degraded over time? How could such dangerous material be transported safely, avoiding densely populated areas -- which is where our rail lines and highways go -- without risk to the ecosystem of the Chesapeake Bay or the human population of the area? (0020-6 [Donn, Marjory])

Comment: The transportation risks, again, are -- there are vulnerabilities to accidents and attacks. (0025-100 [Kamps, Kevin])

Comment: And even if there are no accidents or attacks on these transportation containers, they are like mobile X-ray machines rolling down the railroad tracks, down the highways, in the Port of Baltimore, and there are certain people like pregnant women who should not be exposed to any radioactivity if it can be avoided. (0025-102 [Kamps, Kevin])

Response: *The EIS will evaluate the radiological impacts of transporting fuel and waste to and from the proposed Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant (CCNPP) site. The impacts will be calculated for truck shipments of fuel and waste to and from the plant because the impact of truck shipping bounds the impacts of transporting these materials. The EIS will also include an analysis of the impacts of severe transportation accidents that could potentially occur along a spent fuel transportation route.*

Comment: A system of disposal is already in place for the existing two reactors at Calvert Cliffs. NAACPCCB [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Calvert County Branch] is concerned about the existing disposal program especially in terms of transport of the waste out of the county, and the impact an accident could have on the community. In addition, a 3rd reactor will create more waste, and more possibilities for accidents. NAACPCCB insists on the facility having a detailed plan outlining the disposal of all waste, and contingency plans in the event of accident. (0017-2 [Brown, Jr., Edsel])

Comment: [A]nother accident scenario that folks around here need to worry about is the sinking of a barge on the Chesapeake Bay, because another proposal for removing these wastes from Calvert Cliffs is to barge them up to the Port of Baltimore. There's enough fissile material in the waste containers that, in the presence of water, if water were to infiltrate into a sunken container, a chain reaction could be initiated, and that would make emergency response a suicide mission at that point, because it would be giving off deadly doses of radioactivity. (0025-101 [Kamps, Kevin])

Response: *A detailed analysis of the health and safety impacts of transporting fuel and waste by truck to and from the proposed Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant site will be conducted and included in Chapter 6 of the EIS. Emergency preparedness planning and preparations to respond to transportation accidents is described in detail in the "Final Environmental Impact Statement for a Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada" (DOE/EIS-0250F).*

Comment: [T]he EIS should evaluate the strength of transportation casks from tests conducted at the Sandia National Laboratory and consider the likelihood of a breach in any expected rail accident, including protracted fire and lengthy submersion. We suspect that the common opinion is that high-level waste would be shipped in containers resembling oil drums, and this is untrue. (0025-63 [Meadow, Norm])

Comment: The EIS should evaluate the strength of transportation casks from tests conducted at the Sandia National Laboratory (http://www.sandia.gov/tp/SAFE_RAM/SEVERITY.HTM), and consider the likelihood of a breach in any expected rail accident, including protracted fire, and lengthy submersion. (0028-37 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: The MCC [Maryland Conservation Council] believes that the strength of transportation casks is sufficient to prevent releases of radioactive material in any conceivable transportation accident. (0028-38 [Meadow, Norman])

Response: *The EIS will include an analysis of the radiological impacts of potential transportation accidents involving spent nuclear fuel. Spent fuel is transported in massive, heavily-shielded shipping casks, referred to in 10 CFR Part 71 as Type B containers, and are designed to withstand severe transportation accident environments. The likelihood and consequences of shipping cask failures will be included in the transportation accident impact analysis in the EIS.*

16. Comments Concerning Cumulative Impacts

Comment: [W]hat are the implications of being 15 miles from a naval base? Does it work for us? Does it paint a particular bullseye? How does it weigh in, if at all? (0024-109 [Buchanan, Bill])

Response: *The EIS will take into consideration other Federal projects in the vicinity, and any cumulative impacts of these projects will be assessed. The concern about terrorism is an issue NRC addresses separately and is out of the scope of this EIS.*

17. Comments Concerning the Need for Power

Comment: There is no end in sight to our rapidly expanding population - everywhere, not just in Calvert County - which means there is no end in sight for increasing energy demands. Alternative energy sources would be welcome but, so far, they are technologically inadequate to meet demand. (0004-3 [Arndt, Gunter])

Comment: The EIS needs to ask the following question: Given the above, would not the per capita demand (kW hr per year, say) or the per household residential demand decrease at a rate equal to or exceeding the ca. 1% population growth rate? If the answer is yes, no additional power plants are needed, nuclear or otherwise. (0005-20 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: [T]he EIS needs to evaluate the likelihood that in the Mid-Atlantic grid area, per capita kWhrs/yr will level or has already leveled off. (0005-21 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: Initiatives taken by Maryland state government in 2007 aim to cut per capita electric consumption by 15% by the year 2015. Even if this goal is missed, what can easily be achieved can and probably will offset the 1% population growth rate. How close Maryland will come to reaching this goal cannot be evaluated/predicted just a year after the new measures were enacted. It is reasonable to expect that progress can be evaluated after 3 years, i.e. by 2010. (0005-22 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: Both Maryland and the nation are at a critical juncture. While conservation and energy efficiency will be important responses to increased electricity demand, and we support those efforts as does Constellation Energy and UniStar, conservation and energy efficiency will not offset the need for new base-load generation in Maryland or across the country. We need new energy generation and we need to reduce our dependence on foreign energy supply. (0014-3 [Clark, Gerald] [Kelley, Linda] [Parran, Wilson] [Shaw, Susan] [Stinnett, Barbara])

Comment: I have long recognized the importance of nuclear energy in the electric power industry as a primary source for supplying our country's energy needs. The additional unit will positively contribute to the economic health of not only Calvert County, but the entire state of Maryland and the United States, through the availability of safe and affordable power. Expansion of the Calvert Cliffs, allows diversification of energy sources through the use of non polluting nuclear fuel. The additional unit will meet the increasing energy demands of the state of Maryland and the entire Mid-Atlantic Region. (0015-2 [O'Donnell, Anthony])

Comment: The world is not going to fill its need for clean and environmentally friendly energy without pursuing all the many options available. Nuclear energy is emissions free when managed safely, less damaging to the environment and the technology is here today. We need to go forward with this project. It will be beneficial to my County and the Country by supplying needed energy and reducing our dependence on fossil fuel and all its damaging emissions. (0016-3 [Zahniser, Albert])

Comment: [T]he construction of a third nuclear reactor at Calvert Cliffs would dramatically increase Maryland's energy self-sufficiency, nearly doubling the plant's present capacity and generating enough electricity to serve approximately 2.5 million homes, more than the total number of households projected for the State of Maryland in 2015. (0023-3 [Hodge, Gary])

Comment: As technology advances, our economy and our population increases, so, too, will our need for energy grow. (0024-21 [Kanaley, Mike])

Comment: Maryland is at a critical juncture in the availability of baseload generation, specifically the state's desire to generate enough reliable supply to reduce the import of energy to the state. (0024-8 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: Maryland is at a critical juncture in the availability of base load generation, specifically the state's desire to generate enough reliable supply to reduce the import of energy to the state. (0025-10 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: The U.S. Department of Energy estimates that our electricity demand will increase 25 percent by the year 2030. (0025-118 [Walther, Robert])

Comment: As our technology advances, our economy expands, and our population increases, so, too, will our need for electricity grow. (0025-119 [Walther, Robert])

Comment: According to the U.S. Department of Energy, the United States' demand for electricity will rise approximately 25 percent by 2030. That means our nation will need hundreds of new powerplants to provide electricity for our homes and for our continued economic growth. (0025-128 [Green, Bonnie])

Comment: I believe the power from this plant is absolutely necessary. I have read in the Baltimore and Washington newspapers that we may be looking forward to brownouts as early as 2011, because generation is not keeping up with the demand. (0025-139 [Sinclair, Jim])

Comment: I think that by constantly focusing on how we need to increase supply, and not focusing on how we should be decreasing demand, is really putting the horse -- or the cart before the horse. (0025-162 [Hunter, Theresa])

Comment: I believe that without the addition of the new generating facilities I personally believe that this will leave Maryland at a significant disadvantage. So, basically, we will be forced to import and pay more for electricity that's generated outside of the state. So I know that the environmental reports consider a variety of facts, and I just ask and encourage that you consider the electricity demand as part of your independent review. (0025-166 [Pretto-Simmons, Nancy])

Comment: We do need electricity on the grid. (0025-22 [Russell, Jack])

Comment: [B]usinesses, not only here in Calvert County and St. Mary's County, as it was just mentioned, but also to your neighbor to the north and more regionally, depend upon reliable energy sources to be able to conduct their businesses, and our consumers depend upon reliable energy sources. (0025-32 [Burton, Bob])

Comment: [A]s a state, we have a critical energy supply problem. We need new energy generation, and we need to reduce our dependence on foreign energy supply. (0025-7 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: While energy efficiency and conservation are very desirable, the EIS must consider the rate of growth of the population in Maryland. These measures will perhaps only slow the rate of growth of demand. (0025-74 [Meadow, Karen])

Comment: The PJM itself is estimating the need for a one and a half percent increase per year of summer production capacity over the next 15 years to meet demand. That means an increase of 25 percent of current capacity -- an amount that will be difficult to attain through energy efficiency and conservation alone, or even in concert with renewables. (0025-75 [Meadow, Karen])

Comment: [W]hen you look at the stats and the figures from the State of Maryland, where privately we are being told, "Get ready, because by 2011 we'll have the rolling brownouts," in St. Mary's County we can't afford that. We are a growing community. Our energy needs are not going to decrease, and with conservation we might be able to keep them stable at the current levels. (0025-83 [Scarafia, Bill])

Comment: We feel that it's critical to -- for growth in our region to have this additional supply on hand. We know it's down the road, but as our regions continue to grow we need to make sure that we have enough power to support key development in government agencies and other organizations that come to the State of Maryland and our region. (0025-86 [Green, Joseph])

Comment: [T]he EIS must consider the projected rate of growth of demand for electricity which will be driven significantly by population growth as projected by the U.S. Census Bureau. (0028-22 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: Efficiency and conservation can only slow the rate of growth of energy need, they will not be able to reduce absolute demand. (0028-23 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: The PJM estimates a 1.5% increase per year of summer peak load capacity over the next 15 years to meet demand, resulting in a total increase of 25% of current capacity. Compared to the year 2000, the US Census Bureau estimates that Maryland's population will be 33% larger by 2030 and 260% larger by 2100. (0028-24 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: It is important to acknowledge that demand for electricity in our grid region is significantly higher in the summer as compared to the winter months (the next highest demand season of the year). (0028-8 [Meadow, Norman])

Response: *These comments acknowledge or question the need for power based on an expanding population. The State of Maryland has examined the need for new electricity generation capacity in Maryland (Maryland Public Service Commission (MPSC). 2007. Electric Supply Adequacy Report of 2007. Online at: <http://www.psc.state.md.us/psc/Reports/home.htm>.) These studies will be reviewed in conjunction with preparing the need for power section in the EIS.*

18. Comments Concerning Alternatives - No Action

Comment: The EIS should fully and transparently consider alternatives to Calvert Cliffs-3, including ... the "no action" alternative. (0019-5 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: Alternatives to this plant -- the EIS must consider alternatives to the plant, including the "no action" alternative. The EIS should very carefully look at whether and how Maryland's electric supply and its needs can be met through renewables, through energy efficiency, and the cost factors of those. I believe that a very strong case can be made -- and we'll be making that later this year to the Public Service Commission -- that Calvert Cliffs is the most expensive choice to meet Maryland's electric needs and they can be met much cheaper and much more cleanly through renewables and efficiency. (0025-47 [Mariotte, Michael])

Response: *Alternatives to the proposed action, including siting alternatives, energy alternatives, and the no-action alternative, will be considered in the EIS.*

19. Comments Concerning Alternatives – Energy

Comment: Recent years have seen dramatic Improvements in appliance efficiency (e.g., refrigerators), insulation, light bulbs, etc., paralleled by rapidly decreasing cost of solar photovoltaics, (panel prices are declining at around 8% per year, largely due to reduced manufacturing costs caused by higher production volumes). Passive and PV solar, as well as ground source "geothermal", are very practical in the grid area served by the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant. (0005-19 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: Most will agree that we have to arrest greenhouse gas emissions from fossil carbon fuels, because of likely widespread adverse impacts caused by resultant climate change. The mere fact that nuclear power greatly reduces CO2 emissions does not by itself justify the US renaissance of nuclear power plants advocated by the nuclear industry/lobby and financially

"greased" by EPACT. If nuclear were the only viable alternative to current CO2-emitting coal-fired plants, most would agree we need more nuclear power plants. However, nuclear is absolutely not the only alternative, and is arguably the most risky and environmentally hazardous alternative. (0005-23 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: The EIS needs also to evaluate carbon sequestration (to offset CO2 emissions from coal) and better scrubbing of other pollutants from coal, which the US has in abundance. Coal-fired plants are not inviting terrorist targets, there is no long-term waste issue, and many US jobs depend on coal mining, transport, and utilization. (0005-25 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: [I]t is safe to assume that nuclear fusion reactors will still not be operational even in the middle of this century (if ever). However, PV solar, ground-source geothermal, and solar passive air or water heating are not rocket science-- only the start-up investment and public inertia has slowed their acceptance. (0005-26 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: Recent trends in solar photovoltaic electric generation technology and pricing are dramatic. The EIS needs to extrapolate these trends not just to the time a potential third reactor would go on line (2015?) but for the probable lifetime of such a reactor (2075?). (0005-27 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: Solar power will never cover ALL our electricity needs, but will become a significant fraction of the total power mix. Solar, energy by itself is completely free and clean, and will be available for some billions of years! (0005-29 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: [W]e are lucky enough to be a coastal state. Nuclear reactors are extremely expensive - why can't we just build a great big wind farm out on the ocean like the one planned for Rehoboth, DE? (0007-5 [Shannahan, Brittany])

Comment: The EIS should fully and transparently consider alternatives to Calvert Cliffs-3, including but not limited to:

- use of renewable energy to meet electricity demand and/or equivalent output of Calvert Cliff-3
- use of energy efficiency to reduce electricity demand to equivalent output of Calvert Cliffs-3, including various and aggressive energy efficiency program scenarios
- use of a combination of renewable energy and energy efficiency to meet electricity demand and obtain an equivalent output of Calvert Cliffs-3. (0019-4 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: I hope the EIS will include in-depth consideration of alternatives to Calvert Cliffs -- 3. The area's power needs can be met by safer and more environmentally friendly means: through using renewable energy sources and by developing energy efficiency programs. (0020-8 [Donn, Marjory])

Comment: Renewable energy sources will be valuable in diversifying the nation's energy supply, but their intermittent nature precludes their role as a reliable generation source. (0024-10 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: Conservation and more efficient electrical appliances help and a deeper commitment to renewable sources, such as wind, solar and geothermal, is needed, but conservation and renewable energy don't provide the baseload power we require to ensure the lights go on every time we flick a switch. (0024-22 [Kanaley, Mike])

Comment: [I]t's our belief that through a combination of energy efficiency, clean renewables, like solar, wind, and geothermal, combined heat and power, and distributed generation, the state can meet its energy needs without investing a lot of money in a new nuclear power plant. (0024-36 [Neumann, Johanna])

Comment: [I]f nuclear energy was the only way we could avoid climate change, global warming, then we'd have to weigh those risks, but there are alternatives, including wind power and solar energy and efficiency. (0024-60 [Dubois, Gwen])

Comment: I would argue that there's reliable, fast, cheap, clean, safe, and more secure sources of electricity. Those would include efficiency and renewables. (0024-80 [Kamps, Kevin])

Comment: Efficiency is seven times more cost effective dollar for dollar than nuclear power in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. So, given our limited resources and our limited time in addressing this crisis, we really have to go for the low-hanging fruit. (0024-81 [Kamps, Kevin])

Comment: Nuclear is one of the most expensive and one of the most time-consuming ways to generate electricity, and I would like to commend Constellation Energy for its Super Bowl ad at the end of January where they showed wind power and the potential of wind power, but strangely enough, they didn't mention nuclear at all. So, I would call on Constellation to live up to its Super Bowl ad and pursue wind power. (0024-82 [Kamps, Kevin])

Comment: Conservation and energy efficiency will be important responses to increased electricity demand and we support those efforts as does Constellation Energy and Unistar, but conservation and energy efficiency will not offset the need for new baseload generation in Maryland. (0024-9 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: [H]ow much of a reduction in peak energy demand do you think there would be if we went to smart metering? (0025-109 [Johnston, Bill])

Comment: Conservation and energy efficiency will be important responses to increased electricity demand, and we support those efforts as does Constellation Energy and Unistar. But conservation and energy efficiency will not offset the need for new base load generation in Maryland. (0025-11 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: A single [solar energy] panel setup, 200 miles long, 200 miles wide, that square, would meet the energy demands for the United States in the year 2050. Coal burning uses more land than solar, once you take mining into account, that you are cutting off the mountain tops here and there, filling the ravines. (0025-110 [Johnston, Bill])

Comment: Renewable energy sources will be valuable in diversifying the nation's energy supply, but their intermittent nature precludes their role as a reliable generation source. (0025-12 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: [G]reater conservation and renewable energy don't provide the round-the-clock base load power we require to ensure the lights go on any time we flip the switch. (0025-120 [Walther, Robert])

Comment: I'm a great believer in renewables, such as wind power, and they should absolutely be part of the energy mix, but we can't rely on renewables alone. (0025-140 [Sinclair, Jim])

Comment: I think we should avoid fossil fuel alternatives whenever possible. The effect of greenhouse gases on the environment is becoming very well documented. I truly believe the planet is in peril as a result of the use of fossil fuels. (0025-141 [Sinclair, Jim])

Comment: [T]here is one group and one issue that I don't think anybody has touched on, and that's the new generation of power, and new technologies to generate power in the country is a national security issue. (0025-145 [McGarvey, Sean])

Comment: It seems to me that one of the more important things that ... as a means by which we might help ourselves to become less dependent on any source of power generation, whether that be from nuclear or other sources, is through energy conservation and efficiency. (0025-160 [Hunter, Theresa])

Comment: I think that it's through energy conservation and efficiency that we should be targeting our way forward to get to a point where we're able to support our region with the type of energy needs that we are going to need now and into the future, and not rely upon things such as an expansion of nuclear power. (0025-161 [Hunter, Theresa])

Comment: When considering energy from wind, capacity factors should be documented by actual industry power production reports. For example, for wind installations in Pennsylvania, which are right next to where they want to put them in Maryland, and from the capacity value assigned by the PJM grid managers to the current wind installations, particularly for summer capacity when the demand is highest and the output is lowest. (0025-65 [Meadow, Karen])

Comment: Environmental impact should include the actual land required for erecting those 4,800 turbines, plus the land required for the road system and the transmission lines. This land area would exceed 20,000 acres of cleared forest in the Appalachians, approximately 700 miles of ridge line, because they need to go on the ridge line to get the wind. (0025-67 [Meadow, Karen])

Comment: [T]he EIS should examine the number of studies and their quality to measure bird and bat kills in the Appalachians, and should evaluate whether research done on wind installations in California, in a very different habitat, is applicable to the ecology of birds and bats in the Appalachians. (0025-68 [Meadow, Karen])

Comment: Given that the wind installations proposed for western Maryland would be situated on major bird and bat migratory routes, the environmental impact of the turbines must be carefully considered. The habitat damage of the wind turbines far exceeds the actual cleared pads, since certain species of birds will not roost within 300 feet of a clearing. (0025-69 [Meadow, Karen])

Comment: In regard to offshore wind, the EIS should evaluate the amount of research that has been done on the effects of noise and vibrations from the turbines on the ecology of the waters in which the turbines are placed. We are aware of only one brief study of something that could potentially cause extensive permanent damage to the ecology of these offshore waters, and that's wholly unacceptable. (0025-70 [Meadow, Karen])

Comment: For bioenergy sources, such as with grass or short rotation forest crops, the amount of land required to replace the reactor's output should be investigated based on the known yield of these products. Land required for bioenergy crops would be approximately 6,000 square miles under cultivation. This is 60 percent of the State of Maryland. (0025-71 [Meadow, Karen])

Comment: Photovoltaic power should be evaluated on the basis of capacity factors. Accordingly, in Maryland, it would require covering 100 square miles with very expensive solar panels, which is half the area of Calvert County. (0025-72 [Meadow, Karen])

Comment: [W]e are living in a changing global warming environment, which may change the weather pattern, meaning alternatives to nuclear power that are based on weather, such as wind and sun, may well be ineffective in the years to come. (0025-73 [Meadow, Karen])

Comment: I think if you insist on having nuclear power, and I insist there's very viable alternatives for anyone who is interested in looking into it, they should be located on the ocean where you get cooler water and higher operating efficiencies. (0025-113 [Johnston, Bill])

Comment: There are cleaner forms of energy - solar for one, wind for another. Both are sustainable & with little or no public risk. (0026-2 [Marsh, Rauni])

Comment: One mistake and we're all dead or worse. Nuclear power is not the answer! Sustainable natural energy from Nature is the only answer. (0026-5 [Marsh, Rauni])

Comment: [N]uclear power must be compared to other methods for the generation of electricity on the basis of cost, reliability, and lack of carbon dioxide emissions, balanced against the potential for harm. (0028-1 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: Nuclear reactors work at approximately 90+% capacity year round. Calculated from the Capacity Values mentioned above, 5,500 2 MW wind turbines would be required to produce the same amount of electricity as the proposed reactor during the summer months when our region's demand is highest (and increasing most rapidly). (0028-10 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: Since nearly all commercial wind energy development is currently planned for the ridgetops along the Appalachian Mountain chain, and since the vast majority of these potential development sites are presently covered in dense forest, the impact resulting from construction of 5,500 huge wind turbines and their associated roads and transmission lines likely would result in the clearing of about 20,000 acres of forest along approximately 800 miles of ridge line. Wind energy facilities which have been built in the last 5 years in the PJM grid region have averaged about 3 to 5 acres of forest cleared per wind turbine, and they install on average about 7 or 8 wind turbines per mile of ridgetop. It should be noted that, in fact, there is not nearly enough suitably windy ridgetop in western Maryland to accommodate this intensity of wind energy development. (0028-11 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: Clearing 20,000 acres of forest releases a significant amount of carbon dioxide and eliminates a major carbon sequestration source, which has to be deducted from the environmental advantage of the wind installation. (0028-12 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: When investigating ecological damage caused by industrial wind installation, the NRC should examine the quality of the research done to measure bird and bat kills in the Appalachians and should evaluate whether research done on wind installations in CA is applicable to the ecology of birds and bats in the Appalachians. (0028-13 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: Given that the 20,000 acres of forest and ridgetop habitat in the mountains of Western MD and adjacent states likely would be needed to generate an equivalent amount of electricity from wind installations as compared to the single new reactor proposed to be added to Calvert Cliffs, and given that as many or more than 5,500 huge wind turbines therefore would

be situated on major bird and bat migratory routes, the environmental impact of the wind energy alternative to this nuclear reactor must be carefully considered. (0028-14 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: The habitat damage of the wind turbines far exceeds the actual 20,000 acres cleared, since many forest interior dwelling species will not successfully persist or reproduce within at least 300 feet of a cleared edge, meaning that for the 700 mile length of the road and turbine clearings, an additional 300+ feet of forest interior habitat will be lost along each side of the road and turbine clearings' entire length. (0028-15 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: In regard to offshore wind, the EIS should evaluate the amount of research that's been done on the effects of noise from the turbines on the ecology of the waters in which the turbines are placed. ... The effects of the noise injected into the marine environment might not manifest themselves for several decades. (0028-16 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: About 1650 offshore turbines (3.5 MW using a summer Capacity Factor of 25%) would be required to equal the summer-time generating capacity of the proposed nuclear reactor. (0028-17 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: Bioenergy sources such as switch grass or short rotation forest crops are being proposed to fire steam boilers. The amount of land required to equal the proposed reactor's output should be investigated based on the known energy output and productivity for any crop being considered for firing steam boilers. Current average yields should be used, not unconfirmed projections of yield. (0028-18 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: Approximately 6,000 square miles of land would be required for the cultivation of either switch grass or short rotation forest crops. This is 60% of the State's land area and is equal to the area of all current forest and agricultural land. (0028-19 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: The EIS should investigate the energy required to dry these crops as we have been unable to determine if this has been considered by proponents of the method. (0028-20 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: Photovoltaic power's potential to provide electricity must be evaluated by using the Capacity Factor appropriate for Maryland, and not by nameplate capacity of the installations. The MCC estimates that it would require covering 100 square miles with solar panels (this is 1/2 the area of Calvert County) at a cost of \$86 billion to equal the output of the single reactor. (0028-21 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: The damage to wildlife from small releases should be contrasted with the damage to habitat that would result from the construction of thousands of wind turbines, either on-or off-shore, or the conversion of thousands of square miles of farm and forest to bioenergy production which you will hear about shortly. (0028-34 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: [W]e believe that these renewables cannot provide a sufficient amount of electric power to significantly reduce dependence on coal. (0028-4 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: When considering energy from wind, the potential for electricity generation from commercial installations should be estimated from the annual and summer-time Capacity Factors documented by actual power production reports of existing facilities. (0028-6 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: [T]he Capacity Value (i.e., the capacity factor achieved during the 4-hour summer afternoon expected peak demand period -- following the methodology used by PJM's grid managers) ought to be used in evaluating the capability of wind energy or other renewable energy projects to substitute for this proposed nuclear reactor. (0028-7 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: Nameplate capacity provided by the manufacturers of wind turbines is misleading for estimating the wind generation potential which possibly could come from facilities located in western Maryland or elsewhere in the Mid-Atlantic Highlands region. (0028-9 [Meadow, Norman])

Response: *The comments identify alternative energy sources, request that NRC consider alternatives to its analysis, or comment that certain alternatives cannot meet the power need. Alternative energy sources, including energy conservation and renewable energy sources, will be considered in the EIS.*

Comment: In carrying out the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping process related to Constellation Energy/Unistar's proposed Calvert Cliffs -- 3 reactor, please consider alternatives to building the reactor. (0020-1 [Donn, Marjory])

Response: *The EIS will discuss the no-action alternative, alternative sites, alternative energy sources, and alternative plant systems.*

Comment: We believe that there are cleaner, safer, and more affordable alternatives [to nuclear power], so that Maryland can meet its energy challenges while moving forward with a clean energy economy and, you know, ultimately a much more environmentally sound and much more conscious of public health energy future. (0024-34 [Neumann, Johanna])

Response: *The EIS will be prepared in accordance with 10 CFR 51.75(c). Alternative energy sources, including energy conservation and renewable energy sources, will be discussed in the EIS.*

20. Comments Concerning Benefit – Cost Balance

Comment: Unistar/Constellation Energy's Environmental Report lacks credibility and appears more intended at deflecting and deterring public involvement in the EIS than contributing to careful and transparent analysis. Specifically, the applicant's assertion (and the NRC's apparent acceptance of that assertion) that all financial information, including basic estimates of construction cost, are to remain proprietary makes any discussion of cost/benefit analysis impossible, and thus irrelevant, and leaves the EIS unable to fulfill one of its most basic obligations. (0019-1 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: Even if the NRC staff has access to this allegedly proprietary information, and prepares a cost/benefit analysis based upon its access, the public still would not have the ability to assess this information, add a public perspective the NRC staff may be lacking, and comment upon this information--legal requirements of the EIS. (0019-2 [Mariotte, Michael])

Response: *The applicant is entitled by 10 CFR 2.390 to have trade secrets and commercial and financial information held by NRC as privileged or confidential, subject to certain procedural controls. The Commission also determines whether the right of the public to be fully apprised as to whether the bases for and effects of the proposed action outweighs the demonstrated concern for protection of a competitive position, and whether the information should be withheld from public disclosure. The NRC has determined that the requested financial information shall*

be held as confidential. The comparison of alternatives in the EIS is an environmental comparison, not a financial one.

Comment: Will nuclear power become a dinosaur by mid-century? If so, will it be too costly to dismantle such a plant (none of the size even of Calvert Cliffs Units 1 and 2 have ever been dismantled-this would cost billions of dollars). (0005-28 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: All of the sunken costs related to these construction activities, they should be included in the total capital cost of the project, especially when comparing the costs per kilowatt hour between nuclear and the alternative options. (0025-91 [Fisher, Allison])

Comment: Erecting 5500 wind turbines in western Maryland will cost \$22 billion, using a cost of \$2 million per installed MW. (0028-27 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: [G]iven the wide range of cost estimates already reported by other U.S. utility projects (for example, Florida Power & Light testimony before the Florida Public Service Commission estimates construction costs for a single new nuclear unit running from \$6 to \$12 billion--a huge range), the EIS should not limit itself to a single cost figure, but rather must conduct its cost/benefit analysis on a range of foreseeable construction costs. (0019-3 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: I think there are many reasons why this new reactor should not be built. One of these reasons is the cost. Constellation Energy says they expect it to cost around 4-5 billion dollars, but other estimates have ranged all the way up to a possible 12 billion. Then there's the cost of decommissioning it after the relatively short lifetime of a nuclear reactor. (0020-3 [Donn, Marjory])

Comment: We will provide a cost-benefit analysis for the new nuclear power plant. It will use the current costs of nuclear power that you're seeing in the press today. (0024-116 [Vanderheyden, George])

Comment: [W]e strongly feel that there should be a cost-benefit analysis as part of the environmental impact statement. You know, when Constellation was first embarking on this process, they were thinking the reactor might cost, you know, \$2.5 to \$3 billion. You know, new analyses coming out of Florida suggest that the cost may be as much as \$12 billion. Those are significantly different figures and before we embark on that kind of plan, we need to make sure we know what we're getting into and so a cost-benefit analysis, looking at the tiered construction costs, should be part of this environmental impact statement. (0024-37 [Neumann, Johanna])

Comment: Right now, Constellation is talking, I don't know, somewhere on the order of \$4 billion a reactor, but -- and that may give you one set of conclusions about the costs and benefits of this facility. But if the reactor costs \$8 billion, that might give you a different set of conclusions. And in that regard, that reactor in Finland, the only one that is being built with this design, is, after three years of construction, two years behind schedule and 50 percent over budget. That kind of thing has to be considered. (0025-48 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: This month, two different utilities in Florida submitted documents to the Florida Public Service Commission estimating single reactor costs ranging from \$6- to \$12 billion per reactor. That's a big difference, and that is going to change the cost benefit analysis substantially, and this EIS should look at all of those different possibilities and not just accept this single cost for this facility. (0025-49 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: Cost-benefit analysis should include the actual cost per installed watt of generating capacity of the turbines, as well as the cost of transmission lines, not the net cost after tax benefits, which are always talked about. This cost would be somewhere in the range of \$16 billion as opposed to the \$6- to \$8 billion attributed to the new reactor. (0025-66 [Meadow, Karen])

Comment: Just last December, over \$20 billion was approved in nuclear loan guarantees for new reactors and for uranium enrichment in the United States. This is to an industry that profits at each reactor about a million dollars per day and has already enjoyed hundreds of billions of dollars in subsidies over the decades. (0024-89 [Kamps, Kevin])

Comment: [T]he Price-Anderson Act has been renewed. That means that if there's a major accident at Calvert Cliffs, that it will be the U.S. taxpayers who bear the brunt of that accident in large part. (0024-90 [Kamps, Kevin])

Comment: Cost benefit analysis should include the actual cost for the per installed watt of generating capacity as well as the cost of extensive length of transmission lines that will be required for highly decentralized sources of electric power such as wind and photovoltaics, not the net cost to the purchaser after government tax liability relief. Projections of reductions in cost should not be treated as assured. (0028-26 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: The property damages from that 1982 report were around \$90 billion at each reactor if there's a major accident. So, if you adjust for inflation, double that amount of money, and again these were 1980 era population figures. So, you have to increase the casualty rates because the population has grown since then. (0024-78 [Kamps, Kevin])

Response: *NRC regulations require a reactor license applicant to be financially qualified to engage in licensed activities. The staff will evaluate the applicant's financial qualification in its Safety Evaluation Report, not the EIS. However, the EIS will address the benefit-cost of the proposed action. The benefit-cost balance for the project will rely on the best available estimate of project timing and duration, with uncertainties noted where appropriate. Chapter 11 of the EIS will discuss the estimated overall costs and environmental impacts of the proposed project.*

21. General Comments in Support of the Licensing Action

Comment: I wish to express my support for the proposed 3rd reactor at Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant. I live close by (Solomons, MD) and am well aware of the extremely remote danger posed by the existing reactors; a third would add little to this risk. (0001-1 [Rudy, Mike])

Comment: I manage environmental programs for the U.S. Navy, am a community member of the Cove Point Natural Heritage Trust (a local environmental organization) and am conversant with National Environmental Policy Act requirements. In my opinion, opposition to this project has not gone beyond not-in-my-backyard parochialism and scaremongering. (0001-3 [Rudy, Mike])

Comment: I support the addition of a third unit to Calvert Cliffs, especially if a passive-safety design is used. Such a design was not available when Units 1&2 were built, but has been in development for decades, and should be ready for use by now. (0004-4 [Arndt, Gunter])

Comment: I am an employee of Constellation Energy working at Calvert Cliffs, and I strongly support the construction of Unit 3. (0006-1 [Baummer, Thomas])

Comment: Based on our knowledge of the EPR as an evolutionary design with multi-level safety-related components, we concur with the conclusions of the UniStar ER, specifically that there would be minimal impact from the construction and operation of a new nuclear reactor and that the community benefit would be substantial. (0014-1 [Clark, Gerald] [Kelley, Linda] [Parran, Wilson] [Shaw, Susan] [Stinnett, Barbara])

Comment: We also understand that there will be individuals or groups who believe that our support is uninformed or strictly financially motivated. However, we assure you that Calvert County possesses the history and knowledge of the nuclear industry, an understanding and appreciation of Calvert Cliff's safe operating history, and the plant's dedication to public safety and the environment. Unlike outside entities, Calvert County also assumes all of the perceived risk. We take our responsibility to the community and environment seriously; we live and work here. (0014-6 [Clark, Gerald] [Kelley, Linda] [Parran, Wilson] [Shaw, Susan] [Stinnett, Barbara])

Comment: As stated in August 2007, many of the decisions we make are difficult; however, our decision to support the potential expansion remains simple, uncomplicated, and consistent. (0014-7 [Clark, Gerald] [Kelley, Linda] [Parran, Wilson] [Shaw, Susan] [Stinnett, Barbara])

Comment: I am writing to convey my unequivocal support of UniStar Nuclear Energy's (UNE) application for Combined License Partial Application for a potential advanced-design reactor at the Constellation Energy's Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant. If approved, this reactor will be the third unit at Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant. (0015-1 [O'Donnell, Anthony])

Comment: Because Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant is in the heart of my district, I have had the opportunity to receive much input and support from the community regarding the potential expansion. I have had an overwhelming positive response from my constituency. (0015-4 [O'Donnell, Anthony])

Comment: I would like to go on record supporting the expansion of the present facility and construction of the third reactor. (0016-2 [Zahniser, Albert])

Comment: [T]he Tri-County Council for Southern Maryland supports the efforts of the Board of County Commissioners of Calvert County, Maryland to secure a third nuclear reactor at the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant. (0023-4 [Hodge, Gary])

Comment: Based on our knowledge of the new reactor design with multilevel safety-related components, we concur with the environmental report that indicates that there is a minimal impact from the construction and operation of a nuclear reactor. (0024-1 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: I support the expansion. (0024-108 [Buchanan, Bill])

Comment: [O]ur [Calvert County Board of Commissioners] decision to support the potential expansion remains simple, uncomplicated, and consistent. Calvert County will continue to stand by Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Constellation Energy, and Unistar as we have done in the past. (0024-12 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: On December 13th, 2007, the Council adopted a resolution to support the efforts of Calvert County to secure a third reactor at the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant. (0024-14 [Hodge, Gary])

Comment: I would like to add to that that as a sitting commissioner and member of the Board of County Commissioners my own personal endorsement of the application for the construction of a third reactor at Calvert Cliffs. (0024-16 [Kelley, Linda])

Comment: I personally look forward to the expansion to provide much needed electricity to businesses and residents in the distribution area. (0024-18 [Kelley, Linda])

Comment: We support the NRC's preliminary recommendation and the continuation of the licensing process that will lead to a new construction at Calvert Cliffs. (0024-28 [Kanaley, Mike])

Comment: I support the construction of the third reactor and I do so as a resident of Lusby, sharing a zipcode with the new reactor. (0024-32 [McClure, Deborah])

Comment: We support fully Unistar and Constellation Energy's bid in order to review the possibilities of building a new nuclear power plant here in the United States, hopefully here in Maryland, as well as in other areas, in order to ensure a bright future for all Americans. (0024-39 [McAndrew-Benevides, Elizabeth])

Comment: I fully support the potential expansion of Calvert Cliffs for many reasons but primarily based on their corporate presence, their impeccable safety record. (0024-40 [Chambers, Bill])

Comment: On behalf of the committee, I want to voice our support for the potential expansion of the plant and the findings of the environmental report. (0024-49 [Garrett, Nick])

Comment: From a tourism perspective, we see no negative impact. Instead, we envision what we already know. More people here, more visits to our local sites and treasures, more people shopping in our shops and stores. Tourism is a huge economic engine in Calvert County, and we thank Calvert Cliffs for the ongoing support and the focus on protecting the environment locally. (0024-53 [Garrett, Nick])

Comment: I personally own about 15 acres in a town center right in St. Leonard and I am still in favor of another reactor right in Lusby, Maryland. (0024-57 [Parran, Wilson L.])

Comment: When our Chamber board voted, they voted unanimously to support the expansion of Calvert Cliffs. (0024-95 [Scarafia, Bill])

Comment: We're as concerned as anybody else about our citizens, about their safety and about their future. We're committed to that, but we're also in favor of this proposal. (0024-97 [Scarafia, Bill])

Comment: Based on our knowledge of the new reactor design with multi-level safety-related components, we concur with the environmental report that indicates that there is minimal impact from the construction and operation of a nuclear reactor. (0025-1 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: We support Constellation and Unistar and their plans to expand. (0025-103 [Chambers, Kelly])

Comment: Recently, the Council adopted a resolution in full support of the efforts of Calvert County to secure a third reactor at Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Powerplant. (0025-105 [Hodge, Gary])

Comment: As an advocate for the region's interests and priorities, it is my pleasure to publicly offer our support of the application to construct and operate Unit 3 at Calvert Cliffs. (0025-106 [Hodge, Gary])

Comment: I'm here today, obviously, to speak in support of the project that is being considered. (0025-114 [McGough, Mike])

Comment: We support the NRC's preliminary recommendation and a continuation of the licensing process that will lead to new construction at Calvert Cliffs. (0025-126 [Walther, Robert])

Comment: On behalf of the Partnership, please accept our support of the proposed expansion of Calvert Cliffs. (0025-127 [Green, Bonnie])

Comment: From the Partnership's perspective, we see no negative impact from an expanded Calvert Cliffs. You have the full support of the partnership and the conclusions of the environmental report, and we look forward to reviewing the NRC findings. (0025-131 [Green, Bonnie])

Comment: My house is four miles south of the power plant, and I'm here to speak in favor of the new reactor being built at Calvert Cliffs. (0025-132 [Sinclair, Jim])

Comment: The two units at Calvert Cliffs have been operating safely for 30 years. They are an established part of the community. It makes sense to site an additional reactor there where they can leverage off the existing infrastructure and minimize the impact on the environment of adding this generation capacity. (0025-135 [Sinclair, Jim])

Comment: I believe we need this powerplant. I believe it will make a positive social and economic impact on the community. And I believe it is our best alternative to minimize the environmental impact in Maryland, in the United States, and on planet Earth. (0025-143 [Sinclair, Jim])

Comment: I represent thousands of skilled crafts people in southern Maryland, who live in this community and who would benefit from the opportunity to build this next unit at Calvert Cliffs. (0025-144 [McGarvey, Sean])

Comment: As a member of the business community, I fully support an expansion at Calvert Cliffs. (0025-154 [Benton, Mike])

Comment: My only hope is that we get through this process quickly, get the license approved, and have Unit III up and running, so that we can do our part to stabilize energy production for the country. (0025-155 [Benton, Mike])

Comment: [W]e look forward to the day when Calvert Cliffs once again makes history, receiving NRC approval to construct and operate Unit 3. (0025-16 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: I support the potential expansion at Calvert Cliffs based on their history of corporate stewardship and their long history -- safety record. (0025-165 [Pretto-Simmons, Nancy])

Comment: I was a waterman in the Chesapeake for about 45 years. I have drugged oysters off the base of Calvert Cliffs. I have caught clams, oysters, fish. I've skinned a few eels and dressed some muskrats in my time. So I bring you support from the majority of the Board of County Commissioners in St. Mary's County in support of your quest to put Unit 3 at Calvert Cliffs. (0025-18 [Russell, Jack])

Comment: In short, as me coming from the Chesapeake Bay, and founder of a non-profit that tries to teach young and old alike to be good stewards of the Chesapeake, I think this power is the way to go. (0025-23 [Russell, Jack])

Comment: I support a potential expansion at Calvert Cliffs. (0025-24 [Martins, Darren])

Comment: We support Unistar and Constellation in their efforts to build at Calvert Cliffs. We support the County Commissioners in their endorsement of the expanded plant. (0025-27 [Martins, Darren])

Comment: I'm here this afternoon to speak in support of granting the appropriate licensing to Unistar and Constellation for building and constructing a new reactor at Calvert Cliffs. (0025-31 [Burton, Bob])

Comment: The MCC [Maryland Conservation Council] is one of the oldest conservation groups in the state, and it has worked for 40 years to protect Maryland's natural heritage. Last November, our Board voted to support Constellation Energy -- I guess that should be changed to Unistar now -- to support the request for the third reactor at Calvert Cliffs. (0025-55 [Meadow, Norm])

Comment: [W]e strongly support the building of Calvert Cliffs 3, because we believe it will provide clean electric power with minimal ecological damage. (0025-64 [Meadow, Karen])

Comment: I wish to speak on supporting this next expansion at Calvert Cliffs. (0025-76 [Karbowsky, Brad])

Comment: [T]he St. Mary's County Chamber of Commerce, subsequent to our meeting with all of the officials and our investigation of the facts and information that we were given our Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors unanimously voted to support the expansion of Calvert Cliffs. (0025-84 [Scarafia, Bill])

Comment: [O]ur Chamber of Commerce strongly supports this project. (0025-85 [Green, Joseph])

Response: *These comments express support of the applicant's COL application. They do not provide specific information relating to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS. They are listed to compile a complete record of comments received.*

22. General Comments in Support of the Licensing Process

Comment: I thank the NRC for their continued efforts to ensure that the public stays informed here in our great county. I've done my best to keep myself informed of this project and to make sure that Constellation Energy and Unistar are treated fairly from a business perspective, and I believe that your process truly helps people stay informed. (0024-41 [Chambers, Bill])

Comment: I also want to thank the NRC for this forum. This is the most excellent way to ensure that the citizens of Calvert County can be heard and that hopefully concerns can be addressed about this. (0024-50 [Garrett, Nick])

Comment: I think the environmental impact that the plant could have on our community is probably the paramount issue. That being said, I think the environmental impact has been dealt with adequately in the past and there's no reason to believe it won't be dealt with the same way in the future. (0024-51 [Garrett, Nick])

Response: *These comments express support for the NRC's COL process. They do not provide specific information relating to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS. They are listed to compile a complete record of comments received.*

23. General Comments of Support of Nuclear Power

Comment: Nuclear power is not a perfect solution to the nations energy needs. However, continued reliance on imported energy (Middle East Terrorism) and the domestic fossil fuel (coal burning power plant emissions) make nuclear energy a lesser evil. (0001-2 [Rudy, Mike])

Comment: Most importantly, we need to work together to reverse the growth of greenhouse gas emissions; nuclear is the most viable option to do this. (0014-4 [Clark, Gerald] [Kelley, Linda] [Parran, Wilson] [Shaw, Susan] [Stinnett, Barbara])

Comment: [I]t is important to remember that nuclear energy is critical to our country's ability to provide clean, safe, and reliable energy while balancing our responsibility to the environment. (0014-5 [Clark, Gerald] [Kelley, Linda] [Parran, Wilson] [Shaw, Susan] [Stinnett, Barbara])

Comment: As a member of the Maryland House of Delegates Environmental Matters Committee, I am constantly looking for methods to reduce dangerous greenhouse gas emissions. Since nuclear energy has been proven to be a source of clean energy, I consider it a vital necessity for expanding our nation's energy resources. Newer technology has insured that U.S. nuclear power plants are safe. (0015-3 [O'Donnell, Anthony])

Comment: [T]he construction of a third nuclear reactor at Calvert Cliffs would have a significant state, national and international impact, by enhancing the effectiveness of environmental strategies to reduce the consumption of fossil fuels and reduce greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to global warming, and by increasing domestic energy production and reducing America's dependence on imported oil. (0023-2 [Hodge, Gary])

Comment: I believe that we as a country and as a community need safe, clean, economical, and non-greenhouse gas emission emitting nuclear power to reduce our dependence on foreign oil and to help meet our growing needs for electricity. (0024-104 [McGough, Mike])

Comment: I also believe thoroughly that if we wouldn't had a 30-year moratorium on building nuclear plants in this country, we wouldn't be in the situation we're in today with an energy crunch and greenhouse gases because we'd have had safe, clean source of energy over the last 30 years. (0024-106 [Karbowsky, Brad])

Comment: [W]e are the group of individuals and entities that's pursuing the new nuclear power plant at Calvert Cliffs to meet the region's need for reliable power that does not produce greenhouse gases while we generate electricity. (0024-111 [Vanderheyden, George])

Comment: I think nuclear power is important for the country. (0024-117 [Vanderheyden, George])

Comment: We support construction of new reactors and are actively engaged in generating a public dialogue to inform others about the ways nuclear power enhances America's energy security and economic growth. Nuclear power helps obtain cleaner air, improves the quality of life, health and economic well-being for all Americans. (0024-20 [Kanaley, Mike])

Comment: A wise energy policy recognizes the virtue of diversity and in that diverse plan, nuclear energy is a critical component. (0024-23 [Kanaley, Mike])

Comment: Nuclear energy is clean. It's the only large-scale emission-free source of electricity that we can readily expand to meet our growing energy demand. The environmental impact at nuclear plants is far lower than many other types of power-generating plants and therefore it is not surprising that wildlife often flourishes near nuclear power plants. (0024-24 [Kanaley, Mike])

Comment: Nuclear energy is safe. In fact, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics has shown that it is safer to work at a nuclear power plant than it is to work in the manufacturing sector or even the real estate and financial industries. (0024-25 [Kanaley, Mike])

Comment: North American Young Generation of Nuclear is a dedicated group of individuals looking forward to the future of our world. Being part of that future, we hope that nuclear power will be a great part of our society. (0024-38 [McAndrew-Benevides, Elizabeth])

Comment: [I]t's my hope that the new nuclear renaissance that is occurring right now will both promote and educate people on what a clean and effective means of energy that this is for the State of Maryland. (0024-54 [Garrett, Nick])

Comment: We need new energy generation and we need to reduce our dependence on foreign energy supply. Most importantly, we need to work together to reverse the growth of greenhouse gas emissions and nuclear is the most viable option. (0024-6 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: [I]t is important to remember that nuclear energy is critical to our nation's ability to provide clean, safe and reliable energy while balancing our responsibility to the environment. (0024-7 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: [W]e ask everyone to recognize that without nuclear energy, vast amounts of future electric needs will be produced by coal or other phosphate fuels, and without new clean-based low-generation, the increase in pollution and greenhouse gas emissions will significantly contradict all arguments for clean air. (0024-75 [Pope, Nate])

Comment: I believe that we as a country, and we as a community, need the safe, clean, environmentally responsible and economical power that can come from new nuclear. (0025-115 [McGough, Mike])

Comment: France has 58 operating nuclear powerplants. They provide 80 percent of the power for France. France has the cleanest air quality and lowest cost electricity in all of Europe, and I think that any of you who have visited there would marvel at the safety standards and the quality of their efforts over there. (0025-116 [McGough, Mike])

Comment: We at the Clean and Safe Energy Coalition support construction of new reactors and are actively engaged in generating a public dialogue to inform others about the ways nuclear power enhances America's energy security and economic growth, helps attain cleaner air, and improves the quality of life, health, and economic well being for all Americans. (0025-117 [Walther, Robert])

Comment: A wise energy policy recognizes the virtue of diversity. And in that diverse plan, nuclear energy is a critical component. Nuclear energy is clean. It is the only large-scale emission-free source of electricity that we can readily expand to meet our growing energy demand. (0025-121 [Walther, Robert])

Comment: The environmental impact at nuclear powerplants is far lower than many other types of power generating plants, and, therefore, it is not surprising that wildlife often flourishes near nuclear plants. Nuclear energy is safe. (0025-122 [Walther, Robert])

Comment: The nation's nuclear powerplants are among the safest and most secure industrial facilities in the United States. Multiple layers of physical security, together with high levels of operational performance, protect plant workers, the public, and the environment. When weighing this against the fact that nuclear plants do not generate carbon dioxide -- the principal greenhouse gas -- expanding the country's nuclear energy capability makes sense. (0025-129 [Green, Bonnie])

Comment: If we replicated the positive impact of Calvert Cliffs, we could remove the equivalent greenhouse gas emissions that Calvert Cliffs removed in 2006. (0025-13 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: We recognize the importance of conservation and renewable energy efforts as ways to expand our energy future, but it is not enough. Nuclear energy is reliable, 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Nuclear generation is the safest and cleanest mechanism to protect our global environment. (0025-130 [Green, Bonnie])

Comment: Nuclear plants did not contribute to the greenhouse gas emissions, and their waste stream is isolated from the environment. I think nuclear represents the cleanest base load generation technology we have today. (0025-142 [Sinclair, Jim])

Comment: Unistar Nuclear Energy is the company that is pursuing a new nuclear powerplant at Calvert Cliffs to meet the region's needs for reliable electricity generation, and we do believe nuclear -- and count on the fact that nuclear does not produce any greenhouse gases while generating electricity. (0025-167 [Vanderheyden, George])

Comment: So we support the Commissioners of Calvert County in thinking that nuclear energy is perhaps the best way for power transmission in this situation. (0025-21 [Russell, Jack])

Comment: We also support the use of nuclear power as an alternative solution for stable, reliable energy. This advanced technology will become one of the most productive mechanisms to reduce global warming. (0025-28 [Martins, Darren])

Comment: [N]uclear power is one source through which we can seek additional supply of clean energy to the rest of the State of Maryland. (0025-33 [Burton, Bob])

Comment: [I]n traveling through the countryside of France and Switzerland, and looking how nuclear power has become so much a part of a positive environmental experience, and blends so well into those communities there, and has been accepted and been trusted as a reliable, clean source of energy, I can't help but believe that if our neighbors over in Europe can have such success with a clean energy source that we ourselves here in this country cannot only have the same success but also take on an even greater leadership role and demonstrate to our neighbors and allies around the world that we have the ability to even advance technology to even make it safer. (0025-40 [Burton, Bob])

Comment: The reason is that we believe that nuclear power is the most effective way to produce electricity without carbon dioxide emissions, and it minimizes damage to habitat and biological diversity. (0025-56 [Meadow, Norm])

Comment: [T]he viability of alternative sources of energy moving through the future, where there may be an opportunity for solar and wind power at some point in time to serve our energy needs. Nuclear power is the most efficient way to go at the current rate. (0025-77 [Karbowsky, Brad])

Comment: Most importantly, we need to work together to reverse the growth of greenhouse emissions. Nuclear is the most viable option (0025-8 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: [W]e support conservation, energy efficiency, and other forms of power, but at the same time we realize that nuclear energy is fundamental to making everything in this region work and making sure that we have adequate supply for our businesses and our communities in Prince George's County. (0025-87 [Green, Joseph])

Comment: Regardless of whether the expansion occurs, it is important to remember that nuclear energy is critical to our nation's ability to provide clean, safe, and reliable energy while balancing our responsibility to the environment. (0025-9 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: Nuclear power can provide a very significant share of our region's electricity without emissions of carbon dioxide, and therefore is the most effective technology in terms of reducing "carbon footprint" of our region's population. (0028-25 [Meadow, Norman])

Comment: It is the opinion of the Maryland Conservation Council (MCC) that commercial nuclear power will be far less damaging to the biology of our region than will several among the renewable resources being proposed as alternatives to the construction of the new reactor. (0028-3 [Meadow, Norman])

Response: *These comments express support for nuclear power in general. They do not provide specific information relating to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS. They are listed to compile a complete record of comments received.*

24. General Comments in Support of the Existing Plant

Comment: Calvert Cliffs 1&2 have proven to be very good County neighbors; well-run, efficient and non-polluting sources of electricity, as well as a financial boon to Calvert County. Their industrial profile is low, while their community involvement is high. (0004-2 [Arndt, Gunter])

Comment: I have been a resident of Calvert County for 64 years, and served on the County's Planning Commission for 12 years and the State Critical Areas Commission for 8 years, In spite of all the dire predictions and debates prior to its construction, Calvert Cliffs has proven to be a good neighbor; clean, safe and beneficial to our County. (0016-1 [Zahniser, Albert])

Comment: Calvert Cliffs, the State of Maryland's only nuclear power plant, has maintained an exceptional record of safety, is a significant regional employer, source of local tax revenue, environmental steward, and contributor to the economic prosperity of Southern Maryland, and has proven to be a good corporate citizen in Calvert County and the regional community. (0023-1 [Hodge, Gary])

Comment: I'm here to speak on behalf of my belief that the plant is an important part of our economic and environmental and energy future for this community. (0024-102 [McGough, Mike])

Comment: [F]or the past 30 years, Calvert Cliffs has proven to be a caring and committed corporate citizen in Calvert County. (0024-11 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: I have always been and continue to be perfectly comfortable with the safety record of the plant and the ability of the NRC to oversee and monitor the project and plant operations. (0024-17 [Kelley, Linda])

Comment: Calvert Cliffs employees are our constituents and they continue to be a good neighbor. I think that 30 years of outstanding service has certainly got to count for something. (0024-19 [Kelley, Linda])

Comment: Calvert Cliffs has been a reliable generator of electricity in Maryland for many years and we hope it will continue to do so for many more. (0024-27 [Kanaley, Mike])

Comment: I know there's a lot of what ifs that come into play when you're talking about nuclear power, but I know the facts and the facts are that [for] the last 30 years, Calvert Cliffs has had a stellar energy and safety record. (0024-30 [McClure, Deborah])

Comment: Constellation takes their environmental management of the property located here very seriously and we have seen them keep up with the safety regulations year after year. I know that this has been a better place since they came here 30 years ago by diversifying our population, creating good jobs, and adding significantly to our community in charitable ways. (0024-31 [McClure, Deborah])

Comment: We truly appreciate our longstanding relationship with Constellation Energy and through that relationship, we're very confident that they share our commitment to safeguarding the health of our community. (0024-48 [Schlager, Robert])

Comment: Calvert Cliffs has been a keystone of our community. Volunteerism, strengthening the tax base, and their charitable work, particularly with the United Way, is noteworthy. (0024-52 [Garrett, Nick])

Comment: As the EDC (Calvert County Economic Development Commission) chair, I am unequivocally -- I can unequivocally state that we have historically supported the Calvert Cliffs. Constellation has a significant corporate presence and is an outstanding partner in our community. (0024-73 [Pope, Nate])

Comment: From an economic development standpoint, the presence of Calvert Cliffs is significant. Before Calvert Cliffs, Calvert County was one of the poorest counties in the state of Maryland. Today, Calvert Cliffs' impact continues to resonate through our job creation, revenue paid to the county, and notable financial and volunteer contributions. (0024-74 [Pope, Nate])

Comment: [T]he Unistar commitment to using the most efficient, safe and tested technology available, the fact that Constellation Energy has shown management excellence and expertise and an outstanding safety record, that there has been both economic and social benefit not only in Calvert County but throughout Southern Maryland and in the state of Maryland, and they have brought 800 employees here for the current Calvert Cliffs operation who are important members of our community. (0024-92 [Scarafia, Bill])

Comment: They [Constellation and Unistar] are good neighbors and good for our community. (0025-104 [Chambers, Kelly])

Comment: Constellation Energy has proven itself to be a good corporate citizen, a steward of the environment, and a responsible member of our community. the public can expect that the proposed new plant would continue to follow in that tradition. (0025-108 [Hodge, Gary])

Comment: Now is the time for our country to build more nuclear powerplants to enable us to generate electricity with a clean, safe, and dependable source of power. (0025-124 [Walther, Robert])

Comment: Calvert Cliffs has been a reliable generator for electricity for Maryland for many years, and we hope it will continue to do so for many more in the future. (0025-125 [Walther, Robert])

Comment: By all indications, the current plant has had minimal environmental impact, and has probably prevented other development that would have. (0025-134 [Sinclair, Jim])

Comment: The existing facility has been a good, corporate citizen, and I expect the new plant will be the same. (0025-136 [Sinclair, Jim])

Comment: [F]or the past 30 years Calvert Cliffs has proven to be a caring and committed corporate citizen in Calvert County. We possess the knowledge of the plant's safety, operating history. We know their dedication to public safety, and we witness their environmental and community commitment every day. (0025-14 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: Calvert County will continue to stand by Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Powerplant, Constellation Energy, and Unistar, as we have done in the past. (0025-15 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: [W]e know Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Powerplant. We consider them a responsible and important member of our business community. (0025-174 [Tarhan, Diane])

Comment: Constellation is an outstanding corporate entity here, and they pump millions of dollars into the local, regional, and state economy every year. (0025-25 [Martins, Darren])

Comment: The Unistar environmental report, although quite lengthy, indicates minimal environmental impact. Given our history with the plant and the fact that no significant findings occurred during the relicensing process, we agree with this finding. (0025-29 [Martins, Darren])

Comment: [W]e ask that you remember what an outstanding partner Constellation has been to our community, and what a contributor they have been to our economy. But, most importantly, remember their consistent and continued commitment to the environment. (0025-30 [Martins, Darren])

Comment: [T]he process will be rigorous as you take a look at the various impacts that the expansion of this plant will have in your neighborhood. And I believe that those impacts and those studies will note the very strong public safety and environmental stewardship credentials, which Constellation Energy has demonstrated not only to your community here but to our community to the north, and to your communities to the south. (0025-34 [Burton, Bob])

Comment: As far as Constellation Energy, we are confident in a number of factors there --the management and the expertise of the company. If you look at the safety record for the initiatives that they have undertaken, we are very proud to have them as a member of our community. Their corporate citizenship, their environmental performance, are all records that we would hold as a standard to anyone who wanted to enter this market. (0025-81 [Scarafia, Bill])

Response: *These comments express support for the existing units at the site. They do not provide specific information relating to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS. They are listed to compile a complete record of comments received.*

25. General Comments in Opposition of the Licensing Action

Comment: Subsidized expansion of nuclear power competes with and undermines development and expansion of clean renewable energy. (0005-30 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: I am convinced that the negative benefits of a new reactor would strongly outweigh the positive benefits. (0007-1 [Shannahan, Brittany])

Comment: As a taxpayer and a buyer of power in the State of Maryland, I know that portions of this cost [of the 3rd reactor] will end up coming out of my pocket, and I protest strongly. (0020-4 [Donn, Marjory])

Comment: the Public Service Commission and the Maryland Energy Administration estimate that by 2011, we could be seeing blackouts and brownouts in the state because of our demand for electricity. At the same time, many ratepayers in the state have seen their utility rates skyrocket. However, we don't think that that is reason to build a new nuclear power plant in Maryland. (0024-33 [Neumann, Johanna])

Comment: I want to bring forth some issues that are cautionary for the citizens here because the risks of being in a community with a nuclear power plant are your risks. You are taking this burden on for the rest of the state and in so doing, you know, which is very generous of the people here, the question is, is it a risk that has benefit to it? And I don't think so. (0024-61 [Dubois, Gwen])

Comment: I would urge us not to be rushing to approve the construction of another large reactor on this congested peninsula. (0024-70 [Dubois, Gwen])

Comment: I feel that we should not even be considering an expansion of nuclear power at Calvert Cliffs, because we will only be feeding the whole issue of increasing supply, without dealing adequately with the demand side. (0025-163 [Hunter, Theresa])

Comment: I feel that before we give approval to an expansion of a source of energy that is, in the end, very -- potentially very environmentally destructive, that we ought to look at ways to decrease our demand in the first place. (0025-164 [Hunter, Theresa])

Comment: [I]n this case, the schedule seems to be driven more by Unistar's desire to get its plants built with taxpayer-backed loan guarantees than its readiness to build a reactor. (0025-42 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: As nuclear energy is considered one of the most expensive and we don't know what to do with the highly deadly waste, please don't allow any more nuclear reactors to be built. (0027-2 [Dufay, Frank])

Response: *These comments express opposition to the applicant's COL application. They do not provide specific information relating to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS. They are listed to compile a complete record of comments received.*

26. General Comments in Opposition of Nuclear Power

Comment: Any potential leaks, spills or accidents - whatever the likelihood - will be so catastrophic for Calvert Cliffs (and Maryland in general) that it would be wiser to prevent any increase in the presence of nuclear power in our state. (0007-4 [Shannahan, Brittany])

Comment: [T]he enrichment of uranium is the same process whether it be to produce fuel for nuclear energy or to produce weapons grade materials. (0024-58 [Dubois, Gwen])

Comment: [T]he reprocessing of spent fuel is how you separate plutonium and it's the same plutonium whether it's fuel from a nuclear power plant or it's the weapons grade material that was the material that the Nagasaki bomb was built from. (0024-59 [Dubois, Gwen])

Comment: We have to choice to make. It's a big balancing act. You know, we are just now becoming aware of the fact that we are releasing a lot of pollutants into the environment. We are changing the basic biochemistry and the biology and physics of the plant at an ever-accelerating rate, and we are starting to lose the species. We are losing our biological heritage. And we are producing a background -- a biological and chemical background --that is entirely foreign to that in which we evolved. (0025-112 [Johnston, Bill])

Comment: We don't know what to do with nuclear waste - the only thing it's good for is killing people and everything else. (0027-1 [Dufay, Frank])

Comment: I fear for my safety and that of my family and neighbors. Nuclear waste is one of the greatest threats of all. The NRC MUST look at it seriously. (0029-1 [Be, Maya])

Response: *These comments express opposition to nuclear power in general. They do not provide specific information relating to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS. They are listed to compile a complete record of comments received.*

27. Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope – Emergency Preparedness

Comment: The problem I have is that the Calvert County Commissioners has let growth in the county go wild!! And there is no way that the evac[uation] plan will work in this county. There is so many people living here the roads should have been up graded long time ago. (0002-1 [Boswell, William])

Comment: Is there going to be a way out if something would happen? The way out the roads and the bridges will not take the load it will be grid lock. Come look at our roads and see at rush hour how bad it gets. That's what I'm afraid of. Let me know how they are going to fix that. Thank you. Show me the plan that works for all. I'm a retired firefighter so I understand to get the people out if something happens at the plant. (0002-3 [Boswell, William])

Comment: Few counties in the US are as dependent on a single arterial as Calvert County is on MD 2/4. This circumstance also affects the problem the operator and local authorizes would face trying to evacuate large numbers of people. (0005-7 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: NAACPCCB [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Calvert County Branch] would also like to see formal training programs conducted county wide on emergency preparedness in the event of a leak (aka Three Mile Island) or other emergency. Regular drills (annually) would also seem to be in order. (0017-5 [Brown, Jr., Edsell])

Comment: Since the county only has one major route (Route 2/4) to exit the county, what type of integrated exit strategy does Constellation Energy and Public Officials (county, state, federal) have for citizens of the county. (0017-6 [Brown, Jr., Edsel])

Comment: Constellation Energy must demonstrate that it has coordinated its safety plans with both Police and Fire Departments at all levels of government (county, state, federal). (0017-8 [Brown, Jr., Edsel])

Comment: There is one highway to and from the nuclear power plant and no escape route from the South. What measures will you put in place to ensure an escape route for the population of people in the Southern part of the county? What access route will you use? (0018-5 [Mackall, Kimberly])

Comment: The main conduits out of the zone are route 2/4 and the Thomas Johnson Bridge. Local residents have been quick to point out that traffic on 2/4 and the Johnson Bridge are slow on a good day. The EIS should examine what the result would be of entire communities frantically attempting to exit the zone simultaneously. (0019-24 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: The EIS should address the impact of a simultaneous and spontaneous evacuation of communities well beyond the ten mile emergency planning zone on the orderly and timely evacuation of the current ten mile planning zone. (0019-25 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: The EIS should address the plans--and current lack of plans--to distribute protective Potassium Iodide pills to people living within 20 miles of Calvert Cliffs per Section 127 of Public Law 107- 188 as entitled "The Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness Act" passed in 2002. (0019-26 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: The EIS should describe Calvert Cliff-3's backup power systems for emergency public notification sirens and address how the utility will ensure compliance with the requirement that it can reliably and promptly notify members of the public in the event of an accident and concurrent loss of onsite/offsite power without overburdening other first responders with time consuming mobile route alerting duties. (0019-27 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: The EIS should describe how the emergency plan for Calvert Cliffs has or has not incorporated the likelihood of role delay and/or role abandonment by critical emergency plan personnel as the result of an attrition of an uncertain percentage of first responders due to their attending to personal and family responsibilities first. (0019-28 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: Our hospital has had a longstanding positive relationship with Constellation Energy and the leaders of Calvert Cliffs. Both our physicians and Emergency Department staff are trained to respond in the event of a radiation emergency and we conduct annual reviews and emergency preparedness with Constellation to ensure a continual state of readiness. (0024-45 [Schlager, Robert])

Comment: We've recently completed a \$33 million hospital expansion project which includes the renovated and expanded Emergency Department with a three-stage decontamination area capable of treating 50 patients per hour, a new Intensive Care Unit and additional patient beds. We have sufficient capacity now where we could handle an influx of construction or other workforce that may occur as a result of this project, heaven forbid that, of course. In addition, the new decontamination center, coupled with our existing center and a portable unit which is

housed onsite, will give us the capacity of handling up to a 110 patients per hour. (0024-46 [Schlager, Robert])

Comment: We have formal memorandums of understanding with St. Mary's Hospital down in Leonardtown, with Sophista Medical Center in La Plata, and several area tertiary hospital centers to facilitate transfer of patients, personnel, equipment, and supplies in the event of any large-scale emergency. We also participate in the Maryland Incident Management System and we are FEMA-certified for nuclear response. (0024-47 [Schlager, Robert])

Comment: [O]n an annual basis, we set the transportation infrastructure priorities and our regional priority is the Thomas Johnson Bridge. This is not only a priority for Calvert County but it's a priority for the tricounty region. (0024-5 [Parran, Wilson])

Comment: Here in Maryland, residents of Lusby, within 10 miles of the evacuation zone for Calvert Cliffs, as far as I understand, received no safety instruction packets until December 2007, a day before some public hearings that I attended late last year. (0024-65 [Dubois, Gwen])

Comment: I know that there's a shortage of beds and a recently reported shortage of doctors in Southern Maryland. This area is the area that has the greatest shortage of physicians in the state of Maryland and meanwhile the population is really growing here. (0024-66 [Dubois, Gwen])

Comment: I figure 54,000 residents in the area and I'm sure it's higher now, and there's inadequate escape routes for this peninsula community. There's a bridge to the south, as you all know better than I, and the 2-4 road north which I'm getting better acquainted with, and I understand that at rush hour, there are problems just on a regular day. (0024-67 [Dubois, Gwen])

Comment: After an accident, will hospital staff still be at the hospital or will they be -- some will be evacuating with the rest of the population. The latest estimate of a meltdown accident, what the mortality and morbidity would be, unfortunately, is very old. It's the CRAC Report from 1982, but they estimated for each unit injuries of 15,000 each and fatalities up to 5,600 each. Now whether that's accurate or not, that's the latest report that I've seen. (0024-69 [Dubois, Gwen])

Comment: Let's distribute potassium iodine. Let us develop better evacuation plans and have drills for people who live in Lusby. (0024-71 [Dubois, Gwen])

Comment: [E]vacuations have also been mentioned today, and there's been some confidence expressed in the ability to safely evacuate the residents of the surrounding region if there is an accident at Calvert Cliffs, and I would just point people to the map in the lobby that Public Citizen has prepared showing the bottlenecks, including the bridge right here, that could complicate or even prevent an effective evacuation. (0024-83 [Kamps, Kevin])

Comment: I would also point out that at the FEMA meeting that was held about Calvert Cliffs last December, it became pretty clear that the distribution program for potassium iodide has a lot of problems in this area. The FEMA representative did not even know where the potassium iodide is stored on a local basis and I do have some potassium iodide with me today, if anyone's interested to get some, especially for their family, because the distribution of this safety precaution in the area does not seem to be organized. (0024-87 [Kamps, Kevin])

Comment: [T]he evacuation plan, even though I could never get anyone from the government to tell me this, would be to go across the Thomas Johnson Bridge. Any of you that live in Calvert County, or in St. Mary's County for that fact, and come over here realize what a bottleneck that is? (0025-156 [Boxwell, Bob])

Comment: I'm glad to hear that we're looking at ... the expansion of the bridge or whatever else was going to be done. I want the impact statement to look at what the timing is for that compared to what the timing is for the plant going online. I think they probably coincide with each other, and that brings us to the perfect storm where we have the bridge closed down because we are constructing it, meanwhile we've got the brand-new plant coming up and we've got the old plants there. (0025-157 [Boxwell, Bob])

Comment: I've also noticed St. Mary's County got a grant to put up evacuation signs to help their residents in case there is a problem there. Is Calvert County looking into that? (0025-158 [Boxwell, Bob])

Comment: We conduct several CALVEX drills every year, and that's where the whole conglomeration of counties in this area have disaster preparedness programs put together. We had a mock drill -- I don't know -- probably around October, and then we had a full-fledged drill somewhere around December. I might make note that the -- all of the counties got high marks in trying to prepare for certain types of disasters, whether it be an incident at Calvert Cliffs, whether it be a hurricane, tornado, or some other natural disaster. (0025-19 [Russell, Jack])

Comment: [W]e, as a region, are working with the State of Maryland to enhance the capabilities of the Thomas Johnson Bridge. (0025-20 [Russell, Jack])

Comment: In the area of public safety, with additional resources available to public safety, they will be able to address issues of importance to your local community, not only in terms of day-to-day emergency and other public safety concerns that arise, but in the unfortunate circumstance anything should happen that's on a broader scale, those resources will be there to do it. (0025-39 [Burton, Bob])

Comment: I actually drove over the Thomas Johnson Bridge today for the first time, this morning on my way here, and I can't imagine that being a major evacuation route, but maybe you folks who live closer, you know, know something I don't know. (0025-54 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: [T]he regional priority for Calvert County and for the other two counties -- that's Charles and St. Mary's, and there is 100 percent support for this -- is the Thomas Johnson Bridge. And this priority is one where the State of Maryland Department of Transportation has already started with the initial design study in terms of the Thomas Johnson Bridge and what is needed going forward. (0025-6 [Parran, Wilson])

Response: *NRC evaluates emergency preparedness as part of its safety evaluation of the proposed action. The comments on emergency preparedness are outside the scope of the EIS and will not be evaluated in the EIS. They are listed to compile a complete record of comments received.*

28. Comments Concerning Issues Outside of Scope – Miscellaneous

Comment: CCMBBA [Calvert County Minority Business Alliance] would like to ensure that new job opportunities and career advancement opportunities for current employees be communicated to the community stakeholders. Current practices and plans for hiring, education and development, and career advancement should be reported. Current employee breakouts should show how many minorities by race are employed at the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant as well as by position and levels of management. Training plans should also be communicated to the community, because a highly qualified and trained workforce must be

maintained in order to ensure our community's safety. It is noted that Constellation Energy does have an online job database, however, the overall plans and practices should be communicated to effectively understand the socio economic impacts on the community. (0013-1 [Tucker, Dawn])

Comment: It is requested that Constellation Energy and Unistar communicate contracting opportunities at Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant as well as any specialized training that is required. ... CCMBA requests that the Supplier Diversity Program be extended to the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant if it currently is not already being administered at this location for the proposed 3rd reactor project and current procurement needs similar to those highlighted by BGE. Also, CCMBA asks for the commitment from Unistar/Constellation and its prime contractors to use local businesses and local minority businesses first whenever possible. It is noted that Bechtel Power Corporation, a global engineering, construction and project management company, partners with Unistar/Constellation Energy to build its Nuclear Power Plants and again wherever possible CCMBA asks that local and minority businesses be provided the information and technical assistance to support securing subcontract opportunities. A status report of local businesses that are doing business with Calvert Cliffs should also be provided. This report should also be updated on regular basis, i.e. quarterly, semi annually or annually to track and communicate progress. (0013-2 [Tucker, Dawn])

Comment: NAACPCCB [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Calvert County Branch] would like to view a plan of action of any and all Community Development Projects Constellation Energy has outlined as it readies development for the 3rd reactor. (0017-10 [Brown, Jr., Edsel])

Comment: NAACPCCB [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Calvert County Branch] is concerned about employment at Calvert Cliffs, especially as it relates to minority and women staffing levels. NAACPCCB would like to review current and planned staffing plans for the facility. This would include a breakdown of existing staffing levels (both managerial and non-managerial), as well as those planned for the new reactor. It is of utmost importance that the facility demonstrate its commitment to diversity. As a leading employer in the county, it must lead by example. (0017-11 [Brown, Jr., Edsel])

Comment: The development of Calvert Cliffs to include a new reactor will be a major development project. It is essential that Constellation Energy provide an outline of how it plans to make sure that minority and women contractors get a fair share of the contracting opportunities. NAACPCCB [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Calvert County Branch] would like to be included in any distribution list of procurement opportunities. In addition, NAACPCCB would like Constellation to consider the development of a Mentor-Protege Program to assist small firms in developing their capabilities. (0017-12 [Brown, Jr., Edsel])

Comment: There was a recent law suit filed against the power plant by African American employees due to racism, discriminatory practices, and no opportunity for growth to management. How are you ensuring non-discriminatory practices? What are your procedures for the recruitment of minority employees in executive senior, middle, and entry level management and non management positions? Do you currently implement succession planning? Please advise the number of African Americans in the various levels of management listed above. Do you have a diversity initiative? If so, please explain how it's implemented. If no, what are you doing to ensure a diverse working environment? How many employees are at the Calvert location? How many African Americans? How many African Americans are in management? How many African American women? (0018-11 [Mackall, Kimberly])

Comment: Do you currently have any partnerships in place to empower or give back to the community that you reside? Do you currently have education initiatives with the local schools, vocational or technical schools, or local colleges and/or Historically Black Colleges and Universities? (0018-12 [Mackall, Kimberly])

Comment: How will you keep civic groups, non profits, and faith based organizations aware and informed of the answers to questions outlined in this letter and other letters given to you by community entities? If you are granted the opportunity to build the reactor how will you keep the community leaders informed? (0018-13 [Mackall, Kimberly])

Response: *These comments relate to the applicant's business practices. NRC's authority to regulate the applicant's business practices is limited to activities affecting nuclear safety. The comments do not implicate nuclear safety and will not be evaluated in the EIS. They are listed to compile a complete record of comments received.*

Comment: Given that the work at the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant is technical in nature and that Calvert County is the home of energy projects conducted by companies such as Dominion Cove, Southern Maryland Electric Company (SMECO), and PEPSCO it is imperative and crucial that K-12, collegiate and post graduate studies continue to develop and incorporate curriculums that will support a technical workforce and business community. This requires coordination between the educational systems, the local, state and federal government, and the private sector. It is noted that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission administers a Nuclear Power Educational Program. A consortium of stakeholders should be developed with representatives from community organizations, academia, the private sector and government officials. A proactive approach of developing effective programs must be instituted to help support the unique needs of developing a qualified and capable labor pool. (0013-3 [Tucker, Dawn])

Comment: If construction begins next year, freshmen students at our high schools, local high schools, will be ready to matriculate in this field, potentially with career opportunities at Calvert Cliffs, recognizing this today will help create jobs for citizens in the future. (0025-4 [Parran, Wilson])

Response: *These comments relate to career and educational opportunities. The comments do not provide specific information relating to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS. They are listed to compile a complete record of comments received.*

Comment: At present, the US imports more than 70% of the U-235-enriched uranium used to power most of its nuclear power plants. The EIS needs to evaluate the risks of depending on such imported nuclear fuel, and to consider the tradeoffs and impacts in expanding uranium mining in the US. (0005-24 [Vogt, Peter])

Response: *This comment relates to the risks of importing versus mining uranium in the United States for power plant use. This comment does not provide specific information relating to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS. It is listed to compile a complete record of comments received.*

Comment: [A] part of our strategic mission for our armed forces is to protect what's in our economic security, our available ability to bring oil and natural gas into the United States to continue building our economy. It's a large part of what they do, and I think that we owe it to them who serve, without question, where they're told to go, when they want to go, that we're

willing to take some of the proceeds from drawing down troops as we build the next generation -
- nuclear generation facilities in this country. (0025-146 [McGarvey, Sean])

Comment: [W]e're spending hundreds of billions of dollars, and whole scores of people's lives are being affected, by their service to this country. We owe it to them to go through these processes and see if it's viable and safe to build these next generation powerplants that protect the environment and generate the power which can continue the economic growth that is crucial to this area of the country and the whole United States. (0025-147 [McGarvey, Sean])

Response: *These comments appear to express support for the Armed Services and for the proposed nuclear power plant. Because they do not supply information related to environmental impacts of the plant, they will not be addressed in the EIS.*

Comment: We all know that radiation is a hazardous material. What will you do to ensure a healthier community? How will you educate the entire community and schools about radiation and a healthier environment? How will you reach all of these areas? (0018-6 [Mackall, Kimberly])

Comment: What will you do to ease concerns about radiation scares? (0018-8 [Mackall, Kimberly])

Response: *These comments express concern over the use of radioactive materials in general. They do not provide specific information relating to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS. They are listed to compile a complete record of comments received. However, NRC provides information about radioactive materials and the NRC's regulations that protect workers and the public from radiation exposure on its Web site at www.nrc.gov*

29. Comments Concerning Outside Scope – NRC Oversight

Comment: Many question the safety of nuclear power plants because of the culture of the NRC. (0024-62 [Dubois, Gwen])

Comment: [T]he NRC turned over the investigation of the problem of the sleeping workers to the very managers who allowed the guards to be unmonitored in the first place. Not until the same whistleblower sent recordings of the sleeping guards to a TV station in New York did the NRC pledge to review how it handled the complaint. (0024-63 [Dubois, Gwen])

Response: *The comments do not provide specific information relating to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS. They are listed to compile a complete record of comments received.*

Comment: [Y]ou should include a site redress plan, to address the activities that would be required to restore the site to its present state, in the case that Unistar decides to pursue the project, or simply deny the issuance of a COL. (0025-92 [Fisher, Allison])

Response: *The NRC regulations do not require a site redress plan for COL applicants or holders except to redress activities conducted under a Limited Work Authorization (LWA) pursuant to 10 CFR 50.10. The applicant has not requested an LWA; therefore the comment is outside of the scope of the EIS.*

30. Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope – Safety

Comment: The use by some opponents of nuclear power of terms like "Chernobyl on the Chesapeake" is a baseless scare tactic to intimidate residents which ignores the enormous conceptual design differences between the Chernobyl reactors and reactors in the USA. (0004-1 [Arndt, Gunter])

Comment: I consider the likelihood of a major accident extremely small: I spent a week within less than 100 ft of a reactor on NR-1 and was never concerned about safety. However, we are getting a mixed message: If nuclear power plants are so safe, why was it necessary to renew the Price-Anderson Act yet again? When first passed (1957) it made sense, but was meant for just a decade. When a clearly mature industry-now more than a half century old-still requires the Federal Government to underwrite insurance, something is clearly wrong. (0005-1 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: [R]isks of rare but catastrophic events are usually under-estimated, due to data paucity, i.e. rarity. In the case of even the EXISTING two reactors at Calvert Cliffs, the visitor center was closed only AFTER 9/11. Yet the RISK did not increase as a result of 9/11. It was the nuclear industry's ESTIMATION of the risk which had increased. (0005-2 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: The final area that CCMBBA [Calvert County Minority Business Alliance] would like to address encompasses training, safety and communications. It is critical that training and safety plans be effectively communicated to the community - which includes Calvert County, Southern MD, and the state of Maryland. Communication of opportunities and timelines prior to, during and after the 3rd Nuclear Reactor's application is approved or denied must be established in order to be prepared and proactive to the requirements needed to support the development of energy resources. (0013-4 [Tucker, Dawn])

Comment: To date, Constellation Energy has had a fairly solid track record of safety with the existing two reactors at Calvert Cliffs. Again, with a 3 rd reactor, the potential for accident increases by 33%. Constellation Energy must outline its safety procedures for the reactors. (0017-3 [Brown, Jr., Edsel])

Comment: What are your safety standards? How will you ensure safety standards? (0018-7 [Mackall, Kimberly])

Comment: In order to evaluate the shaking risk to a potential new reactor, the EIS needs to be based on 1) an up-to-date study of historical seismicity in the reactor region, and 2) a geologic assessment of potentially active earthquake faults in the vicinity. At any place on earth, the weaker the shock, the more frequent it will be. Since it is large-magnitude earthquakes relatively close to the site that are relevant to potential damage, the EIS needs to establish the likelihood of a given level of ground shaking being exceeded within the expected lifetime of the reactor (say, 60 years). Earthquake seismology has advanced so greatly in recent years that the EIS should not rely on dated analyses. (0019-34 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: [T]he experience that I've had in working at nuclear power plants with operating and new construction is that the standards and the processes and the materials that go into building those plants are the highest standards in the world. (0024-105 [Karbowsky, Brad])

Comment: Those containment sump issues that are well known in the industry were already addressed by Constellation Energy in Calvert Cliffs Units 1 and over the last two outages. (0024-120 [Vanderheyden, George])

Comment: I realize the hazardous potentials of the power plants and of the areas, but I also know that the safety there is very great. Right now, I work at a fossil fuel power plant and the safety there is no where near what the safety is at Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant. (0024-55 [Parran, Wilson L.])

Comment: Recently, the NRC has come under criticism by the Office of the Inspector General for failing to document how safety inspections support recertification of 13 aging power plants, and in addition, there's the issue of the sump pumps and Calvert Cliffs has sump pumps that we know since 1996 have the potential for becoming clogged if there's a leak of water suddenly. It can chip off paint and clog these sump pumps and the NRC has allowed the power plants, including Calvert Cliffs, to take a long time in replacing these and so my understanding is those sump pumps, they're still there. So, there are known safety problems. (0024-64 [Dubois, Gwen])

Comment: Let's make the data for recertification of Calvert Cliffs 1 and 2 available to the public, so we begin to feel more comfortable living in a community with aging power plants before we build another. (0024-72 [Dubois, Gwen])

Comment: [W]e're the design that has four 100 percent redundant safe trains. Many of you know the current designs have two 100 percent redundant safety trains. We have built a 400 percent safety margin into this design. (0025-170 [Vanderheyden, George])

Comment: I'm struck by the short memories of some of the elected officials around here who seem to forget that Calvert Cliffs was closed for more than a year in the 1980s for safety violations. The words that the NRC used at the time were putting power production above safety, and that cost local ratepayers \$400,000 a day for more than a year. (0025-44 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: I personally have worked in nuclear plants, both operating and building new ones, and I can attest to the safety and the quality control when it comes to building those plants. And I can stand here and say that nowhere in any construction industry, the nuclear industry regulates the construction of those plants more highly, and watches over the construction of them. (0025-79 [Karbowsky, Brad])

Response: *These comments express opinions about nuclear safety. The staff will prepare a Safety Evaluation Report to document its review of safety issues. However, the comments do not provide specific information relating to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS. They are included to compile a complete record of comments received.*

31. Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Security and Terrorism

Comment: The EIS also needs to evaluate the risk and potential impacts from terrorist attacks on high voltage corridors. Although obviously no radioactivity release would be involved, these present relatively 'soft', not regularly patrolled targets, and effect large, even if relatively short-lived (how long?) disruptions in power, should a tower or two be blown up. Obviously shorter corridors with better visibility from adjacent roads would offer lower risks. (0005-18 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: Calvert Cliffs is already a high-profile potential target, located less than 50 miles from the White House. The proposed 1600 MW reactor would also be the largest in the US, and together with the other two would create one of our very largest US nuclear power plants. Add to that its proximity (4 miles!) to the recently enlarged Dominion Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) terminal storage facility and its proximity (9 miles) to the large-and further enlarged in recent

years, as a result of BRAC- Patuxent River Naval Air Station, and you would probably have one of the, if not the, most attractive terrorist targets in the US. The largest US reactor, also closest to the US capitol! (0005-3 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: You will probably also conclude that most potential attacks would be readily thwarted-with the possible exception of a large passenger or freight jetliner flown into a reactor. However, you owe it to the public to say how much this security costs, compared to the security required for a fossil fuel plant of the same MW. What I urge you to calculate is the societal and \$\$ impact from a FAILED attack, which is of course far more probable than a successful one. Public and investor confidence are highly volatile, and the economic and sociopolitical impact of a foiled terrorist attack on Calvert Cliffs could be enormous. What is the dollar worth of a 10% decline in Calvert real estate as a result of such a failed/foiled attack? (0005-5 [Vogt, Peter])

Comment: Constellation Energy must outline its safety procedures for the reactors, including possible terrorist activity. Calvert Cliffs is the closed nuclear facility to Washington, DC and offers a very attractive target for those that would like to make a political statement in the metro DC area. Constellation Energy must document that it will have adequate security personnel to safeguard its facility as well as the citizens of the surrounding area. (0017-4 [Brown, Jr., Edsel])

Comment: An accident or attack that sinks a barge carrying high-level radioactive waste would spell unprecedented catastrophe for the Bay. (0019-11 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: The EIS should address the potential consequences of a jumbo jet assault on Calvert Cliffs-3, taking into consideration the leaked Electricite de France report indicating the EPR design is vulnerable to aircraft crashes. (0019-21 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: Without revealing actual safeguards information, the EIS should address the procedures and safeguards Constellation/Unistar intends to use to ensure that personnel working on the Calvert Cliffs-3 reactor do not have access to restricted areas at the operating Calvert Cliffs 1 and 2 reactors. (0019-32 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: The EIS should address the potential adverse environmental impacts from a successful malevolent act involving a significant release of radiation from Units 1 & 2 on the safe operation of the new co-located unit. (0019-33 [Mariotte, Michael])

Comment: Then, there is the danger of radioactivity being spread by an accident or a terrorist attack. We should be phasing out our use of nuclear power, not building more easy targets. (0020-7 [Donn, Marjory])

Comment: Our concern is, is that, an aircraft attack, be it by large commercial aircraft or even by private aircraft that are laden with explosive, could have a very real and dire consequence on the operation of Unit 3 and as a consequence, it should be raised in the environmental impact statement for Unit 3. (0024-100 [Gunter, Paul])

Comment: I don't think that we should be playing 50-50 odds when we are looking at our national security policy, the public health not only for Calvert County, not only for Maryland, but for the entire Eastern Seaboard. (0024-101 [Gunter, Paul])

Comment: [Unistar has selected] the design that has a dual containment building on it. I talked about that from the perspective of what many Americans are concerned about today and Paul and others have expressed, that since 9/11, we have to take into account the fact that terrorists

might use an airplane in ways that we never envisioned before in this country. (0024-112 [Vanderheyden, George])

Comment: We have double containments on this design. We are the only design that will prove to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, I believe, that we are able to take a direct hit from a jumbo aircraft, the words that have been used today, from private aircraft filled with explosives and other types of things. We will have to produce for the NRC, as a matter of fact we will produce for the NRC above the regulatory requirements 3-D models and actual design information to prove that fact. (0024-114 [Vanderheyden, George])

Comment: [W]e encourage the NRC to expand the scope of their environmental impact statement to consider a greater scope of safety. In particular, you know, we live in a world right now where the reality of a jumbo jet aerial assault is an unfortunate reality but it's a reality nonetheless and we need to make sure that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission considers that as they move forward in this proceeding. (0024-35 [Neumann, Johanna])

Comment: [G]iven the location of Calvert Cliffs so close to the Nation's Capital, so close to the state's capital, I would urge the NRC to take the terrorist threat seriously and to look at those risks. (0024-91 [Kamps, Kevin])

Comment: [T]he environmental impact statement that's being proposed right now, we believe that it should include a full analysis and evaluation of the impacts of aircraft and the hazard that we now face, the threat that we now face with regard to 9/11. (0024-98 [Gunter, Paul])

Comment: The agency and a lot of what we've heard tonight have touted that this process is transparent. We truly would like to see a transparent process that fully evaluates the threat as we see it. However, the facts are that on December 18th, 2002, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission by order said that no security contentions would be addressed in any of its licensing proceedings. (0024-99 [Gunter, Paul])

Comment: [I]n a post-9/11 world, this environmental impact statement for Calvert Cliffs Unit 3 must consider the environmental impacts arising out of aircraft attack on the reactor complex. (0025-148 [Gunter, Paul])

Comment: In 2002, the NRC issued a blanket order stating that it will not consider such consequences in any of its licensing proceedings. Subsequent to that order, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled on June 2, 2006, that NRC failed to comply with NEPA and, in fact, must consider the environmental consequences of acts of malice in its environmental review as required for major federal actions. We contend that it is within the scope of this EIS for NRC to include an analysis and the environmental consequences arising from documented security concerns posed by this federal action at the existing [Units 1&2] nuclear power station. (0025-149 [Gunter, Paul])

Comment: [T]he environmental review lacks an aircraft impacts hazards analysis and consequence arising from single or multiple private aircraft strikes laden with fuel, and high explosives, and the consequential impact on the operations of this proposed Unit 3. (0025-150 [Gunter, Paul])

Comment: Subsequent to the 9/11 attacks, NRC now claims to have conducted further study, which provides industry and agency confidence that a deliberate aircraft attack and impact poses no significant hazard to the environment and the surrounding populations. However, the NRC views this affirming documentation too sensitive to be made public. The agency's logic

and actions are irrational. NRC should make available documentation in this EIS that might substantiate its claims and refute findings and conclusions regarding reactor vulnerability documented in publicly available NRC technical studies and industry documents. (0025-151 [Gunter, Paul])

Comment: [W]e contend that it is necessary to include an aircraft impact hazards analysis for the existing Calvert Cliffs Unit 1 and 2 in this EIS for Unit 3. (0025-152 [Gunter, Paul])

Comment: Given Constellation's documented admission of a conservative 50/50 chance of a core melt by aircraft impact, and the failure of the analysis to yield an evaluation for explosive-laden private aircraft, it is irrational to exempt this site from such analysis and exclude the environmental impacts on the operation of Unit 3. (0025-153 [Gunter, Paul])

Comment: [Y]our analyses should include information on the strength of onsite dry storage casks, including whether they are resistant to any projectile that a terrorist group would likely obtain, and the degree of dispersion of radioactivity from such an attack should be mentioned or estimated. (0025-60 [Meadow, Norm])

Comment: [I]f combined with an incendiary attack, then this high-level radioactive waste could escape into the environment, blow downwind, flow downstream, to harm people. (0025-97 [Kamps, Kevin])

Comment: [T]hese facilities are out in the open air. In fact, they're out in plain sight, and they represent radioactive bull's-eyes on the landscape. They are vulnerable to terrorist attack. They are vulnerable to accidents. (0025-99 [Kamps, Kevin])

Response: *These comments relate to terrorism and physical security issues. NRC examined terrorism under NEPA, for license renewal, and found the impacts similar to the impacts of already analyzed severe reactor accidents. However, NRC has a longstanding view that NEPA does not require a terrorism inquiry, and that sensitive security issues are more appropriately evaluated outside the NEPA process. Although the comments are listed to compile a complete record of comments received, the EIS will not include an evaluation of terrorism. Physical security will be addressed in the staff's Safety Evaluation Report.*

Summary

On July 2008, the NRC received the first part of the COL application from UniStar for a new plant to be located adjacent to the existing Calvert Cliffs Units 1 and 2. This part contained the environmental report and was accepted for docketing on January 25, 2008. Through the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and Conduct Scoping Process (73 FR 8719) issued February 14, 2008, the NRC invited the applicant; Federal, Tribal, State, and local government agencies; local organizations; and individuals to participate in the scoping process by providing oral comments at the public meetings and/or submitting written suggestions and comments no later than April 14, 2008. Public scoping meetings were held at the Holiday Inn in Solomons, Maryland. Comments were organized according to topic. Those comments along with the responses prepared by NRC staff are presented in this Scoping Summary Report.

The draft EIS for UniStar's COL application will address the relevant environmental issues raised during the scoping process. The draft EIS will be made available for public comment. Interested Federal, Tribal, State, and local government agencies; local organizations; and members of the public will be given the opportunity to provide comments on the draft EIS that will be considered during the development of the final EIS.