

**Environmental Impact Statement
Scoping Process**

Summary Report

**Grand Gulf Nuclear Station
Combined License
Claiborne County, Mississippi**

November 2008



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

Introduction

On February 27, 2008, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) received an application from Entergy Operations, Inc. (Entergy) for a combined license (COL) to construct and operate Grand Gulf Nuclear Station (GGNS) Unit 3 at the Grand Gulf early site permit (ESP) site, co-located with the existing GGNS Unit 1. The GGNS site is located in Claiborne County, Mississippi, approximately 6 mi northwest of Port Gibson and 25 mi south of Vicksburg.

On April 5, 2007, the NRC issued ESP-002 to System Energy Resources, Inc. for the Grand Gulf ESP site (the site of the currently proposed GGNS Unit 3). An ESP is the NRC approval of a site as suitable for construction and operation of one or more new nuclear units. The NRC's detailed review of the environmental impacts of constructing and operating a new unit at the Grand Gulf ESP site is documented in NUREG-1817, *Environmental Impact Statement for an Early Site Permit (ESP) at the Grand Gulf ESP Site*, published in April 2006. For a COL application that references an ESP, the NRC staff, pursuant to Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) Part 51.75(c), prepares a supplement to the ESP environmental impact statement (EIS) in accordance with 10 CFR 51.92(e).

NRC regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, are contained in 10 CFR 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 51 and 10 CFR 52, Subpart C.

As part of the application, Entergy submitted an environmental report (ER) prepared in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 51. Pursuant to NRC regulations in 10 CFR 51.50(c)(1), a COL applicant referencing an ESP need not submit information or analyses regarding environmental issues that were resolved in the ESP EIS, except to the extent that the COL applicant has identified new and significant information regarding these issues. In addition, pursuant to 10 CFR 52.39, matters resolved in the ESP proceedings are considered to be resolved in any subsequent proceedings, absent identification of new and significant information.

The NRC staff is preparing a supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) to NUREG-1817, the ESP EIS, in support of the COL application review in accordance with NUREG-1555, *Standard Review Plans for Environmental Reviews for Nuclear Power Plants*. In addition, the staff is conducting a safety review of the applicant's combined license application in accordance with NUREG-0800, *Standard Review Plans for the Review of Safety Analysis for Nuclear Power Plants*.

On May 30, 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 31153). The Notice of Intent notified the public of the NRC staff's intent to prepare an SEIS 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 July 29, 2008.

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

- Identify the economic, technical, and other benefits and costs of the proposed action to the extent that the ESP EIS did not include an assessment of these benefits and costs.
- Identify other energy alternatives to the extent that the ESP EIS did not include an assessment of energy alternatives.
- Identify issues related to the impacts of construction and operation of the facility that were not resolved in the ESP proceeding.
- Identify issues related to the impacts of construction and operation that were resolved in the ESP proceeding but where new and significant information exists, including but not limited to, new and significant information demonstrating that the design of the facility falls outside the site characteristics and design parameters specified in the ESP.

Two public scoping meetings were held at the Port Gibson City Hall in Port Gibson, Mississippi, on June 19, 2008. The NRC announced the meeting in local newspapers (Port Gibson Reveille [Port Gibson], The Clarion-Ledger [Jackson], and The Vicksburg Post [Vicksburg]), issued press releases, and distributed flyers locally. Approximately 40 members of the public attended the afternoon scoping meeting, and approximately 55 attended the evening session. The scoping meetings began with an NRC staff presentation that outlined the overall licensing process under 10 CFR Part 52; provided a description of the NEPA review process; discussed the environmental requirements outlined in 10 CFR Part 51; and addressed how these requirements would be implemented during the COL review.

After the NRC's prepared statements, the meeting was opened for public comments. Three afternoon scoping meeting attendees and 11 evening scoping meeting attendees provided either written statements or oral comments that were recorded and transcribed by a certified court reporter. The transcripts can be found under accession numbers ML081910668 and ML081920162 in the NRC's Agency Document Access and Management System (ADAMS), which is accessible from the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html> (the Public Electronic Reading Room) (note that the URL is case-sensitive). A meeting summary was issued on July 17, 2008 and is available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly Available Records component of ADAMS under accession number ML081910673.

At the conclusion of the scoping period, the NRC staff and its contractor reviewed the transcripts of the scoping meetings and all written material received, and identified individual comments. In addition to the two transcripts and four written comment letters handed in at the scoping meetings, two letters and two emails containing comments were received during the scoping period. All comments and suggestions received orally during the scoping meeting or in writing were considered by NRC staff.

Table 1 identifies the individuals providing comments in alphabetical order, their affiliation, if given, the ADAMS accession number that can be used to locate the correspondence, and the correspondence ID used in Table 3 to identify individual comments. Accession numbers indicate the location of the written comments in ADAMS.

Comments were consolidated and categorized according to topic within the proposed SEIS or according to the general topic if outside the scope of the SEIS. Statements with similar specific objectives were combined to capture the common essential issues that were raised in the source comments. Once comments were grouped according to subject area, the staff determined the appropriate responses. 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 the order they are presented in this document with commenter names and comment identification numbers (correspondence ID-comment number) for the comments that were binned into each category. The rest 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 (ADAMS Accession Number)	Correspondence ID
Crisler, Emma	Port Gibson Reveille	Letter (ML081900015)	0007
Davis, J.B.	Citizens For Better Government Consulting Group	Letter (ML081980344)	0006
Davis, Sr., Joseph	Citizens For Better Government Consulting Group	Letter (ML081980344)	0006
Doss, Evan		Meeting Transcript (ML081920162)	0002
Garner, A.C.		Meeting Transcript (ML081920162)	0002
	Citizens For Better Government Consulting Group	Letter (ML081980344)	0006
	Political Action Committee of the Claiborne County NAACP	Letter (ML081980343)	0005
		Meeting Transcript (ML081910668)	0001
Gunter, Paul	Beyond Nuclear	Meeting Transcript (ML081920162)	0002
Hornh, Charlie	Office of Congressman Bennie Thompson	Meeting Transcript (ML081910668)	0001
Hudson, Sr., Trent L.	Jefferson County Board of Supervisors	Letter (ML082190563)	0010
McDonald, Norris	African American Environmentalist Association	Meeting Transcript (ML081910668)	0001
	Center for Environment, Commerce, and Energy	Meeting Transcript (ML081920162)	0002
Monsour, Mitch	Claiborne County Hospital	Meeting Transcript (ML081920162)	0002
Neal, Sr., Ellis	Citizens For Better Government Consulting Group	Letter (ML081980344)	0006
Pullen, Ruth		Email (ML082140044)	0009
		Meeting Transcript (ML081920162)	0002
Pullen, Tom		Meeting Transcript (ML081920162)	0002
Rollins, Avery	Eco-MS	Meeting Transcript (ML081920162)	0002
Rollins, Jackie	Environmental Coalition of MS	Meeting Transcript (ML081920162)	0002
Ross, George E.	Alcorn State University	Meeting Transcript (ML081920162)	0002
		Letter (ML081980341)	0004
Scutter, Clarence	Citizens For Better Government Consulting Group	Letter (ML081980344)	0006
		Meeting Transcript (ML081920162)	0002
Segrest, Phil		Meeting Transcript (ML081920162)	0002
Thompson, Bennie G.	U.S. House of Representatives	Letter (ML081980346)	0003
Wade, Nell		Email (ML082100328)	0008

Table 2. Comment Categories in Order as Presented in this Report

-
1. Comments Concerning Process - COL
 2. Comments Concerning Site Layout and Design
 3. Comments Concerning Socioeconomics
 4. Comments Concerning Environmental Justice
 5. Comments Concerning Accidents - Severe
 6. Comments Concerning the Uranium Fuel Cycle
 7. Comments Concerning the Need for Power
 8. Comments Concerning Alternatives - Energy
 9. Comments Concerning Benefit-Cost Balance
 10. General Comments in Support of the Licensing Action
 11. General Comments of Support of Nuclear Power
 12. General Comments in Support of the Existing Plant
 13. General Comments in Opposition to the Licensing Action
 14. General Comments in Opposition to Nuclear Power
 15. General Comments in Opposition to the Existing Plant
 16. Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Emergency Preparedness
 17. Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Miscellaneous
 18. Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Safety
 19. Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Security and Terrorism
-

Table 3. Comment Categories with Associated Commenters and Comment IDs

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
Process - COL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Horhn, Charlie (0001-5) • Hudson, Sr., Trent L. (0010-1) • Pullen, Ruth (0009-17) • Rollins, Jackie (0002-35) • Thompson, Bennie G. (0003-5)
Site Layout and Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gunter, Paul (0002-22) (0002-24)
Socioeconomics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crisler, Emma (0007-2) • Davis, J.B. (0006-1) (0006-2) (0006-3) (0006-4) • Davis, Sr., Joseph (0006-1) (0006-2) (0006-3) (0006-4) • Doss, Evan (0002-18) (0002-19) • Garner, A.C. (0001-7) (0002-11) (0005-1) (0005-3) (0005-5) (0006-1) (0006-2) (0006-3) (0006-4) • Gunter, Paul (0002-21) • Horhn, Charlie (0001-4) • McDonald, Norris (0001-13) (0001-15) (0001-16) (0001-19) (0002-61) (0002-62) • Monsour, Mitch (0002-2) (0002-4) (0002-5) (0002-6) (0002-7) (0002-9) • Neal, Sr., Ellis (0006-1) (0006-2) (0006-3) (0006-4) • Pullen, Ruth (0002-48) (0009-11) (0009-12) • Pullen, Tom (0002-52) • Rollins, Jackie (0002-31) • Ross, George E. (0004-4) • Scutter, Clarence (0002-27) (0006-1) (0006-2) (0006-3) (0006-4) • Segrest, Phil (0002-56) • Thompson, Bennie G. (0003-2) • Wade, Nell (0008-4)
Environmental Justice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doss, Evan (0002-16) (0002-17) (0002-20) • Gunter, Paul (0002-26) • Monsour, Mitch (0002-3)
Accidents - Severe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pullen, Ruth (0002-39)
Uranium Fuel Cycle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pullen, Ruth (0002-43) (0002-47) • Wade, Nell (0008-3)
Need for Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • McDonald, Norris (0001-18) • Pullen, Ruth (0009-1) (0009-2) (0009-5)

Table 3. (contd)

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
Alternatives - Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • McDonald, Norris (0002-63) • Pullen, Ruth (0002-45) (0009-3) (0009-4) (0009-6) (0009-7) (0009-8) (0009-9) (0009-10) • Pullen, Tom (0002-50) • Segrest, Phil (0002-59) • Wade, Nell (0008-5)
Benefit-Cost Balance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • McDonald, Norris (0001-12) • Pullen, Ruth (0002-38) • Rollins, Jackie (0002-32) • Wade, Nell (0008-2)
Support of the Licensing Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crisler, Emma (0007-3) • Hudson, Sr., Trent L. (0010-2) • McDonald, Norris (0001-17) • Segrest, Phil (0002-60) • Thompson, Bennie G. (0003-4)
Support of Nuclear Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • McDonald, Norris (0001-11) • Monsour, Mitch (0002-1) • Ross, George E. (0004-3) • Segrest, Phil (0002-57)
Support of the Existing Plant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ross, George E. (0004-1) • Segrest, Phil (0002-55)
Opposition to the Licensing Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Garner, A.C. (0001-6) • Pullen, Tom (0002-54)
Opposition to Nuclear Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pullen, Ruth (0002-46) • Pullen, Tom (0002-49) (0002-53) • Wade, Nell (0008-1) (0008-6)
Opposition to the Existing Plant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Horhn, Charlie (0001-2) (0001-3) • Thompson, Bennie G. (0003-1)

Table 3. (contd)

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
Outside Scope - Emergency Preparedness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Garner, A.C. (0001-8) (0001-9) (0002-12) (0002-13) (0002-14) (0002-15) (0005-2) (0005-4) • Hudson, Sr., Trent L. (0010-4) • Monsour, Mitch (0002-10) • Pullen, Ruth (0002-37) (0009-13) (0009-15) • Pullen, Tom (0002-51) • Rollins, Avery (0002-28) (0002-29) (0002-30) • Rollins, Jackie (0002-34) • Ross, George E. (0004-6) • Thompson, Bennie G. (0003-3)
Outside Scope - Miscellaneous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Garner, A.C. (0001-10) • McDonald, Norris (0001-14) • Monsour, Mitch (0002-8) • Pullen, Ruth (0002-36) • Ross, George E. (0004-2) (0004-7)
Outside Scope - Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Horhn, Charlie (0001-1) • Hudson, Sr., Trent L. (0010-3) • Pullen, Ruth (0002-40) (0002-41)
Outside Scope-Security and Terrorism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crisler, Emma (0007-1) • Gunter, Paul (0002-23) (0002-25) • Pullen, Ruth (0002-42) (0002-44) (0009-14) (0009-16) • Ross, George E. (0004-5) • Segrest, Phil (0002-58)

Grand Gulf Combined License Public Scoping 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 (correspondence ID-comment number) and the commenter name. Comments are grouped by category in the order shown in Table 2.

The draft SEIS will take into account the relevant issues raised during the scoping process and will be made available for public comment. The comment period for the draft SEIS 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 SEIS will be considered in the preparation of the final SEIS. The final SEIS, along with the staff's safety evaluation report, will be considered in the NRC's decision on Entergy's COL application for the GGNS site.

1. Comments Concerning the ESP - COL Process

Comment: [I]t is my responsibility to make sure that all stakeholders surrounding and involved in this proposed site be full and inclusive participants in this process. (0003-5 [Thompson, Bennie G.]

Response: *The NRC staff will prepare an SEIS in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 52.18 and 10 CFR Part 51. During the scoping process, the public is invited to participate by submitting comments. The information presented in the applicant's ER is open for comment during the scoping process. During the scoping process, the NRC is interested in whether a member of the public is aware of something missing from the ER, or newer information is available that the NRC needs to be aware of for their review. This comment does not provide specific information relating to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the SEIS.*

Comment: [I]n moving forward we definitely ask Entergy to further and to richly engage the community in planning. (0001-5 [Horn, Charlie])

Response: *The NRC has no jurisdiction over the public involvement process of private entities, and these issues will not be addressed in the SEIS. The purpose of the EIS is to disclose the environmental impacts of the proposed nuclear power plant. As part of the NRC's process in developing its EIS, the staff will provide the public an opportunity to comment on its evaluation of the applicant's proposal.*

Comment: I just think we need more review before we complete this EIS. We need to know what the final project plan is going to be before we go any further. (0002-35 [Rollins, Jackie])

Response: *The licensing process for COL applications is specified in 10 CFR 52. The environmental review process associated with new reactor licensing includes a detailed review of the COL application to determine the environmental effects of building and operating the nuclear power facility for up to 40 years. After review of the application against the regulations and regulatory guidance, a mandatory hearing or optional contested hearing will be held where the decision is made whether it is appropriate to grant the license. NRC approval of an*

application for a COL is not a foregone conclusion. Safety issues as well as the environmental ones will be evaluated before a decision on an application is reached. Also, granting of a license does not ensure a plant will actually be constructed as that will ultimately be a business decision by the applicant

Comment: Because Jefferson County is within the 10 mile plume exposure pathway of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Plant and a primary evacuation route (Highway 61) traverses Jefferson County, we have consistently asked to be included in meetings, public hearings, etc. as it relates to Grand Gulf. Our first request to be notified of meetings, public hearings, etc., was made at a public hearing in Port Gibson on June 28, 2005. At that time, the names and addresses of all contacts were included: Because we were not notified of the hearing on June 19, 2008, we were not prepared to make public comments. However, we do thank you for this opportunity to submit comments at this time. (0010-1 [Hudson, Sr., Trent L.])

Response: *NRC scoping meetings are announced in the Federal Register, on the NRC website, in local and regional newspapers, through press releases, and through flyers distributed locally. NRC requests the assistance of tribal, church, and community leaders to disseminate the information to potentially affected groups. Participants in the scoping process are provided an opportunity to submit oral comments at the scoping meeting and written comments through a project e-mail address or by regular mail. Specifically, in the case of the GGNS COL, announcements of public meetings were placed in the Jackson (Mississippi) Clarion-Ledger, the Port Gibson (Mississippi) Reveille, and the Vicksburg (Mississippi) Post.*

Comment: I quote from the ESP FEIS. 'The CP or COL applicant must address any other issue not considered and not resolved in the EIS for the ESP.' (ESP FEIS introduction, page 1-4) 'Moreover, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.70(b), the NRC is required to independently evaluate and be responsible for the reliability of all information used in an EIS prepared for a CP or COL application, and the staff may (1) inquire into the continued validity of information disclosed in an EIS for an ESP that is referenced in a COL application and (2) look for any new information that may affect the assumptions, analyses, or conclusions reached in the ESP EIS.' (ESP FEIS introduction, page 1-4, 1-5). Other stipulations are also required which I am sure NRC staff will follow diligently, including verification of all assumptions listed in Appendix J and also the need for power. (0009-17 [Pullen, Ruth])

Response: *The licensing process for COL applications is specified in 10 CFR 52. Requirements for an application referencing an ESP include demonstration that all environmental terms and conditions that have been included in the ESP will be satisfied by the date of issuance of the COL, or that any terms or conditions of the ESP that could not be met by the time of issuance of the COL be set forth as terms or conditions of the COL. As part of the environmental review, the NRC staff will review the need for power that will be discussed in Chapter 8 of the SEIS to ensure that the analysis is (1) systematic, (2) comprehensive, (3) subject to confirmation, and (4) responsive to forecasting uncertainty.*

2. Comments Concerning Site Layout and Design

Comment: I think it's inappropriate to proceed with this EIS without a certified design. (0002-22 [Gunter, Paul])

Comment: [W]e're now talking about proceeding with an Environmental Impact Statement

without a certified design and in the absence of any conclusions as to what that criteria is. So I think that places this community, as it does communities around the country, at a real disadvantage in terms of why this is on such a fast track, why the public is left in the lurch without addressing these very fundamental safety and security issues. And it will only work against us in terms of what real security, what real safety should be. (0002-24 [Gunter, Paul])

Response: *NRC regulations do not require that applicants refer to a certified design in a COL application. They may reference a certified design, a design undergoing design certification review, or a one-of-a-kind design. This comment is out of scope and will not be addressed further.*

3. Comments Concerning Socioeconomics

Comment: Mississippi Power and Light Company and the State of Mississippi decided for some reason that it was necessary to take and split the tax money that came to Claiborne County. At that time Claiborne County was receiving something in the neighborhood of \$16 million per year. You could feel somewhat good about that because funds were available to do almost anything for the protection of people and properties here in Claiborne County. It has changed here now, drastically. Since the funds were taken away and distributed in other parts of the State of Mississippi, Claiborne County only receives about \$8 million in 2008. (0001-7 [Garner, A.C.])

Comment: I have been proud of Grand Gulf Nuclear Station and Unit 1. But a few years ago, I started gaining mixed feelings about this. At one time Claiborne County seemed to be on a progressive path, but there was something that took place. Mississippi Power and Light Company and the State of Mississippi decided to split up the tax monies that were rightfully Claiborne County's and sent them to 45 other counties in the State of Mississippi. (0002-11 [Garner, A.C.])

Comment: I'd just like to say very briefly some of the concerns that I have, one of which is as a taxpayer, I have been and all of us have been funding this industry with our tax dollars. The Entergy stockholders do not have as vested an interest in this industry as far as dollars put in than the taxpayer has. The taxpayer has funded research. Liability issues come back to the taxpayer. And I am concerned about the cozy relationship between the regulatory industry and Entergy, the utility companies. (0002-31 [Rollins, Jackie])

Comment: The tax problem ... came about by the Mississippi Legislature taking the money away, not Grand Gulf, not the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, not the local officials. The State Legislature took that money away from us. And, yes, it hurt. And, yes, they didn't do us right. They don't do that to any other big industries in the state. They didn't do it to the Nissan plant in Madison County. They don't do it to the gambling facilities that are in the area that citizens from Claiborne County participate in. (0002-56 [Segrest, Phil])

Comment: I served as Director of the Emergency Management Center for about fifteen years; I was there when the plant went on line some twenty-three years ago. I have watched things in this county and around Grand Gulf Nuclear Station deteriorate for several years. It all started when M.P. & L. and the State of Mississippi decided to split tax money that was rightfully Claiborne County's money. The money was sent to some forty-five other counties, at that time Claiborne County received about 16 million each year. All monies were placed in an escrow

account and when the bill was passed by the Mississippi Legislature, the money remained in the hands of the State of Mississippi. (0005-1 [Garner, A.C.]

Comment: In 1986 Claiborne County received 16 million from Grand Gulf now the county only received only 8 million each year. Now Claiborne County can not afford to do upkeep on its Emergency Operation Center, they are presently operating out of a fabricated building. The only hospital in this county is in need of emergency repairs. At first we had five fire stations opened in this county operating 24 hours per day, now we can only afford one, also law enforcement is short at all times; one of the reasons is because money is not available to pay decent salaries. (0005-3 [Garner, A.C.]

Comment: We call on you, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Federal Emergency Management, the State of Mississippi, by all means the Mississippi Legislature to do something about returning the tax dollars to Claiborne County. (0005-5 [Garner, A.C.]

Comment: Concerning the Legislature and the tax money split, my comments are that our citizens need to write, email, talk to legislators about allowing all the money to stay in the county rather than being divided among Entergy's 45 counties. This is not your responsibility/business, but you surely hear it a lot, right? (0007-2 [Crisler, Emma])

Response: *The NRC regulates the nuclear industry to protect the public health and safety within existing policy. Issues related to the distribution of taxes for infrastructure and/or services are outside of the NRC's mission and authority and will not be addressed in the SEIS; however, the socioeconomic impacts (both adverse and beneficial) were addressed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the ESP EIS (NUREG-1817). Impacts related to socioeconomics previously resolved in the ESP EIS will be evaluated in terms of new and significant information to determine if the NRC's evaluation is affected.*

Comment: So in addition to the steel and concrete and all the wiring and everything else, all the jobs that are going to come in for years during the construction of the plant, to really stimulate development in Claiborne County, you want to attract and retain these office building which will then lead to restaurants. Restaurants need a lunch crowd, a dinner crowd. And to the extent you attract those sorts of businesses, they decide to bring their families here, you never know they might decide to stay. (0001-15 [McDonald, Norris])

Comment: [W]e think that recognizing the economic depression that's in this community that some commitments need to be made for greater opportunities, both in the area of health care, education, job opportunities and job training, business opportunities, and the long term investment in the infrastructure also is very critical to this community. (0001-4 [Horn, Charlie])

Comment: [A]verage income really hasn't benefitted from Grand Gulf over the last 25 years. Unemployment rates are probably 40 percent higher than the rest of the State of Mississippi. Keep in mind that the average income is probably only about 65 to 70 percent of the average of Mississippi which is way down of course near the bottom of the United States. So again healthcare is a very, very important aspect about this. (0002-4 [Monsour, Mitch])

Response: *The impacts of the plant and its construction and operating workforce on the local economy were discussed in the ESP EIS (NUREG-1817). Impacts related to socioeconomics previously resolved in the ESP EIS will be evaluated in terms of new and significant information to determine if the NRC's evaluation is affected. These impacts include secondary*

employment.

Comment: The things about these plants whether they cost a billion dollars or five or six million dollars, you're talking about a lot of steel, a lot of concrete, a lot of other supplemental sources of jobs. So that helps my concern within the context of Claiborne County and some of the economic concerns you have here and the hospital concerns. (0001-13 [McDonald, Norris])

Comment: With a good business plan then that helps your case for getting a hospital. No matter where you are, hospitals are hard to maintain. It usually takes some state subsidies with that. Well, if they have the office complexes and the people who maybe did the construction to stay here in Claiborne County, then that would lead to more support possibly for the sort of health care that the NAACP mentioned earlier and that the community is talking about. (0001-16 [McDonald, Norris])

Comment: I'd say that nuclear energy in this Grand Gulf is, should be and can be a very positive community partner here in Claiborne County. It's here for economic development. But for my perspective here, it's for the healthcare needs of the people here in Claiborne County. (0002-2 [Monsour, Mitch])

Comment: And clearly one of the issues that's not resolved is the issue of how the current tax structure impacts versus the plan. And so the -- and I think it's clear that if you take a tour of the infrastructure here in Claiborne County, if you go out to the hospital, if you observe the closed fire stations, if you contemplate what it's like to have one police officer on duty at night for an area the size of Washington, D.C., you begin to understand that this application is deficient in that the -- a new reactor adds a burden to this community that if not picked up will just be unresolved. And so I think it's that kind of burden that not only addresses the concerns of the safety and the public health of this community, but is very clearly also a security issue. (0002-21 [Gunter, Paul])

Comment: [W]hen you start talking about 2010 for the approval on something like this and the time of construction, I'm making a very valid argument that again you need to start planning for this infrastructure today. (0002-5 [Monsour, Mitch])

Comment: [F]or this little -- small little hospital that's 50 years old, totally antiquated, out of date. But again its role and mission is it's not like a tertiary care facility. This hospital is here for primary care for the people, for preventative care for the residents of Claiborne County, emergency care, disasters like what you all might be touching on tonight. And at the end of the day that creates jobs. Patient care creates jobs, and good-paying jobs. (0002-6 [Monsour, Mitch])

Comment: We want to have an environment and a location that when the children of Alcorn graduate in healthcare specialties that they have a job to come back to in Claiborne County. And this is not low-paying jobs. This is \$20, \$25 on average jobs with nurses and skilled health staff. (0002-7 [Monsour, Mitch])

Comment: [I]f you're thinking about a two-year approval or the construction starts with all these hundreds of thousands of people that might come down here, this preplanning needs to start today because the infrastructure in healthcare that we have today in Claiborne County is totally inadequate. It's inadequate. And so if you start planning and do what can be done in this little hospital today, the preplanning that would be infrastructure again in that partnership that I described needs to occur today so that by the time that you have construction started for these

people again the basics are in place. (0002-9 [Monsour, Mitch])

Response: *Impacts of plant construction and operation on the utilization of existing local infrastructure or need for new infrastructure, such as healthcare, are within the scope of the SEIS and will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5. All socioeconomic impacts previously resolved in the ESP EIS (NUREG-1817) will be evaluated in terms of new and significant information to determine if the NRC's evaluation is affected.*

Comment: I would recommend that NRC look at this Black Enterprise magazine. It's the June issue of the BE-100s. It lists companies, black companies, that are in construction, that are in metals. And so those would be the sorts of people you would want to reach out to here to start talking about some sort of basically business plan, business model that could lead to some of the other amenities that I mentioned. (0001-19 [McDonald, Norris])

Response: *An assessment of employment opportunities and impacts was conducted during the ESP review and is discussed in Chapter 4 of the ESP EIS (NUREG-1817). Choices about the sources and composition of the construction and operating workforces are the responsibility of the applicant and their contractors.*

Comment: Does NRC consider the jobs that would be created at Unit 3 to be green jobs? And we would like to recommend that NRC consider jobs that would be created at Unit 3 to be green jobs. To consider the possibility of describing those jobs in the EIS as green jobs. Now the Energy Information and Security Act of 2007 that was passed just last year included \$125 million and created 30,000 training positions. So if nuclear is included in the green jobs area -- and that's the new sexy area that's coming down now in addition to environmental justice -- then possibly it could help with the economic development items many people have discussed here today. (0002-61 [McDonald, Norris])

Comment: Job creation and Health-Care are major priorities in Claiborne County. Our unemployment rate here is 12.8%. Poverty leads to crime, drugs, alcohol, violence and mental problems, among other things. (0006-1 [Davis, Sr., Joseph] [Davis, J.B.] [Garner, A.C.] [Neal, Sr., Ellis] [Scutter, Clarence])

Response: *Socioeconomic impacts, including job creation associated with the construction and operation of the proposed nuclear station, were discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the ESP EIS (NUREG-1817). Impacts related to socioeconomic previously resolved in the ESP EIS will be evaluated in terms of new and significant information to determine if the NRC's evaluation is affected. The NRC does not assign a term, such as green, for jobs that may be created.*

Comment: The other thing is that we begin to see in the social services area here individuals who are migrating here who don't have houses, who don't have food, but anticipate on getting jobs in this area here who are now filling up our shelters here within the community that we no longer have the room or the capacity to take care of some of the local individuals that we have. (0002-18 [Doss, Evan])

Comment: Some of the recommendations that we're [Citizens for Better Gov't Consulting Group] talking about are continue to support and upgrade our public education system; continue to upgrade the Sheriff's Department; continue to upgrade the county Fire Department; utilization of Alcorn State University, Hinds Community College, and local schools for workforce training programs and technical assistance; develop a comprehensive plan to address the

needs of our senior citizens; develop a comprehensive recreational program; upgrade the infrastructure of water, sewage and roads; adequate housing program; establish drug and alcohol and mental health program. (0002-27 [Scutter, Clarence])

Comment: Our senior citizens and children are suffering for the necessities to survive day to day. (0006-4 [Davis, Sr., Joseph] [Davis, J.B.] [Garner, A.C.] [Neal, Sr., Ellis] [Scutter, Clarence])

Response: *Impacts of plant construction and operation on the utilization of existing local infrastructure and services and the need for new infrastructure and/or services are within the scope of the SEIS. Impacts related to socioeconomics previously resolved in the ESP EIS (NUREG-1817) will be evaluated in terms of new and significant information to determine if the NRC's evaluation is affected.*

Comment: These things are going to cost a tremendous amount of money if, in fact, Grand Gulf 3 gets built here in this community. That's going to have a drastic effect on -- and therefore, a condition needs to be put on Grand Gulf 3 is that if the local community don't have the money, somebody has got to pay for these kinds of things. (0002-19 [Doss, Evan])

Comment: And Entergy has been a member of this community with Grand Gulf 1. They have been contributing a very, very small amount of money to the hospital. (0002-33)

Comment: [S]ome people have tried through the Mississippi Legislature to put this all on the rate payer. Did you think the money was going to come from Entergy? Are they going to help you build a new hospital if the cost for their Unit 3 escalates? Are they going to stick it on the rate payer? Are they going to ask for an additional increase in rates? (0002-52 [Pullen, Tom])

Comment: Though Entergy has been located in the district for several years, the economically- distressed communities have not seen the tangible benefits of having a successful multimillion dollar facility. Unfortunately, the surrounding communities have not been afforded the opportunity and/or assistance from Entergy to build upon its waning local infrastructure and fledging economy. Entergy has failed to take full advantage of the academic community and has missed the mark in supporting local' businesses and community projects. (0003-2 [Thompson, Bennie G.]

Comment: When GGNS was first proposed for Claiborne County, the community was promised a great deal of prosperity and economic development. After over 25 years of operation and being in the community, the Nuclear Station remains a high tech oasis within a socioeconomically disadvantaged community, with a limited number of tangible benefits accruing to the community. Entergy is capable of making its presence more pronounced than it has been so far in the surrounding communities. (0004-4 [Ross, George E.]

Comment: Health studies shows over 20 years we have major increases in cancer, heart diseases, strokes, diabetes and obesity. We must have a new hospital with modern technology to provide the services to the citizens of this community. (0006-2 [Davis, Sr., Joseph] [Davis, J.B.] [Garner, A.C.] [Neal, Sr., Ellis] [Scutter, Clarence])

Response: *The NRC regulates the nuclear industry to protect the public health and safety within existing policy. Issues related to the source(s) of funds for infrastructure and/or services are outside of the NRC's mission and authority and will not be addressed in the SEIS; however, the socioeconomic impacts were addressed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the ESP EIS (NUREG-*

1817). *Impacts related to socioeconomics previously resolved in the ESP EIS will be evaluated in terms of new and significant information to determine if the NRC's evaluation is affected.*

Comment: I'd love to see some training jobs in Port Gibson. Maybe legislation could even be considered in that direction. Instead of 30,000 positions, maybe just 3,000 training positions here paying them \$30,000 each. (0002-62 [McDonald, Norris])

Response: *Issues related to legislation and policy are outside of the NRC's mission and authority and will not be addressed in the SEIS.*

Comment: We are one of the poorest counties in the State of Mississippi. We ask Entergy's help locate two (2) industries that might locate in Claiborne County that can provide jobs in this area. (0006-3 [Davis, Sr., Joseph] [Davis, J.B.] [Garner, A.C.] [Neal, Sr., Ellis] [Scutter, Clarence])

Response: *The NRC has no jurisdiction over the public process of private entities. Recruitment of industry to the Grand Gulf vicinity are outside of the NRC's mission and authority and will not be addressed in the SEIS.*

Comment: The Mississippi Legislature just passed a bill that would allow Entergy to increase rates to pay for building this facility whether it's ever put into production. They would never have to return the money to rate payers. For people that are economically challenged now, that is going to put an additional burden on them if their energy rates are increased. So that is something else that needs to be considered in your socio-economic analysis. (0002-48 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: Approval of rate increases prior to a private industry's choice to build is an inequitable policy. (0008-4 [Wade, Nell])

Comment: As the price of nuclear energy continues to climb (Lovins attached document and also attached document Price of Nuclear Saloncom.doc), the cost of renewable sources of energy and energy efficiency continues to drop. Entergy has requested, and the Mississippi Legislature has passed, provisions to allow a rate hike to pay for the new plant construction, whether or not the GG3 facility is ever completed or put on-line. Claiborne County is one of the poorest counties in the state and this rate increase would cause economic hardship for many of its residents. It would also cause economic hardship for many other Entergy customers in various parts of Mississippi and other States in the service area. (0009-11 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: Entergy has requested a 28 % rate increase because of higher Natural Gas prices, adding an additional burden to ratepayers. At the same time Entergy is requesting rate increases, it has programs to help needy families pay utility bills. 'Across Entergy's four-state utility system, almost one-quarter of all households have incomes that fall below the poverty level.' Entergy has revenues of more than \$10 billion, and the utility worked with others to help approximately 18,000 needy families and individuals with utility bills in 2007. (http://www.entergy-mississippi.com/news_room/newsrelease.aspx?NR_ID=275) The company acknowledges economic problems in Mississippi, yet requested a rate increase to build a facility that is not needed. (0009-12 [Pullen, Ruth])

Response: *Issues related to the rate adjustments are outside of the NRC's mission and authority and will not be addressed in the SEIS; however, the socioeconomic impacts were addressed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the ESP EIS (NUREG-1817). Impacts related to*

socioeconomics previously resolved in the ESP EIS will be evaluated in terms of new and significant information to determine if the NRC's evaluation is affected.

4. Comments Concerning Environmental Justice

Comment: By building the Nuclear Power Plant Unit 3, it's going to have a drastic effect upon low income people here within Claiborne County. (0002-16 [Doss, Evan])

Comment: We intend to file whatever petition that it would take in order to correct this environmental injustice that's going to tremendous affect low income people. If you talk about the crisis of the housing that we already have here and bring in a third nuclear -- bring in Grand Gulf 3 to this community, it's going to have a drastic impact on those individual residents that are already living here. (0002-17 [Doss, Evan])

Comment: [O]ne of the things that we challenge the NRC to add is that this needs to be resolved in terms of the education system, in the case of the housing system, and the hospital system, and for social service programs here that's drastically that's going to affect low income people. (0002-20 [Doss, Evan])

Comment: If you do an environmental impact study, we have to be very aware of the Claiborne demographics. I believe that there's one basic fact that Claiborne County has a larger percentage of minorities or African Americans than any other county in the United States. And with that goes some of the highest instances and prevalence of chronic disease, be that heart disease, stroke, cancer, arthritis, and diabetes. It has one of the highest obesity rates here in the United States of any county in the United States. And with that comes other problems with our youth, with our prenatal problems and indicators. (0002-3 [Monsour, Mitch])

Response: *Environmental justice, the disproportionate environmental impact on low income and minority communities, including socioeconomic impact, was addressed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the ESP EIS (NUREG-1817). Impacts related to environmental justice previously resolved in the ESP EIS will be evaluated in terms of new and significant information to determine if the NRC's evaluation is affected.*

Comment: [W]e would agree with all the speakers that have addressed the environmental justice issue up here today that you need to address how this community is disadvantaged by a discriminatory tax code that undermines the infrastructure for the Emergency Plan for Grand Gulf Unit 1 as well as this proposed Grand Gulf 3. (0002-26 [Gunter, Paul])

Response: *The NRC regulates the nuclear industry to protect the public health and safety within existing policy. Issues related to taxes and distribution of taxes for infrastructure and/or services are outside the NRC's mission and authority and will not be addressed in the SEIS. Environmental justice, the disproportionate environmental impact on low income and minority communities, including socioeconomic impact, was addressed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the ESP EIS (NUREG-1817). Impacts related to environmental justice previously resolved in the ESP EIS will be evaluated in terms of new and significant information to determine if the NRC's evaluation is affected.*

5. Comments Concerning Accidents - Severe

Comment: [T]he NRC in its Environmental Impact Statement is not really addressing in detail what would happen if there was a catastrophic accident at this plant. And I think that is a real lack in the EIS and I think it needs to be addressed. (0002-39 [Pullen, Ruth])

Response: *Design-basis and severe accidents of the proposed Unit 3 are within the scope and will be discussed in Chapter 5 of the SEIS. The accidents evaluated will include accidents with core melt and containment failure. The evaluation will include estimates of both probability of occurrence and accident consequences. Impacts related to design-basis and severe accidents previously resolved in the ESP EIS (NUREG-1817) will be evaluated in terms of new and significant information to determine if the NRC's evaluation is affected.*

6. Comments Concerning the Uranium Fuel Cycle

Comment: You've got 20 years of nuclear waste stored above ground, making Port Gibson essentially a nuclear waste dump for the state of Mississippi. All these and then you're talking about putting another reactor there. (0002-43 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: Other [issues] include environment safety and health issues, nuclear proliferation concerns, and the challenge of long term waste management. Now several of these issues should be addressed in an EIS. They're related to this facility. They're related if you add another facility. And they should be addressed. (0002-47 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: Nuclear energy is too costly as a producer of dangerous toxic wastes that defy safe disposal or transport. (0008-3 [Wade, Nell])

Response: *Chapter 6 of the SEIS will address new and significant information related to the environmental impacts of the uranium fuel cycle and solid-waste management to include uranium enrichment activities. The generic impacts of the fuel cycle are codified in 10 CFR 51.51(b), Table S-3, "Table of Uranium Fuel Cycle Environmental Data." Per the guidance in 10 CFR 51.51, the staff will rely on Table S-3 as a basis for the impact of uranium fuel-cycle impacts to include uranium enrichment. Chapters 5, 6, and 7 of the SEIS will address new and significant information related to environmental safety and health.*

7. Comments Concerning the Need for Power

Comment: The electricity sector is having all kinds of problems figuring out which direction they're going to go in and what they're going to do. What you're going to look up with are very high electricity prices. Without the supply, there's nothing like a huge plant like this sort of unit that they want to build here that could help solve a lot of these problems. (0001-18 [McDonald, Norris])

Response: *Determination of the need for power within a given area is not under the NRC's regulatory purview. However, the NRC staff will review the need for power that will be discussed in Chapter 8 of the SEIS to ensure that the analysis is (1) systematic, (2) comprehensive, (3) subject to confirmation, and (4) responsive to forecasting uncertainty. The determination of electricity prices is within the responsibility of the Mississippi Public Service Commission.*

Comment: According to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Early Site Permit (ESP); "An ESP environmental report is not required to include a benefits assessment

(e.g., the need for power) (10 CFR 52.17) or a discussion of energy alternatives (NRC 2003a); **these may be deferred to the CP or COL application"** (emphasis mine) (Introduction, page 1-3). Since we are at the COL stage, it is time for the benefits assessment discussed above to be produced and evaluated in the EIS. The fact that Entergy is considering designating GG3 a merchant plant, indicates that more power is not needed in Mississippi. Because building a plant, the plant's discharges, wastes, etc., affect the environment, **the need for power should be one of the first and major considerations in this EIS.** (0009-1 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: Entergy Mississippi, Inc. provides electricity to more than 433,000 customers in 45 Mississippi counties, approximately 17% of its customer base of about 2.6 million in portions of Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas. Based on these numbers, it is impossible to justify building another reactor in Mississippi. The facility should not be built at all, but if it is, it should be built where demand is greatest. (0009-2 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: In Section 9.2.2.2 of its ESP application, SERI established a target value for the desired electrical output of 2000 MW(e) for a new nuclear generating facility constructed at the Grand Gulf ESP site and used this value in its analysis of energy alternatives (SERI 2005). (ESP FEIS, pg 8.3.), yet it has not been established that any new power is needed, and certainly not 2000 MW. (0009-5 [Pullen, Ruth])

Response: *The determination for the need for power within a given area is not under the NRC's regulatory purview. When another agency has the regulatory authority over an issue, NRC defers to that agency's decision. The NRC staff reviews the need for power analysis to determine if it is (1) systematic, (2) comprehensive, (3) subject to confirmation, and (4) responsive to forecasting uncertainty. If the need for power evaluation is found to be acceptable, no additional independent review by the NRC is needed.*

8. Comments Concerning Alternatives - Energy

Comment: [I]t [the ESP EIS] was talking about Port Gibson as a site for providing solar power. Well, the fact is that one of the benefits of solar power and other alternatives is that they do not have to be site-specific. They can be dispersed. So for example, you don't have to put all your solar panels in Port Gibson. First of all, it should look at the entire service area and what facilities it could provide. You've got wind power. There's just tremendous opportunities in the alternative energy market that really make nuclear power at this time because of so many of the problems associated with it just unacceptable. (0002-45 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: If you look at the cost for alternative energy sources, such as solar or wind and other, they continue to go down year by year by year. And I think this is an important thing. And I would urge the NRC to look very carefully at that issue in the EIS Supplement that's being prepared. (0002-50 [Pullen, Tom])

Comment: Mississippi can't support wind energy. If they could, you would have seen a lot of windmills used on farms to pump water back before they had electricity in the rural areas. There's just not the wind, sustainable winds, here to take care of that, let alone produce power. A lot of places where they can produce it -- I think it was Connecticut or Massachusetts coast -- I read two to three, four weeks back -- don't want the wind turbines in their area. (0002-59 [Segrest, Phil])

Comment: Government subsidies and long-term tax incentives would be better utilized promoting alternative, carbon-free, lower impact, renewable power (such as wind, solar & thermal power), and energy efficiency. (0008-5 [Wade, Nell])

Comment: [D]istributed energy 'technologies are playing an increasingly important role in the nation's energy portfolio. **They can be used to meet base load power, peaking power, backup power, remote power, power quality, as well as cooling and heating needs.**' (emphasis mine) (0009-10 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: [A]dvances and successes in energy efficiency, conservation, cogeneration, and renewables, make the need for a new reactor unnecessary at any location. References and attachments discussed in section II. will clarify this statement. (0009-3 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: Alternative Energy. This issue was not adequately addressed in the FEIS for the ESP and therefore should be considered in this EIS. Looking only at the Port Gibson site when reviewing possible alternatives does not take into account one of the primary advantages of renewable energy, i.e. distributed resources. Nor does it account for the entire service area, or the Gulf of Mexico, which has wind resources for Mississippi and surrounding states of at least Class 4-Class 7, not Class 1 as the ESP FEIS stated for Mississippi and Louisiana. (0009-4 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: In section 8.2.1(ESP FEIS page 8-3) it is stated that 'The Commission determined (NRC 2005) that conservation or demand side management programs are not a reasonable alternative to an ESP for a base load nuclear power plant. Consequently, this alternative is not further considered.' This is an outdated and inaccurate assessment of modern day programs and needs to be reconsidered. (0009-6 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: According to Heather Staley, Chief Executive of the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (EECA), '**Investment in energy efficiency is often the cheapest solution and should always be considered when looking at future needs.**' (emphasis mine) Locking in energy efficiency now means gains into the future'. ...'Many energy efficiency measures are instant. **We can realise the benefits right now, including cheaper power bills and reduced environmental impacts.**' (emphasis mine) (0009-7 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: [T]he cost of renewable energy is rapidly dropping because of improvements in technology, and, as market share continues to grow, some at over 20% per year, some such as solar increasing even more. (0009-8 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: [A]ccording to the U. S. Department of Energy's National Energy Renewable Energy laboratory (NREL), 'Customer choice programs are proving to be a powerful stimulus for growth in renewable energy supply. In 2007, total utility green power sales exceeded 4.5 billion kilowatt-hours (kWh), about a 20% increase over 2006.' Utility green pricing programs are one segment of a larger green power marketing industry that counts Fortune 500 companies, government agencies and colleges and universities among its customers... **In addition, the rate premium that customers pay for green power continues to drop.** (emphasis mine). <http://www.nrel.gov/news/press/2008/348.html>. As will be discussed in the Socioeconomic Effects section of this document, reduction in power bills will be of great benefit to Claiborne County, one of the poorest counties in Mississippi, and indeed to Mississippi, one of the lowest per capita income states in the U.S. (0009-9 [Pullen, Ruth])

Response: *Alternative energy sources, including energy conservation and renewable energy sources, were discussed in Chapters 8 and 9 of the ESP EIS (NUREG-1817). Impacts related to alternative energy sources previously resolved in the ESP EIS will be evaluated in terms of new and significant information to determine if the NRC's evaluation is affected.*

Comment: [The President of Alcorn] mentioned a high temperature reactor. Well, that's some interesting new research. That's a new type of reactor. I happened to have visited that type of reactor outside of Beijing. We talked after he spoke. And that's the sort of thing we can talk about. (0002-63 [McDonald, Norris])

Response: *The comment is noted. The comment provides no new information and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.*

9. Comments Concerning Benefit-Cost Balance

Comment: My concern now though is that when we first started about 2000, they projected that these nuclear plants would cost about a billion dollars. Now we're hearing four and five and possibly higher prices. So when I hear NRC today say that, well, they may get the Combined Operating License, but that doesn't mean they'll necessarily make a decision to build. And so that basically becomes a Wall Street decision and whether or not these companies, even when they form consortiums, whether or not then they can attract the funding to build this sort of plant. Even in competition with other areas who have the Combined Operating License approved, there will be some sort of Wall Street competition. (0001-12 [McDonald, Norris])

Comment: I don't think we get objective figures when we look at estimates of final costs. I've read some objective, unconnected reviews of these costs and many of them say they're just ridiculously low. They're not even in the ballpark. (0002-32 [Rollins, Jackie])

Comment: Nuclear energy is too costly as a capital expense, and as a per kilowatt hour production cost. (0008-2 [Wade, Nell])

Response: *The NRC's responsibility is to regulate the nuclear industry to protect the public health and safety within existing policy. The NRC is not involved in establishing energy policy or project financing, nor does it have the authority or responsibility by law to ensure that the proposed plant is the least costly alternative to provide energy services. The benefit-cost balance for the project will be addressed in Chapter 10 of the SEIS and will rely on the best available estimate of project timing and duration, with uncertainties noted.*

Comment: I don't know how many of you are aware of the Price Anderson Act. This was an Act enacted by Congress in the '50s, I believe, because the utility and the insurance companies felt that the liability in the case of a nuclear accident at a power plant was so high that they would not even consider building a plant. So the government came up with the Price Anderson Act, which is essentially a subsidy which limits the liability of the nuclear power industry in the event of a catastrophic accident. So now here the Congress feels that this is an issue important enough that they're passing legislation. That act has been renewed numerous times. (0002-38 [Pullen, Ruth])

Response: *The NRC's responsibility is to regulate the nuclear industry to protect the public health and safety within existing policy. The NRC is not involved in establishing and*

administering energy policy, such as the Price-Anderson Act.

10. General Comments in Support of the Licensing Action

Comment: [M]y fear is that we're going to end up in the same situation with electricity that we have with gasoline right now. That is these incredibly high prices because we're not building enough supply. And if we're going to build supplies, build nuclear plants that don't emit greenhouse gases and smog. (0001-17 [McDonald, Norris])

Comment: Let's look at the positive things that Grand Gulf has brought to us. Let's look at the positive things that another unit at Grand Gulf can bring to us, especially if we can get the Legislature to be fair with the county. (0002-60 [Segrest, Phil])

Comment: As the Member of Congress that represents this area, I am supportive of the expansion opportunity. (0003-4 [Thompson, Bennie G.])

Comment: Since Grand Gulf I was being built up until now, the worriers about the radiation, etc. have been outsiders mostly. I am not worried about it and maybe this is not smart, but it's a fact. I just hope Grand Gulf III can get built and will be an asset to our county and town. (0007-3 [Crisler, Emma])

Comment: As stated by Mr. Ray Perryman, representing the Board of Supervisors, in the public hearing on June 28, 2005, the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors recognizes the important impact that is associated with locating a new, advanced technology nuclear power plant in this area. All elected leaders appreciate the economic impact and job creation opportunities that are created for our citizens. (0010-2 [Hudson, Sr., Trent L.])

Response: *These comments express general support for the proposed GGNS Unit 3 or the associated COL application. They provide no new and significant information; therefore, they will not be evaluated further.*

11. General Comments in Support of Nuclear Power

Comment: We come at this from a national perspective, even an international perspective at this point. We support nuclear power because of the threat from global warming and because global warming causes a smog threat. (0001-11 [McDonald, Norris])

Comment: I'm very bullish on nuclear energy. (0002-1 [Monsour, Mitch])

Comment: We haven't built a nuclear power plant in this country in quite a number of years. But that doesn't mean that the nuclear industry has stood still. The nuclear industry has been flourishing in other countries. Europe, where the population density is a lot heavier than it is in any part of the United States except some of the large metropolitan areas, is heavily involved in that. (0002-57 [Segrest, Phil])

Comment: There are about 104 commercial nuclear generating units in operation in the United States contributing 20 percent of the total electricity produced. The nuclear industry has a demonstrated record of reliability and safety. There has not been one death that has been attributed to commercial nuclear generators. Therefore, the State of Mississippi and Claiborne County are glad to host nuclear generating stations. (0004-3 [Ross, George E.])

Response: *These comments express general support of nuclear power. They provide no new and significant information; therefore, they will not be evaluated further.*

12. General Comments in Support of the Existing Plant

Comment: Taxes are a lot higher down there [in Jefferson County] than they are up here. Services are a lot lower. Unemployment is higher down there [in Claiborne County]. Grand Gulf is our difference. (0002-55 [Segrest, Phil])

Comment: Alcorn is also pleased to be in Entergy's service area and to a collaborative partner and neighbor of the Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant. (0004-1 [Ross, George E.])

Response: *These comments express general support for the existing unit at the site or for the applicant. They provide no new and significant information; therefore, they will not be evaluated further.*

13. General Comments in Opposition to the Licensing Action

Comment: There are certain situations here which cause me to question, a third or second -- well, Reactor No. 3 coming to Claiborne County. (0001-6 [Garner, A.C.])

Comment: [T]o put all your eggs in the basket of an additional unit at Grand Gulf Unit 3 is in my opinion a mistake. And that needs to be very carefully analyzed in the Supplemental EIS. (0002-54 [Pullen, Tom])

Response: *These comments provide only general information in opposition to the GGNS Unit 3 COL application or the construction and operation of a reactor at the site. They provide no new and significant information; therefore, they will not be evaluated further.*

14. General Comments in Opposition to Nuclear Power

Comment: And if you get out and read, you'll see the costs for nuclear energy are just ridiculous and they keep escalating. They keep increasing and increasing. (0002-46 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: [N]uclear energy is not a cost effective way of producing energy. If you look at the situation across the spectrum, costs continue to escalate year by year. Every year it's worse. (0002-49 [Pullen, Tom])

Comment: [Y]our Supplemental EIS in my opinion should direct a great deal of attention to this issue of alternatives to a nuclear power plant. There are a lot of options that should be explored. (0002-53 [Pullen, Tom])

Comment: I remain opposed to the Grand Gulf facility expansion for many reasons. (0008-1 [Wade, Nell])

Comment: Please design and build for the quality of life of multiple generations. (0008-6 [Wade, Nell])

Response: *These comments provide only general information in opposition to nuclear power. They provide no new and significant information; therefore, they will not be evaluated further.*

15. General Comments in Opposition to the Existing Plant

Comment: [W]hen we look back at the present reactor here now the Congressman's position is that we feel that the community have not been quite as well economically and should have when it comes to how the community has been benefitted economically, education and those kinds of things. We think that opportunity might have been squandered. (0001-2 [Horn, Charlie])

Comment: Entergy has not actively engaged the local community in the region in and around the nuclear facility whereby the community could benefit. (0001-3 [Horn, Charlie])

Comment: While the community has been supportive and receptive of Entergy Corporation, regrettably, Entergy has not actively engaged the local communities and region in and around the Grand Gulf Nuclear facility in a mutually satisfactory manner. (0003-1 [Thompson, Bennie G.])

Response: *These comments express opposition to the existing unit at the site or to the applicant. They provide no new and significant information; therefore, they will not be evaluated further.*

16. Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope – Emergency Preparedness

Comment: And I promise you when you see that you're going to see that environmental impact so far as the community impact and the jobs and the preparedness and true emergency preparedness for the disasters that you all might start talking about insofar as your overall impact study and preparedness. (0002-10 [Monsour, Mitch])

Response: *The comments on emergency preparedness are outside the scope of the NRC staff's environmental review. An evaluation of emergency preparedness issues will be part of the NRC's safety evaluation of the proposed action.*

Comment: An Emergency Management group is not a group that you can put together one time and forget about it and it last forever. That doesn't happen. With Emergency Management, you have to continue to prepare. Claiborne County has not been able to do that because of a short of funds. (0001-8 [Garner, A.C.])

Comment: The Emergency Operations Center that house emergency respondents during the time of emergencies is no longer in operation for the simple reason Claiborne County cannot afford to repair or replace this facility. To go a little bit further, there is only one hospital located in Claiborne County. Right now it's at a dilapidated stage. (0001-9 [Garner, A.C.])

Comment: I must also say that I was Director of Emergency Management here around Grand Gulf Nuclear Station for 15 years and was the Director at the time that the Plant went online. At that time preparedness was firsthand. There were things that could be done whereas that the community could feel safe. Right now it's a question mark. And one of the reasons why it is a question mark is when you see departments and agencies in this county who have the responsibility of first response does not have the funds to pay their employees and to get the necessary equipment and what-have-you to operate successful in this county. (0002-12

[Garner, A.C.]

Comment: Claiborne County does not have an adequate Emergency Operations Center. They operate out of a fabricated building that is too small for the department and agencies to come together. (0002-13 [Garner, A.C.]

Comment: I think that someone -- and I think it could start with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. It could also go to FEMA, Federal Emergency Management Agency, because they're charged with the responsibility of looking at departments and agencies in states and counties and municipalities that is around a nuclear station. I don't think that this has taken place. Someone has dropped the ball along the way. (0002-14 [Garner, A.C.]

Comment: [T]he Fire Department at one time had five fire stations that operated 24 hours per day. Now they only have one. If it was needed back in the late '80s after the plant came on line, it's also needed today. (0002-15 [Garner, A.C.]

Comment: At the previous scoping meeting, I expressed my concerns about the fact that as a private public citizen now I have no way of examining the emergency plans or emergency response in the event of a terrorist incident at Grand Gulf 1 or possibly Grand Gulf 2. I re-express those concerns. (0002-28 [Rollins, Avery])

Comment: The fact that it does not appear that your normal emergency preparedness is presently operational in the sense that it should be to respond not to Grand Gulf 3, but to respond to a Grand Gulf 1 incident or accident. (0002-29 [Rollins, Avery])

Comment: The comments made by apparently knowledgeable officials or former officials here tonight would seem to indicate that a closer study needs to be made of emergency preparedness presently in Claiborne County to see if the NRC would not be putting all the residents here and those of us who live within 75 miles of Grand Gulf 3 -- if you would not be putting us at additional personal risk by continuing to operate Grand Gulf 1 and establishing and operating Grand Gulf 3 where the county does not have the appropriate emergency response preparedness that would be necessary (0002-30 [Rollins, Avery])

Comment: [I]f anyone is in an accident and is affected by radiation, they come into the main door of the hospital, contaminate everything that they come in contact with, and then they're ushered into this little room with really nothing there. There's a window and, you know, a door, and two other walls. That's it. So where is the emergency preparedness to handle a crisis, or will this be similar to Katrina or forest fires in the West or flooding that we're seeing now in the upper Mississippi River? I mean is it going to be an after-the-fact review and sudden change in looking at what we should have done beforehand, not after-the-fact? (0002-34 [Rollins, Jackie])

Comment: One of the things that I do want to address that I feel is real lack in the EIS was the effect of a catastrophic accident in this area. This is a source of power so potentially dangerous it's the only one that has to have evacuation routes, has to have trained emergency personnel specifically trained for this kind of accident. (0002-37 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: We've heard a number of people here tonight talk about how unprepared this area is in case of an emergency, and of the need for a great deal of infrastructure improvement, etcetera. If we proceed here and begin building Unit 3 and the costs continue to escalate as they most certainly will, where is the money going to come from to address these needs? (0002-

51 [Pullen, Tom])

Comment: A second reactor places further burden on a community whose existing local infrastructure would not have the capacity to take on a significant healthcare or security crisis. (0003-3 [Thompson, Bennie G.]

Comment: [W]e feel a responsibility, at Alcorn, to have in place the appropriate facilities, trained personnel and mass notification systems to secure and protect our on and off campus constituencies if an emergency occurs. (0004-6 [Ross, George E.]

Comment: I have watched the first respondent, department and agencies not have what they need to respond in case of an accident or an incident around Grand Gulf Nuclear Station. (0005-2 [Garner, A.C.]

Comment: We have concerns about something that is taking place around Grand Gulf; we have questions about Emergency Response in protecting the citizens and their properties. (0005-4 [Garner, A.C.]

Comment: I am also concerned about the inadequate emergency planning and infrastructure in Claiborne County and beyond. Claiborne County's emergency planning infrastructure is too under-funded to deal with the present nuclear plant-let alone a new plant. There is not adequate money available to fund the Sheriff's Department, Civil Defense, Fire Department or hospital. No new reactors should be considered until these inadequacies have been remedied. (0009-13 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: The Jefferson County Board of Supervisors and the citizens of Jefferson County are concerned about the adequacy of emergency response planning in the vicinity of the nuclear reactor and want to assure that offsite radiological emergency planning is effective and can be fully implemented in a timely and coordinated manner during emergency events. Of particular concern to us is the need to aggressively engage our citizens in emergency planning, the need for effective warning devices in our population centers, and the need for interoperable communication between local first responders. To ensure the safety and welfare of our community, there is a need for emergency warning sirens to be located in populated areas; communication devices that will enable all emergency first responders to communicate on the same frequency in the event of an emergency; and assuming a plume moving in a northerly direction, then evacuation routes would be southerly from Grand Gulf (directly through Jefferson County). The regulations, as I understand them, place the responsibility for this emergency response directly on the shoulders of Entergy, and not on the community. (0010-4 [Hudson, Sr., Trent L.]

Response: *These comments relate to the adequacy of emergency plans, which is a safety issue that is outside the scope of the NRC staff's environmental review. As part of its site safety review, the NRC staff will determine, after consultation with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and Federal Emergency Management Agency, whether the emergency plans submitted by the applicant are acceptable. The currently operating unit has an emergency plan in place that has been reviewed and approved by both NRC and DHS/FEMA.*

17. Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope – Miscellaneous

Comment: [W]e call on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, we call on Federal Emergency Management, we call on the State of Mississippi, we call on Mississippi Emergency Management, and we call on the Mississippi Legislature to do something about the situation here in Claiborne County. (0001-10 [Garner, A.C.]

Comment: I think it is outrageous that there is even a consideration of putting another nuclear power plant in this area when they do not have adequate safety measures, adequate infrastructure to protect them in the case of an accident at the already existing Plant. And I don't even think another Plant should be considered until those measures, those needs are taken care of. (0002-36 [Pullen, Ruth])

Response: *The purpose of the environmental impact statement is to disclose the environmental impacts of the proposed nuclear power plant. Issues related to the source(s) of funds for infrastructure and/or services are outside of the NRC's mission and authority and are not addressed in the SEIS.*

Comment: My notion would be that you would try to aggressively partner with Entergy somehow to come up with some sort of a community agreement so you can develop some sort of business model business plan that really leverages the general statement made by NRC in the report. (0001-14 [McDonald, Norris])

Comment: I propose environmentally that there be a very, very strong partnership between Entergy, Alcorn State University, Claiborne County, and the Claiborne County Hospital. They all are very, very synonymous to the needs of the community. (0002-8 [Monsour, Mitch])

Comment: Contrary to the comments written in the June 12, 2008 issue of the Port Gibson Reveille, we at Alcorn State University, of necessity see ourselves as a fit into the Grand Gulf situation. Our commitment is to have our mutual staff involved and engaged in education, training, research and economic ventures that will support the nuclear industry and the university's mission. It is our sincere hope that the statement attributed to Mr. James Randy Douet, Vice President of Operations, suggesting that there was no mandate including ASU is incorrect and/or taken out of context. We have had a long collaborative and mutually beneficial relationship with Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant through the placement of faculty and students in internships and joint research initiatives. With the growth potential of the nuclear industry, and the likelihood of building a new high temperature gas-cooled reactor adjacent to the existing Grand Gulf Nuclear Power Plant, it is imperative that Alcorn State University strengthen its partnership with Entergy Nuclear by assisting in the recruitment and training of the human capital and serving as a pipeline for trained technical subject area experts to contribute to the production, research, and development of the next generation of nuclear power. (0004-2 [Ross, George E.]

Comment:

[W]e propose that Alcorn State University will seek assistance from Entergy Nuclear to build its infrastructures, expand its Alcorn State University educational and training opportunities, and strengthen its services and outreach capacities. To accomplish these goals, the University will need financial resources to:

1. Develop and initiate degree programs
 - BS Nuclear Engineering Technology
 - BS Radiation Science and Technology
 - BS and MS degree in Emergency Management
2. Establish and manage a GGNS 3 near site Nuclear Training/Research Center
3. Create two Endowed Professorships in the School of Arts and Sciences
 - Chemistry
 - Physics
4. Develop and operate a Workforce Development Training Facility on the ASU Campus
5. Build and manage a Local Emergency Preparedness and Homeland Security Center
 - Emergency Shelter in Place
 - State of the Art Emergency Management Training
 - Mass Notification System
 - Transportation
6. Create a Regional Economic Development Partnership
7. Perform an in-depth data-based study of the factors that affect socioeconomic and housing decisions of residents in relocating and living in communities surrounding Grand Gulf. The anticipated costs of implementing these goals and associated strategies will be approximately \$200 million over a three-year period. This figure represents a request of funding to meet the educational, research, emergency preparedness, community and economic development needs of the university and the southwest Mississippi region. Funding to the university will be leveraged with resources from state, federal, and private sources for greater impact and sustained development in the region. (0004-7 [Ross, George E.])

Response: *The purpose of the SEIS is to disclose the environmental impacts of the proposed nuclear power plant. The NRC has no jurisdiction over the business practices of private entities, and these issues will not be addressed in the SEIS.*

18. Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope – Safety

Comment: [I]n all his [Congressman Bennie Thompson] public meetings both in this immediate community as well as surrounding areas, he has made it clear that, No. 1, his concern of the safety of the nuclear reactor. (0001-1 [Horn, Charlie])

Comment: [T]he effects of a catastrophic accident at this plant are just incredible, not only for Claiborne County. But you're talking about a facility that's two miles from the Mississippi River, one of the main thoroughfares, shipping thoroughfares, in the country which carries what drinking water and water down to the Gulf of Mexico. So a catastrophic accident at this plant would not only affect the economy of Claiborne County but would affect the economy of states all through the Gulf and the health of people along the Mississippi River. (0002-40 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: [T]here's a dead zone in the Gulf of Mexico that stretches from Louisiana to Texas. It's the result of agricultural chemicals coming down the Mississippi River from the Midwest. It has tremendous economic impacts on the fisheries and other aspects of income down in the

Gulf. And an accident at this plant could have the same kind of effect, if not worse because it would affect the tourist industry. It would just have a lot more effect. So I think that that's something that needs to be addressed in this EIS. (0002-41 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: We recognize the exemplary safety tract record of Grand Gulf, Entergy, and System Energy Resources. As there are positive economic opportunities associated with the expansion of Grand Gulf, there are also potential negative externalities that all elected representatives of the public must consider since our first obligation is to protect the health, safety, and welfare of our citizens.

(0010-3 [Hudson, Sr., Trent L.])

Response: *The issues raised in these comments are safety issues and as such are outside the scope of the environmental review and will not be addressed in the SEIS. A safety assessment for the proposed licensing action was provided as part of the application. The NRC is developing a safety evaluation report that analyzes all aspects of reactor and operational safety.*

19. Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope – Security and Terrorism

Comment: [T]hey did [Argonne National Labs] a study which shows that Grand Gulf Unit 1 was never designed or constructed to take an aircraft impact. So there's a concern with regard to the viability and the security of that Plant. Now you're going to talk about adding another unit, this unit as we understand it is a result of a rule-making that was initiated in December -- I guess closed in December of 2007. They are supposed to go through and the Agency is now developing an aircraft impact hazards analysis. So they're going to look at what are the criteria that should go into helping make these reactors more aircraft penetration resistant. (0002-23 [Gunter, Paul])

Comment: [W]e think that you should include the impact of an aircraft or a security event at Grand Gulf 1 and how it relates to the safe operations of this new unit. So you know because they're co-located, because they're in the same spot, and because Grand Gulf Unit 1 was never designed or constructed, according to Argonne National Laboratory, to take an aircraft impact, you need to look at that in that context. (0002-25 [Gunter, Paul])

Comment: I think that the terrorism issue does need to be addressed. We not only have to worry about the air, we have to worry about land and water attacks. And I just think -- assuming that the facility is safe, you've got one nuclear -- you've got Grand Gulf 1 now. (0002-42 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: [G]iven the effects that it would have on the Mississippi River and the economy in the Gulf of Mexico really increase the risk of a terrorist attack at this facility because the effects would be devastating. So I think that all these issues need to be addressed in more depth. (0002-44 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: I'd like to know what in this country is designed to take an aircraft impact. I mean 9/11 pretty much showed you that buildings like the Pentagon, building like the Trade Centers that were, I believe, built in pretty much the same time frame that Grand Gulf was built certainly couldn't take it. There are buildings around here that couldn't take the impact of a gasoline tanker, let alone an aircraft or an aircraft tanker. (0002-58 [Segrest, Phil])

Comment: Given the national sense of urgency in emergency preparedness following 9/11, having one of the largest nuclear power facilities as a neighbor, demands that we not only consider safeguarding our community from the remote potential of an accidental nuclear related event, but also threats of terrorist attacks, which is a homeland security issue. (0004-5 [Ross, George E.])

Comment: After listening to the comments and then writing the article for next week's Reveille, it seems that security/public safety are major concerns of those attending this meeting. I realize that Grand Gulf has a security system we know nothing about, but as the NRC staff with knowhow, is it enough protection for the plant and those of us who live in Claiborne County? (0007-1 [Crisler, Emma])

Comment: The 911 terrorists were considering an attack on a nuclear facility, therefore a terrorist attack and the resulting consequences should be considered as a Design Basis Threat (DBT) and should be included in the EIS. (0009-16 [Pullen, Ruth])

Comment: Why would terrorists select this site when Port Gibson is not an area of economic significance like New York? Because of the site's proximity to the Mississippi River. An accident or act of sabotage at this facility and its stored nuclear waste could contaminate the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. Many communities downstream depend on the River for drinking water and the River is a major commercial transportation artery, used for shipping large amounts of cargo both upstream and downstream. In addition, the extensive industrial corridor between Baton Rouge and New Orleans depends on River water for processing. In the event of an accident, these industries might have to be shut down. Contamination of vital wetlands that provide nurseries for larval and other developmental stages of fish, for shrimp, oysters, etc., could devastate the seafood industry. Certainly the tourist industries in Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas would be affected. Thus the economic consequences of a severe accident or attack could affect not only this region, but the entire country- just the type of effect that terrorists accomplished with 911 and would want to cause again. Because of these factors, another reactor at Port Gibson would greatly increase the likelihood of a terrorist attack. (0009-15 [Pullen, Ruth])

Response: *Comments related to security and terrorism are safety issues that are not within the scope of the staff's environmental review.*

The NRC is devoting substantial time and attention to terrorism-related matters, including coordination with DHS. As part of its mission to protect public health and safety and the common defense and security pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act, the NRC staff is conducting vulnerability assessments for the domestic utilization of radioactive material. Since the events of September 2001, the NRC has identified the need for license holders to implement compensatory measures and has issued several orders to license holders imposing enhanced security requirements. The NRC has taken actions to ensure that applicants and license holders maintain vigilance and a high degree of security awareness. Consequently, the NRC will continue to consider measures to prevent and mitigate the consequences of acts of terrorism in fulfilling its safety mission. Additional information about the NRC staff's actions regarding physical security since September 11, 2001, at operating reactors can be found on the NRC's public web site (<http://www.nrc.gov>).

Comment: The fact that 10 CFR Part 52 states that 'an applicant for a license to manufacture, construct, and operate a utilization facility' is [not]required to provide for design features or other measures for the specific purpose of protection against the effects of - (a) Attacks and destructive acts, including sabotage, directed against the facility by an enemy of the United States, whether a foreign government or other person' shows how biased this entire process is towards the utility companies. Not only should these safety features be considered, but the environmental impact statement should contain an evaluation of the effects of contamination of the Mississippi River resulting from a catastrophic accident or terrorist attack at the reactor site. (0009-14 [Pullen, Ruth])

Response: *Though the quoted text is from 10 CFR Part 50, Domestic Licensing of Production and Utilization Facilities, similar text is included in the regulations for the licensing of new nuclear power reactors in 10 CFR 52.10. The comment on security and terrorism is outside the scope of the NRC staff's environmental review. An evaluation of security and terrorism issues will be part of the NRC's safety evaluation of the proposed action.*

Summary

On February 27, 2008, the NRC received an application from Entergy for a COL for the proposed Unit 3 at the Grand Gulf ESP site, to be co-located with GGNS Unit 1. On May 30, 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 31153). The notice of intent notified the public of the staff's intent to prepare an SEIS 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 July 29, 2008. Public scoping meetings were held at the Port Gibson City Hall in Port Gibson, Mississippi, on June 19, 2008.

All comments received were consolidated and categorized according to topic within the proposed SEIS or according to the general topic if outside the scope of the SEIS. Those comments along with the responses prepared by NRC staff are presented in this scoping summary report.

The draft SEIS for Entergy's COL application will address the relevant environmental issues raised during the scoping process. The draft SEIS 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 SEIS that will be considered during the development of the final SEIS.