May 28, 2009

MEMORANDUM TO: Robert Schaaf, Branch Chief
Environmental Projects Branch 3
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews
Office of New Reactors

FROM: Douglas Bruner, Project Manager **/RA/**
Environmental Projects Branch 3
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews
Office of New Reactors

SUBJECT: SCOPING SUMMARY REPORT RELATED TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING PROCESS FOR THE LEVY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2, COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) conducted a scoping process from October 24 thru December 23, 2009, to determine the scope of the NRC staff's environmental review of the combined license application for the Levy Nuclear Power Plant (LNP), Units 1 and 2. As part of the scoping process the NRC staff held a public scoping meeting in Crystal River, Florida on December 4, 2009, to solicit public input regarding the scope of the environmental review.

The NRC staff has prepared the enclosed Scoping Summary Report which identifies comments received either at the public scoping meeting, by letter, or by electronic mail and provides responses to those comments. In accordance with 10 CFR 51.29(b), all participants of the scoping process will be provided with a copy of the scoping summary report. The transcripts of the scoping meeting are publicly available in ADAMS under accession numbers ML083520102 and ML083520105.

The next step in the environmental review process is the issuance of a draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which is scheduled for October 2009. Notice of the availability of the draft EIS and the procedures for providing comments will be published in an upcoming *Federal Register* Notice.

CONTACT: Douglas Bruner, DSER/RAP3
301-415-2730

Michelle Moser, DSER/RAP3
301-415-6509

Docket Nos.: 52-029 and 52-030

Enclosure: Scoping Summary Report

May 28, 2009

MEMORANDUM TO: Robert Schaaf, Branch Chief
Environmental Projects Branch 3
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews
Office of New Reactors

FROM: Douglas Bruner, Project Manager **/RA/**
Environmental Projects Branch 3
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews
Office of New Reactors

SUBJECT: SCOPING SUMMARY REPORT RELATED TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING PROCESS FOR THE LEVY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2, COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) conducted a scoping process from October 24 thru December 23, 2009, to determine the scope of the NRC staff's environmental review of the combined license application for the Levy Nuclear Power Plant (LNP), Units 1 and 2. As part of the scoping process the NRC staff held a public scoping meeting in Crystal River, Florida on December 4, 2009, to solicit public input regarding the scope of the environmental review.

The NRC staff has prepared the enclosed Scoping Summary Report which identifies comments received either at the public scoping meeting, by letter, or by electronic mail and provides responses to those comments. In accordance with 10 CFR 51.29(b), all participants of the scoping process will be provided with a copy of the scoping summary report. The transcripts of the scoping meeting are publicly available in ADAMS under accession numbers ML083520102 and ML083520105.

The next step in the environmental review process is the issuance of a draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which is scheduled for October 2009. Notice of the availability of the draft EIS and the procedures for providing comments will be published in an upcoming *Federal Register* Notice.

CONTACT: Douglas Bruner, DSER/RAP3
301-415-2730

Michelle Moser, DSER/RAP3
301-415-6509

Docket Nos.: 52-029 and 52-030

Enclosure: Scoping Summary Report

Distribution: See next page

ADAMS Accession No**: ML091260469**

OFFICE	PM:RAP 3: DSER:NRO	LA:RAP 3 DSER:NRO	LA:RAP 3 DSER:NRO	OGC	BC:RAP 3 DSER:NRO
NAME	D. Palm	E. Hylton	D. Bruner	S. Kirkwood	R. Schaaf
DATE	05/06/09	05/06/09	05/07/09	05/22/09	05/28/09

OFFICIAL RECORDS COPY

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC

DBruner, NRO	MMoser, NRO	DPalmrose, NRO	EHylton, NRO
RSchaaf, NRO	BAnderson, NRO	JMartin, OCG	SKirkwood, OGC
FSaba, NRR	TMorrissey, RII	RHannah, RII	GWilson, RII
RidsNroDser	OCA	OPA	RidsNroDserRap3
RidsRgn1MailCenter	RidsOgcMailCenter	RidsOpaMail	

Ellen Prendergast-Kennedy, PNNL, Ellen.Prendergast@pnl.gov
Michael Smith, PNNL, Michael.Smith@pnl.gov
Stephen Wyngarden, ISL, SWyngarden@icfi.com
Gordon Hambrick, USACE, Gordon.A.Hambrick@usace.army.mil

Environmental Impact Statement Scoping Process

Summary Report

Levy Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 Combined License Levy County, Florida

May 2009

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Rockville, Maryland

Introduction

On July 28, 2008, Progress Energy Florida, Inc. (PEF) submitted to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) an application for a combined license (COL) for construction and operation of two new commercial nuclear power reactors at a greenfield site in Levy County, Florida, that will be called the Levy Nuclear Plant (LNP). The LNP site is located in southern Levy County, 4 miles north of the Levy-Citrus County border, 7.9 miles east of the Gulf of Mexico, and 30.1 miles west of Ocala, Florida.

As part of the application, PEF 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 two new nuclear units at the LNP 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) of 1969, as amended, 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 51 and 10 CFR 52, Subpart C.

The NRC staff is preparing an environmental impact statement (EIS) in conjunction with the PEF application. The proposed action is NRC approval of the PEF application to build and operate two new base-load nuclear power generation facilities (new units), LNP Units 1 and 2, to be located on the new LNP site. The EIS will include an evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposed action and the environmental impacts of alternatives to the proposed action, including the no-action alternative, alternatives related to the facility cooling and circulating water systems, and alternatives available for reducing or avoiding adverse environmental effects in accordance with NUREG-1555, *Standard Review Plan for Environmental Reviews for Nuclear Power Plants*. It also will address alternative energy options. 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 PEF COL application in accordance with NUREG-0800, *Standard Review Plan for the Review of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants*.

On October 24, 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 63517). 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 December 23, 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 National Historic Preservation Act, 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, including any contractor assistance to be used.

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. The transcripts can be found under accession numbers ML083520102 and ML083520105 in the NRC's Agency Document Access and Management System (ADAMS), which is accessible from the NRC website at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html (the Public Electronic Reading Room) (note that the URL is case-sensitive). In addition, 4 letters and 30 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 the NRC staff.

The public scoping meetings were held at the Florida National Guard Armory in Crystal River, Florida, on December 4, 2008. The NRC announced the meeting in local newspapers (the *Citrus County Chronicle*, the *Ocala Star-Banner*, and *The Newscaster/Nature Coast News*), issued press releases, and distributed flyers locally. Approximately 100 members of the public attended the afternoon scoping meeting and approximately 90 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 meeting was opened for public comments. Thirty-two (32) afternoon scoping meeting attendees and 20 evening scoping meeting attendees provided either written statements or oral comments that were recorded and transcribed by a certified court reporter. The meeting summary was issued on December 23, 2008. The meeting summary is available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly Available Records component of ADAMS under accession number ML083460121.

Table 1 lists in alphabetical order the individuals who provided comments, their affiliation (if given), the ADAMS accession number that can be used to locate the correspondence, and the correspondence identification (ID) number. Accession numbers indicate the location of the written comments in ADAMS.

Comments were consolidated and categorized by topic within the proposed EIS or by the general topic if outside the scope of the EIS. Once comments were grouped according to subject area, the NRC staff determined the appropriate response for the comment. Comments in the same subject area with similar objectives were grouped together and one response was provided that addressed the common essential issues raised in the comments. The comment categories are listed in Table 2 in the order in which they are presented in this document.

Table 3 lists the comment categories in alphabetical order, with commenter names and comment identification (ID) numbers for the comments that were binned into each category. The comment ID number consists of the 4-digit correspondence ID number (also shown in Table 1) followed by a hyphen and the number of the comment within the correspondence.

Table 1. Individuals Who Provided Comments During the Comment Period

Commenter	Affiliation (if stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession #	Correspondence ID
Albert, Pamela		Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015
Arnason, Deb		Email (ML090060934)	0039
Barnwell, Martha	Progress Energy Florida	Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
		Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015
Berger, Betty		Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015
Berger, Sarah		Email (ML083640014)	0020
Bullock, Wade		Email (ML083510834)	0013
Burrell, Troy	Burrell Engineering	Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Cannon, Renate		Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Casey, Emily	Environmental Alliance of North Florida	Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015
Cheek, Ken		Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Cox, Lesley		Email (ML083640026)	0029
Craig, Avis		Email (ML090060936)	0035
Damato, Dennis		Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015
Davis, Suellyn		Email (ML083470118)	0009
Dickinson, Josh		Email (ML083470113)	0006
Dickinson, Sally		Email (ML083470113)	0006
Douglas, Amanda	Nature Coast Business Development Council	Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Edison, Jeff	Levy County Schools	Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Eppes, Thomas		Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
		Letter (ML090480055)	0043
Foreman, Patricia		Email (ML090060937)	0036
		Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Frink, Ken	Burrell Engineering	Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Garvin, Bill		Email (ML083640012)	0018

Table 1. (contd)

Commenter	Affiliation (if stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession #	Correspondence ID
Haghighat, Alireza		Email (ML083470108)	0005
Harris, Mac		Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Hernandez, Michael		Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
		Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015
Heywood, Harriet		Email (ML083640013)	0019
Highsprings, Jojo		Email (ML083640019)	0023
Hilliard, Dan		Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Hodges, Alan	University of Florida	Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015
Hollins, Dixie	Hollinswood Ranch	Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015
Hopkins, Norman	Unnamed environmental organizations	Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
		Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015
Horgan, Wendy		Email (ML083640024)	0028
Johannesen, Francine	Marion County Building Industry Association	Letter (ML083500251)	0010
Jones, Art		Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Karson, Annabeth		Email (ML083640030)	0031
Kirk, Susan	City of Crystal River	Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Klutho, Mark		Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015
Latimer, Al	Enterprise Florida	Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Lewis, Maloni		Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015
Maidhof, Gary	Citrus County Department of Development	Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
		Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015
Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee		Email (ML083640018)	0006
		Email (ML083640018)	0042

Table 1. (contd)

Commenter	Affiliation (if stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession #	Correspondence ID
Marmish, John	United Way of Citrus County	Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Marraffino, Paul		Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
McCray-Holly, Katrice	Community Action Foundation of Citrus County	Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015
Medlin, Ted		Email (ML083460103)	0040
Michaels, Edward		Email (ML083640016)	0021
Miller, Joan		Email (ML083640011)	0017
Miller, Ron		Email (ML083640011)	0017
Moore, Brian		Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015
Mucci, Matt	Advocacy for the Tampa Bay Partnership	Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Mueller, Heinz J	Environmental Protection Agency	Letter (ML090400336)	0044
Murphy, Joe	Gulf Restoration Network	Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015
Musser, Marcie		Email (ML083470117)	0008
Nelson, Tami		Email (ML083640023)	0027
Olson, Mary		Email (ML090060933)	0038
Pernu, Dorothy	Seven Rivers Regional Medical Center	Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015
Peters, Michael		Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015
Renfro, E. E.	Meadowcrest Community Association	Email (ML090060935)	0034
Roberts, Preston		Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Roff, Rhonda		Email (ML083640028)	0030
Russell, John	Self	Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Slaback, Laura	Levy County Public Education Foundation	Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Smith, Bobbie	Levy County Schools Foundation	Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Smith, Robert		Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Stewart, Anita		Meeting Transcript	0015

Table 1. (contd)

Commenter	Affiliation (if stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession #	Correspondence ID
		(ML083520105)	
Sullivan, Jennifer		Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015
Terry, Steve	Miccosukee Tribe	Email (ML090120781)	0037
Towles Ezell, Joy		Email (ML083640022)	0026
Tulenko, James		Letter (ML083500252)	0011
		Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Tyler, Janice		Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Vianello, Mark	Marion Technical Institute	Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Waldron, Theresa	Nature Coast Sierra Group	Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
		Email (ML083640010)	0016
Walther, Robert	Clean and Safe Energy Coalition	Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
		Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015
Wapner, Howard		Email (ML083640021)	0006
Welker, Randy	Economic Development Council for Citrus County	Meeting Transcript (ML083520102)	0014
Wheeler, Leonard		Email (ML083640020)	0024
Whiteley, Naomi		Email (ML083470116)	0007
Wilansky, Laura Sue		Email (ML083640031)	0032
Williamson, John	Environmental Radiation Section of the Florida Department of Health, Bureau of Radiation Control	Meeting Transcript (ML083520105)	0015

Table 2. Comment Categories in the Order in Which They Are Presented in this Report

2.1 Comments Concerning Process - COL
2.2 Comments Concerning Process - NEPA
2.3 Comments Concerning Site Layout and Design
2.4 Comments Concerning Land Use - Site and Vicinity
2.5 Comments Concerning Land Use - Transmission Lines
2.6 Comments Concerning Hydrology - Surface Water
2.7 Comments Concerning Hydrology - Groundwater
2.8 Comments Concerning Ecology - Terrestrial
2.9 Comments Concerning Ecology - Aquatic
2.10 Comments Concerning Socioeconomics
2.11 Comments Concerning Historic and Cultural Resources
2.12 Comments Concerning Health - Nonradiological
2.13 Comments Concerning Health - Radiological
2.14 Comments Concerning Accidents
2.15 Comments Concerning the Uranium Fuel Cycle
2.16 Comments Concerning Transportation
2.17 Comments Concerning Decommissioning
2.18 Comments Concerning Site Redress
2.19 Comments Concerning Cumulative Impacts
2.20 Comments Concerning the Need for Power
2.21 Comments Concerning Alternatives - Energy
2.22 Comments Concerning Alternatives - Sites
2.23 Comments Concerning Benefit-Cost Balance
2.24 General Comments in Support of the Licensing Action
2.25 General Comments in Support of the Licensing Process
2.26 General Comments in Support of Nuclear Power
2.27 General Comments in Support of the Applicant
2.28 General Comments in Opposition to the Licensing Action
2.29 General Comments in Opposition to Nuclear Power
2.30 General Comments in Opposition to the Applicant
2.31 Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Emergency Preparedness
2.32 Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Miscellaneous
2.33 Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - NRC Oversight
2.34 Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Safety
2.35 Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Security and Terrorism

Table 3. Comment Categories with Associated Commenters and Comment ID Numbers

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
Accidents-Severe	• Cox, Lesley (0029-3) • Davis, Suellyn (0009-4) • Heywood, Harriet (0019-8) • Musser, Marcie (0008-12) • Olson, Mary (0038-12) • Wilansky, Laura Sue (0032-12)
Alternatives-Energy	• Arnason, Deb (0039-2) (0039-7) (0039-9) • Barnwell, Martha (0014-7) (0014-10) (0015-13) (0015-14) • Berger, Betty (0015-94) • Cox, Lesley (0029-5) (0029-6) • Davis, Suellyn (0009-5) • Dickinson, Josh (0006-4) (0006-11) • Dickinson, Sally (0006-4) (0006-11) • Eppes, Thomas (0014-73) (0014-75) (0014-76) (0014-77) (0014-78) (0014-79) • Foreman, Patricia (0036-3) • Frink, Ken (0014-38) • Haghighat, Alireza (0005-2) • Hernandez, Michael (0014-135) • Heywood, Harriet (0019-10) • Highsprings, Jojo (0023-1) • Hopkins, Norman (0014-57) (0014-58) (0014-59) (0015-111) • Horgan, Wendy (0028-5) • Klutho, Mark (0015-44) • Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee (0006-4) (0006-11) (0042-2) • Mucci, Matt (0014-105) • Mueller, Heinz J (0044-2) • Musser, Marcie (0008-2) (0008-4) (0008-13) • Olson, Mary (0038-6) (0038-7) (0038-18) • Roberts, Preston (0014-94) (0014-95) (0014-96) (0014-97) • Roff, Rhonda (0030-10) • Russell, John (0014-68) • Stewart, Anita (0015-79) (0015-80) • Sullivan, Jennifer (0015-58) • Towles Ezell, Joy (0026-2) (0026-8) • Tulenko, James (0014-20) • Waldron, Theresa (0016-2) • Walther, Robert (0014-109) (0014-110) (0015-47) • Wapner, Howard (0006-4) (0006-11) • Welker, Randy (0014-29) • Whiteley, Naomi (0007-2) • Wilansky, Laura Sue (0032-10)

Table 3. (contd)

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
Alternatives-Sites	• Albert, Pamela (0015-54) • Barnwell, Martha (0014-12) • Casey, Emily (0015-31) • Jones, Art (0014-147) (0014-152) (0014-155) • Mueller, Heinz J (0044-1) • Peters, Michael (0015-96) • Towles Ezell, Joy (0026-3) • Tyler, Janice (0014-158)
Benefit-Cost Balance	• Barnwell, Martha (0014-11) (0015-15) • Davis, Suellyn (0009-2) • Dickinson, Josh (0006-8) • Dickinson, Sally (0006-8) • Eppes, Thomas (0043-1) (0043-3) (0043-4) (0043-5) • Foreman, Patricia (0036-1) • Heywood, Harriet (0019-1) (0019-3) (0019-4) • Hodges, Alan (0015-69) • Hopkins, Norman (0014-56) (0015-110) • Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee (0006-8) • Miller, Joan (0017-1) • Miller, Ron (0017-1) • Moore, Brian (0015-104) • Musser, Marcie (0008-3) • Olson, Mary (0038-19) • Roberts, Preston (0014-98) • Tulenko, James (0011-6) • Wapner, Howard (0006-8) • Wilansky, Laura Sue (0032-1) (0032-11) (0032-13)
Cumulative Impacts	• Barnwell, Martha (0015-10) • Casey, Emily (0015-32) • Dickinson, Josh (0006-2) • Dickinson, Sally (0006-2) • Hilliard, Dan (0014-185) • Horgan, Wendy (0028-2) • Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee (0006-2) • Murphy, Joe (0015-114) • Olson, Mary (0038-2) (0038-21) • Peters, Michael (0015-98) • Smith, Robert (0014-34) • Towles Ezell, Joy (0026-5) • Wapner, Howard (0006-2)

Table 3. (contd)

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
Decommissioning	• Russell, John (0014-66) • Wilansky, Laura Sue (0032-9)
Ecology-Aquatic	• Cox, Lesley (0029-10) • Davis, Suellyn (0009-3) • Dickinson, Josh (0006-7) • Dickinson, Sally (0006-7) • Hopkins, Norman (0014-55) (0015-109) • Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee (0006-7) • Murphy, Joe (0015-116) • Musser, Marcie (0008-10) (0008-11) • Wapner, Howard (0006-7)
Ecology-Terrestrial	• Casey, Emily (0015-29) • Marraffino, Paul (0014-115) (0014-179) • Murphy, Joe (0015-113) (0015-122) • Smith, Robert (0014-35)
Health-Non-Radiological	• Marraffino, Paul (0014-117) (0014-118) (0014-183) • Medlin, Ted (0040-5) • Sullivan, Jennifer (0015-64)
Health-Radiological	• Cannon, Renate (0014-128) • Cox, Lesley (0029-7) • Dickinson, Josh (0006-5) • Dickinson, Sally (0006-5) • Hopkins, Norman (0014-54) (0015-106) (0015-107) • Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee (0006-5) • Marraffino, Paul (0014-119) (0014-181) • Olson, Mary (0038-20) (0038-23) • Roberts, Preston (0014-93) • Roff, Rhonda (0030-1) (0030-6) • Wapner, Howard (0006-5) • Williamson, John (0015-4) (0015-5)
Historic and Cultural Resources	• Terry, Steve (0037-1)
Hydrology-Groundwater	• Berger, Betty (0015-93) • Berger, Sarah (0020-3) • Casey, Emily (0015-25) (0015-27) (0015-28) (0015-30) (0015-33) • Cox, Lesley (0029-9) • Hopkins, Norman (0014-53) (0015-105)

Table 3. (contd)

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
	• Olson, Mary (0038-10) (0038-13) • Roberts, Preston (0014-92) • Roff, Rhonda (0030-3) (0030-5) (0030-9) • Tyler, Janice (0014-156) • Waldron, Theresa (0014-165) (0014-166) (0014-167) (0014-168) (0014-172) • Wilansky, Laura Sue (0032-3)
Hydrology-Surface Water	• Arnason, Deb (0039-5) • Barnwell, Martha (0015-16) • Berger, Betty (0015-91) • Berger, Sarah (0020-2) • Cannon, Renate (0014-126) • Casey, Emily (0015-24) (0015-26) • Cox, Lesley (0029-8) • Dickinson, Josh (0006-6) • Dickinson, Sally (0006-6) • Frink, Ken (0014-41) • Hilliard, Dan (0014-184) (0014-186) • Hopkins, Norman (0015-108) • Jones, Art (0014-148) (0014-149) (0014-153) • Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee (0006-6) • Marraffino, Paul (0014-116) (0014-182) • Moore, Brian (0015-103) • Murphy, Joe (0015-115) (0015-119) • Musser, Marcie (0008-9) • Olson, Mary (0038-8) (0038-14) (0038-16) • Roff, Rhonda (0030-2) (0030-4) (0030-8) • Wapner, Howard (0006-6) • Wilansky, Laura Sue (0032-2) (0032-4)
Land Use-Site and Vicinity	• Craig, Avis (0035-2) • Medlin, Ted (0040-1) (0040-8) • Welker, Randy (0014-27)
Land Use-Transmission Lines	• Albert, Pamela (0015-88) • Barnwell, Martha (0015-17) • Marmish, John (0014-143) • Peters, Michael (0015-97)
Need for Power	• Barnwell, Martha (0014-6) (0014-8) (0015-11) (0015-12) • Bullock, Wade (0013-1)

Table 3. (contd)

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
	• Craig, Avis (0035-5) • Foreman, Patricia (0014-50) • Johannesen, Francine (0010-2) (0010-3) • Jones, Art (0014-154) • Maidhof, Gary (0014-131) (0015-1) • Mucci, Matt (0014-103) • Olson, Mary (0038-15) • Pernu, Dorothy (0015-8) • Walther, Robert (0014-108) (0015-46) (0015-48)
Opposition-Licensing Action	• Arnason, Deb (0039-1) • Davis, Suellyn (0009-1) (0009-7) • Dickinson, Josh (0006-12) • Dickinson, Sally (0006-12) • Eppes, Thomas (0043-6) • Heywood, Harriet (0019-11) • Hopkins, Norman (0014-51) • Horgan, Wendy (0028-1) • Jones, Art (0014-150) • Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee (0006-12) • Moore, Brian (0015-99) • Russell, John (0014-70) • Waldron, Theresa (0016-1) • Wapner, Howard (0006-12) • Whiteley, Naomi (0007-1)
Opposition-Nuclear Power	• Arnason, Deb (0039-3) • Cox, Lesley (0029-1) • Dickinson, Josh (0006-10) • Dickinson, Sally (0006-10) • Heywood, Harriet (0019-2) • Karson, Annabeth (0031-1) • Klutho, Mark (0015-36) (0015-38) • Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee (0006-10) (0042-1) • Moore, Brian (0015-100) • Musser, Marcie (0008-1) • Russell, John (0014-62) (0014-69) • Stewart, Anita (0015-76) • Sullivan, Jennifer (0015-56) (0015-59) (0015-62) (0015-65) • Towles Ezell, Joy (0026-6) • Waldron, Theresa (0014-161) (0016-3) • Wapner, Howard (0006-10)

Table 3. (contd)

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
Opposition-Applicant	• Foreman, Patricia (0014-45) • Klutho, Mark (0015-34) • Michaels, Edward (0021-2) • Roberts, Preston (0014-91)
Outside Scope-Emergency Preparedness	• Berger, Sarah (0020-1) • Frink, Ken (0014-42)
Outside Scope-Miscellaneous	• Casey, Emily (0015-23) • Foreman, Patricia (0014-47) • Klutho, Mark (0015-40) (0015-41) (0015-43) • Medlin, Theresa (0040-4) • Renfro, E.E. (0034-3) • Sullivan, Jennifer (0015-57) (0015-60) • Waldron, Theresa (0014-170)
Outside Scope-NRC Oversight	• Heywood, Harriet (0019-9) • Musser, Marcie (0008-6) • Waldron, Theresa (0014-164) • Welker, Randy (0014-33)
Outside Scope-Safety	• Horgan, Wendy (0028-4) • Klutho, Mark (0015-39) • Moore, Brian (0015-101) • Olson, Mary (0038-4) (0038-17) (0038-22) • Roff, Rhonda (0030-7) • Towles, Ezell, Joy (0026-1) (0026-4) • Tyler, Janice (0014-159) • Waldron, Theresa (0014-163) • Wheeler, Leonard (0024-1) (0024-2) • Wilansky, Laura Sue (0032-5)
Outside Scope-Security and Terrorism	• Arnason, Deb (0039-6) • Cannon, Renate (0014-124a) • Davis, Suellyn (0009-6) • Eppes, Thomas (0014-74) • Heywood, Harriet (0019-6) (0019-7) • Klutho, Mark (0015-35) • Musser, Marcie (0008-7) • Roberts, Preston (0014-90) • Russell, John (0014-65) • Tyler, Janice (0014-157)

Table 3. (contd)

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
Process-COL	• Cheek, Ken (0014-138) • Hilliard, Dan (0014-187) • Mueller, Heinz J (0044-3) • Murphy, Joe (0015-112)
Process-NEPA	• Cannon, Renate (0044-127) • Olson, Mary (0038-1) • Murphy, Joe (0015-118) (0038-1) • Terry, Steve (0037-2)
Site Layout and Design	• Berger, Betty (0015-92) • Jones, Art (0014-151)
Site Redress	• Mueller, Heinz J (0044-4)
Socioeconomics	• Arnason, Deb (0039-8) • Barnwell, Martha (0014-13) (0014-14) (0015-18) • Berger, Sarah (0020-4) • Bullock, Wade (0013-3) • Cheek, Ken (0014-139) • Douglas, Amanda (0014-61) • Edison, Jeff (0014-1) (0014-3) (0014-4) • Foreman, Patricia (0014-46) (0014-48) (0014-49) (0036-2) • Frink, Ken (0014-37) (0014-40) (0014-44) • Garvin, Bill (0018-1) • Haghighat, Alireza (0005-5) • Hernandez, Michael (0015-52) • Hodges, Alan (0015-66) (0015-67) (0015-68) (0015-70) (0015-71) (0015-72) • Hollins, Dixie (0015-86) • Hopkins, Norman (0014-52) • Klutho, Mark (0015-42) • Latimer, Al (0014-80) (0014-82) (0014-84) • Marmish, John (0014-145) • Medlin, Ted (0040-2) (0040-3) (0040-6) • Michaels, Edward (0021-1) (0021-3) (0021-4) (0021-5) • Mucci, Matt (0014-102) (0014-104) • Murphy, Joe (0015-117) (0015-120) (0015-121) • Musser, Marcie (0008-8) • Pernu, Dorothy (0015-9) • Russell, John (0014-63) (0014-64) • Smith, Robert (0014-36) • Stewart, Anita (0015-77)

Table 3. (contd)

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
	• Sullivan, Jennifer (0015-55) (0015-63) (0015-78) • Tulenko, James (0011-8) (0014-25) • Tyler, Janice (0014-160) • Vianello, Mark (0014-88) (0014-176) • Waldron, Theresa (0014-169) (0014-171) • Walther, Robert (0014-112) (0015-49) • Welker, Randy (0014-26) (0014-30)
Support-Licensing Action	• Albert, Pamela (0015-87) • Barnwell, Martha (0014-15) (0015-22) • Bullock, Wade (0013-4) • Burrell, Troy (0014-100) • Cannon, Renate (0014-124) (0014-129) • Cheek, Ken (0014-137) (0014-140) • Craig, Avis (0035-1) (0035-4) • Damato, Dennis (0015-90) • Douglas, Amanda (0014-60) • Edison, Jeff (0014-5) • Frink, Ken (0014-43) • Haghighat, Alireza (0005-1) (0005-4) • Harris, Mac (0014-120) (0014-123) • Johannesen, Francine (0010-1) (0010-5) • Kirk, Susan (0014-86) • Latimer, Al (0014-81) • Lewis, Maloni (0015-75) • Maidhof, Gary (0014-133) (0015-3) • Marmish, John (0014-146) • McCray-Holly, Katrice (0015-73) • Mucci, Matt (0014-101) • Nelson, Tami (0027-2) • Pernu, Dorothy (0015-6) • Renfro, E. E. (0034-2) • Tulenko, James (0011-1) (0014-17) • Vianello, Mark (0014-174) (0014-178) • Walther, Robert (0014-111) (0014-114) (0015-50) • Welker, Randy (0014-28)
Support-Licensing Process	• Barnwell, Martha (0015-20) (0015-21) • Craig, Avis (0035-3) • Dickinson, Josh (0006-1) • Dickinson, Sally (0006-1) • Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee (0006-1) • Nelson, Tami (0027-1) • Renfro, E. E. (0034-1)

Table 3. (contd)

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
	• Wapner, Howard (0006-1)
Support-Nuclear Power	• Barnwell, Martha (0014-9) (0014-16) • Bullock, Wade (0013-2) • Frink, Ken (0014-39) • Haghighat, Alireza (0005-3) • Harris, Mac (0014-121) • Hernandez, Michael (0014-134) (0015-51) (0015-53) • Johannesen, Francine (0010-4) • Latimer, Al (0014-83) • Tulenko, James (0011-2) (0011-3) (0011-4) (0011-5) (0011-7) (0014-18) (0014-21) (0014-22) (0014-23) • Vianello, Mark (0014-177) • Walther, Robert (0014-107) (0014-113) (0015-45)
Support-Applicant	• Barnwell, Martha (0015-19) • Berger, Betty (0015-95) • Burrell, Troy (0014-99) • Damato, Dennis (0015-89) • Edison, Jeff (0014-2) • Harris, Mac (0014-122) • Hollins, Dixie (0015-81) (0015-82) (0015-83) (0015-84) (0015-85) • Kirk, Susan (0014-85) • Maidhof, Gary (0014-132) (0015-2) • Marmish, John (0014-141) (0014-142) (0014-144) • Marraffino, Paul (0014-180) • McCray-Holly, Katrice (0015-74) • Mucci, Matt (0014-106) • Pernu, Dorothy (0015-7) • Slaback, Laura (0014-136) • Smith, Bobbie (0014-173) • Vianello, Mark (0014-87) (0014-89) (0014-175) • Welker, Randy (0014-31) (0014-32)
Transportation	• Medlin, Ted (0040-7) • Wilansky, Laura Sue (0032-7)
Uranium Fuel Cycle	• Arnason, Deb (0039-4) • Cannon, Renate (0014-125) (0014-130) • Cox, Lesley (0029-2) (0029-4) • Dickinson, Josh (0006-3) (0006-9) • Dickinson, Sally (0006-3) (0006-9) • Eppes, Thomas (0014-71) (0014-72) (0043-2)

Table 3. (contd)

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
	• Heywood, Harriet (0019-5) • Horgan, Wendy (0028-3) • Klutho, Mark (0015-37) • Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee (0006-3) (0006-9) • Moore, Brian (0015-102) • Musser, Marcie (0008-5) (0008-14) • Olson, Mary (0038-3) (0038-5) (0038-9) (0038-11) • Russell, John (0014-67) • Sullivan, Jennifer (0015-61) • Towles Ezell, Joy (0026-7) • Waldron, Theresa (0014-162) • Wapner, Howard (0006-3) (0006-9) • Wilansky, Laura Sue (0032-6) (0032-8)

Levy Combined Construction and Operating 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 ID number (document number-comment number). Comments are grouped by category. The draft EIS will take into account the relevant issues raised during the scoping process, and it 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, will be considered in the NRC's decision on PEF's COL application for the LNP site.

2.1 Comments Concerning Process - COL

Comment: I trust that the NRC and Progress Energy will bring us a responsible design. (**0014-138** [Cheek, Ken])

Comment: For these reasons I have rendered this presentation. I find these apparent inconsistencies unsettling. I do not object to the proposed project in a conceptual sense. However, I pointedly request the various agencies involved in this process hold the State and Applicant to strict interpretation of Federal Statutes and exercise due diligence in this review. The State's determined need for this project is met by a real need to preserve resources in this region. They are very interdependent issues. (**0014-187** [Hilliard, Dan])

Comment: The Gulf Restoration Network (GRN) has deep and profound concerns about the potential environmental impacts that could result from this project being permitted. We strongly urge all local, State, and Federal agencies involved in any and all levels or aspects of permitting this project to fully and completely analyze all potential environmental risks from this project and deny permitting if any environmental review demonstrates a potential threat to Florida's natural resources or regional water systems, supply, or hydrogeology (both in terms of quality and quantity). (**0015-112** [Murphy, Joe])

Response: *The licensing process for combined license (COL) applications is specified in Title 10 CFR Part 52. The environmental review process associated with new reactor licensing includes a detailed review of an applicant's 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 about whether or not it is appropriate to grant the license. Safety issues as well as environmental issues will be evaluated before a decision is reached on an application.

Comment: EPA also has questions about the approval process of certain construction activities mentioned in LNP's Limited Work Authorization (LWA) and Site-Redress Plan. It is our understanding that the LWA may be approved by the NRC prior to all (or most) environmental permits being obtained. Approval of the LWA could therefore potentially authorize site development and deep/shallow foundation construction for the LNP site, to include all or some of the following tasks:

- Installing waterproofing beneath the mud mat under the nuclear islands.
- Installing rebar in the nuclear island concrete foundations.
- Erecting safety-related concrete placement forms.
- Installing Turbine Building foundation drilled shafts.
- Installing Annex Building foundation drilled shafts.
- Installing Radwaste Building foundation drilled shafts.
- Installing circulating water piping between the cooling tower basins and the entrance point to the turbine building condensers. Installing the raw water system intake structure and make-up line to the cooling tower basin.

It is our understanding that the NRC could grant approval of the LWA for the above work prior to approval of the following applications and permits:

- Approval of the application to the NRC for a COL;
- Approval of the application to the State of Florida for site certification;
- Approval of any required National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Permit(s) (NPDES) for water discharge;
- Approval of the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) air permit;
- Approval of a 316(b) demonstration for the proposed cooling water intake;
- Approval of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Section 404 and Section 10 permits to construct structures in wetlands and regulated waterways;
- Approval of hazardous waste management and disposal plans;
- Approval of the determination of consistency under the requirements of the Coastal Zone Management Act to ensure the LNP is consistent with existing federal and state coastal zone management plans.

The EIS should clarify whether approval of the LWA can actually occur before most, or all, of the applications and permits mentioned above are approved. (**0044-3** [Mueller, Heinz J])

Response: *By letter to the NRC dated May 1, 2009, Progress Energy provided notification to withdraw their request for a LWA.*

2.2 Comments Concerning Process - NEPA

Comment: After the survey is completed, please continue to consult with us as this project develops. Thank you for consulting with the Miccosukee Tribe. (**0037-2** [Terry, Steve])

Response: *The NRC has initiated consultation with the Miccosukee Tribe in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and NEPA and will continue to do so throughout the EIS process.*

Comment: I understand that Progress Energy says it is collaborating with local agencies to ensure the plant has no significant adverse impacts on resources or nearby wells. I would like to know which local agencies. (**0014-127** [Cannon, Renate])

Response: *Interactions between Progress Energy and local agencies is outside the purview of NRC's environmental review of the COL application. The NRC has initiated informal consultation with a variety of Federal and State agencies during the environmental review in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). A list of agencies and organizations contacted will be provided in Appendix B of the EIS. Adverse impacts on surface water and groundwater resources will be addressed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: In recognition of the Holiday season and the fact that the Progress Energy proposal is in a league of its own - the only "green fields" site not previously licensed for nuclear construction - NIRS asks the Commission to extend the comment period by a minimum of 30 days. We regret that we have not made this request sooner, however it is in the interests of the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act that affected parties be able to participate in this process fully. The fact that more than half of this comment period falls in the range of Thanksgiving and Christmas / Chanukah / Buddha's Enlightenment / Winter Solstice (NIRS members, including those in Florida, do celebrate across this spectrum) means that people have had to either forgo family celebration or forgo participation in this process. If extension is granted we would appreciate a direct notice of this fact (828-675-1792 / nirs@main.nc.us) and we will notify NIRS members and members of the public with whom we are in contact in Florida. (**0038-1** [Olson, Mary])

Response: *The commenter requests an extension to the scoping comment period. The NRC established the time period for comments on the scope of the environmental review for new*

licenses to balance the Commission's goal of ensuring openness in the regulatory processes, with its goal of ensuring that the NRC's actions are effective, efficient, realistic, and timely. While the NRC staff believes that the 60 days provided were sufficient for the comment period, the NRC also considered additional comments that were submitted after the scoping period ended to the extent practicable.

Comment: Please conduct a full consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Gulf of Mexico Fisheries Management Council, and the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. (**0015-118** [Murphy, Joe])

Response: *In accordance with NEPA, the NRC has initiated informal consultation with a variety of Federal and State agencies during the environmental review. Agencies with which NRC is consulting include the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FFWCC). Impacts on the aquatic environment will be addressed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

2.3 Comments Concerning Site Layout and Design

Comment: I believe that the plant is way too big. I mean, Progress Energy hasn't built any nuclear plants in over thirty years, there's just been nothing built in this country. So if you are going to start building nuclear plants again let's start out with something really small. (**0014-151** [Jones, Art])

Response: *The NRC staff will review the need for power and alternatives analyses for the proposed LNP Units 1 and 2 and these analyses will be discussed in Chapters 8 and 9 of the EIS. The external appearance of the proposed facility will be addressed in Chapter 3 of the EIS.*

Comment: Progress Energy states they will barge building supplies up the Barge Canal. A barge has never been able to use the canal due to the twelve-foot depth and the available width. It was one tried it half loaded and it went aground. So I don't understand how they figured this if they didn't know about the barge in April that went aground. (**0015-92** [Berger, Betty])

Response: *Plant construction, including transportation of materials, will be described in Chapter 3 of the EIS.*

2.4 Comments Concerning Land Use - Site and Vicinity

Comment: We the undersigned, are opposed to the Progress Energy railroad line being placed on the old abandoned railroad bed at the south end of The Villages of Rainbow Springs. (**0040-1** [Medlin, Ted])

Comment: We feel the railroad spur in its proposed location will have an irreversible negative impact on our environment, on our property values and on the quality of our lives. (**0040-8** [Medlin, Ted])

Response: *Progress Energy filed a Notice of Amendment on November 26, 2008, to the State of Florida Site Certification Application (SCA), to amend the SCA to withdraw all of those sections of the SCA which addresses the proposed 13-mile corridor in Levy and Marion Counties, Florida. Additionally, the Progress Energy response to information need CR-5, by letter dated January 16, 2009 to NRC, states that the rail line has been removed from the plan.*

Comment: I was the President of the Community Reuse Organization for the Fernald Feed Plant that was a uranium processing plant in Ohio. And, as you know, we've dismantled most of those plants. And this past summer if you go to this plant you will see a field in an area that is truly wildlife oriented. It is completely returned to its use. Now, is that something we would like to always happen with our power plants in the future? And I would say no, we would like to be able to use these as long as we can and continue to use them so that they are productive and whatever. But I think it does answer the question: Can we return certain sites to pristine conditions, and I would argue yes as we saw there. Again, my background is also in brownfield redevelopment, and I've seen the successful redevelopment of sites that are dirty from what we have done in industry and we've been able to accomplish those tasks. (**0014-27** [Welker, Randy])

Response: *Should the Levy Plant be built, the NRC will require decommissioning of the facility when it permanently ceases operation. Land-use impacts of plant construction will be discussed in Chapter 4 of the EIS, and land-use impacts of plant operation will be discussed in Chapter 5.*

Comment: The site is as well suited to accommodate the proposed use in an area of sparse population. (**0035-2** [Craig, Avis])

Response: *Land use impacts of construction and operation of proposed LNP Units 1 and 2 will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

2.5 Comments Concerning Land Use - Transmission Lines

Comment: I have also had the opportunity to participate on the community working group which was composed of community and business leaders and local citizens. Our task was to find a route for the transmission lines through Citrus County. And many other counties have similar groups meeting, whether it be Levy, or Hernando I believe had them. And we all worked in conjunction, trying to figure out the best route for these transmission lines. We all voted for everything to be buried below the ground so we didn't have to look at them. That didn't work. That was a very expensive alternative. But we all concluded that the best routes were probably the present routes that we have going through the county, and maybe to tie that in with those

lines and with the Suncoast Parkway that's coming up through the county. And the purpose was we wanted to see less impact on to our established communities so that the lines did not disrupt that. (**0014-143** [Marmish, John])

Comment: This site also works well with our transmission facilities like the ones we have existing in our plant facility to help bring this generation to our other customers in our thirty-five counties, as well as serving our customers here in Levy and Citrus. (**0015-17** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: All we ask, I think, is that you keep us informed as far as the environmental audit to see impacts on our property. Right now it shows the lines will be going about through our living room. So a good share of our five acres may become transmission lines. I don't know. But anyway, all we ask is that you, you know, keep us informed and best of luck to you. (**0015-88** [Albert, Pamela])

Comment: What we are looking at, folks, is the largest land grab via eminent domain for the new distribution network, which I believe is probably unneeded, in the history of the state. Levy County has had multiple county officials formally involved in ruling on the zoning and other issues involving this plant indicted for bribery at the Federal level most recently. (**0015-97** [Peters, Michael])

Response: *Environmental impacts associated with construction and operation of any planned new transmission line rights-of-way will be addressed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS. The analysis will address any potential impacts associated with upgrades to the existing lines if required. The NRC does not have any regulatory authority regarding the implementation of Federal, State, or local guidelines in siting, constructing, or operating transmission lines. The EIS will address any known or proposed activities that could impact the site or transmission corridor environmental conditions and proposed mitigation measures, as appropriate.*

2.6 Comments Concerning Hydrology - Surface Water

Comment: The vast amounts of water consumed in cooling would make a mockery of State efforts to conserve water. These plants would consume our personal drinking water at an unsustainable rate. (**0006-6** [Dickinson, Josh] [Dickinson, Sally] [Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee] [Wapner, Howard])

Comment: I worked for the Texas Water Development Board. Bringing me to another point. The agency was not called Water Commission. We had that, too. It said development, meaning there wasn't enough around. And Florida is heading in the right direction, the same direction at an alarming rate. (**0014-126** [Cannon, Renate])

Comment: I am confused by the assertion that the Withlacoochee River does not contribute to the CFBC by the applicant. Within the SCA is a veritable treasure trove of hydrological

information, including many pages of data gleaned from USGS stations regarding system flows in the river. There are two engineered discharge points at Lake Rousseau. One is the Inglis Bypass Spillway, which contributes all flows to the Lower Withlacoochee River. It typically provides an average of slightly more than 1,000 CFS to that outstanding Florida water. The second is the Inglis Dam located on the southwest portion of the lake. It provides for water level management on the lake by allowing SWFWMD to discharge excessive water into the CFBC through the upper segment of the Lower Withlacoochee River during high rainfall events. Due to documented leakage there is a contribution of a minimum additional flow of 70 CFS to the segment of the river which discharges in the CFBC and this is a continuous contribution. Within the SCA the applicant has clearly identified contributions to the CFBC for a 35 year period, which during one event exceeded 6,000 CFS (SCA Table 2.3-6 sheets 1 & 2). Monthly mean contributions to the CFBC over the Inglis Dam are in the range of 400 CFS per the applicant's submission. (**0014-186** [Hilliard, Dan])

Comment: We [Progress Energy] have chosen Levy County as our preferred site for several reasons. And one of those is a sufficient supply of cooling water, a critical factor in the operation of a nuclear plant. The preferred site was chosen because it has ample water supply to support the plant without affecting other water usage and requirements in the area. The cooling water for the plant will be supplied by salt water intake coming from the Gulf of Mexico. (**0015-16** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: Just like with the economy the world is beginning to realize that we are now experiencing the starting point of a global water crisis. People are slowly cutting back on unnecessary water usage and are starting to make wise choices on when and where to consume water. Globally people are suffering from the lack of clean and fresh water and there is no government that can bail us out of this crisis. Everyone is learning that we cannot continue with business as usual. All over the world people are having to make difficult choices concerning how much water they can obtain for food, cleanliness, health, and industry needs. The choices made today will affect the future of not only many generations of humans to come but the health of all our ecological systems on this planet. This country is in an important period where change does need to occur. (**0015-24** [Casey, Emily])

Comment: The vast amounts of water consumed in cooling would make a mockery of State efforts to conserve water. (**0029-8** [Cox, Lesley])

Comment: And frankly, we need the water that would be used by these plants for other purposes in our state, which already experiences regular droughts, and employs extensive water use restrictions throughout much of the year. (**0032-4** [Wilansky, Laura Sue])

Comment: Given the likelihood that we are entering a period of reduced availability of fresh water - NRC must project not only the environmental impact of such sacrifice of fresh water - but also the human impact in terms of the whole fresh water system in the area, and the economic

impact. Is it possible that the profit margin on that freshwater could in only a decade or two actually be greater for a corporation like Progress? (**0038-14** [Olson, Mary])

Comment: [P]lease enlist a climate crisis expert to help you with the assumptions you use when you project water availability. (**0038-16** [Olson, Mary])

Comment: This proposed sacrifice (and approval of an activity that will likely garner public subsidy) must be weighed against a full disclosure of the methodology of projecting supply of cooling water over the course of the license period. A disclosure of the ways in which climate change has or has not been factored and an explanation of either choice. (**0038-8** [Olson, Mary])

Comment: [Nuclear energy] evaporates millions of gallons of water PER DAY. (**0039-5** [Arnason, Deb])

Response: *The construction and operation of a nuclear plant involves the consumption of water. The staff will independently assess the impact of these consumptive water losses on the sustainability of both the local and regional water resources. This assessment will consider both current and future conditions, including changes in water demands to serve the needs of the future population and changes in water supply resulting from climate variability and climate change. While NRC does not regulate or manage water resources, it does have the responsibility under NEPA to assess and disclose the impacts of the proposed action on water resources. The staff's assessment of the impacts on the sustainability of water resources will be presented in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS for construction and operation, respectively.*

Comment: The Waccasassa River Drainage Basin is a precious resource; the presence of nuclear power reactors within the basin could seriously jeopardize its well-being. Water withdrawal and discharge will cause hydrological alterations in surrounding freshwater streams, lakes, the Cross Florida Barge Canal, groundwater, and the Gulf of Mexico. (**0008-9** [Musser, Marcie])

Comment: [W]e love our water here in Crystal River. Kings Bay is made up of over thirty freshwater springs and it is a manatee sanctuary here in the winter. Anything that has any danger of interrupting the flow of fresh water into those springs is something that we are absolutely opposed to. (**0014-148** [Jones, Art])

Comment: I think the plant, the location of this plant is just in a bad, bad, bad location. As Mr. Hopkins pointed out, it's at the top of the -- what was the word he used -- point true metric concentric circles that brings water down. So it is one of the highest points in this area and the water flows south into Crystal River. And then you have Rainbow River right next to it over in Marion County. (**0014-149** [Jones, Art])

Comment: Mr. Hopkins was talking about tritium going into the environment and tritium into the water. I mean, it just doesn't make sense. I think that the Rainbow Springs, and Kings Bay, and Crystal River, and this whole area around here in the water is absolutely priceless. (**0014-153** [Jones, Art])

Comment: In the SCA it is stated by the applicant that the project will be consistent with the Coastal Zone Management Act as administered by the State's CZMP. It is stated there are no known federal permits required that do not have comparable state permit requirements. While such programs may be properly administered by the State as part of the Act, it is necessary that diligent Federal oversight be administered. I say this because the Federal Government has a vested interest in preserves located nearby such at the Big Bend Sea Grasses Preserve. A component parcel, the Waccasassa Bay State Preserve, is a National Natural Landmark. My concerns are precipitated by assertions made by the applicant which seem unfounded or in conflict with elements of Florida Administrative Code which relate to the State's Coastal Zone Management Program. It is stated in Volume 5 of the SCA, Appendix 10.2.2:

- That the CREC (Crystal River Energy Complex) discharge canal is a Class III surface water and that discharge from the proposed Levy County project will integrate water discharge with that of the CREC.
- That the expected LNP discharge will be cooler than the existing CREC discharge.
- Also in Volume 5, that the Withlacoochee River is not contributing to the CFBC.
- In Volume 8 of the SCA are found depictions of thermal plume models which clearly delineate expansive distribution of heated water from these discharges.

Copies of these extracted assertions are submitted with this presentation. What concerns me, and I admit freely that I simply may not have found reference within the volumes of the application, is this: The waters beyond the discharge canal have a higher classification under Florida Administrative Code and this does not appear to be recognized in the applicant's submission. The impact of their discharge cannot reasonably be considered only in context of the discharge canal. This is certainly a matter for the state to resolve, yet if I understand our purpose here today, oversight of the process is a Federal responsibility.

62-302.400 (FAC) Classification of Surface Waters, Usage, Reclassification, Classified Waters

Class II Coastal Waters - From the southern side of the Cross Florida Barge Canal southward to the Hernando County line, with the exception of Crystal River (from the southern shore at the mouth of Cedar Creek to Shell Point to the westernmost tip of Fort Island), Salt River (portion generally east and southward along the eastern edge of the islands bordering the Salt River and Dixie Bay to St. Martins River), and St. Martins River from its mouth to Greenleaf Bay. (**0014-184** [Hilliard, Dan])

Comment: [I]t is my understanding also there is a very serious concern about the impact upon the nearby waters in the Gulf of Mexico, just in the act of construction. (**0015-103** [Moore, Brian])

Comment: My second concern is with regard to the cooling waters for the plant. It is clear from Progress Energy literature that most water used at any new plant on the Levy County site will cycle between the Cross Florida Barge Canal and the Gulf at between 100 and 130 million gallons per day, together with a million gallons a day drawn from the freshwater aquifer. It is estimated that 60% of barge canal water would go to the Gulf with 40% released to the atmosphere. Heat, tritium and other pollutants would thus be vented to the air and directly into Withlacoochee Bay and Gulf coastal waters. (**0015-108** [Hopkins, Norman])

Comment: What are the impacts to coastal wetlands habitat, estuaries, and seagrass beds from degraded water quality in the region and from this project (discharges of high temperature water, etc.)? What are the impacts to the Withlacoochee River, coastal wetlands habitats, estuaries, and seagrass beds from reduced fresh water flows resulting from changes in hydrologic patterns and increased groundwater pumping related to this project that lead to less fresh water reaching the coastal ecosystems? How will reduced fresh water flows resulting in high salinity impact these systems? What will the combined impact of reduced flow/higher salinity and increased temperatures via plant discharges do to surrounding natural systems? (**0015-115** [Murphy, Joe])

Comment: What will the cumulative impact of this project be on the surrounding state sovereign submerged lands along the coast, and the public lands in the greater region (Goethe State Forest, Waccasssa Bay State Preserve, etc.) How will those publicly owned lands be potentially negatively impacted in terms of reduced recreational use, habitat loss, changes in hydrologic patterns regionally, lessened economic contributions to the region, and overall reduced ecological function? How will reduced freshwater flows to the coast (leading to higher salinity), and potentially degraded water quality of waters reaching the coast impact the Big Bend Seagrasses Aquatic Preserve and any aquatic resources of state or Federal importance in the region? How will discharges of high temperature water impact the Big Bend Seagrasses Aquatic Preserve? (**0015-119** [Murphy, Joe])

Comment: The locations of the proposed Levy 1 and 2 nuclear power plants would be in the area of the single most important recharge zone for southern Levy County and thus for the Waccasassa Bay, the Big Bend sea grass beds, the Withlacoochee River and its watershed, the Goethe state forest, the Gulf Hammock wildlife management area, the Rainbow Springs watershed area, the aquiculture area and of utmost importance the area would be for that it provides fresh drinking water to the inhabitants of most of the southern part of Levy County, part of Marion County, and the northern part of Citrus County. (**0015-26** [Casey, Emily])

Comment: I am requesting that the EIS examine and clearly explain to the residents of Levy and Citrus counties and the surrounding region, the difference between the conditions now and

the conditions if the new nuclear units reach full operation as proposed. I am interested in the conditions specifically due to the two new reactors and associated operations, without regard for the decommissioning of the coal fired unit at Crystal River. Please express the detailed quantitation and any assumptions made for the calculations of [t]hermal discharges, zone of influence clearly displayed on a map image, and limits which will be applied to the facility. (**0030-2** [Roff, Rhonda])

Comment: I am requesting that the EIS examine and clearly explain to the residents of Levy and Citrus counties and the surrounding region, the difference between the conditions now and the conditions if the new nuclear units reach full operation as proposed. I am interested in the conditions specifically due to the two new reactors and associated operations, without regard for the decommissioning of the coal fired unit at Crystal River. Please express the detailed quantitation and any assumptions made for the calculation of [z]one of influence of surface water withdrawal, incorporating the Florida Department of Environmental Protection's Phase II Florida Aquifer Vulnerability Assessment for Levy and Citrus counties. (**0030-4** [Roff, Rhonda])

Comment: There are many reasons why building new nuclear plants at the Levy site is a terrible idea. One of the big reasons is the impact this would have on water in Florida. Development and population growth in Florida have made water a very big issue here, and it's vital for us to protect the ever-dwindling sources of fresh water we still have. Two new nuclear plants on this site that has never had any power plant, let alone nuclear plants that will use massive amounts of water, is a very bad idea indeed. The water in this area is connected to a large freshwater resource for Florida, and the plant construction alone would damage these resources. (**0032-2** [Wilansky, Laura Sue])

Response: *Chapter 2 of the EIS will describe the current hydrological condition at the proposed site. Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS will describe the methods and results of the evaluation of impacts on water resources from the construction and operation of the proposed action. Included will be consideration of impacts on fresh waterbodies, groundwater, and the Gulf of Mexico. The NRC staff's review will be performed over a range of climate conditions including drought. The staff will consider the opportunity to mitigate possible impacts by considering alternative plant cooling systems. The NRC staff will address cumulative surface water and groundwater impacts in Chapter 7 of the EIS. The release of radionuclides to the environment resulting from normal operations, along with associated impacts, will be described in Chapter 5 of the EIS. The NRC staff's Safety Evaluation Report will address the consequences of an accidental release of radionuclides. Because the State of Florida is the primary regulatory authority over water use and water quality, the staff will work closely with state agencies. Representatives of several state agencies attended the site audit and discussed their specific concerns with the staff. Because construction and operation of the proposed action also have an impact on water quality and aquatic ecology, the staff will closely coordinate these reviews.*

Comment: I would just like to propose be considered for the Environmental Impact Statement ... that there be a robust stormwater system, stormwater management system; that it be a closed system, meaning that any rainfall that falls on the site doesn't run off on the surface but is dealt with with DRA's and with bio-remediation and other methods. (**0014-116** [Marraffino, Paul])

Comment: Specifically a "closed" robust stormwater system for the property should be designed to keep all rainwater on site for the highest level of remediation defined by the water district. No stormwater, including a 100-year storm event, should leave the site without treatment or remediation. (**0014-182** [Marraffino, Paul])

Response: *The construction and operation of a nuclear plant involves management of stormwater on the site. The staff assessment of stormwater management plans prepared by the applicant will be presented in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS for construction and operation, respectively.*

Comment: They [Progress Energy] are also going to use the Barge Canal as their intake water. Again, it is an aspect that is there; why not make use of it. And they are also going to use the Barge Canal as the, not the conduit, but the pathway to get to the discharge points which are existing discharge points on the existing power plant. (**0014-41** [Frink, Ken])

Comment: Well, they are going to pull water from the Barge Canal several miles from the Gulf. There are dilution channels that branch off and possibly could bring salt water into public water supply and many private wells. The Barge Canal is presently not as salty as the Gulf because they send water over the Inglis main dam to try and lower the amount of salt. (**0015-91** [Berger, Betty])

Comment: They plan to draw water from the Gulf up the Barge Canal beginning their piping about 7 miles inland. The Barge Canal has periodic flushes of fresh water to keep it diluted so as not to put salt water into the Floridan aquifer, where the entire area draws their drinking water. This plan actually pulls the Gulf water inland as completely salty and not diluted. If they draw from the Gulf they MUST start their enclosed piping at the Gulf and NOT inland. (**0020-2** [Berger, Sarah])

Response: *Chapter 5 of the EIS will describe the methods and results of the evaluation of water quality impacts from the operation of the proposed plant. Included will be consideration of impacts on the Cross Florida Barge Canal and on groundwater along the canal and in the vicinity of the Levy site. Because the State of Florida is the primary regulatory authority over water quality, NRC staff will work closely with state agencies. Additionally, Chapter 9 of the EIS will evaluate alternative cooling systems.*

Comment: In addition to the assessment of chemical loadings, I am requesting an analysis of the impact of the predicted rising sea temperatures on the effectiveness of the cooling system. (**0030-8** [Roff, Rhonda])

Response: *As part of the NRC's environmental review, the staff will independently assess the impact of operation of the plant cooling system including consideration of current and future conditions resulting from climate variability and climate change. The staff's assessment of the impacts will be presented in Chapter 5 of the EIS.*

2.7 Comments Concerning Hydrology - Groundwater

Comment: There's quite a few items that we, as a community, need to be aware of. We are situated on a hydraulic part of the sand hill. Everyone has heard of the karst and how fragile it is. We are at a downhill position from I believe it is north of Levy. (**0014-165** [Waldron, Theresa])

Comment: My first concern is concerning the siting of the facility which is proposed in Levy County. The proposal is to put it on top of the highest level of ground water pressure for miles around, which means that everything that gets generated there is going to go out into the river systems which are fed with fresh water from that very location. (**0014-53** [Hopkins, Norman])

Comment: The environmental review that we are here for today is extremely important to me because I'm a farmer. I have a farm and I'm familiar with aquifers and how they work, and the water flow, and I can even hear it in places on my property. And once you poison those aquifers we're all done and Florida is going to lose its glitter. And the aquifers run all the way across the state and a lot of people draw water from them. (**0014-92** [Roberts, Preston])

Comment: My first concern is regarding the siting of the proposed plant. From a potentiometric map, of which this is a copy, the site appears to be at the highest potentiometric level for miles around. Such that ground water flows out to such environmentally sensitive features as the Rainbow, Withlacoochee, Crystal River/Kings Bay and Wekiva River systems and state parks. That locality is considered to be the source of fresh water to the Crystal River system, and is due to be verified next year. (**0015-105** [Hopkins, Norman])

Comment: It is a very karst area and that means that the thin limestone covering of the Floridian aquifer has lots of holes in it, and there is also sinkholes, in fact, in that surrounding area. And this is Exhibit 2. The red shows all the sinkhole areas or at least within 787 feet of a sinkhole area. And this is right in here. And water can flow and will flow in many different directions. It just depends on the amount of water in the system at any given time. (**0015-28** [Casey, Emily])

Comment: I am requesting that the EIS examine and clearly explain to the residents of Levy and Citrus counties and the surrounding region, the difference between the conditions now and

the conditions if the new nuclear units reach full operation as proposed. I am interested in the conditions specifically due to the two new reactors and associated operations, without regard for the decommissioning of the coal fired unit at Crystal River. Please express the detailed quantitation and any assumptions made for the calculations for [a]mount of Discharge to Groundwater itemized by chemical species, limits which will be applied, and zone of influence. (**0030-3** [Roff, Rhonda])

Comment: The further risk of permanent groundwater contamination posed by operating nuclear plants here is very high. We have seen this kind of contamination again and again around other nuclear plants all over the country, including right here at Turkey Point in Florida. It is simply not worth the risk to our irreplaceable Florida water resources! (**0032-3** [Wilansky, Laura Sue])

Comment: Please assess the sacrifice zone that NRC will be creating by this license action. ...for instance - licensee contaminates ground water - since NRC has not been able to prevent this at dozens of currently licensed sites, it should be assumed to have a reasonable likelihood of happening at Levy. (**0038-10** [Olson, Mary])

Comment: Since the site is on top of karsts - spring recharge areas - the sacrifice must assess the loss of this natural water resource regardless of any spill, contamination or accident - simply by construction. (**0038-13** [Olson, Mary])

Response: *The EIS will evaluate the impact of the proposed plants on groundwater quality and availability. A description of the current groundwater resources will be provided in Chapter 2 of the EIS. The impact of construction at the Levy site will be addressed in Chapter 4 of the EIS. The impact of operating the proposed plants at the Levy site will be addressed in Chapter 5 of the EIS, including the impacts to the environment resulting from the release of radionuclides during normal operations. The NRC staff will evaluate the consequences of an accidental release of radionuclides in its Safety Evaluation Report, and releases from postulated accidents, such as design-basis accidents, will be evaluated in the EIS.*

Comment: I don't think the public understands. It doesn't matter the money, the house, the jewels you own, when we run out of water we are out of life. And there is no guarantee that the millions of gallons of water that these new plants are planning to use are not going to be affecting the down flow of the aquifer. And everyone that is on the down flow, which would be everyone practically, our wells could be contaminated. (**0014-167** [Waldron, Theresa])

Comment: In addition to the assessment of chemical loadings, I am requesting an analysis of the competing demand for groundwater under the worst-case scenario buildout analysis for the year 2060 as produced by 1000 Friends of Florida. (**0030-9** [Roff, Rhonda])

Response: *The NRC staff will describe and evaluate the impacts of any use of groundwater on local groundwater users during construction and operation of the proposed plants in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS. The NRC staff will review the consequences of an accidental release of radionuclides in the staff's Safety Evaluation Report, and releases from postulated accidents, such as design-basis accidents, will be evaluated in the EIS.*

Comment: I am concerned about our groundwater. We have a unique system with the Florida aquifer and it is our drinking water. That is a great concern to me. (**0014-156** [Tyler, Janice])

Comment: [T]his central part of Florida only receives the water that we receive from rain. We don't get it from any other location. We don't get it from snow fall, or another river, or anything else. Central Florida is totally dependent for drinking water from rain which goes through our wetlands that are being destroyed every day. They are being purified and filtered to go into our private aquifer. This aquifer only feeds Central Florida. North Florida has its own aquifer. (**0014-166** [Waldron, Theresa])

Comment: We don't know when that water is going to get the salt intrusion from the Gulf. There is -- I want that in writing, too -- a guarantee that you're not going to be destroying our wells. Because I live in the country I don't have city water. I have the best water I have ever had in my life. I have a private well on the Florida aquifer. (**0014-168** [Waldron, Theresa])

Comment: And if you are going to build the plants, are you also going to voluntarily build us a de-sal plant? Just go ahead and do it for community service and guarantee there is water because in ten years I don't think there will be. (**0014-172** [Waldron, Theresa])

Comment: The only way our environment is ever going to be able to recover from the water deficit is to allow the earth's ecological banking system to work. Where can this banking system be found and what types of resources are needed to make this accounting system functional? The recharge areas which allow water from rainfall to percolate into the Floridian aquifer quickly and the wetlands, which hold, or in parentheses I have (save) water after the rainfall event, must be protected now. (**0015-25** [Casey, Emily])

Comment: This small red zone right down in here, the southern part of Levy County, is a part of the Floridian aquifer's vulnerability assessment map. It shows an area where the groundwater's quality and quantity are extremely vulnerable. (**0015-27** [Casey, Emily])

Comment: From Cedar Key through an area north of Bronson and over to Daytona Beach it is now known that the aquifer only receives water from rainfall. The monitoring well set up north of this area, north of the proposed area, by the USGS shows that the system is at a critical stage for water quantity a lot of the year. The less rainfall the less water that goes into the system. The less water in the system, along with the extremely high increases in consumption, can and will be catastrophic to this area. We tend to think of countries that have lots of oil under their

feet as being rich. We should understand that an area with fresh, clean water has a treasure under their feet and it must not be wasted any more. (**0015-30** [Casey, Emily])

Comment: It has been estimated that to provide water needs for all uses through the year 2030, the world would need to invest at least $1 trillion a year on technologies towards that end. By not placing more demands on our fragile Floridian aquifer but to restore habitat and allow nature to work as it was intended to do it provides a cost-free system to obtain the most precious commodity that we all need, clean and fresh water. (**0015-33** [Casey, Emily])

Comment: Their [Progress Energy's] draw of fresh water from the Floridan aquifer is unaccounted for presently, but it could be astronomical. Across Highway #19 from them is the Tarmac King Road proposed mine, drawing 22 million gals of water/day from the Floridan to wash their lime rock. There are 194 private shallow wells in the area, plus four public water supplies and more wells. The Southwest Florida Water Management District has put out printed material stating that this area of the Floridan aquifer is fed only by rainfall due to the high ridges surrounding it. AND IT'S NOT RAINING! Water is more important to people than lime rock and certainly more than nuclear plants, which are not environmentally friendly. (**0020-3** [Berger, Sarah])

Comment: These plants would consume our personal drinking water at an unsustainable rate. (**0029-9** [Cox, Lesley])

Comment: I am requesting that the EIS examine and clearly explain to the residents of Levy and Citrus counties and the surrounding region, the difference between the conditions now and the conditions if the new nuclear units reach full operation as proposed. I am interested in the conditions specifically due to the two new reactors and associated operations, without regard for the decommissioning of the coal fired unit at Crystal River. Please express the detailed quantitation and any assumptions made for the calculation of [z]one of influence of groundwater withdrawl, incorporating the Florida Department of Environmental Protection's Phase II Florida Aquifer Vulnerability Assessment for Levy and Citrus counties. (**0030-5** [Roff, Rhonda])

Comment: There is a shortage of water. Across the highway from Progress Energy is plans for Tarmac Mine pumping 22 billion gallons of water a day to wash their lime rock. For 100 years this area of the Floridian aquifer is fed only by rainfall and it is not raining. According to SWFWMD they have applied to SWFWMD -- this is Tarmac -- they have applied to SWFWMD that they are only using 500,000 gallons. SWFWMD is just counting what they are consuming. They are not counting what they are pumping out, making it turbid, pumping it back in the aquifer. Not pristine water that they pumped out. ...Anyway, it will be turbid, conceal the crevices of the karst limestone. We won't have what they took out. Blasting is with ammonium nitrate and oil. Nitrate is infiltrating the area's springs already. Do they need more? (**0015-93** [Berger, Betty])

Response: *The NRC staff will describe and evaluate the impacts of any use of groundwater on local groundwater users during construction and operation of the proposed plants in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS. Changes in the availability of the water resource by competing demands and long-term variability will be addressed in Chapter 7 of the EIS, cumulative impacts on water use and quality.*

2.8 Comments Concerning Ecology - Terrestrial

Comment: Surrounding the vulnerable recharge area -- since I equate it to economics I call that the area where money can be spent quickly -- it is the most important asset Florida has, the wetlands. And that's the savings account. (**0015-29** [Casey, Emily])

Response: *The impacts on wetlands and groundwater recharge resulting from construction and operation of proposed LNP Units 1 and 2 will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS. The discussion will include an analysis of the possible effects of groundwater changes on wetlands in the region.*

Comment: What are the potential impacts of habitat loss and disruption, heavy industrial activity on this site, and related projects in the greater region resulting from the proposed Progress Energy Nuclear Power Plant to year round and migratory bird species (neotropical migrants and songbirds, swallowtail kites, etc.) who currently use the greater Nature Coast and Levy County region (the term Nature Coast henceforth shall be used in this document to refer to the coastal and inland ecosystems that stretch from just north of Tampa Bay to the Wakulla County region)? Please conduct a detailed study and full analysis of all State and Federally listed and protected species, both year round and migratory species. (**0015-113** [Murphy, Joe])

Response: *The impacts on resident and migratory birds, including but not limited to Federally and State-listed species, resulting from construction and operation of the proposed LNP will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS. Cumulative impacts on birds will be addressed in Chapter 7 of the EIS.*

Comment: In terms of regional listed species (State and Federal) and their habitats and wildlife corridors we request that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission request a full site review and regional review and consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FFWCC). We also request that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission fully and independently review past relevant biological and species site/regional data from the Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI), any current or past wildlife surveys conducted by FFWCC for the region, any current or past documents or species surveys conducted by the property's previous owners. Lastly it is imperative the publicly funded site/regional surveys be conducted with State or Federal biologists as part of the environmental review. (**0015-122** [Murphy, Joe])

Response: *In order to determine Federally and State-listed species to be evaluated in the EIS, the NRC has started informal consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FFWCC). These agencies provided NRC with information on listed species that they believe should be addressed in the EIS. All relevant studies and species surveys for Federally and State-listed species from the project vicinity will be reviewed and incorporated into Chapter 2 of the EIS. The results of the NRC's assessment will be reported in a Biological Assessment that will be forwarded to the appropriate services. Additionally, the NRC staff will describe impacts to protected species in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS. The NRC will consult with the FWS and the NMFS regarding potential impacts identified in the biological assessment.*

Comment: I'm here to speak just for myself and my wife, Sandra, and narrow it to the Lake Rousseau and your neighbor to the new proposed site for the nuclear power plant. When the dam was put on Lake Rousseau in 1906, it raised the water level and created a lot of islands, marshes and other things that are a wonderful breeding site for many birds in the community. Thousands and thousands of breeding pairs are located there. The Office of Greenways and Trails has been a good steward of this property along with other state agencies. And the question is now that we have a major development being proposed could this large site have an impact on this location. And we, of course, want to minimize that impact because we like birds there. My wife and I do, at least. (**0014-115** [Marraffino, Paul])

Comment: For over a hundred years Lake Rousseau with its vast area of marshes, islands and hummocks, has provided breeding opportunities for a wide variety of birds. With the current stewardship of the Office of Greenways and Trails and other state agencies, nesting populations have grown and flourished. Many of the breeding populations are listed species that require special attention for protection from the environmental impact of large-scale development. The Levy County Nuclear Power Plant that is under development is near Lake Rousseau and, without measured discipline, could have a negative impact on the water quality and breeding potential of this extraordinary area. (**0014-179** [Marraffino, Paul])

Response: *Impacts on water levels and water quality in Lake Rousseau resulting from construction and operation of the proposed LNP, including any associated impact on breeding bird populations and their habitats, will be addressed in Chapters 4, 5, and 7 of the EIS.*

Comment: [O]n the outside border of their property are you all going to require a fence to border their property all the way around to cut off the movement of the wild game to the State Forest and surrounding people. (**0014-35** [Smith, Robert])

Response: *Discussion of impacts on wildlife, including wild game, resulting from any proposed fencing around the LNP site will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

2.9 Comments Concerning Ecology - Aquatic

Comment: Discharges of hot water will harm Gulf estuarine ecosystems and fisheries. (**0006-7** [Dickinson, Josh] [Dickinson, Sally] [Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee] [Wapner, Howard])

Comment: The water discharged from the nuclear plant would be hotter than what is withdrawn. Temperature changes negatively affect the fish, plant, and animal life that depend on healthy water systems. (**0008-10** [Musser, Marcie])

Comment: We have done enough damage to our environment and the animals. The hotter water released by this plant would increase not lessen our disastrous impact there. (**0009-3** [Davis, Suellyn])

Comment: My concern in this regard is the impact upon the marine food web nurtured in our offshore sea grass meadows, and the impact upon dependent professional and recreational fisheries. Power plants are notoriously damaging to sea grasses when venting to such waters. (**0015-109** [Hopkins, Norman])

Comment: Discharges of hot water will harm Gulf estuarine ecosystems and fisheries. (**0029-10** [Cox, Lesley])

Response: *The NRC staff will assess impacts on aquatic biota and ecosystems in the Gulf of Mexico from thermal discharges from proposed LNP Units 1 and 2 in Chapter 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: The water intake system will likely increase salinity in the upper reaches of the Cross Florida Barge Canal, as well as threaten fish and fish larvae, among other aquatic organisms. (**0008-11** [Musser, Marcie])

Response: *The NRC staff will assess impacts on aquatic biota in the Cross Florida Barge Canal from water intake operations for proposed LNP Units 1 and 2 in Chapter 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: My second concern is with regard to the cooling waters of the plant. Huge quantities of water are going to be cycled from the Cross Florida Barge Canal and put back to the -- into the Gulf. My concern in this regard is the possible impact upon the marine food web which is nurtured in our offshore sea grass meadows, and the impact upon the dependent professional and recreational fisheries. Power plants are notoriously damaging to sea grasses when venting to such waters. (**0014-55** [Hopkins, Norman])

Comment: What are the impacts to State and Federally listed marine species, game fish, and commercial fisheries that depend on healthy and functional coastal estuaries and seagrass beds in this region? Specifically please review and provide analysis of the potential negative impacts to scallops, mullet, sea trout, redfish, oysters, clams, jacks, grouper, sheepshead,

shrimp, blue crab, manatee, sea turtles, sturgeon and other important estuary oriented species in the region. (**0015-116** [Murphy, Joe])

Response: *The NRC staff will assess the effects of the withdrawal and discharge of cooling water for the proposed nuclear power plants on aquatic biota, including protected species and species that are recreationally, commercially, or otherwise important, inhabiting the Cross Florida Barge Canal and the Gulf of Mexico in Chapter 5 of the EIS.*

2.10 Comments Concerning Socioeconomics

Comment: This project is essential for the economy and prosperity of citizens of the State of Florida. (**0005-5** [Haghighat, Alireza])

Comment: Finally, the Levy Nuclear plant will be a major source of economic income for both the civil government and the citizens of Levy county through taxes and excellent employment opportunities. (**0011-8** [Tulenko, James])

Comment: I have conversed with many, many people in our county about the proposed power plant. Everyone I have spoken to, without exception, is in favor of the plant. We absolutely want the jobs and the tax base it will bring to our area. (**0013-3** [Bullock, Wade])

Comment: Levy County is excited about these opportunities for our kids. I am interested in the -- mostly interested in our human environment because that's what I deal with all the time in our schools. (**0014-1** [Edison, Jeff])

Comment: As an economic development organization, we feel this would be the most significant infrastructure investment in decades. It is no secret that our region and our state is growing and making sure that it is smart growth is a pivotal step. (**0014-102** [Mucci, Matt])

Comment: The plan for two new reactors would mean a significant amount of jobs which would head our economy back in the right direction. (**0014-104** [Mucci, Matt])

Comment: But there are other benefits of a nuclear power plant to our local economy. It supports high paying jobs directly at the plant. The Levy plant will provide thousands of construction jobs and many permanent jobs to the region. Furthermore it is estimated that for every job created at a nuclear plant, three more are created in the surrounding community. Three more. Those are Levy jobs. Those are not exportable. They will not go overseas. Better schools, roads, and other civic improvements are also products of nuclear energy and nuclear energy will save Floridians $1 billion a year once up and running. (**0014-112** [Walther, Robert])

Comment: [T]he economic benefits for Levy County will provide a great tax base, job growth, local services, and there are many other benefits that Levy County will also experience. Quite frankly we will have about 800 jobs at our two combined units which will generate about 1,000 to 2,000 indirect jobs as well as 3,000 jobs during construction. (**0014-13** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: I believe the economic impact to the area is very important. (**0014-139** [Cheek, Ken])

Comment: But the investment in the plant is only part of our investment. The other part is in our community because we strive to be an excellent neighbor in Levy County, and we strive to continue the strong partnership that we have. (**0014-14** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: I think that in summation that the things that they are going to bring to you is greater employment to Levy County, but we hope that all the employees live in Citrus County. ...[I]t will enhance the quality of life for both counties. (**0014-145** [Marmish, John])

Comment: [W]hat is going to happen for property devaluation when you run your transmission lines through people's, near people's homes because of health purposes? Is there any monetary compensation? (**0014-160** [Tyler, Janice])

Comment: [T]here are estuaries that will be destroyed in the bend area of Florida once you open that up to sprawl. (**0014-169** [Waldron, Theresa])

Comment: Bringing construction and everything to Levy County, bringing money, jobs. After the construction is done, how many local people will you be employing with a high school diploma and maybe a year of technical school? Will that be adequate for any of your jobs or will you be bringing in highly-trained college educated people from other plants in other areas? Our area does not have a lot four, six, eight year diplomas hanging around for you to just suck up and employ. So that, I believe, is a fallacy. (**0014-171** [Waldron, Theresa])

Comment: The building of these reactors will be an integral part of strengthening and growing our region's economy. It is my belief that the economic impact will be positive; providing thousands of well-paying jobs, many of which can be filled by current and future students. (**0014-176** [Vianello, Mark])

Comment: [T]he Levy Nuclear Plant will be a major source of economic income for both the civil government and the citizens of Levy County through taxes and excellent employment opportunities. (**0014-25** [Tulenko, James])

Comment: I'm the Executive Director for the Economic Development Council for Citrus County. And obviously, we don't want the plant to go to Levy; we want it to go to Citrus County. (**0014-26** [Welker, Randy])

Comment: [Progress Energy employees] are our Little League coaches, they are our school advisory council members, and we greatly look forward to working with Progress Energy in the opportunities that we have in the field of nuclear and technical education. (**0014-3** [Edison, Jeff])

Comment: I'm concerned about our economy. Our economy is in need of this type of use that is economical and beneficial to our community as well as the United States. From what I understand, this power plant currently that we live in this area with and who has been a very good citizen for our community, is the third largest producer of power in the country. (**0014-30** [Welker, Randy])

Comment: [W]hat kind of information do you all have on the devaluing of the adjoining properties to a nuclear power plant. (**0014-36** [Smith, Robert])

Comment: I would like to touch on three aspects of what we see good things about this project. First and foremost is the positive impact we see in the community. You know, I moved here back in the mid-seventies and we've been visiting Citrus County since the early seventies. And I've watched how all five of those plants, particularly the nuclear power plant up there, has transformed this community. Citrus County has always been a retirement, a slow-moving community with a severe lack of meaningful jobs. It's mostly been support jobs. And this one particular project is going to bring, just during the construction of it, I'm hearing over 3,000 skilled laborers, plus all the ancillary, you people that are going to be supporting those people. And then also they have like over 800 full-time jobs that support these plants on a fulltime basis for probably the next eighty or a hundred years. And this doesn't even account for the ripple effect, the secondary jobs needed to support those folks. (**0014-37** [Frink, Ken])

Comment: But this plant offers a lot of economic and job opportunities for the kids and the families of Levy County, both directly working here at the facilities here now and in the future, and the spin- off businesses that are going to result from the nuclear power plants. (**0014-4** [Edison, Jeff])

Comment: As proven in the past with Crystal River 3, it [the Levy plant] will ultimately be embraced by the community and have a lasting positive impact on both the environment and our local economy. (**0014-44** [Frink, Ken])

Comment: [E]conomic development is about creating sustainable wealth and improving quality of life in our communities. This is done by increasing prosperity, creating high quality jobs, creating new personal income, advancing private enterprise, productive use of local businesses and resources, and broadening the tax base. We believe -- myself, along with the Council believes that this project is going to create an opportunity for that to take place in this entire county. (**0014-61** [Douglas, Amanda])

Comment: [A] couple thousand jobs that have been described as being generated by the construction and operation of this plant, both direct and indirect, will be far and away eclipsed by the numbers of quality jobs for the kinds of people, the people with the skill sets that would accommodate these jobs, that are missing in action today with declining construction in a declining economy. (**0014-64** [Russell, John])

Comment: As we work to diversify the state's economy and create jobs, which is our mission, we have strategically focused our business retention and recruitment efforts on industries that offer great high growth potential and pay higher than average state wages. Clean energy is one of the sectors that we focus on. (**0014-80** [Latimer, Al])

Comment: As Enterprise Florida works to attract new businesses to the state and helps existing businesses to expand, we recognize the many benefits of nuclear power companies. It is generally accepted that businesses function best in an environment where things are predictable and certain. Nuclear generated power can provide low stable cost electricity which helps businesses avoid uncertainty. (**0014-82** [Latimer, Al])

Comment: The jobs that will be generated by the construction of this nuclear plant will be high wage jobs. Those jobs will help raise the state average wage and improve the quality of life for not only this community but for the entire state. (**0014-84** [Latimer, Al])

Comment: I would also like to say that I think it will be important for the economic development. What's being proposed here in Levy County will be a tremendous benefit to our students, to students in North Central Florida and to adults in North Central Florida as well. I think they are a tremendous positive economic impact. (**0014-88** [Vianello, Mark])

Comment: The economic benefits of this plant are terrific. The large local investment will allow the county and residents to make investments through increased tax base, new jobs, enhanced local services and a variety of other benefits that local businesses will receive through our plant that we anticipate building here. Levy County can expect to see about 800 permanent jobs with the two units. In addition to that, 1,000 to 2,000 ancillary jobs will be created and we anticipate during construction 3,000 jobs will be needed, or 3,000 people will be needed on site at its peak for construction. But our investment doesn't just stop with the plant. Our investment, as you have heard already, also involves the community and being a good partner and a good steward. We strive to be a good steward and a good neighbor in the communities we serve. (**0015-18** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: But there are other benefits of nuclear energy to the local economy. It supports high paying jobs directly at the plant. In fact, the Levy plant will provide thousands of construction jobs and many permanent jobs to the region. Furthermore it is estimated that for every permanent job that is created at the plant, three more jobs will be created in the surrounding community. That's three more Levy jobs. They can't be exported. Better schools,

roads, and other civic improvements are also products of nuclear energy and nuclear energy will save Floridians $1 billion a year once up and running. $1 billion a year once up and running. (**0015-49** [Walther, Robert])

Comment: Homestead Florida also happens to be, according to U.S. News and World Report, the fastest growing city in the United States of America with 50,000 residents or less. That's indicative, at least to me and to that community that having Turkey Point in that area has not been a detriment to population growth. It certainly hasn't been a detriment to the economy. Despite the housing slowdown, it is still very populated. We have restaurants going up everywhere. There is a Chili's that was just built down the street from my home. And nuclear power has not been a detriment. (**0015-52** [Hernandez, Michael])

Comment: This is an expensive and dangerous proposition. Scientists in their studies can be biased towards whoever is funding them. If they dangle jobs in front of you, what kind of jobs? What is your health worth to you to look the other way? (**0015-63** [Sullivan, Jennifer])

Comment: Local spending on plant construction and power generation operations are considered to be new economic activities that represent additional final demand, and thus will generate secondary or spin-off effects for the local and state economies. (**0015-66** [Hodges, Alan])

Comment: For example, purchases of concrete for construction, which they use a lot of in a nuclear plant, gives rise to new demand for aggregate materials which, in turn, stimulates purchases of inputs from mining operations. Another type of spinoff effect is the personal consumption expenditures made by industry employees for food, clothing, housing, transportation and so forth and are model accounts for the different spending patterns that occur by households of different income levels. (**0015-67** [Hodges, Alan])

Comment: Typically, the total impacts of a new development project on a regional economy may be one and-a-half to two-and-a-half times the value of the original spending. Somebody else mentioned three times. That would be a bit unusual. But it all depends on what the structure of your local area is on how these spinoff effects play out. (**0015-68** [Hodges, Alan])

Comment: At this point it has not yet been determined how much of that investment will occur in the local area or what this will contribute toward the assessed value of property in Levy County. Estimating construction expenditures in this case is made difficult because of the rapidly changing prices for commodities, and also the fact that there have not been any new nuclear plants built in the U.S. in over thirty years. (**0015-70** [Hodges, Alan])

Comment: Based on data currently available, there would be about 2,900 workers on site at the peak of construction, including Progress Energy personnel and contract employees. And

based on staffing patterns for other similar large projects, we can estimate that about sixty percent of those contract employees would reside in the local area. (**0015-71** [Hodges, Alan])

Comment: Once in operation, the plant is expected to have 800 to 900 permanent employees, all of whom would presumably reside in the local area and therefore would be spending their income locally. These are, of course, it's been mentioned, very well-paying jobs. Roughly half of those positions are expected to receive annual salaries in excess of $70,000 and an overall average of about $65,000, which is more than double the current average annual earnings in this three-county area of about $31,000. (**0015-72** [Hodges, Alan])

Comment: I am also the President-Elect of the Citrus County Chamber of Commerce, 1200 members. And we are so excited about what this will boost the economy, jobs, schools, education, and the opportunity for our educated people to stay here in this area and have a good job. (**0015-86** [Hollins, Dixie])

Comment: We believe that the development of the nuclear power project in Levy County will bring jobs and economic benefit, not just to Levy County, but also the surrounding communities. We welcome Progress Energy's initiative in bringing a balanced approach to the future energy demands of Florida in our region. (**0015-9** [Pernu, Dorothy])

Comment: Property owners will lose part of the investment they have made in their homes as property values drop and homes become more difficult to sell. (**0040-6** [Medlin, Ted])

Response: *These comments generally refer to potential positive or negative socioeconomic impacts. Socioeconomic impacts of construction and operation will be addressed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: Our nation is in a recession and the prediction is that it will be a deep and long one. Floridians need ways to reduce their electric bills through energy efficiency and conservation and cannot afford the rate increases that will occur if Progress builds a risky new nuclear plant. (**0008-8** [Musser, Marcie])

Comment: I am a retired senior citizen living on a fixed income. And after what the Energy Commission did and the income today, I can't afford groceries. And it is getting bad and it is getting worse. I've been a professional all my life but at my age nobody wants to hire me. (**0014-46** [Foreman, Patricia])

Comment: There was an article published in the Chronicle on October the 27th by Chris Van Ormer, a wonderful article. Charges Jolt Customers. The utility has virtually no risk if the plant does not come to fruition. It does not have to return our moneys that they want to start collecting in January. To me that is very, very unfair. (**0014-48** [Foreman, Patricia])

Comment: I am not afraid of a nuclear plant but since no one can tell me where the electrical is going from Crystal River, I have, on the QT -- question: I'm told it goes to Chicago and the big cities. Now, if that's true, or maybe if it isn't true, wherever it goes on the grid, charge them. Let them pay for another nuclear plant because I'm tired of it. Everybody is coming along and raiding my kitchen cabinets. It's like I went before the Board for the water, so they've raised it $10. And then they send me a letter telling me the water is poisoned and it has been for a year.

So I take it to my doctor and I say, Hey, what am I supposed to do?" He says, Honey, I don't know. I don't know how it will affect you because it will affect everybody different." (**0014-49** [Foreman, Patricia])

Comment: First of all ... the levy of the charges on the customers to help pay for the facility. What, in effect, they are being asked to do is to contribute to the capital base of Progress Energy for nothing. And two letters have already been written to the Governor concerning this. But essentially there is one easy answer. And that is that Mr. Lyash, or Lash, or, I'm sorry, I don't know how to pronounce his name, should do one thing. And that is not to make the levy. That is the simplest way of eliminating it. I've had suggestions that we get together and put together a class action suit and get a petition and so on and so forth, but really that is going to take an enormous amount of time and expense. But the simple way is not to charge the levy. (**0014-52** [Hopkins, Norman])

Comment: [T]he basic issue is it's as if the future will stand still over the interval from breaking ground to putting this plant on line and, indeed, charging present customers for the privilege of doing so. This is not right. (**0014-63** [Russell, John])

Comment: The hole gets deeper and here what do we have? The article in the paper here, Costly Fuel, Bigger Buildings. I'm going to the Commission meetings in Hillsborough and Pinellas County, the School Board meetings, and I'm reminding all the senior citizens: You're paying and there's going to be a big jump in the utility bills. You are paying for these power plants and you are doing it for the investors. And a lot of the senior citizens, they're not going to see a lot of that electricity. They will be dead and buried. This is a crime. (**0015-42** [Klutho, Mark])

Comment: But although it is more expensive to move this energy so far and it is more wasteful to move it, the customer is going to pay for that anyway. (**0015-55** [Sullivan, Jennifer])

Comment: If the Levy County nuclear reactor is private enterprise, why is Progress Energy passing on the cost of the planned nuclear reactor to its customers in the way of a rate hike in their power bills? Why, if the customers are paying for this enterprise, do they not own it? Is Progress Energy prepared to pay millions of dollars to repair a nuclear plant should it fail after a hurricane, or would the cost of that repair also be passed on to the Progress Energy consumers and customers? (**0015-77** [Stewart, Anita])

Comment: In this time of the super big bailouts, citizens are becoming very weary of footing the bills for the major corporation and their own government. And we can make a perfect example of what happened after Hurricane Andrew when Florida Power and Light's Turkey Point Nuclear Plant, who failed during the storm, one smoke stack was imploded not shortly after the storm itself, and the company paid out $90 million to make the repairs to get the plant back on line. Many people don't know that happened but my source was an article by Tom Dubuque out of the Miami Herald. And my research is still ongoing regarding who actually paid the $90 million. (**0015-78** [Sullivan, Jennifer])

Comment: I would like to voice my strong opposition to Progress Energy's increase to cover, in advance, the cost of new nuclear power plants. I do not feel it is just for them to charge their existing customers in advance for new equipment. In the past bond issues have been used to fund this type of project and I believe it should continue that way. (**0018-1** [Garvin, Bill])

Comment: What is VERY important and seems to be legal is the addition of 25% surcharge on all electric bills beginning in January and extending into infinity. There are presently people without heat in this area, as they had to choose between that and buying food. Their children are barefoot and jobs are gone. The number will be increased unless the Dept. of Energy does something to block this surcharge imposed years before nuclear plant building is completed. (**0020-4** [Berger, Sarah])

Comment: Senior Citizens cannot afford this increase per month on electric bills. Plus, we will not be given the nuclear energy (electric) in our homes. (**0036-2** [Foreman, Patricia])

Comment: [I]t will not be tolerated by the citizens of Florida to be taxed to pay billions for nuclear power plants or charged as customers for something that a private company would never find profitable without public money. (**0039-8** [Arnason, Deb])

Response: *The NRC regulates the nuclear industry to protect public health and safety within existing policy. Issues related to the rate adjustments are outside of the NRC's mission and authority and will not be addressed in the EIS. This authority and responsibility is most often the role of state regulatory authorities such as public service commissions. However, the socioeconomic impacts of construction and operation will be addressed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: [T]his project up in Citrus and Levy Counties, is what it is going do is it going to make use of the defunct Cross Florida Barge Canal. That's a project, in my opinion, they stopped back in the seventies, probably never should have been built, but here is an organization that is going to come in and make lemonade out of lemons. This project, what it is going to do is it is going to utilize the transportation aspects of the Cross Florida Barge Canal to bring in their heavy equipment and what not. And I don't know if you could find that somewhere

else, but it is going to take down, or take away the wear and tear on the local transportation. (**0014-40** [Frink, Ken])

Comment: In reference to Progress Energy Florida, Inc's LWA and COL to build Units 1 and 2 of its LNP site, the following are considerations that must be addressed: Whereas the Town of Inglis, FL lies less than five miles directly south of the proposed site, and whereas the Town of Inglis is populated by approximately 1,700 residents, and whereas the Inglis Police Department's budget is less than $400,000/yr with slightly less than 24/7 coverage, and whereas the Inglis Fire and Rescue Dept is solely staffed by volunteers with old equipment, and whereas the demands on these two departments of the Town of Inglis will be dramatically overburdened if such a permit is granted. (**0021-1** [Michaels, Edward])

Comment: Currently, less than 28% of the households in the Town of Inglis pay ad valorum taxes. We are a very poor town, with extremely high unemployment, and a high percentage of retirees. The burden of a sudden influx of workers and ancillary businesses to the area will overstress the aforementioned departments to a point of breaking. We simply will not be able to protect and serve our current residents, nor the influx of people that these plants will bring to our town, at the level of service that our residents have come to expect. The Town of Inglis is currently a one stop-light town. Our way of life will dramatically change, and we should not be expected to pay for the myriad changes that one company will immediately and forever bring to us for their benefit. Our town is not even a part of their customer base. (**0021-3** [Michaels, Edward])

Comment: The only possible scenario that would provide us with the capabilities to protect and serve our residents at the current level, once this sudden change befalls us, would be if PEF supplies us with a substantial amount of cash, before construction commences, to supplement our departments, and further, a yearly enforceable commitment to maintain the levels needed, once they have been achieved. (**0021-4** [Michaels, Edward])

Comment: Furthermore, our road and maintenance departments will also be stressed beyond their current capacity. It is imperative that these issues be resolved before PEF can be given a permit. (**0021-5** [Michaels, Edward])

Comment: Having trains cross Highway 41 may block emergency vehicles from homes and medical facilities, making it less safe for all residents in Dunnellon, Rainbow Springs and all adjoining areas. (**0040-2** [Medlin, Ted])

Comment: The already-heavy traffic on Highway 41 will become worse with a second Dunnellon railroad crossing and the resulting train delays. (**0040-3** [Medlin, Ted])

Response: *Socioeconomic impacts such as impacts on transportation and local infrastructure associated with the construction and operation of proposed LNP Units 1 and 2 will be addressed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: Please analyze the negative impacts this project could have on the clam industry and attempts to develop an expanded local, sustainable aquaculture industry in the Nature Coast. (**0015-117** [Murphy, Joe])

Comment: What are the negative economic impacts to the region, the Nature Coast, and the Gulf Coast of Florida that will result from coastal ecosystems harmed by polluted runoff (high high temperature) and reduced freshwater flow/higher salinity to the coast? What will the economic and social impacts be to the recreational and commercial fishing industry along the Gulf Coast of Florida due to reduced function in coastal estuaries? Please consider these questions in the context of the economic impacts coastal related activities in Florida (see 2006 FFWCC estimates below):

- Saltwater Fishing - $6.0 billion, 59,000 jobs
- Freshwater Fishing - $2.2 billion, 19,000 jobs
- Total Fishing - $8.1 billion, number one in the nation
- Commercial Fishing - $576 million, 9,000 jobs
- Boating Industry - $18.4 billion, 220,000 jobs

(**0015-120** [Murphy, Joe])

Comment: What will the negative economic impacts to Levy County, Citrus County, and the Nature Coast be from reduced ecotourism, reduced local fishing activity, and loss of seasonal visitors who engage in wildlife viewing and outdoor recreational activities? These questions directly relate to the growing ecotourism and wildlife viewing industry in Florida, and along the Nature Coast. In a recently released report the FFWCC reported that: In 2006, 3.3 million Floridians viewed wildlife at or near their homes, and 1.6 million Floridians and tourists traveled around Florida for the sole purpose of wildlife viewing. These viewers generated more than $3 billion in total economic impact throughout Florida. Retail sales account for approximately $1.8 billion of this total. While other areas of the economy may be experiencing a downswing the FWC's report finds retail sales for wildlife-viewing activities have almost doubled from $1.575 billion in 2001. Overall, 4.2 million people participated in some form of wildlife viewing in Florida in 2006. (**0015-121** [Murphy, Joe])

Response: *The NRC staff will consider the potential effect of construction and operation of proposed LNP Units 1 and 2 on local fishing, wildlife viewing and outdoor recreational activities, as well as potential socioeconomic impacts of changes in the volume of these industries. These topics will be addressed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

2.11 Comments Concerning Historic and Cultural Resources

Comment: We [the Miccosukee Tribe] have no direct knowledge of any cultural resources located in the area of the two new proposed nuclear power units. However, we recommend that a Phase I Cultural Resources Survey be conducted of the area to ascertain if there are any cultural resources which may be impacted by this project. (**0037-1** [Terry, Steve])

Response: *Evaluation of historical, archaeological, and other cultural resources is part of the NRC staff's assessment. The results of the Phase I Cultural Resources Surveys for the project site will be summarized in Chapter 2 of the EIS. Impacts and mitigation measures on historic and cultural resources will be addressed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

2.12 Comments Concerning Health - Nonradiological

Comment: I would just like to propose be considered for the Environmental Impact Statement ... that there be minimum use of pesticides and herbicides on the site and that within 150 feet of any water source, such as a stream, lake, or large ponds, that there be a pesticide and herbicide free zone within 150 feet of that area. (**0014-117** [Marraffino, Paul])

Comment: I would just like to propose be considered for the Environmental Impact Statement ... to control hazardous materials in a very robust way, including diesel fuel and other petroleum products that are on the site. (**0014-118** [Marraffino, Paul])

Comment: In addition the use of pesticides and herbicides should be minimized to the lowest level practical. There should be a pesticide and herbicide free zone within 150 feet of any lake, river, stream or pond. Finally control of hazardous material including diesel fuel should used and stored in a manor the prevents them from entering the groundwater system. (**0014-183** [Marraffino, Paul])

Response: *Protection of human and ecological health will be assured by compliance with all applicable State and Federal regulations governing the use of pesticides and herbicides and with the storage and control of diesel fuel and other hazardous materials. Issues associated with herbicide and pesticide use and diesel fuel and hazardous materials storage during the construction and operations phases will be addressed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS, respectively.*

Comment: You can listen online to the archives of today's Democracy Now. This show presented today shows studies of the poisons that workers, civilians and soldiers were exposed to, supposedly regulated, and the repercussions are these. One example was the Vietnam Agent Orange. And then there is what is known as the Kuwait Cough from the Gulf War II, or Gulf War I, rather. And now there is a chromium poison by KBR, Kellogg, Brown and Root.

They used to be an affiliate of Halliburton. Anyway, that's in the Gulf War, too. But these things have been happening. (**0015-64** [Sullivan, Jennifer])

Response: *Workers at the site will be protected by compliance with all applicable Federal and State occupational and safety standards related to exposures to toxic substances. Occupational safety and health issues arising in the construction phase will be addressed in Chapter 4, and issues arising during the operations phase will be addressed in Chapter 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: Some Woodlands property owners will have trains operating along the edges of their yards, in close proximity to their homes, and would threaten their tranquility. (**0040-5** [Medlin, Ted])

Response: *Progress Energy filed a Notice of Amendment on November 26, 2008, to the State of Florida Site Certification Application (SCA), to amend the SCA to withdraw all of those sections of the SCA which addresses the proposed 13-mile corridor in Levy and Marion Counties, Florida. Additionally, the Progress Energy response to information need CR-5, by letter dated January 16, 2009 to NRC, states that the rail line has been removed from the plan.*

2.13 Comments Concerning Health - Radiological

Comment: I would just be interested as a matter of point that somebody give some data from this conference on what the radiation testing is around the current nuke plant here in Crystal River. Do some drilling and take some bore samples out of the wells around here and let's just see how they have changed since they've been there for thirty years. I will guarantee you that there is going to be some things here that you are probably not going to want to divulge. (**0014-93** [Roberts, Preston])

Response: *This comment relates to the Radiological Environmental Monitoring Program (REMP) and the airborne and liquid radioactive effluents from the existing Crystal River Energy Complex and proposed LNP. Chapter 2 of the EIS will discuss the radiological environment around the LNP, Chapter 5 will address the release of effluents during operation and the impacts from these releases, and Chapter 7 will address cumulative impacts, including those from the existing Crystal River Energy Complex.*

Comment: There should be test wells around the site. There should be an early development that be measured at a base level and then on a regular basis measure a large selection of items that would be of concern for health reasons and so on. (**0014-119** [Marraffino, Paul])

Response: *This comment relates to the Radiological Environmental Monitoring Program (REMP) and the airborne and liquid radioactive effluents from proposed LNP Units 1 and 2. Chapter 2 of the EIS will discuss the radiological environment around LNP and Chapter 5 will*

address the monitoring of effluent releases during operation and the impacts from these releases.

Comment: With the existing Progress Energy Nuclear Power Plant in Crystal River and at other locations, health physics is a paramount consideration for system management. At the new Levy County plant, monitoring and protection of ground water should be performed at the same level of discipline as the radioactive element in the core facility. This should be required for the potable water requirements of the populace of surrounding communities. Added to the human requirement is the need to protect the water quality and natural habitat of Lake Rousseau. (**0014-181** [Marraffino, Paul])

Response: *Chapter 2 of the EIS will discuss the radiological environment and monitoring conducted around the Levy Nuclear Plant. Chapter 5 of the EIS will address the release of effluents during operation, the impacts from these releases, and radiological monitoring during operations.*

Comment: The Bureau of Radiation Control is responsible for performing a radiological environmental monitoring program around all the nuclear plants in the state of Florida. (**0015-4** [Williamson, John])

Response: *This comment addresses activities conducted by the Florida State Department of Health, Bureau of Radiation Control. Radiological monitoring for proposed LNP Units 1 and 2 will be addressed in Chapter 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: We've been monitoring Crystal River since, I believe, 1969, approximately seven years before they ever first started the plant up. If anyone is interested in getting reports of this environmental monitoring, I encourage you to talk to me after the meeting. I can provide you a business card. You can contact me and I would be happy to provide any of the reports that you like. (**0015-5** [Williamson, John])

Response: *This comment is related to the environmental monitoring program for the nuclear plant at the Crystal River Energy Complex and is not directly related to this environmental review. Radiological monitoring for proposed LNP Units 1 and 2 will be addressed in Chapter 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: I would just like to quote, first of all, from some Progress Energy document: Tritium, which is a hydrogen radioactive isotope, is a byproduct of generating electricity at nuclear power plants. All nuclear power plants release tritium into both the water and air. The U. S. Environmental Protection Agency regulates the acceptable level of tritium concentrations in ground water and drinking water, no matter where it comes from." Now, it is quite clear from the documentation that tritium will not go in through, into a human's body from outside it normally. But if it is ingested in any way, that's a different question. But also I'm not sure -- and, in fact, I

don't know, whether the EPA regulations safeguard microorganisms on which the ecology depends. Now, don't get me wrong. Tritium is the stuff which enables our waters to be seen in the dark. But don't get me wrong. I'm not suggesting that the algae, the fish, the other organisms are going to glow in the dark and that will reduce the need for more generating capacity. I'm not saying that. But also I'm not saying that the algae, the plankton, or the fish will either glow, nor will they grow arms and legs, but they could die, they could get bigger and they could poison whatever eats them. (**0014-54** [Hopkins, Norman])

Comment: In Progress Energy's own words: "'Tritium *(a hydrogen radioactive isotope)* is a byproduct of generating electricity at nuclear power plants. All nuclear plants release tritium into both the water and air. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulates the acceptable level of tritium concentrations in ground water and drinking water". To site that plant precisely where the potentiometric groundwater level is highest for miles around does not seem sensible to me. Tritium, with a half life of more than 12 years, cannot be contained. While emissions are unlikely to be externally harmful to humans, if ingested or otherwise absorbed internally tritium is an issue. (**0015-106** [Hopkins, Norman])

Response: *These comments concern emissions of tritium and health effects that may result from such emissions. Emission estimates will be based on the revision of the AP-1000 Design Control Document referenced in the COL application; these emission estimates are anticipated to be conservative (that is, to overestimate emissions). The NRC staff will evaluate human health and environmental impacts of the emissions in the EIS, and the results of this analysis will be presented in Chapter 5.*

Comment: Evidence exists that there is NO such thing as a safe dose of radiation, from release in the predictable periodic accidents or from the continual low grade emissions of radiation from existing and nuclear future plants. Any radiation released is more than a zero impact. (**0006-5** [Dickinson, Josh] [Dickinson, Sally] [Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee] [Wapner, Howard]) (**0029-7** [Cox, Lesley])

Comment: In addition to the comparison of wastes and emissions people living on the Nature Coast of Florida deserve to know in specific terms (measurable units) the amount of radioactivity that will be released from the site as:

- radioactive air emissions - including routine and batch releases
  - including both projections of total source term and also concentration
- other pollutants with or without radioactive mixing
- releases of liquid radioactive wastes - and other chemicals released together or separately, with total amounts and projected concentration
- release of heat to both air and water - and amount of water that will leave the site as vapor (**0038-20** [Olson, Mary])

Comment: Assuming that Part 20 is being fully implemented and enforced - and no, I am not attacking the rule - though we would like to - and assuming ALARA is being added on top, why have two studies in the last couple of years found a direct (statistically significant) correlation between distance of residence from a nuclear power plant and incidence of leukemia? Please include and account for these studies in your finding of impact. (**0038-23** [Olson, Mary])

Response: *These comments relate to radiation doses from release of radioactive material from the proposed LNP Units 1 and 2. The impacts on human health from radiological emissions will be addressed in Chapter 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: Furthermore, I do not know whether the EPA levels protects micro-organisms on which the health of existing ecologic systems depend, and upon which the economic health of local communities exist. (**0015-107** [Hopkins, Norman])

Response: *This comment relates to radiation doses from release of radioactive material from the Levy Nuclear Plant. The impacts to biota other than humans from radiological emissions will be presented in Chapter 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: I am requesting that the EIS examine and clearly explain to the residents of Levy and Citrus counties and the surrounding region, the difference between the conditions now and the conditions if the new nuclear units reach full operation as proposed. I am interested in the conditions specifically due to the two new reactors and associated operations, without regard for the decommissioning of the coal fired unit at Crystal River. Please express the detailed quantitation and any assumptions made for the calculations.

- Airborne radionuclides and other pollutants by chemical species and concentration
- Waterborne radionuclides and other pollutants by chemical species and concentration
- Pollutant levels in soil and graphic depiction of zones of influence.
- Pollutant uptake by vegetation and graphic depiction of zones of influence. (**0030-1** [Roff, Rhonda])

Response: *Radiological impacts from normal operation of proposed LNP Units 1 and 2 will be discussed in Chapter 5 of the EIS, and cumulative impacts will be discussed in Chapter 7 of the EIS.*

Comment: I am requesting that the EIS examine and clearly explain to the residents of Levy and Citrus counties and the surrounding region, the difference between the conditions now and the conditions if the new nuclear units reach full operation as proposed. I am interested in the conditions specifically due to the two new reactors and associated operations, without regard for the decommissioning of the coal fired unit at Crystal River. Please express the detailed quantitation and any assumptions made for the calculation of:

- The increased potential for uptake of Strontium 90 in humans.
- Any potential changes in mammalian milk quality, including dairy cattle and humans.
- Projected increased cancer risk, including but not limited to childhood leukemia as depicted in the epidemiological study recently published by Joseph Mangano and attached hereto. (**0030-6** [Roff, Rhonda])

Response: *Chapter 2 of the EIS will discuss the radiological environment around proposed LNP Units 1 and 2 and Chapter 5 of the EIS will address the release of effluents during operation and the impacts from these releases.*

Comment: And another thing I would like to know is does this United States, what you said, Nuclear Regular Atomic Commission, require specific environmental standards and which have to be complied with? (**0014-128** [Cannon, Renate])

Response: *The NRC, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act, has established the nuclear power plant regulatory program for radiation protection of individuals and the public. The primary radiological standards are contained in 10 CFR Part 20, 40 CFR Part 190, and 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix I.*

2.14 Comments Concerning Accidents

Comment: A 1982 Congressional report estimated that if a meltdown occurred at just one of Progress Energy's reactors at their nearby Crystal River nuclear plant, it could cause 900 peak early fatalities, 3800 peak early injuries, 2800 peak cancer deaths, and over $53 billion in property damage. The operation of more reactors in this area will only worsen these terrible impacts and put more people's lives and health at risk. (**0008-12** [Musser, Marcie])

Comment: If there is an accident or meltdown the # of fatalities and injuries are absolutely inacceptable for those who live in this state. (**0009-4** [Davis, Suellyn])

Comment: Don't forget, in a facility that stores an average quantity of spent fuel, around 450 metric tons, a meltdown would kill 25,000 people over a distance of 500 miles if evacuation were perfect. (**0019-8** [Heywood, Harriet])

Comment: Accidents happen. It is technically impossible to build a facility that is 100% secure. (**0029-3** [Cox, Lesley])

Comment: Another very important point is the fact that nuclear plants themselves cannot be made 100% safe. Whether through equipment malfunction, operator error, or terrorist attack, nuclear plants pose an unacceptable risk, not just to those of us living in Florida, but to all life on earth. One little incident could literally mean the actual end of all life on earth! If you don't think

it can happen, think about that little O ring on the Challenger. We humans are not infallible, and neither is anything we produce. This means that nuclear plants cannot, simply cannot be guaranteed to be safe. And when it comes to accidents or attacks involving nuclear materials, anything less than 100% safety is just not good enough. (**0032-12** [Wilansky, Laura Sue])

Comment: Please assess the sacrifice zone that NRC will be creating by this license action. ...in the event of some type of local accident, fourth would be disclosure of estimates, as were made in the CRAC II report - of a fuel pool accident and a reactor accident. In this day and age, it should also include projections of impact were BOTH containments were to be lost. (**0038-12** [Olson, Mary])

Response: *In Chapter 5 of the EIS, the NRC staff will address risks associated with both design basis and postulated severe accidents. The staff will also address the cumulative risks from operation of the proposed new reactor. Design basis accidents will be evaluated by comparison with regulatory criteria, and the probability-weighted consequences of severe accidents will be compared with risks to which individuals and populations are generally exposed.*

2.15 Comments Concerning the Uranium Fuel Cycle

Comment: High-level radioactive waste created (used nuclear fuel) has no place to be stored or disposed, nor is it likely that a "solution" will be found in our lifetimes. Building a nuclear plant in Levy County will unfairly burden future generations with a legacy of radioactive waste. (**0008-5** [Musser, Marcie])

Comment: The proposed location in Levy County is currently a "green field" site; it is clean and free of contamination or industrial facilities. The long-lived, highly radioactive nuclear waste that will be produced by the proposed new reactors will remain onsite for generations, indefinitely threatening the health of nearby communities and the environment. (**0008-14** [Musser, Marcie])

Comment: Please assess the sacrifice zone that NRC will be creating by this license action. ...the burial of wastes on the site and need for long-term license or institutional controls. (**0038-11** [Olson, Mary])

Comment: Nonetheless, the fact that the Levy County site is the only true "green field" application brings this matter into ever clearer focus. Therefore we offer here a series of issues that we believe MUST be considered in the FEDERAL environmental evaluation of this federal action - to license a site that has never previously been licensed for a new nuclear-waste-generating and radionuclide-leaking site. This proposed sacrifice (and approval of an activity that will likely garner direct public subsidy) must be weighed against current reevaluation of the Waste Confidence Decision by the Commission - to affirm dry cask storage as THE source of

federal confidence in continuing to produce high-level radioactive waste in the form of irradiated nuclear fuel. (**0038-3** [Olson, Mary])

Comment: If nuclear power generation is so clean, why do we need to build storage facilities like Yucca Mountain? (**0043-2** [Eppes, Thomas])

Response: *The safety and environmental effects of long-term storage of spent fuel onsite have been evaluated by the NRC and, as set forth in the Waste Confidence Rule at 10 CFR 51.23, the NRC generically determined that "if necessary, spent fuel generated in any reactor can be stored safely and without significant environmental impacts for at least 30 years beyond the licensed life for operation (which may include the term of a revised or renewed license) of that reactor at its spent fuel storage basin or at either onsite or offsite independent spent fuel storage installations." The impact of the uranium fuel cycle, including disposal of low-level radioactive waste and spent fuel, will be addressed in Chapter 6 of the EIS.*

Comment: [W]hat about the disposal of massive amounts of nuclear waste. According to the NY Times (11.29.08), we can't properly handle the amount of waste flowing into the Chesapeake Bay from a chicken farm with 150,000 chickens in Maryland. So who believes we can adequately and safely deal with the piles of nuclear waste which will accrue from permitting these plants? (**0006-9** [Dickinson, Josh] [Dickinson, Sally] [Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee] [Wapner, Howard])

Comment: Yucca Mountain was supposed to take nuclear waste twenty-seven years ago. (**0014-125** [Cannon, Renate])

Comment: Yucca Mountain never occurred. (**0014-162** [Waldron, Theresa])

Comment: This nation does not need and cannot afford to continue stockpiling nuclear waste. I think that is the biggest environmental issue of this hearing. Nuclear waste remains deadly for longer than any society has ever existed. What makes us think that we're going to be around to take care of it. (**0014-71** [Eppes, Thomas])

Comment: Until the problem of waste storage is successfully resolved -- and by successful I mean, politically, economically, scientifically, and safely -- no new nuclear power plant should be permitted by the NRC. (**0014-72** [Eppes, Thomas])

Comment: [W]e [the Socialist Party] stand against the expansion of this type of power in the country because [of] the inability of the country to dispose of waste products. (**0015-102** [Moore, Brian])

Comment: I have here this article about the EPA ruling that says the waste must now be sequestered for a million years. Tell me who and how you are going to get a million year guarantee. And also it was just recently in the news that Yucca Mountain, which, by the way, is

not going to be able to accept the waste, can't hold everything that the power plants now have ready to go, much less what any new power plant might make. Talk about a safety issue, an environmental issue. (**0015-37** [Klutho, Mark])

Comment: First, do no harm. We already have nuclear waste with a half life of thousands of years that will already fill the Yucca Mountain area. As the gentleman said, let's not make more. (**0015-61** [Sullivan, Jennifer])

Comment: The safety concerns are enormous. Currently, most nuclear power plants are reaching the ends of their lives, and will have to be decommissioned and there is still no plan to safely compensate for the nuclear waste which is stored onsite at every one of these accidents waiting to happen. These spent fuel rods will be hot for 10,000 years. (**0019-5** [Heywood, Harriet])

Comment: President-elect Obama has expressed reservations about whether our country's massive new investments in renewable energy should include nuclear power until issues of ... disposal of waste have been resolved. (**0028-3** [Horgan, Wendy])

Comment: We still do not have a solution for radioactive waste. (**0029-2** [Cox, Lesley])

Comment: Nuclear power is not sustainable when you have to secure the waste for 100,000 years. (**0029-4** [Cox, Lesley])

Comment: There is also no place for nuclear waste storage in Florida. Due to our delicate and fragile eco-system, our Floridan Aquifer which underlies our entire state and parts of four others, and the way everything in our Florida environment is interconnected, there is just no site here stable or isolated enough for any kind of nuclear waste storage - low-level or high-level. Levy County is certainly not a good place to turn into a nuclear waste dump, and as I understand it, Progress Energy has no other place to store waste from these plants. ...And we still have no permanent long-term solution for what to do with high-level nuclear waste, which remains radioactive for thousands upon thousands of years - so why create more of it?! (**0032-6** [Wilansky, Laura Sue])

Comment: [Uranium] is mined, radioactive, has hazardous waste that remains for thousands of years. (**0039-4** [Arnason, Deb])

Response: *The safety and environmental effects of long-term storage of spent fuel onsite have been evaluated by the NRC and, as set forth in the Waste Confidence Rule at 10 CFR 51.23, the NRC generically determined that "if necessary, spent fuel generated in any reactor can be stored safely and without significant environmental impacts for at least 30 years beyond the licensed life for operation (which may include the term of a revised or renewed license) of that reactor at its spent fuel storage basin or at either onsite or offsite independent spent fuel storage*

installations. Further, the Commission believes there is reasonable assurance that at least one mined geologic repository will be available within the first quarter of the twenty-first century and sufficient repository capacity will be available within 30 years beyond the licensed life for operation of any reactor to dispose of the commercial high-level waste and spent fuel originating in any such reactor and generated up to that time." The impact of the uranium fuel cycle, including disposal of low-level radioactive waste and spent fuel, will be addressed in Chapter 6 of the EIS.

Comment: Nuclear power is NOT a solution to climate change. When the entire fuel chain is examined, including the initial construction and production processes, nuclear power (sold superficially as carbon neutral) becomes a big carbon producer. (**0006-3** [Dickinson, Josh] [Dickinson, Sally] [Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee] [Wapner, Howard])

Comment: I think several hundred million dollars is a joke when we talk about the total cost over time of storing those materials. We today have no effective, you know, plan, reliable means of dealing with even the small amounts of waste that the professor had discussed. They may be small but they are potent. And I encourage people to look at a movie called Kilowatt Ours, Kilowatt O-U-R-S. It specifically delineates where we are at with regard to, you know, even the mining of uranium, which is a declining resource in exactly the same way as oil. (**0014-67** [Russell, John])

Comment: Nuclear is not a carbon-neutral enterprise. Those who say it is are not taking into account the mining, extraction, purifying, storing, transportation and all other aspects of providing the fuel for nuclear power plants. (**0026-7** [Towles Ezell, Joy])

Comment: Nuclear energy is neither carbon-free nor emission-free throughout its entire life cycle, which includes a variety of wastes produced by mining uranium and making nuclear fuel, in addition to the aforementioned unsolved problem with spent fuel and other nuclear waste. (**0032-8** [Wilansky, Laura Sue])

Comment: Nonetheless, the fact that the Levy County site is the only true "green field" application brings this matter into ever clearer focus. Therefore we offer here a series of issues that we believe MUST be considered in the FEDERAL environmental evaluation of this federal action – to license a site that has never previously been licensed for a new nuclear-waste-generating and radionuclide-leaking site. This proposed sacrifice (and approval of an activity that will likely garner direct public subsidy) must be weighed against:

- Current - and possible future lack - of any facility licensed under 10CFR61 for the permanent disposal of so-called low-level waste. If NRC is planning to license the expanded production of this waste production of this waste for which there is no permanent disposition that is currently licensed - what will the impacts (procreative, health, safety, environment, socio-economic, economic, legal, security) be on Levy County if a so-called "temporary plan" becomes a defacto permanent "solution"?

- The environmental impact statement must include the environmental impact of any possible "short-term" plan that Progress (or NRC) plan to employ to deal with the operational waste that would be generated at this site. These "short-term" options may include:
  - on-site storage - de facto permanent would mean that the waste never actually leaves the site, so the County is effectively becoming both a "low-level" and a "high-level" dump site. Please apply the above climate informed projections to a the so-called "low-level" waste as well.
  - shipping to a radioactive waste processor for decontamination and release - please include a complete assessment in the environmental impact statement of the impacts of Levy-generated waste on the public, workers (including transport), processor community, and eventual "end-users" of any materials released for re-use or recycle, or impact of disposal in municipal land-fills
  - shipping to a processor / waste broker for storage - please analyze all impacts to the public workers (including transport), host community and the potential of this plan reverting to on-site storage since it is likely that such storage would be time-limited
  - incineration - same as above
- combinations of all of these in a "shell game" that still does not resolve the fundamental problem of making this waste with no where for it to end up. (**0038-5** [Olson, Mary])

Response: *The NRC staff will evaluate impacts from the life-cycle of fuel production, construction, operation, and decommissioning of the plant. The results of this analysis will be presented in Chapters 4, 5, and 6 of the EIS. 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. In accordance with the guidance in 10 CFR 51.51, the staff will rely on Table S-3 as the basis for evaluating the environmental impacts (including fossil emissions) of uranium mining and milling, the production of uranium hexafluoride, isotopic enrichment, fuel fabrication, reprocessing of irradiated fuel, transportation of radioactive materials and management of low-level wastes and high-level wastes related to uranium fuel cycle activities.*

Comment: I would like to know why we cannot recycle the waste and re-use it like it is done in France, if I am not mistaken. (**0014-130** [Cannon, Renate])

Response: *Federal policy no longer prohibits reprocessing. The Energy Policy Act of 2005, P.L. 109-58, Section 953, directed the U.S. Department of Energy (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 research and development is needed before commercial reprocessing and recycling of spent fuel produced under the U.S. commercial*

nuclear power program occurs. Reprocessing as part of the fuel cycle and waste management will be discussed in Chapter 6 of the EIS.

Comment: This proposed sacrifice (and approval of an activity that will likely garner pulic subsidy) must be weighed against an examination of the supply of uranium that is cost-effective and energy balance-effective to use for fuel. A disclosure of assumptions made in licensing 2 new reactors that would operate 40 - 60 years while other nations are also expanding their nuclear generating capacity and the impact on both cost to operate and reliability of this form of power generation. (**0038-9** [Olson, Mary])

Response: *The irretrievable and irreversible commitment of resources, such as uranium, will be addressed in the context of the resources availability in Chapter 10 of the EIS.*

2.16 Comments Concerning Transportation

Comment: [T]ransportation of radioactive waste through our state to other sites poses additional environmental dangers. (**0032-7** [Wilansky, Laura Sue])

Comment: In spite of assurances from Progress Energy, residents are concerned about the possible future transportation of hazardous materials and nuclear waste through their neighborhoods. This danger would obviously pose significant pollution and health hazards. (**0040-7** [Medlin, Ted])

Response: *A detailed analysis of the impacts of transporting fuel and waste by truck to and from the proposed LNP site will be conducted and included in Chapter 6 of the EIS.*

2.17 Comments Concerning Decommissioning

Comment: But what are we going to do with those plants? That's why I asked that question before. We have plants that are old right now that need to be decommissioned. (**0014-66** [Russell, John])

Comment: This [nuclear] waste includes the plants themselves, which operate for a few decades, and then take, at a minimum, hundreds of years to be decommissioned. (**0032-9** [Wilansky, Laura Sue])

Response: *10 CFR Section 50.75 requires the applicant to provide reasonable assurance that funding will be available for decommissioning activities at the time they are needed. The environmental impact from decommissioning a permanently shutdown commercial nuclear power reactor will be discussed in Chapter 6 of the EIS. In addition, the staff may consider information from Supplement 1 to NUREG-0586, Generic Environmental Impact Statement on*

Decommissioning of Nuclear Facilities, which was published in 2002, when analyzing the expected impacts from decommissioning.

2.18 Comments Concerning Site Redress

Comment: The EIS should provide information on what actions will be taken by PEF, if, in fact; the LWA work is accomplished, but all environmental clearances and permits are not obtained or if PEF decides not to continue with the project. How will the site be restored? What types of mitigation measures, if any, will be needed for affected wetlands? The EIS should fully document all actions to be taken by PEF if an LWA is granted, the work accomplished, and the project does not go forward. (0044-4 [Mueller, Heinz J])

Response: *By letter dated May 1, 2009, Progress Energy provided notification to NRC to withdraw their request for an LWA*.

2.19 Comments Concerning Cumulative Impacts

Comment: There appears to be no recognition of cumulative impacts resulting in the discharge of three nuclear power plants in a single location, a discharge flowing into a very shallow coastal estuary region and rich marine resource. It is both a marine nursery and habitat for at least one listed species. I find no reference to, or evaluation of salinity increases and associated impacts resulting from the LNP Blowdown contribution to the CREC discharge flow and think this is pertinent to the CZMA. (**0014-185** [Hilliard, Dan])

Comment: I'm going to be Progress Energy's closest neighbor. I live 7,000 feet or less from where their nuclear reactor is going to be. And I have three questions I've been trying to get answered and I think I got some answers but not all. One of them is, I want to know how many people live within 7,000 feet or less of adjoining properties to two nuclear reactors in the state of Florida, and I want to know if there has been any health studies done on them people within thirty years. (**0014-34** [Smith, Robert])

Comment: Is there another location in the United States or the world where two nuclear power plants will be located within eight statute miles of each other? If so, I would like to know it because with all the research I've done -- and a lot of people will tell you I'm a heck of a researcher -- it doesn't exist. Just one. Could you please tell us, the folks located between the two projected closest locations in the world, why they are so needed so proximate to that which already exists with the grid for distribution that already exists? (**0015-98** [Peters, Michael])

Comment: The proposed site plan is too close to the current Florida Power & Light nuclear plant exposing the people and environment in the entire area to too much of a potential for disaster to occur. Having nuclear power plants within close proximity to each other invites those

who wish to do harm to our country to act upon those deadly desires. The proposed site is also next to a state forest - a place that the people of the state of Florida wish to preserve. (**0026-5** [Towles Ezell, Joy])

Comment: Progress Energy operates a nuclear power plant in Citrus County, Florida, where I live and its proposal to locate another nuclear power facility nearby unreasonably exposes the residents of Levy and Citrus County to the increased risks that are well understood to be associated with nuclear power plants. (**0028-2** [Horgan, Wendy])

Response: *The comments address the proximity of proposed LNP Units 1 and 2 to the existing Crystal River Unit 3. The cumulative impacts associated with the construction and operation of the proposed nuclear power facility will be evaluated and the results of this analysis will be presented in Chapter 7 of the EIS.*

Comment: Under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), we are compelled to point out that building a new nuclear power reactor at all, anywhere is a "major federal action" not in and of itself, but also because it has now been almost 34 years since a new nuclear power reactor was ordered that actually went on-line. As such, the 15 some combined operating licensing actions now pending before the NRC constitute together this major federal action. Since NRC is implementing NEPA at each site, there is an overall effect of truncation since the decision to license a nuclear power reactor at all is not being considered. (**0038-2** [Olson, Mary])

Response: *The spatial and temporal effects identified for the proposed action will be reasonably bounded to the appropriate geographical area in Chapter 7 of the EIS.*

Comment: The largest single issue facing our world today is CLIMATE CHANGE. Any decisions we make from now on MUST contain an analysis of that project's impact on climate change. It is a matter of life. The whole world should have a say as to whether or not these proposed power plants are permitted. Think Alaskan villages toppling into the sea, Bangladeshi coastal-dwellers, the low lying portions of our own fair state of Florida, and the melting permafrost that is releasing methane at unprecedented rates. Increased carbon emissions mean accelerated climate change. (**0006-2** [Dickinson, Josh] [Dickinson, Sally] [Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee] [Wapner, Howard])

Comment: Maybe we could use the wetlands and the trees. They are part of a carbon sequestration banking system. I just think it is an idea since we're talking about all different ways to help our environment and the air and global climate change. (**0015-32** [Casey, Emily])

Comment: It is not acceptable to state that the climate crisis is speculative, nor is it acceptable to contemplate granting a federal license that will result in billions of dollars of taxpayer and electric-power consumer money being spent on something that is not going to address that

crisis - but the public funding is being justified under such a banner. This is either delusion or fraud. (**0038-21** [Olson, Mary])

Response: *The airborne emissions from proposed nuclear plants, although normally sufficiently small as to not degrade air quality or be important in climate change, will be considered in the evaluation of potential impacts. The impacts on air quality resulting from construction and operation of proposed LNP Units 1 and 2 will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS. The impacts of nuclear power generation on climate change will be addressed in Chapter 7 of the EIS.*

Comment: [Progressive Energy] [has] made no decisions about the four coal units that we have operating in Crystal River. Clearly we have decisions that we will be making in the long term but it is quite a few years off before we will have all of the decisions finalized. (**0015-10** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: What are the cumulative environmental impacts of this project for the greater Nature Coast region given current and other proposed projects in the region (Tarmac Mine, Cemex Mine, proposed residential developments in Levy County, Gulf Hammock mines currently in operation)? Please fully explore the full cumulative regional impacts from this project and other projects in the region and their connections and relationships in terms of regional water supply, health and structure of the aquifer, regional water quality, health of wetlands systems, habitat, and coastal ecosystems and estuaries, etc. (**0015-114** [Murphy, Joe])

Response: *The cumulative impacts associated with the construction and operation of the proposed nuclear power facility will be evaluated and the results of this analysis will be presented in Chapter 7 of the EIS.*

2.20 Comments Concerning the Need for Power

Comment: We have followed with great interest the steady progression of PEF in pursuit of their proposed electrical generating facility, which when completed will:

- Provide electricity to meet the demands of continued growth in the region, for customers of Progress Energy and other utilities.
- Ensure more flexibility and a backup system for providing critical energy to the area.
- Maintain a robust system for supplying and delivering electricity to ensure the continued economic prosperity of the region. (**0010-2** [Johannesen, Francine])

Comment: We concur with the PEF philosophy that -electricity is far too important to risk service interruptions or problems with power quality due to inadequate equipment. We applaud Progress Energy for its continued efforts to work cooperatively with regulators, community

leaders, and other stakeholders in Florida to ensure the company makes the best long-term decisions to meet Florida's future energy needs. (**0010-3** [Johannesen, Francine])

Comment: Life would be nice without the threats associated with nuclear power. However, no one I know wants to give up electricity and what it brings to our lives; therefore, power plants are a necessary evil. With that in mind, I believe, and most people agree, rural areas are the best place for power plants. (**0013-1** [Bullock, Wade])

Comment: Along with the proper transit solutions, energy production/consumption is a critical component and decisions need to be made now so that the state is not faced with an energy shortage. (**0014-103** [Mucci, Matt])

Comment: The U.S. Department of Energy estimates that our electricity demand will increase twenty-five percent by the year 2030. Roughly that means, for every four Americans you can add one more flipping the switch, adjusting the thermostat or opening the refrigerator. As technology advances and our population increases, so too will our need for energy grow. In Florida alone demand is increasing faster than the state's population. Is it any wonder? It used to be the only thing you would carry on your person that ran on electricity was your watch, just a small battery. But today we have cell phones, laptops, Blackberries, iPods, and in the not too distant future we may have cars that are running on electricity that you have to plug into the wall every single night. In fact, it is somewhat ironic that today on Capitol Hill, Congress is talking about to get bailed out the car manufacturers are going to have to make electric vehicles. So how will we handle the enormous increases in electricity that we will need? (**0014-108** [Walther, Robert])

Comment: The Levy County project clearly is intended to address the documented needs for additional electrical service that is going to be required within the State of Florida. (**0014-131** [Maidhof, Gary])

Comment: Despite the current economic downturn that we are seeing not only in this state but across the United States, Florida is, indeed, the fourth largest state in the United States. And we are ranked third nationally in per capita energy consumption. Over the last three decades homes in the state have grown by an average of over fifty percent and usage is up in those homes by over thirty percent. And, quite frankly, over the next decade we anticipate that usage will increase by over twenty-five percent. (**0014-6** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: Even with our significant commitment to alternatives, renewables, and to energy efficiency, we will need additional generation to meet the growth of our state. (**0014-8** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: The need for electricity within this region, both now and in the future, is clearly documented. (**0015-1** [Maidhof, Gary])

Comment: [L]et me just begin with by saying that despite the fact that this area of the state of Florida, as well as across the United States, that we are seeing an economic downturn, energy usage and growth in the State of Florida has been strong for a number of years. Florida is the fourth largest state and ranks third in the usage per capita of energy consumption. In addition, over the last three decades our home sizes have grown by over fifty percent and our usage has grown by over thirty percent. In the next decade, we project that we will have a twenty-five percent growth in usage here with our customers in the state of Florida. (**0015-11** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: At Progress we recognize that there is no one solution to the energy needs that we have here in the state. It must be a balanced solution. And that solution includes energy efficiency, investments in alternatives and renewables, as well as the building of state of the art plants, including state of the art nuclear plants. (**0015-12** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: The U.S. Department of Energy predicts that by the year 2030 our demand for electricity will have gone up by twenty-five percent. Roughly that means for every four people in the United States add another who is flipping a switch, opening the refrigerator, or adjusting the thermostat. As technology advances and our population increases, so too does our demand for electricity. In Florida alone demand is increasing faster than the state's population. But is it any real wonder? It used to be the only thing you used to carry on your person that used electricity was a watch than ran off a small battery. But now laptops, iPods, Blackberries, cell phones, and pretty soon we may have cars that are plugging into the outlets. I mentioned earlier that today we had a hearing on the Hill with the automakers. And our congressmen and women suggested that electric hybrid plug-ins have to be part of the solution, have to be part of the future. So how are we handling the enormous increases in electricity that we will need? Conservation and more efficient electrical appliances will help. (**0015-46** [Walther, Robert])

Comment: Our region is one of the fastest growing in Florida. Progress Energy is mindful of that fact and how best to serve Florida's future energy demand. The Levy County project will do just that. (**0015-8** [Pernu, Dorothy])

Comment: Our future energy needs are paramount. (**0035-5** [Craig, Avis])

Response: *The comments support or conclude that more baseload power resources are needed. The NRC staff will evaluate the need for power in Chapter 8 of the EIS.*

Comment: I would like to see Progress Energy present some true alternatives. I mean, a lot of their models are based on Florida just growing, growing, growing. We all know it's not happening right now. Things have slowed down and there is no guarantee that things are going to start taking off and growing in the future again like they used to be. Past performance is no guarantee of future performance. You know, our country is changing. It is time to downsize. If

they need power let's build small efficient plants where the power is needed. (**0014-154** [Jones, Art])

Comment: I guess what I really want to say is I have an answer for us dummies. We need to form a coalition, hire an advocate attorney, and nip this thing in the bud from the Governor all the way down. Now, you say: Well, that probably wouldn't work. Well, it did because I donated my $10 in Palm Beach County. We took Florida Power and Light to court and we won. And I got $13.75 back and I got $10 a month lower in the bill. So it is possible. I've written this in the newspapers, both St. Pete Times and the Chronicle. I would be very happy to form this and spend my time. It will take donations. Now, I only gave $10, but my God, you've got to figure that was 1950. So I don't know what it would take. But I think it is the idea, a way for us seniors to fight this. Not so much the plant. You can build a dozen plants but don't ship my energy up north. (**0014-50** [Foreman, Patricia])

Comment: The new plant that could be built in Levy will be able to power 1.4 million homes. The reality is we will need to require more from all of these sources and all others in the years ahead. If the housing crisis in Florida has shown us anything, it is that sound economic policy must recognize the virtue of diversity. So too must a wise energy plan. And in that diverse plan nuclear energy is a critical component. (**0015-48** [Walther, Robert])

Comment: This society has convinced itself that electric power is vital to our survival. NRC in implementing NEPA must remember and evaluate resources based on the truth - living human beings need in this order: air, water, food and then a whole bunch of things - somewhere down that list is electric power. (**0038-15** [Olson, Mary])

Response: *The NRC staff will evaluate the need for power in Chapter 8 of the EIS*.

2.21 Comments Concerning Alternatives - Energy

Comment: We should be putting our emphasis on conservation and efficiency instead of simply generating more power. (**0006-11** [Dickinson, Josh] [Dickinson, Sally] [Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee] [Wapner, Howard])

Comment: Not only will its construction and use be detrimental in many ways, most significantly, its high dollar cost will directly squander the resources essential for America to implement meaningful climate mitigation through development of alternative/sustainable energies. Florida already has FREE energy coming to us every day, from the sun. We should be pouring our resources into developing solar energy state wide. (**0006-4** [Dickinson, Josh] [Dickinson, Sally] [Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee] [Wapner, Howard])

Comment: This 17 million dollars could be better spent on renewable, clean, safe energy technologies - we do not want any further investment in coal or nuclear! (**0007-2** [Whiteley, Naomi])

Comment: [W]e must produce electricity needed in Florida through less risky energy supplies such as energy efficiency, solar, wind, water and biopower. (**0008-13** [Musser, Marcie])

Comment: Floridians need and want affordable, clean and safe energy choices such as energy efficiency, wind, water, solar, and biopower. (**0008-2** [Musser, Marcie])

Comment: Were the "Sunshine State" to put 1/4 th that amount into solar we could avoid all the drawbacks of nuclear power. (**0008-4** [Musser, Marcie])

Comment: It would make much more common sense, be more affordable, present less hazard to us and the environment or animals if we developed renewable energy. (**0009-5** [Davis, Suellyn])

Comment: We have taken an interest in alternative energy approaches and it is a priority of our local legislative state delegation. (**0014-105** [Mucci, Matt])

Comment: The Clean and Safe Energy Coalition supports conservation. Let me be clear. We support conservation. Energy conservation and efficient electrical appliances will help and a deeper commitment to renewable sources like wind, solar and geothermal is needed. Again, let me be clear. We support these alternative forms of energy. (**0014-109** [Walther, Robert])

Comment: Wind and solar are also a part of the diverse mix. I want to make that very clear and continue to stress we may be a coalition that does advocate the expansion of nuclear power, but we also support a diverse portfolio. (**0014-135** [Hernandez, Michael])

Comment: And it is an enormous amount of money which is being taken out of financing other forms of alternative energy which are competitive and cleaner. Now those competitive systems could be brought on stream well in advance of the time taken for the Levy plants to be completed and brought on stream. (**0014-57** [Hopkins, Norman])

Comment: Progress Energy has right of way of hundreds of miles of land under existing transmission lines. It uses solar energy in five Sun Smart schools in Florida. It exercises hydrogen fuel economies in Florida. I'm sorry, initiatives in Florida. And its facility in Citrus County has cheap railcar access. One ought to exploit these assets as an alternative to putting something which is essentially a tumor on our society and on our land, possibly by siting solar installations on their own rights of way, which they already have, capturing the electricity generated, back-feeding it to the plant site to supply the national grid, converting excess loads generated into hydrogen fuel to service cars and transportation as a future resource. A

balanced complementary generating policy is needed. If this were founded in Citrus County, creating jobs of the type just described for handling all of that solar energy collection, and increasing the County purse because that would not suffer, then go, make progress. (**0014-59** [Hopkins, Norman])

Comment: [W]e can look at vortex-induced vibration for aquatic clean energy, which is a hybrid which works. You know, these are proven technologies. It is wave energy on steroids. Of course, on the campaign trail one of the state senators that I was on the dais with, he had no clue what wave energy was. This is a problem that I spoke about that involves the political industrial hand-in-glove relationship that is in return for those lobbyists' contributions of $2300 we have people that go along and get along. There is great ownership in denying us progress in the future. (**0014-68** [Russell, John])

Comment: This [no new nuclear plant should be permitted by the NRC until the problem of waste storage is successfully resolved] is especially true in Florida which has enormous yet largely untapped sources of safe, clean, renewable energy. The technology to convert that energy into electricity can be installed by the power companies for about half the cost of building a nuclear plant and will create far more permanent jobs to help our economy. (**0014-73** [Eppes, Thomas])

Comment: Please do not permit our utilities to divert tens of billions of dollars, of our dollars, into Twentieth Century nuclear technology when Twenty-First Century solar technology is so much safer, cleaner and cheaper. Companies like Southern California Edison, Sun Edison, Solyndra, and VRB Power are showing everyone how to do it. The NRC can help by not permitting Progress Energy Florida to build a nuclear plant in Levy County. Some things last forever like nuclear waste and solar cells. Which would you rather have in your environment? (**0014-75** [Eppes, Thomas])

Comment: France was mentioned. France has gone big on nuclear. It is an entirely different nuclear process than what Progress Energy is talking about doing here and what we do in the United States. Germany has not been mentioned. Germany is doing a huge amount of solar energy. Which business model do we want to follow? Progress Energy talks about a balanced solution which I support. I think we need to have a balanced solution of alternative energy and energy efficiency in addition to state of the art power plants. (**0014-76** [Eppes, Thomas])

Comment: But where is the balance when Progress Energy is going to limit renewable energy sources to just three percent of the fuel mix with or without this nuclear plant. Where is the balance when Progress Energy has an energy efficiency program that based on current expenditures over the next eight years will amount to less than ten percent of their investment in this nuclear power plant. (**0014-77** [Eppes, Thomas])

Comment: This power plant will cost $7.7 million per megawatt. Southern California Edison is installing solar panels on leased commercial rooftops in high growth areas for $3.5 million dollars per megawatt. Less than half the cost. (**0014-78** [Eppes, Thomas])

Comment: A recent study by Navigant Consulting for the Florida Public Service Commission showed that Florida's solar potential is 175.8 kilowatt hours which amounts to 71.7 percent of all the electricity produced in Florida in 2007. That simply confirms the study done by the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy last year which showed that solar and other renewables could replace 26 percent of conventionally generated electricity in Florida by the year 2023. California is going to have 20 percent of their electricity generated by renewables by 2010. Certainly we can do just as good a job. (**0014-79** [Eppes, Thomas])

Comment: We can reduce our energy -- now, I'm familiar with this because when we lived in Europe in the eighties they were building buildings over there that had solar energy built into them when they were brand new. The Greeks. We lived in Greece and they had on the tops of roofs, every new house being built had pipes running up to the roof for heating hot water. We haven't done anything like that in this country. We don't have any solar panels here to speak of except in California, which is the leader, the big leader, and God bless them. (**0014-94** [Roberts, Preston])

Comment: We can reduce our energy requirements by, I calculate, a minimum of twenty percent when we build a new home. And the way of doing it is through the design of the house, the positioning of the house for the sun. They do that in many places out west. They design a house so that they either get rid of the sun or attract the sun. Insulation, and there are all kinds of insulation programs available today, different kinds of insulation. Triple glazed glass in your windows. Tremendous heat gain can be stopped by having triple glazed glass or you can keep your cool in or your heat in, whichever you're trying to do. Improved heat pump systems. (**0014-95** [Roberts, Preston])

Comment: [P]utting solar panels on the roofs and having the Federal government, as well as the State, start giving incentive to contractors to put these units in and let us sell the energy back to Progress. Let us make lots of electricity in our homes, which we can do. We can use -- we have batteries there. We pull that energy in, we use it in our homes. We will use what we need to use when we want it, want to do that, and the balance, let's sell it back. Boulder, Colorado has gone all electric now with panels in their homes. This is true. This was out about two weeks ago. And they are conserving energy and they are very interested in solar. And all the homes now have these units in there that control the house electric flow at the prime and peak times. And that's not something new; that's been readily available. But Boulder is on top. And they are going after it and doing it, and God bless them. (**0014-96** [Roberts, Preston])

Comment: I understand this Progress Energy plant is going to service thirty-five counties. That's what was told to me today, thirty-five counties. I wonder if we held a vote, a vote in those

thirty-five counties, explained the alternate possibility besides a nuke plant, two nuke plants, three nuke plants, maybe solar panels. Solar farms they call them. They call them solar farms. Putting those solar farms in place. (**0014-97** [Roberts, Preston])

Comment: My fourth concern questions the relevancy of the project at this time. Efficiency first. The project diverts money, attention and effort from such a campaign that could reduce energy consumption in this country by one fifth. (**0015-111** [Hopkins, Norman])

Comment: Our last electric bill, $36.47. Now, you want to talk about the environment? That's because of the solar on the roof for our hot water. I haven't even done the retrofit on the house yet. It will be even less when that's completed and the house will also be able to stand up to a hurricane five. (**0015-44** [Klutho, Mark])

Comment: Where are the options of conservation? You want to hear that. They don't make money off of that. Where are the solar representatives? Not invited, not funded, not considered as an option. Where are the wood power reps? Same thing. Solar is being used worldwide despite the oil, coal, gas and nuclear industry's suppression of it. It is used in the Northwest United States and in Scandinavia. There are huge solar fields that are being built in the western part of this nation. And if you think we don't have wind here in Florida, they say we don't, then these people need to get out in the Gulf of Mexico once in a while. We've got wind. (**0015-58** [Sullivan, Jennifer])

Comment: Progress Energy could do the right thing and take the billions of dollars that are allocated for the planning and implementation of this plant and work on creating truly sustainable energy plans for our state using solar, wind and other natural alternatives. By doing this we would be creating just as many jobs, sustaining our environment, protecting our employment, and leaving green solutions for those who come after us, such as our children. (**0015-79** [Stewart, Anita])

Comment: By the time the Levy County plant comes on line some of its technology will already be outdated. Everybody is talking about change this year. It has become a real key word. Do we want nebulous change or something really life changing. This is something that we all need to think about and this gives us many opportunities. Alternative energy sources could be our real change. (**0015-80** [Stewart, Anita])

Comment: Possibly there is no real need for the nuclear but there is a need for more wind and water. (**0015-94** [Berger, Betty])

Comment: We are at the edge of a new beginning in terms of energy and the environment. New technology is beckoning at our door and we must open that door to the future. Thousands of new jobs, trades and learning opportunities are enveloped in the new solar, wind, thermal and tide energies. We as a world leader must say 'NO' to the old ways of polluting our own world.

Just like our bodies, we only get one. Though it is too late for us as a nation to take the lead in this environmental transition, we join the advanced nations on the correct path. (**0016-2** [Waldron, Theresa])

Comment: The environmental negatives of such a project are obvious, and I don't need to elaborate extensively on them. The science does not support nuclear power as a viable alternative to greenhouse gases. Nuclear power distracts us from the real viable alternative fuels that don't pollute and add to the greenhouse effect. Solar, wind, geothermal and other clean fuel technologies are the only answer to our energy future. (**0019-10** [Heywood, Harriet])

Comment: Progress Energy had made little effort in developing our region's energy conservation and energy alternatives. We live in a state where solar energy is about to take hold. Progress and Levy County are in a position to set the trend for the future through the promotion of conservation and solar and wind energy. (**0023-1** [Highsprings, Jojo])

Comment: [T]he loss of this expanded level of state grid capacity would be catastrophic to the state power supply needs, since the utilities in Florida have not brought forward other renewable energy supplies such as solar and solar photovoltaic, river current electricity, tidal energy, ocean current, nor wind where possible. (**0026-2** [Towles Ezell, Joy])

Comment: The NRC should work its way out of existence by concentrating on closing down nuclear power plants and moving into a new, sustainable, safe, renewable power future for the United States. (**0026-8** [Towles Ezell, Joy])

Comment: This is not the time to push ahead with a nuclear power plant that is not supported by the general public and does not advance our country's interests in developing renewable energy sources that are safe for people and the environment. (**0028-5** [Horgan, Wendy])

Comment: Uranium is a scarce resource. The sun, wind, conservation, and energy efficiency are not. (**0029-5** [Cox, Lesley])

Comment: Not only will its construction and use be detrimental in many ways, most significantly, its high dollar cost will directly squander the resources essential for America to implement meaningful climate mitigation through development of alternative/sustainable energies. Florida already has FREE energy coming to us every day, from the sun. We should be pouring our resources into developing solar energy state wide. (**0029-6** [Cox, Lesley])

Comment: Lastly, and most importantly, I would like to see an assessment of the <u>long-term opportunity cost</u> of constructing, maintaining and employing this type of electricity generation as opposed to meeting the projected demand through conservation, efficiency and renewable energy generation. Give the limited financial resource projection and current Florida regulation,

we are not confident that conservation, efficiency and renewables will be fundable once the nuclear capacity is funded. (**0030-10** [Roff, Rhonda])

Comment: And building new nuclear plants will directly interfere with the development of better, safer technologies by diverting much-needed resources from their development. There is enormous potential in many already existing sustainable technologies, as well as new ones currently in development. If these promising technologies had a fraction of the resources that have been poured into the giant sinkhole that is the nuclear industry, we would not even be having this discussion. It would be crystal clear to everyone, as it is to me, that there are better, safer energy options, and that there is no need for new nuclear plants in Florida or anywhere else. If we are to save our environment and our planet, now is the time to invest everything we can into truly safe, sustainable technologies. But the huge financial investment required by new nuclear plant construction will mean that the full development of new renewable, sustainable energy technologies could be set back by years, at the time when we need these new technologies the most. Florida in particular has abundant solar energy that is not being used. And through improved energy conservation alone, we could reduce our power consumption in Florida enormously. These are just a few of the many safer and more cost-effective ways to address our Florida energy needs, rather than building new nuclear plants. (**0032-10** [Wilansky, Laura Sue])

Comment: What about turbines & sun uses for electric in our communities? (**0036-3** [Foreman, Patricia])

Comment: Address the climate crisis head-on: compare nuclear energy (including fuel production and waste management) to other forms of electric power generation - besides coal which IS the problem - for contribution to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Please also include systemic programs that produce “nega-watts” - also called energy efficiency - but in this case NOT the action of individual consumers, but actual institutional programs whether by utility corporations or independent administrators. (**0038-18** [Olson, Mary])

Comment: Given the striking fact that there has not been a new reactor license that was not subsequently canceled in more than 30 years, under NEPA there should be a specific comparison to other alternatives that includes a comparison of the wastes, emissions and routine releases from various forms of energy. Please include carbon footprint in this analysis - and include the mining and production of the fuel and the handling of the wastes in that analysis. We all know that coal has very bad emissions and wastes as well, however it is time that NRC includes a fair and balanced assessment of nuclear compared to the fastest growing electric power generating capacity on the planet: wind. Concentrating solar is growing as well - and while new forms of hydro are still under development, some of these could be included as well. While you are at it, please include the so-called “Gen IV” reactors since they are being invoked by the industry as THE REASON to build the current sorry generation 2 (it is a stretch to call these same-old, same-old PWRs and BWRs Gen 3). We need some good data

disclosure on the wastes of Gen II, Gen III and Gen IV - it would a service for NRC to give us these comparisons. (**0038-6** [Olson, Mary])

Comment: My husband and I, 400 signatures I have collected from family and friends, say no coal, no nukes, go solar first. (**0039-2** [Arnason, Deb])

Comment: [Nuclear energy] accident potential far beyond that of solar, wind, wave, geothermal. (**0039-7** [Arnason, Deb])

Comment: Power companies should be public utilities. We need honest plans like www.ieer.org, Carbon-Free and Nuclear-Free, A Roadmap for US Energy Policy and Google Energy's plan to power the US 2500x over using solar, wind and geothermal. This is being done. Only the political and corporate determination to make a killing instead of a living off of the citizens of Florida and the US and the planet keep us from truly clean, renewable energy. (**0039-9** [Arnason, Deb])

Comment: Please heed the warnings from mere citizens such as myself for me and my young family members. Find the alternatives that promote health and well being. (**0042-2** [Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee])

Comment: Please clarify whether the EIS process will incorporate a review of reasonable alternative energy sources. To inform the reviewer, applicant's design alternative evaluations can be incorporated by reference. (**0044-2** [Mueller, Heinz J])

Response: *Decisions regarding which generation sources and alternatives to deploy are made by the applicant and regulatory bodies such as State energy planning agencies. The alternatives must be technically viable, feasible, and competitive. Alternative actions such as the no-action alternative (energy efficiency and demand-side management), new generation alternatives, purchased electrical power, alternative technologies (including renewable energy sources such as wind and solar), and the combination of alternatives will be considered in Chapter 9 of the EIS.*

Comment: The territory of the State of Florida is quite unique, being a peninsula, with limited energy resources, limited borders with other states, and therefore limited space for installation of power lines. All this indicate that the State should invest on internal generation of power/electricity. Different sources specially Nuclear Power and Solar Energy should be expanded because both do not have greenhouse gas emissions. (**0005-2** [Haghighat, Alireza])

Comment: It [nuclear power] also provides long-term cost stability as it is the lowest production cost of any major source of electricity, including natural gas and coal. And as we invest in more

carbon-free nuclear, we decrease our reliance on fossil fuels and we help to stabilize rates and reduce fuel volatility that we've been experiencing over the past several months. (**0014-10** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: The greater conservation and renewable energy don't provide the base load power, the power that gets you to and from work, that gets the economy moving all twenty-four hours of the day. Consider that today all renewal sources produce two percent of our electricity while nuclear power accounts for twenty percent or one out of every five homes and businesses in the United States. (**0014-110** [Walther, Robert])

Comment: With regard to the waste question, the fissioning of a uranium atom releases 200 million electron volts. The burning of one coal atom releases four electron volts. In other words, on an atom-for-atom basis, nuclear creates 50 million times less waste. (**0014-20** [Tulenko, James])

Comment: [T]he true honest concern is yes, I do have a large carbon footprint; yes, I would like to see alternatives to the fuel that we are currently using because it is not in our best interest. (**0014-29** [Welker, Randy])

Comment: [I]n my opinion, fossil fuels need to become a dinosaur and a way of the past. And fossil fuels, obviously there is no doubt that they harm the environment and there is lasting impacts that we would like to see go away. (**0014-38** [Frink, Ken])

Comment: As an aside, a remark has been made about the cost, the comparative cost of electricity. Now, according to Amory B. Lovins, J. Rom (phonetic), Lester Brown who are widely accepted in this field, the cost of the energy in terms of cents per kilowatt hour from the nuclear plants will be at least twice the cost of the same from wind or solar. (**0014-58** [Hopkins, Norman])

Comment: At Progress Energy we have a responsibility to serve the electrical needs of our customers but we also recognize that there is no one single solution to meeting the energy needs of our customers. Our solution is a three-fold solution, a balanced solution. It is a combination of energy efficiency, alternatives and renewables, as well as investing in state of the art plants. (**0014-7** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: Even with a significant commitment to energy efficiency and renewables, we will not be able to meet the needs without cost-effective environmentally responsible ways to serve Florida's needs through nuclear. Nuclear also provides long term cost stability and it is the lowest production cost of any source of electricity, including coal and natural gas. (**0015-13** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: As we invest in carbon-free nuclear, we decrease our reliance on fossil fuels, and we stabilize our rates and reduce the fuel volatility that we have seen over the past several months. (**0015-14** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: A deeper commitment to renewable sources such as wind, solar and geothermal is needed. Let me be clear. We support them. But greater conservation and renewable energy don't provide the base-load power, the round-the-clock power that we need to run our country. We need to be able to turn the switch on any time of day. Consider today that all renewal sources produce two percent of our electricity while nuclear power accounts for twenty percent. That's one out of every five homes or businesses in the United States. (**0015-47** [Walther, Robert])

Comment: Energy Yield - or Energy Balance / Thermal Pollution - please start including in your side-by-sides of the different alternatives an honest disclosure of energy in vs energy out...include the mining and production of the fuel and handling of the wastes. It is high time that the younger generation get to SEE that 2/3 of the radioactive waste generated in this process did NOT make electric power. The latent heat issue needs full disclosure in the context of efficiency of power production. It is not appropriate to assert that wind and solar are intermittent forms of power and operate at a lower capacity without in the same comparison pointing out that power production that depends on steam wastes 2/3 of the fuel by releasing the latent heat of phase transition as thermal pollution, not power. (**0038-7** [Olson, Mary])

Response: *The NRC is not involved in establishing energy policy; rather, it regulates the nuclear industry to protect public health and safety within existing policy. The discussion of alternative energy sources in Chapter 9 of the EIS will describe potential impacts from alternative energy sources, including fossil and renewable energy sources such as wind and solar, in comparison with the proposed action.*

2.22 Comments Concerning Alternatives - Sites

Comment: [W]e have chosen Levy County as our preferred site. It provides a sufficient supply of cooling water which is one of the major requirements and important factors in the sustainability of any plant site. Our preferred site was chosen because it has ample water to meet the needs without adversely affecting other water usage and requirements in the area. Cooling water for the plant will be supplied through an intake from the Gulf of Mexico. This site also works well because it can connect easily to our transmission grid with our transmission plans that we have associated with the plant, allowing the energy generated here to serve in our thirty-five counties. (**0014-12** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: I think that the location of this plant is a bad location. I've listened to what people have said here, and particularly Mr. Norm Hopkins. And this is somebody who has really done

his homework. It is somebody that is not on anybody's payroll. It is somebody who is doing his homework because they care about Crystal River and all the people that live here. (**0014-147** [Jones, Art])

Comment: [L]et's build it where the need is for the power so you don't, you know, have these transmission lines going 180 miles to bring power over the villages. If the villages are growing, and the villages need power, and these nuclear plants are so safe, well then build it over near the villages. This just looks like a really bad location for the plant. It looks like a bad environmental disaster waiting to happen. (**0014-152** [Jones, Art])

Comment: So, you know, I just want to say I think we should keep it simple. I know the NRC has got tons, and tons, and tons of paperwork to go over and, you know, I hope you really look and listen clearly to people like Mr. Hopkins who has done their homework and that will take the burden off you. Here is someone that did the homework and it is just not a good location for these plants. (**0014-155** [Jones, Art])

Comment: And this is a lovely area, pristine area, and I think that's one of the reasons we've been targeted to put three together in here. And I would like to know where the energy is going aside from locally. (**0014-158** [Tyler, Janice])

Comment: Placing the proposed plants in this area would contribute to the degradation of the ecological banking system which has worked fine for us in the past and will work better in the future if we can restore or at least maintain a lot of what we already have and not lose any more. (**0015-31** [Casey, Emily])

Comment: [T]hey [Progress Energy] are putting this plant so far away from the population that it supposed to be serving. The more populous areas would be a lot more costly to cover should there be a disaster. (**0015-54** [Albert, Pamela])

Comment: [T]here are 4100 acres in Crystal River where there happens to be two coal-fired plants and a nuclear power plant. Well, there are over 3,000 acres there unused. There is an existing distribution network for the power that could be made with the new dual nuclear power plants located where one already is and two back-up coal-fired plants already are. (**0015-96** [Peters, Michael])

Comment: Progress Energy has proposed one of the worst siting situations in history. (**0026-3** [Towles Ezell, Joy])

Comment: The NRC issued a public notice for the 12/4/2008 meeting that stated that it intended to gather the information necessary to prepare the EIS as part of the review of the LWA and COL application for the LNP site. The public notice stated that the EIS would include alternatives to the proposed action (issuance of the LWA and COL), such as no action,

reasonable alternative energy sources, and alternate sites. But at the public scoping meeting, NRC Environmental Project Manager Douglas Bruner stated that the EIS would be developed for only one specific site, the 3105 acre site near Inglis, FL specified in the Levy Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 COL Application's Environmental Report. Mr. Bruner indicated that no alternative sites are to be assessed. Also, it was stated that the NRC would only consider the one specific design submitted by PEF. Please clarify whether the EIS process will incorporate a review of reasonable alternate sites. To inform the reviewer, applicant's site alternative evaluations can be incorporated by reference. (**0044-1** [Mueller, Heinz J])

Response: *The NRC will address alternatives to the proposed action in Chapter 9 of the EIS such as "no action, reasonable alternative energy sources, and alternate sites" to a level necessary to meet the requirements of NEPA. Additionally, the EIS will provide the information necessary for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to address the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) in their Record of Decision required under Section 404(b)(1) of the Clean Water Act.*

2.23 Comments Concerning Benefit-Cost Balance

Comment: I am greatly angered by the audacity of the NRC for allowing the investors to build a double reactor in Levy County. Aside from the nonsensical, and I might add astronomical, cost for such a HUGE time-consuming dinosaur, the environmental and safety concerns are staggering. (**0019-1** [Heywood, Harriet])

Comment: [I]t is clear to me that building new nuclear plants at the proposed Levy County site would be extremely dangerous and very costly in a variety of ways. (**0032-1** [Wilansky, Laura Sue])

Response: *These comments express opposition to the applicant's COL application. The NRC will carefully review the application against its regulations that are intended to protect public health and safety and the environment. An evaluation of the benefit-cost balance of constructing proposed LNP Units 1 and 2 will be discussed in Chapter 10 of the EIS.*

Comment: The insolence of the nuclear industry's request for REDUCED safeguards at the same time they ask for massive Federal funding should be a first signal that something is terribly out of whack. We now have a more refined sense of what an ANNUAL request for $25 billion or MORE actually represents in terms of the public's ability to pay. (**0006-8** [Dickinson, Josh] [Dickinson, Sally] [Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee] [Wapner, Howard])

Comment: My third concern is the cost of the project and the unrewarded charges to consumers for capital expense of Progress Energy incurred. (Both costs and time to build are guesses at this stage. Even Progress Energy literature is vague on this in a range of $2.5 billion to $17 billion). The project costs are hard to comprehend. Looked at another way, the latter

equals about three times the value of gold reserves held by the International Monetary fund (IMF), or 5% of IMF total reserves. That is a huge sum to apply to a single venture, taking money away from competitive power generation alternatives, which would be expected to mature years before the Levy County system is completed. (**0015-110** [Hopkins, Norman])

Response: *The NRC does not have authority under the law to ensure that the proposed plant is the least costly alternative to provide energy services under any particular set of assumptions concerning future circumstances. This authority and responsibility is most often the role of State regulatory authorities such as public service commissions, or in the case of merchant plants, the competitive marketplace. The EIS will consider the potential for alternative non-nuclear technologies to provide the electricity that could be generated by the proposed plant and their environmental impacts. The potential effect of a particular nuclear power investment on the future development and implementation of alternative technologies is speculative and beyond the scope of the EIS.*

Comment: Progress Energy's proposal to build the Levy County nuclear plant provides a recent example of the high cost of nuclear energy and the difficulty in providing accurate cost estimates. The cost of two Westinghouse AP1000 reactors has nearly tripled since initial estimates, to more than $17 billion. (**0008-3** [Musser, Marcie])

Comment: [W]hen are we going to get a lottle sense and quit spending so much money??? Of there is an affordable way and one that eventually we MAY recoup the expenses then common sense says that going the more affordable way would make financial sense. (**0009-2** [Davis, Suellyn])

Comment: A major advantage of a nuclear power plant is that once built, electricity costs will remain relatively stable for the next 60 to 80 years, because the major costs are the capital cost of building the plant. Once built, the fuel costs are a minor part of the total cost, unlike natural gas. (**0011-6** [Tulenko, James])

Comment: If our plans continue to move forward and are approved by our State and Federal regulators, the two new advanced technology reactors could begin operating in 2016 and 2017 respectively. And once those plants begin operating we will save our customers over $1 billion annually in fuel costs. (**0014-11** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: Because of the time and expense required to build nuclear facilities we've got to take the long-term view now, and that is why we are all here today. If plans continue to move forward and we receive state and Federal regulatory approval, the two new advanced technology reactors could begin operating in 2016 and 2017, respectively. Once the plants begin, we anticipate that we will save our customers over $1 billion annually in fuel costs. (**0015-15** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: According to figures provided by Progress Energy, total investment in the two new nuclear units and associated infrastructure will be on the order of $17 billion. This is certainly a large investment by any standard, and particularly in a relatively rural area such as this. Perhaps the largest single investment ever made in Levy County. (**0015-69** [Hodges, Alan])

Comment: I ask you to include the true costs of nuclear plants throughout their entire life cycle in your environmental calculations, including among other factors: the guaranteed damage to Florida's environment; the very real potential for enormous risks to health and life; the diversion of resources from the desperately- needed development of truly safe and sustainable energy technologies; the cost of hundreds of years of plant decommissioning; and the cost of nuclear waste storage for thousands of years to come. (**0032-13** [Wilansky, Laura Sue])

Response: *The disclosure of the costs of the proposed action will rely on the best available estimate of financial costs with uncertainties noted. Associated costs that cannot be reliably quantified also will be discussed. The EIS will discuss the estimated overall internal and external benefits, costs, and associated environmental impacts of the proposed project.*

Comment: My third concern is the cost of the project, and also the fact that we are being asked to contribute to the capital base as has already been discussed. It is difficult to comprehend $17 billion, but it's three times the gold reserves of the International Monetary Fund. It is also five percent of the total reserves of the International Monetary Fund. (**0014-56** [Hopkins, Norman])

Comment: Let's look at a cost comparison. Let's do a vote. Let's have a mandate that we take those thirty-five counties and get people to say yes or no. Then there is no question on whether or not it is going to happen. If they say yes, they've got the go-ahead. If they say no, we want more environmental information, and we want to see the dollars and cents figures. (**0014-98** [Roberts, Preston])

Comment: Another issue is that it's apparently $10 billion to erect a power plant of this nature and the economy cannot bear this burden, especially in light of what is happening today. (**0015-104** [Moore, Brian])

Comment: Another problem is that Wall Street does not like the nuclear industry because of the huge risk factors involved. Many folks remember huge cost overruns, ignored safety inspections, and deep pocket corruption. (**0019-3** [Heywood, Harriet])

Response: *While these comments are related to benefit-cost balance, they do not provide specific information related to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS.*

Comment: Please take action to stop Progress Energy from making the citizens pay for the construction costs of the planned nuclear power plant. The Progress Energy shareholders, not

the public, should bear the cost of building new plants. For the next 8 years Progress Energy plans to charge the average customer each and every month to pay for this plant. That will total of thousands of dollars for each and every one of us. We, the citizens, should not pay thousands of dollars to enrich the Progress Energy Corporation. (**0017-1** [Miller, Joan] [Miller, Ron])

Comment: In a time when money is so tight, and clean, and relatively cheap energy sources are begging to be developed, why is the NRC so hot to allow the nuclear industry to push such a risky a venture on us? Who will be paying for this project? Public subsidies (us) rate increases (us). (**0019-4** [Heywood, Harriet])

Comment: I do not believe it should be the responsibility of present Progress Energy Customers to pay for two buildings in Levy County for Nuclear Power. If the CEOs, Governor, Legislature and Energy Commission want these two plants let them pay for them. (**0036-1** [Foreman, Patricia])

Response: *The NRC regulates the nuclear industry to protect public health and safety within existing policy. Issues relate to sale adjustments are outside of the NRC's mission and authority and will not be addressed in the EIS. This authority and responsibility is most often the role of state regulatory authorities such as public service commissions.*

Comment: If nuclear power generation is so safe, why do we still need the Price-Anderson Act? (**0043-1** [Eppes, Thomas])

Comment: If nuclear power generation is so cost-effective, why does it continue to require billions of taxpayer dollars in Federal subsidies? (**0043-3** [Eppes, Thomas])

Comment: What is the dollar value (per megawatt of capacity) of all Federal subsidies to the nuclear power industry, including Price-Anderson and the projected costs of securely storing deadly waste for the requisite thousands of years? (**0043-4** [Eppes, Thomas])

Comment: I suggest that future NRC public meetings specifically address these [Federal subsidies and long term waste storage costs] questions. If you have the answers to any of these questions, please send them to me. Thank you for your public service. (**0043-5** [Eppes, Thomas])

Response: *The NRC is not involved in establishing energy policy; rather, it regulates the nuclear industry to protect public health and safety within existing policy. Thus, matters related to the Price-Anderson Act of 1957 are outside the scope of this review and will not be included in the EIS. However, the EIS will include an evaluation of potential health impacts of operating a nuclear plant on the LNP site in Chapter 5. In addition, the safety assessment for the proposed licensing action was provided as part of the application. The NRC is in the process of*

developing a Safety Evaluation Report that analyzes all aspects of construction and operational safety. The NRC will only issue a license if it can conclude that there is reasonable assurance that: (1) the activities authorized by the license can be conducted without endangering public health and safety, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the rules and regulations of the NRC. Issues related to the evaluation of the benefit-cost balance for proposed LNP Units 1 and 2 will be addressed in Chapter 10 of the EIS.

Comment: If nuclear energy was truly cost-effective and truly a profitable business, the companies trying to build new nuclear plants would not have to keep coming back to Congress for loan guarantees, liability insurance and tax breaks. The fact that this industry cannot obtain operating insurance by any means other than Congressional action is extremely telling! Nuclear plants are uninsurable!!!! Does that sound like an environmentally safe, economically sound business to you?! It surely doesn't to me! And haven't we had enough Congressional bailouts of failing private industries? The investments we have already made in the nuclear industry over many past decades have not paid off for the American people, and no further such investments should be made, based on their extensive existing track record. (**0032-11** [Wilansky, Laura Sue])

Comment: The people who decided to promote new reactor licenses (Dick Cheney, George Bush for two) liked to claim that nuclear energy will solve the climate crisis" - is this true? Is it the most cost effective way? This is particularly important, since NRC's licensing decision would trigger the use of massive public subsidy in the form of tax dollars and also public loan guarantees. It is NRC's fiduciary responsibility to address the climate issue head-on and disclose real facts about the comparative value of the public's investment in fighting this imminent threat. (**0038-19** [Olson, Mary])

Response: *The NRC is not involved in establishing energy policy. Rather, it regulates the nuclear industry to protect the public health and safety within existing policy. Issues related to the subsidization of nuclear power are outside of the NRC's mission and authority and are not addressed in the EIS. These comments will not be considered further in the EIS.*

2.24 General Comments in Support of the Licensing Action

Comment: As a resident of the State of Florida, I would like to express my strong support for the Levy Nuclear Power Facility Project which is being planned by Progress Energy Florida. (**0005-1** [Haghighat, Alireza])

Comment: I strongly support this major initiative of construction of nuclear power plants by Progress Energy Florida. (**0005-4** [Haghighat, Alireza])

Comment: This letter is written in support and hopeful approval of your agency's consideration of the Progress Energy. Florida (PEF) application for a Combined Construction and Operating

License (COL) for its planned nuclear power plant in Levy County, Florida. (**0010-1** [Johannesen, Francine])

Comment: As the leading voice of the construction industry in Marion County, and on behalf of our more than 400 members and their subscribing employees, families and associates of our trade association, we urge the NRC to approve Progress Energy's application for a Combined Construction and Operating License (COL) for the planned Levy County project. (**0010-5** [Johannesen, Francine])

Comment: I would like to speak in support of the Progress Energy application to build an AP 1000 reactor from Westinghouse at the Levy county site to serve the energy needs of the Citizens of North Central Florida. (**0011-1** [Tulenko, James])

Comment: I'm sure there are some opposed, and I'm sure they will speak loudly, but my opinion is they are a very small minority in our county. If you are seeking a place where the plant will be welcomed, Levy County is that place. (**0013-4** [Bullock, Wade])

Comment: It is my opinion that the siting of this plant environmentally is reasonably well thought out. They've picked an area that has relatively low population, that has access to water, access to, you know, the transmission grids. So by and large I'm in favor of it. I think it is going to bring a boom to both Citrus and Levy County in an economic perspective. I think it is a fairly well thought-out location so I'm in favor of it and I look forward to its process. (**0014-100** [Burrell, Troy])

Comment: It is my pleasure to be here today to speak on behalf of Progress Energy and their application process to build and operate two new reactors in Levy County. This project we have supported for several years. And of the seven counties I previously mentioned, five are within Progress Energy's service territory. (**0014-101** [Mucci, Matt])

Comment: The new plant that could be built in Levy will be able to power 1.4 million homes. The reality is we will require more from these sources and all others in the years ahead. If the housing crisis in Florida has shown us anything, it is that sound economic policy must recognize the virtue of diversity. So too must a wise energy plan and in that diverse plan nuclear energy is a critical component. (**0014-111** [Walther, Robert])

Comment: We support the NRC's preliminary recommendation and a continuation of the licensing process that would lead to new construction in Levy County. (**0014-114** [Walther, Robert])

Comment: I came here today because I care greatly about the future of our country and I believe construction of this plant is a vital part of that future. (**0014-120** [Harris, Mac])

Comment: I believe the technology being used in this plant is the most environmentally friendly of those that are commercially available and the company applying for the permit will construct the plant in an environmentally conscious way. And for these reasons I ask that this panel approve this plant construction. (**0014-123** [Harris, Mac])

Comment: I am basically for the construction of this plant. However, I would like to mention a few concerns. But before I do, let me address the point that I hear over and over from various persons who are very much concerned that the plants, two, or three, or one, make a fantastic target for Homeland Security, meaning terrorist attacks. (**0014-124** [Cannon, Renate])

Comment: [L]et it be enough of the passing in general I do support this plan. (**0014-129** [Cannon, Renate])

Comment: [T]his is the right location for nuclear power facilities and the timing is right. (**0014-133** [Maidhof, Gary])

Comment: I've been fishing and boating in this area for pretty much my entire life. I've really never seen any adverse environmental impacts from the operations here in Crystal River. (**0014-137** [Cheek, Ken])

Comment: Progress Energy brings great experience to this initiative. We have a proven track record for excellence in nuclear operations as we have been in the business for over thirty-six years. We operate over five reactors at four different sites, including our site here at Crystal River, which has been in operation since the seventies. (**0014-15** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: I'm in favor of the project. (**0014-140** [Cheek, Ken])

Comment: Through this community work that I did and through the tour of the facility and with all the information we constantly receive from the working groups and their leadership, I really look forward to having a nuclear facility here nearby. (**0014-146** [Marmish, John])

Comment: I would like to speak in support of Progress Energy's application to build an AP1000 reactor from Westinghouse at the Levy County site to serve the energy needs of the citizens of North Central Florida. (**0014-17** [Tulenko, James])

Comment: Allow me to take this opportunity and show my support for Progress Energy and the two new reactors they propose to build in Levy County. (**0014-174** [Vianello, Mark])

Comment: I have a tremendous amount of confidence in the leadership at Progress Energy and see this opportunity as a win-win situation for North Central Florida. I strongly support this endeavor. (**0014-178** [Vianello, Mark])

Comment: [T]he other important part of why I'm here and why I want this to occur is because of our future. (**0014-28** [Welker, Randy])

Comment: I just ask that the NRC look positively on the Levy County reactor project. (**0014-43** [Frink, Ken])

Comment: So we are excited about these opportunities and I look forward to our continued relationship with Progress. (**0014-5** [Edison, Jeff])

Comment: I'm here to provide a positive voice in support for the proposed project that we're discussing today. (**0014-60** [Douglas, Amanda])

Comment: We classify nuclear power generation companies as clean energy and support Progress Energy's application for construction, for a construction and operator's license. (**0014-81** [Latimer, Al])

Comment: I favor this project. I would only expect, and I have no doubt, that Progress Energy will do what they can to return back to the community and maintain that stewardship to the environment that they have already displayed. (**0014-86** [Kirk, Susan])

Comment: We're confident that these reviews will conclude that our licensing application is sound and provide the needed options to meet our energy needs in the future. (**0015-22** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: And this particular project is going to be in close proximity to the existing transmission system which makes it both efficient and less of an environmental impact. While we still don't necessarily agree you picked the right county, this is the right region to locate that plant. (**0015-3** [Maidhof, Gary])

Comment: We all have a shared stake in America's energy future and now is the time for the country to build more nuclear power plants to enable us to generate electricity with a clean, safe and dependable source of power. We support the NRC's preliminary recommendation and a continuation of the licensing process that would lead to new construction in the Levy community. (**0015-50** [Walther, Robert])

Comment: Seven Rivers would like to express its support for Progress Energy's application to the NRC to construct and operate the Levy County nuclear site, Units #1 and #2. (**0015-6** [Pernu, Dorothy])

Comment: I am here today in support of Progress Energy and the two power plants that they proposed to build, wherever that may be in this area so that our families can have access to better opportunities as well as they have a partnership with Central Florida Community College. (**0015-73** [McCray-Holly, Katrice])

Comment: I am nine years old. I attend Seven Rivers Christian School and I want to be a trained engineer when I grow up. I want the new power plant because it can help people get jobs and to lower the energy cost for my family and friends. (**0015-75** [Lewis, Maloni])

Comment: [M]y husband and I are property owners. We own right on the edge of the existing Florida Power -- excuse me -- Progress Energy transmission corridor and we are in the preferred corridor for the expansion of transmission lines. Nonetheless, we are in favor of nuclear power and we are in favor of the plant going in in Levy County. We don't live that far from the plant in Citrus County. (**0015-87** [Albert, Pamela])

Comment: I support and look forward seeing this legacy continue in our neighbor southern Levy County with the construction and operation of the Levy County nuclear facility. (**0015-90** [Damato, Dennis])

Comment: I wanted to write in my support of the plant, provided it's built in a safe manner and run safely, which I'm sure everything is being done within the committee's power to be sure it is. I don't subscribe to the climate change argument pushed in the sample letter and believe with proper procedures in place, nuclear power is a good choice to help meet our power needs. You have my full support with proper care in place to help make Florida's power system more stable and stronger. (**0027-2** [Nelson, Tami])

Comment: - All "negative" comments/speeches were bad-mostly opinions and none based on any good data, specifics, or specific referenced reports or studies. In essence there were no valid negative environmental comments. - It's a valid project go!! (**0034-2** [Renfro, E. E.])

Comment: [I] wish to record my support for this vital energy project. (**0035-1** [Craig, Avis])

Comment: The sooner this can begin the better. (**0035-4** [Craig, Avis])

Response: *These comments provide general information in support of the applicant's COL. They do not provide any specific information related to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS.*

2.25 General Comments in Support of the Licensing Process

Comment: [T]hank you for this opportunity to express our family's feelings about the proposed Progress Energy nuclear power plants in Levy County. We appreciate your interest in hearing what local residents, as well as what scientists and representatives of various organizations have to say about these projects. (**0006-1** [Dickinson, Josh] [Dickinson, Sally] [Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee] [Wapner, Howard])

Comment: We recognize that we have a significant decision here ahead of us from the regulators, and from the communities, and from our company. We also welcome and applaud the rigorous regulatory review that we are going through. (**0015-20** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: We also believe it is essential that nuclear is part of our energy mix to meet the needs of our customers and the citizens of Florida in the coming years. This process takes several years and it is important for us to file our application now in order to support the long-term needs of our state and nuclear as an option. (**0015-21** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: I appreciate your consideration of public comments in the planning process. (**0027-1** [Nelson, Tami])

Comment: Meeting served its purpose very well. (**0034-1** [Renfro, E. E.])

Comment: I find that your evaluation process assures safeguards to the environment, population in residences nearby. (**0035-3** [Craig, Avis])

Response: *These comments provide general information in support of the NRC COL process. They do not provide any specific information related to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS.*

2.26 General Comments in Support of Nuclear Power

Comment: Nuclear Power represents the cheapest source of electricity, and provides production of large amount of electricity (i.e., base-load) with limited footprint. Because of its high power density (highest among all sources of electricity), lack of emissions, Nuclear Power offers a major source of electricity with minimal impact on the environment. (**0005-3** [Haghighat, Alireza])

Comment: Nuclear power will prove to be our state's best option to provide reliable, affordable and emission-free energy. (**0010-4** [Johannesen, Francine])

Comment: Nuclear energy today provides about 18 % of the world's electricity supply and 20% of the U.S. electricity supply, according to the Energy Information Agency. In France, nuclear energy provides approximately 80% of their electricity needs. France has 59 operating nuclear reactors. In fact, France generates so much low-cost power from nuclear, that it exports electricity to its neighbors, earning a considerable amount each year. (**0011-2** [Tulenko, James])

Comment: Nuclear power is cleaner than coal, has demonstrated an excellent safety record and relies on a fuel found right here in North America. (**0011-3** [Tulenko, James]) (**0014-19** [Tulenko, James])

Comment: In Florida, we have 5 nuclear plants. Florida Power and Light has four, which are the two Turkey Point Plants and the two Saint Lucie Plants. And, of course, Progress Energy operates the Crystal River Plant right here in Crystal River. The 104 nuclear plants operating in the United States have shown that nuclear power is both safe and economic. (**0011-7** [Tulenko, James]) (0014-24 [Tulenko, James])

Comment: With regard to the waste question, the fissioning of a uranium atom releases 200 million electron volts. The burning of one coal atom releases 4 electron volts. Thus, on an atom for atom basis, nuclear creates 50 million times less waste. The final volume of nuclear waste from the French recycled fuel needed to power the home of a French family of four for 20 years is only slighter larger than a lipstick case. (**0011-4** [Tulenko, James])

Comment: I have stood on top of all the nuclear waste stored in France and it is contained in one building. Pictured below with this statement is all the nuclear fuel waste stored at the Maine Yankee plant that operated for 25 years from 1972 to 1996 generating 900 MWe for the Maine citizens. One can enter into this area and safely touch each of these containers. (**0011-5** [Tulenko, James])

Comment: The final volume of nuclear waste from the French recycled fuel needed to power the home of a French family of four for twenty years is only slightly larger than a lipstick case. This is something most people don't understand. I have stood on top of all the nuclear waste stored in France and it is contained in one building. (**0014-21** [Tulenko, James])

Comment: The picture below -- and this was a picture that will be carried on -- is all the nuclear fuel waste stored at the Maine Yankee plant that operated for twenty-five years from 1972 to 1976, generating 900 megawatts of electric for the Maine citizens. One can enter into this area and safely touch each of these containers. And the picture shows how small of an area all the waste from twenty-five years of operation of the Maine Yankee plant is. (**0014-22** [Tulenko, James])

Comment: I also believe nuclear power has the least drawbacks of any power plants available today. (**0013-2** [Bullock, Wade])

Comment: The coalition boasts a membership of 1700 individuals and organizations across the nation and locally who support our mission. We support construction of new reactors and are actively engaged in generating a public dialog to inform others about the way nuclear power enhances America's energy security and economic growth, helps obtain cleaner air and improves the quality of life, health and economic well being for all Americans. (**0014-107** [Walther, Robert])

Comment: We all have a shared stake in America's energy future. Now is the time for our country to build more nuclear power plants to enable us to generate electricity with a clean, safe and dependable source of power. (**0014-113** [Walther, Robert])

Comment: I've covered energy as a news reporter and the last thirty-five years I've unfortunately been involved in oil and gas supply issues, coal issues, with various energy crises we've had; construction of two nuclear plants and upgrades at three others. I've been involved in national energy policy such as the 1992 Energy Policy Act where I wrote some papers. During this time I have become increasingly convinced that the only rational and environmentally sound way to meet our energy needs is through the construction of additional nuclear power plants. I have seen firsthand all of the ways we generate power in commercial quantities and any electric generating power plant has an impact on the environment. But there is no question in my mind that a nuclear power plant has less impact and it is the only commercially feasible way to produce the power we need. (**0014-121** [Harris, Mac])

Comment: [W]e support nuclear energy not only because it is clean, and it is safe, and it is something that provides us for the future. (**0014-134** [Hernandez, Michael])

Comment: We believe it is essential to keep nuclear power as part of the energy mix for Florida, and we know that the review process is going to take several years. Also construction will take several years. So it is critical that we apply now for our application to support nuclear as an option for us in the future. We're confident that these reviews will conclude with the favorable licensing, that it is sound and that we will be able to provide the need that energy -- we will be able to meet the energy needs of our citizens here in the state of Florida. (**0014-16** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: Just as important environmentally, these reactors are needed to continue the pursuit of alternative sources of energy for our nation. (**0014-177** [Vianello, Mark])

Comment: Nuclear energy today provides about eighteen percent of the world's electricity supply and twenty percent of the U.S. electricity supply according to the Energy Information Agency. In France, nuclear energy provides approximately eighty percent of their electrical needs. France has fifty-nine operating nuclear reactors. In fact, France generates so much low-cost power from nuclear that it exports electricity to its neighbors, earning a considerable amount of money each year. (**0014-18** [Tulenko, James])

Comment: A major advantage of a nuclear power plant is that once built, electricity costs will remain stable for the next sixty to eighty years because the major costs are the capital costs of building the plant. Once built the fuel costs are a minor part of the total costs, unlike natural gas. (**0014-23** [Tulenko, James])

Comment: [N]uclear, in my opinion, is the single most effective method of energy production in terms of reliability, efficiency and proven effectiveness. (**0014-39** [Frink, Ken])

Comment: Nuclear generated power is reliable. In Florida we have seasonal challenges called hurricanes. During and after hurricanes fossil fuel supplies are interrupted causing price hikes. These unanticipated increases negatively impact businesses ability to survive and compete. (**0014-83** [Latimer, Al])

Comment: Nuclear power presents the most cost-effective and environmentally responsible alternative to meet Florida's growing needs. (**0014-9** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: We support construction of new reactors and are actively engaged in generating a public dialog to inform others about the way that nuclear power enhances America's energy security and economic growth. (**0015-45** [Walther, Robert])

Comment: I also wanted to discuss from an legislative perspective the support that nuclear energy has in Florida. Just this past legislative session, Democrats and Republicans, 109 in the Senate and the House together the vote for a new energy bill in this state that supports nuclear energy and renewables as we do passed 108 to 1. 108 to 1 for a comprehensive new energy policy. (**0015-51** [Hernandez, Michael])

Comment: I do want to get that on record that while we do support as a coalition renewables and various sources to power our future, nuclear has to be a part of it in our view. (**0015-53** [Hernandez, Michael])

Response: *These comments provide general information in support of nuclear power. They do not provide any specific information related to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS.*

2.27 General Comments in Support of the Applicant

Comment: We commend Progress Energy for their inclusion in the process and for taking our recommendations into consideration. I thank you for allowing me to address you today and I hope you will look favorably on this application and recognize the state-wide benefits. (**0014-106** [Mucci, Matt])

Comment: I've also seen firsthand the commitment to energy excellence and to the protection of the environment that Progress Energy shows, and I'm convinced they will take all necessary steps. (**0014-122** [Harris, Mac])

Comment: Progress Energy, and its predecessor, Florida Power Corporation, has a long and established history of providing -- of operating nuclear power plants both efficiently and safely.

And the site in question is in close proximity to existing transmission lines which will help deliver that energy in a cost-effective fashion. (**0014-132** [Maidhof, Gary])

Comment: My purpose today is to briefly share with you the positive effect Progress Energy has had on Levy County over the past few years. Over the past six years they have given a total of over $83,000 just to Levy County alone to the public education. In 2002, that's when we were first approached by Progress Energy. They approached us and gave us $1,000 to support our classroom grants which goes directly to programs in the classrooms for the students and teachers. In 2004, they gave us $15,000 toward the teacher program because we had a critical teacher shortage in the areas of science, math, and special education. They have continued over the last four years for a total of $50,000, additional dollars to the $15,000 towards that program. In 2003 through 2008 they have supported our annual scholarship program. We have a Superintendent's Gala we do every year, and they constantly give towards those scholarships for graduating seniors. In 2008 Progress Energy has joined our Board of Directors. And this last year the most recent grant, they gave $17,000 towards a career and tech program. So we just want to tell you, just reconfirm what other people have said, that they are a great corporate citizen and certainly contribute a lot to the students and teachers of Levy County. (**0014-136** [Slaback, Laura])

Comment: I'm here to tell you about the great support we get from Progress Energy. Progress Energy is a great community partner. You might say they offer a brain trust, and pardon the pun on that. But they support so many nonprofits in Citrus County through their leadership and through their knowledge. On our United Way Board we have two to three employees that represent not only that entity but support the community. (**0014-141** [Marmish, John])

Comment: Financial support, I never totaled up how much dollars that has come from the employees of Progress Energy, but I dare say that it is millions of dollars that we have received over the years. Their employees support many nonprofits in the community through direct financial contributions, but also as volunteers. They actively get out and support those nonprofits and provide services that we do not have the talents for or the energy for. And many days are spent on our Day of Caring, which is volunteer work back into the community, food drives. Their Volunteer Council is composed of volunteers from their employees. And they get out and actively support the nonprofits. (**0014-142** [Marmish, John])

Comment: We also had the opportunity to take a tour of the plant. And I can't tell you how impressed I was with the security measures that they have in place as far as they could tell us, and as far as I could see. I was very, very impressed. (**0014-144** [Marmish, John])

Comment: In 2002, Progress Energy's Community Relations Representative, Mrs. Lynette Vennillion, contacted us and offered Progress Energy's support of our Levy County Schools Foundation. She provided funding for our new Classroom Grant Program to award science and math grants (This has continued every year since then). More importantly she made us aware

of other corporations that offered support to school foundations and gave us contact information to help us contact them. In 2003, a Progress Energy employee, Frank Dola (who we met because his wife was Levy Teacher of the Year), agreed to become a member of our Board of Directors. Since that time, a Progress Energy representative has continuously been an active member of our Board. They have also since that time been a gold sponsor of our annual Superintendent's Gala and sponsored our Evening of Excellence, which honors teachers, employees and volunteers of the year. In 2004, Levy County Schools Foundation was awarded a $15,000 grant to support School Board of Levy County employees who wanted to work toward a degree to teach or to become certified in areas of critical shortage (such as science, math and special education). They have continued to fund this grant for 4 years for a total of $50,000 making dreams come true for residents seeking to complete their education. This year, through our foundation, Progress Energy awarded a technology grant in the amount of $17,000 to help in the establishment of new career and technical education opportunities for our students. Progress Energy has not just given money. Their employees have invested time, used their resources to help us grow our organization and become our friends. We think they will make great neighbors and support their presence in our county. (**0014-173** [Smith, Bobbie])

Comment: As principal of Marion Technical Institute, one of our strongest and most visible business partners we have is Progress Energy. They have been most generous in donating time, resources, and expertise to help prepare the much needed future workforce for our region. The statistics are alarming; within the next five years, 50% of the energy industry workforce will be eligible to retire. The leadership at Progress Energy understands this and is helping our community prepare for it. Their good stewardship to our school and region touches students in every high school in Marion County. MTI is designed so students from around the district can attend our school and focus on a specific career path. Our philosophy is to provide real world experiences, hands on activities, certification and career opportunities. Progress Energy helps turn this belief into reality. One of MTI's newest, most exciting, and popular programs is our Power Industry Academy. As lead company for the MTI Power Academy and an active member of our Business Task Force, Progress Energy has gone above and beyond to set up field trips, provide guest speakers, and allow their employees to deliver hands on experiences for our students. (**0014-175** [Vianello, Mark])

Comment: Fortunately Progress Energy has shown a desire to protect the environment while building large projects to produce electricity required by a growing Florida. (**0014-180** [Marraffino, Paul])

Comment: Progress Energy has been wonderful business partners with our schools well before these talks began. They sit on our education foundation and many of the employees that work here in Crystal River are families in Levy County. (**0014-2** [Edison, Jeff])

Comment: [The existing unit(s)] is actually doing much, much more for this country than just for us in this community. So I'm very, very supportive. (**0014-31** [Welker, Randy])

Comment: I do want to be as supportive as I possibly can because when we look at things from an economic development standpoint, we try to develop the relationship with the company. We want to see how they are going to be responsive to us and our community. And I don't think that there is any doubt in anybody's mind that Progress Energy has proved themself over and over again as being a very good corporate citizen. We've relied on them to help us with our schools; we've relied on them -- me personally -- for our economic development; we've relied on them to be honest and upstanding citizens in our community. And if you look at their workers, most of their workers are involved in some way in the community in making it a better place. (**0014-32** [Welker, Randy])

Comment: I became aware of Progress Energy's efforts and the extensiveness of their efforts to work with environmental impact on the areas that they are involved in. If you go on their web page you will understand and see how their foundation has worked to mitigate areas of the environment and to restore those areas. (**0014-85** [Kirk, Susan])

Comment: I'm here to speak in favor and on behalf of Progress Energy. The last speaker mentioned good stewardship to the community. I am the principal of Marion Technical Institute which is the only technical high school in Ocala. What makes our school unique is the relationship that we have with the business community, whether it be the Economic Development Corporation, Citrus-Levy; Marian County Workforce Development; or Progress Energy. Progress Energy has been a tremendous partner with us over the past two years as we've developed our power academy in their help in preparing students to be linemen, preparing students to work in the energy field. Whether it be providing guest speakers, providing internship opportunities, or employment opportunities, providing resources for our students, they are there. They provide manpower. They are really a tremendous supporter of education and a tremendous steward to our community. (**0014-87** [Vianello, Mark])

Comment: I would like to say in my two years in working with the leadership of Progress Energy, specifically Martha Barnwell and Jim Sochacki, I have known them to be extremely intelligent, extremely organized, and I have a tremendous amount of confidence in their ability to work and make this a very positive experience. (**0014-89** [Vianello, Mark])

Comment: I've been a Levy County resident for about the last forty-six years. I live in southeast Levy County probably fifteen to twenty miles from the proposed plant location and about twenty-five to thirty to the existing nuclear plant location. And all that time Progress Energy has been a good neighbor. (**0014-99** [Burrell, Troy])

Comment: We have a proven track record in nuclear operations. We safely and efficiently have operated nuclear plants for more than thirty-six years. We have five units and over four sites in North Carolina, South Carolina and here in Florida. And our Crystal River plant has been operating since 1970. (**0015-19** [Barnwell, Martha])

Comment: Progress Energy, and their predecessor, Florida Power Corporation, has a long and established history of providing efficient and safe operation of a nuclear power plant. (**0015-2** [Maidhof, Gary])

Comment: Progress Energy has operated a nuclear plant here in the energy complex in Crystal River for over thirty years. During that time Progress Energy has been an exceptional corporate partner and neighbor. They have contributed to Citrus County's tax base. Their employees have donated immeasurable funds as well as personal time for nonprofit organizations and the company has been a diligent partner in growing our community in a positive way. (**0015-7** [Pernu, Dorothy])

Comment: [W]e support their engineering technology programs again in hopes of educating our community to provide better jobs and incomes for our family. (**0015-74** [McCray-Holly, Katrice])

Comment: I am the present owner of Hollinswood Ranch in Citrus County, which my father and grandfather purchased in 1942 which comprised approximately 20,000 acres. And I'm very proud to be here as a third generation Floridian and be part of the Progress Energy, Florida Power back then, of the four coal units and the nuclear power unit that's here today in Citrus County. (**0015-81** [Hollins, Dixie])

Comment: I lived and still live in that vicinity. I lived as close as a half mile for twenty-five years next to Progress Energy's plant, including the nuclear power plant. I can attest to you that they are good neighbors. I can assure you that a full cooperation with that company. They have gone beyond the call of duty on security, drainage, protecting the environment. And the only problem that I've ever had with them is when they put the fish hatchery in. And my father was very concerned that they didn't give him the key to the fish hatchery so he could go fishing. (**0015-82** [Hollins, Dixie])

Comment: This is a huge opportunity for the people in Citrus County and Levy County to grow with this environment and this economy up here. Change is coming and we need electricity. This is the cleanest electricity that I know of. They have done a good job. They will bend over, as I said, backwards for this community, whether it is in Citrus or Levy County. (**0015-83** [Hollins, Dixie])

Comment: I am very proud to be standing up here in front of you as a third generation Floridian and been a first line experience with Progress Energy. They have various concerns with their noise, with their lighting, drainage, as I already mentioned. They put salt water cooling towers in. They also put drift monitors on my property because I was in the timber business and I was concerned with salt. Complete cooperation. (**0015-84** [Hollins, Dixie])

Comment: I am also a landowner to the north of them. I will be a landowner to the south of Progress Energy in Levy County and I am a landowner to the north of the existing Progress

Energy. And I can't say enough about what this is going to do for this community and the economy that is such in bad need here in the United States of America. (**0015-85** [Hollins, Dixie])

Comment: I witnessed the Crystal River Energy Complex grow to what it is today. At all times, Progress Energy has been an excellent corporate partner to this community in every respect. They are part of our local fabric ... and culture of that community and while preserving ... [and] while providing a basic commodity we all need and use. I view the provision of good jobs, tax base, and community support as valuable assets to this area. (**0015-89** [Damato, Dennis])

Comment: I'm not against Progress Energy. I think they are a great company. (**0015-95** [Berger, Betty])

Response: *These comments express support for the applicant. They do not provide any specific information related to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS.*

2.28 General Comments in Opposition to the Licensing Action

Comment: This hearing should conclude with a resounding rejection of the requested permits, based on all of the above grounds. (**0006-12** [Dickinson, Josh] [Dickinson, Sally] [Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee] [Wapner, Howard])

Comment: I am writing in protest of the nuclear expansion. (**0007-1** [Whiteley, Naomi])

Comment: There are many very vamid reasons that I do not want this to go through. (**0009-1** [Davis, Suellyn])

Comment: Please, register my vote and voice against this dangerous way of getting the rich guys even richer. (**0009-7** [Davis, Suellyn])

Comment: Now, I understand that the nuclear plant is going to bring a lot of tax money into Levy County but it is going to affect the environment here in Crystal River. So it is just a bad location for the plant. (**0014-150** [Jones, Art])

Comment: I'm a director of a couple of environmental organizations locally. And I guess I'm not going to speak in favor of the Levy County nuclear facility. (**0014-51** [Hopkins, Norman])

Comment: I thank these gentlemen for being here. I am sure they mean well and want to do their job well, but we need to, as a citizenry, take the bull by the horns and take control of this rather than letting the utility companies and contractors sort of run roughshod over our future and that of our children and grandchildren. (**0014-70** [Russell, John])

Comment: I am opposed to the construction of a second nuclear facility in Crystal River. (**0015-99** [Moore, Brian])

Comment: Good Day, As a responsible citizen and nature buff, I am 100% against the permitting and building of the 2 new nuke plants by PE. (**0016-1** [Waldron, Theresa])

Comment: Oppose the Levy County Plant. (**0019-11** [Heywood, Harriet])

Comment: I am OPPOSED to the Levy Nuclear Power Plant Units 1 and 2 currently being proposed by Progress Energy Florida, Inc. (**0028-1** [Horgan, Wendy])

Comment: I am opposed to new nukes in Florida. (**0039-1** [Arnason, Deb])

Comment: Please do not permit any more nuclear power plants to be built in Florida. (**0043-6** [Eppes, Thomas])

Response: *These comments provide general information in opposition to the applicant's COL. They do not provide specific information related to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS. The NRC will carefully review the application against its regulations that are intended to protect public health and safety and the environment.*

2.29 General Comments in Opposition to Nuclear Power

Comment: All in all, these proposed nuclear plants are NOT SUSTAINABLE in any way - from carbon emissions, water use, waste disposal, taxpayers financial commitment, carbon production and populations dosed with radiation. (**0006-10** [Dickinson, Josh] [Dickinson, Sally] [Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee] [Wapner, Howard])

Comment: [W]e have to not build new nuclear power plants in Florida. (**0008-1** [Musser, Marcie])

Comment: I do believe it is time for change and I do believe we've heard that lately. Nuclear is old. It has been here. It has done its thing and it has helped us, it really has. But we have to be looking to the future and nuclear is not the future. (**0014-161** [Waldron, Theresa])

Comment: I am concerned with any decision that involves constructing a dinosaur. Make no mistake about it. One gentleman alluded to fossil fuels becoming a dinosaur. You don't replace one dinosaur with another. ... The bottom line is that the replacements for nuclear and fossil fuels are upon us today. (**0014-62** [Russell, John])

Comment: [W]e don't feel that there should be anymore development of nuclear power in the country. (**0015-100** [Moore, Brian])

Comment: And this last nonsense about it being something efficient and an economical way to provide energy, in this column, he writes: As The Economist magazine repeatedly emphasizes and Amory Lovins and all of my colleagues recently detailed in Forget Nuclear, nuclear power still makes no sense financially. Well, you know, The Economist has only been publishing since 1843, the bible of the conservatives, the right. (**0015-36** [Klutho, Mark])

Comment: And then here is this article: Anti-Nuclear Demonstrators Chain Selves to Tracks. Everybody talks about how great it is in France that they get seventy percent of their electricity from nuclear. Well, they are sending it to Germany who is phasing out nuclear power. And 15,000 demonstrators are trying to stop the train from bringing the waste over that. If it's so good why don't they keep all that waste in France. (**0015-38** [Klutho, Mark])

Comment: Chernobyl, Three Mile Island were the disasters but we are told that they've learned from their mistakes. If you make a poisonous cake it would be okay to eat it if I could come up with a less poisonous cake. (**0015-56** [Sullivan, Jennifer])

Comment: Uranium is used to heat water. Nuclear is not clean. It is poisonous, it is deadly, it is dangerous to the area's environment, to people, animals, soil, and water. It can be used by terrorist. Let's not make more. (**0015-62** [Sullivan, Jennifer])

Comment: But it is interesting to see the kind of poisons, the kind of things that we hear from politicians or from people in power that are making some money off of something and they are going feed people this story that sounds good. And you repeat it and you repeat it and people start to believe it as truth. Well, it is not truth. So another source would be the GP.Org site, and you could go on that. That is Green Party. And you can go to the Florida Green Party and we have a Florida paper on energy, The Green Paper on energy and you can see what our studies on nuclear show. And also, as I said, read Helen Caldicott, Doctor Helen Caldicott's book. (**0015-65** [Sullivan, Jennifer])

Comment: The money is not available for old ways and time is not one our side. We must act now. Please deny any permitting, building or future advancement of any nuclear plants in Levy County or any other county in our nation. I speak for myself and many members of our local Naturecoast Sierra Group. (**0016-3** [Waldron, Theresa])

Comment: The fact is, nuclear power has never recovered from the crises that hit three decades ago with the reactor fire at Browns Ferry, Alabama in 1975, the meltdown at Three Mile Island in 1979, followed by the Chernobyl meltdown in 1986. The last nuclear power plant ordered by a US utility, the TVA's Watts Bar 1 began construction in 1973 and took 23 years to complete. The steady decline since that time has seen almost as many plants canceled as completed. In fact, the nuclear power industry has been one of the greatest industrial failures of modern times. (**0019-2** [Heywood, Harriet])

Comment: Nuclear is not safe. Just one mistake could forever ruin our entire region. I live about 60 miles north of the proposed site and am worried that the NRC is making a huge mistake in allowing a nuclear plant to be sited in Levy County, Florida. (**0026-6** [Towles Ezell, Joy])

Comment: I have attached the entire paper on Energy Options for the State of Florida, as Presented by the Florida Green Party and the Palm Beach County Environmental Coalition. Please include the section entitled "Nuclear Revival", on pages 9 and 10, in the public comment for Federal Register d.p/2008-10-24E8-2538. [The text referenced by the commenter is in opposition to nuclear power.] (**0031-1** [Karson, Annabeth])

Comment: I share the concerns expressed below [in Dickinson letter, LNP-COL1&2-SC-00006]....They cover the resounding points of why nuclear power plants are not sustainable nor desirable by the inhabitants, animals and plants, that live in and around such places. (**0042-1** [Malwitz-Jipson, Merrillee])

Comment: [T]his is not green, it is not efficient, it is not clean. And let's take a stand as the public and move forward towards a new, the new energy age. The information age eclipsed by the new energy age. (**0014-69** [Russell, John])

Comment: I do not believe that nuclear energy is clean nor is it safe for the consumers, the environment. And it is definitely not energy that provides sustainability. (**0015-76** [Stewart, Anita])

Comment: Nuclear power is NOT a solution to Florida's energy needs or climate change. When the entire fuel chain is examined, including the initial construction and production processes, nuclear power (sold superficially as carbon neutral) becomes a big carbon producer. (See: Carbon Free and Nuclear Freeby Arjun Makhijani, Ph.D. published as a joint project between the Nuclear Policy Research Institute and the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, IEER Press and RDR Books, 2007). (**0029-1** [Cox, Lesley])

Comment: Nuclear energy is NOT renewable nor clean. (**0039-3** [Arnason, Deb])

Comment: Meanwhile, after being one of the first to use nuclear, the Germans are phasing it out completely by 2020. Germany is the second largest economy in the world and they see nuclear as a bad investment. Why should we pour money into nuclear when the second largest economy in the world is phasing it out? (**0015-59** [Sullivan, Jennifer])

Response: *These comments provide general information in opposition to nuclear power. They do not provide any specific information related to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS.*

2.30 General Comments in Opposition to the Applicant

Comment: I am not in business to support Progress Energy. Because it seems it's all been positive because of what it is going to give to the community. (**0014-45** [Foreman, Patricia])

Comment: They [Progress Energy] are out of Raleigh, North Carolina. And so we are just strictly a business interest to them and they could care less about Florida, other than making money. I believe that's a fair point. (**0014-91** [Roberts, Preston])

Comment: A nuclear bulls eye is on our back. This was from the Tampa Tribune. It's an abridged version. You can find the full edition in Solar Today. And, you know, like the last time the NRC was here, I hear a lot of lies from Regressive Energy. (**0015-34** [Klutho, Mark])

Comment: I have repeatedly exposed our fears to PEF at the monthly meetings. PEF has made no firm commitments to allay our fears. (**0021-2** [Michaels, Edward])

Response: *These comments express opposition to the applicant. They do not provide any specific information related to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS.*

2.31 Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Emergency Preparedness

Comment: I would like to talk about ... Progress Energy's readiness to respond to a disaster. My previous position before I bought into this engineering firm was the Public Works Director for Citrus County. And I've sat through numerous drills and numerous real-time disasters, most notably in 2004 during the hurricanes, watching Progress Energy in action either getting ready for, responding to, or preparing for these disasters. And in my opinion, we all should feel safe knowing of the competent professionals involved from this organization that do watch over the safety of those reactors. (**0014-42** [Frink, Ken])

Comment: This proposed plant puts Inglis in the position of the meat in the sandwich. Crystal River Nuclear 5 miles South and Levy Nuclear 2 miles North of Inglis, population 1500 people. In the event of a disaster from the plant there is no escape route from the Levy County site. On the West is the Gulf - The North and South routes are not escape centers - The East where Williston emergency center is for overnighters - will be blocked by their haul-over road planned for Highway #40 to bring water pipes, etc. from the Barge Canal up to their site. (**0020-1** [Berger, Sarah])

Response: *These comments relate to the adequacy of emergency plans, which is a safety issue that is outside the scope of the staff's environmental review. As part of its site safety review, the NRC staff will determine, after consultation with Department of Homeland Security*

and Federal Emergency Management Agency, whether the emergency plans submitted by the applicant meet applicable requirements.

2.32 Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope – Miscellaneous

Comment: In his [Amory Lovins'] paper from 1999, Climate: Making Sense and Making Money, one of the things he talks about in a typical building lighting circuit, if you go to the next gauge wire, next size larger wire, you will get a 193 percent annual return on your investment because you let the electrons flow through the wire more efficiently and you don't pay to heat the wire. Now Regressive Energy just built a new building in downtown St. Petersburg. Guess what? I guarantee if you go in and you look at that building they did that wiring to code and they didn't do it like it tells you in this, Climate: Making Sense and Making Money. Now, $17 billion and $3 billion goes to the power lines. (**0015-41** [Klutho, Mark])

Comment: Back to funding. Progress Energy is for profit. That is why so many who have jobs and in this business for profit are here to promote it. (**0015-57** [Sullivan, Jennifer])

Response: *The purpose of the EIS 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 EIS.*

Comment: Environmental concerns, I say that's a big one, a really big one. Here is Amory Lovins' book, Non-Nuclear Futures, The Case for an Ethical Energy Strategy. I've had this one since 1975. That was five years after I was on a nuclear weapons assembling team, arming the warheads for 155 Howitzers. (**0015-40** [Klutho, Mark])

Comment: You know what Amory Lovins says about getting your hot water from electricity? It's like cutting butter with a chainsaw. (**0015-43** [Klutho, Mark])

Response: *These comments provide no new information relevant to the environmental review of the COL application and therefore will not be evaluated in the EIS.*

Comment: The advance environmental report available at the local library was very difficult to comprehend and follow. I spent over an hour reading it & got little out of it. (**0034-3** [Renfro, E. E.])

Response: *This comment expresses concern about the complexity of the environmental report. This comment provides no specific information relevant to the environmental review of the COL application and will not be considered further in the EIS.*

Comment: If you work for a group whose job it is to promote nuclear, if you work for a commission whose job it is to regulate nuclear, if you work for a company wanting to profit from the nuclear, you will be giving a biased opinion and we are being immersed in pro-nuclear this evening, ladies and gentlemen. (**0015-60** [Sullivan, Jennifer])

Response: *This comment provides general information in opposition to the NRC's COL process and will not be evaluated in the EIS. The NRC will carefully review the application against its regulations that are intended to protect public health and safety and the environment.*

Comment: Due to additional trains on the present line, rail noise will increase for all areas of Rainbow Springs including Grand Park, Grand Park North, Country Club Estates, The Forest, The Villas, Fox Trace, The Woodlands, and Fairway Estates, as well as the surrounding area. (**0040-4** [Medlin, Ted])

Comment: [E]veryone talks smart growth. I would like to see smart growth if you have to grow. People live, people want houses. Why don't we have individual communities that are self-sufficient that do not have constant sprawl, sucking the resources from everyone around them? That is smart growth. (**0014-170** [Waldron, Theresa])

Comment: Where does the electric go from the nuclear plant? I've lived here since 1976. I have never had nuclear power. I have always paid for oil and coal which to me is terribly, terribly unreasonable. You ask me to live twenty-five miles from the plant and you can't supply nuclear energy to my little home. (**0014-47** [Foreman, Patricia])

Comment: Our economy is in a crisis, just not enough money for everyone to sustain their previous lifestyle. And now several things are occurring. Everyone is cutting back on their usage of money and making wise decisions on their purchases. Globally governments are bailing out financial institutions and big businesses who did not manage or use their money very wisely in the past. Everyone is learning that we cannot continue with business as usual. All over the world people are having to make choices about their finances that will affect the future of many generations to come. This country is in a period where change, driven by needs, needs to occur quickly and smartly. (**0015-23** [Casey, Emily])

Response: *These comments provide information or raise questions unrelated to proposed LNP Units 1 and 2 licensing action and are not addressed in the EIS.*

2.33 Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - NRC Oversight

Comment: [T]he NRC has refused to address or consider this very important issue [long-term storage of nuclear waste] in previous cases. (**0008-6** [Musser, Marcie])

Comment: I don't know that the everyday citizen has the opportunity to hold a nuclear commission, such as yourself, to the fire if you destroy our homes, and our lives, and our drinking water. And I would like to see that in writing just like the liability of any other company that could affect my day or my life. (**0014-164** [Waldron, Theresa])

Comment: I want to encourage you all to look at what you do very professionally and make sure they do it properly, which I'm sure they will. But I also want to encourage you, because this is a very, very important decision and we're excited about what is going to happen. (**0014-33** [Welker, Randy])

Comment: So, I ask, why is the NRC willing to allow this risk? I'd be willing to bet not one investor lives downstream from any of their facilities. (**0019-9** [Heywood, Harriet])

Response: *The NRC takes seriously its responsibility under the Atomic Energy Act to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment in regulating the U.S. nuclear power industry. More information about NRC's roles and responsibilities is available on the NRC's website at http://www.nrc.gov/what-we-do.html. The comments did not provide new information related to the environmental effects of the proposed action and will not be evaluated in the EIS.*

2.34 Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Safety

Comment: I always consider myself a bottom line kind of person. So I'm just wondering what is Progress Energy and the NRC, what is your liability in case of a nuclear mishap. Because sadly we know they happen. Chernobyl, Three Mile Island. What is your responsibility? (**0014-159** [Tyler, Janice])

Comment: I don't believe there is any national hazmat standards created to be enforced for any nuclear accident. (**0014-163** [Waldron, Theresa])

Comment: [W]e [the Socialist Party] stand against the expansion of this type of power in the country because of the terrible threats to the community, the safety hazards imposed upon the community. (**0015-101** [Moore, Brian])

Comment: I mean, there are so many disasters and did you know that the odds makers, what they give for a nuclear catastrophe at a plant? It is one in two, fifty percent. And can any nuclear power plant get insurance? No. (**0015-39** [Klutho, Mark])

Comment: President-elect Obama has expressed reservations about whether our country's massive new investments in renewable energy should include nuclear power until issues of safety ... have been resolved. (**0028-4** [Horgan, Wendy])

Comment: In addition to the assessment of chemical loadings, I am requesting an analysis of the effect of the nearby mining, including the seismic impacts of the blasting, on the nuclear power generation. (**0030-7** [Roff, Rhonda])

Comment: Look at rising sea water temperature - and all water temperature - with respect to the cooling of the reactor. It was a Swedish reactor that, about 6 years ago had to go to low power because the Scandinavian ocean waters were too warm to meet tech specs...or was it the condenser? (**0038-17** [Olson, Mary])

Comment: Word has it that there is a mining operation that uses dynamite right across the street from the site Progress is proposing to use for fission. This will result in questions that pertain more directly to the FSAR, but in the accident assessment of the EIS, it would be appropriate to include not only the potential for a seismic event that triggers an accident, but also in the light of the recent Palo Verde pipe bomb, to consider the security implications of such proximity. (**0038-22** [Olson, Mary])

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 EIS. 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.*

Comment: NRC must evaluate the Levy site for permanent - or at least a century + 20 years (time frame for current dry cask licensing regime) storage of irradiated fuel - please include:

- climate crisis informed projections of temperature (and impact on air-cooled waste storage
- climate crisis informed projections of rainfall / water availability
- climate crisis informed projections of sea level (**0038-4** [Olson, Mary])

Response: *This comment generally express concern about the impacts of global warming on the proposed nuclear power plants. The EIS is concerned with the potential effects of plant construction and operation on the environment. Therefore, this comment is not within the scope of the environmental review. The staff's safety evaluation report will address the effects of weather on the plant. Nuclear power plants are extremely robust structures that are designed to survive severe weather. This comment is outside of the scope of the environmental analysis and will not be addressed in the EIS.*

Comment: It is site located in a very low coastal plain faced by a shallow bay to the Gulf of Mexico and within the latest FEMA slosh studies this flood plain is highly likely to be under between 15 and 25 feet of salt water storm surge each cat 3 or larger storm ...and the loss of this expanded level of state grid capacity would be catastropihic to the state power supply needs. (**0024-1** [Wheeler, Leonard])

Comment: The proposed Levy County site is located over an unconfined area of the Floridan Aquifer, in a very low coastal plain faced by a shallow bay to the Gulf of Mexico and within the latest FEMA slosh studies this flood plain is highly likely to be under between 15 and 25 feet of salt water storm surge each cat 3 or larger storm. (**0026-1** [Towles Ezell, Joy])

Comment: The National Weather Service and NOAA along with the National Academy of Science all concur in the public record and in peer reviewed studies that we are in a period of global warming which causes super hurricane developments more and stronger storms for possibly for two more decades. The proposed location of this mass MW central plant in a very high risk coastal zone with modeled slosh destruction and with extensive heavy grid network reliance is of questionable engineering reasonableness and economic value under the storm damage/surge federal risk base scenarios of NWS NOAA and Lloyds. (**0024-2** [Wheeler, Leonard])

Comment: The National Weather Service and NOAA along with the National Academy of Science all concur in the public record and in qualified peer reviewed studies that we are in a period of global warming which is already causing more and more hazardous hurricane developments, and more and stronger storms for possibly for two more decades. The proposed location of this mass MW central plant in a very high risk coastal zone with modeled coastal destruction and with extensive heavy grid network reliance is of questionable engineering reasonableness and economic value under the storm damage/surge federal risk base scenarios of NWS, NOAA, and Lloyds. (**0026-4** [Towles Ezell, Joy])

Comment: Another water-related issue here is the very real risk of flooding due to global warming. We've all seen the maps. Do we really want to build new nuclear plants on a site that could be underwater by the time the plants come online? (**0032-5** [Wilansky, Laura Sue])

Response: *These comments generally express concern about the impacts of severe weather and climate change on the operation of the proposed nuclear power plant. The EIS is concerned with the potential effects of plant construction and operation on the environment. Therefore, these comments are not within the scope of the environmental review. The staff's Safety Evaluation Report will address the effects of weather on the plant. Nuclear power plants are extremely robust structures that are designed to survive severe weather such as hurricanes and tornadoes. If an extreme weather event causes the nuclear power plant to be shut down (i.e., the reactor is shut down as a hurricane is approaching, rather than the reactor being shutdown by the hurricane), the reactor can be maintained in a safe condition. The likelihood of the maximum wind speed in a hurricane or tornado exceeding the design wind speed for the reactor and its safety related systems is typically less than 1 in 10 million in any given year.*

2.35 Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Security and Terrorism

Comment: Nuclear plants are vulnerable to terrorist attacks and sabotage; building a new nuclear plant threatens our security. If an accident or successful terrorist attack occurred, the full impacts to human health and the environment in this region would be immense. (**0008-7** [Musser, Marcie])

Comment: Terrorism and sabotage would be much less likely with renewable energy. (**0009-6** [Davis, Suellyn])

Comment: Well, if there is any place that has three together, I think that's too many. And I think that makes a terrorist target. (**0014-157** [Tyler, Janice])

Comment: The security of this plant. It is a bulls eye. Any of these plants are a bulls eye. I think Robert Kennedy spoke of 9-1-1 --Robert Kennedy, Junior -- that if that plane had chosen to crash into a nuclear power plant up in that region far more damage would've occurred by that plane crashing into a nuclear power plant than was seen in Manhattan. So we have to look at the security issues that are certainly superior in a decentralized power generation system. We are going to be spending over a trillion dollars to rebuild our national grid. That national grid must incorporate, facilitate, decentralized power generation. (**0014-65** [Russell, John])

Comment: [T]he nuclear plant presents a tempting target for terrorist. Distributed solar energy would deprive them of that target. (**0014-74** [Eppes, Thomas])

Comment: I am not an advocate of three nuke plants in close proximity here. I think that's a very, very dangerous thing to do. I've worked all over the world. I'm more familiar with things that can happen. And three of those plants with stacks sticking up there are ideal targets for our enemies, and we have a few, and we've created a lot of them. (**0014-90** [Roberts, Preston])

Comment: FBI Director Robert Mueller, testifying before the Senate Committee on Intelligence in 2005, said: Another area we consider vulnerable and target rich is the energy sector, particularly nuclear power plants. Al-Qaida planner Khalid Sheikh Mohammed had nuclear power plants as part of his target set, and we have no reason to believe that al-Qaida has reconsidered. A typical 1,000 megawatt reactor contains more than fifteen billion curies compared to about 2,000 from Hiroshima. (**0015-35** [Klutho, Mark])

Comment: Meanwhile, partially burned uranium is stored at these old power plants in pools of water called Spent fuel pools and lye near large cities, on waterways, in rural (Levy County) areas and small towns, posing potentially catastrophic risks, among them, terrorist attacks. (**0019-6** [Heywood, Harriet])

Comment: Don't forget, in a facility that stores an average quantity of spent fuel, around 450 metric tons, a terrorist attack would kill 25,000 people over a distance of 500 miles if evacuation were perfect. (**0019-7** [Heywood, Harriet])

Comment: [Nuclear Energy] offers a potential terrorist target, nuclear proliferation. (**0039-6** [Arnason, Deb])

Comment: But before I do [mention a few concerns], let me address the point that I hear over and over from various persons who are very much concerned that the plants, two, or three, or one, make a fantastic target for Homeland Security, meaning terrorist attacks. (**0014-124** [Cannon, Renate])

Response: *Comments related to security and terrorism are safety issues that are not within the scope of the NRC staff's environmental review and are regulated by 10 CFR Part 73, "Physical Protection of Nuclear Power and Materials." Anti-terrorist security measures are established for each plant. The NRC is devoting substantial time and attention to terrorism-related matters, including coordination with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. 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 use of radioactive material. Since 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. Finally, 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, can be found on the NRC's public website (http://www.nrc.gov).*

Summary

On July 28, 2008, PEF submitted to the NRC an application for a COL for Levy Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 to be located at the Levy Nuclear Plant site in southern Levy County, Florida.

On October 24, 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 63517). 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 December 23, 2008. Public scoping meetings were held at the Florida National Guard Armory in Crystal River, Florida, on December 4, 2008. Comments were consolidated and categorized according to topic within the EIS or according to the general topic if outside the scope of the EIS. The comments, along with the responses prepared by NRC staff, are presented in this Scoping Summary Report.

The draft EIS for PEF'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. The NRC staff will consider these comments during the development of the final EIS.