

August 21, 2000

Craig G. Anderson, Vice President
Entergy Operations, Inc.
Arkansas Nuclear One
1448 SR 333 GSB-3C
Russellville, Arkansas 72802

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING SUMMARY REPORT
ASSOCIATED WITH THE STAFF'S REVIEW OF THE APPLICATION BY
ENTERGY OPERATIONS, INC. FOR RENEWAL OF THE OPERATING
LICENSE FOR ARKANSAS NUCLEAR ONE, UNIT 1

Dear Mr. Anderson:

From March 10 to May 9, 2000, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) conducted a scoping process to determine the scope of the NRC staff's environmental review of the application for renewal of the license for Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1 (ANO-1), submitted by Entergy Operations, Inc. on January 31, 2000. As part of the scoping process, the NRC staff held two public environmental scoping meetings in Russellville, Arkansas on April 4, 2000 to solicit public input regarding the scope of the review. The scoping process is the first step in the development of a plant-specific supplement to NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants (GEIS)," for ANO-1.

The NRC staff has prepared the enclosed environmental scoping summary report identifying comments received at the April 4, 2000 license renewal environmental scoping meetings, and in writing during the comment period. In accordance with 10 CFR 51.29(b), you are being provided a copy of the scoping summary report. The transcripts of the meetings can be found at the NRC Internet website at <http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/REACTOR/LR/ANO-1/docs.html>, and as an attachment to the May 1, 2000 meeting summary. The comment letters and e-mail are available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly Available Records (PARS) component of NRC's document system (ADAMS). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/ADAMS/index.html> (the Public Electronic Reading Room) (Note that the URLs are case-sensitive).

C. Anderson

-2-

The next step in the environmental review process is the issuance of a draft supplement to the GEIS scheduled for December 2000. Notice of the availability of the draft supplement to the GEIS and the procedures for providing comments will be published in an upcoming *Federal Register* notice. If you have any questions concerning this matter, you can call me at (301) 415-1120.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Thomas J. Kenyon, Senior Project Manager
Generic Issues, Environmental, Financial, and
Rulemaking Branch
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-313

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: see next page

The next step in the environmental review process is the issuance of a draft supplement to the GEIS scheduled for December 2000. Notice of the availability of the draft supplement to the GEIS and the procedures for providing comments will be published in an upcoming *Federal Register* notice. If you have any questions concerning this matter, you can call me at (301) 415-1120.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Thomas J. Kenyon, Senior Project Manager
Generic Issues, Environmental, Financial, and
Rulemaking Branch
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-313

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/encl: see next page

DISTRIBUTION (wo/encl)

PUBLIC

RGEB r/f

DMatthews/CAder

CCarpenter

BZalcman

TKenyon

BPrato

MNolan

CGrimes

RBarrett

OGC

EHickey (PNNL)

Document Name:g:\rgeb\ano\scoping rppt transmittl ltr.

OFFICE	RGEB	SC:RGEB	C:SPSB
NAME	TKenyon:sw	BZalcman	RBarrett
DATE	8/8/00	8/9/00	8/10/00
OFFICE	C:RGEB	C:RLSB	OGC
NAME	CCarpenter	CGrimes	BPoole
DATE	8/13/00	8/14/00	8/21/00

RGEB ROUTING SLIP

ORIGINATOR: Tom Kenyon

SUBJECT: ISSUANCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING SUMMARY REPORT
ASSOCIATED WITH THE STAFF’S REVIEW OF THE APPLICATION
BY ENTERGY OPERATIONS, INC. FOR RENEWAL OF THE
OPERATING LICENSE FOR ARKANSAS NUCLEAR ONE, UNIT 1

SECRETARY: Sue Wiens (x1282) (MS 11F1)

NAME	DATE
T. Kenyon	_____
B. Zalcman	_____
R. Barrett	_____
C. Carpenter	_____
C. Grimes	_____
OGC	_____

**Environmental Impact Statement
Scoping Process**

Summary Report

**Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1
Russellville, Arkansas**

August 2000



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

INTRODUCTION

On January 31, 2000, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) received an application for renewal of the operating license of Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1 (ANO-1). ANO-1 is located in southwestern Pope County, Arkansas. As part of the application, Entergy Operations, Inc. (Entergy), the applicant, submitted an environmental report (ER) prepared in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Part 51. 10 CFR Part 51 contains the NRC requirements for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and the implementing regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). Section 51.53 outlines requirements for preparation and submittal of environmental reports to the NRC.

Section 51.53(c)(3)(ii) was based upon the findings documented in NUREG-1437, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Power Plants," (GEIS). The GEIS, in which the staff identified and evaluated the environmental impacts associated with license renewal, was issued for public comment. The staff received input from Federal and State agencies, public organizations, and private citizens. As a result of the assessments in the GEIS, a number of impacts were determined to be generic to all nuclear power plants. These were designated as Category 1 impacts. An applicant for license renewal may adopt the conclusions contained in the GEIS for Category 1 impacts, absent new and significant information that may cause the conclusions to fall outside those of the GEIS. Category 2 impacts are those impacts that have been determined to be plant-specific and are required to be addressed in the applicant's ER. The Commission determined that the NRC does not have a role in energy planning decision-making for existing plants, which should be left to State regulators and utility officials.

Therefore, an applicant for license renewal need not provide an analysis of the need for power, or the economic costs and economic benefits of the proposed action. Additionally, the Commission determined that the ER need not discuss any aspect of storage of spent fuel for the facility. This determination was based on the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and the Commission's Waste Confidence Rule, 10 CFR 51.23.

On March 10, 2000, the NRC published a Notice of Intent in the Federal Register (65 FR 13061), to notify the public of the staff's intent to prepare a plant-specific supplement to the GEIS to support the renewal application for the ANO-1 operating license. The plant-specific supplement to the GEIS will be prepared in accordance with NEPA, CEQ guidelines, and 10 CFR Part 51. As outlined by NEPA, the NRC initiated the scoping process with the issuance of the Federal Register Notice. The NRC invited the applicant; Federal, State, Tribal, and local government agencies; local organizations; and individuals to participate in the scoping process by providing oral comments at the scheduled public meetings and/or submitting written suggestions and comments no later than May 9, 2000. The scoping process included two public scoping meetings which were held at the Holiday Inn in Russellville, Arkansas on April 4, 2000. The NRC announced the meetings in the local newspapers, issued press releases, and distributed flyers locally. Approximately 37 people attended the meetings. Both sessions began with NRC staff members providing a brief overview of the license renewal process and the NEPA process. Following the NRC's prepared statements, the meetings were open for public comments. Three

attendees provided oral comments at both the afternoon and evening sessions that were recorded and transcribed by a certified court reporter. The meeting transcripts are available on the NRC Internet website at <http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/REACTOR/LR/ANO-1/docs.html>, and as an attachment to the May 1, 2000, meeting summary. In addition to the comments provided during the public meetings, four comment letters and one e-mail were received by the NRC in response to the Notice of Intent. The meeting summary, comment letters, and e-mail are available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly Available Records (PARS) component of NRC's document system (ADAMS). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/ADAMS/index.html> (the Public Electronic Reading Room).

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

- Define the proposed action
- Determine the scope of the supplement to the GEIS and identify significant issues to be analyzed in depth
- Identify and eliminate peripheral issues
- Identify any other environmental assessments and environmental impact statements being prepared that are related to the supplement to the GEIS
- Identify other environmental review and consultation requirements
- Indicate the schedule for preparation of the supplement to the GEIS
- Identify any cooperating agencies
- Describe how the supplement to the GEIS will be prepared.

At the conclusion of the scoping period, the NRC staff and its contractor reviewed the transcripts and all written material received, and identified individual comments. All comments and suggestions received orally during the scoping meetings or in writing were considered. Each commenter was given a unique identifier (commenter number) such that it could be traced back to the transcripts or written comments. Table 1 identifies the individual providing the comment. The individuals are listed in the order in which they spoke at the meetings or provided written comments. The accession number is provided for the written comments to facilitate access to the document through the Public Electronic Reading Room (ADAMS). Comments were then consolidated and categorized according to the topic within the proposed supplement to the GEIS, or according to the general topic if outside the scope of the GEIS. Comments with similar

specific objectives were combined to capture the common essential issues that had been raised in the source comments. Once comments were grouped according to subject area, the staff and contractor determined the appropriate action for the comment. The staff made a determination on each comment that it was one of the following:

- a comment that was actually a request for information and introduces no new information.
- a comment that was either related to support or opposition of license renewal in general (or specifically, ANO-1) or that makes a general statement about the licensing renewal process. It may make only a general statement regarding Category 1 and/or Category 2 issues. In addition, it provides no new information and does not pertain to 10 CFR Part 54.
- a comment about a Category 1 issue that
 - provided new information that required evaluation during the review, or
 - provided no new information
- a comment about a Category 2 issue that
 - provided information that required evaluation during the review, or
 - provided no such information
- a comment that raised an environmental issue that was not addressed in the GEIS
- a comment on safety issues pertaining to 10 CFR Part 54, or
- a comment outside the scope of license renewal (not related to 10 CFR Parts 51 or 54).

Each comment is summarized below. For reference, after the comment, the unique identifier (commenter number listed in Table 1) of the commenter is provided in parentheses. In those cases where no new information was provided by the commenter, no further evaluation will be performed.

The preparation of the plant-specific supplement to the GEIS (which is the SEIS) will take into account all the relevant issues raised during the scoping process. The SEIS will address both Category 1 and 2 issues, along with any new information identified as a result of scoping. The SEIS will rely on conclusions supported by information in the GEIS for Category 1 issues, and will include the analysis of Category 2 issues and any new and significant information. The draft supplement to the GEIS will be available for public comment. The comment period will offer the next opportunity for interested Federal, State, Tribal, and local government agencies; local organizations; and members of the public to provide input to the NRC's environmental review

process. The comments received on the draft SEIS will be considered in the preparation of the final SEIS. The final SEIS, along with the staff's Safety Evaluation Report (SER), will provide the basis for the NRC's decision on the ANO-1 license renewal.

TABLE 1
Individuals Providing Comments During Scoping Comment Period

Commenter Number	Commenter's Name	Commenter's Affiliation (If Stated)
Afternoon and Evening Session of Public Scoping Meeting		
1	Craig Anderson - spoke at both afternoon and evening sessions	Vice President for ANO-1
2	Garry Young - spoke at both afternoon and evening sessions	Senior Lead Engineer, ANO-1
3	Angie Howard - spoke at both afternoon and evening sessions	Senior Vice President Nuclear Energy Institute
Letters and E-Mails Received During Comment Period		
4	Jim Wood (April 5, 2000, ACN*: ML003711383)	no affiliation
5	Jim Wood (April 7, 2000, ACN: ML003712876)	Director, Yell County Wildlife Federation
6	Jim Wood (e-mail)(April 30, 2000, ACN: ML003711388)	no affiliation
7	Robert Cast (May 15, 2000, ACN: ML003725767)	Historic Preservation Officer, Caddo Tribe of Oklahoma

*ACN - accession number

Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1

Public Scoping Meeting and Written Input

Comments and Responses

The following pages summarize the comments received as part of the scoping process, and discuss their disposition. The unique identifier (commenter number listed in Table 1) for the individual who provided the oral or written comment is in parentheses after the comment. General comments are listed first; then comments related to specified issues are listed.

General Statements in Support of License Renewal

Comment: License renewal for plants is important for energy security for our nation and for the environmental needs, and we're seeing growing policy maker awareness within the Congress and internationally about the need to continue the clean air and other environmental benefits that nuclear energy provides, as well as a reliable source of electricity. (3)

Comment: There are three key benefits to license renewal:

- (1) It will permit the United States to maintain economic electric generation that does not produce the greenhouse gases or other atmospheric pollutants such as sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide, and particulates. That's very important.
- (2) License renewal will preserve good jobs for Americans, and communities where these plants are located will retain substantial tax revenue, and that's important from a community standpoint on quality of life.
- (3) The renewal of a plant's license is far more economical than building any new kind of generating facility. With the restructuring of the electricity industry throughout this country, it's an important economical consideration that a nuclear plant can provide an additional 20 years of electricity. (3)

Comment: Nuclear energy represents the only large-scale form of non-emitting generation that can be expanded, so it's important that we not only maintain our existing plants but also, through license renewal, provide that longer term of clear air through non-emitting generation. (3)

Comment: In a survey sponsored by the Nuclear Energy Institute, 87% of the American public favor the continued operation of the renewed license of nuclear facilities that meet all safety standards. (3)

Response: *The comments are noted. The comments are supportive of license renewal in general, and make only general statements. They provide no new information and do not pertain to 10 CFR Part 54. Therefore, they will not be evaluated further.*

General Statements in Opposition to License Renewal

NONE

General Statements in Support of License Renewal for ANO-1

Comment: ANO-1 has established a national reputation as a well-run facility. Entergy is committed to protecting the health and safety of the public. (1)

Comment: Entergy, like most electric utilities, considers every reasonable alternative before a major decision such as license renewal is made. But the bottom line is license renewal for ANO-1 makes the most sense for the environment, for our customers, and for Entergy. (1)

Response: *The comments are noted. The comments are supportive of license renewal for ANO-1. They provide no new information and do not pertain to 10 CFR Part 54. Therefore, they will not be evaluated further.*

General Statements in Opposition to License Renewal for ANO-1

NONE

Comments Concerning Ecology

Comment: Entergy performed a study that included a review of water quality, water flow at the intake and discharge structures, water use, and the fish habitats on Lake Dardanelle. Evaluation of historic data indicates no changes to water resources. There are no planned changes in Entergy's operations that result from license renewal. Therefore, Entergy will continue to maintain the same water quality. (1)

Comment: Entergy has consulted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission, and Arkansas Game and Fish Commission regarding threatened and endangered species inhabiting ANO-1 property and its transmission lines. Based on these consultations, no records of threatened or endangered species nor species of concern were identified along the transmission line corridor.

With regard to threatened and endangered species on the Entergy property, six species were identified as having geographic ranges that could possibly include the ANO-1 property. However, of the six species, only the bald eagle has occasionally been known to visit the site area. Suitable habitat for the other five species does not exist on the site property.

Although there were no state listed threatened or endangered species inhabiting the site property, based on consultation with the Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission, there were seven

elements of interest identified in their records. Only the Northern Crayfish Frog and the species living in a sandstone glade outcrop habitat have suitable habitat to exist at ANO-1.

Based on the rarity of the Northern Crayfish Frog (which has not been observed at the site), the Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission has changed the ranking of this species to a status that requires no protection. In addition, the few areas of Sandstone Outcrop Habitat present on the site property were impacted during initial construction activities and have lost their original habitat value.

In summary, Entergy has concluded that no threatened or endangered species inhabit the ANO-1 property and therefore, there is no adverse impact from the continued operation of Unit 1. (1)

Comment: For the past 25 years of operation, ANO-1 has not adversely affected the air quality. There are no planned changes in operation associated with the license renewal that would alter the air quality in any way. (1)

Response: *The comments are noted. The comments summarize the applicant's review of ecological issues, as documented in detail in its license renewal application. The comments address both Category 1 and Category 2 issues. The comments provide no new information and therefore will not be evaluated further.*

Comments Concerning Socioeconomics

Comment: Over the years, ANO-1 has demonstrated high levels of safety and reliability, and serves as an economical source of electricity for Entergy customers. Even if you add the cost of construction, future cost of operation and maintenance, and the license renewal process, Unit 1 is projected to be a sound, cost-effective supply of electricity. (1)

Comment: Unit 1 is a valuable asset that has continued to improve with time. It is operated more efficiently today than it did when it was new. With this trend and continued improvement, it clearly makes economic sense to pursue renewal of the Unit 1 operating license. (1)

Comment: In addition to being a safely operated facility, ANO-1 has benefitted the communities in the form of increased tax revenues. Over the past 25 years, Entergy has contributed almost \$200 million in taxes to Pope County. The ANO-1 facility will also keep jobs in the community, which helps maintain a strong local economy. ANO-1's annual payroll of over \$80 million helps support local business and industry. (1)

Response: *The comments are noted. The comments summarize the applicant's review of socioeconomic issues, as documented in detail in its license renewal application. The comments address both Category 1 and Category 2 issues. The comments provide no new information and therefore will not be evaluated further.*

Comments Concerning Archeological and Historic Resources

Comment: Entergy has consulted with the State Historic Preservation office to identify any new information regarding sites of potential archaeological, historical, or architectural significance on the ANO-1 site. Although no historical or architectural sites were identified, a few archaeological sites of interest were reported to exist around ANO-1.

However, none of these areas is close enough to existing facilities to warrant concern. The commenter stated that a map identifying these sites was provided to Entergy, and controls are in place to ensure that their archaeological value remains protected.

Entergy also considered how the land will be used over the additional operating time. License renewal will not require additional land usage and Entergy's activities will remain within the existing site boundaries. Based on these evaluations, Entergy has determined that the renewal of the Unit 1 license will not impact historic, archaeological, or land resources in the community. (1)

Response: *The comments are noted. The comments summarize the applicant's review of archeological and historic resources, as documented in detail in its license renewal application. The comment pertains to a Category 2 issue. The comments provide no new information.*

Comment: As a result of the staff's observations during the ANO-1 site audit (see summary dated May 1, 2000), one commenter expressed concern with the subsurface disturbance to any of the potentially historic properties at the ANO-1 site. The commenter asked that, as a condition of the license renewal and any future permits, that the area be surveyed for archeological and historic properties and that any areas of disturbance be reported to the Arkansas Historic Preservation Officer and to the Caddo Tribe of Oklahoma. The commenter further asked for additional information concerning disturbance of some potentially historic sites at the plant. (7)

Response: *In a letter dated August 10, 2000, the staff informed the Arkansas State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) of observations it made during the April site audit to ensure that the State official was made aware that sites of potential historical value have or may have been disturbed, and are possibly not being tracked by Entergy. The commenter's letter was also forwarded to the SHPO. These comments involve concerns that are relevant to current ANO-1 operation, and therefore, will be dispositioned under the current reactor oversight process.*

Comments Concerning Operational Safety Issues Associated with Current Operation

Comment: The commenter stated that community safety issues concerning emergency planning

... are produced through ANO-1 licensing and its sphere of influence that extends to the Logan County portion of the plant's 10 mile Emergency Preparedness Zone (EPZ), and thus seem to qualify as Issues of local concern and should be included

in [the EIS.]... Based upon NEPA Section 102's 'to the greatest extent possible' provision and procedural provisions at 40 CFR 1500-1508, the Delaware Township EPZ situation concerning emergency evacuation route maintenance is site-specific to ANO-1 licensing consideration/evaluation and within the scope of issues that qualify for EIS analysis. How nuclear safety programs affect property and people who live in the EPZ and their current exclusion from a meaningful role in decisions that affect their interests, causes the ANO-1 license to be an influence upon the Social and Economic Human Environment and thus is a part of the 'affected environment' to be described and evaluated as provided by 40 CFR 1502.15.

In order for the ANO-1 license to comply with NEPA requirements and meet the test of "minimizing adverse impacts of the action", the commenter proposes the following be considered as conditions of the renewed license.

- (1) As long as private vehicles remain the mode of emergency evacuation transportation within the 10 mile EPZ, establish all weather availability maintenance standards for all EPZ evacuation routes and provide for monitoring compliance. Include these standards as a plant licensing extension requirement. NRC authority to address nuclear safety for the general public within EPZs has authorization through Public Law passed by Congress following the Three Mile Island accident, which is superior to State/County authority.
- (2) The current Nuclear Planning and Response Program Advisory Committee is comprised of elected Mayors and County Judges with no representation from the EPZ affected public at large. NRC should require that not less than half of these Advisory Committee members be appointed from the public at large who reside within the EPZ.
- (3) How off-site public safety is provided and funded is an issue that continues to be highly controversial, thus discussion of the matter in ANO's licensing EIS is appropriate. (4)

Comment: To comply with environmental documentation requirements of NEPA for proposed Federal ANO-1 licensing actions, the commenter requests that NRC identify and include analysis of the site-specific Human Environment encompassed within the 10 mile EPZ and compare its findings with public safety capability licensing requirements, and treat the matter as an Issue for full analysis in its EIS documentation." (6)

Response: *The staff considered the need for a licensing review of emergency planning issues in the context of license renewal during its rulemaking proceedings on 10 CFR Part 54. As discussed in the Statement of Considerations for the rulemaking (56 FR 64966), the Commission stated that the programs for emergency preparedness at nuclear plants apply to all nuclear power plant licensees, and require the specified levels of protection from each licensee regardless of plant design, construction, or license date. The requirements of 10 CFR 50.47 and*

Appendix E to 10 CFR Part 50 are independent of the renewal of the operating license, and will continue to apply during the license renewal term.

To ensure that a licensee's plan remains adequate to protect the health and safety of the public during the term of the initial license, the NRC requires a detailed annual review of the facility's emergency preparedness plan. Included within the review is an evaluation of the continued adequacy of applicable and appropriate communication and working relationships with State and local governments. Under Appendix E to 10 CFR Part 50, licensees must also perform an annual exercise of their emergency preparedness plans and be evaluated by the NRC against definitive performance criteria. Following each of the required exercises, findings are made concerning the success of the plan and, in some cases, weak and deficient areas that require correction are identified and action is taken to correct them. These processes will continue during the renewal term.

In conclusion, through its standards and required exercises, the Commission ensures that existing plans are adequate throughout the life of any plant even in the face of changing demographics and other site-related factors. Thus, these drills, performance criteria, and independent evaluations provide a process to ensure continued adequacy of emergency preparedness in light of changes in site characteristics that may occur during the term of the existing operating license, such as transportation systems and demographics. Therefore, the Commission has determined that there is no need for a licensing review of emergency planning issues in the context of license renewal.

However, because these comments concerning emergency preparedness involve concerns that are relevant to current ANO-1 operation, the staff has referred them to the NRC operating plant project manager for disposition. The commenter has been informed of this decision by letter dated June 6, 2000.

Comment: One commenter was seeking information about NRC's current regulatory nuclear power plant safety guidance that the Agency may have regarding construction of new regional airports within the 10 mile Emergency Planning Zone, and the affects such a large airport may impose upon renewal of nuclear plant licensing. The commenter goes on to further say there is concern about the environment of many of the local habitats if the regional airport is built. (5)

Response: *Because these comments involve concerns that are relevant to current ANO-1 operation, the staff has referred them to the NRC operating plant project manager for disposition. The commenter will be informed of this decision.*

Comments Concerning Age-Related Safety Issues

Comment: As ANO-1 equipment ages, it loses a measure of reliability. Equipment age vs. likely reductions in plant equipment reliability should also be included in your EIS as an ANO-1 site-specific issue for analysis along with required mitigation (40 CFR 1508.20). (4)

Response: *The staff has determined that the reliability of equipment would not change substantially throughout the life of the plant, provided the applicant has aging management programs that conform with 10 CFR Part 54. Regulatory controls ensure that the physical plant condition and associated risk (i.e., the predicted probability of and radioactive releases from an accident) will be maintained at acceptable levels during the renewal period. Therefore, no aging effects are considered in the probability risk assessment for a nuclear plant, and aging-related Severe Accident Mitigation Alternatives are not identified. Aging management programs are reviewed under the safety portion of the license renewal review. The adequacy of these programs will be addressed in the Safety Evaluation Report developed under 10 CFR Part 54.*

Summary

The preparation of the plant-specific supplement to the GEIS will take into account all the relevant issues raised during the scoping process that are described above. Concerns related to the environmental license renewal review of ANO-1 will be considered during the development of the draft SEIS for ANO-1. The draft SEIS will be available for public comment, and interested Federal, State, Tribal, and local government agencies; local organizations; and members of the public will be given the opportunity to provide additional input to be considered during the development of the final SEIS.

Concerns identified that are outside the scope of the staff's environmental review have or will be forwarded to the appropriate NRC program manager for disposition.