

## **Appendix A**

### **Comments Received on the Environmental Review**

## Appendix A

### Comments Received on the Environmental Review

#### Part I - Comments Received During Scoping

On October 25, 2002, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) published a Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* (67 Federal Register 65612), to notify the public of the staff's intent to prepare a plant-specific supplement to the *Generic Environmental Impact Statement for License Renewal of Nuclear Plants* (GEIS), NUREG-1437, Volumes 1 and 2, to support the renewal application for the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station (V.C. Summer) operating license and to conduct scoping. The plant-specific supplement to the GEIS has been prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (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 January 6, 2003.

The scoping process included two public scoping meetings, which were held at the White Hall A.M.E. Church in Jenkinsville, South Carolina, on December 11, 2002. Approximately 20 members of the public attended the meetings. Both sessions began with NRC staff members providing a brief overview of the license renewal process and the NEPA process. After the NRC's prepared statements, the meetings were open for public comments. Attendees provided either oral or written statements that were recorded and transcribed by a certified court reporter. The meeting transcripts are an attachment to the Scoping Meeting Summary dated January 14, 2003.

At the conclusion of the scoping period, the NRC staff and its contractor reviewed the transcripts and all written material to identify individual comments. All comments and suggestions received orally during the scoping meetings or in writing were considered. Each set of comments from a given commenter was given a unique identifier (Commenter ID number), so that each set of comments from a commenter could be traced back to the transcript or letter by which the comments were submitted. Several commenters submitted comments through multiple sources (e.g., afternoon and evening scoping meetings).

Table A.1 identifies the individuals who provided comments and the Commenter ID number associated with each person's set(s) of comments. The individuals are listed in the order in which they spoke at the public meeting.

## Appendix A

**Table A-1. Individuals Providing Comments During Scoping Comment Period**

Commenters			Comment Source and
ID	Commenter	Affiliation (If Stated)	ADAMS Accession Number
SU-A	Pearson		Afternoon Public Meeting <sup>(a)</sup>
SU-B	Marcharia	Fairfield County Council	Afternoon Public Meeting
SU-C	Bursey		Afternoon Public Meeting
SU-D	Coleman	Representative	Afternoon Public Meeting
SU-E	Robinson	Fairfield County Council	Afternoon Public Meeting
SU-F	Wilder	Fairfield County Schools	Afternoon Public Meeting
SU-G	Murphy	Fairfield County Council	Afternoon Public Meeting
SU-H	Harmon	Pomaria-Garmany Elementary School	Afternoon Public Meeting
SU-I	Byrne	V.C. Summer Nuclear Station	Afternoon Public Meeting
SU-J	Summer	SCANA Services	Afternoon Public Meeting
SU-K	White	South Carolina Public Service Commission	Afternoon Public Meeting
SU-L	Bowlers	Irma/Chapin Recreation Commission	Afternoon Public Meeting
SU-M	Vickers	Fairfield County Chamber of Commerce	Afternoon Public Meeting
SU-N	Cannon	Pastor	Evening Public Meeting <sup>(b)</sup>
SU-O	Pearson		Evening Public Meeting
SU-P	Sprott	Fairfield County School System	Evening Public Meeting
SU-Q	Byrne	V.C. Summer Nuclear Station	Evening Public Meeting
SU-R	Summer	South Carolina	Evening Public Meeting
SU-S	White	South Carolina Public Service Commission	Evening Public Meeting
SU-T	Rabb		Evening Public Meeting
SU-U	Caldwell		Evening Public Meeting
SU-V	Spratt	United States House of Representatives	Letter, December 11, 2002 (ML023540416)

(a) The afternoon transcript can be found under accession number ML030030808.

(b) The evening transcript can be found under accession number ML030030848.

Comments were 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 question and introduced no new information
- A comment that was either related to support for or opposition to license renewal in general (or specifically, V.C. Summer) or that made a general statement about the licensing renewal process. It may have made only a general statement regarding Category 1 and/or Category 2 issues. In addition, it provided no new information and did not pertain to 10 CFR Part 54.

- A comment about a Category 1 issue that
  - provided new information that required evaluation during the review
  - provided no new information.
- A comment about a Category 2 issue that
  - provided information that required evaluation during the review
  - provided no such information.
- A comment regarding alternatives to the proposed action
- A comment that raised an environmental issue that was not addressed in the GEIS
- A comment outside the scope of license renewal, which includes comments regarding the need for power
- A comment outside the scope of the environmental review on safety issues pertaining to 10 CFR Part 54.

Each comment applicable to this environmental review is summarized in this section. This information, which was extracted from the V.C. Summer Scoping Summary Report, is provided for the convenience of those interested in the scoping comments applicable to this environmental review. As part of its ongoing review, the staff has clarified some of the responses included in the Scoping Report. The comments that are general or outside the scope of the environmental review for V.C. Summer are not included here. More detail regarding the disposition of general or inapplicable comments can be found in the summary report. The ADAMS accession number for the summary report is ML030520583. This accession number is provided to facilitate access to the document through the Public Electronic Reading Room (ADAMS) <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm.html>.

The following pages summarize the comments and suggestions received as part of the scoping process that are applicable to this environmental review and discuss the disposition of the comments and suggestions. The parenthetical alpha-numeric identifier after each comment refers to the comment set (Commenter ID) and the comment number.

Comments in this section are grouped in the following categories:

#### 1. Comments Concerning Socioeconomic Issues

## Appendix A

2. Comments Concerning Air Quality Issues
3. Comments Concerning Human Health Issues
4. Comments Concerning Terrestrial Resource Issues
5. Comments Concerning Threatened and Endangered Species Issues
6. Comments Concerning Water Resources Issues
7. Comments Concerning Uranium Fuel Cycle and Waste Management Issues

### Part I. Comments Received During Scoping

#### 1. Comments Concerning Socioeconomic Issues

**Comment:** We also provide jobs for about 625 SCE&G employees and in excess of 100 long-term contract employees. (SU-I-5)

**Comment:** We also are the largest employer in the county now. (SU-Q-7)

**Comment:** Summer Station's operations provide jobs for nearly a thousand people. (SU-V-3)

**Response:** *The comments are noted. Information regarding impacts resulting from employment of plant workers during the 20-year renewal term is discussed in Chapter 4 of this SEIS.*

**Comment:** SCE&G is a wonderful partner for our county. Because they came online, we now have some of the finest school facilities in the state. We also are able to offer, because of their tax dollars, services to the people of this county that otherwise we could not afford because our people cannot pay taxes to provide those services. (SU-E-3)

**Comment:** As far as an economic development impact on this county, this to me is a very clean lake that they have provided. We then have people who are able to fish in this lake, and we now have people who are selling property around this lake, which to us is an economic development tool. And these people are coming in and building homes, which add to our tax base. (SU-E-6)

**Comment:** ...that the plant has been a very vital part of the tax base in our county. (SU-F-2)

**Comment:** So if the plant were not to be licensed and, in my personal opinion, the industry was not here to replace the plant that not relicensed, it would be devastating on the county. And for the county to have a \$16 million impact from one plant, that's a big impact into our economic base on the county level. (SU-F-3)

1 **Comment:** The school district is fortunate that the V.C. Nuclear Summer Plant is the largest  
2 tax base in the county. We get in excess 11 million dollars per year in taxes from the plant.  
3 (SU-F-4)  
4

5 **Comment:** The benefits of the taxes that's been b[r]ought in, over \$17 million to the county.  
6 Where would we be if it wasn't for V.C. Summer? (SU-G-3)  
7

8 **Comment:** We're also the largest taxpayer in the county. You've heard a lot about that. We  
9 pay about 17-1/2 million dollars in taxes and represent about 67 percent of the tax base.  
10 (SU-I-6)  
11

12 **Comment:** Aside from being the largest employer, we're also the largest taxpayer. Prior to  
13 Mack's closing, we were 67 percent of the tax base. ... V.C. Summer pays about 17-1/2 million  
14 dollars a year in property taxes to the county. (SU-Q-8)  
15

16 **Comment:** There is a big tax check that keeps our schools going. (SU-T-5)  
17

18 **Comment:** There are many things I could touch on that SCE&G has done in this community  
19 but just to give you an overall picture of how they became our neighbors and how good they are  
20 and the things that they have done. My husband had a vision many years ago for a fire  
21 department. ... And so SCE&G said, No problem, we will come up with the building. ... Then  
22 came EMS, which is a vital part of the community, very much needed, through SCE&G.  
23 (SU-T-3)  
24

25 **Comment:** Then they became customers of the Jenkinsville Water Company, very good  
26 customers, for that we appreciate. They keep us going, they keep the post office going,  
27 because we're a small community. We're just thankful for the things that they have done.  
28 (SU-T-4)  
29

30 **Comment:** SCANA owned companies pay more than 17.5 million in taxes to Fairfield County,  
31 money that helps support vital public services and provides for a better quality of life. (SU-V-4)  
32

33 **Response:** *The comments are noted. Public services, offsite land use, taxes, and education*  
34 *are discussed in Chapters 2 and 4 of this SEIS.*  
35

## 36 **2. Comments Concerning Air Quality Issues**

37

38 **Comment:** ...want to make certain that SCE&G continue to follow guidelines to ensure that we  
39 are subjected to clean air and a safe environment. (SU-F-1)  
40

## Appendix A

**Comment:** Reliable operation of the Summer Station, a non-greenhouse gas emitter, precludes the requirement to use greenhouse gas from any generation and is economical for our customers. (SU-K-4)

**Comment:** Reliable operation of Summer Station, a non-greenhouse gas emitter, precludes the requirement to use greenhouse gas from any generation and is economical for our customers. (SU-S-5)

**Response:** *The comments are noted. Air emissions are regulated through the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the State of South Carolina. Issues associated with air quality are discussed in Chapters 2 and 4 of this SEIS. The impacts resulting from the use of fossil fuel to generate electricity are discussed in Chapter 8 of this SEIS. The comments provide no new information and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.*

### **3. Comments Concerning Human Health Issues**

**Comment:** I've had constituencies ask me over the last 15 years -- there appears to be a substantial increase in different types of cancer, particularly with our senior citizens. What can you say to assure the community that this plant has no direct impact in regards to these questions? (SU-B-3)

**Comment:** ...does your agency also check environmentally any of the medical records to see whether or not these perceptions of increase of different types of cancers, ... do you also check whether or not there is an increase of health risk to citizens in the area? (SU-B-4)

**Comment:** I did get asked the question about the perception of cancer. Fairfield County leads the state in terms of diabetes, ... and the perception that the environment might complicate these conditions. So I'm just raising this because we do need an independent study. That's why I asked for a medical explanation. Have DHEC or other folks, the agency for this area, and just for the public safety to make sure that these conditions and perceptions, that they are not found, they're not authentic, and I think that will go a long ways to some uncertainties. (SU-B-6)

**Comment:** As far as health issues, we have a lot of health issues in Fairfield County, and a lot of contributory things that have been done. We're unique in different things. We have a fault line that runs right through here. We also have a great deposit of granite in the county that lets off radon gas and all these other things that's not attributed to the Summer plant. (SU-G-2)

**Response:** *The comments are noted. The NRC's regulatory limits for radiological protection are set to protect workers and the public from the harmful effects of radiation. The limits are based on the recommendations of standards-setting organizations. Radiation standards reflect*

1 extensive study by national and international organizations (International Commission on  
2 Radiological Protection [ICRP], National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements,  
3 and National Academy of Sciences) and are conservative to ensure that the public and workers  
4 at nuclear power plants are protected. The NRC radiation exposure standards are presented in  
5 10 CFR Part 20, "Standards for Protection Against Radiation," and are based on the  
6 recommendations in ICRP 26 and 30. Emissions and effluents that are below the limits set by  
7 the NRC are not considered to pose any significant risk to public health or safety. V.C. Summer  
8 monitors its radiological emissions and effluents to ensure that any radioactive releases are  
9 within allowable limits. SCE&G reports the results of its monitoring program on an annual basis  
10 in two documents that are available to the public and are provided to the NRC. These reports  
11 are (1) Annual Effluent and Waste Disposal Report, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, and  
12 (2) Radiological Environmental Monitoring Report, Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station.

13  
14 The NRC does review the annual amounts of radiological emissions and effluents released into  
15 the environment by V.C. Summer and has found them to be well within the acceptable limits. In  
16 the past, the State of South Carolina independently monitored the environment around  
17 V.C. Summer for radioactive contamination and their results were consistent with those  
18 reported by SCE&G. To ensure that the exposure limits to the public are met, NRC sets limits  
19 on radiological effluents, requires monitoring of effluents and foodstuffs. SCE&G monitors its  
20 effluents and calculates potential offsite doses caused by radioactive liquid and gaseous  
21 effluents. These calculations are performed to demonstrate the licensee's compliance with its  
22 technical specifications and the NRC regulations. Based on the information provided by  
23 SCE&G, radiological emissions and effluents from the station have been well below the limits  
24 set by the NRC and, therefore, pose no significant risk to public health or safety.

25  
26 Numerous scientifically designed, peer-reviewed studies of personnel exposed to occupational  
27 levels of radiation (versus life-threatening accident doses or medical therapeutic levels) have  
28 shown minimal effect on human health, and any effect was from exposures well above the  
29 exposure levels of the typical member of the public from normal operation of a nuclear power  
30 plant.

31  
32 The NRC does not routinely evaluate medical records. The NRC is not aware of any increase  
33 in health risk to citizens in the area around V.C. Summer that could be linked to station  
34 operations or emissions and effluents.

35  
36 Radiation exposures to the public and workers were evaluated in the GEIS and determined to  
37 be Category 1 issues. Information regarding the expected radiological impacts on human  
38 health is discussed in Chapters 2 and 4 of this SEIS. The comments provide no new  
39 information and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.



1     **4. Comments Concerning Terrestrial Resource Issues**

2  
3     **Comment:** We're a haven for wildlife. (SU-I-9)

4  
5     **Comment:** On our site, you will hear a little bit more about this [haven for wildlife], but you will  
6     find deer, turkeys, obviously fish, eagles and more buzzards than I can count, and an  
7     occasional arrowhead. (SU-Q-10)

8  
9     **Response:** *The comments are noted. Information regarding aquatic and terrestrial biological*  
10    *resources and cultural resources is discussed in Chapters 2 and 4 of this SEIS. The comments*  
11    *provide no new information and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.*

12  
13    **5. Comments Concerning Threatened and Endangered Species Issues**

14  
15    **Comment:** The creation of Summer Station and its companion generating plant, Fairfield  
16    Pumped Storage Facility, have provided an environment which has been conducive to the  
17    expansion of the bald eagle population. (SU-J-2) (SU-R-2)

18  
19    **Comment:** This survey found no evidence of threatened or endangered species on the plant  
20    site or the transmission corridors. (SU-J-5)

21  
22    **Comment:** This survey found no evidence of threatened or endangered species on the plant  
23    site or the transmission corridors, with the exception of the eagles that are not nesting on the  
24    site now, but they do come onto the site. (SU-R-7)

25  
26    **Response:** *The comments are noted. Information regarding threatened and endangered*  
27    *species at the V.C. Summer site is discussed in Chapters 2 and 4 of this SEIS.*

28  
29    **6. Comments Concerning Water Resources Issues**

30  
31    **Comment:** ...it's just very important for me to know that we're protecting those lakes, because  
32    at some point, that may be the only source of drinking water we're going to have. So water is  
33    just a very important element to each of our lives. (SU-E-1)

34  
35    **Response:** *The comment is noted. Information regarding water resources is discussed in*  
36    *Chapters 2 and 4 of this SEIS. The comment provides no new information and, therefore, will*  
37    *not be evaluated further.*

## 7. Comments Concerning Uranium Fuel Cycle and Waste Management Issues

**Comment:** As stewards of the environment, management of Summer Station has reduced the tri-annual cycle volume of low-level radioactive waste by 90 percent over the last six cycles for 18 years, recycling items previously disposed of and training the workforce to exercise prudent utilization and materials have accomplished the significant reduction. (SU-K-2) (SU-S-3)

**Response:** *The comment is noted. Information regarding low-level waste management is discussed in Chapters 2 and 6 of this SEIS. The comment provides no new information and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.*

### Part II. Comments Received on the Draft SEIS

(Reserved for comments received on the draft SEIS.)