

**Environmental Impact Statement
Scoping Process**

Summary Report

**Shearon Harris
Nuclear Power Plant**

July 2007



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

Introduction

On November 16, 2006, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) received an application from Carolina Power & Light Company (CP&L), doing business as Progress Energy Carolinas, Inc., dated November 14, 2006, for renewal of the operating license of Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant (HNP), Unit 1. HNP is located in Wake County, North Carolina. As part of the application, CP&L 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. Section 51.53 outlines requirements for preparation and submittal of ERs to the NRC.

Section 51.53(c)(3) 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 first issued as a draft for public comment. The NRC staff received input from Federal and State agencies, public organizations, and private citizens before developing the final document. As a result of the assessments in the GEIS, a number of impacts were determined to be small and to be generic for 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 evaluated 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 that is within the scope of the generic determination in 10 CFR 51.23(a) and in accordance with 10 CFR 51.23(b). 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 20, 2007, the NRC published a Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* (72 FR 13139), 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 HNP operating license. The plant-specific supplement to the GEIS will be prepared in accordance with 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, 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 comments by May 19, 2007. The scoping process included two public scoping meetings, which were held at the New Horizons Fellowship in Apex, North Carolina, on April 18, 2007. The NRC issued press releases, and announced the meetings in local newspapers. Approximately 180 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. Following the NRC's prepared statements, the meetings were open for public comments. Thirty-four (34) attendees provided either oral comments or written statements that were recorded and transcribed by a certified court reporter. The transcripts of the meetings can be found as an attachment to the meeting summary, which was issued on May 14, 2007. The meeting summary is publicly available and can be found at the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) under accession number ML071200434. ADAMS is accessible at <http://adamswebsearch.nrc.gov/dologin.html> or through the NRC's Electronic Reading Room link at <http://www.nrc.gov>. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS should contact the NRC's Public Document Room staff at 1-800-397-4209, or 301-415-4737, or by e-mail at pdr@nrc.gov.

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 environmental assessments and other 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

All comments received by the NRC during the scoping period have been considered

At the conclusion of the scoping period, the NRC staff reviewed the transcripts and all written material received, and identified individual comments. Fourteen (14) letters and resolutions containing comments were also received during the scoping period. All comments received orally during the scoping meetings or in writing were considered. Each set of comments from a given commenter was given a unique alpha identifier (Commenter ID letter), allowing each set of comments from a commenter to be traced back to the transcript, letter, or resolution in which the comments were submitted.

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 NRC staff determined the appropriate action for the comment.

Table 1 identifies the individuals providing comments and the Commenter ID letter associated with each person's set(s) of comments. The Commenter ID letter is preceded by HNP (short for Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1). For oral comments, the individuals are listed in the order in which they spoke at the public meeting. Accession numbers indicate the location of the written comments in ADAMS.

TABLE 1 - Individuals Providing Comments During Scoping Comment Period

Commenters ID	Commenter	Affiliation (If Stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession Number^(a)
HNP-A	John Rukavina	Director of Public Safety, Wake County	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
HNP-B	Lynn Bauchkey	Local Citizen	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
HNP-C	Herman Jaffe	Local Citizen	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
HNP-D	David McNellis	Research Professor, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
HNP-E	John Byrne	Mayor, Fuquay-Varina	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
HNP-F	Paul Fisher	Alderman, City of Southport; Chairman, North Carolina Municipal Power Agency	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
HNP-G	Robert J. Ahlert	Mayor ProTem, Town of Clayton	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
HNP-H	David Finger	Chairman, Cary Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
HNP-I	Scoop Green	Executive Director, Holly Springs Chamber of Commerce	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
HNP-J	Harvey Schmitt	President, Greater Raleigh Chamber of Commerce	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
HNP-K	Liz Cullington	Local Citizen	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
HNP-L	Michael Leach	Raleigh-Apex branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
HNP-M	Robert Duncan	Site Vice President, HNP	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
HNP-N	Keith Sutton	President, Triangle Urban League	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
HNP-O	Tom Oxholm	Chief Financial Officer, Wake Stone Corporation	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
HNP-P	Carl Wilkins	Past President, North Carolina Chapter of the American Association of Blacks in Energy	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
HNP-Q	Nelle Hotchkiss	Senior Vice President of Corporate Relations, North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
HNP-R	Ken Atkins	Executive Director, Wake County Economic Development	Afternoon Scoping Meeting
HNP-S	Hilda Pinnix-Ragland	Vice President, Progress Energy's Northern Region	Afternoon Scoping Meeting

Commenters ID	Commenter	Affiliation (If Stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession Number^(a)
HNP-T	Dick Sears	Mayor, Holly Springs	Evening Scoping Meeting
HNP-U	Gina Dean	State Advisor, NAACP	Evening Scoping Meeting
HNP-V	Ann Turnbull	Local Citizen	Evening Scoping Meeting
HNP-W	Lee Craig	Professor of Economics, North Carolina State University	Evening Scoping Meeting
HNP-X	Lou Ebert	President, North Carolina State Chamber of Commerce	Evening Scoping Meeting
HNP-Y	John Rukavina	Director of Public Safety, Wake County	Evening Scoping Meeting
HNP-Z	Marvin Furman	Local Citizen	Evening Scoping Meeting
HNP-AA	Sandy Jordan	Vice President of Economic Development, Cary Chamber of Commerce	Evening Scoping Meeting
HNP-BB	Bernie Hodges	President, Wade Manufacturing Company	Evening Scoping Meeting
HNP-CC	Elizabeth Rooks	Executive Vice President, Research Triangle Foundation	Evening Scoping Meeting
HNP-DD	William D. Lynch	People's Channel	Evening Scoping Meeting
HNP-EE	Ed Bonner	Member, Board of Directors of the Raleigh Chamber of Commerce	Evening Scoping Meeting
HNP-FF	Scott Lasell	Chairman, Eastern Carolina Section of the American Nuclear Society	Evening Scoping Meeting
HNP-GG	Tony Gurley	Chairman, Wake County Board of Commissioners	Evening Scoping Meeting
HNP-HH	Donna Alexander	Employee, Progress Energy	Evening Scoping Meeting
HNP-II	Herman Jaffe	Local Citizen	Evening Scoping Meeting
HNP-JJ	Jackie Clements	Retired Employee, Progress Energy	Evening Scoping Meeting
HNP-KK		Town of Clayton	Resolution (ML071300371)
HNP-LL		Holly Springs Chamber of Commerce	Resolution (ML071300371)
HNP-MM		Cary Chamber of Commerce	Resolution (ML071300371)
HNP-NN		Fuquay-Varina Chamber of Commerce	Resolution (ML071300371)
HNP-OO		Wake County Mayor's Association	Resolution (ML071300371)
HNP-PP		Greater Raleigh Chamber of Commerce	Resolution (ML071300371)
HNP-QQ		Wake County Economic Development Commission	Resolution (ML071300371)
HNP-RR		Board of Commissioners of the North Carolina Eastern Municipal Power Agency	Resolution (ML071300371)

Commenters ID	Commenter	Affiliation (If Stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession Number^(a)
HNP-SS		Raleigh-Apex NAACP	Resolution (ML071300024)
HNP-TT		Wendell-Wake Br. NAACP	Resolution (ML071300024)
HNP-UU		American Association of Blacks in Energy North Carolina Chapter	Resolution (ML071300024)
HNP-VV	Keith Sutton	President and CEO, Triangle Urban League	Letter (ML071300024)
HNP-WW	Liz Cullington	Local Citizen	Letter (ML071150313)
HNP-XX	Rudolph Williams	Local Citizen	Letter (ML071210160)

(a) The afternoon and evening transcripts can be found as an attachment under accession number ML071200434.

The subject areas the comments were grouped into are as follows:

1. Request for Information
2. Opposition to Nuclear Power
3. Support for Nuclear Power
4. License Renewal and Its Processes
5. Opposition to License Renewal at Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1
6. Support for License Renewal at Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1
7. Water Quality and Use Issues
8. Human Health Issues
9. Socioeconomic Issues
10. Uranium Fuel Cycle and Waste Management Issues
11. Alternatives
12. Environmental Justice
13. Global Warming
14. Issues Outside the Scope of License Renewal: Operational Safety, Security, & Emergency Preparedness; Safeguards and Security; Need for Power; and Cost of Power

Each comment is summarized in the following pages. For reference, the unique identifier for each comment (Commenter ID letter listed in Table 1 plus the comment number) is provided. In those cases where no new information was provided by the commenter, no further evaluation will be performed.

The preparation of the plant-specific supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) to the GEIS will take into account all the relevant issues raised during the scoping process. The SEIS will address both Category 1 and 2 issues, and will rely on conclusions supported by the GEIS for Category 1 issues, and will include the analysis of Category 2 issues and any new and significant information. The draft plant-specific supplement to the GEIS will be made available for public comment. The comment period will offer the next opportunity for the applicant; interested Federal, State, and local government

agencies; local organizations; and members of the public to provide input to the NRC's environmental review process. The comments received on the draft SEIS will be considered in the preparation of the final SEIS. The final SEIS, along with the staff's Safety Evaluation Report, will provide much of the basis for the NRC's decision on the HNP license renewal application.

**Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 (HNP)
Public Scoping Meeting
Comments and Responses**

1. Request for Information

Comment: I'm asking the NRC to provide a copy of the generic environmental impact statement to the Cary library. I also request that the NRC allow another 60 days to allow for adequate comment.
(HNP-K-15)

Comment: The NRC is urged to allow another 60 days to allow for adequate comment. We also request that the GEIS be provided to the Cary Library and Eva Perry Library. Without these documents it is impossible for interested members of the public to know what environmental impacts are supposed to be considered in which process, the adequacy of current scoping plans, or how the process affects the future of their environment.
(HNP-WW-7)

Response: The NRC staff believes that 60 days is an appropriate time frame to conduct the environmental scoping process for License Renewal. A scoping period extension of 60 additional days in this case was not warranted. In the past the NRC staff has accepted late comments on the scope of the environmental review to the extent that it was practicable to do so. In response to this comment received during the scoping meeting, the NRC staff placed a copy of the GEIS in the local libraries and also provided a copy of the GEIS to the commenter.

2. Opposition to Nuclear Power

Comment: I like to put the onus, the responsibility on the public, on us, to figure an issue. I worked for ABC News for many years. That doesn't mean a thing. I have the benefit of their library, and when Three Mile Island happened, and when the arms build-up in the '80s happened, I got involved in the anti-nuclear movement, and the anti-weapons movement.

But I realized, when somebody said to me, on the street, handing out a leaflet, you don't know what you are talking about. All the literature out there is a lot to read, isn't it? But to study the beast, or the benefit, is something we must do, right? That is why we are here. It is really serious. People joke. Like I was talking with one of the engineers from the NRC about the Simpsons being something that jokes about glowing reactors, and all this.

This is true. Why is this? Because are we scared of our ignorance of the issue, are we scared of the potential? When I drive across 64, and I see the cooling tower steaming away, and think of all the people boating, and having fun in the lake, and just the risk that exists, that is a gut fear. Apex had the chemical fire, Three Mile Island had their thing, Love Canal had their thing, Virginia Tech had their thing. The unexpected can happen. And that is why I'm actually more in the side of the military running plants than commercial ventures, because of the risk of profit overriding safety.
(HNP-DD-2)

Response: *The comment is noted. The comment opposes nuclear power and does not provide any new information. This comment is not within the scope of 10 CFR Part 51 for the environmental review associated with the application for license renewal at Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1. Therefore, this comment will not be considered further in the SEIS.*

3. Support for Nuclear Power

Comment: And I agree with DOE assistant secretary Dennis Bergen, who recently said, any serious efforts to stabilize greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, while providing the increasing amount of energy for economic development and growth must include expanded use of nuclear energy. That, obviously, includes the retention of current capabilities through the license renewal process.

(HNP-M-2)

Comment: In a broader context, nuclear energy is essential to a balanced portfolio for any energy company operating in North Carolina. North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation has interest in a nuclear plant as well, and supports the continuation and development of nuclear resources in our state.

(HNP-Q-2)

Comment: I entered my profession because I believe that nuclear technology provides many benefits to our society, and improves our quality of life. I also believe, from many years of interactions with nuclear professionals, from Progress Energy and the NRC, that nuclear technology is being used safely for the generation of power here in North Carolina.

(HNP-FF-1)

Comment: In my 12 years of experience, working at three different nuclear research reactor facilities, I have been continually impressed with the dedication and commitment of the nuclear professionals with whom I have come in contact. This includes the scientists and staff responsible for the operation and utilization of the facilities, and the NRC inspectors, and examiners, that regularly visit the facility, to assure the safe operation, and regulatory compliance.

(HNP-FF-3)

Response: *The comments are noted. The comments are in favor of nuclear power and do not provide any new information. The comments are not within the scope of 10 CFR Part 51 for the environmental review associated with the application for license renewal at Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1. Therefore, these comments will not be considered further in the SEIS.*

4. License Renewal and Its Processes

Comment: The generic environmental impact statement is not adequate to address future environmental impacts 40 years into the future, since it was only prepared in the 1990s. Significant new mechanisms have been discovered since that time, which have drastically altered both projected impacts and timeliness of climate change effects.

Any issue that was covered inadequately in the GEIS, or not covered at all, but which involves future environmental impacts, in this case, should be allowed into the scope of the plant specific environmental impact statement.
(HNP-K-14)

Response: *The NRC staff will base its analysis of environmental impacts of license renewal on the GEIS which was issued in 1996 as amended in 1999. As part of its review the NRC staff will look for any new and additional information that might call into question the conclusions reached in the GEIS for Category 1 issues. The review for Category 2 issues will take into account available site specific data and analysis to base its conclusions. While the commenter argues that the GEIS is outdated and should not be used as a base for the assessment, the NRC staff believes that the current process assures that any new information that comes to light will be used to make the final assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed action.*

Comment: Scoping issues that ought to be included in the supplemental plant specific EIS, specific environmental and public health impacts that are supposed to be analyzed in the EIS seem very hard to predict in the future, but I tried to come up with a list of things that should be analyzed, and what is wrong with the current analysis.
(HNP-K-4)

Comment: The vast majority of the public only had a few days notice from Sunday's April the 17th News and Observer, or possibly a week from one or more of the local papers. That is a certain amount of information, but probably not full or adequate. Without these documents it is impossible for interested members of the public to know what environmental impacts are supposed to be considered, and which process the adequacy of current scoping plans, or how the process affects the future of their environment. The entire relicensing process is a premature action which is unwise and unnecessary. What is the hurry? The Harris plant operating license is good for another 20 years, and does not need to be renewed at this time. To rule on aging and safety issues, 20 years in the future, is both risky and absurd. The licensee has not even attempted to frame these issues in the required future years of 2026 to 2046. Instead they have prepared a report that could be quickly adapted for other purposes, such as to support a combined operating and siting license, construction license, for one or two new reactors at the Harris site, since it covers conditions in the year 2006, not 2026, let alone 2046.
(HNP-K-16)

Comment: Why are you all here? Are your heads tired, a lot of science, politics, economics? It may be because I'm a new resident to Chatham County, who is anti-nuclear, but is also curious about the whole issue, which isn't just are you against or for the plant, the renewal, another plant. Are you scared of the plant, are you wanting the plant? Or maybe because this opportunity to come to a meeting, to speak with the NRC, to speak with and listen to other community members who are very well versed in what their agenda is, to present to the public. What I have seen of the public's discussion of the issue is impassioned, desperate perhaps, fearful, and unfortunately not as informed as we could be.
(HNP-DD-1)

Comment: But thank God the NRC is there, and that there are people who oversight, and that there is oversight, and there is review. But as we know, from Katrina, as we know from so many things, it is not enough. The responsibility is on us. As Progress Energy rate payers, as future rate payers if there is a new plant, as parents, citizens, Americans, taxpayers.
(HNP-DD-3)

Response: *The comments are noted. These comments oppose license renewal and speak to NRC's license renewal review process in general, but do not provide new and significant information. The comments do not raise any issues within the scope of this license renewal review. Therefore, the comments will not be evaluated further.*

5. Opposition to License Renewal at HNP

Comment: It is their future, for our sins. And I'm just asking you to please consider it. People don't want alternative. I lived in Wales for a year and a half. Actually I thought the windmills looked pretty good. I would rather look at a windmill than look at nothing, or know that I lived and gave these sins of us, to our children. And that is about all I have to say, thank you.
(HNP-B-2)

Comment: Shearon Harris has stalled on replacing known unsafe firewalls, and wiring, and does not really qualify as a responsible operator. The corrections must be made before you, the NRC, consider a license extension that Shearon Harris has asked for.
(HNP-C-3)

Comment: For this reason alone it is dangerous and unnecessary for the NRC to proceed with considering extending the Harris plant license at this time.
(HNP-K-7)

Comment: Because it is that important. The fire safety issues, the bizarre potential of an evacuation being jammed up, and any kind of a reaction to get away from an accident to me is crazy. But I have a lot more to learn about it. It is easy to say stuff. People talk a lot, there is not much real dialogue. American Idol is what people watch, isn't it? But do they watch the news, do they stay with an issue? I hope that everybody leaves here, tonight, with a different perspective. It is not about who is sitting here, or sitting there, or talking. It is what do we do at this point in our history about our energy use, and the safe development of it. Because this place is developing, North Carolina, the country, at an incredible rate. And is nuclear going to be one of the answers?
(HNP-DD-4)

Comment: There are several other reasons, I said, that let's us want to consider not the extension at this time, but to wait ten years. We may be, by that time, considering shutting Shearon Harris down, and that is a fact of life. I know I heard about 11 people praising Progress Energy to the hilt, and I can appreciate why. But, you know, the world changes, things change, and it is time that you guys got out there and looked a little bit beyond your rose colored lenses.
(HNP-II-2)

Comment: Progress Energy's Environmental Report is an arrogant insult to the public that pays their bills, drinks their radioactive water, and has to put up with their legitimate concerns being routinely dismissed as scaremongering, attacks on the workers, or sheer ignorance. It is clear that Progress Energy assumes that no one will read the report, a pretty fair assumption, but also that no one at the NRC will either. That is how low an opinion they have of the NRC. They apparently believe that they can submit any sort of document, as long as it is of suitable thickness, to support any new decision they are asking for.
(HNP-WW-8)

Response: *The comments are noted. The comments oppose license renewal at Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 and do not provide new and significant information. These comments are not within the scope of 10 CFR Part 51 for the environmental review associated with the license renewal application for HNP. Therefore, these comments will not be evaluated further in the SEIS.*

6. Support for License Renewal at HNP

Comment: I'm here to speak in favor of extending the license for the Shearon Harris nuclear power plant.
(HNP-D-1)

Comment: I have toured the facility and, periodically, talked with some of the plant's staff and employees. They have earned my confidence, over the years, and I'm pleased to speak in support of this application to extend the license, for the Harris facility, for an additional 20 years.
(HNP-D-7)

Comment: Many of the employees who work at the Shearon Harris plant live in, and are a part of, our community. I am confident that their commitment to safe operation of the plant, and their strong commitment to the environment, are there. There are numerous activities that the lake, and the Harris park, offers, to citizens, including hiking, and nature trails.
(HNP-E-2)

Comment: While we face challenges in meeting the demands of growth, certainly our region has, and will continue, to meet those challenges while we work together. In that spirit of team work, cooperation, the Wake County Mayors Association has unanimously, there are 12 municipalities in Wake County, and they support this renewal, unanimously, with a resolution. I'm also a member of the Board of Directors of the Fuquay Chamber of Commerce, and its support was unanimous. I truly believe that we will have a continued safe and reliable operation at the Harris plant, with the 20 year license renewal.
(HNP-E-4)

Comment: Progress Energy has an outstanding track record and is recognized, world-wide, as an industry leader in safe and reliable nuclear operations. The North Carolina Municipal Power Agency supports the continued safe and secure operations of the Harris plant, and encourages favorable considerations of the license renewal extension. I have left a copy, with your

receptionist, of my remarks, plus the Resolution of the 32 cities in support of this license renewal favorably. I thank you for the opportunity to speak to you this afternoon.
(HNP-F-2)

Comment: In closing, the town of Clayton, and the Eastern Municipal Power Agency, endorse the application of Progress Energy to renew the operating license for Shearon Harris nuclear generating plant. Premature closing of the plant would have a negative impact for the more than 425,000 citizens in the agency municipalities, and the more than 250,000 electric customers they serve. We encourage you to give favorable consideration to a safe and secure operating license renewal of the Shearon Harris plant for the economic and environmental reasons previously stated.
(HNP-G-3)

Comment: The Cary Chamber fully supports the continued safe and secure operation of the Harris plant, and encourages the NRC to extend the Harris plant's operating license an additional 20 years.
(HNP-H-1)

Comment: To the NRC we ask that you take whatever steps are necessary to facilitate the operating license extension, and thank you for allowing us to participate in this hearing today. And I would also like to leave, with you, a resolution that was unanimously approved by our Board of Directors and our Executive Board.
(HNP-H-5)

Comment: On January 24th, 2007, with one hundred percent support, the Holly Springs Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors passed a resolution in support of the continued safe and secure operations of the Shearon Harris nuclear plant. Besides Progress Energy's proven track record and safety, we also recognize their tremendous economic impact, and the environmental resources that Progress Energy has in Holly Springs, as well as within Wake County. Please support the necessary steps to facilitate the operating license extension.
(HNP-I-1)

Comment: Obviously it has a big impact. Greater Raleigh Chamber of Commerce would support this relicensing request, and would ask that the agency consider the fact that this growth has taken place in the market, and will have an impact on the need for electricity in our community for some time to come.
(HNP-J-2)

Comment: And I have submitted a resolution in support of the Harris license renewal. I work with Progress Energy on various projects over the years. And I'm familiar with its Harris plant.
(HNP-L-1)

Comment: Therefore I support to ensure the Harris plant continues to operate in the future, providing safe, reliable, and affordable energy.
(HNP-L-3)

Comment: It is important to clarify that if our application is approved, that doesn't give us carte blanche to operate for another 20 years. We have to earn that license every minute, of every day, through our performance. We are a good neighbor, and a capable corporate citizen. And we intend to preserve what has been entrusted to us, and that is our commitment.
(HNP-M-5)

Comment: Like other community leaders I have worked closely with Progress Energy since 2000, and I know first hand the commitment this company has to the community that it serves. As that community continues to grow, with these accolades and others, so will the demand for electricity. Therefore I advocate for safe, affordable, and reliable electricity. And in my observation Progress Energy is capable of providing such and, therefore, I support moving forward with the license renewal of the Harris plant.
(HNP-N-1)

Comment: With demand for our products growing in Wake county, and eastern North Carolina, failure to renew the license of the Harris plant would threaten the reliability of our needed power source, and affordability of our products.
(HNP-O-4)

Comment: Thank you for the opportunity to speak, and to ask you to please renew the Harris plant license.
(HNP-O-7)

Comment: We have lived with the Shearon Harris nuclear power plant in our region since 1987 and have observed that it is operated without a major incident. We also know that it operates at a low cost of production, which helps keep our local electric rates low. In addition we have observed that it has operated reliably and safely. Therefore it is the opinion of the North Carolina Chapter of the American Association of Blacks in Energy, that Progress Energy's application to extend this operating license for Shearon Harris nuclear power plant be granted by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
(HNP-P-3)

Comment: North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation is a wholesale customer of Progress Energy Carolinas. The Harris plant is an important part of Progress Energy's resources. Extending the life of a well run, existing plant, in today's global environment of rising energy costs, and environmental sensitivity, provides for the continuation of emission free, reliable power, at the lowest possible cost to the citizens of North Carolina, including our electric cooperative membership.
(HNP-Q-1)

Comment: We strongly support the relicensing of the Harris plant and encourage the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to do so as well.
(HNP-Q-3)

Comment: I'm here to support the extension of the license for Progress Energy. North Carolina and Research Triangle Region is recognized as one of the most dynamic economies in the U.S., we heard some of the earlier accolades.
(HNP-R-1)

Comment: It is for that reasons, and many of the others that you heard today, that Wake County Economic Development strongly supports the extension of the license. We feel it is a critical part of our vibrant economy and must be in place for us to move forward.
(HNP-R-3)

Comment: Now, as I close, I'm extremely pleased to announce that we have support from 13 different entities. These are resolutions. Some of them have been mentioned already. I will mention just the 13. The Raleigh Apex branch of the NAACP, the American Association of Blacks in Energy; the Wendell Wake branch of the NAACP, the Triangle Urban League, the Holly Springs Chamber of Commerce, the Fuquay-Varina Area Chamber of Commerce, Wake County Economic Development, Town of Clayton, the Greater Raleigh Chamber of Commerce, the North Carolina Economic Developers Association, the North Carolina Eastern Municipal Power Agency, and the Wake County Mayors Association.

Again, I thank you for allowing me this opportunity, and I definitely endorse the renewal of the plant.
(HNP-S-4)

Comment: And I'm pleased to support, pleased to support, Progress Energy's request for license renewal. Briefly, which is difficult for mayors, the reasons behind that would include I met with both of these gentlemen, several months ago, and we talked about this in detail. The plant has been part of our area, now, for almost 20 years. And, in my opinion, they have supplied safe, reliable, efficient, and clean electricity to our town, region, and state.
(HNP-T-1)

Comment: We have just been impressed with the diversity initiatives that Progress Energy has shown us, as well as their relationships with the community. And so it is with great pleasure that I lend our support, and the NAACP, and to the Harris plant, but in short, we have the confidence that will tend to the growth, and everything else, as they always have, and will continue to do.
(HNP-U-1)

Comment: And we are just very fortunate that we live in Wake County, in experiencing the growth, and the prosperity here. And having said that, I would like to tell you that I hope that you grant the renewal for the license for the Shearon Harris nuclear plant so we can continue to grow and prosper in Wake County.
(HNP-V-2)

Comment: I'm pleased to stand here tonight in support of Progress Energy's application for reauthorizing the Shearon Harris plant. The State Chamber, the North Carolina Chamber, and its 25,000 members across the state, support a growing and competitive economy, which creates opportunities for all North Carolina citizens.
(HNP-X-1)

Comment: We expect that that relationship will continue, and we look forward to working with Progress Energy in maintaining those emergency response plans, and exercising them so that if something were to occur we would be ready to respond appropriately in the interest of the community.
(HNP-Y-1)

Comment: For 20 years the Shearon Harris nuclear plant has helped provide the region with reliable electrical energy. It is a facility that has operated safely, and efficiently, during those 20 years, and is extremely important, as our region looks to its future prosperity. Accordingly I would ask the Commission to positively act on the license renewal request requested by Progress Energy.
(HNP-AA-2)

Comment: I am not aware of any environmental or safety issues caused by the Shearon Harris plant. I believe the past record, and rules and regulations that the plant operates under, are evidence of a well run and properly regulated facility. I simply believe the word nuclear has bad connotations. I wish we could change the word. I certainly believe the majority of homeowners and industrial customers want the lowest rate for electricity. I further believe that all North Carolinians want to do our best to save manufacturing jobs in our state.

For these reasons I support and strongly encourage the office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, to fully investigate and extend the requested operating license for the Shearon Harris plant.
(HNP-BB-3)

Comment: The Research Triangle Foundation is the developer of the Research Triangle Park, a 7,000 acre science park, which houses 157 companies, and over 20 million square feet of buildings, and employs more than 39,000 people. RTF has been a major economic engine for the Triangle area, and for North Carolina as a whole. Provision of adequate, clean, cost-effective, reliable electricity is crucial to the maintenance, and future expansion, of companies in RTP. For these reasons we support the license renewal of the Harris plant.
(HNP-CC-1)

Comment: And I would like to respectfully submit, for the record, a resolution passed unanimously, by the general membership of the Raleigh Chamber, supporting the extension of Progress Energy's license to operate the Shearon Harris nuclear plant.
(HNP-EE-1)

Comment: And, finally, Progress Energy's commitment to our community. The membership of our chamber recognizes that extending the operating license of the Harris plant is an important part of meeting our community's growing electricity needs, and asks this Commission to extend the license of the Shearon Harris nuclear plant.
(HNP-EE-4)

Comment: I would, therefore, like to go on record as supporting the relicensing of the Shearon Harris plant, by the NRC, because I believe that nuclear energy is a reliable and environmentally sound, and above all else, a safe form of power generation.
(HNP-FF-2)

Comment: So, to summarize, my professional experience has given me an appreciation of the clear benefits of nuclear technology. And, as importantly, trust and respect for the people that are responsible for ensuring its safe deployment and utilization here in North Carolina. In closing I simply ask the NRC to carefully and thoughtfully execute your responsibilities as related to the renewal of the Harris plant license, and support the ongoing generation of electricity with nuclear power.

(HNP-FF-5)

Comment: I would like to express my personal support for the license renewal for Progress Energy's Shearon Harris facility. My responsibility as a county commissioner is to prepare for the growth in our county, while improving the quality of life for all citizens. I have found Progress Energy to be a willing and capable partner in my efforts, over the past five years. Progress Energy, through its capable employees, have contributed in a very positive manner, as a responsible corporate citizen. Most importantly the services and the energy produced by Progress Energy are needed and are essential to the continued growth of this area. I'm proud to offer my support and gladly offer my thanks for the many contributions from Progress Energy to the citizens of Wake County.

(HNP-GG-1)

Comment: I am -- I can personally attest to the company's commitment to the environmental protection, both from a radiological and non-radiological programs. I am proud to work with a dedicated team of individuals at the plant. Many long time employees that provide the essential energy for the area. And I can say that decisions made at the plant safety is considered first and foremost in all decisions that are made, both personal safety and nuclear safety. And I'm excited to be a part of the extended operating license for the Harris plant.

(HNP-HH-1)

Comment: And I'm here to personally attest to my complete confidence and trust in the ability of Progress Energy to continue to operate the Shearon Harris plant, which we need, in the most safe, reliable, efficient operation. I have worked with the management teams, and employees of the Shearon Harris plant, during the construction of the plant, as well as after it went into commercial operation.

(HNP-JJ-1)

Comment: I appreciate the opportunity to speak tonight, to you. And, again, I'm in favor the license renewal. We need the plant to meet customer growth. It is clean power. The management team at Progress Energy, as well as the employees, have a culture of acting with integrity, and the commitment to nuclear power is there on a daily basis, 24/7.

(HNP-JJ-3)

Comment: NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Town of Clayton supports the continued safe and secure operation of the Harris Plant and encourages the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to extend the Harris Nuclear Plant's operating license an additional 20 years.

(HNP-KK-5)

Comment: Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that the Holly Springs Chamber of Commerce supports the continued safe and secure operation of the Harris Plant and encourages the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to extend the Harris Nuclear Plant's operating license an additional 20 years.
(HNP-LL-5)

Comment: Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that the Cary Chamber of Commerce supports the continued safe and secure operation of the Harris Plant and encourages the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to extend the Harris Nuclear Plant's operating license an additional 20 years.
(HNP-MM-5)

Comment: Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that the Fuquay-Varina Area Chamber of Commerce supports the continued safe and secure operation of the Harris Plant and encourages the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to extend the Harris Nuclear Plant's operating license an additional 20 years.
(HNP-NN-5)

Comment: Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that the Wake County Mayor's Association supports the continued safe and secure operation of the Harris Plant and encourages the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to extend the Harris Nuclear Plant's operating license an additional 20 years.
(HNP-OO-5)

Comment: Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that the Greater Raleigh Chamber of Commerce supports the continued safe and secure operation of the Harris Plant and encourages the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to extend the Harris Nuclear Plant's operating license an additional 20 years.
(HNP-PP-7)

Comment: Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that the Wake County Economic Development Commission supports the continued safe and secure operation of the Harris Plant and encourages the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to extend the Harris Nuclear Plant's operating license an additional 20 years.
(HNP-QQ-7)

Comment: Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Commissioners of the North Carolina Eastern Municipal Power Agency supports the continued safe and secure operation of the Harris Plant and encourages the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to extend the Harris Plant's operating license an additional 20 years.
(HNP-RR-6)

Comment: Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that the Raleigh-Apex NAACP supports the continued safe and secure operation of the Harris Plant and encourages the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to extend the Harris Nuclear Plant's operating license an additional 20 years.
(HNP-SS-5)

Comment: Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that the Wendell-Wake Br. NAACP supports the continued safe and secure operation of the Harris Plant and encourages the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to extend the Harris Nuclear Plant's operating license an additional 20 years.
(HNP-TT-5)

Comment: Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that the American Association of Blacks in Energy North Carolina Chapter supports the continued safe and secure operation of the Harris Plant and encourages the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to extend the Harris Nuclear Plant's operating license an additional 20 years.
(HNP-UU-5)

Comment: We support the continued safe and secure operation of the Harris Nuclear Plant and encourage the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to extend the plant's operating license an additional 20 years.
(HNP-VV-3)

Response: *The comments are noted. The comments support license renewal at Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 and do not provide new and significant information. These comments are not within the scope of 10 CFR Part 51 for the environmental review associated with the license renewal application for HNP. Therefore, these comments will not be evaluated further in the SEIS.*

7. Water Quality and Use Issues

Comment: I urge the NRC to reject Progress Energy's application for license extension at this time. If the NRC insists on proceeding along this relicensing track, then I urge the NRC to reject the company's draft EIS and require them to attempt to meet their legal requirements for the future period in question. Secondly, the NRC must not begin consideration of an application for one or two new reactors at the Harris site, until the relicensing process for the first reactor is finalized, and all the water supply, and other issues, described above, are resolved. The NRC must not allow a separate track process under which the company could allocate the same resource to several different safety and environmental impact analysis without the left hand counting what the right hand is doing.
(HNP-K-17)

Comment: The first one is water supply for reactor cooling. There are significant water supply issues with the plant now, with water having to be pumped from the lower Harris lake reservoir, to the upper lake reservoir, during dry months. The source for this information is Progress Energy's application for renewal of its North Carolina NPDES permit in 2006. Harris lake, compared to some other lakes in our state, has a relatively small and poor catchment area. It is not fed by a single major river. To what extent is Progress Energy double dipping in regards to the possibility of raising the water level in the lower reservoir of Harris Lake? The company has said that this could be done to serve two additional reactors. That water supply, if that is done, that water supply would not be available for additional reactors if it turns out that it is needed for the current reactor, and vice versa.
(HNP-K-5)

Comment: In addition to actual water volume use of the lake for makeup water for a nuclear reactor, raises its temperature. And so a usable water body can be temperature limited, and affected by increasingly hot summers. The availability of Harris lake as a heat sink not just for routine cooling for the period of 2026 to 2046 would need to be evaluated in light of this water supply factors, and may need to be evaluated for the current term of the operating license. (HNP-K-6)

Response: *The comments are noted. Water use conflicts and Cumulative Impacts will be discussed in Chapter 4 of the SEIS.*

Comment: The high level waste storage, i.e., the fuel pools and the water supply, a separate analysis would need to be done for future scenarios of climate change on the fuel pools, including the possibility of no repository. This analysis must include the availability of the lake to provide cooling, and the heat sink, to the fuel pools, and the reactor, simultaneously, under the most severe drought conditions, and the most catastrophic accident conditions. (HNP-K-8)

Comment: Issue number 4, water impacts and water pathways to humans and other species. An environmental impact statement for an additional 20 years of operation beyond 2026, would have to be able to adequately predict, under uncertain climate change scenarios, all the water pollution aspects of all those activities just discussed above. (HNP-K-10)

Response: *While climate change is a legitimate concern, the specific impacts of climate change within a particular region or watershed are still highly speculative, and are, therefore, beyond the scope of a NEPA review for reactor license renewal. Furthermore, any changes in watershed characteristics would likely be gradual, allowing water-use conflicts to be resolved as needed. The comment does not provide new and significant information; therefore, it will not be evaluated further.*

8. Human Health Issues

Comment: Tritium is currently released at the Harris lake, and thus into the Cape Fear river downstream, which is used as a drinking water source by a number of counties and municipalities. Harnett county is merely the first intake downstream. And water from that intake is currently sold to other water needy counties and municipalities. Tritium cannot be filtered out of water, and is incorporated into the body of humans and other animals. Analysis would have to include increased emissions of tritium, under aging and accident scenarios, and include higher concentration under drought conditions, and the concentration and consequent exposures during simultaneous catastrophic accident and severe drought conditions. (HNP-K-11)

Comment: Anyway, I want to talk about the safety issue. And I'm not talking about nuclear meltdowns, and we can forget about the adverse environmental factors, and we also can forget about the terrorist factor here. What I'm talking about is that if you have parents who live in this area, and you have children, your children are in danger of getting leukemia. There is a better chance they will get leukemia because there is a nuclear power plant here. And I have pulled evidence off the internet to show this here, and I will just point out that there is so much evidence

on this here, and I'm only going to point out two things to you. First I'm going to tell you that Canada, France, Germany, and the Soviet Union, there were high incidence of leukemia in the proximity of nuclear power plant among children. And another example of evidence that I'm going to give you, is that SEER, that is surveillance and epidemiology and end result program, of the United States Center for Disease Control and Prevention, came out with figures that from 1975, to 2000, cancer rates in children, near nuclear power plants, went up 40 percent. If you are a parent, but more important Mayor are you here? Do you have grandchildren? Are you concerned about your grandchildren? Okay, think about that, look it up. Those children are in danger, I'm telling you. Wake up.
(HNP-Z-1)

Comment: All exposure analyses to humans would have to be able to predict demographic patterns 20-40 years into the future (currently predicted to be increasing sharply.)
(HNP-WW-2)

Comment: (v) Additional operational exposures: An EIS would have to predict accurately the range of the additional future radiation exposures through all pathways from an additional 20 years of plant operation forty years into the future to:

- (A) nuclear plant workers including contract workers
- (B) the public near the nuclear plant
- (C) uranium miners
- (D) the public near or downstream of uranium mining
- (E) fuel fabrication workers
- (F) the public near fuel fabrication facilities
- (G) spent fuel handling workers
- (H) the public along spent fuel transportation routes
- (I) low-level waste transport workers
- (J) the public along low-level transport routes
- (K) low-level waste incineration and compaction workers
- (L) the public near low-level waste incineration and compaction facilities
- (M) low-level waste disposal workers
- (N) the public near low-level waste disposal facilities

(HNP-WW-3)

Comment: (vi) Air, ingestion, direct and other pathways: An EIS for an additional 20 years of operation during the period 2026-2046 would also have to consider all other exposure pathways to humans. All pathways of radioactive emissions/releases/pollution through food animals and fish to humans would have to be analyzed. Progress Energy's annual or periodic environmental reports state that there are no food animals impacted by the Harris Plant, but in fact there are deer and ducks that can migrate from Harris Lake to adjacent game land and Jordan Lake and which are seasonally hunted for food. Harris Lake is open to fishing and fish caught in the lake are consumed as food. The EIS should also consider future conditions under various fuel constraint and economic downturn scenarios under which there is an increase in the utilization of these food sources.

(HNP-WW-4)

Response: *The comments are noted. The GEIS evaluated radiation exposures to the public for all plants including HNP, and concluded that the impact was small. During the plant-specific environmental review, the NRC will search for new and significant information that causes the NRC to question this generic conclusion for HNP. The information provided by the comments will be reviewed as part of that search. In addition, evaluation of new studies and analyses of the health effects of radiation exposure, such as BEIR VII, is an ongoing effort at the NRC. If significant new information is found, the NRC will perform a plant-specific analysis of this environmental impact. This issue will be addressed in Chapter 4.*

9. Socioeconomic Issues

Comment: Shearon Harris is also a member of the local community. Its management communicates with, and advises, local and state officials, on matters related to its operation. It communicates with the public through its visitor centers, and outreach programs, and participates with local and state organizations, in safety related drills and exercises.
(HNP-D-6)

Comment: Aside from benefiting from the plant's safe and productive operation, our community realizes a tremendous positive and economic impact from Progress Energy and the Harris plant by virtue of the tax revenues generated, salaries generated, and the company's strong philanthropic contributions to Cary and Wake County.
(HNP-H-4)

Comment: We are a 37 year customer of Progress Energy, spending close to a million dollars per year for power to crush our products to state specifications. We count on them to always provide our stone crushing plants with a reliable power. A power outage in our business means equipment that locks up, full of thousands of tons of raw material. A lockup might take us a full day to unclog. When we do have a power problem they get right on it, helping us get back in business as quickly as possible. The Harris plant is an important part of Progress Energy plan to ensure reliable power at the lowest possible cost to us, and to other business customers.
(HNP-O-1)

Comment: I would also like to add that I'm a former member of the Wake county Board of Education, serving from 1999 to 2003. And there is no better partner for public education than Progress Energy. School children's safety is always their top priority. And Wake County public schools confidently depend on their reliability record.
(HNP-O-5)

Comment: I will leave the complete list with you, but I think you are getting a feel for what we are saying. These new companies, and the others that came in, represent 29,759 net new jobs for the citizens of Wake County. We must continue to grow our jobs, and investment, for us to continue having a dynamic economy. My staff and I were involved in every one of the projects I just mentioned. And I can tell you a key factor in their decision to come here was the availability of reasonably priced reliable energy. And it is extremely important to us that this license be renewed, because many of these companies, particularly Novardas [Novartis], the vaccine producer, it will take them five to six years even to get their facility up and operating. They are

very concerned that there is a long term plan in place to continue having a good steady supply of electricity, and a very vibrant market.
(HNP-R-2)

Comment: Now, we are also mindful of making an impact in our communities. In fact, there are two great examples. Our employees, and our customers, since 1982, have contributed more than 16 million dollars to our energy neighbor fund. Now, that fund was created by us to make sure those customers who can't afford to pay their bills, have that opportunity. And they can do so by applying for this Energy Neighbor Fund dollars. Furthermore, in 2006, Progress Energy contributed more than 12 million dollars to support our community, to enhance education, to protect the environment, to promote economic development. And, of course, we are supportive of our communities, because we have more than 10,000 employees, out and about in our communities. Now, we have a major tax impact on this community. I think someone mentioned it earlier. In Wake County the tax revenue is about 15.1 million dollars, of which 7.4 million is directly attributable to the Harris plant.
(HNP-S-3)

Comment: We also need roads, which is another subject that we will talk about at a different time, for the traffic that all these people bring to our area.
(HNP-T-4)

Comment: Whether we realize it or not, Progress Energy touches all of our lives. Not just when we flip on the light switch, or drive down the street at night, but they are a member of our community, and an excellent corporate citizen. If you are not aware, Progress Energy supports this community in many, many ways. And I know this because I do some volunteer work with my PTA, through my son's school, and through other educational programs and organizations. They are a generous supporter of public education, and they demonstrate a true, true commitment to the high quality that we experience here in Wake County.
(HNP-V-1)

Comment: As I just mentioned, my report tonight summarizes an economic impact study. There are two ways in which one can interpret an economic impact study of this type. One way is to interpret it in a way that would let us view and answer the following question. Holding all other economic variables constant, what does the plant in question contribute to the local economy? Another way to interpret a study like this would be to see it as an answer to a slightly different, but related, question. Which is, if this plant had never been constructed, or if it were to be closed, or otherwise go missing, then how would that impact the local economy?
(HNP-W-1)

Comment: The economic impact report that I'm summarizing contains at least five key economic indicators. These are: One, the value of economic output; two, employment; three, personal income, which is to say primarily wages and salaries; four, all other income; and five, tax revenues. As of calendar year 2005 Dr. Erickson estimates that the Shearon Harris plant generates the following economic impacts for these five categories. The plant generates roughly 700 million dollars in economic output. The plant supports more than 2,100 jobs in the Triangle region. The plant generates 86 million dollars in personal income, and nearly 40 million dollars in other income. And the report estimates that the plant generates roughly ten million dollars in

indirect business taxes, which in North Carolina are largely sale taxes, and 20 million dollars in property taxes. In concluding this summary I offer one additional and final impact, which was estimated in the report. At current property tax rates, in the Triangle Region, the property value required to generate 20 million dollars in property taxes is approximately 2.8 billion dollars, which is greater than one percent of the value of the assessed property in the Triangle, at the time of the study.

(HNP-W-2)

Comment: WHEREAS, the Harris Plant provides approximately \$10 million dollars in taxes to Wake County each year;

(HNP-PP-6 through RR-5)

Comment: The Harris Plant has been a part of the local community for two decades and has proved to be an outstanding corporate citizen, providing significant economic benefits to the surrounding community. Since 1987, the plant has been generating safe and efficient electricity to more than 550,000 homes and businesses. More than 600 people work at the Harris Plant and live in the surrounding communities in Wake, Chatham, Harnett and Lee counties.

(HNP-VV-1)

Response: *The comments are noted. Socioeconomic issues specific to the plant are Category 2 issues and will be addressed in Chapter 2 and 4 of the SEIS.*

10. Uranium Fuel Cycle and Waste Management Issues

Comment: Let me start by saying that I'm not here saying I know everything, I know nothing. I'm just a mom, I'm a grandmother, I'm a wife. I'm very concerned about what we are going to do with the spent rods, before we do any renewal of license. I have been here for two years. Previous to that I lived in a small town called Bayville, New Jersey. We were right outside Oyster Creek. You guys renewed their license, I cried that day. If you could renew Oyster Creek license, you could renew your license. But anyone that opposes it, I feel for you, I truly do feel for you. And what I'm doing is I'm begging that you do look into disposing of these used rods. When we first started nuclear energy we never expected to keep them on the facilities, and we have. They don't want them out there in the desert, in Nevada. They are very, very dangerous in our backyards.

(HNP-B-1)

Comment: The Progress Energy staff has demonstrated, over the past 20 plus years, that it is fully capable of safely operating the facility, and storing the spent assemblies in pools, and in dry casks. I am convinced that they are fully capable of also preparing the assemblies for shipment, when the repository, or an interim storage facility is available.

(HNP-D-2)

Comment: The global nuclear power industry has now, according to my estimates, over 12,000 reactor years of operation, or operational experience. The storage pools at Shearon Harris was originally built to store the assemblies, from the four reactors for which the site was originally designed. There is, of course, only one reactor in operation at the site, and the pool holds, of its own fuel, again according to my estimates, less than 25 percent of its capacity of 8,400 rods, or

assemblies. And with its own fuel will only be approximately at 75 percent of capacity, at the end of the relicense period.
(HNP-D-3)

Comment: Uranium supply, analysis of remaining global uranium supply does not support the feasibility of operating the Harris plant for an additional 20 years under current assumptions regarding fuel availability, or price. Uranium prices are projected, by industry analysts, to continue to rise with global scarcity, and increasing global demand for uranium, for both fuel fabrication and nuclear feed stock, until they reach 500 dollars a pound, and then conceivably people would just stop paying. The price advantage cited by Progress Energy and the nuclear industry, generally, over other alternatives, often relies on old uranium prices, such as when several years it was 8 dollars a pound, now it is 113 dollars a pound, and shows no sign of slowing down. It has risen 57 percent since the start of 2007. Uranium mining is dependent on a supply of water very nearby. The environmental impact statement would have to consider the effects of uranium mining using alternative water supply methods because, basically, that water supply future is not assured.
(HNP-K-13)

Comment: The EIS would have to project the environmental effects of alternative methods of uranium mining, in the 2026-2046 period, and its effects on price of uranium mining/operational cost factors of HNP compared to alternative sources under futuristic pricing scenarios.
(HNP-WW-6)

Response: *The comments are noted. All of the environmental impacts associated with the uranium fuel cycle are addressed in the GEIS. The GEIS concluded that all of those impacts including the offsite radiological impact of storage, transportation, and disposal of spent fuel and other radioactive waste are Category 1 issues. The impact of all these Category 1 issues was judged to be small in the GEIS. During the plant-specific environmental review of HNP, the NRC will search for new and significant information that causes the NRC to question the generic conclusion for HNP. If significant new information is found, the NRC will perform a plant-specific analysis of these environmental impacts. Chapter 6.0 of the plant-specific SEIS for HNP will address these issues.*

11. Comments Concerning Alternatives

Comment: An environmental scoping process is not a popularity contest. The environmental impact statement is supposed to analyze the effect of a no-action alternative, which would mean an NRC denial to extend the operating license beyond 2026 to 2046, or deciding not to do so at this time. It also has to consider alternative sources for power. We are talking about a very early extension of the license. The license doesn't expire for 20 years. We won't have the same staff, we won't have the same environmental conditions, we won't have the same population.
(HNP-K-1)

Response: *Chapter 8 of the HNP SEIS will contain the analysis related to alternatives to the proposed action. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the consideration of alternatives to the proposed action in an environmental impact statement (EIS). NEPA also*

requires the alternatives analysis in the EIS to include the alternative of no action. In the case of license renewal not renewing the operating license.

Comment: Seeking other sources, without the Shearon Harris plant, would undoubtedly direct the agency to other higher costs, fossil fuel generating plants, in the southeastern, part of the United States. That is, of course, assuming there is transmission capacity in order to get that power to our member cities. In addition to economic impact, consideration should be given to the negative impact of replacing clean nuclear power with fossil fuel power, that generates greenhouse gases, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, mercury, and nitrogen oxide. Likewise, conservation measures would not be sufficient to offset the loss output from the Harris plant. (HNP-G-2)

Comment: The alternative energy sources that Progress Energy has considered, in its report, are limited to those that are available now, in terms of electricity demand now, not in 2026. And on their claim that energy demand is simply going to increase for the foreseeable future. They only consider, in their report, power generation sources that they consider viable now, a new nuclear or new fossil fuel plant, or purchase power from such dirty sources, rather than what might be available, and viable, in 2026. (HNP-K-2)

Comment: Alternatives, any discussion of available alternative energy generation must be done for a period beginning 20 years into the future, and not based on currently available technologies or prices. Reasonable assumptions, which are not found in Progress Energy's report, include wind, solar, and current clean renewable alternatives will be cheaper than at present, and possibly have lower impacts than at present. Additional renewable energy options will be developed in the future, beyond what is considered in Progress Energy's report, or basically in any of our minds right now. Thirdly, coal fired power plants may not be an available or viable option in 2026, and natural gas supplies via pipeline may not be available either. If the environmental impact statement is still to include alternatives such as new nuclear, coal or natural gas generation, then their environmental impacts would have to be evaluated, thoroughly, for the period 2026 to 2046, for their entire fuel cycle, not just utility operation. From exploration and mining, through transportation, and up to disposal of wastes, it would also have to include all the resources committed and used, those would be impacted in the full range of water and air emissions, resulting in deep stage. (HNP-K-12)

Comment: The newspaper article stated that Shearon Harris supplies 12 percent of Progress Energy's capacity now. That is a small amount when I look at the study done for the North Carolina State Utility Commission, as directed by the State. The study states that we can get ten percent of our electric needs from solar and wind if we develop them. The associate, Mr. Jonathan Winter, also agreed with me that the new environmentally sound compact fluorescent light bulbs, now on the market, will reduce demand by at least 25 percent over the next few years. Progress, two years ago, reported capacity on hand to us through 2016, with no increase in capacity needed. Now you take these numbers, and they tell us that we really don't need Shearon Harris, or any other nuclear or coal plants at this time. By 2016 California's public gas and electric, which is one of the largest, if not the largest in the United States, is instituting a program, right now, to boost electric car power for the grid, on demand, and will be in operation within the

next four or five years. They are planning on using something like the new Honda electric car that is due for sale to the public in 2009. You can read about this in this article here, in the newspaper, but you folks don't get this kind of newspaper, it is a weekly that goes out world-wide, it is called the Epic Times. That is why this is not the time to consider a license extension, as I said earlier. Progress should be spending time studying places like Wakeland, Florida's utility plant, where they have leasing solar hot water heaters to their rate payers.
(HNP-II-1)

Comment: Progress Energy's Environmental Report (Draft EIS). The Environmental Impact Statement is supposed to analyze the effect of the "no action alternative" which means the NRC denying to extend the operating license for the period of 2026 to 2046, or deciding not to do so at this time. Progress energy has not provided any evidence or compelling argument that the operating license needs to be renewed, or more accurately, extended, now, 20 years in advance of when that action might be needed.

Progress Energy has rounded up a number of resolutions in favor of license extension from local chambers of commerce, and their glossy brochure might lead you to think that this action is needed now to allow the plant to operate for the next twenty years. However, the company makes it clear in their 476 page "Environmental Report" that, in the unlikely event of the NRC not renewing the operating license, the plant could still operate until 2026.

In addition that brochure uses an old technique illustrated in that old but still relevant book "How to Lie with Statistics" in comparing nuclear energy to other sources. Leaving aside for the moment the misleading nature of only considering the fuel component, the figure used to illustrate these costs adds in two misleading features. One is the reference to a processed uranium pellet rather than the many pounds of raw uranium ore, but the other is that as the height of the little picture grows, so does the width. So you might take away the idea that other sources of large centralized power are seven times as costly, rather than merely slightly higher, were these figures actually total costs, which they are not.

Worse, Progress Energy claims in the material that they are not handing out, but burying within hundreds of pages in the Apex Library, that since the impacts of decommissioning the plant in 2026 would be the same as decommissioning it in 2046 there is no difference, conveniently leaving out the significant and varied additional public health and environmental impacts of 20 years of additional uranium mining, plant releases, and 20 years more worth of high and low-level radioactive waste.

The alternative energy sources that Progress considers are limited to those that "meet system needs" based on electricity demand now, not in 2026-2046, saying that energy demand is going to increase "for the foreseeable (sic) future." They only consider power generation sources that they consider viable now, a new nuclear or fossil fuel plant, or purchased power from such sources, rather than what might be available and viable in 2026.

Progress Energy describes "incentive programs that encourage customers to replace old, inefficient appliances or equipment with new high-efficiency appliances or equipment" as if it were a current program, but there is no such program in the company's NC service area, and there has never been one. If there's one just started in Florida, that's outside this analysis.

Progress Energy actually projects DECREASING impacts of conservation, in spite of national trends favoring more efficiency. And those trends are used as an argument that there's nothing left to do: "...The adoption of increasingly stringent national appliance standards for most major energy-using equipment and the adoption of energy efficiency requirements in state building codes. These mandates have further reduced the potential for cost-effective utility-sponsored measures."

What is this supposed to mean? That governments and states have done so much there's nothing left for a poor utility to do in this area? On the contrary, what remains is the gigantic gap between the brand new appliances and systems and actually getting them into customer's

homes, thus reducing their demand, or getting the customers into more energy efficient homes, or upgrading their homes to these new codes.

The past, present or future creation of new codes for building and/or appliances create increasing gaps between current use and future use of electricity. Without some incentive to increase the rate of adoption these standards and requirements don't have a large immediate impact on overall demand. However, they may well have a significant impact by 2026-2046 which is the period this report is supposed to cover.

(HNP-WW-1)

Comment: Conservation: Conservation options should consider what might be feasible 20 years from now, and not based on what is available today, under various adoption rate scenarios, including with incentives, and what could be developed in future.

(HNP-WW-5)

Comment: I have been doing my best to get in touch with you. But I do believe that some companys have done their best to hide me from you. Right down to N.C. News & Observer, I have written them (N&O) 5 strait times trying to get them to put me in touch with the right people. I have invented a power source that is inexpensive and 95% safe to the consumer & the world. It is a fully self sustaining electrical power/generator, this invention will power anything & everything electrical that we have created thus far. But I believe for the sake of the companys losing out on millions of dollars they have made up their minds to try and hide this discovery from you & the rest of the world. So I have been fighting against all odds to get national attention to what I have named I AM COIL. This engine/generator will change the way we supply power to our homes, offices & business. Because instead of wires running for miles & miles, we will be able to place one small I Am Coil (3 feet wide x 4 feet high x 7 feet long) on the building or home lot of land in which it sits on. And I need not tell you how great a benefit that will be in storms, floods & summer. This is a great invention and it should be put into full production starting now. If you truely (sic) do care about our safety & making the world a great place to live for our kids, then I will see you at this prison no later than 3 days after you have received this letter. Then I will take you through the whole system of the I Am Coil, and explain to you how it works from top to bottom. And when I finish you will know for yourself that it truely works and works good, forget about me being in prison & look at what I have invented, that is the most important subject here. I stay off to myself & I don't let to (sic) many people know what I have created in here, because it is

a multi billion dollar invention. And like my Grandfather use to say talk is cheap, action is more, so come & see this invention for yourself. I will be waiting for you to show up.
(HNP-XX-1)

Response: *The comment is noted. Impacts from reasonable alternatives for the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, will be evaluated in Chapter 8 of the SEIS.*

12. Environmental Justice Issues

Comment: We learned that African-Americans, and other minorities, pay a disproportionate share of their income for energy, and these groups to be more acutely affected by air emissions from our transportation and energy sectors. We also learned that our communities tend to live in older housing stock, which isn't energy efficient, and usually has older, less efficient appliances, and heating and cooling systems. With these observations, as a back drop, we have determined that our constituents, and our communities, would be greatly served from measures that would ensure low cost, clean and reliable energy sources.
(HNP-P-1)

Response: *In order to perform a review of environmental justice in the vicinity of a nuclear power plant, the NRC staff examines the geographic distribution of minority and low-income populations within 80 kilometers (50 miles) of the site. The NRC staff uses the most recent census data available. The NRC staff also supplements its analysis by field inquiries to such groups as county planning departments, social service agencies, agricultural extension personnel, and private social service agencies. Once the locations of minority and low-income populations are identified, the staff evaluates whether any of the environmental impacts of the proposed action could affect these populations in a disproportionately high and adverse manner.*

The comments relate to environmental justice issues and will be considered in the preparation of the SEIS. The NRC conducts an independent analysis of the impacts of license renewal with regard to environmental justice; potential impacts will be discussed in Chapter 4 of the SEIS.

13. Global Warming Issues

Comment: ...its operation is not contributing to the tropospheric loading of green house gases.
(HNP-D-5)

Comment: Third issue, greenhouse gas emissions from the entire fuel cycle, from an additional 20 years of operation. Progress Energy, in its report said if we decommission the plant in 2026, or if we decommission the plant in 2046, oh what is the difference? Well, the difference is, among other things, significant quantities of various greenhouse gases are released during the entire fuel cycle, uranium fuel cycle, some of which are many times more damaging than carbon dioxide, such as those emitted during fuel fabrication. The plant specific environmental impact statement should consider all the greenhouse gas emissions, not just carbon dioxide, associated with extended operation for 20 years, beyond 2026, such as uranium mining, fuel fabrication, fuel

transport, repair, replacement, manufacture and transport, to maintain the reactor, spent fuel transport, low level radioactive waste transport, low level radioactive waste incineration, and so on.
(HNP-K-9)

Comment: The Harris plant is essential to meeting the needs of our customers and we meet those needs with zero greenhouse gas emissions. With very real concerns about global warming it is good for our customers and good for the environment to take steps now to ensure that the Harris plant continues to be that clean air energy source well into the future. Renewing the plant's license will allow us to do exactly that. A recent Bisconti research national survey determined that 85 percent of the public believe that the U.S. should take advantage of all low carbon energy opportunities in the future, including nuclear power.
(HNP-M-1)

Comment: In addition, it is my belief that there is less environmental pollution from nuclear generation than a coal fired, or natural gas fired electricity generation source. There are no air pollutants being emitted. In an age where global warming appears a real issue, certainly nuclear power is the correct means of electricity generation for the future.
(HNP-BB-2)

Comment: WHEREAS, nuclear energy produces no greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to global climate change;
(HNP-KK-3)

Comment: WHEREAS, nuclear energy produces no greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to global climate change;
(HNP-LL-3 through OO-3; SS-3 through UU-3)

Comment: WHEREAS, nuclear energy produces no greenhouse gas emissions that can lead to ozone formation or acid rain;
(HNP-PP-3; QQ-3)

Comment: WHEREAS, nuclear energy produces no greenhouse gas emissions;
(HNP-RR-3)

Response: *While climate change is a legitimate concern, the specific impacts of climate change within a particular region is still highly speculative, and is, therefore, beyond the scope of a NEPA review for reactor license renewal. The comments do not provide new and significant information; therefore, they will not be evaluated further.*

14. Issues Outside the Scope of License Renewal

Operational Safety, Security, & Emergency Preparedness

Comment: Since the initial licensing efforts, for the plant, Wake County and, at the time, CP&L, and subsequently Progress Energy, have had a continuing relationship. And that relationship includes financial planning, and work support, in development and maintenance of our

emergency response plans, and other preparedness activities. And, as a result of that continuing collaborative effort, when we've tied our emergency response activities, it has been determined that we meet NRC and FEMA standards for emergency response external to the plant. In Wake County we actually conduct annual tests of that plan. In alternating years we either test the activation of the EOC only, or we activate the EOC and the field activities response for exercise purposes. And what I wanted to establish, for the record, was that current relationship with Progress Energy, in emergency planning and testing, and managing the emergency plan for Shearon Harris.
(HNP-A-1)

Comment: I have had a chance to visit the plant and interface with Bob Duncan, and his management team. I have seen, first-hand, the security measures in place, and the dedication, and the commitment, of the entire Progress Energy team.
(HNP-E-1)

Comment: This is a very safe plant, it has proven that it has stood the test of time, and it meets a very, very important part of our community and region's needs.
(HNP-E-5)

Comment: Progress Energy has a proven 35 year track record of operating nuclear plants safely and securely.
(HNP-H-2)

Comment: I'm here today representing 650 employees who work at the Harris plant, many of who are in the audience today to show their support. These are highly skilled, extensively trained professionals, who are dedicated and committed to their work. Understandably these employees, including me, are held to very high expectations. We are responsible for safely operating a nuclear reactor, and that is a huge responsibility. We come to work every day with our first priority not simply to generate electricity, but to make sure that we are generating electricity in a sustainable way, that ensures the health and safety of the public, and the environment. It is my responsibility to ensure that safety for our employees, and for our public. Safety has, and always will be, a top priority for the Harris plant.
(HNP-M-3)

Comment: We do need to be environmentally responsible to concerns about global warming, and we need to be safe. One of our plants is about ten miles from the Harris plant. We are very pleased with Progress Energy's outstanding safety record, and are very confident in their ability to keep our employees safe.
(HNP-O-3)

Comment: I have toured the plant at least four to five times, the total plant, inside, out, the whole nine yards. And I, personally, am very pleased and comfortable with their safety precautions. I would also encourage any elected officials who might be here, or others, to do the same thing that I have done, take a look at the plant, go through the whole thing, you will be impressed.
(HNP-T-2)

Comment: The Harris plant has been operating for 18 years and, over that time, has consistently been ranked, by its peers, as among the top nuclear plants in the country, in terms of safety, production, and cost. Progress Energy has a 35 year track record of operating nuclear plants safely, and securely. The Harris plant continuously updates equipment, and undergoes constant oversight and scrutiny by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
(HNP-EE-3)

Comment: In the past three years I have had the opportunity to become involved with the local section of the American Nuclear Society. In the numerous society functions and meetings I have attended, I have interacted extensively with personnel from Progress Energy, both from the corporate offices, and the Harris plant. Without exception I have found these professional men and women to be of the highest caliber, possessing a good questioning attitude, and ensuring understanding of the technical concepts presented at section meetings. Their strong commitment to their profession, and to excellence and safety in nuclear plant operations, is evident.
(HNP-FF-4)

Comment: As Ms. Alexander spoke to, I can also attest to being a part of seeing, first-hand the conservative decisionmaking that is used in our nuclear safety programs to ensure the highest degree of safety to employees, the plant, and the public. My husband and I, after having different assignments in other states, moved back to North Carolina, and chose to locate in Apex, North Carolina. I currently volunteer in the emergency department in a local hospital. And when nuclear power is brought up I have the opportunity to talk with residents, and I tell them, and I'm genuine in saying this, if there were a natural disaster, the first place I would want to be would be inside the containment building at the Shearon Harris nuclear power plant.
(HNP-JJ-2)

Comment: WHEREAS, the Harris Plant has been consistently ranked by its peers among the top nuclear plants in the country in terms of safety, production and cost; and WHEREAS, Progress Energy has a 35-year track record of operating nuclear plants safely and securely, and the plant features multiple backup systems to ensure safety; and WHEREAS, the Harris Plant is closely monitored by on-site inspectors from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; and WHEREAS, the 650 professionals who work at the plant and live in the community are committed to the safety and security of the site;... (HNP-KK-2 through OO-2; RR-2 through UU-2)

Comment: WHEREAS, the Harris Plant has been consistently ranked by its peers as among the top nuclear plants in the country in terms of safety, production, and cost; and WHEREAS, Progress Energy has a 35-year track record of operating nuclear plants safely and securely;
(HNP-PP-2; QQ-2)

Comment: WHEREAS, the 650 professionals who work at the plant and live in the community are committed to the safety and security of the site;
(HNP-PP-5; QQ-5)

Response: *The comments are noted. Operational safety, security, and emergency preparedness is outside the scope of this review. An NRC safety review for the license renewal period is conducted separately. Although a topic may not be within the scope of review for license renewal, the NRC is always concerned with protecting health and safety. Any matter potentially affecting*

safety can be addressed under processes currently available for an existing operating license absent a license renewal application.

Emergency preparedness is an ongoing process at all plants, including HNP. Each nuclear plant must have an approved emergency plan, as required by 10 CFR Part 50, that is revised periodically and required to be updated. Licensees are required to frequently test the effectiveness of the plans by conducting emergency response exercises. Emergency planning is part of the current operating license and is outside the scope of the environmental analysis for license renewal. The comments did not provide any new and significant information and do not fall within the scope of license renewal as set forth in 10 CFR Parts 51 and 54; therefore, the comments will not be evaluated further.

Security

Comment: I have been around for over 80 years. And as far as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, I have been around from the get-go. And I supervised security offices back in the '70s. And all the blab, and all the blurb from Progress Energy, I can sum up in one little statement from every security officer I supervised in five different atomic energy plants, in the northeast. Anything happens here, bud, I'm the first one out the gate. And this is all security officers I'm referring to, who I supervised. You have no real security if a major accident occurs. And we have just been going along hoping that they spot a fire, like they did back in '93, before it becomes a major conflagration.
(HNP-C-4)

Response: *As part of its oversight process the NRC constantly ensures that licensees meet appropriate security levels.*

The issue of security at nuclear power plants is not unique to facilities that have requested a renewal to their license; therefore, security will not be addressed within the scope of this SEIS. The comments did not provide new and significant information and do not fall within the scope of license renewal as set forth in 10 CFR Parts 51 and 54; therefore, will not be evaluated further.

Aging Management

Comment: Now, there are several reasons not to extend the license of Shearon Harris nuclear plant. The most important is that Shearon Harris has been stalling, for 15 years, and now asks for another ten years to correct the wiring of firewalls. This is material installed, originally, by the builders of Shearon Harris and approved by you, the NRC. Shearon Harris is spending 500,000 dollars a year on a fire watch system, again, approved by the NRC, hoping to prevent a major fire.
(HNP-C-1)

Comment: The next reason not to extend the license is that it was built to last 40 years, only, and it is wearing out, much as a car that was built to last 100,000 miles, and has run over 550,000 miles. There are parts of the plant that cannot be measured for durability, and us life, just as an old car engine and drive train can only be estimated. When a piece of equipment is designed for

40 years of use, there are hidden weaknesses to consider. It ages. Let's wait ten more years before we consider a license renewal.
(HNP-C-2)

Comment: In terms of plant aging issues and those affects on the public health and the environment, aging of plant systems is the only area, other than environmental issues, that the NRC is supposed to consider in relicensing a plant or not. But this is the one area that is very impossible to predict so far in advance. During the first 20 to 30 years of U.S. power reactor operation numerous systems and components have turned out to age and deteriorate more rapidly than expected, and to be missed by routine inspections. It seems extremely likely that additional generic aging issues will emerge in the next 5, 10, and 20 years if U.S. power reactors continue to operate. It simply is not credible that either Progress Energy, or the NRC, can predict additional aging effects 40 years into the future. Two dangerous examples of such unforeseen issues that have emerged in recent years are reactor head corrosion, and the pressurized water reactor problem with butt welds. These appear to be -- there are likely to be many more as reactors age. A responsible regulator would not tie its hands so far in advance, but would retain the authority to shut down nuclear reactors that can no longer be operated safely.
(HNP-K-3)

Comment: WHEREAS, the Harris Plant is continually updating equipment and undergoes constant oversight and scrutiny by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission;
(HNP-PP-4; QQ-4)

Response: *The comment is noted. The NRC's environmental review is confined to environmental matters relevant to the extended period of operation requested by the applicant. Safety matters related to aging are outside the scope of this environmental review. An NRC safety review for the license renewal period is conducted separately. The comments provide no new information and will not be evaluated further in the context of the environmental review. However, the comments will be forwarded to the project manager for the license renewal safety review for consideration.*

Need for Power

Comment: Shearon Harris is contributing to the provision of the base load of electricity that we, the consumers, are demanding. It is contributing to our national goal of energy independence...
(HNP-D-4)

Comment: I have lived in Fuquay for over 30 years, and continue to count on Progress Energy to provide the electricity needed for our community, and the region, and recognize that the Shearon Harris plant has been a part of providing infrastructure, and meeting the tremendous growth that has taken place in our area. I'm satisfied, in fact, that we could not have had this type of growth if we hadn't had the type of energy needed for this region. And the Harris plant has met those demands.
(HNP-E-3)

Comment: The agency [North Carolina Eastern Municipal Power Agency], the power agency, owns 16.17 percent of the Harris nuclear plant. The Harris nuclear plant provides safe and reliable power to more than 250,000 power agency customers. The Harris plant is important to

Progress Energy to ensure reliable power to both and all of its customers. The plant does not depend on imported fuel and is environmentally responsive to concerns of global warming.
(HNP-F-1)

Comment: And, lastly, the agency [North Carolina Eastern Municipal Power Agency] owns 16.17 percent of the Shearon Harris nuclear generating plant, located in southwest Wake County, in North Carolina. And that is the subject of this operating license renewal hearing today. The rated capacity of this plant is 900 megawatts. The agency's share of the Shearon Harris plant's output is 146 megawatts. This represents about 10 percent of the capacity that is owned by the agency's generating capacity, and 12 percent of the energy requirements. The Harris plant has provided safe, secure, economical power to the agency, its members, and customers, for almost 20 years. Should the NRC not grant an operating license renewal for the Harris plant, beginning in 2027, the agency, including the town of Clayton, would have to purchase power from other sources to meet the requirements of its customers.
(HNP-G-1)

Comment: The Harris plant supplies power to more than 550,000 businesses and residences, or about 12 percent of the total electricity generated by PE Carolinas. Continued operation of the Harris plant will result in no greenhouse gas emissions, and reduce dependence upon unstable foreign energy supplies.
(HNP-H-3)

Comment: Over the past 12 months our area has received many high rankings and accolades; number one place for business, and careers, by Forbes, number eight fastest growing metro in the nation by the U.S. Census Bureau; number one best U.S. city for job, Forbes; top 50 hottest cities for expanding and relocating companies; top ten tech town; Wake County number one school district, and the Wake County's schools gold rating from Expansion Management magazine. What those ratings suggest is that dynamic growth that has taken place in this market is likely to continue. And that kind of growth requires energy to meet new demand. The Shearon Harris plant currently supplies more than a half million residences and businesses, and provides 12 percent of the total energy generated by Progress Energy of the Carolinas. And the plant generates more than 7.9 million megawatt hours of electricity, and approximately ten million dollars in taxes to Wake County, annually.
(HNP-J-1)

Comment: I'm also a customer of Progress Energy. I count on them to provide me, and the members I represent, with reliable power. The Harris plant is an important part of Progress Energy's plan to ensure reliable power at the least expensive cost to me, and other customers.
(HNP-L-2)

Comment: I'm also currently the finance chair of the Board of Directors of Wake Med Health and hospitals. The hospital system cannot operate without safe dependable power. Progress Energy has an unwavering commitment to all of Wake Med's hospitals and patients, that Wake County citizens depend on, every minute of every day.
(HNP-O-6)

Comment: I have the opportunity to serve 16 counties in central and northern North Carolina for Progress Energy. And I also have this opportunity to ensure that our commercial, our industrial, and our residential customers receive the power to their homes, and their businesses. We must make sure that reliable, 24/7 flow of power, is there to meet their needs each and every day. And, especially, for those hospitals, the fire and police departments, and for our industrial customers, often who can't even tolerate a flick within their power flow. So continuous power is needed. The Harris plant is an important, no it is essential, it is an essential part to a balanced solution, to meeting all of our customers needs. So we are applying to renew the Harris plant's operating license because we have responsibility to serve our customers, to ensure they have power today, and for tomorrow.
(HNP-S-1)

Comment: And, in summary, due to the rapid growth in our area, in particular Holly Springs, we are moving in 2.7 families every day. We need Shearon Harris and we need the electricity.
(HNP-T-3)

Comment: As the fourth fastest growing state in America, and the tenth largest state in the country, business needs reliable, affordable, and clean energy, to compete, to create jobs, and drive the continued economic growth of our state. There are many reasons that make our state the envy of most in the country. Maintaining and improving our competitive position, as a state, is the primary mission of the North Carolina Chamber. And the competition to grow jobs, and expand, costs matter. Energy drives North Carolina business, it drives our economy, and creates opportunities for all of us.
(HNP-X-2)

Comment: We have experienced quality sustainable growth that is the envy of many other communities. The local investment by companies, that are moving here, and the jobs that they are creating for our growing population, have done much to enhance the quality of life that all of us appreciate and enjoy. Key to that past growth, and to its sustainability, as we move forward, has been, and will continue to be, an adequate supply of quality power. The ability to meet our electrical demands is critical. If we cannot say, with certainty, that an adequate supply of electrical power is available, we will no longer be able to attract these investments, and new jobs to our area.
(HNP-AA-1)

Comment: Without reading the entire resolution we support the license extension based on renewing the Harris plant's license will ensure Progress Energy can continue to meet the growing Triangle area's need for electricity in a safe, efficient, and affordable manner. The Harris plant provides electricity to more than 55,000 residents, and businesses, in the Triangle.
(HNP-EE-2)

Comment: WHEREAS, renewing the Harris Plant's operating license will help ensure that Progress Energy can continue to provide the electricity needed for the growing Triangle region; and WHEREAS, the Harris Plant supplies power to more than 550,000 residencies and businesses, and provides 12 percent of the total electricity generated by PE Carolinas; and WHEREAS, in 2005, the Harris Plant generated more than 7.9 million megawatt-hours of

electricity, the largest volume in its 18 years of operation; (HNP-KK-1 through OO-1; RR-1 through UU-1)

Comment: WHEREAS, nuclear power helps the United States reduce dependence on unstable foreign energy supplies;
(HNP-KK-4 through OO-4; RR-4 through UU-4)

Comment: WHEREAS, renewing the Harris Plant's operating license will ensure that Progress Energy can continue to provide the electricity needed for the growing Triangle region; and WHEREAS, the Harris Plant supplies power to more than 550,000 residences and businesses, and provides 12 percent of the total electricity generated by PE Carolinas; and WHEREAS, In 2005, the Harris Plant generated more than 7.9 million megawatt-hours of electricity, the largest volume in its 18 years of operation;
(HNP-PP-1; QQ-1)

Comment: Renewing the Harris Plant's operating license will ensure that Progress Energy can continue to provide the electricity needed to fuel the growing Triangle region far into the future. As an organization that is committed to improving the quality of life of residents in the Triangle, the Urban League recognizes that renewing the license at the Harris Plant is also a key part of Progress Energy's balanced solution to meeting the growing energy needs of our region.
(HNP-VV-2)

Response: *The need for power is considered to be outside the scope of license renewal (10 CFR 51.95 (c)(2)). The purpose and need for the proposed action (renewal of an operating license) is to provide an option that allows for power generation capability beyond the term of a current nuclear power plant operating license to meet future system generating needs, as such needs may be determined by State, utility, and where authorized, Federal (other than NRC) decision makers. The comments are outside the scope of the license renewal review; therefore, will not be evaluated further.*

Cost of Power

Comment: We also have an obligation to produce power in a cost effective way. The Harris plant helps Progress Energy do that. We consistently rank high in the industry in this category. And in 2002 and 2005 the Harris plant was the lowest cost energy provided, in dollars per megawatt generated, of any nuclear plant in the country.
(HNP-M-4)

Comment: Nuclear power helps Progress Energy protect customers from price volatility, ensures a reliable supply of energy. We do not need to depend on imported fuels.
(HNP-O-2)

Comment: With the current volatility in the fossil fuels market, we believe that the stable cost of nuclear power has had a positive effect on our local rates with respect to fuel adjustment. Our

members and constituents want continued access to low cost energy, as we see it as necessary to having a growing economy, and the quality of life which we have grown accustomed to.
(HNP-P-2)

Comment: The nuclear power generated at Harris is the lowest cost option, and it produces no greenhouse gases that contribute to global climate change.
(HNP-S-2)

Comment: My company is being asked to compete in a large international market and environment. The game has changed rapidly in the last few years. The cost of electricity is one of the few areas we have an advantage over foreign competition. Electricity is cheaper, and more dependable, in the United States than in overseas locations. We certainly want to retain that cost advantage. Our plants are in rural North Carolina, all manufacturing jobs are meaningful in those areas. For an electrical utility nuclear power is the lowest cost source of generating electricity on a large scale. I wish Progress Energy had more nuclear generated electricity. Without the cost of nuclear generated electricity averaged into the overall cost of all electricity generated by Progress Energy, the cost would force some industrial manufacturing companies to shut their doors, or relocate to areas with competitive electricity costs.
(HNP-BB-1)

Response: *The comments are noted. The economic costs and benefits of renewing an operating license are specifically directed to be outside the scope of license renewal in 10 CFR 51.95(c)(2). The comments provide no new and significant information and, therefore, will not be evaluated further.*

Summary

The preparation of the SEIS for the Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, will take into account all the relevant environmental issues raised during the scoping process that are described above. The draft SEIS will be made available for public comment. Interested Federal, State, and local government agencies, local organizations, and members of the public will be given the opportunity to provide comments to be considered during the development of the final SEIS. Concerns identified that are outside the scope of the staff's environmental review have been or will be forwarded to the appropriate NRC program manager for consideration.