July 22, 2009

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

FROM: Tomeka L. Terry, Environmental Project Manager ***/RA/***
Environmental Projects Branch 2
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews
Office of New Reactors

SUBJECT: SCOPING SUMMARY REPORT RELATED TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING PROCESS FOR THE BELL BEND NUCLEAR POWER PLANT COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

The staff of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) conducted a scoping process, from January 6, 2009 to March 9, 2009, to determine the scope of the NRC staff's environmental review of the combined license application for Bell Bend Nuclear Power Plant (BBNPP). As part of the scoping process, the NRC staff held a public scoping meeting in Berwick, Pennsylvania on January 29, 2009, to solicit public input regarding the scope of the environmental review.

The NRC staff has prepared the enclosed Scoping Summary Report, which identifies comments either received at the public scoping meeting, by letter, or by electronic mail and provides responses to those comments. In accordance with 10 CFR 51.29(b), all participants of the scoping process (who have provided mailing information) will be provided with a copy of the scoping summary report. The transcript of the scoping meeting is publicly available in ADAMS under accession number ML090570419.

The next step in the environmental review process is the issuance of a draft environmental impact statement (EIS) scheduled for April 2010. Notice of the availability of the draft EIS and the procedures for providing comments will be published in an upcoming *Federal Register* Notice.

Docket No.: 52-039

Enclosure: Scoping Summary Report

cc: See next page

CONTACT: Stacey Imboden, DSER/RAP3 301-415-2462
Tomeka Terry, DSER/RAP2 301-415-1488

July 22, 2009

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

FROM: Tomeka L. Terry, Environmental Project Manager ***/RA/***
Environmental Projects Branch 2
Division of Site and Environmental Reviews
Office of New Reactors

SUBJECT: SCOPING SUMMARY REPORT RELATED TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING PROCESS FOR THE BELL BEND NUCLEAR POWER PLANT COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

The staff of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) conducted a scoping process, from January 6, 2009 to March 9, 2009, to determine the scope of the NRC staff's environmental review of the combined license application for Bell Bend Nuclear Power Plant (BBNPP). As part of the scoping process, the NRC staff held a public scoping meeting in Berwick, Pennsylvania on January 29, 2009, to solicit public input regarding the scope of the environmental review.

The NRC staff has prepared the enclosed Scoping Summary Report, which identifies comments either received at the public scoping meeting, by letter, or by electronic mail and provides responses to those comments. In accordance with 10 CFR 51.29(b), all participants of the scoping process (who have provided mailing information) will be provided with a copy of the scoping summary report. The transcript of the scoping meeting is publicly available in ADAMS under accession number ML090570419.

The next step in the environmental review process is the issuance of a draft environmental impact statement (EIS) scheduled for April 2010. Notice of the availability of the draft EIS and the procedures for providing comments will be published in an upcoming *Federal Register* Notice.

Docket No.: 52-039

Enclosure: Scoping Summary Report

cc: See next page

CONTACT: Stacey Imboden, DSER/RAP3
301-415-2462

Tomeka Terry, DSER/RAP2
301-415-1488

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

ADAMS Accession No.: ML091760096

OFFICE	PM:RAP2: DSER:NRO	LA:RAP3: DSER:NRO	PM:RAP2: DSER:NRO	OGC	BC:RAP3: DSER:NRO
NAME	TTerry	EHylton	SImboden	RWeisman (NLO)	RSchaaf
DATE	06/25/2009	06/25/2009	06/25/2009	07/10/2009	07/22/2009

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Memo to Robert G. Schaaf from Tomeka Terry dated ____July 22, 2009___

SUBJECT: SCOPING SUMMARY REPORT RELATED TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING PROCESS FOR THE BELL BEND NUCLEAR POWER PLANT COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC

SImboden, NRO	RSchaaf, NRO	RidsOpaMail	MCanova, NRO
TTerry, NRO	EHylton, NRO	JColaccino, NRO	RidsNroDser
PDoub, NRO	RidsOcaaMailCenter	RAP2 Distribution	RidsNroDserRap1
DScrenci, R1	Rap1 R/F	SBurnell, OPA	RidsRgn1MailCenter
RAP1 Distribution	RENV Distribution	RidsOgcMailCenter	RFuhrmeister, R1
PKrohn, R1	FJaxheimer, Rgn1	BVaidya, NRR	GNewman, R1
BMcDowell, PNNL(bruce.mcdowell@pnl.gov)			RWeisman
KLeigh, PNNL (Kimberly.leigh@pnl.gov)		GDay (Grant.Day@amec.com)	

COL - Bell Bend Mailing List (Revised 7/17/2009)

cc:

Mr. Richard L. Baker
Bechtel Power Corporation
5275 Westview Drive
Frederick, MD 21703-8306

Ms. Michele Boyd
Legislative Director
Energy Program
Public Citizens Critical Mass Energy
and Environmental Program
215 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Ms. Kristen A. Burger
Maryland People's Counsel
6 St. Paul Centre
Suite 2102
Baltimore, MD 21202-1631

Kerry Holton, Tribal President
Delaware Nation
P. O. Box 825
Anadarko, OK 73005

Mr. Carey Fleming, Esquire
Senior Counsel - Nuclear Generation
Constellation Generation Group, LLC
750 East Pratt Street, 17th Floor
Baltimore, MD 21202

Mr. Ray Ganthner
Senior Vice President
AREVA, NP, Inc. 3315
Old Forest Road
P.O. Box 10935
Lynchburg, VA 24506-0935

Terry L. Harpster
GM-Site Development & Design
PPL Nuclear Development LLC
38 Bomboy Lane, Suite 2
Berwick, PA 18603

Mr. Clifford Farides
Mill Memorial Public Library
495 E Main Street
Nanticoke, PA 18634

Ms. Karen Walsh
614 N. Front Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Mr. Max Furek
57 Jeanette Street
Mocanaqua, PA 18655

Mr. Brian Hastings
Public Utility Commission
William B. Travis Building
P.O. Box 13326
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, TX 78701-3326

Mr. Roy Hickok
NRC Technical Training Center
5700 Brainerd Road
Chattanooga, TN 37411-4017

Mr. Norris McDonald
President
AAEA
9903 Caltor Lane
Ft. Washington, MD 20744

Mr. Charles Peterson
Pillsbury, Winthrop, Shaw & Pittman, LLP
2300 "N" Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037

Regional Administrator
Region I
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Mr. Leroy Hess
124 Hess Road
Wapwallopen, PA 18660

Ms. Amy Elliott
US Army Corps of Engineers – Baltimore Dist
1631 So Atherton St, Suite 102
State College, PA 16801

Mr. Rich Miller
McBride Memorial Library
500 N Market Street
Berwick, PA 18603

Mr. Malcolm S. Plevyak
1446 Salem Blvd.
Berwick, PA 18603

Mr. Jack Wirbicki
212 Deer Run Drive
Mountaintop, PA 18707

Ms. Carla Alber
7844 Blue Ridge Trail
Mountaintop, PA 18707

COL - Bell Bend Mailing List
Cc:

Ms. Emily McBracken
494 Mingle Inn Road
Berwick, PA 18603

Mr. Herbert Harmon
32 Stone Church Road
Berwick, PA 18603

Mr. Chuck Henry
1051 Scotch Valley Dr.
Bloomsburg, PA 17815

Mr. John Zadigaka
205 Magtzville Rd
Berwick, PA 18603

Mr. David J. Allard
Director and State Liaison Officer
Department of Environmental Protection
Bureau of Radiation Protection
Rachel Carson State Office Building
400 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Mr. Rich Janati, M.S., Chief
Division of Nuclear Safety
Administrator, Appalachain Compact Commission
Rachel Carson State Office Building
400 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Mr. Don Klima, Director
Office of Federal Agency Programs
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Old Post Office Building
1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 809
Washington, DC 20004

Douglas C. McLearen, Chief
Division of Archaeology & Protection
Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission
Bureau for Historic Preservation
Commonwealth Keystone Building, 2nd Floor
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0093

The Honorable Glenna Wallace, Chief
Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma
P. O. Box 350
Seneca, MO 64865

The Honorable Raymond Halbritter, Nation Rep.
Oneida Indian Nation
5218 Patrick Road
Verona, NY 13478

The Honorable Rick Hill, Chairman
Oneida Nation of Wisconsin
P. O. Box 365
Oneida, WI 54155-0365

Karen Kaniatobe, THPO
Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma
2025 S. Gordon Cooper
Shawnee, OK 74801

Clint Halftown, Heron Clan
Representative
Cayuga Nation
P.O. Box 11
Versailles, NY 14168

Mr. James R. Leigey
Pennsylvania Game Commission
2001 Elmerton Avenue
Harrisburg, PA 17110-9797

Mr. Chris Urban
Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission
450 Robinson Lane
Bellefonte, PA 16823

Mr. Herb Lord
Data Review Specialist
Natural Heritage Program
P.O. Box 404
22 South Clinton Avenue
Trenton, NJ 08625-0404

Ms. Patricia A. Kurkul
Northeast Regional Administrator
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
Northeast Regional Office
55 Great Republic Drive
Gloucester, MA 01930-2298

Mr. David Densmore
Supervisor
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Pennsylvania Field Office
315 South Allen Street, Suite 322
State College, PA 16801-4850

Mr. Eric Davis
Project Leader
New Jersey Field Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
927 North Main Street
Heritage Square, Building D
Pleasantville, NJ 08232

Mr. Maurice A. John, President
Seneca Nation of Indians
P. O. Box 231
Salamanca, NY 14779

The Honorable LeRoy Howard, Chief
Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma
P. O. Box 1283
Miami, OK 74355

The Honorable Ron Sparkman, Chairman
Shawnee Tribe
29 South 69a Highway
Miami OK 74354

Mr. Robert Chicks, Tribal Chairman
Stockbridge-Munsee Band of the
Mohican Nation, Wisconsin
Route 1
P.O. Box 70
Bowler, WI 54416

Mr. Tony Gonyea, Faithkeeper
Onondaga Nation
Rd 11a Box 245
Nedrow, NY 13120

Jim Stout, President
Berwick Historical Society
102 East Second Street
Berwick, PA 18603-4827

The Honorable Leo Henry, Chief
2006 Mt. Hope Road
Tuscarora Nation
Via Lewiston, NY 14092

The Honorable Roger Hill, Chief
Tonawanda Seneca Nation
7027 Meadville Road
Basom, NY 14013

The Honorable James Ransom, Chief
St. Regis Mohawk Tribe
412 State Route 37
Akwesasne, NY 13655

Email

APH@NEI.org (Adrian Heymer)
awc@nei.org (Anne W. Cottingham)
bennettS2@bv.com (Steve A. Bennett)
bob.brown@ge.com (Robert E. Brown)
BrinkmCB@westinghouse.com (Charles Brinkman)
carey.fleming@constellation.com (Carey Fleming)
chris.maslak@ge.com (Chris Maslak)
cwaltman@roe.com (C. Waltman)
dasuper@verizon.net (Dave Superdock)
david.lewis@pillsburylaw.com (David Lewis)
ecullington@earthlink.net (E. Cullington)
greshaja@westinghouse.com (James Gresham)
gzinke@entergy.com (George Alan Zinke)
jgutierrez@morganlewis.com (Jay M. Gutierrez)
jim.riccio@wdc.greenpeace.org (James Riccio)
JJNesrsta@cpsenergy.com (James J. Nesrsta)
John.O'Neill@pillsburylaw.com (John O'Neill)
Joseph_Hegner@dom.com (Joseph Hegner)
KSutton@morganlewis.com (Kathryn M. Sutton)
ktscopelliti@pplweb.com (Karen Scopelliti)
kwaugh@impact-net.org (Kenneth O. Waugh)
lchandler@morganlewis.com (Larry Chandler)
lois@ieer.org (Lois Chalmers)
Marc.Brooks@dhs.gov (Marc Brooks)
maria.webb@pillsburylaw.com (Maria Webb)
mark.beaumont@wsms.com (Mark Beaumont)
matias.travieso-diaz@pillsburylaw.com (Matias Travieso-Diaz)
media@nei.org (Scott Peterson)
mike_moran@fpl.com (Mike Moran)
MSF@nei.org (Marvin Fertel)
nirsnet@nirs.org (Michael Mariotte)
patriciaL.campbell@ge.com (Patricia L. Campbell)
paul.gaukler@pillsburylaw.com (Paul Gaukler)
Paul@beyondnuclear.org (Paul Gunter)
phinnen@entergy.com (Paul Hinnenkamp)
pshastings@duke-energy.com (Peter Hastings)
RJB@NEI.org (Russell Bell)
RKTemple@cpsenergy.com (R.K. Temple)
rrsgarro@pplweb.com (Rocco Sgarro)
sandra.sloan@areva.com (Sandra Sloan)
signs@bellessigns.com (Ryan Search)
sfrantz@morganlewis.com (Stephen P. Frantz)
tkkibler@scana.com (Tria Kibler)
tlharpster@pplweb.com (Terry Harpster)
trsmith@winston.com (Tyson Smith)
Vanessa.quinn@dhs.gov (Vanessa Quinn)
VictorB@bv.com (Bill Victor)
Wanda.K.Marshall@dom.com (Wanda K. Marshall)
executive_director@berwickymca.org (Nick Pajovich)
dbogard@evenlink.com (Deborah Bogard)
kpetock@curtisswright.com (Kelly Petock)
Dzampogna@srbc.net (Damian M. Zampogna)
rmpaley@pplweb.com (Robert M. Paley)
TomPopko@hotmail.com (Tom Popko)

ecology3@gmail.com (Ted Jacobsen)
vincekelly@gmail.com (Vince Kelly)
ruppert125@aol.com (Greg Ruppert)
jmausteller@fnbbank.com (Jeff Mausteller)
NATE@NathanSnavely.com (Nate Snavely)
dsimpson@bloomu.edu (David Simpson)
tmpiquet@bloomu.edu (Tina Piquet)
eschloyer@yahoo.com (Erin Schloyer)
bbusher@state.Pa.us (Brian Busher)
wilburdennisjr@hotmail.com (Wilbur Dennis Jr)
kcarey960@gmail.com (Kyle Carey)
clombard@pa.metrocast.net (Cynthia Lombard)
chebrink@localnet.com (Reverend Chad A. Hebrink)
terrimeighan@msn.com (James E. Meighan)
rgpollock1@yahoo.com (Ralph Pollock)
kaysm@verizon.net (Catherin Stuccio Mentrinkoski)
jh14ferrari@aol.com (John Heim)
djallard@state.pa.us (Dave Allard)

Environmental Impact Statement
Scoping Process

Summary Report

Bell Bend Nuclear Power Plant
Combined License
Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

July 2009

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Rockville, Maryland

Introduction

On October 10, 2008, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) received an application from PPL Bell Bend, LLC (PPL) for a combined license (COL) to construct and operate a new unit at its Bell Bend Nuclear Power Plant (BBNPP) site. The BBNPP site is located west of the existing Susquehanna Steam Electric Station (SSES) site on approximately 882 acres in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania, on the Susquehanna River, approximately five miles northeast of Berwick, Pennsylvania. Revision 1 of the application was submitted on February, 27, 2009.

As part of the application, PPL submitted an environmental report (ER) prepared in accordance with the requirements of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) Part 51 and 10 CFR Part 52. The ER focuses on potential environmental effects from the construction and operation of a new nuclear unit at the BBNPP site. It also includes an evaluation of the environmental consequences of alternatives, including the proposed actions and any mitigating actions that may be taken. NRC regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, are contained in 10 CFR Part 51, Subpart A. In addition, the NRC follows the Council on Environmental Quality regulations to the extent set forth in 10 CFR 51.10 and 10 CFR 51.14(b). NRC regulations related to the environmental review of COL applications are contained in 10 CFR Part 51 and 10 CFR Part 52, Subpart C. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, is cooperating with the NRC for the purpose of complying with NEPA.

The NRC staff is preparing an environmental impact statement (EIS) regarding the PPL application. The proposed action is NRC approval of the PPL application to build and operate a new base-load nuclear power generation facility. The EIS will include an evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposed action and the environmental impacts of alternatives to the proposed action including the no-action alternative, alternatives related to the facility cooling and circulating water systems, and alternatives available for reducing or avoiding adverse environmental effects in accordance with NUREG-1555, *Standard Review Plans for Environmental Reviews for Nuclear Power Plants*. It also will address alternative energy options. Finally, the EIS will include an evaluation of alternative sites to determine if there is an obviously superior alternative to the proposed site. In addition, the staff is conducting a safety review of the PPL combined license application in accordance with NUREG-0800, *Standard Review Plan for the Review of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants*.

On January 6, 2009, in accordance with 10 CFR 51.26, the NRC initiated the scoping process by publishing a Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and Conduct Scoping Process in the *Federal Register* (74 FR 470, January 6, 2009). The Notice of Intent notified the public of the staff's intent to prepare an EIS and conduct scoping for the COL application. Through the notice, the NRC also invited the applicant; Federal, Tribal, State, and local government agencies; local organizations; and individuals to participate in the scoping process by providing oral comments at the public meetings and/or submitting written suggestions and comments no later than March 9, 2009.

The scoping process provides an opportunity for members of the public to participate in identifying issues to be addressed in the EIS and to highlight public concerns and issues. The Notice of Intent identified the following objectives of the scoping process:

- Define the proposed action that is to be the subject of the EIS.
- Determine the scope of the EIS and identify significant issues to be analyzed in depth.
- Identify and eliminate from detailed study those issues which are peripheral or which are not significant.
- Identify any environmental assessments and other EISs that are being prepared or will be prepared that are related to, but not part of, the scope of the EIS being considered.
- Identify other environmental review and consultation requirements related to the proposed action.
- Identify parties consulting with the NRC under the National Historic Preservation Act, as set forth in 36 CFR 800.8(c)(1)(i).
- Indicate the relationship between the timing of the preparation of the environmental analyses and the Commission's tentative planning and decision-making schedule.
- Identify any cooperating agencies and, as appropriate, allocate assignments for preparation and schedules for completing the EIS to the NRC and any cooperating agencies.
- Describe how the EIS will be prepared and identify any contractor assistance to be used.

The public scoping meeting was held at the Berwick Area Senior High School in Berwick, Pennsylvania, on January 29, 2009. The NRC announced the meeting in local newspapers (the *Press-Enterprise*, the *Standard-Speaker*, and the *Times Leader*), and issued press releases. Approximately 145 members of the public attended the scoping meeting. The scoping meeting began with NRC staff members providing a brief overview of the NRC's review process for COL applications and the NEPA process. After the NRC's prepared statements, the meeting was opened for public comments. Twenty-one scoping meeting attendees provided either written statements or oral comments 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 February 24, 2009. The meeting summary and transcripts are available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly Available Records component of NRC's Agency Document Access and Management System (ADAMS) under accession number ML090440489. ADAMS is accessible from the NRC website at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html (the Public Electronic Reading Room) (note that the URL is case-sensitive).

At the conclusion of the scoping period, the NRC staff and its contractors reviewed the transcript of the scoping meeting and all written material received and identified individual comments. In addition, eight letters and five emails containing comments were received during the scoping

period. All comments and suggestions received orally during the scoping meeting or in writing were considered by the NRC staff.

Table 1 identifies the individuals providing comments in alphabetical order; their affiliation, if given; the ADAMS accession number that can be used to locate the correspondence; and the correspondence identification number (ID) used in Table 2 to identify individual comments. Accession numbers indicate the location of the written comments in ADAMS.

Table 1. Individuals Providing Comments During the Comment Period

Commenter	Affiliation (if stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession #	Correspondence ID
Baker, Elisabeth (Lisa)	Senate of Pennsylvania	Letter (ML090440081)	0008
Belles, Donnie	Belles Signs & Designs	Letter (ML090440082)	0009
Bershline, Roy		Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0018
Bodnar, Steve		Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0012
Bogard, Deborah		Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0018
Cleary, Jim		Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0012
Creasy, David	EAM Mosca Corp	Email (ML090690086)	0014
Creasy, David		Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0012
Creasy, Mary		Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0012
Davenport, Bill		Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0012
Eachus, Todd	House of Representatives, PA	Letter (ML090290058)	0005
Epstein, Eric		Letter (ML090650459)	0015
Fatula, Ken		Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0012
Hartman, Cindy	Luzerne County Planning Commission	Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0012
Hess, Leroy		Letter (ML090500380)	0016
Hess, Leroy		Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0018
Janati, Rich	Department of Environmental Protection	Email (ML091030556)	0017

Table 1. (continued)

Commenter	Affiliation (if stated)	Comment Source and ADAMS Accession #	Correspondence ID
Kowalski, Daniel	Newport Township Fire Dept	Letter (ML090350113)	0007
McGinnis, Joy	Berwick Area United Way	Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0012
Metzger, Marvin		Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0012
Musto, Raphael	Senate of Pennsylvania	Letter (ML090290059)	0006
Pajovich, Nick	Berwick Area YMCA	Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0012
Phillips, Stephen	Berwick Industrial Development Association (BIDA)	Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0012
Search, Ryan	Belles Signs Company	Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0012
Siecko, Joseph		Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0012
Snavely, Nate		Email (ML090410139)	0004
Soberick, Bill		Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0012
Stilp, Gene		Email (ML090680546)	0013
Stilp, Gene		Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0012
Superdock, Dave		Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0012
Walsh, Karen	PA Energy Alliance	Email (ML090330085)	0003
Walsh, Karen	PA Energy Alliance	Meeting Transcript (ML090440109)	0018
Yudichak, John	House of Representatives, PA	Letter (ML090440083)	0010

Comments were consolidated and categorized according to topic within the proposed EIS or according to the general topic if outside the scope of the EIS. 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 response for the comment. Table 2 lists the comment categories in alphabetical order with commenter names and comment identification numbers assigned to each category of comments. The comment categories are listed in Table 3 in the order in which they are presented in this report.

Table 2. Comment Categories with Associated Commenters and Comment IDs

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
Accidents - Severe	• Creasy, David (0012-30) • Stilp, Gene (0012-80) (0013-22) (0013-27)
Alternatives - Energy	• Fatula, Ken (0012-33) • Stilp, Gene (0012-76)
Benefit-Cost Balance	• Bodnar, Steve (0012-58) • Creasy, David (0014-6) • Stilp, Gene (0013-21) • Walsh, Karen (0003-4)
Cumulative Impacts	• Janati, Rich (0017-8) • Stilp, Gene (0013-2) (0013-4) (0013-10)
Decommissioning	• Creasy, Mary (0012-18) (0012-23) (0012-24) • Fatula, Ken (0012-37) • Stilp, Gene (0013-24) (0013-30)
Ecology - Aquatic	• Janati, Rich (0017-7) (0017-9) (0017-10) • Stilp, Gene (0013-15)
Ecology - Terrestrial	• Stilp, Gene (0012-77)
Environmental Justice	• McGinnis, Joy (0012-71) • Pajovich, Nick (0012-65)
Geology	• Stilp, Gene (0013-34)
Health - Radiological	• Bogard, Deborah (0018-9) • Creasy, David (0012-26) (0014-2) (0014-3) (0014-4) • Fatula, Ken (0012-31) (0012-32) • Stilp, Gene (0012-2) (0012-3) (0012-4) (0012-8) (0012-81) (0013-11) (0013-12) (0013-31) • Superdock, Dave (0012-49)
Hydrology - Groundwater	• Davenport, Bill (0012-17) • Janati, Rich (0017-11)
Hydrology - Surface Water	• Janati, Rich (0017-1) (0017-3) (0017-4) (0017-6) • Stilp, Gene (0012-7) (0012-78) (0013-3) (0013-7) (0013-9) (0013-13) (0013-16) (0013-18)
Land Use - Site and Vicinity	• Janati, Rich (0017-2)
Land Use - Transmission Lines	• Stilp, Gene (0013-17)

Table 2. (continued)

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
Meteorology and Air Quality	• Hess, Leroy (0016-2) (0018-6) • Stilp, Gene (0012-6) (0012-79) (0012-82) (0013-6) (0013-19)
Need for Power	• Baker, Elisabeth (Lisa) (0008-2) • Bodnar, Steve (0012-54) • Eachus, Todd (0005-1) • Musto, Raphael (0006-2) • Walsh, Karen (0003-2) (0018-2) (0018-4) • Yudichak, John (0010-2)
Opposition - Licensing Process	• Creasy, Mary (0012-25) • Stilp, Gene (0012-5) (0013-1) (0013-29)
Opposition - Nuclear Power	• Creasy, David (0012-29) • Stilp, Gene (0012-1) (0012-11)
Opposition - Plant	• Stilp, Gene (0012-10) (0013-35)
Outside Scope - Emergency Preparedness	• Bogard, Deborah (0018-8) • Creasy, Mary (0012-22) • Kowalski, Daniel (0007-2) • Soberick, Bill (0012-67) • Stilp, Gene (0013-33)
Outside Scope - Miscellaneous	• Epstein, Eric (0015-1) • Stilp, Gene (0013-14)
Outside Scope - NRC Oversight	• Cleary, Jim (0012-42) • Stilp, Gene (0013-8)
Outside Scope - Safety	• McGinnis, Joy (0012-69) • Stilp, Gene (0012-9) (0013-23)
Outside Scope - Security and Terrorism	• Cleary, Jim (0012-46) • Creasy, Mary (0012-21) • Stilp, Gene (0013-25) (0013-32)
Process - COL	• Hess, Leroy (0016-1) • Janati, Rich (0017-5)

Table 2. (continued)

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
Socioeconomics	• Baker, Elisabeth (Lisa) (0008-3) • Belles, Donnie (0009-2) • Bodnar, Steve (0012-51) • Bogard, Deborah (0018-10) • Cleary, Jim (0012-44) (0012-45) • Eachus, Todd (0005-2) • Hess, Leroy (0016-3) • McGinnis, Joy (0012-70) • Musto, Raphael (0006-3) • Pajovich, Nick (0012-64) (0012-66) • Phillips, Stephen (0012-12) (0012-13) (0012-14) • Search, Ryan (0012-39) • Siecko, Joseph (0012-62) • Snavely, Nate (0004-1) (0004-3) • Stilp, Gene (0013-5) • Yudichak, John (0010-3)
Support - Licensing Action	• Baker, Elisabeth (Lisa) (0008-1) (0008-5) • Bershline, Roy (0018-11) • Fatula, Ken (0012-38) • Kowalski, Daniel (0007-1) (0007-5) • McGinnis, Joy (0012-72) • Metzger, Marvin (0012-59) • Musto, Raphael (0006-4) • Walsh, Karen (0003-1) (0018-1) • Yudichak, John (0010-1) (0010-4)
Support - Nuclear Power	• Belles, Donnie (0009-3) • Bodnar, Steve (0012-53) (0012-55) • Kowalski, Daniel (0007-4) • Metzger, Marvin (0012-61) • Search, Ryan (0012-40) • Soberick, Bill (0012-68) • Superdock, Dave (0012-48) • Walsh, Karen (0003-3) (0018-3)
Support - Plant	• Baker, Elisabeth (Lisa) (0008-4) • Belles, Donnie (0009-1) • Bodnar, Steve (0012-52) (0012-56) • Cleary, Jim (0012-41) (0012-43) • Fatula, Ken (0012-36) • Kowalski, Daniel (0007-3) • Metzger, Marvin (0012-60) • Musto, Raphael (0006-1) • Pajovich, Nick (0012-63) • Phillips, Stephen (0012-15) • Snavely, Nate (0004-2) • Walsh, Karen (0003-5) (0018-5)

Table 2. (continued)

Comment Category	Commenter (Comment ID)
Transportation	• Creasy, Mary (0012-20) • Fatula, Ken (0012-35)
Uranium Fuel Cycle	• Bodnar, Steve (0012-57) • Bogard, Deborah (0018-7) • Creasy, David (0012-27) (0012-28) (0014-1) (0014-5) • Creasy, Mary (0012-19) • Davenport, Bill (0012-16) • Fatula, Ken (0012-34) • Hartman, Cindy (0012-47) • Janati, Rich (0017-12) (0017-13) • McGinnis, Joy (0012-73) • Stilp, Gene (0012-74) (0012-75) (0013-20) (0013-26) (0013-28) • Superdock, Dave (0012-50)

Table 3. Comment Categories in Order as Presented in This Report

1.	Comments Concerning Process - COL
2.	Comments Concerning Land Use - Transmission Lines
3.	Comments Concerning Meteorology and Air Quality
4.	Comments Concerning Geology
5.	Comments Concerning Hydrology - Surface Water
6.	Comments Concerning Hydrology - Groundwater
7.	Comments Concerning Ecology - Terrestrial
8.	Comments Concerning Ecology - Aquatic
9.	Comments Concerning Socioeconomics
10.	Comments Concerning Environmental Justice
11.	Comments Concerning Health - Radiological
12.	Comments Concerning Accidents - Severe
13.	Comments Concerning the Uranium Fuel Cycle
14.	Comments Concerning Transportation
15.	Comments Concerning Decommissioning
16.	Comments Concerning Cumulative Impacts
17.	Comments Concerning the Need for Power
18.	Comments Concerning Alternatives - Energy
19.	Comments Concerning Benefit-Cost Balance
20.	General Comments in Support of the Licensing Action
21.	General Comments in Support of Nuclear Power
22.	General Comments in Support of the Existing Plant
23.	General Comments in Opposition to the Licensing Process
24.	General Comments in Opposition to Nuclear Power
25.	General Comments in Opposition to the Existing Plant
26.	Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Emergency Preparedness
27.	Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Miscellaneous
28.	Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - NRC Oversight
29.	Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Safety
30.	Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Security and Terrorism

BBNPP Combined License
Public Scoping Comments and Responses

The comments and suggestions received as part of the scoping process are summarized and discussed below. Parenthetical numbers after each comment refer to the Comment Identification (ID) number (correspondence number-comment number) and the commenter name. Comments are grouped by category.

The draft EIS will take into account the relevant issues raised during the scoping process, and it will be made available for public comment. The comment period for the draft EIS will offer the next opportunity for members of the public, interested Federal, Tribal, State, and local government agencies, local organizations, and the applicant to provide input to the NRC's environmental review process. The comments received on the draft EIS will be considered in the preparation of the final EIS. The final EIS, along with the staff's Safety Evaluation Report, will be considered in the NRC's decision on PPL's COL application for the BBNPP site.

1. Comments Concerning Process - COL

Comment: I don't think the hearing for increasing the output of the present reactor or the application for a permit to construct a third reactor were properly advertised. The hearing for the increased output was never in the local newspaper (Press Enterprise) and the meeting for the public input on the application for the third reactor was listed on the inside in a small notation. Most of the local citizens don't get a daily paper. It was never advertised on the TV or radio news. I mentioned it in church the following Sunday and no one knew about it. Something as important as this should have been well advertised so all the local population could have input in the decision. (**0016-1** [Hess, Leroy])

Response*: The NRC staff used a number of methods to inform the public about the scoping meeting. The "Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and Conduct Scoping Process" was published in the Federal Register on January 6, 2009. In addition, public notice was provided through local newspaper ads and public service announcements, as well as on the NRC website. The staff appreciates the concern raised by the commenters and will continue to look for ways to improve public notification of these meetings.*

2. Comments Concerning Land Use - Transmission Lines

Comment: The scoping document must also include the environmental aspects associated with any and all new power lines that go to and from the plant including the current proposed line to New Jersey. (**0013-17** [Stilp, Gene])

Response*: Environmental impacts associated with any planned new transmission lines and rights-of-way will be addressed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS. The transmission lines associated with the proposed BBNPP are located entirely within the Bell Bend site. The NRC does not have any regulatory authority regarding the implementation of Federal, State, and local guidelines in the siting, construction, and maintenance of other proposed transmission corridors and lines. The proposed Susquehanna-Roseland line will be constructed regardless of whether the BBNPP is constructed and is not considered a connected action under NEPA.*

3. Comments Concerning Meteorology and Air Quality

Comment: I have reservations about adding another reactor and cooling tower. I already have enough problems with the present cooling towers from the steam vapor emited into the atmosphere. It is like having an irrigation system that you can't turn off. I have a farm approximately 3 miles east of the present plant. I have a lot of problems trying to dry any crops like corn, soy beans, hay and wheat. The house siding gets solid mildew. It was always bad but last summer (2008) was the worst after they increased the output of steam from cooling tower (No. 1). Now they want to increase the output from cooling tower (No.2). If they add a third reactor & cooling tower the situation will only get worse. If it were me emiting something into the atmosphere they would have me shut down immediately. A lot of days the vapor completely blocks out the sun all day. It probably was a poor location for this plant because of the mountain terrain. The steam clouds form over the valley that is like a box canyon and it [is] there all day. (**0016-2**, **0018-6** [Hess, Leroy])

***Response**: The commenter expresses his concern that additional steam plume from the BBNPP cooling towers will compound an impact to his crops that he attributes to plumes from the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station (SSES) cooling towers. The NRC staff will evaluate impacts associated with the proposed cooling towers associated with BBNPP, including the cumulative impact of adding two additional cooling towers next to the existing SSES cooling towers. The evaluation will be summarized in Chapter 5 of the EIS. Cumulative Impacts will be discussed in Chapter 7 of the EIS.*

Comment: Environmentally, we have to look at the air (**0012-6** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: [W]e think of the traditional items in the scoping document, the air, the water, the fauna and foliage, whatever that is, the animals and plants also have to be studied. Interestingly enough, I never saw any animals evacuated during a nuclear emergency. Anyhow, that whole aspect has to be studied also. (**0012-79** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: The entire project can have a major impact on the air quality from the first reaction to the last half life of the waste products. This issue is bound up with all aspects of nuclear production from mine to transport to utilization to waste storage and the air aspect from normal operation to accident mode has to be addressed. (**0013-26** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: The NRC staff will evaluate air quality impacts from construction and operation of the BBNPP in Chapters 4 and 5, respectively, of the EIS.*

Comment: Your scoping documents shouldn't be limited to the Berwick area or across the river. Which way does the wind blow? Does it blow through Hazle or Mountain Top? All those communities have to be involved too in this scoping document if your prevailing winds are mostly that way. And what about your percentage of the time the winds are blowing some other way? So the scope should not be just left to the immediate area. (**0012-82** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: The NRC staff will examine both onsite and regional meteorological averages and extremes, including severe weather phenomena and air quality conditions. Results from the meteorological evaluation will be presented in Chapter 2 of the EIS.*

Comment: The one hundred yea[r]/five hundred year weather predictors must be considered. (**0013-6** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: Following the Standard Review Plans for Environmental Reviews for Nuclear Power Plants (NUREG-1555), the NRC staff will include in the draft EIS a discussion of the severe weather phenomena (e.g., tornadoes, hurricanes, thunderstorms, atmospheric stagnation episodes) experienced in the region with expected frequencies of occurrence and measured extremes of parameters, such as temperature and precipitation. The information will be presented in Chapter 2 of the EIS.*

Comment: The scoping document must include long term weather and climate projections. What will the weather be like twenty, thirty years or fifty years out? I know: the NRC will just change the rules like it has in the past to accommodate the industry. (**0013-19** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: The NRC staff will evaluate the implications of the local climatology on the proposed action during its evaluation of the COL application, and a discussion of the pertinent aspects of the local climatology will be presented in Chapter 2 of the EIS. Potential downwind impacts from construction and operation for the proposed site will be considered in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

4. Comments Concerning Geology

Comment: The EIS scoping document must produce updated information on seismic activity for the area. The old studies done forty years ago with outdated methodology cannot be the main source of information for the new EIS. The NRC must employ the most updated methodologies to ascertain the seismic conditions that exist around the plant and the effects of seismic activity at relevant distances as they relate to shaking activity and its affect on the proposed plant and existing plants. These studies must also look into the future because the waste must be stored on site for who know how long and seismic activity can affect waste storage. What time frame should be used? Let us start with at least a century. After all, the region is still dealing with the coal strippings and abandoned mines from the middle of the nineteenth century. Why not look ahead. (**0013-34** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: Seismic hazards are outside the scope of the environmental review. As part of the NRC's site safety review, the staff considers whether, taking into consideration the site criteria in 10 CFR Part 100 and information provided by the applicant, the proposed reactor can be constructed and operated without undue risk to the health and safety of the public.*

5. Comments Concerning Hydrology - Surface Water

Comment: Environmentally, we have to look at...the water (**0012-7** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: [W]e think of the traditional items in the scoping document, the air, the water, the fauna and foliage, whatever that is, the animals and plants also have to be studied. Interestingly enough, I never saw any animals evacuated during a nuclear emergency**.** (**0012-78** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: The NRC staff will assess consumptive water use and water quality impacts from operation of the proposed facility. The results will be described in Chapter 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: Also, the document must include a complete study of all other proposed power plants by all companies along the length of the Susquehanna River. Manufacturing facilities must also be studied for present and future demand on the river's resources. The study must

include the entire watershed of the Susquehanna from the river inception to its conclusion. (**0013-3** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: All river activities must be considered from drinking water use, to sewage use to fishing and boating use, to agricultural use, to tourism use, to industrial use, etc. Streams impacts must also be studied. Above ground and below ground stream and well implications must be studied. (**0013-9** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: All water sources that the population with fifty miles of the plant depends on have to be considered. (**0013-13** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: Water issues also have to consider the already impacted and dead streams that are the result of coal mining and acid mine drainage waste that already impact the entire region. (**0013-18** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: The NRC staff will consider present and known future surface-water uses (withdrawals, consumption, and returns) that are within the BBNPP site's hydrological system and that may affect or be affected by the plant. The NRC staff will also consider present and known future groundwater withdrawals on the site and for distances great enough to cover aquifers that may be adversely affected by the facility. Results of the cumulative impact analyses will be presented in Chapter 7 of the EIS.*

Comment: The Susquehanna River Basin Commission must be a full party to any scoping document. If the SRBC does not initiate comments, the NRC must approach and include the SRBC research and analysis of the future condition of the watershed in its decision making process and also the history of the actions by PPL in relation to the Susquehanna River and the SRBC. (**0013-7** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: The NRC held a site audit with the applicant the week of April 27, 2009, in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, to review the applicant's Environmental Report and to tour the site. The Susquehanna River Basin Commission (SRBC) staff attended the NRC audit. SRBC staff provided information to the NRC staff regarding the SRBC water withdrawal permit process and SRBC reports. Because the SRBC is the primary regulatory authority for water withdrawals from the Susquehanna River, the NRC staff will work closely with the SRBC during preparation of the EIS.*

Comment: All documents from NOAA must be considered as they relate to water and storm activity and water availability and quality. (**0013-16** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: The applicant's Final Safety Analysis Report (Part 2 of the application) and the NRC's Safety Evaluation Report will evaluate storm activity, precipitation depths/rates, and flooding potentials at the site. Water-use and water quality impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed BBNPP will be evaluated by the NRC staff, and results will be presented in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS. Chapter 2 of the EIS will provide a description of the environment potentially impacted by the proposed facility. Information to be used during the COL review will include documents obtained from NOAA and other State and Federal Agencies to the extent necessary to characterize the BBNPP site.*

Comment: The proposed transmission line to transport sewage from the Bell Bend facility should be sized to handle flows from both the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station (SSES) and

the Bell Bend facility, should SSES decide to terminate the existing Outfall 079 river discharge in the future. (**0017-1** [Janati, Rich])

Comment: Act 537 Planning approval for the facility's sewage is needed. Since Berwick is located in the North Central Region of DEP, that regional office will need to be contacted for that approval. (**0017-2** [Janati, Rich])

***Response**: The NRC staff will assess nonradioactive waste systems resulting from operation of the proposed facility. This assessment includes sanitary system effluents. The results will be presented in Chapter 3 of the EIS.*

Comment: The application did not identify the need to obtain a Water Quality Management Permit for the industrial wastewater treatment facilities that will be constructed to treat the wastewater before it is discharged to the Susquehanna River. (**0017-3** [Janati, Rich])

***Response**: Because the State of Pennsylvania is the primary regulatory authority over water quality, the NRC staff will work closely with Pennsylvania state agencies during the EIS review. In Section 1.3.2 of the Environmental Report, the applicant identified the need to obtain permits from the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection for water quality, stormwater discharge, and industrial wastewater treatment and discharge. Table 1.3-1 of the applicant's Environmental Report identifies the various environmentally related authorizations from Federal, State, and local authorities for the proposed action. The NRC staff will review this list to ensure it is complete.*

Comment: A detailed evaluation of the combined thermal effects of both the SSES and the proposed Bell Bend discharge will need to be included in the NPDES application. (**0017-4** [Janati, Rich])

***Response**: The NRC staff will consider water quality impacts resulting from construction and operation of the proposed facility on the Susquehanna River, including temperature (thermal) effects. Results will be presented in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS. The staff will consider cumulative water quality impacts from the proposed BBNPP and SSES, Units 1 and 2, including the effect described in the comment in Chapter 7 of the EIS.*

Comment: The application states that the closest impaired water body to the proposed project is the Little Nescopeck Creek. The closest 2008 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment report listed impaired water body is the Susquehanna River. (**0017-6** [Janati, Rich])

***Response**: The comment is noted. Water quality impacts of construction and operation of the plant will be evaluated by the NRC staff. Assessment results will be documented in Chapters 4, 5, and 7 of the EIS.*

Comment: The application does not include all of the detailed information that is required to determine if the project will conform to all Water Management Program requirements. (**0017-5** [Janati, Rich])

***Response**: This comment relates to approvals required for operating the BBNPP. The comment provides no information on environmental impacts of the proposed action and will not be evaluated further.*

6. Comments Concerning Hydrology - Groundwater

Comment: Another concern is when they were doing the test boring back at the site and I haven't been there, I only know this from people that were doing the boring and have talked, they've practically hit underground rivers which are just lots and lots of water, what's flowing our way. Water flows downhill. I'm concerned about building where our water table can be that disruptive. (**0012-17** [Davenport, Bill])

***Response**: The movement of groundwater under the BBNPP site, as well as the planned groundwater monitoring systems, will be described in Chapter 2 of the EIS. The effects of the construction and operation of the plant on the local and regional groundwater hydrology will be evaluated in Chapters 4 and 5.*

Comment: The application describes the pre-application hydrological monitoring program that will be implemented at the BBNPP site, including installations of groundwater (GW) monitoring wells. It is recommended that the applicant continue to maintain the existing wells, following the completion of the pre-construction phase, and for the purpose of future GW monitoring. The applicant should also make a commitment to develop and maintain a GW Monitoring and Protection Program, during plant operations, to comply with the industry's GW Protection Initiative. (**0017-11** [Janati, Rich])

***Response**: At this time, NRC regulations do not explicitly require the monitoring of onsite groundwater during plant operation. However, Section 6.2.7 of the applicant's Environmental Report, Revision 1, related to the Radiological Environmental Monitoring Program states that the program will include "The addition of eight new on-site well water sampling locations to monitor for potential leaks from plant facilities which could impact ground water." The Nuclear Energy Institute's "Groundwater Protection Initiative" (NEI 07-07) identifies actions to implement a groundwater protection program, but at the present time it is not an NRC requirement and compliance is voluntary. The applicant has stated in Section 6.5.2.3 of the ER that they will continue to follow development of the NEI initiative and address future requirements as applicable.*

7. Comments Concerning Ecology - Terrestrial

Comment: ...we think of the traditional items in the scoping document, the air, the water, the fauna and foliage, whatever that is, the animals and plants also have to be studied. (**0012-77** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: The impacts of construction and operation of the proposed BBNPP on the terrestrial environment will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, respectively, of the EIS.*

8. Comments Concerning Ecology - Aquatic

Comment: All PA Department of Conservation and Natural Resources documents must be consulted. The effect of the thermal aspects of the water returning to the river is a major consideration. The effects on the fish and water wildlife from a new reactor in addition to the operation of the old reactors must be studied. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's existing water and stream knowledge and all documents available from that source must be considered. (**0013-15** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: The NRC staff is coordinating the review of impacts of the proposed BBNPP with numerous State and Federal agencies, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission, and the Pennsylvania Game Commission. This coordination includes periodic meetings with the NRC staff and the applicant. The impacts of the construction and operation will be considered in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS, respectively.*

Comment: There is an issue with Walker Run, with wild trout being found in a stream not on the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission's wild trout list. If the stream is reclassified, there is the potential that we will have to deal with EV wetlands. Current project design calls for a section of this stream to be relocated and piped. (**0017-10** [Janati, Rich])

Comment: Stream habitat assessment should be included in the measurement of success for the comparison of the natural stream design sections to the reference stream sections. (**0017-7** [Janati, Rich])

***Response**: The EIS analysis will use the most recently available information about aquatic biota and water quality to characterize the existing conditions in the vicinity of the BBNPP site and to analyze potential impacts from the project on the aquatic ecosystem in Walker Run and in the Susquehanna River. Existing conditions will be described in Chapter 2 of the EIS. The impacts of construction and operation will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, respectively. The cumulative impacts of construction and operation will be presented in Chapter 7 of the EIS*.

Comment: There are issues related to filling the wetlands which may have a large impact on the project. Wetland replacement may be an issue. (**0017-9** [Janati, Rich])

***Response**: The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, as part of its conduct of the 404 permitting program, and the NRC staff will evaluate the impact of the construction and operation of the BBNPP on wetlands located onsite and along the Susquehanna River. Wetlands will be described in Chapter 2 and impacts to wetlands due to construction will be described in Chapter 4. The NRC's responsibility under NEPA is to provide an analysis of potential impacts related to the proposed action, to evaluate alternatives, and to suggest mitigation if deemed necessary. Approval of other Federal and State permits associated with the proposed new nuclear unit and any requirements for mitigating actions will be the responsibility of the permitting agencies.*

9. Comments Concerning Socioeconomics

Comment: I am very excited about the future economic benefits to my business and to my family directly relating to the Bell Bend project (**0004-1** [Snavely, Nate])

Comment: In addition the proposed Bell Bend nuclear unit would create thousands of construction jobs and hundreds of new permanent jobs, which would benefit the economic health of this area and the surrounding region. I have found that PPL and its employees support the community in many ways. A new nuclear unit would create a significant ripple effect throughout the local economy that will help the housing market, retail businesses and service providers such as restaurants and hotels. We need new sources of electric generation for northeastern Pennsylvania to grow and prosper. (**0006-3** [Musto, Raphael])

Comment: Ensuring the availability of abundant and affordable energy is vital to a healthy economy and to attracting and retaining new industry. This facility will address these needs

directly and locally by creating thousands of new construction jobs in the near term and over time, hundreds of highly skilled, permanent jobs that will positively impact the local housing market, retail businesses, restaurants, and other establishments in Salem Township and the surrounding area. (**0008-3** [Baker, Elisabeth (Lisa)])

Comment: Belles Signs strongly feels that the proposed Bell Bend Unit would not only create much needed employment in this area, but it will attract more business to our local retail stores, restaurants, and boost the housing market in these dire of economic conditions that we are currently going through. (**0009-2** [Belles, Donnie])

Comment: In addition, the Bell Bend project would create over 4,000 construction jobs and 400 new permanent jobs, providing a significant economic boost to our region. (**0010-3** [Yudichak, John])

Comment: They [PPL] provide good jobs. And they're willing to expand and have a project that will bring in hundreds of jobs to the local area and the effect in the economy. So I just say let them do it. Let's go. We need the power and we need the jobs. (**0012-45** [Cleary, Jim])

Comment: BIDA [Berwick Industrial Development Association] is the premiere economic development agency serving the greater Berwick area. Historically, PPL and its predecessor companies have been strong allies of the economic development community. BIDA and its sister economic development organizations in the greater Berwick area have been recipients of assistance from PPL in numerous ways, including, but not limited to marketing aid, direct financial contributions to help underwrite the cost of administering a conference of economic and community development programs and construction of an industrial shell building. (**0012-12** [Phillips, Stephen])

Comment: Belles Signs strongly feels that the proposed Bell Bend unit would not only create much needed employment in this area, but it will attract more business to our local retail stores, restaurants, and boost the housing market in these dire of economic conditions that we are currently experiencing. (**0012-39** [Search, Ryan])

Comment: our Chambers of Commerce is out there trying to scrounge up employers coming in here who will bring in new businesses and maybe they're going to bring in 50 jobs or 100 jobs. And here we have an employer who has proven them to be good corporate citizens. (**0012-44** [Cleary, Jim])

Comment: I've worked for a lot of guys in the power plant and honestly, if it wasn't for the power plant, this community would be -- it would be here, but we'd be very short of jobs. One thing is when the new plant comes in; there will be a lot of jobs coming up. The people that work at the plant now, where will they be if this plant does get shut down? (**0012-51** [Bodnar, Steve])

Comment: PPL is an economic -- has an economic impact in our area. It employs over one thousand people and in an outage time, almost 1500. It is the largest payer of school taxes. It pays to the Berwick Area School District -- $2,769,000 is paid to the Berwick Area School District. If they were not there, calculating everything, our school taxes would be 20 percent higher. (**0012-62** [Siecko, Joseph])

Comment: And as I sit back and think about it, you know, it's easy to categorize PPL as this corporate entity, but you know, they're not. They're our neighbors, they're our friends, and I believe it was Mr. Fatula who said something that was really profound and really true. They don't want to die any more than we do. I believe and trust in them with my family's safety. I think they do a tremendous job up there. I have no reason to believe that if the third reactor went in, they wouldn't continue to do a tremendous job. I have no reason not to believe that there wouldn't be even more employees involved in our communities. The economic impact, too, it's easy to categorize that as money, and it's easy to say that money wins, but money is something that our community desperately needs. (**0012-64** [Pajovich, Nick])

Comment: It is true they are in business to make money. Well, you know, we all are. In the United States, we live under a capitalist society and capitalism is a reality. They shouldn't be faulted for that. They should be applauded for that, because again, the best way you can help a community, the best way you can contribute is to have the financial resources to do that. PPL has done that. They've proven it time and time again and I believe with all my heart the community will be a stronger, better community if Bell Bend becomes a reality. (**0012-66** [Pajovich, Nick])

Comment: As Nick [Pajovich, CEO of Berwick Area YMCA] said, there is not a nonprofit in this area that has not benefitted from the abilities that they bring to this community and to the time that they're willing to give to the nonprofits in this area. This community is made better and stronger because of PPL. (**0012-70** [McGinnis, Joy])

Comment: Furthermore, this facility will create an estimated 4,000 construction jobs and 400 permanent jobs to operate and maintain the plant, which is vital in the current economic climate. To that end, I am requesting your full support of their application. (**0005-2** [Eachus, Todd])

Comment: PPL's current workforce of approximately 1100 persons is a key component of the Berwick area's economic base. Those employees are among the highest compensated in the entire region. The payroll generated in the greater Berwick area would be the envy of many other locales. The proposed 400 to 500 positions expected to be created by the proposed third reactor will add substantial economic benefit to the greater Berwick area. (**0012-13** [Phillips, Stephen])

***Response**: These comments relate to socioeconomic issues and anticipated economic benefits that will accrue to the local community from future BBNPP construction and operation. Socioeconomic impacts of the proposed action will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: Lastly, the outdoor recreational opportunities of the area have been greatly enhanced with the Susquehanna Riverlands recreation area and Council Cup - both crown jewels of our region. (**0004-3** [Snavely, Nate])

***Response**: The comment is related to socioeconomic impacts, specifically tourism, recreation, or historic appeal. Public services involving tourism and recreation will be discussed in Chapter 2 of the EIS.*

Comment: The current facility underwrites approximately 20 percent of the tax revenue generated by the Berwick area school district. Construction of the anticipated new facility will certainly greatly increase the existing tax revenue. Without this tax revenue, the burden on

other property owners would greatly increase. No one could dispute the fact that the utility has been a good corporate citizen. It's contributions in both the monetary and personnel sense to area municipalities have been well documented. (**0012-14** [Phillips, Stephen])

Comment: I am sure PP&L knows all about it but they choose to do nothing. PP&L bought a lot of property in Conyngham Twp. and bull-dozed all the buildings taking them off the local tax base. We are left to make up the taxes (loss) with no consideration locally. The power plant is in Salem Twp. (**0016-3** [Hess, Leroy])

Comment: When is PPL going to contribute their 'fair share' toward school taxes? (**0018-10** [Bogard, Deborah])

***Response**: The EIS will evaluate the expected economic impacts of construction and operation activities including any local purchasing of construction and production inputs, local and in-migrating labor, local spending of earnings, and tax revenues generated by local purchasing activities or from changes in real property assessments. The evaluation will include both Conyngham and Salem Townships. The information will be presented in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: The population growth, density, and affiliated infrastructure must also be considered in the immediate radius of the plant and beyond. (**0013-5** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: These comments briefly identify potential socioeconomic impacts on the community and local municipalities of plant construction and operation, including the fiscal impact of monetary investments required to maintain the community infrastructure. These topics will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS.*

10. Comments Concerning Environmental Justice

Comment: In my capacity to lead our YMCA, I see the poverty in our community. Four in ten kids in our school district live below the poverty level, folks, and that's real. That's not a made-up statistic. I see the kids we help at the Y. I see the kids that other agencies, I believe I've heard the Boy Scouts mentioned. But the fact is there's not one nonprofit in our community that isn't touched by PPL whether it's in terms of time, in terms of finances, in terms of expertise. And quite honestly, we couldn't operate without them. They are that important and that significant. (**0012-65** [Pajovich, Nick])

Comment: As CEO of Berwick Area United Way, we are seeing some real concerns about the economic conditions in this community. As Nick said, four out of every ten of the kids in the School District are eligible for the subsidized meal programs. Thirty-three percent of the people who live in Berwick have a disability. Over a third of the residents are tenants, they are not homeowners. The average salary in Berwick is $40,000 and that's for a family of four. Even the State of Pennsylvania says that the sustainability standard in Columbia County is $43,994. So even from the get-go, people in Berwick are at a disadvantage. (**0012-71** [McGinnis, Joy])

***Response**: NRC will consider disproportionate impacts on minorities and low income populations that result from the operation of the proposed BBNPP in Chapter 5 of the EIS.*

11. Comments Concerning Health - Radiological

Comment: Look at the whole aspect and how far out are you going to go? Usually, they say right next to the plant or five miles, ten miles. I don't know what the scope of your past scoping documents says has been, but I would study it not in concentric circles, but you have to study, I believe, which way the wind blows and the wind blows pretty far. (**0012-81** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: The proximity of this plant to the metro NY and NJ areas which are in the extended keyhole of the prevailing winds...give this location elevated status as something we should protect and not contaminate with the wastes and potential irradiation. (**0014-2** [Creasy, David])

***Response**: These comments concern airborne radioactive effluents from the plant. The NRC staff will address the patterns of wind and weather in Chapter 2 of the EIS. Based on that information, the NRC staff will address the environmental impacts of airborne radioactive effluents of the plant and accidents in Chapter 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: The present radionuclides given off from the plant and those that have been put out for the past almost thirty years have to be studied for their impact via the water on the population that was present during the past years. (**0013-11** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: The fact that the Susquehanna River is a water source for many communities downstream and the major source of the Chesapeake Bay's water give this location elevated status as something we should protect and not contaminate with the wastes and potential irradiation. (**0014-3** [Creasy, David])

Comment: In the Draft Environmental Assessment to increase Maximum Reactor Power Level taken from the Federal Register, Vol.72, No. 233, December 5, 2007, this plant in 2005 released 1,470,000 gallons of radioactive waste water into the river. The report states that increasing the power levels would raise the release levels directly. What would a new reactor emit? (**0014-4** [Creasy, David])

***Response**: These comments refer to health impacts of releases of radiological effluents to the Susquehanna River. The impact analysis for the BBNPP in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS will address health impacts of releases of radioactive effluents to the Susquehanna River. Cumulative impacts will be discussed in Chapter 7 of the EIS.*

Comment: Everybody in this room who has lived in Berwick all their lives, they have become of the key people, one of the key aspects of the scope of the environmental scoping for this new plant. Everybody should be looked at; the human health of all those people should be looked at. (**0012-2** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: Health impacts associated with plant operation will be discussed in Chapter 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: A study of all the people who come in from out of town to do the transition when they put the new fuel storage in there. (**0012-3** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: The NRC's regulatory limits for radiological protection are set to protect workers and the public from the harmful health effects of radiation on humans. These limits are presented in 10 CFR Part 20, Standards for Protection Against Radiation, and are based on*

recommendations of national and international standards-setting organizations and the National Research Council's committee reports on the Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation (the BEIR reports). The effects on workers, including additional workers brought in to assist during outages from cumulative radiological releases from the proposed BBNPP unit and from SSES, Units 1 and 2, will be described in Chapter 7 of the EIS.

Comment: ...are there any documented cases of death to radiation exposure as a result of a nuclear power plant? I'm asking the question. And the answer would be there's no study done on it. Okay. If there are, then that's something to look at. If there aren't, then that sounds like a lot of smoke. (**0012-31** [Fatula, Ken])

Comment: Does nuclear power generation release environmentally damaging gases or pollution? We've been told about picocuries. My question is how many picocuries kill? How many do you have to ingest? What is their decay rate? There are a lot of statements; I refer to them as alarmism, quite honestly. (**0012-32** [Fatula, Ken])

Comment: Now you say I feel fine, but at a genetic level, who knows? You're messing with your children's lives. You're messing with your future generations' lives. You do not know what constant low-level nuclear radiation does to you. (**0012-4** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: Environmentally, we have to look at...the people's health, (**0012-8** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: The primary concerns with nuclear power plants, of course, is radiation. And those concerns are true. Biological effects, that's basically cancer. What are the carcinogenic effects of radiation and what are the genetic effects? We can spend a great deal of time on this, but I'll just give you two pieces of information. For example, at TMI, there were over 12 studies done, National Cancer Institute, Columbia University, in other words, agencies and groups that are not a part of the industry. The result of those studies indicate that in a 50-mile radius involving 2 million people where the normal number of cancers would be 17 percent, in other words those people 2 million, 17 percent of them will die from cancer. That would be 340,000 people. For the exposures of radiation release from TMI, how many of that 340,000 could be credited to TMI? The answer is one. Genetic effects, one of the most interesting and we generally assume that they are present, but there were 840,000 survivors in Japan, Hiroshima, Nagasaki, that were exposed to very high levels of radiation, didn't die. Subsequently, they married, some of them to each other and gave birth to children. The studies that have been done on the children of those 84,000 exposed people shows no significant difference in terms of birth defects over what you would have normally for that population. No significant difference. (**0012-49** [Superdock, Dave])

Comment: Studies that follow present and former residents must be conducted. (**0013-12** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: What is the distance of safe living from not only the reactor, but the storage facilities? (**0018-9** [Bogard, Deborah])

***Response**: Radiological health effects from routine operation of the proposed BBNPP unit will be addressed in Chapter 5 of the EIS.*

Comment: A little reference material. Half a liter of water. The tap water contains 1/100th picocuries per liter, twice this amount, 1/100th picocuries. A picocuries is one trillionth of a curie. From documents on the Federal Register, Wednesday, December 5, 2007, draft environmental assessment to increase maximum reactor power level. Currently, Susquehanna has 3439 megawatts per unit. In this environmental draft statement, they were asking or talking about increasing to 3952 megawatts per reactor, a 13 percent thermal power increase. What this means is that they would be generating more waste. In looking over the radioactive waste assessments for the history of the plant, the single year highest radioactive releases between 2000 and 2005. In 2005, 1,470,000 gallons of radioactive, liquid radioactive waste was released into the Susquehanna River. In 2003, they don't list the amount released, but it contained 70 curies of tritium and in 2000, contained 36.9 curies of fission and activation products. Now remember, twice this much, 1/100th of a picocurie which is one trillionth of a curie and they have released millions of gallons before the increase in megawattage. And now with the third reactor anticipated, that has to be potentially increased by at least 33 percent. I'm not math wizard, but if you've got two and you add one, that's a third. (**0012-26** [Creasy, David])

Comment: How many additional gallons of waste are to be put into the Susquehanna River each year? Who gets to drink what waste down stream? Yummy. (**0013-31** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: These comments address the amount of liquid radioactive effluents projected to be released from the combined operation of the SSES units and the proposed BBNPP unit. Chapters 5 and 7 of the EIS will address the radiological environmental impact from the combined operations of the SSES units and the proposed BBNPP unit.*

12. Comments Concerning Accidents - Severe

Comment: Does the probability of a nuclear accident go up with a plants age? (**0013-22** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: The issue raised in this comment is a safety issue and, as such, is outside the scope of the environmental review and will not be addressed in the EIS. A safety assessment for the proposed licensing action was provided as part of the application. The NRC is developing a Safety Evaluation Report that analyzes all aspects of reactor and operational safety for the BBNPP.*

Comment: The fact of the location of the plant. We are approximately 100 miles upwind of New York City metro area. We are approximately 100 miles upstream from Chesapeake, one of the largest ecosystems in North America, yet we're at the triangulation point where if something catastrophic were to occur, and God forbid that would ever happen for all of our sakes, we have the potential of losing some of the most valued property, resources, and population centers in North America. (**0012-30** [Creasy, David])

Comment: if you're looking at the economics of this whole thing, any kind of nuclear accident would also involve everybody involved in the dairy industry, the farming industry, and who knows how many billions of dollars that generates and how many jobs that creates in Pennsylvania. Isn't Pennsylvania the leading economic thing for jobs? Isn't it farming? (**0012-80** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: The amount of radiation released via different accident scenarios and its environmental impact on populations whether they be human, animal or plant has to be

considered. Why plant and animal? Because of the economic impact on Pennsylvania and on Pennsylvania's major source of revenue: agriculture. That is unless you are ready to utilize Pennsylvania's aging population as a source of "Solient Green." Bon Appetite. The total air movement in the Mid-Atlantic must be studied and one would conclude that any plant that is in a direct line with major eastern cities with mass populations should be shut immediately let alone the building of a new reactor that can put its radioactive product into the prevailing wind. There will be another accident at some point with aging plants. The aging plants at Berwick are right along the Route 80 line that goes directly to the New York City region by prevailing wind. Why put fifty million people at risk? Oh excuse me, that is the business of the NRC. (**0013-27** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: These comments refer to nuclear accidents and their consequences. The environmental impacts of postulated accidents will be evaluated, and the results of this analysis will be presented in Chapter 5 of the EIS.*

13. Comments Concerning the Uranium Fuel Cycle

Comment: I have major concerns about living next to a nuclear waste dump. I'm not against nuclear power. It's far better than reading by candlelight. We have many of our citizens, especially in Salem Township living within a quarter mile of a nuclear waste dump. President Bush did sign legislation to open Yucca Mountain; however, Harry Reid has stopped it. It's up to you to get to your Congressmen and your Senators and your legislators to get Yucca Mountain opened for safe storage of nuclear waste or for reprocessing waste. (**0012-16** [Davenport, Bill])

Comment: The other part that I don't care for about this process is that we're talking about the plant. And it's just one little piece in the a la carte menu of the fuel cycle and the environmental impact. We're here to talk about environmental impact, but yet we can't speak about the mining and the milling process that takes place somewhere else. And they don't care about us. But the tailings, the tons, the acres of tailings that are emitting radiation because we only want the Uranium-235 which is 1 percent of what they take out of the ground. Ninety-nine percent is Uranium-238, but that's no good, so we just leave that here for those people that we have to process, that we have to reprocess it. Then we have to formulate it into the ceramic pellets. All along the chain, there's environmental impact. (**0012-28** [Creasy, David])

Comment: I am a lifelong resident of Salem Township. I write this as a concerned citizen but more as a father of two who thinks the impact of the power plant is far greater than the limited scope the owners and the NRC are presenting. If we are to talk about the scope of the environmental impact a new reactor would have on the surrounding area, I believe we must first recognize that there is a great impact from the moment the first shovel of dirt is removed from the Earth here at the site and also from the mining areas in the western US, Canada and now Eastern Europe and Russia. The impact is being created and is not just a disruption of soil and water. We are talking about elements which are toxic for hundreds of thousands of years. The notion that the mining, processing and transportation are outside the scope of this process is taking a tunnel vision approach and should be considered in any environmental impact assessment. (**0014-1** [Creasy, David])

***Response**: The impacts related to the uranium fuel cycle will be addressed in Chapter 6 of the EIS. The generic impacts of the fuel cycle are codified in 10 CFR 51.51(b), Table S-3, "Table of*

Uranium Fuel Cycle Environmental Data" and in 10 CFR 51. 52, Table S-4, "Environmental impact of Transportation of Fuel and Waste to and from One Light-water Cooled Nuclear Power Reactor."

Comment: These nuclear power plants were built without a defined plan for safe waste disposal or transportation. This issue has never been solved. We now not only have a facility without a plan or money for decontaminating, we now have a high-level radioactive waste dump. And I might add it is being stored in temporary storage units. How temporary is 30 years? Who builds a home without a sewage system? (**0012-19** [Creasy, Mary])

Comment: If your neighbor were to dump his garbage in the yard and let it pile up for 20 years would he be a good neighbor? I don't think so. We're not talking about smelly garbage here. We're talking about radioactive waste. We're talking about a containment, a spent fuel pool that has been filled to capacity that has been over-filled, condensed to a point where it can't store any more so now the old rods are being encased in concrete and put into the back yard, the back 40. And this will continue and continue and continue. (**0012-27** [Creasy, David])

Comment: And people are complaining about the fact that well, we have on-site storage. This could have been addressed decades ago. The problem was that we have politicians that are more concerned about getting votes from environmentalists and their lobby than they are about doing what we know to be right. (**0012-34** [Fatula, Ken])

Comment: I was going to bring up an issue of the spent fuel rods that are up there. It's been brought up by several people before me. But I remember going to such meetings as this 35 years ago and I asked the -- one of the gentlemen conducting the meeting, Bill Begdin, his name was, what are you going to do about the spent waste? And he said we feel very comfortable that the Federal Government will find a place to put it. Well, now I'm in the twilight of my mediocre career and we still don't have a place to put the waste and I am concerned about that because the waste is my neighbor. Nothing makes me feel good about it. (**0012-47** [Hartman, Cindy])

Comment: I agree with the problem with high-level waste and I look forward to the point when the politicians will get together and solve that problem. Technologically, it's solved. Politically, it hasn't been solved. (**0012-50** [Superdock, Dave])

Comment: At what point does the cost benefit analysis include the fact that production of nuclear waste is of no benefit when it cannot be stored as originally conceptualized at a distant location and sold to the public as it was thirty years ago. The new "public confidence" effort as it relates to changing the way nuclear waste is considered by the NRC must be looked at in this cost/benefit analysis. What is the cost of the nuclear waste produced by the old reactors and the new reactor? The public was always told high level waste would go somewhere else when the original two plants were constructed at this site. (**0013-20** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: When you build a nuclear plant you are actually building two structures: the plant itself and the waste storage facility. You actually need a separate EIS scoping document for the new type of facility needed for the type of waste generated from the new reactor design. (**0013-29** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: The current reactors have filled and overfilled the spent fuel pools. The older fuel has been encased in concrete. How much capacity will ultimately be held? The answer is all

the waste the reactors generate. With the recent cut-off of funding for the Yucca Mtn. disposal site, the current administration has finally realized that burial there is not a solution and that all waste will be held at the respective sites. The environmental impact of that reality is exponentially increased for the next millennia. Who will be responsible for this once PPL has squeezed every kilowatt out of the Uranium? (**0014-5** [Creasy, David])

Comment: My concern is about the safety of the existing and future 'temporary' storage of nuclear waste onsite. Can this be returned to the mine that it came from? Can it be recycled? (**0018-7** [Bogard, Deborah])

***Response**: The safety and environmental effects of long-term storage of spent fuel on site have been evaluated by the NRC and, as set forth in the Waste Confidence Rule at 10 CFR 51.23 (available at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/part051/part051-0023.html), the NRC generically determined that "if necessary, spent fuel generated in any reactor can be stored safely and without significant environmental impacts for at least 30 years beyond the licensed life for operation (which may include the term of a revised or renewed license) of that reactor at its spent fuel storage basin or at either onsite of offsite independent spent fuel installations. Further, the Commission believes there is reasonable assurance that at least one mined geologic repository will be available within the first quarter of the twenty-first century and sufficient repository capacity will be available within 30 years beyond the licensed life for operation of any reactor to dispose of the commercial high-level waste and spent fuel originating in any such reactor and generated up to that time." On October 9, 2008, the NRC published for public comment a proposal to amend its generic determination of no significant environmental impact for the temporary storage of spent fuel after cessation of reactor operation codified at 10 CFR 51.23(a) (73 FR 59547) and a related update and proposed revision of its 1990 Waste Confidence Decision (73 FR 59551). The impact of the uranium fuel cycle, including disposal of low level radioactive waste and spent fuel, will be addressed in Chapter 6 of the EIS.*

Comment: There is radioactivity. It is in the ground. That's the only thing that we should really be worried about right now; if they could get that out, if they do have a place to store it or if they can find a place to store it. (**0012-57** [Bodnar, Steve])

Comment: Also, you have to look at during the mining process and all through it, what is emitted? Are there CFCs emitted by the nuclear mining and the nuclear development process? You have to look at everything that's attached to the reprocessing of nuclear --highly controversial aspects of reprocessing nuclear waste. (**0012-75** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: The impacts related to the uranium fuel cycle will be addressed in Chapter 6 of the EIS. The generic impacts of the fuel cycle are codified in 10 CFR 51.51(b), Table S-3, "Table of Uranium Fuel Cycle Environmental Data." In accordance with 10 CFR 51.51(a) and the guidance in Section 5.7 of NUREG-1555, the staff will use the Table S-3 data as the basis for evaluating the uranium fuel cycle impacts.*

Comment: One of the key impacts we've heard tonight from a lot of the anti-nuclear people is the high-level nuclear waste. There's also low-level nuclear waste that has to be looked at. Low-level nuclear waste -- well, it's all nuclear waste, but it emits different items. Now low-level nuclear waste should be looked at. (**0012-74** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: The waste has to be the billion curie gorilla that cannot be solved. This entire exercise is pointless unless you solve the waste problem. No reactor construction can begin until the problem is solved. The reactor design proposed for this spot has to be analyzed for the amount and toxicity of the waste produced. Is the waste produced of a more intense nature than other reactor designs? Does this EPR design produce more intense wastes? Is the waste storage design now in place able to handle these increased aspects of the waste? By reference please address any and all other questions that have been directed to your office by groups and citizens concerned with the siting of this reactor design in or near their communities Do you need different types of storage facilities for waste produced from this reactor design? Will this site become a defacto long term storage site for other reactors' wastes? What is the waste streams' affects on the water, air and land? And yes, the waste at some point according to the NRC will be shipped cross country. Part of that country is right here. But the entire waste transport process must be part of the scoping process. The security aspects of waste transport are dealt with later. Again, the holistic approach must be used rather than a compartmentalized NRC whitewash. (**0013-28** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: The impact of the uranium fuel cycle and its transportation steps, including disposal of low-level radioactive waste and spent fuel, will be addressed in Chapter 6 of the EIS. The generic impacts of the fuel cycle are codified in 10 CFR 51.51(b), Table S-3, "Table of Uranium Fuel Cycle Environmental Data." In accordance with 10 CFR 51.51(a) and the guidance in Section 5.7 of NUREG-1555, the staff will use the Table S-3 data as the basis for evaluating the uranium fuel cycle impacts. The safety and environmental effects of long-term storage of spent fuel on site have been evaluated by the NRC and, as set forth in the Waste Confidence Rule at 10 CFR 51.23 (available at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/part051/part051-0023.html), the NRC generically determined that "if necessary, spent fuel generated in any reactor can be stored safely and without significant environmental impacts for at least 30 years beyond the licensed life for operation (which may include the term of a revised or renewed license) of that reactor at its spent fuel storage basin or at either onsite of offsite independent spent fuel installations. Further, the Commission believes there is reasonable assurance that at least one mined geologic repository will be available within the first quarter of the twenty-first century and sufficient repository capacity will be available within 30 years beyond the licensed life for operation of any reactor to dispose of the commercial high-level waste and spent fuel originating in any such reactor and generated up to that time." On October 9, 2008, the NRC published for public comment a proposal to amend its generic determination of no significant environmental impact for the temporary storage of spent fuel after cessation of reactor operation codified at 10 CFR 51.23(a) (73 FR 59547) and a related update and proposed revision of its 1990 Waste Confidence Decision (73 FR 59551). It should be noted that the EIS will not address specific low-level waste burial locations, existing or proposed. Site specific data for these locations is developed as part of the NRC licensing process under 10 CFR Part 61. The impacts from the transportation of radioactive materials will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria in Table S-4 of 10 CFR 51.52(c) and the guidance in Section 3.8 of NUREG-1555.*

Comment: The application contains a discussion of potential actions or measures to reduce the amount of Class B and C wastes. It is expected that the applicant will develop and implement an effective waste minimization plan to minimize the generation of all types of waste including Class A and Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) wastes. Additionally, the planned Radioactive Waste Processing Building at BBNPP may not have sufficient capacity for on-site storage of LLRW considering uncertainties associated with the future of LLRW and GTCC

disposal. It is recommended that the applicant construct a separate temporary storage facility for LLRW and GTCC wastes, during the initial construction of the facility. (**0017-12** [Janati, Rich])

***Response**: The onsite storage of radioactive waste will be described in Chapter 3 and will be evaluated in Chapter 5 of the EIS. This evaluation will include the necessity for waste minimization efforts or the need for construction of a separate onsite storage facility for low-level radioactive waste and Greater than Class C waste.*

Comment: The Commonwealth has publicly expressed concerns regarding long-term storage of spent nuclear fuel (SNF) at reactor sites. Considering that there is currently no permanent repository for SNF, it is possible that there will be a need for an Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI) at the proposed BBNPP site in the future. Therefore, the applicant should demonstrate that the proposed site is adequate for construction of an ISFSI and dry storage of SNF during normal and extended plant operations, as applicable. (**0017-13** [Janati, Rich])

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

14. Comments Concerning Transportation

Comment: These nuclear power plants were built without a defined plan for safe...transportation... And let's face it; you haven't come up with any kind of safe, radioactive honey trucks. (**0012-20** [Creasy, Mary])

Comment: Yucca Mountain, from what I understand, isn't that dangerous. We know that shipping this stuff, they've designed some containers that are very, very secure. (0012-35 [Fatula, Ken])

***Response**: The EIS will include an analysis of the radiological impacts of transportation involving spent nuclear fuel in Chapter 6 of the EIS. Spent fuel is transported in massive, heavily-shielded shipping casks, referred to in 10 CFR Part 71 as Type B containers, and are designed to withstand severe transportation accident environments.*

15. Comments Concerning Decommissioning

Comment: These reactors were built without a budget to decontaminate the facility when their ability to continue to generate financial gains for whoever may own them at that point in time. We cannot expect PPL to own this facility indefinitely since they were trying to sell it a few years ago. (**0012-18** [Creasy, Mary])

Comment: The bottom line is this plant spits out immense amounts of energy making incredible amounts of money for PPL, its stockholders and employees. The community has lost revenue from property taxes, school taxes, building permits, and will end up with the cost for decontamination when the cost usefulness has been met. (**0012-23** [Creasy, Mary])

Comment: It was created; it has created a high-waste dump, stress, and a target for terrorists and a questionable future. There are no requirements for PPL to deal with the high-waste dump, high waste which has accumulated over these 30 years. What is keeping them from selling the facility and walking away, leaving the burden on the government or the community? (**0012-24** [Creasy, Mary])

Comment: What does happen to the site if they have to abandon it in 10, 20, or 30 years? I do want to have an answer to that. Who is going to be responsible because certainly if it is the taxpayer, I don't like that answer. (**0012-37** [Fatula, Ken])

Comment: The bankruptcy of PPL , PPL Electric Utilities, or whatever related business entity that exists or will exist that has a stake in the plant must be looked at. How does bankruptcy effect environmental planning? At what point does the government own the waste? I am sure that is no benefit to anyone. Decommissioning of the new plant has to be considered in the scoping document's cost/benefit analysis. It will cost more to decommission this plant than it will cost to build it. What will the decommissioning costs of the other two plants do to the company who has to decommission them whether that is a PPL related company or some stupid purchaser of the two existing plants? What does French ownership of the reactor building aspects do to the project? Does the NRC have access to French company records to see the financial health or future financial projections of the company? (**0013-24** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: Several nuclear power plants have successfully undergone decommissioning; in addition, 14 plants are currently undergoing decommissioning (see http://www.nrc.gov/info-finder/decommissioning/power-reactor/). Federal regulations (10 CFR 50.33(k) and 10 CFR 50.75(b)) require an applicant for a COL to certify that sufficient funds will be available to ensure radiological decommissioning at the end of power operations. Chapter 6 of the EIS will evaluate the applicant's plan for ensuring these funds are available.*

Comment: Added here should be the long term issue of decommissioning of the plant itself because that is a pile of waste itself. The decommissioning aspect must be fully addressed in the scoping document. (**0013-30** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: Decommissioning the BBNPP upon its retirement will be discussed in Chapter 6 of the EIS. The environmental impact from decommissioning a permanently shut down commercial nuclear power reactor is also discussed in Supplement 1 to NUREG-0586, Generic Environmental Impact Statement on Decommissioning of Nuclear Facilities, which was published in 2002. In Supplement 1, NRC staff found that for most environmental issues, the impact from decommissioning activities is considered small.*

16. Comments Concerning Cumulative Impacts

Comment: In addition, the increased operating power requests for the existing reactors into the future must be considered. (**0013-2** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: The Chesapeake Bay impact from the flow of the Susquehanna River must also be considered and the other states affected by the river's flow into the Bay must be considered in depth. Increased nuclear activity associated with the Bay must also be considered overall. The effort to put another reactor at Calvert Cliffs is part of the whole picture that must be considered. (**0013-4** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: The full impact of power generation increases at the existing plants on all aspects of water must be considered in addition to the impacts by a new reactor at this site. (**0013-10** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: The effects of thermal discharges, chemical additives in discharges, impingement and entrainment issues of aquatic organisms from the existing SSES and the proposed Bell Bend facility intake and blowdown structures should continue being addressed together due to the close proximity of these intake structures to the Susquehanna River. (**0017-8** [Janati, M.S., Rich])

***Response**: Cumulative impacts result from the combined effects of the proposed action and past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions, regardless of who takes the actions. The appropriate geographic area and time period for considering cumulative impacts depend on the resource being affected and will be determined for each resource as part of the staff's evaluation. The impacts of the construction and operation of the proposed BBNPP on the Susquehanna River and adjacent lands would be added to other known or reasonably foreseeable actions and stressors within the defined geographic area of interest, including known or planned upgrades of SSES Units 1 and 2, or other power plants, if appropriate. The results of the analysis of impacts of BBNPP operations to the aquatic environment will be presented in Chapter 5 of the EIS. The results of cumulative impact analyses will be presented in Chapter 7 of the EIS.*

17. Comments Concerning the Need for Power

Comment: As you know, Pennsylvania is the nation's second largest producer of nuclear energy. One-third of our electricity comes from this carbon-free source. Unfortunately, Pennsylvania also has the distinction of ranking 4th highest in the nation in carbon dioxide emissions, 2nd highest in sulfur dioxide emissions and 5th highest in nitrogen oxide emissions. Over the next 10 years, our electricity demand is expected to rise 1.5% a year. To meet our ever-increasing demand for electricity in a way that does not destroy our environment, we need a diverse energy mix that includes nuclear power, cleaner fossil fuels, renewable sources, and energy efficiency. However, conservation alone will not offset the expected growth in our electricity use and renewable sources like wind and solar are unreliable. (**0003-2, 0018-2** [Walsh, Karen])

Comment: Nuclear energy has served our community for the past 25 years, and with the ever increasing demand for electricity, Bell Bend will serve as a vital component to the future of our regional energy infrastructure. The construction of Bell Bend will help meet the increasing demand, along with providing enough power for more than one million homes. (**0010-2** [Yudichak, John])

Comment: We need power. I don't see anybody that goes home without turning on a light switch at night. What are we going to do? (**0012-54** [Bodnar, Steve])

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

Comment: As a state representative from Luzerne County, I am extremely cognizant of the positive impacts this facility will have in area by greatly increasing the electricity infrastructure, which is essential in attracting economic development, and ensuring that the projected electricity demands are met. (**0005-1** [Eachus, Todd])

Comment: A new nuclear unit will provide much needed electricity in Pennsylvania without adding greenhouse gas emissions. (**0006-2** [Musto, Raphael])

Comment: As Pennsylvania continues its transition to a deregulated electric market, additional electric generating capacity is critical to keeping prices affordable for families in our region and throughout the Commonwealth. This project seeks to do this without increasing our dependence on foreign sources of energy and without an accompanying increase in greenhouse gases and pollutants that come with other electric generation technologies. (**0008-2** [Baker, Elisabeth (Lisa)])

Comment: The Bell Bend Nuclear Power Plant would significantly increase the percentage of electricity that PPL generates from non-carbon sources -currently at 40 percent -and provide a reliable source of electricity that does not contribute to global warming. (**0003-4**, [Walsh, Karen])

***Response**: The comments express general support for additions to new electric generating capacity in eastern Pennsylvania such as the proposed BBNPP. The comments imply that nuclear plant emissions contain less carbon than other generation alternatives. Emissions from plant construction and operation will be evaluated in Chapters 4 and 5 of the EIS. Emissions from the uranium fuel cycle will be evaluated in Chapter 6. Emissions from power generation alternatives will be evaluated in Chapter 9 of the EIS.*

18. Comments Concerning Alternatives - Energy

Comment: I hear people talk about the fact that we shouldn't have nuclear energy at all. Does somebody have any other option? More birds are killed, and bats by wind generation than by a nuclear power plant. Talk to somebody who operates a site that tries to synchronize wind power with the grid. Have you ever seen a wind tower come down? Check it out. You can see it because it's on You Tube. Sometimes they virtually come apart and explode. Ask the people that work in coal mines if that's not dangerous and then the people who object to or complain about strip mining and yet we all want electricity. (**0012-33** [Fatula, Ken])

Comment: ...look at the alternatives, all the alternatives that are available instead of nuclear power and as an aside, those items also create many, many jobs. If you have $5 or $10 billion to invest, you can invest that into many job-producing things, but we're talking about the environment and what has to happen. So I'd like you to look at all the other processes that are involved. When you look at this, you have to compare them and also to either rule them out after studying them or -- well, you do have to study them. I'd like them studied in the environmental scoping document. And also look at the efficiencies that are involved. I think nuclear power is one of the least efficient processes. (**0012-76** [Stilp, Gene])

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

Comment: The Bell Bend Nuclear Power Plant would significantly increase the percentage of electricity that PPL generates from non-carbon sources - currently at 40 percent - and provide a reliable source of electricity that does not contribute to global warming. (**0018-4** [Walsh, Karen])

Response*: Life-cycle carbon impacts will be considered in Chapters 4 and 5 (construction and operation) and Chapter 9 (alternatives) of the EIS.*

19. Comments Concerning Benefit-Cost Balance

Comment: I believe the scope of your environmental responsibility is far reaching and absolutely so large that the benefits do not outweigh the risks put on the surrounding population. Do your job but keep in mind the magnitude of your decisions. (**0014-6** [Creasy, David])

Response*: The costs and benefits of construction and operation of the proposed BBNPP will be addressed in Chapter 10 of the EIS.*

Comment: I'm one of the closest homes. I see the towers every day. That's the only thing I don't like. They look like chimneys on my house. Besides that, this plant is going to be lower, so the effect won't be there as much. It still covers a lot of grounds. I used to work on the farm that this power plant is going to be on. There were a lot of kids raised on that farm. The guy that owned it employed a lot of kids. It will affect us in that way because it takes away some of the beauty, but like I said, jobs are the thing with the economics today, we have to get every job we can get. (**0012-58** [Bodnar, Steve])

Response*: The NRC will carefully review the application against its regulations that are intended to protect public health and safety and the environment. An evaluation of the benefit-cost balance of constructing proposed BBNPP will be discussed in Chapter 10 of the EIS.*

Comment: Continuing. What has already been spent on the new reactor and what will be the cost? What is the present projected cost in 2009 dollars? Twelve billion dollars is the new estimate. What is the full analysis of what will be spent on this reactor? What will be the methodology utilized to project the future actual costs? Who will design the equations to figure this out? How will these studies be kept independent? What will the public actually be able to see from the utility? What will the NRC demand in the way of figures? All costs must be available publicly for the public and the NRC to ascertain the truth which is always presented in false fashion by the utility. No cost/benefit analysis can exist without these figures verified independently. Continuing. The cost/benefit analysis has to also say who will benefit by this plant. New Jersey and New York customers as the primary consumer of plant out put does not justify primary burdens on the non-using population that surround the plant. Would a Delaware River site be more beneficial for the intended end use of the electricity? I guess the cost of siting it there would be astronomical compared to a site where the population is beaten down for thirty years, forty if you consider construction time, and act like heroin addicted sheep for the mere chance to be human radiation sponges and the site of high level nuclear waste dump forever. The entire degradation of the coal regions of Pennsylvania is living proof that the environmental disasters and scars of the past live from century to century to century and populations are myopic as to the future consequences. Utilizing the cost/benefit analysis to ascertain the benefit of utilizing different forms of energy production to produce energy have to be considered. Emerging wind, solar, gas, and etc production must be considered in depth. Therefore the exact figures as to the plant costs must be presented by the utility. The financial

stability of the company must also enter into the cost benefit analysis. Currently, a PPL 40 % rate increase that is due to take effect on January 1, 2010 is the subject of a major effort to overturn the increase and re-regulate the utility because of the major impact economic impact on jobs in Pennsylvania. The NRC can take note of this as it produces this scoping document and cannot ignore this major economic factor as to the overall cost/benefit. The exact standing and analysis to PPL's business health overall must be looked at in light of the current and projected market conditions. What does the market analysis show for this and for similar projects across the country, across the northeast, and what has been the experience of reactors of similar design overseas? These factors must be considered in the cost benefit analysis as these costs are compared with a more decentralized approach to energy needs for the future? Where do renewables fit in the NRC analysis? If they are not even considered, they should be. (**0013-21** [Stilp, Gene])

Response*: The NRC staff will consider renewables in Chapter 9. The NRC does not have authority under its regulations to ensure that the proposed plant is the least costly alternative to provide energy services under any particular set of assumptions concerning future circumstances. This authority and responsibility is most often the role of State regulatory authorities such as public service commissions or, in the case of merchant plants, the competitive marketplace. The EIS will consider the potential for alternative non-nuclear technologies to provide the electricity that could be generated by the proposed plant and their environmental impacts in Chapter 9.*

20. General Comments in Support of the Licensing Action

Comment: Thank you for the opportunity to speak in support of the proposed Bell Bend Nuclear Power Plant. ...We have formed this coalition to support nuclear energy and to advocate for additional clean, safe and reliable sources of electricity generation in our Commonwealth. (**0003-1, 0018-1** [Walsh, Karen])

Comment: I would ask that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission look favorably on the proposed Bell Bend nuclear plant (**0006-4** [Musto, Raphael])

Comment: I would like to take this opportunity to express the support of my department to the endeavors of the PPL, Bell Bend Plant project. (**0007-1** [Kowalski, Daniel])

Comment: I would gladly elaborate on how we feel about this project; I hope I was able to convey our feelings toward this expansion. In fact, we would like to see this one built, and you could put another one right here in Newport Township as well. (**0007-5** [Kowalski, Daniel])

Comment: I am writing in support of PPL Corporation's proposal to expand the scope of its operations in Salem Township, Luzerne County. (**0008-1** [Baker, Elisabeth (Lisa)])

Comment: The expansion of the Bell Bend facility is expected to continue to positively impact northeastern Pennsylvania, its communities, its residents, and the overall economy. (**0008-5** [Baker, Elisabeth (Lisa)])

Comment: I wish to offer my full support to Pennsylvania Power & Light (PPL) in their efforts to construct the proposed Bell Bend Nuclear Plant near the existing Susquehanna Nuclear Power Plant in Salem Township, Luzerne County, Pennsylvainia. (**0010-1** [Yudichak, John])

Comment: Once again I would like to offer my full support and commitment to PPL in their efforts to construct the Bell Bend Power Plant. I am hopeful that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission will share my view and favorably consider this application. (**0010-4** [Yudichak, John])

Comment: In terms of the procedure to extract, and I guess refine uranium, I know that it can be dirty, but folks, your Prius, if you bought one, has a nickel battery in it that has created an environmental disaster up in Canada. There is no cheap way to get power, but I think that there are some economical ways or more economical ways and I think that we should permit PPL to do this responsibly. (**0012-38** [Fatula, Ken])

Comment: a lot of what I have to say focuses a lot on the jobs and opportunities that a third unit will create. You can tell by my button that I support the program that they have in place. (**0012-59** [Metzger, Marvin])

Comment: We need the jobs that this power plant will bring. We need the jobs of the construction that the plant will bring. And I very strongly welcome PPL to expand. (**0012-72** [McGinnis, Joy])

Comment: I am in favor of all the reactors that they want to put in for Bell Bend. (**0018-11** [Bershline, Roy])

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

21. General Comments in Support of Nuclear Power

Comment: Nuclear energy is the only source that can reliably generate electricity around-the-clock for millions of consumers with no harmful greenhouse gas emissions. Each year in the United States, nuclear-generated electricity avoids almost 700 million tons of carbon dioxide, three million tons of sulfur dioxide and one million tons of nitrogen oxide. The environmental benefits of nuclear power are just some of the reasons why the PA Energy Alliance supports the continued safe operation of Pennsylvania's nuclear industry. (**0003-3, 0018-3** [Walsh, Karen])

Comment: Nuclear energy has proven to be a safe and clean source of energy. Our residents have spent their lives in the coal industry; quite frankly, we are in the center of coal country. The fact that these people are convinced of the value of nuclear energy is a clear indication that PPL has been a Good Neighbor. (**0007-4** [Kowalski, Daniel])

Comment: we [Belles Signs] feel it is our responsibility to encourage and promote the use of nuclear energy as the immediate answer to the growing concerns with greenhouse gases that is being pumped in to the atmosphere with the use of fossil fuel in energy production. We believe nuclear energy is the way of the future and look forward to the positive impact the construction will have in our area. (**0009-3** [Belles, Donnie])

Comment: Belles Signs not only welcomes the proposed Bell Bend unit, as we have shown by our sign of support along Route 11, we feel it is our responsibility to encourage and promote the use of nuclear energy as the immediate answer to the growing concerns with greenhouse gases that are being released into the atmosphere with the use of fossil fuel and energy production. (**0012-40** [Search, Ryan])

Comment: I support the application. I support nuclear energy. I've studied it for 50 years. And I really believe that as we look at the world, we see 438 reactors operating throughout the world, 104 of them are in the United States. Japan has 55. That, to me, is extraordinary. This is the only nation in the world that had the destruction of nuclear bombs dropped on it and yet, they are able to go ahead and recognize the opportunities available in this source of energy and are not afraid as we have become in the United States. We see France up to 80 percent of their electrical energy from nuclear power. We're at about 20 percent. There are currently under construction throughout the world 44 nuclear power plants. And one of those is in the United States. There are many in Japan, India, China and what that indicates to me is the world, generally speaking, has accepted nuclear power as being safe and economical and I concur with that. (**0012-48** [Super dock, Dave])

Comment: We have hydro. We have coal. There's other things coming up, but atomic power is going to be the answer. Like I said, it's going to create a lot of jobs in the area. It's going to help a lot of businesses. (**0012-55** [Bonder, Steve])

Comment: Nuclear power is a clean technology. It is the best energy alternative we have. Let's keep this economic jewel in our backyard. If our community does not support a third unit, a separate community will take this multi-billion dollar opportunity from us. None of us want our children to move away to get a good job in another community that seizes this opportunity. (**0012-61** [Metzger, Marvin])

Comment: I'm very scared for my children and grandchildren and how their life and their economics is going to be if we don't do something about stop sending all our money over to the Middle East for oil. We have a power. We have a nuclear power that's proven. We've known for 25 years it is safe here. If it's well managed as it has been with PPL, I can rest assured that that's the future that I want to see for our country to help solve our energy problems. (**0012-68** [Soberick, Bill])

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

Comment: Global warming, that's another thing. This is going to help that. I'm not much on it, but I do know that in Alaska and stuff the fisheries and all the different things are all being affected from global warming. Atomic power doesn't have anything to do with that. (**0012-53** [Bonder, Steve])

***Response**: The airborne emissions from proposed nuclear plants, although normally sufficiently small as to not degrade air quality or be important in climate change, will be considered in the evaluation of potential impacts. The impacts on air quality resulting from construction and operation of proposed unit will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 of the environmental impact statement.*

22. General Comments in Support of the Existing Plant

Comment: Our confidence in the environmental benefits of the Bell Bend project rests, in large part, on PPL's proven history of responsible monitoring in the area near the Susquehanna plant. PPL's commitment to protecting Pennsylvania's environment extends to voluntarily protecting nearby wildlife and their habitats. For nearly four decades, PPL has conducted radiological

studies of the air, water, soil, crops, plants and wildlife and found no significant environmental impact. (**0003-5, 0018-5** [Walsh, Karen])

Comment: I am writing in support of the proposed Bell Bend Nuclear Plant in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania. As the Democratic Chairman of the Senate Environmental Resources and Energy Committee, I am well aware of the importance of nuclear power to our state's environment and economy. A nuclear facility has been in Luzerne County for the past 25 years, and I have always been supportive of it as it has been a good neighbor. (**0006-1** [Muston, Raphael])

Comment: A project of this magnitude can logically be expected to contain some elements which will need to be modified during the implementation phase. The historical willingness of PPL to adjust the changing conditions and rectify actual and perceived shortcomings is what should be applied. PPL quite simply has been and will continue to be a good neighbor and friend to the economic development community. (**0012-15** [Phillips, Stephen])

Comment: I live close to the plant. I know people that do work for them and quite honestly I have confidence that they're pretty bright people. They don't want to die any more than I do. I support having the unit. (**0012-36** [Fatula, Ken])

Comment: I support PPL's application. I have in-laws living in New York and our cost for kilowatt is less than half of what they pay there. So efficiency wise, PPL has been very good to us for our power needs. Service has been very consistent. In the 30 years I've been here I think there was one time I remember being without electrical power for four hours and that was it. They've been good providers. They've been safe. (**0012-41** [Cleary, Jim])

Comment: People at PPL have been very good corporate citizens. That word was used before. I serve on the Boy Scout Board and PPL has not only helped with people and they're very involved with that, but they've had volunteers up at our camp and they've helped out. I know they've helped many of the not for profit organizations here. They've been extremely supportive of United Way, which helps a lot of different organizations. So they've been very good out there. (**0012-43** [Cleary, Jim])

Comment: I'm a firm believer in backing PPL. (**0012-56** [Bodnar, Steve])

Comment: I believe we can trust these people with our safety and adherence to the environmental regulations. (**0012-60** [Metzger, Marvin])

Comment: In my position in the community, I get to work alongside a lot of the employees and leaders at PPL. I've worked on a lot of community projects with them. They serve on our Boards of Directors. They contribute money to our nonprofits and to say that they are a responsible or good neighbor is an understatement. (**0012-63** [Pajovich, Nick])

***Response**: These comments express support for the existing units at the adjacent SSES site. They provide no information relevant to the environmental review; therefore, they will not be evaluated further.*

Comment: I also have great confidence in PPL's commitment to our area's environmental concerns. (**0004-2** [Snavely, Nate])

Comment: In the beginning the residents we protect were afraid and skeptical. The track record of the plant, and the support PPL gives to the community has changed their attitude immensely. (**0007-3** [Kowalski, Daniel])

Comment: PPL has been a responsible operator of its current facility and has earned the trust of the community during more than 25 years of successful and safe operations. (**0008-4** [Baker, Elisabeth (Lisa)])

Comment: Not once in the last 25 years of working so close to a nuclear facility was our safety threatened nor did we ever have any environmental issues with the nuclear power plant. (**0009-1** [Belles, Donnie])

Comment: One of the things is that people are talking about the water. Years ago, when I fished in the river, it was disgusting. It was orange, dirty, none of that came from the plant. It came from sulphur from coal, a lot of it was. A lot of the streams were polluted in the area. All the fish were dead and this had a lot to do with coal mines. (**0012-52** [Bodnar, Steve])

***Response**: These comments express support for the applicant's management of the SSES. They provide no information relevant to the environmental review; therefore, they will not be evaluated further.*

23. General Comments in Opposition to the Licensing Process

Comment: These proceedings are nothing more than the same old dog and pony show that the requirement for public town meetings are met. Unfortunately, the financial gains will always outweigh the environmental reality. (**0012-25** [Creasy, Mary])

Comment: the NRC, to me, goes part and parcel with the nuclear power industry in this country, and they're worth anything. You might as well have the NRC people here wearing the I Support Bell Bend buttons tonight, because that's what you'll get out of them. (**0012-5** [Stilp, Gene])

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

Comment: It is the tendency of the NRC to compartmentalize the environmental scoping document and take one topic at a time or even to leave out those aspects which don't fit into the NRC preconceived plan and goal. However, the environmental scoping document, I believe, should take a holistic approach. Water issues are affected by waste issues and both are affected by security issues, which impact on evacuation issues; and all of these are affected by population issues. Just as the human condition cannot be sliced and diced into a few manageable categories, neither can a scoping document. A holistic, interdependent approach, which is not in the NRC mindset, must be established as a basic requirement of any scoping document. Therefore, the environmental scoping document must include an analysis of the NRC own ability to actually conduct a true, impartial, holistic and interdependent study of the issues involved. In other words, what makes the NRC think they have any kind of fair and convincing record to lead such an effort? There is no evidence in the past. So, the NRC must begin with a self examination of the NRC's ability to do more than give a public and press dog and pony show. Such a show was in evidence on January 29th. Thank God someone at the

NRC had the sense not to actually inflict any pain on animals by actually leaving the dogs and ponies home and only bring the human dogs and ponies. (**0013-1** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: Standard Review Plans for Environmental Reviews for Nuclear Power Plants (NUREG-1555) provide the methodology for NRC's conduct of the environmental review of the BBNPP COL. These plans include specific instructions to ensure the assessments of nuclear power plant construction and operation consider interfaces between related impact areas. For example, NRC staff assessing aquatic ecology is instructed to obtain information regarding hydrological alterations from operation and the adequacy of the plant water supply so that an evaluation of impacts to the aquatic ecosystem from the cooling system intake can be completed. This comment provides no specific information for the environmental review and will not be considered further.*

24. General Comments in Opposition to Nuclear Power

Comment: been doing anti-nuclear stuff ever since the accident at Three Mile Island. That's where I learned about nuclear power. I'm from Wilkes-Barre, living in Harrisburg. The accident at Three Mile Island opened my eyes. I came here to Bell Bend to fight this. (**0012-1** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: You were promised nuclear power at the beginning that was too cheap to meter. Then you promised a deregulation that would bring you competition. What a joke. We fought that then. We're fighting this 40 percent rate hike now because it's not what they promised, simple as that. (**0012-11** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: It seems to me that we're creating an environmental impact and we're increasing that exponentially at our expense. We're the ones that have been here and lived here long enough to know that this is a beautiful area, but to sacrifice it for a few extra megawatts or a few more days of air conditioning, I think is ludicrous. (**0012-29** [Creasy, David])

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

25. General Comments in Opposition to the Existing Plant

Comment: One of the main things though and this is why this is such a joke is because how can you build a nuclear power plant, a new nuclear power plant next to a site that is a disaster already? By disaster, I mean there is a nuclear, high-level nuclear waste dump sitting up the road, so how can you actually build a new nuclear power plant next to a nuclear waste dump? (**0012-10** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: This party reserves the right to enter additional contentions at any future date. This party encourages the NRC to go where they have not gone before and do an actual true and independent study of all the aspects related to PPL's outdated and pathetic concept of building a new nuclear plant at this site. PPL cannot be allowed to continue to be a corporate saboteur of Pennsylvania's economy and environment. The NRC must finally realize that PPL stands for Pollution, Profits and Lies. (**0013-35** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: These comments express opposition to the existing SSES plant and the proposed unit at the BBNPP site. The comments do not provide new information related to the environmental review for the proposed units and will not be evaluated further.*

26. Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Emergency Preparedness

Comment: The greatest reason for this support is the training and support we as an emergency services provider receive on a regular basis. We are well within the 10 mile EPZ [Emergency Planning Zone] and are very versed on emergency procedures as they pertain to the Nuclear Facility. Because of this training and constant update, my staff were able to successfully evacuate 2 communities in a situation unrelated to the power plant. In 1987, a

chemical processing plant located in our neighboring town, caught fire and exploded in the middle of the night, releasing several toxic compounds. If not for the training received from PPL, we would have no idea how to even begin such an undertaking. As it stood, and still stands, we knew exactly what we needed to do. The entire evacuation went off without any problems. Within a few days all residents were allowed to return. I do not even know how to put a value on the training received. In the case mentioned, it was priceless! (**0007-2** [Kowalski, Daniel])

Comment: The reality is this community would not be capable of evacuating for any possible accident or event. There just aren't enough ambulances, buses, service vehicles or emergency personnel to handle the nursing homes, hospitals, schools, or individuals. The emergency system in place has never been taken seriously. It hasn't worked properly in the past and the community doesn't even take it seriously, unfortunately. When the sirens do go off, the system put in place has the community listen to radio stations or TV stations to find out necessary information. When there is a mistake or a misfire of the sirens, the system breaks down. They don't put anything on the radio or televisions stations announcing the misfire. When you follow the protocol after there is nothing on the radio or television, and call the 800 number, you get Allentown. The answering service at this number has no clue what is going on. We have been given the answer after they find an emergency director on their end. The emergency director hasn't been paged, so it probably is a mistake. Let me take your number and I will call you back. I still haven't got the calls back. After four hours waiting to see whether the sirens were a mistake, I thought I'll call the borough. Our borough building has become the last fallback for information and this was not a publicized protocol. And the scenario has taken place too many times. The sirens can't be heard in the winter with the houses closed tight. I found out months after they misfired one night from the borough manager and I never heard them. Most people think they are testing them when they go off and just ignore them. The system is pointless anyway. It is just pacification for the community and legality. (**0012-22** [Creasy, Mary])

Comment: [I think I have to...] speak to you as an elected official and a County Commissioner. I have to take issue with the statement I heard earlier that is very important to me about our evacuation plans for our citizens in case there is an emergency at the plant. I can tell you personally over the last 17 years how outstanding our EMA and our municipalities, our townships and our borough are well prepared and the proof is in the pudding in the natural disasters we've had in Columbia County, how well prepared we are. I've talked to people throughout the state and throughout the nation and because of PPL's support and working with us in our emergency management, we are more than well prepared to meet any natural or plant disaster if that should happen. (**0012-67** [Soberick, Bill])

Comment: The day before the scoping hearing on January 29, 2009 brought an ice storm to the Berwick area that would have crippled any evacuation plan. Why wasn't the plant shut down during this environmental threat to the whole evacuation plan. If everyone had to leave that day the chaos would have been beyond belief. At three thirty p.m. the day of the hearing, Route 11, the main way out of Berwick to the south was crippled by the merging of school busses from a local school one block off that route. The ice remained a major obstacle to any real evacuation if necessary that day also. All evacuation is, is a roll of the dice when poor weather is happening. No evacuation can take place during a hurricane but the plant remains on line. Same for major snow storms, forest fires, and floods etc. The environmental scoping document must address the actual ability to evacuate this area. The human environmental consequences are never really addressed in regard to evacuation preparation. If an accident

were to happen with a radiation release the proper safety fact to ascertain first would be which direction is the wind blowing, where is the plume of radiation headed? The last thing one would want to do is to use a pre-existing plan that would dump five thousand kids on busses into the plum of radiation when an exodus in the other direction would prevent that from happening. Assessment of the environmental aspects of poor evacuation planning must be considered. The pre existing plan is only good as a pathetic generic solution. One size does not fit all and any scoping document must assess this. Needless to say the supplying of iodine to the affected population must also be addressed. First responders are all trained to be aware of the fact that they are no good to anyone if their safety is compromised. They are as human as anyone else and the percentage of those that will not remain must be assessed. The river to the east is an environmental boundary that must be recognized. Chaos on Route 11 is the only aspect of an emergency that one can count on and must be addressed in the scoping document as an environmental catastrophy to the fleeing population. The lack of planning for those most at risk continues to be a major flaw in NRC planning. Infants and children in private facilities are not addressed by the NRC. The effects of such non-planning must be addressed. Returning to the lack of radiation release immediate plume analysis as a factor governing adequate evacuation planning. The plume analysis and evacuation planning should extend well beyond the arbitrary ten mile radius. No wind that I have ever seen stops at a given line. Not even the hot air from a utility executive can be projected to stop at a given line. (**0013-33** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: When local emergency services are put on alert due to an incident at PPL Susquehanna, we, the public, would like the courtesy of a radio on TV announcement that an alert has been called. Whether or not we need to pack bags. At this time, we are packing bags and trying to track down any information that says no need to worry. (**0018-8** [Bogard, Deborah])

***Response**: These comments relate to the adequacy of emergency plans, which is a safety issue that is outside the scope of the staff's environmental review. As part of its site safety review, the NRC staff will determine, after consultation with the Department of Homeland Security and the Federal Emergency Management Agency, whether emergency plans submitted by the applicant meet applicable requirements.*

27. Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Miscellaneous

Comment: PPL should implement a program for senior citizens on fixed incomes who will be forced into a hardship class. PPL should implement a program to decrease the dramatic rise in customer terminations. (**0015-1** [Epstein, Eric])

***Response**: The comment relates to the applicant's business practices. NRC's authority to regulate the applicant's business practices is limited to activities affecting nuclear safety. The comment does not provide information relevant to the environmental review and will not be evaluated in the EIS.*

Comment: The water impacts must also consider the possible additional siting of any low-level nuclear waste dump at the site or nearby. Such a waste dump was considered for Salem Township during the 1990's as part of the Mid Atlantic Compact. The siting studies for the Mid Atlantic Compact waste site have abundant water information for the area and should be reviewed and via this document I wish to enter them into the record. All are available from the PA Department of Environmental Protection. (**0013-14** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: The comment considers the possibility of a low-level nuclear waste disposal facility being sited in the future at a site near the proposed BBNPP site. Such a facility would require a separate license from the NRC and a separate NEPA EIS at the time an application is submitted. NRC is not aware of any such proposed application in the State of Pennsylvania. The NRC staff will consider relevant resource information, such as the siting studies referenced in the comment, in its environmental review of the BBNPP application.*

28. Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - NRC Oversight

Comment: As far as I read when the NRC has been published in the papers and we look at the NRC for being neutral arbitrator of what's safe and what's not safe, I think despite this morning's press, things have been pretty safe at PPL. They've done a good job using power, delivering power to us in a safe way. (**0012-42** [Cleary, Jim])

***Response**: The comment is regarding the role and responsibility of the NRC. It does not provide any information relevant to the environmental impacts of the proposed BBNPP and will not be evaluated further.*

Comment: All activities where PPL was fined must be considered. (**0013-8** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: The comment does not provide new information related to the environmental review for the proposed units and will not be evaluated further.*

29. Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Safety

Comment: A few years ago, I became CEO of the Berwick Area United Way. In that capacity, I have toured the nuclear power plant, I have been in the power plant a number of times for meetings, and every single time I am there, I am so impressed by the level of safety, care, and concern the PPL employees have for the plant, for the operation, and for the community in which they are located. (**0012-69** [McGinnis, Joy])

Comment: Environmentally, we have to look at...safety (**0012-9** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: So you have to put that into the cost benefit analysis. Risk is part of analysis. The cost/benefit analysis has to look not only at accident projections but the lack of the ability of the insurance industry or even a federally backed insurance scheme to really deal with an accident in the population rich Mid Atlantic region. And the insurance guarantee for a new plant has to consider the added risk of the old plants malfunctioning and that impact on the cost/benefit situation. How can the cost/benefit analysis even be accomplished if the reactor design is not yet approved and the approval process is years in the future. Is the NRC actually capable of crystal ball analysis? Please tell me which stocks to purchase now and how the market will do in five years. (**0013-23** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: The issues raised in these comments are safety issues and, as such, are outside the scope of the environmental review and will not be addressed in the EIS. A safety assessment for the proposed licensing action was provided as part of the application. The NRC is developing a Safety Evaluation Report that analyzes all aspects of reactor and operational safety for the BBNPP. The EIS will, however, include an evaluation of severe accident risk at the proposed plant in Chapter 5.*

30. Comments Concerning Issues Outside Scope - Security and Terrorism

Comment: Now not only do we have a more devastating target than the World Trade Center for terrorists, I might add in the '60s when this plant was being developed, here was a study done with the scenario of the devastation that would be created if a small plane were to collide with one of the reactors. The death rate and contamination were insurmountable. (**0012-21** [Creasy, Mary])

Comment: my biggest concern being ten and a half miles away from the plant, other than when the siren goes off, I'm not sure what it is, is the security since 911. And I want to tell you after I've been there and went through the security and the checks and saw the other people getting into the plant, I'm a lot more comfortable about the security that happened if a terrorist or anybody else would come at the plant. (**0012-46** [Cleary, Jim])

Comment: The cost benefit analysis has to look at the cost of security related to this nuclear plant as related to the cost of securing a renewable source. A terrorist taking out a substation for a windfarm is one thing. Security for nuclear plants is a cost that has increased dramatically over the years for good reason. The cost of security during the life of the plant and the cost of security for the waste generated is probably equal to any corporate profit derived from the operation of the plant. This security aspect must be included in the scoping doc as a cost/benefit equation. What does it cost to guard a solar panel farm? (**0013-25** [Stilp, Gene])

Comment: This is the age of terrorism. International and domestic. We are only seven and one half years away from the events of 9-11, an international terrorist attack. We are only thirteen years out from the Oklahoma domestic terrorist attack. The scoping document needs to address security as mentioned above in the waste section. Here, the scoping document has to recognize and assess the environmental aspects of a nuclear facility that has been attacked and where security has been breached. The NRC must address all the varieties of attacks and the environmental consequences of each on the populations, air, water and lands. Anything less would be living in fantasy land. The aircraft that was brought down by the courageous passengers on Flight 93 before all of them died, the plane that was probably headed for the nation's capitol, first passed over Pennsylvania. It passed over the existing reactors at Berwick as it left Newark and than made a left turn somewhere over western Pennsylvania. There is no reason why it could not have been crashed by the terrorists into the existing plant at Berwick. So the scoping document must deal with this and all aspects of terrorism. The rail lines with tracks into the plant, the roadways, the ground access, the air and water access, all must be addressed. When I say addressed I do not only mean that the document must detail that security is in place, but the document must detail the possible consequences to the environment from such terrorist actions after the security has been breached. Recently a New York Times reporter and a longtime activist drove on to the Three Mile Island grounds unimpeded and toured the entire site without confrontatrion. These were peaceful people. Terrorists or a lone disgruntled worker can cause untold damage. What are your environmental projections from that one-in-a-million attack? Start living in the real world. It's protecting someone's kids and elderly parents that you are dealing with here. Waste transport as mentioned above must be included in the scoping doc as it also relates to terrorist activity. The recent studies of the attitudes of workers at the existing PPL plants at Berwick by the NRC are a key indicator of a problem that breeds acts of sabotage on site that affect the environment. (**0013-32** [Stilp, Gene])

***Response**: These comments related to security and terrorism are safety issues that are not within the scope of the NRC staff's environmental review and are regulated by 10 CFR Part 73,"Physical Protection of Plants and Materials."*