

BBNPCEm Resource

From: genestilp@comcast.net
Sent: Monday, March 09, 2009 1:05 PM
To: BBNPCOLEIS Resource
Subject: Bell Bend Enviromental Scoping Comments
Attachments: ppl scoping doc testimony 3-8.doc

Please accept these environmental scoping comments attached. Gene Stilp c/o 275 Poplar Street Wilkes-Barre, PA 18702 717-829-5600 Please notify me via return email that youn have received these comments today.

Federal Register Notice: 74FR470
Comment Number: 4

Mail Envelope Properties (1522527810.1718461236618291135.JavaMail.root)

Subject: Bell Bend Enviromental Scoping Comments
Sent Date: 3/9/2009 1:04:51 PM
Received Date: 3/9/2009 1:04:51 PM
From: genestilp@comcast.net

Created By: genestilp@comcast.net

Recipients:
"BBNPCOLEIS Resource" <BBNPCOLEIS.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: sz0055a.westchester.pa.mail.comcast.net

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	213	3/9/2009 1:04:51 PM
ppl scoping doc testimony 3-8.doc		57920

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received:

3-8-09

Chief, Rules and Directives Branch
Division of Administrative Services
Office of Administration
Mailstop TWB-05B01M
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Re: Comments on EIS Scoping for Berwick/Susquehanna/BellBend # 3, (NTBB”)

Gene Stilp, c/o 275 Poplar Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pa 17112, 717-829-5600, genestilp@comcast.net submits these comments in addition to the brief oral testimony presented at the January 29, 2009 hearing in Berwick, PA and reserve the right to expand upon these comments in the future.

First of all let me point out that this plant will never be built.

And now on with this procedural exercise.

OVERALL APPROACH OF NRC

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.

WATER USE

The proposed reactor is to join two other reactors sited at that location. All three reactors would be totally dependent on the Susquehanna River for water. In addition, the increased operating power requests for the existing reactors into the future must be considered. Water use for the reactors that now exist is at critical levels. Also, the existing reactors compete for water with other plants nuclear and non-nuclear along the same river. Three Mile Island and Peach Bottom nuclear plants exist down river. In addition other power plants that depend on the Susquehanna River's limited water supply also exist: coal fired power plants, gas plants, waste incinerators, swage burning plants, etc., in Pennsylvania and New York. 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. 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. The population growth, density, and affiliated infrastructure must also be considered in the immediate radius of the plant and beyond. The one hundred year/five hundred year weather predictors must be considered. 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. All activities where PPL was fined must be considered. 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. 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. 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. Studies that follow present and former residents must be conducted. All water sources that the population with fifty miles of the plant depends on have to be considered. The water issue for a vast area surrounding the plant cannot be separated from the security issue. This will be mentioned below in the security area. 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. 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 Federal Fish and Wildlife Service's existing water and stream knowledge and all documents available from that source must be considered. All documents from NOAA must be considered as they relate to water and storm activity and water availability and quality. 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. The NRC probably isn't even aware of that aspect of power production as affecting the scoping document. 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. 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.

NEW REACTOR COSTS AND THE ANALYSIS AS TO WHO BENEFITS It sure enough isn't Pennsylvania

The scoping hearing of January 29, 2009 presented quite a number of witnesses who seemed to miss the point of the scoping hearing. All witnesses, or should I say, witlesses, who testified for the plant brought up one topic only. That topic was that the plant would provide jobs for the area. If one was to consider a permanent high level nuclear waste site as a great local jobs producer than apparently all these witnesses would welcome all the nuclear wastes from throughout the country because that would be a boost to the local economy. 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. This will be dealt with below in the waste, security sections and evacuation sections.

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 s 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.

The cost benefit analysis must also include a detailed analysis of the financial wisdom of building a new nuclear plant next to two old nuclear plants. Does the probability of a nuclear accident go up with a plants age? Of course it does. 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. 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 be 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? 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?

AIR QUALITY

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. 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.

NUCLEAR WASTE - HIGH LEVEL AND LOW LEVEL

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 analysed 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. 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. 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. 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.

SECURITY

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 then 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 confrontation. 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.

EVACUATION

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 catastrophe 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.

EARTHQUAKE STUDIES

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.

CONCLUSION AND RESERVATION

This party reserves the right to enter additional contentions at any future date. This party encourage 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.

“ NTBB Never To Be Built