

**USACE Information Needs for
Bell Bend Second Alternate Sites Visit**

Info Needs #	ER Section	Information Needed
USACE -1	9.3.2.1	Provide an expert who can discuss the wetland scoring for criterion 16c. (High Quality Wetlands within Site) for the Bell Bend site now that wetlands connected to Walker Run are designated as Exceptional Value wetlands. As the scoring would appear to change from a 5 to a 1, how would this change affect the overall scoring of Bell Bend and the decision that there is no environmentally preferred site?
USACE-2	9.3.2.1	Provide an expert who can discuss the terrestrial resources scoring for criterion 3a. (Endangered / Threatened Habitats) for the Bell Bend site now that the July 1, 2009 letter from U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service has stated that suitable habitat exists on site for the Indiana bat (<i>Myotis sodalis</i>). As the scoring would appear to change from a 5 to a 1, how would that change affect the overall scoring of Bell Bend and the decision that there is no environmentally preferred site?
USACE-3	9.3.2.1	Provide an expert who can discuss the scoring for criterion 2c. (Water Availability) for the Bell Bend site. The scoring uses a Q7-10 calculated over the last 10 years (1999-2009). However, per the SRBC, the recommended Q7-10 should use the lowest 7-day average flow with a 10% chance of reoccurrence, based on the entire period of record of the referenced gage. If the recommendation by SRBC is followed, then the Q7-10 should be re-calculated for all of the alternative sites as well as the candidate sites.
USACE-4	9.3.2	Provide an expert who can discuss the screening criteria for consumptive water use at the preferred and alternative sites. Consumptive water use was not used as a sub-set of criterion 2 (Hydrology, Water Quality, & Water Availability), however according to the March 1, 2010 letter from the SRBC, the consumptive water use of the Bell Bend site (up to 31 million gallons per day (mgd)) appears to have the potential to adversely impact the Susquehanna River.
USACE-5	9.3.2	Provide an expert who can discuss the screening criteria for criterion 7 (Historic & Cultural Resources). It appears that there is no scoring basis for a resource if it is located on site. It also appears that neither sub-criterion 7a. (Historic Buildings, Structures, Objects & Sites) nor sub-criterion 7b (Historic Districts) included potential impacts to archeological sites. The Corps, in its review, requires an analysis of both historic and archeological resources.
USACE-6	9.3.2.1	Provide an expert who can discuss the scoring for criterion 7 (Historic & Cultural Resources) for the Bell Bend site. Based on preliminary results of GAI's Phase II National Register evaluations, two of the seven archeological sites (36LU281 & 36LU285) are recommended as eligible for listing on the NRHP. These sites are within the owner controlled area. As such, the scoring should change. How would this change affect the overall scoring of Bell Bend and the decision that there is no environmentally preferred site?
USACE-7	9.3.2.1	Provide an expert who can discuss the historic and archeological impacts on the Bell Bend site. In Section 5.1.3 of Part 3 of the Environmental Report, it states "Based on results of cultural resources investigations conducted to date, it is likely that there will be adverse impacts to cultural resources from construction."
USACE-8	9.3.2.3	CAN Do, Inc. of Hazleton, PA is the current owner of the Humboldt alternative site. CAN Do., Inc has submitted permit applications to the PA DEP Northeast Regional Office and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Baltimore

Info Needs #	ER Section	Information Needed
		District for authorizations to develop this site into an industrial park. Provide an expert who can discuss this issue and document how/ why this site was chosen as an alternative site if it is currently being proposed as an industrial subdivision.
USACE-9	9.3.2	As provided in Table 9.3-12 – Comparison of Wetland and Waterway Impacts: BBNPP vs. Alternative Sites, provide an expert who can discuss the minimum width ROW requirements for the water line that would need to be constructed at the alternative sites. It is unclear why a water line would require a 120-foot ROW for the installation of two new 60” pipes. The Corps would view this ROW width as excessive and would require a much smaller width. As such, these estimations of impact should be re-calculated.
USACE-10	9.3.2.2	As provided in Table 9.3-12 – Comparison of Wetland and Waterway Impacts: BBNPP vs. Alternative Sites, provide an expert who can discuss the wetland and stream impacts for the new water line ROW at the Montour site. The Corps is aware that an established 12-mile ROW to the West Branch Susquehanna River already exists as part of the coal fired generation plant at Montour. This PPL owned, 12-mile ROW was recently established for the effluent associated with the newly installed scrubbers. Why weren’t the estimated wetland and/or stream impacts based on using this established ROW?
USACE-11	9.3.2	As provided in Table 9.3-12 – Comparison of Wetland and Waterway Impacts: BBNPP vs. Alternative Sites, provide an expert who can discuss the minimum width ROW requirements for the transmission lines that would need to be constructed at the alternative sites. It is unclear why a transmission line would require a 300-ft ROW to accommodate the EPR. The required ROW for the Susquehanna-Roseland project (the transmission line that will accommodate the EPR at the Bell Bend site) will be a maximum of 200 feet. For the Susquehanna-Roseland project, PPL Electric Utilities’ Vegetation Management Plan recognizes a Wire Security Zone (WSZ) – 17 feet from the lines – that must be maintained; the remaining ROW will allow vegetation re-growth. As such, the Corps would view the 300 foot ROW width as excessive and would require a much smaller width. As such, these estimations of impact should be re-calculated.
USACE-12	9.3.2	As provided in Table 9.3-12 – Comparison of Wetland and Waterway Impacts: BBNPP vs. Alternative Sites, provide an expert who can discuss the wetland and stream impacts for the transmission line ROW for the alternative sites. The Montour site, for example, has two existing 500 kV lines within the 30-mile radius for possible interconnection – one is 14.3 miles away and the other 20.5 miles. Aerial crossings of wetlands and streams should not be viewed as an impact; as such it is unclear how the impact numbers (6.3 acres of wetlands and 2,587 l.ft. of stream) were calculated for the Montour site. In comparison, the transmission line project for the Bell Bend site (Susquehanna-Roseland) will be approximately 100 miles long with a TOTAL wetland impact of 0.58 acres (this accounts for any and all temporary access).
USACE-13	9.3.2	As provided in Table 9.3-7 Summary Comparison of Alternative Sites, provide an expert who can discuss the transmission corridor criterion and provide a rationale for summarizing impacts as “small to moderate” for the three alternative sites.