

Request for Additional Information No. 5022
Letter Number 2010002
Application Revision 2

DRAFT

8/23/2010

Bell Bend
PPL Bell Bend LLC.
Docket No. 52-039
EIS 9.3 - Alternative Sites
Application Section: ER PART 3

QUESTIONS for Environmental Projects Branch 3 (RAP3)

EIS 9.3-11

This RAI is related to the second alternative sites audit information need ALT-1.

Provide the scoring rationale (as done in Alternate Site Evaluation Report (ASER), Appendix C) for all nine Candidate sites scored in Table 6.1 (e.g., Bainbridge, Conowingo, Martin's Creek).

Full Text (Supporting Information)

The environmental report (ER) has not yet been revised to reflect the changes in the screening methodology which resulted in the changes to the list of alternative sites. Therefore, at this stage of development by the applicant, only the ASER is available to explain the details of the revised alternative site screening process. Relevant elements of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission's (SRBC's) comments from its review of the ASER have been included in these RAIs to assure consistency between the applicant's response to the SRBC and future revision of the ER and ASER.

ESRP 9.3 indicates that the applicant's process for identifying alternate sites for evaluation is acceptable if "the applicant has employed a practicable site-selection process with the principal objective of identifying candidate sites that would be among the best that could be reasonably found for the proposed plant" and the process is ultimately supportive of a determination that there are or are not obviously superior sites to the proposed site. More detail is needed regarding the screening criteria, the weighting and ranking system, and the procedures followed in implementing the screening methodology.

EIS 9.3-12

This RAI is related to the second alternative sites audit information need ALT-7.

Provide clarification of the scoring on ASER page 27 for criterion 2c. In light of SRBC's March 1, 2010 determination that sufficient water will not be available at all times from the Susquehanna River without mitigating low flows, please justify the score of 5 for BBNPP for criterion 2c, and address whether other alternative sites that depend upon the Susquehanna River should have their scores revised for this criterion.

Full Text (Supporting Information)

The ER has not yet been revised to reflect the changes in the screening methodology which resulted in the changes to the list of alternative sites. Therefore, at this stage of development by the applicant, only the ASER is available to explain the details of the revised alternative site screening process. Relevant elements of the SRBC's comments from its review of the ASER have been included in these RAIs to assure consistency between the applicant's response to the SRBC and future revision of the ER and ASER.

ESRP 9.3 indicates that the applicant's process for identifying alternate sites for evaluation is acceptable if "the applicant has employed a practicable site-selection process with the principal objective of identifying candidate sites that would be among the best that could be reasonably found for the proposed plant" and the process is ultimately supportive of a determination that there are or are not obviously superior sites to the proposed site. More detail is needed regarding the screening criteria, the weighting and ranking system, and the procedures followed in implementing the screening methodology.

EIS 9.3-13

This RAI is related to the second alternative sites audit information need ALT-12.

Clarification is needed for ASER Appendix A, Criterion 5e. Given the workforce size, please justify why it takes more than 1,000 schools, or even 250 schools, to meet the need of the construction work force. Additionally, please address why the current capacity of nearby schools to accept new students was not considered.

Full Text (Supporting Information)

The ER has not yet been revised to reflect the changes in the screening methodology which resulted in the changes to the list of alternative sites. Therefore, at this stage of development by the applicant, only the ASER is available to explain the details of the revised alternative site screening process. Relevant elements of the SRBC's comments from its review of the ASER have been included in these RAIs to assure consistency between the applicant's response to the SRBC and future revision of the ER and ASER.

ESRP 9.3 indicates that the applicant's process for identifying alternate sites for evaluation is acceptable if "the applicant has employed a practicable site-selection process with the principal objective of identifying candidate sites that would be among the best that could be reasonably found for the proposed plant" and the process is ultimately supportive of a determination that there are or are not obviously superior sites to the proposed site. More detail is needed regarding the screening criteria, the weighting and ranking system, and the procedures followed in implementing the screening methodology.

EIS 9.3-14

This RAI is related to the second alternative sites audit information need ALT-15.

Clarification is needed on ASER page A-10, Criterion 12a. Score 2 includes Point of Interconnection greater than or equal to 30 miles. "*Transmission lines greater than 30 miles*" is an exclusionary criterion on page 9. Please clarify this apparent inconsistency.

Full Text (Supporting Information)

The ER has not yet been revised to reflect the changes in the screening methodology which resulted in the changes to the list of alternative sites. Therefore, at this stage of development by the applicant, only the ASER is available to explain the details of the revised alternative site screening process. Relevant elements of the SRBC's comments from its review of the ASER have been included in these RAIs to assure consistency between the applicant's response to the SRBC and future revision of the ER and ASER.

ESRP 9.3 indicates that the applicant's process for identifying alternate sites for evaluation is acceptable if "the applicant has employed a practicable site-selection process with the principal objective of identifying candidate sites that would be among the best that could be reasonably found for the proposed plant" and the process is ultimately supportive of a determination that there are or are not obviously superior sites to the proposed site. More detail is needed regarding the screening criteria, the weighting and ranking system, and the procedures followed in implementing the screening methodology.

EIS 9.3-15

This RAI is related to the second alternative sites audit information need ALT-20.

Clarification is needed for ASER Appendix C, page C-7. Criterion 1e attributes "steep" topography to the Montour site. The Montour site visited during the initial alternative site tour did not appear to have any steep terrain.

Full Text (Supporting Information)

The ER has not yet been revised to reflect the changes in the screening methodology which resulted in the changes to the list of alternative sites. Therefore, at this stage of development by the applicant, only the ASER is available to explain the details of the revised alternative site screening process. Relevant elements of the SRBC's comments from its review of the ASER have been included in these RAIs to assure consistency between the applicant's response to the SRBC and future revision of the ER and ASER.

ESRP 9.3 indicates that the applicant's process for identifying alternate sites for evaluation is acceptable if "the applicant has employed a practicable site-selection process with the principal objective of identifying candidate sites that would be among the best that could be reasonably found for the proposed plant" and the process is ultimately supportive of a determination that there are or are not obviously superior sites to the proposed site. More detail is needed regarding the screening criteria, the weighting and ranking system, and the procedures followed in implementing the screening methodology.

EIS 9.3-16

This RAI is related to the second alternative sites audit information need ALT-23.

Clarification is needed for ASER Appendix C, Page C-17, Criterion 1e. The conclusion: "*There is approximately 130 feet of relief across the site. However, the plot plan can be accommodated with limited cut and fill activities....*" appears to be inconsistent with the

definition of the criterion's scoring basis (page A-1) that would score >100 ft of relief a score of 1. There is no provision in the definition of a score of 3 for "limited cut and fill".

Full Text (Supporting Information)

The ER has not yet been revised to reflect the changes in the screening methodology which resulted in the changes to the list of alternative sites. Therefore, at this stage of development by the applicant, only the ASER is available to explain the details of the revised alternative site screening process. Relevant elements of the SRBC's comments from its review of the ASER have been included in these RAIs to assure consistency between the applicant's response to the SRBC and future revision of the ER and ASER.

ESRP 9.3 indicates that the applicant's process for identifying alternate sites for evaluation is acceptable if "the applicant has employed a practicable site-selection process with the principal objective of identifying candidate sites that would be among the best that could be reasonably found for the proposed plant" and the process is ultimately supportive of a determination that there are or are not obviously superior sites to the proposed site. More detail is needed regarding the screening criteria, the weighting and ranking system, and the procedures followed in implementing the screening methodology.

EIS 9.3-17

This RAI is related to the second alternative sites audit information need ALT-24.

Clarification is needed for ASER Appendix C, page C-21, Criterion 16c for the BBNPP site. Given the decision by the state of Pennsylvania to designate Walker Run as a wild trout stream of the State and the associated wetlands as EV, why is this score not a 1 instead of 5?

Full Text (Supporting Information)

The ER has not yet been revised to reflect the changes in the screening methodology which resulted in the changes to the list of alternative sites. Therefore, at this stage of development by the applicant, only the ASER is available to explain the details of the revised alternative site screening process. Relevant elements of the SRBC's comments from its review of the ASER have been included in these RAIs to assure consistency between the applicant's response to the SRBC and future revision of the ER and ASER.

ESRP 9.3 indicates that the applicant's process for identifying alternate sites for evaluation is acceptable if "the applicant has employed a practicable site-selection process with the principal objective of identifying candidate sites that would be among the best that could be reasonably found for the proposed plant" and the process is ultimately supportive of a determination that there are or are not obviously superior sites to the proposed site. More detail is needed regarding the screening criteria, the weighting and ranking system, and the procedures followed in implementing the screening methodology.

EIS 9.3-18

This RAI is related to the second alternative sites audit information need ALT-25.

Based on the SRBC's indications that alternative water sources will be required to augment low flow conditions in the Susquehanna River for plant operations at the BBNPP site, discuss the direct and indirect impacts of each alternative water source and address whether the low flow requirement would apply to the Humboldt and Seedco sites.

Full Text (Supporting Information)

The ER has not yet been revised to reflect the changes in the screening methodology which resulted in the changes to the list of alternative sites. Therefore, at this stage of development by the applicant, only the ASER is available to explain the details of the revised alternative site screening process. Relevant elements of the SRBC's comments from its review of the ASER have been included in these RAIs to assure consistency between the applicant's response to the SRBC and future revision of the ER and ASER.

ESRP 9.3 indicates that the applicant's process for identifying alternate sites for evaluation is acceptable if "the applicant has employed a practicable site-selection process with the principal objective of identifying candidate sites that would be among the best that could be reasonably found for the proposed plant" and the process is ultimately supportive of a determination that there are or are not obviously superior sites to the proposed site. More detail is needed regarding the screening criteria, the weighting and ranking system, and the procedures followed in implementing the screening methodology.

EIS 9.3-19

This RAI is related to the second alternative sites audit information need ALT-27.

Identify (a) the cost of consumptive water use and (b) the environmental impacts of blowdown from all six heat-dissipation alternatives, as requested in the SRBC March 1, 2010 letter to PPL (pp. 2 & 3).

Full Text (Supporting Information)

The ER has not yet been revised to reflect the changes in the screening methodology which resulted in the changes to the list of alternative sites. Therefore, at this stage of development by the applicant, only the ASER is available to explain the details of the revised alternative site screening process. Relevant elements of the SRBC's comments from its review of the ASER have been included in these RAIs to assure consistency between the applicant's response to the SRBC and future revision of the ER and ASER.

ESRP 9.3 indicates that the applicant's process for identifying alternate sites for evaluation is acceptable if "the applicant has employed a practicable site-selection process with the principal objective of identifying candidate sites that would be among the best that could be reasonably found for the proposed plant" and the process is ultimately supportive of a determination that there are or are not obviously superior sites to the proposed site. More detail is needed regarding the screening criteria, the weighting and ranking system, and the procedures followed in implementing the screening methodology.

EIS 9.3-20

This RAI is related to the second alternative sites audit information need ALT-29.

Identify the water source from which construction water would be trucked, the amount needed, its availability, and the truck traffic generated in terms of daily trips and duration. Discuss the effects of such shipments on the level-of-service (LOS) of route(s) that would be used.

Full Text (Supporting Information)

The ER has not yet been revised to reflect the changes in the screening methodology which resulted in the changes to the list of alternative sites. Therefore, at this stage of development by the applicant, only the ASER is available to explain the details of the revised alternative site screening process. Relevant elements of the SRBC's comments from its review of the ASER have been included in these RAIs to assure consistency between the applicant's response to the SRBC and future revision of the ER and ASER.

ESRP 9.3 indicates that the applicant's process for identifying alternate sites for evaluation is acceptable if "the applicant has employed a practicable site-selection process with the principal objective of identifying candidate sites that would be among the best that could be reasonably found for the proposed plant" and the process is ultimately supportive of a determination that there are or are not obviously superior sites to the proposed site. More detail is needed regarding the screening criteria, the weighting and ranking system, and the procedures followed in implementing the screening methodology.

EIS 9.3-21

This RAI is related to the second alternative sites audit information need ALT-24.

Given that the State has now designated certain wetlands on the BBNPP site as EV wetlands, explain any changes to alternative sites rankings from rescoring of the BBNPP site relative to wetlands.

Full Text (Supporting Information)

The ER has not yet been revised to reflect the changes in the screening methodology which resulted in the changes to the list of alternative sites. Therefore, at this stage of development by the applicant, only the ASER is available to explain the details of the revised alternative site screening process. Relevant elements of the SRBC's comments from its review of the ASER have been included in these RAIs to assure consistency between the applicant's response to the SRBC and future revision of the ER and ASER.

ESRP 9.3 indicates that the applicant's process for identifying alternate sites for evaluation is acceptable if "the applicant has employed a practicable site-selection process with the principal objective of identifying candidate sites that would be among the best that could be reasonably found for the proposed plant" and the process is ultimately supportive of a determination that there are or are not obviously superior sites to the proposed site. More detail is needed regarding the screening criteria, the weighting and ranking system, and the procedures followed in implementing the screening methodology.

EIS 9.3-22

This RAI is related to the second alternative sites audit information need ALT-32.

The SRBC in its March 1, 2010, letter to PPL requested that the weighting assigned to water availability be increased. Please clarify whether or not PPL will comply with this request, and if so, identify any changes that may result in scoring and ranking among the sites from this revised weighting.

Full Text (Supporting Information)

The ER has not yet been revised to reflect the changes in the screening methodology which resulted in the changes to the list of alternative sites. Therefore, at this stage of development by the applicant, only the ASER is available to explain the details of the revised alternative site screening process. Relevant elements of the SRBC's comments from its review of the ASER have been included in these RAIs to assure consistency between the applicant's response to the SRBC and future revision of the ER and ASER.

ESRP 9.3 indicates that the applicant's process for identifying alternate sites for evaluation is acceptable if "the applicant has employed a practicable site-selection process with the principal objective of identifying candidate sites that would be among the best that could be reasonably found for the proposed plant" and the process is ultimately supportive of a determination that there are or are not obviously superior sites to the proposed site. More detail is needed regarding the screening criteria, the weighting and ranking system, and the procedures followed in implementing the screening methodology.