

Comments on Public Notice NAB-2008-01401-P13

Bell Bend Nuclear Power Plant to

USACE Baltimore PN 12-07

February 20, 2012

By Tina Daly - [REDACTED]

→ Please DO NOT put my home address on line ← ☆

This application to allow work on a NEW nuclear power plant is very strange.

It appears that the PPL Bell Bend LLC has applied for a permit and that the USACE has rephrased the applicant's words into this Public Notice.

This is a BIG DEAL.

The Corps is putting the cart before the horse. Doing the permitting in pieces is NOT the way to let a nuclear power plant get the go-ahead

Where does this permit fit into the whole picture?

Is it part of an EIS? How, beyond what is presented in this notice. There are lots of water issues which may need to be addressed in conjunction with dredge + fill in wetlands.

How do we know that other agencies will allow all the things that this Notice seems to take for granted: water intake, final design ~~at this time~~

2.

for impacts to waters + wetlands - what stage of the design are we in?

The Corps states on p. 2 that it will (in the future) issue a jurisdictional determination verifying which waters would be jurisdictional. Shouldn't this be done PRIOR to putting this out for comment? This is premature.

Why should we comment on "potentially jurisdictional areas: SUMMARIZED below?"

summarized? what is left out? or added?
or restated?

P. 2 A-F

where do the sewer lines go?

what is the bridge design

what is in the fill? is it contaminated material?

Access is interesting but not the whole picture.

P. 2 G

Rail access: we need to know more about the need for rail access.

P. 2-3 K

The intake structure. Is this for water associated with the Susquehanna River Basin Authority permits? If so, the cart is before the horse. Like Limonite

3.

Nuclear Power Plant and The Schuylkill River -
where the river is practically dedicated to
the power plant and air and water pollution
have been linked and where if you want to see
the River - look in the sky

Is that what this is?

Why comment until the SRBA decides about
withdrawals?

P. 3 N

What contaminants are in the dredge spoils?

Who tests?

P. 3 O

Blowdown Diffuser Pipe - what comes out of
this pipe? Radioactive materials?

P. 3 - PQR

All very large scale and a bit vague.

P. 4 Maintenance Impacts

Proposing to issue permits good for 10 years is putting the cart
way ahead of horse.

2. What is expected to be in the dredge spoils?

Will it be tested? Be specific.

4
P. 5

Obviously there are huge water issues here that must be dealt with within the framework of the Big Picture and not splintered into tiny decision making pieces. Please look at the water & wetland issues in a much more comprehensive way.

P. 6

The argument that ONLY nuclear power can fulfill the need is questionable and must be discussed in a broad way and not in the context of this notice.

There is a GLUT of natural gas. There is Coal.
There are many voices to be heard.

P. 6-7

Compensatory Mitigation measures are nonsense. Bell Bend owners, nor anyone, can improve on nature and neither can they "enhance" a stream channel, that is realigned (to suit them).

P. 9

Please save the Indians Bet.

5.

Please recognize that this is a Big Deal.

The Corps is out of step

Please DO NOT issue this permit

Please look at All water issues at the same time.

There is no EIS

There is no jurisdictional determination

Please

STOP + wait + go slowly

What about onsite storage of HLW?

This sets a Bad Precedent for permitting new nuclear power plants. I object to what is going on.

I thank the Corps for soliciting public comment.

The biggest environmental threat is the lack of opportunity for citizens to be part of the decision-making process and to participate in a timely, meaningful way, so their voices are heard.

—H—

RECEIVED FEB 1 8 50 AM '87