

**Official Transcript of Proceedings**  
**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title: Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Bell Bend Nuclear Power Plant  
Evening Session

Docket Number: 52-039

Location: Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania

Date: Thursday, June 4, 2015

Work Order No.: NRC-1607

Pages 1-40

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.  
Court Reporters and Transcribers  
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 234-4433

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

Regarding the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Bell Bend Nuclear Power Plant  
Combined License Application  
Evening Session

+ + + + +

Docket No: 52-039

+ + + + +

Thursday, June 4, 2015

7:30 p.m.

+ + + + +

Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania

NRC STAFF PRESENT:

Francis Cameron, Meeting Facilitator

Jennifer Dixon-Herrity, NRC, Branch Chief

Tomeka Terry, NRC, Environmental Project Manager

Wade Chandler, USACE-Baltimore District Section Chief

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(7:30 p.m.)

MR. CAMERON: Good evening, everyone. My name is Chip Cameron, and I'd like to welcome you to tonight's public meeting. And I'm going to serve as your facilitator for the meeting tonight, and in this role I'll try to help all of you to have a productive meeting.

The topic for tonight is the draft environmental impact statement that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has prepared as part of its evaluation on a license application to build and operate a new reactor. And that application was submitted by PPL Bell Bend Company that's since been renamed, it's now Talen Energy, but the NRC staff in talking about the draft environmental impact statement will be referring to it as PPL Bell Bend. And the new reactor would have -- would be at a site adjacent to the existing Susquehanna Steam Electric Station.

We'll try not to use many acronyms tonight but we will use NRC for Nuclear Regulatory Commission and EIS for environmental impact statement. And the EIS is one of the two primary documents that the NRC prepares in determining whether they're going to -- to issue a license to a company to build and operate a nuclear power plant. The other document is something

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 called the safety evaluation report; and that document  
2 looks to see whether the license application meets all  
3 of the requirements, safety requirements, that the NRC  
4 has for building and operating a nuclear power plant.

5 And I would note that the safety review is  
6 on hold at this point because of the fact that the design  
7 for the reactor, that effort has been suspended at this  
8 point. And so that's why the NRC has put their safety  
9 evaluation on hold. But they're going forward with  
10 looking at potential environmental impacts, and that's  
11 why we're here tonight.

12 I know that many of you probably are  
13 wondering about what this means in the time table for  
14 this project, and the best people to tell you about that  
15 are the people from Talen Energy, and we have two  
16 representatives from Talen here tonight. There's Rocky  
17 Sgarro, who's back there, and beside Rocky is Todd  
18 Martin. And if you have questions about the time table,  
19 they're going to be here after the meeting to talk with  
20 you about that.

21 What I want to do is give you a little bit  
22 of a few minutes' briefing on what the meeting process  
23 is going to be like tonight so that you know what to  
24 expect, and I'd like to tell you about the objectives  
25 for the meeting, the format for the meeting, some simple

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 ground rules that we're going to operate under, and  
2 introduce the speakers from not only the NRC but from  
3 the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

4 The NRC is the lead agency in the  
5 preparation of this draft EIS but the Army Corps of  
6 Engineers is what is known as a cooperating agency in  
7 the preparation of the draft EIS. The Army Corps has  
8 permitting responsibilities in regard to the  
9 construction of this new reactor, and they're going to  
10 be talking to you about their responsibilities relative  
11 to this. And we have -- we have Wade Chandler right here,  
12 and Wade is the Chief of the Pennsylvania Section of  
13 the Corps's Baltimore District. And with Wade is the  
14 Project Manager for this environmental review for the  
15 Corps, and that's -- that's Amy Elliott. So you're going  
16 to be hearing from them in a few minutes.

17 In terms of the objectives, we want to make  
18 sure that you get a clear explanation of the EIS process  
19 and also some of the findings in the draft EIS, and I  
20 would emphasize that word draft. Because this  
21 environmental impact statement is not going to be  
22 finalized, and it won't be used in the decision-making  
23 process on granting this license, until the NRC and the  
24 Corps of Engineers evaluates all the public comments  
25 that they receive on the draft EIS. That includes any

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 comments that they hear tonight from any of you. It also  
2 includes written comments. And you're going to hear  
3 about how to submit those comments.

4 Tomeka Terry is the Environmental Project  
5 Manager for the NRC on this license application, and  
6 she's going to tell you how to submit those written  
7 comments. And you can speak tonight, and you can also  
8 submit a written comment later, or you can listen to  
9 what people say, what the NRC says, the Corps says, and  
10 then decide to submit a written comment. But comments  
11 tonight carry the same weight as -- as written comments.

12 And that ties into the second objective,  
13 which is for the NRC and the Corps to listen carefully  
14 to what you -- to what you say and to start thinking  
15 about how that might affect, further promote the  
16 quality of the environmental impact statement.

17 Format, very simple; we're going to have  
18 some brief presentations for you, and after those  
19 presentations we'll have some time to see if you have  
20 any clarifying questions about the process, we'll  
21 answer those questions. And then we're going to go to  
22 public comment. And if you want to comment, I know that  
23 our staff at the desk has asked you if you wanted to  
24 fill out a yellow card to comment. If you didn't fill  
25 out a yellow card and something sparks your interest

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 during the meeting and you want to comment, we can  
2 accommodate you on that, even though you didn't fill  
3 out a yellow card.

4 Ground rules, just wait until all the  
5 presentations are done so you get the complete picture  
6 before you -- you ask questions. When we get to the  
7 question period, just give me a signal, raise your hand,  
8 and I'll bring this microphone to you; and please  
9 introduce yourself to us and ask your question, and  
10 we'll try our best to give you a clear answer to that.

11 And I would just ask that only one person  
12 at a time speak, because that will let us give that  
13 person our full attention, whomever has the floor, but  
14 also it -- it aids in getting what I call a clean  
15 transcript. Ruth is our court stenographer tonight,  
16 and she's taking a transcript, and that will be your  
17 record of this meeting and it will be the NRC's record  
18 of the meeting. It will be publicly available.

19 I usually ask people to be brief in their  
20 comments so that we can make sure that we get to  
21 everybody who wants to talk. We only have one person  
22 so far who wants to speak tonight, so that -- that we  
23 have -- we don't have to worry too much about the time  
24 spent on an individual comment. But if you can try to  
25 be brief, that would be -- that would be -- that would

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 be helpful.

2 The NRC and the Corps, they're not going  
3 to engage in any dialogue with you when you're  
4 commenting. And some people when they comment, they get  
5 up and they ask a bunch of questions. The NRC and the  
6 Corps, they're not going to be talking to you about your  
7 comments, but they are going to be listening carefully  
8 to what you say, and then they will evaluate those  
9 comments and questions when they are preparing the  
10 final environmental impact statement.

11 There's always a lot of concerns, the NRC  
12 is here and the Corps, they're here to talk about this  
13 environmental review for this proposed new plant. The  
14 public has lots of other concerns usually besides the  
15 focus of the meeting. For example, you might have  
16 concerns about the -- the existing reactors. We're not  
17 here to talk about that, but I want to introduce two  
18 key people that will be here to talk to you later on  
19 if you have questions about the existing reactors. And  
20 we have our senior resident inspector right here, Jon  
21 Greives; and we have someone from NRC headquarters,  
22 Jeff Whited, who is with the Office of Nuclear Reactor  
23 Regulations. So see them if you have questions about  
24 the operating reactors.

25 And I should mention that the NRC's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 resident inspectors live in the community, they're at  
2 the site to ensure that NRC regulations and license  
3 conditions are followed.

4 And I guess a final thing is, just for all  
5 of us, is to extend courtesy to one another. You may  
6 have different views from people that speak tonight,  
7 and I just would ask you to respect those views and the  
8 people who are giving them. And.

9 Oh, one thing I should mention. The NRC  
10 conducts a yearly assessment of each nuclear reactor  
11 operating site. And the annual assessment for the  
12 Susquehanna reactors, the ones that are operating, is  
13 going to be on June 11th. And it's going to be at the  
14 Susquehanna Information Center which is at 634 Salem  
15 Boulevard in Berwick. And again, John and Jeff can give  
16 you more information about that.

17 Let me introduce our speakers, some of whom  
18 I've already mentioned. Our senior NRC official tonight  
19 is Jennifer Dixon-Herrity right here. Jennifer is the  
20 Chief of the Environmental Project Branch, and she's  
21 going to welcome you and say a little bit about what  
22 we're doing here. And then we're going to hear from  
23 Tomeka Terry, who's the Environmental Project Manager.

24 I should note that the other NRC  
25 environmental project managers, Pat Vokoun is right

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1       there in the back of the room. And after Tomeka tells  
2       you a little bit about the -- how this all came about,  
3       we're going to hear from -- from Wade Chandler from the  
4       Corps of Engineers, who will talk to you about the  
5       Corps's responsibility. And finally Tomeka is going to  
6       come back and tell you a little bit about what the NRC  
7       and the Corps has found in terms of draft environmental  
8       impacts.

9                       And with that I guess I could turn it over  
10       to you, Jennifer.

11                      MS. DIXON-HERRITY: Okay. Good evening, and  
12       welcome to today's public meeting. As Chip indicated,  
13       we're here to talk about the Bell Bend Nuclear Power  
14       Plant draft environmental impact statement which we  
15       published in April of this year. The reason we meet with  
16       the public to collect comments is to give you the chance  
17       to tell us if we've missed something, if you have  
18       concerns about the area that we should be aware of,  
19       environmentally, or if we've mischaracterized anything  
20       in our document. We want to make sure that we have a  
21       high quality, accurate document to go forward for the  
22       decision when it -- when it is time to license this  
23       reactor.

24                      Through this meeting and through the  
25       different methods that Tomeka's going to talk about,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we collect all the comments, and we try to address them.  
2 How we address them and the actual comments verbatim  
3 will be included in the final environmental impact  
4 statement in Appendix E.

5 Next slide, please?

6 I think that Chip has covered this very  
7 well, so we won't go over it again.

8 I want to thank you again for coming out  
9 today, and we'll move right forward with Tomeka. I hope  
10 we have a great meeting. Thank you.

11 MS. TERRY: Thank you, Jennifer.

12 I also wanted to thank all of you for taking  
13 the time to come out here today. My name is Tomeka Terry,  
14 and I am the Environmental Project Manager for the  
15 environmental review for the proposed site, Bell Bend  
16 site.

17 Since it has been several years since we  
18 were here for the public scoping meeting, I want to take  
19 a few moments to talk about the combined license  
20 application submitted by PPL.

21 In October 2008, PPL submitted an  
22 application to the NRC for one new nuclear unit at the  
23 Bell Bend site for a combined license application. A  
24 combined license, if it's granted, would be  
25 authorization to construct and operate one nuclear unit

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on the Bell Bend site, which is adjacent to the existing  
2 Susquehanna Steam Electrical Station.

3 For the Bell Bend Nuclear Power Plant  
4 combined license application, NRC conducts two reviews  
5 at the same time; a safety review and an environmental  
6 review. The safety review will result in a safety  
7 evaluation report in which the staff will determine  
8 whether the reactor design chosen by PPL built at this  
9 site meets our safety requirements.

10 Please note: An NRC decision cannot occur  
11 on the combined license application until both the  
12 safety and the environmental review are complete.

13 But today, the primary focus of this  
14 meeting is to gather comments on the NRC draft  
15 environmental impact statement, or EIS, for the  
16 environmental review.

17 Next slide, please.

18 The NRC is the lead Federal agency that has  
19 partnered with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,  
20 Baltimore District as a cooperating agency. In  
21 addition, the Corps plans to utilize some of the  
22 information on the draft EIS in its review of the  
23 Department of Army permit application submitted by PPL.

24 In a few moments, Mr. Wade Chandler,  
25 Section Chief of Regulatory Branch from the U.S. Army

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Corps of Engineers, is going to talk with us about the  
2 Corps environmental review of the proposed project.

3 At this time, before I get into the  
4 environmental review process and the permanent  
5 analysis of environmental impacts, Wade Chandler is  
6 going to come up and talk about the Corps environmental  
7 review of the proposed project.

8 Next slide. Wade?

9 MR. CHANDLER: Thank you.

10 Good evening. As I said, my name is Wade  
11 Chandler, and I am the Chief of the Pennsylvania Section  
12 for Regulatory Branch Baltimore District Corps of  
13 Engineers. Also with me is Amy Elliott; she's the  
14 Project Manager who's in charge of evaluating the  
15 permit application for this proposed project. We want  
16 to welcome you to the joint U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
17 public hearing and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
18 public meeting for the proposed Bell Bend Power  
19 project.

20 It is the responsibility of my office to  
21 evaluate the applications for Department of Army  
22 authorization for work in navigable waters of the  
23 United States and waters of the United States including  
24 jurisdictional wetlands. Our authority comes from  
25 Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

2 At this time no decision has been made  
3 regarding whether or not a Department of the Army permit  
4 will be issued for the proposed project.

5 The purpose of today's meeting is to inform  
6 you of this proposed project and allow you the  
7 opportunity to provide comments to be considered in the  
8 Corps's public interest review for the proposed  
9 project. A Federal public hearing is a formal process  
10 used to gather information that otherwise would not be  
11 available during the public notice comment period. Your  
12 comments will be included in and addressed in the  
13 environmental impact statement for the project. Your  
14 comments are important in the preparation of this  
15 document and our evaluation of the permit application.

16 The subject project is proposed by Talen  
17 Nuclear Development, LLC, formerly PPL Nuclear  
18 Development, LLC, and is referenced as the Bell Bend  
19 Nuclear Power Plant project. The project as proposed  
20 is to construct a new nuclear power plant at a site  
21 adjacent to the existing Susquehanna Stream Electric  
22 Station. Of the approximate 2,055-acre site,  
23 approximately 961 acres would be altered to support  
24 construction and operation of the proposed facility.  
25 Site preparation and construction work will include but

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 not be limited to construction access, temporary  
2 laydown areas, switch yard expansion, power block,  
3 cooling towers, transmission lines, and river dredging  
4 for intake and discharge structures.

5 Proposed project impacts to navigable  
6 waters of the United States are located in the North  
7 Branch Susquehanna River. Impacts to waters of the  
8 United States including jurisdictional wetlands are  
9 located in North Branch Susquehanna River, Walker Run,  
10 and an unnamed tributary to Walker Run, all located near  
11 Berwick, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania.

12 As proposed, construction of the Bell Bend  
13 facility will result in the following impacts:

14 Approximately 11.15 acres of wetland  
15 impact, of which 1.25 acres will be permanent; 9 acres  
16 will be permanent wetland type conversion; and  
17 nine-tenths of an acre would be a temporary wetland  
18 impact; 1,443 linear feet of stream impact, temporary;  
19 and 742 linear feet of permanent stream impact  
20 proposed. The impacts to the North Branch of the  
21 Susquehanna River as a result of river dredging total  
22 approximately 1.18 acres.

23 The decision of whether or not to issue a  
24 permit will be based on an evaluation of probable  
25 impacts, including cumulative impacts of the proposed

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 activity on the public interest, and compliance with  
2 the Clean Water Act Section 404(b)1 guidelines. That  
3 decision will reflect the national concern for both  
4 protection and utilization of important resources. The  
5 benefits which may reasonably be expected to accrue  
6 from the proposal will be balanced against its  
7 reasonable foreseeable detriments.

8 All factors that may be relevant to the  
9 proposal were considered. Among these are  
10 conservation, economics, aesthetics, general  
11 environmental concerns, wetlands, cultural values,  
12 fish and wildlife service values, flood hazards,  
13 accretion, recreation, water supply and conservation,  
14 water and air quality, threatened and endangered  
15 species, energy needs, food and fiber production,  
16 safety, environmental justice, cumulative impacts, and  
17 the general needs and welfare of the public.

18 In compliance with the National  
19 Environmental Policy Act, the Corps is a cooperating  
20 agency in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's  
21 preparation of an environmental impact statement for  
22 the proposed project.

23 The Corps's comment period for this  
24 hearing and for public comments extends until July 1st  
25 of 2015. Comments received tonight and throughout the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433



comment period will be considered by the Corps as we reach a permit decision. Your testimony this afternoon and this evening will be recorded and will be prepared, and we will prepare a verbatim record of today's hearing. If you'd like to receive a copy of the transcript of these proceedings, please provide us with your information on the attendance record at the registration table. Once we have the verbatim record, we will contact you and let you know the associated cost and how we can provide you with a copy of the record. All comments made at this proceeding will be made part of the hearing record.

As I discussed, and as has already been presented, the NRC is the lead Federal agency for this overall project. As part of their role, they are dealing with and ensuring compliance of Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act for the overall project.

The Corps is a cooperating agency, and we are dealing in part responsibility for Section 106, compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act. Our permit application evaluation involves the NEPA document, the draft EIS, the final EIS, and, as mentioned, we are a cooperating agency with the NRC.

We also have a public interest review where we consider public interest review factors and we look

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 at the compliance with the 404(b)1 guidelines.

2 The Corps permit evaluation and decision,  
3 we will document in our record a decision which will  
4 reference the final EIS and any additional information  
5 necessary to support compliance with other regulations  
6 in our permit decision.

7 Next, please?

8 We received an application for the  
9 proposed project in June of 2011. This slide references  
10 our file number that we have, so if you are still  
11 supplying any comments to the Corps we would ask that  
12 you cite the project and if possible also quote our  
13 filing number.

14 There is a link here showing our public  
15 notice of the proposed project. We do have copies of  
16 the public notice also at our desk out in the lobby.

17 Contact with us. The Project Manager, as  
18 mentioned, is Amy Elliott. Her contact information is  
19 provided here as well.

20 And if you'd like other information about  
21 the regulatory program, we have it at the table in the  
22 lobby, and you can also find it at this link.

23 Thank you. And turn it back to Tomeka.

24 MS. TERRY: This slide provides a high level  
25 overview of the environmental review process. This is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the step-wise approach in how we meet our  
2 responsibility under the National Environmental Policy  
3 Act, or NEPA. We received the -- I'm sorry, excuse me.

4 The review process started in 2008. The  
5 public scoping period ran from January 2009 to March  
6 2009. Then the public scoping meeting was held on  
7 January 6, 2009. Also, a 30-day supplemental public  
8 scoping period ran from June 2012 to July 2012 in  
9 regarding PPL revising the site layout that included  
10 a relocated power block footprint developed to avoid  
11 wetlands impacts on the building site.

12 The input provided during this scoping  
13 period is summarized in Appendix D of the draft EIS.

14 Also during this time we conducted site  
15 audits, visits to the alternative sites, and met with  
16 officials from Federal, tribal, state, and local  
17 agencies. We carried out independent analyses and  
18 evaluations based on information that was provided to  
19 us by applicant and other information sources we  
20 developed. All of these steps led to the publication  
21 of the draft EIS, which occurred April the 17th, 2015.

22 Currently we are here in the comment period  
23 for the draft EIS. And we are seeking public comments.

24 The 75-day comment period began April 24th  
25 and will remain open until July the 7th. Once the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

comment period is over, the staff will start processing all the comments that were received on the draft EIS. That includes anything that you want to share with us today.

Please note: Any comments you share with us today will be considered in the same manner as a comment received by letter or email. All comments carry the same weight.

And in addition, comments and responses on the draft EIS will be included in Appendix E of the final EIS so that you can be aware of how the review team considered your comments.

Based on the comments received, we will adjust our analysis as needed to finalize the EIS. We expect to issue the final EIS in April 2016.

Next slide, please.

Let's take a look at the organization of the draft EIS. This is a table of contents.

We start off during chapter 1 through 3 by describing the current environmental settings and the proposed project. Then we discuss the results of analysis of impacts for the various phases of the project in chapter 4 through 7.

We assess the need for power in chapter 8, as well as the alternatives to the proposed project in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

chapter 9.

In chapter 10 we conclude the EIS with NRC staff, preliminary recommendation to the Commission.

Finally, finally we have appendices which mainly include detailed information and materials which support the environmental review.

Next slide, please.

To prepare for the EIS, we assembled a team with background in necessary technical disciplines. NRC contracted with Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, PNNL, and Numark to assist in preparing the EIS. Also the Corps -- also, the Corps provided technical -- I'm sorry. Also, the Corps also provided technical expertise in the development of the EIS.

This slide shows most of the resource areas that we considered in the EIS, and many of these staff expertise have been available to you today during our informal open house and are here tonight to receive your comments. In the interest of time, I will only be presenting the results of the evaluation of some of these resource areas.

Next slide, please.

NRC has established three impacts category levels, small, moderate, and large, to help explain the effects of the project in consistent terms

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 for each of the resource areas. As the team was  
2 developing its analysis, the review team members were  
3 asked if the effects are minor or not even detectable,  
4 then we categorize them as small effects. If the effects  
5 was sufficient to noticeably alter but not destabilize  
6 important attributes to the resource, then it would be  
7 moderate effect. Or if the effects were sufficient to  
8 destabilize important attributes of the resource, then  
9 it would be a large impact.

10 So throughout that EIS, for each technical  
11 areas, like one we saw in the previous slide, the team  
12 would develop an analysis and assign a level of  
13 significance, small, moderate, or large, to impacts.

14 Next slide, please.

15 Now we'll get into a little bit more  
16 details about the technical, technical areas. First,  
17 the water resource. Our evaluation considered the  
18 impact of construction and operation Bell Bend for both  
19 surface water and groundwater resource. This includes  
20 impacts of water use and water quality.

21 PPL application indicated that surface  
22 water would not be used during building activities on  
23 the proposed site. During operations of the proposed  
24 Bell Bend unit, the Susquehanna River would be the  
25 source of makeup water for the normal plant operation.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Therefore, our evaluation concluded the impact of  
2 surface water use and surface water quality during  
3 building and operating would be small.

4 No on-site groundwater would be withdrawn  
5 for operational use of the proposed building unit.  
6 Susquehanna River Basin Commission requires mitigation  
7 in the form of releases from upstream sources to  
8 compensate for Bell Bend consumptive water use during  
9 low flow conditions.

10 Next slide, please.

11 Next is ecology impacts. The review team  
12 evaluated the impacts on ecology that either exist or  
13 can exist on the Bell Bend site or in the surrounding  
14 areas or nearby water bodies. Our evaluation covered  
15 species such as the northern cricket frog and the  
16 northern long-eared bat and the brown trout. The staff  
17 consulted with other agencies including Fish and  
18 Wildlife, Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission, and  
19 Pennsylvania Game Commission, and other state  
20 agencies.

21 The review team concluded that the  
22 terrestrial ecology impacts would be moderate during  
23 building activities due to disturbance of wetlands,  
24 forests, and other terrestrial habitats at the Bell  
25 Bend site and associated impacts on wildlife such as

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the long-eared bat and the northern cricket frog.

2 The potential impacts of operating the  
3 proposed Bell Bend and associated cooling system,  
4 including consumptive water use, mitigation, on upland  
5 or shoreline vegetation, birds, and mammals, including  
6 important species and habitats, are likely to be minor.  
7 Therefore, the review team concludes that the impacts  
8 from operation of the proposed building site on the  
9 terrestrial resource would be small.

10 The review team concluded that the  
11 aquatic -- sorry. The review team concluded that  
12 aquatic ecology impacts would be small during both  
13 building activities and operation. The potential for  
14 a small aquatic ecology impact during building  
15 activities would involve some unavoidable permanent  
16 impacts on wetlands, streams, and would require  
17 mitigation. The purpose -- a portion of this mitigation  
18 includes streams and flood plain restoration projects  
19 on two reaches of Walker Run. This would improve the  
20 local hydrology and provide high quality habitat for  
21 brown trout. PPL would need to comply with mitigation  
22 measures.

23 Operational impacts from the river water  
24 intake system would be minimized with the use of closed  
25 cycle cooling and dual low travel screens with low

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 through screen intake velocity. The impacts of aquatic  
2 resource habitat in the Susquehanna River due to  
3 discharge could result in thermal, chemical, and  
4 physical effects, as well as hydrology changes, but the  
5 impacts were found to be minor.

6 Next slide, please.

7 As part of the NRC analysis, we evaluated  
8 potential doses to workers during construction, doses  
9 to the members of the public, the plant workers during  
10 operation, and the doses that are received by wildlife.  
11 NRC provided further guidelines that nuclear power  
12 plant operators are expected to maintain the doses to  
13 the public as low as reasonably achievable by limits  
14 of -- limiting liquid and gaseous release  
15 concentrations.

16 NRC regulation limits the whole body doses  
17 to a member of the public from both liquid and gaseous  
18 effluent releases not to exceed around 8 MREMs per year  
19 from a nuclear power plant.

20 NRC regulations also impact -- NRC also  
21 implements U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
22 standards designed to limit individual whole body doses  
23 from the entire fuel cycle not exceeding 25 MREMs per  
24 year.

25 To put the above radiation exposure into

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 perspective, the average dose of an individual in the  
2 United States from natural background sources, cosmic  
3 radiation, naturally occurring radioactive materials  
4 in the soil, and building materials is around 310 MREMs  
5 per year. The NRC regulated limits is less than 10  
6 percent of the total from the natural background  
7 source.

8 The impacts on all three groups, doses to  
9 a member of the public, plant workers, wildlife, would  
10 be small, since PPL must comply with stringent NRC and  
11 EPA regulations, regulatory limits.

12 Next slide, please.

13 In chapter 9 the review team evaluated  
14 energy alternative sources, alternative sites,  
15 alternative system designs, as well as no action  
16 alternatives.

17 In the alternative energy analysis, the  
18 review team evaluated generations of base load power,  
19 which is when the power is continuously producing 24  
20 hours per day, 7 days a week.

21 For base load power, we examined sources  
22 such as coal, natural gas, combination sources such as  
23 natural gas, solar, wind, biomass, and additional  
24 conservation and demand side management programs.

25 As stated, conservation, demand side

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 management, solar, and wind were also considered but  
2 could not individually meet the need of power. Base load  
3 power.

4 The review team also compared the proposed  
5 Bell Bend site to three other alternative sites in  
6 Pennsylvania. This included Montour, Humboldt, and  
7 Seedco. The NRC staff determined that none of these  
8 alternatives would be environmentally preferable to  
9 the Bell Bend site.

10 Next slide, please.

11 In chapter 10 of the EIS, NRC staff makes  
12 a preliminary recommendation to the Commission that the  
13 COL be issued. This recommendation is based on the  
14 mostly small to moderate environmental impacts,  
15 mitigation measures, and NRC staff's conclusion that  
16 no alternative sites or alternative base load energy  
17 source would be environmentally preferable. The  
18 recommendation is considered preliminary until we  
19 evaluate your -- your comments on the draft EIS.

20 In addition, this recommendation is for  
21 environmental review only. As mentioned at the  
22 beginning of the presentation, there are two concurrent  
23 NRC reviews associated with the combined license  
24 application; the environmental review and the safety  
25 review.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Next slide, please.

2 If you don't already have a copy and want  
3 to look at the draft EIS, we have CDs available in the  
4 back of the readers guide out in the lobby. Or you can  
5 contact me or Pat Vokoun to request a copy, our contact  
6 information is provided on the slides. Also, Amy  
7 Elliott's information on the slide in case you need to  
8 contact her as well. You also may find it online at the  
9 NRC website page provided on the slides. On the slide.  
10 Or you can go to a local library listed on the slide,  
11 slides. They have hard and electronic copies of the  
12 draft EIS on file.

13 Next slide, please.

14 As stated earlier, our main purpose  
15 tonight is a meeting to listen to you to gather your  
16 comments on the draft EIS. Many of you have already  
17 signed up to speak during tonight's meeting. However,  
18 if you think of anything later, want to submit your  
19 comments later, there are several other ways to submit  
20 your comments by the July 7th deadline. First, you can  
21 hand write a comment, mail it in, or additionally you  
22 can submit it electronically via email at this email  
23 address, BBNP.COLEIS@nrc.gov, or submit it through the  
24 website regulations.gov.

25 Please note the comment period of the draft

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 EIS is open until July the 7th.

2 With this, with that, I conclude my  
3 presentation. I appreciate your time tonight, looking  
4 forward to hearing your comments.

5 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Tomeka.  
6 And Wade and Jennifer.

7 And before we go to hear comments from the  
8 public, are there any -- any things that we can clarify  
9 about the process for you, anybody have any questions  
10 on, before we go to comment?

11 (No response)

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's go to comment. And  
13 our first commenter and the only commenter we have so  
14 far is Helen Natarelli.

15 Thank you.

16 Helen, do you want to come up and talk to  
17 us? And it's Helen Natarelli. All right.

18 MS. NATARELLI: I just, as a concerned  
19 citizen, I just have a couple of comments. They're  
20 random here so bear with me.

21 I'm definitely opposed to having another  
22 reactor in the area. First of all, I was opposed to the  
23 two that are here now and of course couldn't do anything  
24 about it. I'm speaking for a lot of citizens and a lot  
25 of people, a lot of family, and I said to them why don't

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you come with me. And they said no, because why should  
2 we. They're only going to do what they want to do anyway.

3 And I said well, that could be the case but  
4 I still have to speak my mind because I live in this  
5 area. I live in a ten-mile radius. I've lived here all  
6 my life, I've loved it, it's a beautiful place, and ever  
7 since they put these two reactors here, I must tell you  
8 I am constantly -- I can't say constantly, but on edge  
9 a lot.

10 When there's news breaks, whether -- even  
11 if it's a hurricane warning or something, but whenever  
12 they break in on the TV, my first thought is is that  
13 the power plant? And -- and I see, I -- you know, I go  
14 into the Wilkes-Barre area, or anywhere, all I see are  
15 these steam coming out. And to me, and I know this may  
16 sound weird to you, but to me, like that's a devil in  
17 the sky to me. And to put another one here after we have  
18 two now, to endanger us even more, is disgusting. I just  
19 can't believe it. I can't. And I can't believe this has  
20 happened to begin with.

21 And like they say, there's only low  
22 radiation. Okay, so you have one power plant with  
23 radiation, two power plants, then you're going to get  
24 another one, so that's three times the radiation. It's  
25 not just low level from one, it's low level from three.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   There's been a lot of cancer in the area.  
2                   I'm not saying, I don't have proof that it's from the  
3                   power plant. But I do think it could contribute to it.

4                   And also the danger, I hear that -- many  
5                   years ago they had a meeting, and I came, and it was  
6                   in the papers too, where they have a lot of problems  
7                   even at these two up here, they have to shut down off  
8                   and on, they have to do this, they have to do that, and  
9                   it's like I don't even pay that much attention to it  
10                  but I did read it in the papers the last time I was here,  
11                  if you check back, I should have brought them but I  
12                  didn't.

13                  It's just that I'm concerned about the  
14                  safety too. We have to worry about the two that are here,  
15                  now we're going to have to worry about if there's  
16                  another one or more.

17                  And they say okay, we have the resources  
18                  here, we have water, we have the rivers. Go somewhere  
19                  else where there's water and rivers. It's not just us.

20                  You're supplying power to New York, New  
21                  Jersey, whomever, I don't even know, but I know it's  
22                  not for us. And even if it was, go there. Let them have  
23                  their own power. You supply it from their own states,  
24                  not here.

25                  It's like -- and first of all there should

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 be more people here. I'm surprised in the Berwick,  
2 Bloomsburg area. And even around my area. But people  
3 say what's the use, they're going to do what they want.  
4 So we don't even come. And it's hard. It's hard for me  
5 because I've lived here all my life, and I have family;  
6 I have a daughter, a grandson, and they plan on living  
7 here. And it's scary. They don't -- I mean they're not  
8 worried about it because they're -- they're young and  
9 they don't care. When I was younger I wish I would have  
10 objected to this, the two power plants that were here,  
11 I would have done more, but I wasn't aware then; and  
12 they're younger now, they're not aware. But I am now.

13 It's -- it's just that we have enough, I  
14 think, with the two, we have enough to worry about now;  
15 I don't think we need one or two more to worry about  
16 also.

17 And they think oh, this is a -- okay, we're  
18 plain people here, we're not high profile people, most  
19 of us, or anything, we're just plain, everyday,  
20 ordinary people that want to live a good life and love  
21 this area. And like I said, now we have to worry about  
22 the two that are here and then plus if another one comes  
23 in? And more radiation in the air. And they say there's  
24 not but there is. It's not a hundred percent sure that  
25 there isn't, we wouldn't have that here if it wasn't

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1 for them. You know what I mean, I mean it's just, these  
2 were my concerns.

3 Then they say okay, we'll bring in more  
4 jobs. Oh, right. Yeah, bring in more jobs, and these  
5 people will come, they'll build it, they'll leave,  
6 we'll have to deal with it, or there may be some that  
7 are here now, but it's still a danger to us in the area,  
8 and we have to deal with it and live with it.

9 And they'll say well, then why don't you  
10 move away. I don't want to move away. This is  
11 my -- my -- my town, my area, and I like it here, and  
12 as long as -- who knows, in the future I may, but I -- I  
13 certainly don't plan on it.

14 But all these are my concerns. And that's  
15 just what I have to express.

16 You can say all you want, you know, say  
17 everything about everything you've just said here,  
18 which a lot of it I don't even understand. But it means  
19 nothing to me because all I know is I just think it's  
20 a danger and a health hazard here, and I think we have  
21 enough already. We have -- we can't do anything about  
22 the two that we have here. But hopefully we can do more  
23 about not bringing any more in here. And go somewhere  
24 else to the other states and let them deal with it like  
25 we have to. Why should we have to bear everything and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just come here because they think we're everyday people  
2 and we don't care. Or just plain people. But we do care,  
3 we live here.

4 So that's just all that I have to say. I  
5 just hope that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission will  
6 take this into consideration and look in every nook and  
7 cranny and consider everything, and hopefully that will  
8 just -- you can find other places to do this. I don't  
9 even want other places to have these power plants but  
10 I certainly don't want it here. Or any -- to me, any  
11 other kind of -- any alternative, solar, many that you  
12 mentioned before, would be better than a nuclear plant.  
13 I think they're the most dangerous. And we have enough  
14 here already, and then we're going to have to have  
15 another one to worry about?

16 So. That's just all I have to say. Thank  
17 you.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much,  
19 Helen, for coming in and sharing that with us.

20 Is there anybody else who wants to come up  
21 and share their thoughts with us?

22 Yes. Why don't you come up, and please just  
23 introduce yourself to us. Thank you.

24 MS. DENNIS: Hi. My name is Lori Dennis, and  
25 I live less than a mile away from the proposed site.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I am extremely concerned about it. I'm neither for nor  
2 against the building of it because I don't have enough  
3 information about it. So I -- I would like to get more  
4 information regarding not only the construction but  
5 also the effects that it's going to have on the  
6 community, the land, the water quality, the air  
7 quality, the property value. I want to have all that  
8 information so that I can make an educated decision  
9 about it.

10 I'm -- I'm very nervous about it. Again,  
11 but I'm not going to make judgment until I have more  
12 information.

13 I wonder about Walker Run. Fortunately  
14 before we had this presentation some great people came  
15 and answered some of my questions while I was looking  
16 out there at the maps and that. And I do appreciate it  
17 very much, I'm -- I'm glad that you guys are having  
18 this -- this presentation so that I can come up and ask  
19 questions because I don't think I have enough  
20 information about it.

21 I did give you my name, my address, and my  
22 email, so any kind of information that can be sent to  
23 me would be greatly appreciated.

24 Again, I do have the same concerns; what  
25 it's going to affect our environment, how's it going

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to affect the wildlife around there; we have some  
2 beautiful wetlands around there, we have -- it's a  
3 beautiful place to live. I enjoy where I live, I've been  
4 there for 20 years.

5 Again, I don't know what's going to happen,  
6 and you guys can reassure me right now to say it's going  
7 to be okay but I don't know that. I'm not sure. That's  
8 why I would like to get more information from you.

9 What I really want is just to be kept in  
10 the loop. I want to be able to say, you know, when people  
11 ask me what's going on with the power plant, I can say  
12 hey, this is the information that I got. This is the  
13 information that they're sharing with me. I think  
14 that's fair.

15 We have a great community, and I know it's  
16 going to be beneficial in bringing jobs; and that's  
17 another thing that I said, if there's a job market  
18 that's going to be opened up, I'd like to know about  
19 it. I teach high school; I'd like to be able to tell  
20 my students hey, they're -- they're hiring people up  
21 the road in the power plant. What kind of training do  
22 these kids need to have for it. What kind of background.  
23 And I have two children, you know, they might be able  
24 to get into that field.

25 I just want to have a little bit more

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 information about it so that I can make better decisions  
2 about it and I can share it with my family.

3 Unfortunately, like -- like you had said  
4 before, not everybody is -- is brave enough to come to  
5 the meetings because they do have the attitude of you  
6 guys are going to do whatever you want anyway. I don't  
7 know that. That's why, again, I need some more  
8 information.

9 But I do thank you for giving me the  
10 opportunity to come up and speak my mind and give my  
11 opinion. So thanks.

12 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very  
13 much.

14 Anybody else want to -- want to speak  
15 tonight?

16 Yes, sir. Please come up and introduce  
17 yourself to us.

18 MR. SHEPLER: Yes, my name is Dennis  
19 Shepler, S-H-E-P-L-E-R.

20 I see nothing up here about security. And  
21 many years ago you never thought you'd have to worry  
22 about security, about somebody actually trying to break  
23 into a plant and blow it up. Most things you worried  
24 about were accidents.

25 Now, I live fairly close. I'm more

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 concerned about storing used rods. Senator Harry Reid  
2 is no longer in power of the -- of the situation. We -- we  
3 spent billions of dollars to hollow out Mount Yucca  
4 (Yucca Mountain). It's done. We have paid in through  
5 our electric bill. It's done. Why isn't the used spent  
6 rods being sent to Nevada.

7 Every plant is a potential weapon for  
8 terrorists. Unheard of years ago. Many, many years ago  
9 they stored these concrete cylinders to help store the  
10 waste rods. Well, they -- they started with them right  
11 here in the perimeter. And now they built a facility  
12 to make it stronger. But we have so many potential  
13 terrorists in this world today. They're just sick. All  
14 it takes is one to crack these storage units into a dirty  
15 bomb.

16 I'm not talking about what an  
17 environmentalist can do, it's what they can do. I  
18 don't know how to address it to the Federal Government  
19 other than it can be a big deal.

20 We have Yucca Mountain done. Why aren't we  
21 moving the waste to that one mountain, where we can  
22 protect it. Just doesn't make sense.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very  
25 much.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Anybody else want to comment?

2 (No response)

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Before we have  
4 Jennifer, who's our senior official, come up and close  
5 the meeting for us, I just want to say that the NRC staff  
6 and their expert consultants are here. They have the  
7 white badges on. And they'd be glad to talk to you about  
8 your concerns.

9 And I would ask the staff, you heard from  
10 our three speakers, you heard what their concerns are  
11 including the last speaker in terms of getting the waste  
12 off of the site. If -- if you have expertise in that  
13 area, in security, whatever, if you could talk to the  
14 speakers after we close out the meeting, that might be  
15 helpful to give them more information, and I think the  
16 NRC certainly wants to keep people in the loop with  
17 further information.

18 So I guess, Jennifer, do you want to close  
19 this out?

20 MS. DIXON-HERRITY: Yes.

21 Ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much  
22 for coming out tonight. We appreciate you taking the  
23 time to review our draft environmental impact statement  
24 and to make us aware of the concerns that you've brought  
25 our attention to. It means a great deal to us. We'll

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 consider all the comments that we heard tonight, we'll  
2 also consider any comments that are forwarded to us  
3 during the comment period.

4 The more detail you can give us in your  
5 comments, the easier it will be for us to address them  
6 more fully. We'll do our best to address the comments  
7 that we receive.

8 Our mission is to make sure that when  
9 nuclear materials are used for commercial purposes that  
10 they're used safely, securely, and in an  
11 environmentally appropriate manner. Our agency is led  
12 by five presidentially appointed commissioners who  
13 are approved by the Senate of the United States. Once  
14 our review and the safety review are complete, we'll  
15 make our recommendations on licensing to these five  
16 individuals, who will make the determination as to  
17 whether or not the plant should be licensed. We take  
18 our role very seriously, and we can't do our jobs unless  
19 we hear from you and you keep us informed of concerns  
20 in this area.

21 I thank you again for coming out and for  
22 giving us this opportunity to meet with you. Thank you  
23 very much.

24 (Proceedings were adjourned at 8:30 p.m.)

25

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8