#5.

August 20, 1979

Wm. E. Regan, Jr., Chief
Environmental Projects Branch 2
Division of Site Safety and
Environmental Analysis
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Mr. Regan:

I would like to thank you for sending me a copy of the "DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT" of SSES. The following are my comments on same.

It is unbelievable that so much of the report is taken up by studies on the flora and fauna while the human aspect is almost completely ignored. It does tend to explain the treatment of those who do live within this area. According to the report we don't hardly exist. The report goes on to some length before Beach Haven is even mentioned. It gives the impression that this is a very sparsely populated area scarred from mining with a very high unemployment rate and greatly effected by the Agnes flood. PP&L saved the area by deciding to build their nuclear plant here. How much better off we would all have been if PP&L would have built their plant somewhere else.

So much space is devoted to the concern for the environment, but where was that concern when the site was cleared with trees bulldozed onto piles as high as houses and set afire to burn for weeks.

Missing from the report was the fact that much blasting would be necessary to prepare the site for the buildings. This omission could explain their reluctance to admit that damages resulted from this blasting effecting local properties. In order to resolve the situation it was necessary to go one step short of a court trial. The resulting aggravation, harrassment and stress on the property owners can never be measured.

Just to set the record straight, not that it will make any impact on the licensing of SSES, the following are the true facts concerning this area. This was a very beautiful, peaceful area before the start of construction of this nuclear power plant. We were experiencing a residential growth that was extending into the rural areas at a very fast pace. Some of the best agricultural areas were taken by the plant site. Naturally the agricultural activity has decreased because of the land taken out of productivity by the plant site. It is far from being the desolate area pictured in the report. Many homes are within a mile radius of the plant site and I am sure the number would be much greater in this area if it were not for the plant being here. Approximately twenty-one homes have been demolished by PP&L for the site. Our area consists of

7908270495

tree covered rolling hills and mountains interspersed with farm land. Except for sand and gravel excavation the only other scarring of the landscape has been done by PP&L with the cutting of power lines in all directions through our beautiful mountains. The mining referred to in the report is in the Wilkes-Barre area and is not visible here. There is no undermining of this area. The effects of Agnes was minimal in this area. In fact, I don't think there was one family in the Beach Haven, Berwick area that was displaced by the flood. (If they were effected, they have moved back into their homes.) Economically we were much better off before the start of construction of the PP&L plant. With the influx of workers and the high pay scale for union workers, the rents doubled and tripled. This area is now one of the most expensive places to reside. Very few residents of the Berwick area are employed at the plant site. The traffic from the commuting workers is very disruptive to local residents. As for the recreational area being developed by PP&L, it would not have been missed in my opinion. Before the acquisition of land by PP&L we had the best hunting and trapping area for many miles around.

#15-1 4NL PL

In light of TMI we are most concerned about the possibility of an accident and the storage of spent fuel on the plant site. Our experience with PP&L makes us most apprehensive of any reports that would come from PP&L in case of an accident. I can't help but believe there would be no report if they thought an accident could be covered up. With the granting of a permit to store the spent fuel on the plant site is this area destined to become a dumping spot for nuclear waste? Recent reports of release of radioactivity into the environment from nuclear power plants across the United States and the "accidental" dumping of 200 gallons of radioactive water by the Oyster Creek nuclear plant, what can we expect here? How many accidents of this type can we expect during the life of this plant?

#15-2 AEB & ETSB ?

We, for one, are too close to the plant site for any errors. As you know our land borders the site to the south and southwest, with the closest cooling tower approximately 550' from our land. To date the government has done nothing to protect us or our property. Can we expect any protection from the government or are we the dispensible ones in the scheme of things?

#15-3 AEB

Respectfully yours,
Mrs. Stanley Shortz

Mrs. Stanley Shortz
RFD #1 Box 246
Berwick, Penna 18603

#17

RE: Mike Huntington
Rd #1
Hunlock Creek, Pa.
18621

8-19-79

Sirs,

I am writing in response to your request for my input on the Draft Environmental Statement for the Steam Electric Station at Berwick, Pa. Well, much as I have tried to plow through the voluminous information that it contains, the short amount of time that I have been allowed for this task makes me skeptical of the N.R.C.'s sinserity about being genuinely interested in my input. The advertisement of the availability of this report was made only approximately 1 1/2 months ago in our local paper

7908280535

since it does take time to recieve one through the mail, the amount of time to assess this mass of data has been severly limited. I am not an expert on these matters and dealing with so much unfamiliar territory does not make for quick progress either. But just because I am not overly qualified in areas of nuclear science or ecological balance does not mean that my opinions and observations are without value. I live less than 10 air miles from this proposed facility and work practically within the shadow of it's cooling towers. I also used to live about 15 miles from T.M.I. but evacuated from there and did not feel very thrilled to returning to a town that gets a good portion of it's drinking water from the Susquehanna River—

at a point below TMI. I don't want to have to leave my home ever again because of fears of my safety due to Nuclear radiation! Since TMI, I have looked deep and hard into the area of nuclear power. I am convinced that we do not at the present time have the technology to deal with the requirements of infalibility that it demands. I am also of the opinion that the N.R.C. has failed in it's responsibility to look first after the better interests of the U.S. public. With specific reference to the Environmental statement mentioned, and the amount of it that I have had the time to study, I have several observations: P.P&L is basing it's cost benefit analysis on a 60% to 70% efficiency factor. over

#17-1
ANL
FL

Generally, the performance of the nuclear industry has in fact been much much lower — "the cumulative to date capacity factor for all plants from the first year of operation through 1976 was 53.7%. Moreover, the plants show a decline in performance as they get older. During the first two years of commercial operation, they average 54%, rise to an average of 63% during the next 6 years, and thereafter decline to an average of 39%", ...

* The Silent Bomb
Peter Faulkner

P.P.+L is not telling the truth to their rate payers as to the true economics of this plant.

#17-1
AJL
+
PL

The Environmental statement is also invalid due to a shocking lack of consideration of the events at Three Mile Island — I saw one footnote that regarded some data as pending! This is outrageous! T.M.I has not even been fully assessed, yet the

#17-2
AEB

significance of any findings from this event seem to be regarded as having little relation to already established findings for this specific environmental statement.

Another major point that I contend in this report is the establishment of the uranium mining and milling necessary for this plant as having an "acceptabe" impact upon the environment. Acceptable to whom, I ask? The N.R.C. itself has been unable to disagree with Dr. Chauncey Kepford's findings that 1.2 million people per year will die in the future from the effects of radon gas emitted from the tailings produced just to fuel T.M.I. Now, surely the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station is going to require an equally substantial amount of fuel for its operation too.

#17-3
RAB

are we to be asked to define as "acceptable" the premature deaths of another group of 1.2 million people per year in this situation too?!

Something not found in this report is very good coverage of alternatives — and their impact on the environment — to the S.S.E.S. No mention of solar energy, conservation, cogeneration, bio mass, etc. Coal was not treated fairly or totally. The benefits that a coal-fired S.S.E.S. would have on the local economy is vastly underrated.

#17-4 ANL & PL

Other points that I highly object to, which probably should be headed under the cost/benefit analysis, are the areas of waste disposal and insurance coverage. I resent being called upon as a U.S. tax payer to support P.P.&L, along with all of the other nuclear

#17-5 ANL (PL will also discuss with CSG and others)

utilities, with responsibility for disposal of rad waste and absolutely unjust insurance limitations — also at my expense — under the Price Anderson act. If P.P+L were held responsible — as they should be — for the permanant and safe disposal of the mill tailings, rad waste, and worn out reactor [when they are through with it] the economics would be a little different. If they were only required to pay their own insurance — without unrealistic limitations such as 560 million ceilings on liability claims — the economics of this plant would be prohibitive. I do not want any part of subsidizing these aspects of the nuclear industry. They have created a false state of economy for the utilities and as a free citizen, I feel that my own

#1-5 continued

freedom of choice has been trampled upon. The N.R.C has a dismal record of putting the public's health, safety, and welfare ahead of the profit schemes of power utilities. It is time for a turn around from this stance — past time! I charge you with the task of fulfilling the duties as public protectors that you have been established for.

In total opposition to Nuclear generated electricity

Michael J. Huntington

#19

PP&L

TWO NORTH NINTH STREET, ALLENTOWN, PA. 18101 PHONE: (215) 821-5151

September 4, 1979

Mr. Donald E. Sells, Acting Branch Chief
Environmental Projects Branch 2
Division of Site Safety and Environmental Analysis
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

SUSQUEHANNA SES
COMMENTS ON DES
ER 100450 FILE 991-2
PLA- 396

DOCKET NOS. 50-387
AND 50-388

Dear Mr. Sells:

Attached are PP&L's comments on the Draft Environmental Statement issued by NRC in June, 1979.

Very truly yours,

N. W. Curtis

JSF #587:5

Copy to:
Mr. Paul Leech
Mail Stop P522
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

5. Table 4.1 - This table contains several typographical errors. A copy of the table with corrections indicated will be forwarded under separate cover. #19-11 ANL

6. Table 4.5, pg. 4-16 #19-13 ~~RAB~~ ETSB

   Staff assumptions regarding Turbine Building releases do not allow credit for the leakoff collection system.

   Staff assumptions regarding the off-gas system releases are significantly higher than the ER-OL estimates. It appears this is due to a failure to adjust the charcoal absorption factors for temperature.

   Applicant believes that iodine releases should be reduced due to the use the leakoff collection system.

5. ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING #19-FS RAB

   1. Table 5.1, pg. 5.3 - This table has been updated to reflect changes in sampling locations and station nomenclature corrections. The lower limits of detection have also been revised per NUREG 0473. A copy of the table with corrections indicated will be forwarded under separate cover.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF POSTULATED ACCIDENTS #19-14 AAB

   No Comments

7. NEED FOR POWER

   1. Section 7.1, pg. 7-1 - The present schedule for commercial operation of Unit 1 is July, 1981 and for Unit 2, October, 1982. Line 7 - 4970 MW is without UGI. #19-1 ANL

   2. Section 7.3.2, pg. 7-2 - The annualized construction cost of $105 million is from FES-CP. The cost of the plant to PP&L in the ER-OL is forecast to be $1.9 billion. With an assumed 15% levelized annual carrying charge rate a carrying charge of $285 million per year results. #19-16 ANL

   3. Table 7.4, page 7.5 appears to contain two errors. First, firm purchases are accounted for twice. Normally, these transactions are either added to total capacitors or subtracted from peak load. Since 76 MWe are included in total capacities, this amount should not be subtracted from the Winter Peak. Second, for years 1982 through 1985, only Unit 1 was subtracted from the total capacities to calculate reserves without Susquehanna. Unit 2 should also be deducted. #19-1 ANL