REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR:7911010446 DOC.DATE: 79/10/25 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
FACIL:50-387 Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 1, Pennsylva 05000387
50-388 Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 2, Pennsylva 05000388
AUTH.NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION
MOLESEVICH,M.M. Affiliation Unknown
RECIP.NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
MULLER,D. Division of Site Safety & Environmental Analysis

SUBJECT: Comments on DES:quality of Figure 2.1 map is substd,more data is required on hosp capabilities,data on fire & police protection is inadequate & use of results from salt study at MD plant is invalid.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: C002B COPIES RECEIVED:LTR 1 ENCL 0 SIZE: 3
TITLE: Environ. Comments.

NOTES: SEND I&E 3 CYS FSAR + ALL AMDTS. L.A. 1 CY EVERYTHING (ORNL)

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR	COPIES ENCL	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR	COPIES ENCL
ACTION:	05 PM P LEECH	4	4	17 BC EPB #2	1	1
	18 LA EPB #2	1	1	AD MOORE	1	0
INTERNAL:	01 REG FILE	1	1	02 NRC PDR	1	1
	07 I&E	2	2	09 ENVN SPEC BR	1	1
	10 CST BNFT ANL	1	1	11 TA/EDO	1	1
	12 GEOSCIEN BR	1	1	13 HYDRO-METEOR	1	1
	14 ACDENT ANALY	1	1	15 EFLT TRT SYS	1	1
	16 RAD ASMT BR	1	1	19 DIR DSE	1	1
	AD ENVIRON TECH	1	0	AD SITE ANALY	1	0
	OELD	1	0			
EXTERNAL:	03 LPDR	1	1	04 NSIC	1	1
	20 NATL LAB	5	5	ACRS	1	0

LTR
LWR
LWR #3 BC
MINER
LWR #3 LA

NOV 5 1979

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR ~~28~~ 36 ENCL ~~23~~ 4

ENVIRO

216 North Fifth Street
Apt. 2
Lewisburg, Pa. 17837
October 25, 1979

Mr. Daniel Muller
Director, Division of Site Safety and
Environmental Analysis
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Dear Mr. Muller:

The purpose of this letter is to express my comments on the Draft Environmental Statement related to the operation of the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Docket Numbers 50-387 & 50-388.

1) In refering to figure 2.1, the map that is presented is of very poor quality and standards. There is no north orientation nor is there any distance scale presented. The map is blurred, and worst of all, the plant site is not shown. If you were to assume that north is pointing to the top of the map, then the two counties that shown are backwards. Colombia County is east of Luzerne County, and it is not the other way as they are incorrectly shown. Finally, after making these corrections, I recommend that a much larger base area be used so as to locate other areas of the state in relation to the plant site.

2) In refering to section 2.2.4.2, the amount of data presented on the capabilities of the nearby hospitals handling emergency situations that can occur with a nuclear facility is inadequate. There should be much more data presented on the qualifications of the hospitals in handling and treating radiological accidents and cases.

3) In refering again to section 2.2.4.2, the amount of data concerning police and fire protection is also inadequate. If an emergency situation should arise, such as a fire at the plant, are the local volunteer fire companies adequately trained to fight a fire at such a facility? Are the local volunteers trained to cope with an emergency that may envolve radiological precautions? Do they have the necessary equipment? These questions should be considered for the final statement.

4) In refering to section 2.2.6.1, the land-use categories for Luzerne County for developed land correctly add to 100%, but the land-use categories for developed land in Colombia County do not total 100%. This error should be checked and corrected.

4

7911010 446

Coo2
ES
1/0
CHANGE: E4
P.M. 4

5) In refering to section 3.2.I, if the applicant is considering building an additional reservoir, then this should be included in the cost/benefit ratio. Also, if the plant must be shut down during periods of low flow, then this should be included in the cost/benefit ratio.

6) In refering to section 4.4.I.I, there is an area that does need attention. In paragraph six the applicant states that 880 grams of salt per hectare per month will be deposited. The staff believes that this will not cause an impact on local biota and soils because of the results of recent studies from the Chalk Point Power Plant in Maryland. I disagree with this assumption. Because the salt has no adverse results in Maryland does not mean that it will have no adverse effects in Pennsylvania. The fact that Maryland is close to the coast could mean that the flora there has adapted to the salt that naturally drifts in from oceanic breezes. I am sure that the species of flora along the coast are much more tolerant of brackish conditions than those species that are found near and around Berwick, Pennsylvania. I also believe that the soils along the coast are naturally brackish. Therefore, any small amount of extra salt imposed on those soils will be in the tolerable range of those coastal soils. However, adding appreciable amounts of salt to those types of soils that are not accustomed to salt will most certainly have adverse effects. In conclusion, I think that the assumption made on the results of the power plant in Maryland are misleading and do not apply to SSES. Therefore, this problem needs to be solved.

7) In refering to section 4.4.3, the assumptions made are not compatible with SSES. Again the assumption is that if there are no problems at one plant, then there will be no problems at the next. The assumption that little or no fogging or icing will occur at SSES is not valid. Berwick and surrounding areas along the Susquehanna River have always been known for being subject to fog conditions. The effects of the plumes will add to this natural phenomenon. The occurence of ground-base inversion layers, a common meteorlogical phenomenon in the ridge and valley province of Pennsylvania during the winter months, was not even mentioned. Should this occur with below-freezing temperatures, the consequences will be much icing of foilage, utility lines, highway surfaces (Route II), and any other surfaces. I cannot see how the applicant and the NRC can draw conclusions about the effects of the NDCT's at SSES from the results obtained in Europe. This section must also be corrected and further studied.

8) In refering to table 5.I, the frequency of monitoring has to be increased. The most frequent monitoring that table 5.I mentions is weekly. Giving the applicant the benefit of doubt, I assume that this will not be the complete schedule of the radiological monitoring. If this is not the complete monitoring schedule, then the complete schedule of frequencies and locations should be included in the final statement.

9) In refering to tables 6.I and 6.2, I find it very disturbing that the applicant and/or staff has not included the possibility of a class nine accident occuring. Since the draft was published after the accident at Three Mile Island, then the results should have been incorporated. Also included should be the psychological effects that TMI has had and the psychological effects that the SSES will have.

I0) In refering to tables 7.4 and 7.5, I find that the reserve margin with SSES in both cases is much too high. As a matter of fact these two tables show that the plant is really not needed.

II) In refering to section 8.6, I think that a decomissioning plan should be prepared before operation in the case of an emergency where time would be a factor in preparing one. In other words a plan should be ready should the event arise that it is needed. Also the cost that is stated for decomissioning seems quite low. Is the cost of decomissioning included in the cost/benefit ratio?

I2) In refering to figures B-I, B-2, and B-3, one cannot give a critical evaluation of the planned routes of the transmission corridors when one cannot even read the maps. These maps are also of very poor quality for obvious reasons. (See comment I).

I think that these comments are very much worth consideration in preparation of the final environmental impact statement for the SSES. I would appreciate and welcome any reply to the above comments.

Sincerely,

Michael M. Molesevich

Michael M. Molesevich

Secretary
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Wash., D.C. 20555

Dear Secretary,

Please put my name on the mailing list for all hearing notices and documents relating to the Susquehanna Steam Generation Plant at Berwick, Pa.

Furthermore, I wish to appear as a witness in future hearings related to Docket #50-387 and #50-388.

Please advise me of any requirements I must fullfill to qualify for any of the above requests.

Respectfully,

Eugene P. Stilp

Acknowledged by card 9/7/79

Eugene P. Stilp
275 Poplar Street
Wilkes-Barre, Pa. 18702

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
PENNSYLVANIA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY	)	Docket No.(s) 50-387
	)	50-388
	)	
(Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2)	)	
	)	
	)	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document(s) upon each person designated on the official service list compiled by the Office of the Secretary of the Commission in this proceeding in accordance with the requirements of Section 2.712 of 10 CFR Part 2 - Rules of Practice, of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Rules and Regulations.

Dated at Washington, D.C. this
7th day of SEPT 1979.

Peggy T. Duerring
Office of the Secretary of the Commission

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
PENNSYLVANIA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY, ET AL.	)	Docket No.(s) 50-387 50-388
	)	
(Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2)	)	

SERVICE LIST

Charles Bechhoefer, Esq., Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Mr. Glenn O. Bright
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S.Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Oscar H. Paris
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Counsel for NRC Staff
Office of the Executive Legal Director
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Jay E. Silberg, Esq.
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
1800 "M" Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company
ATTN: Mr. Norman W. Curtis
Vice President - Engineering and Construction
2 North Ninth Street
Allentown, Pennsylvania 18101

Dr. Judith H. Johnsrud
Co. Director, Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power
433 Orlando Avenue
State College, Pennsylvania 16801

Ms. Colleen Marsh
558A
R.D. #4
Mount Top, Pennsylvania 18707

Mrs. Irene Lemanowicz
The Citizens Against Nuclear Dangers
P.O. Box 377
RD 1
Berwick, Pennsylvania 18603

Gerald Schultz, Esq.
Susquehanna Environmental Advocates
174 Machell Avenue
Dallas, Pennsylvania 18612

Mr. Thomas M. Gerusky, Director
Bureau of Radiation Protection
Department of Environmental Resources
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
P.O. Box 2063
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

2. If at all possible, to have an additional source of water available other than the Susquehanna River, and particularly Pond Hill Reservoir, before the Station goes into operation.

Yours truly,

Edward Haiselberg, Director of Planning
Luzerne County Planning Commission

EH/mss

cc: Nick Souchik, Luzerne County Civil Defense Agency
Susquehanna River Basin Commission
Senator Frank O'Connell
Nancy Snee
Pennsylvania Power and Light Company
Susquehanna Alliance

216 North Fifth Street
Apt. 2
Berisburg, Pa. 17837
October 25, 1979

Mr. Daniel Muller
Director, Division of Site Safety and
Environmental Analysis
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Dear Mr. Muller:

The purpose of this letter is to express my comments on the Draft Environmental Statement related to the operation of the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Docket Numbers 50-387 & 50-388.

1) In refering to figure 2.1, the map that is presented is of very poor quality and standards. There is no north orientation nor is there any distance scale presented. The map is blurred, and worst of all, the plant site is not shown. If you were to assume that north is pointing to the top of the map, then the two counties that shown are backwards. Columbia County is east of Luzerne County, and it is not the other way as they are incorrectly shown. Finally, after making these corrections, I recommend that a much larger base area be used so as to locate other areas of the state in relation to the plant site.

2) In refering to section 2.2.4.2, the amount of data presented on the capabilities of the nearby hospitals handling emergency situations that can occur with a nuclear facility is inadequate. There should be much more data presented on the qualifications of the hospitals in handling and treating radiological accidents and cases.

3) In refering again to section 2.2.4.2, the amount of data concerning police and fire protection is also inadequate. If an emergency situation should arise, such as a fire at the plant, are the local volunteer fire companies adequately trained to fight a fire at such a facility? Are the local volunteers trained to cope with an emergency that may envolve radiological precautions? Do they have the necessary equipment? These questions should be considered for the final statement.

4) In refering to section 2.2.6.1, the land-use categories for Luzerne County for developed land correctly add to 100%, but the land-use categories for developed land in Columbia County do not total 100%. This error should be checked and corrected.

7911010 484

5) In refering to section 3.2.I, if the applicant is considering building an additional reservoir, then this should be included in the cost/benefit ratio. Also, if the plant must be shut down during periods of low flow, then this should be included in the cost/benefit ratio.

6) In refering to section 4.4.I.I, there is an area that does need attention. In paragraph six the applicant states that 320 grams of salt per hectare per month will be deposited. The staff believes that this will not cause an impact on local biota and soils because of the results of recent studies from the Chalk Point Power Plant in Maryland. I disagree with this assumption. Because the salt has no adverse results in Maryland does not mean that it will have no adverse effects in Pennsylvania. The fact that Maryland is close to the coast could mean that the flora there has adapted to the salt that naturally drifts in from oceanic breezes. I am sure that the species of flora along the coast are much more tolerant of brackish conditions than those species that are found near and around Berwick, Pennsylvania. I also believe that the soils along the coast are naturally brackish. Therefore, any small amount of extra salt imposed on those soils will be in the tolerable range of those coastal soils. However, adding appreciable amounts of salt to those types of soils that are not accustomed to salt will most certainly have adverse effects. In conclusion, I think that the assumption made on the results of the power plant in Maryland are misleading and do not apply to SSES. Therefore, this problem needs to be solved.

7) In refering to section 4.4.3, the assumptions made are not compatible with SSES. Again the assumption is that if there are no problems at one plant, then there will be no problems at the next. The assumption that little or no fogging or icing will occur at SSES is not valid. Berwick and surrounding areas along the Susquehanna River have always been known for being subject to fog conditions. The effects of the plumes will add to this natural phenomenon. The occurence of ground-base inversion layers, a common meteorological phenomenon in the ridge and valley province of Pennsylvania during the winter months, was not even mentioned. Should this occur with below-freezing temperatures, the consequences will be much icing of foliage, utility lines, highway surfaces (Route II), and any other surfaces. I cannot see how the applicant and the NRC can draw conclusions about the effects of the NDCT's at SSES from the results obtained in Europe. This section must also be corrected and further studied.

8) In refering to table 5.I, the frequency of monitoring has to be increased. The most frequent monitoring that table 5.I mentions is weekly. Giving the applicant the benefit of doubt, I assume that this will not be the complete schedule of the radiological monitoring. If this is not the complete monitoring schedule, then the complete schedule of frequencies and locations should be included in the final statement.

9) In refering to tables 6.I and 6.2, I find it very disturbing that the applicant and/or staff has not included the possibility of a class nine accident occuring. Since the draft was published after the accident at Three Mile Island, then the results should have been incorporated. Also included should be the psychological effects that TMI has had and the psychological effects that the SSES will have.

10) In refering to tables 7.4 and 7.5, I find that the reserve margin with SSES in both cases is much too high. As a matter of fact these two tables show that the plant is really not needed.

11) In refering to section 8.6, I think that a decomissioning plan should be prepared before operation in the case of an emergency where time would be a factor in preparing one. In other words a plan should be ready should the event arise that it is needed. Also the cost that is stated for decomissioning seems quite low. Is the cost of decomissioning included in the cost/benefit ratio?

12) In refering to figures B-I, B-2, and B-3, one cannot give a critical evaluation of the planned routes of the transmission corridors when one cannot even read the maps. These maps are also of very poor quality for obvious reasons. (See comment I).

I think that these comments are very much worth consideration in preparation of the final environmental impact statement for the SSES. I would appreciate and welcome any reply to the above comments.

Sincerely,

Michael M. Molesevich

Michael M. Molesevich