

Table J-2. DOE responses to comments on Draft EIS

Comment number	Comments	Responses
	<p>TESTIMONY OF HENRY D. McMASTER,            APRIL 30, 1986, BEFORE THE            ALTERNATIVE COOLING WATER DRAFT EIS            PUBLIC HEARING</p>	
	<p>Thank you, ma'am. I'm very happy to have the opportunity to speak to you today on this issue, and appreciate your taking the time to conduct this hearing. I know the people of this area and of the state are very interested in the Savannah River Plant because it is a very important part of our state.</p>	
AA-1	<p>There are just a few things that I'd like to say, and basically, this deals with the one alternative to the cooling towers, or any other form of cooling the water, and that is the irrigation system. It is a system which has been recommended for study by Clemson University and the Department of Agriculture, and I think as a private citizen, and also one interested in public affairs, I think that this is something that needs to be included in the Environmental Impact Statement, because I believe we must study the issue, here, to see if there aren't ways to put more back into the state; to have some more positive benefits flowing to the state than are presently flowing from the Savannah River Plant, and of course, those benefits now are substantial to the state and to the nation. But, we have a good opportunity, here, I believe, to do something positive for the state, for the State's economy, particularly in terms of the farm industry, the farm, the farmers.</p>	<p>DOE has incorporated a new appendix in this EIS (Appendix I) that addresses the feasibility of using the cooling water discharges from K- and C-Reactors for agricultural and aquacultural uses, industrial applications, direct power generation, and ethanol production.</p>
	<p>So those, briefly, that's what I had in mind. I'll say this: I think that instead of treating the huge amount of heated water and potential energy it represents - which is estimated to having a value of about a half a billion dollars a year - as a nuisance, and something we should worry about being</p>	

Table J-2. DOE responses to comments on Draft EIS (continued)

Comment number	Comments	Responses
	<p>disposed of, we should be studying the alternatives for harnessing this for future economic development of this area and the State of South Carolina, because it does provide some tremendous opportunities for us. There are many needs for heated water in various industries. Besides attracting new industries, this heated water could benefit the area farmers if used for inexpensive irrigation or crop drying. The nation's fuel consumers could benefit from the inexpensive production of ethanol this heat could produce, not to mention the area farmers who could produce the raw materials from various row crops, including turnips, rutabagas, parsnips and all sorts of other things, that Clemson University has been talking about.</p>	
	<p>In my opinion, I think what we should do is work to redefine the role of the Savannah River Plant. We would all benefit if the bureaucratic red tape that's in all government, especially the Federal Government it seems, were cut and if the blinders which narrow us to the potential benefits of this plant were taken off. I think that we cannot allow the opportunity that this resource--this hot water--presents to the people of this region, for economic growth, to be thrown away by the construction of very expensive water-cooling towers. Instead, we must look toward ways of using this energy to benefit all of the area's people; and the Savannah River Plant's role should be redefined in that fashion, I believe, so that it can make these additional major contributions to the economy and ecology of South Carolina. But, in a nutshell, this is what could happen: instead of taking this hot water and cooling it for later discharge into the river, we could have all sorts of things to be based upon that. I understand that the water from the present reactors is not hot enough to produce electricity. If a new production</p>	

Table J-2. DOE responses to comments on Draft EIS (continued)

Comment number	Comments	Responses
		<p>reactor were built here--and I understand there's question about that--of course, that water would be hot enough; it could be used in that fashion to produce electricity and could possibly reduce heating bills about \$200.00 per family around South Carolina, I am told. But, with the present reactors that we have, the hot water could be used, number one, to create ethanol which, of course, doesn't have the environmental problems associated with it of coal, and the regular gas-burning automobiles. And, also, that after the crops that are used, like parsnips, rutabagas and turnips that have a much higher starch and protein and sugar content than other crops that are used to make those--to make the ethanol--the residue could be used to feed hogs, for example, could be used for feed all around the state. So, you could have a whole industry developing of farmers growing these row crops that they can't grow, now, because it's too expensive to dry them, and they're about ninety percent water, and it's just too expensive to dry them in order to ship them around the country. So, people don't get into that. If we were to use the heat given off by the present system in that fashion, we could build up that farming industry, that part of the farming industry; create new industries for feeding hogs, things of that nature; and then, take the water and run it through, for instance, part of Allendale County. I'm told there are about 300,000 acres that could be irrigated there by the water, and it would be very helpful. As far as the new production reactor goes, which is not a question, here, I believe that if it is constructed, here, when it is constructed, here, it should also be viewed from these same viewpoints, to see if these types of positive benefits could be built into that system to benefit the people of this area.</p>