

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

Comment number	Comments	Responses
STATEMENT OF WILLIAM D. ANDERSON, JR.		
<p>Telephone Area 803 795-3716</p> <p>College of Charleston Grice Marine Biological Laboratory 205 Fort Johnson Charleston, South Carolina 29412</p>		
29 April 1986		
<p>Mr. R. P. Whitfield, Director Environmental Division U.S. Department of Energy Savannah River Operations Office P. O. Box A Aiken, South Carolina 29802</p>		
RE: DEIS for Cooling Water Systems		
Dear Mr. Whitfield:		
<p>I have examined the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) (DOE/EIS-0121D) entitled Alternative Cooling Water Systems, Savannah River Plant, Aiken, South Carolina, dated March 1986, and offer the following for your consideration.</p>		
A0-1	<p>Based on the data presented in the DEIS the construction of recirculating cooling towers for C- and K- Reactors is by far the best alternative in each case because it would result in a considerable improvement in water quality and in the reestablishment of a large acreage of wetlands (ca. 1500 acres, according to Tables 2-10 and 2-11).</p>	<p>The Record of Decision prepared by DOE on this EIS will present the alternatives DOE considered in reaching its decision and will specify the alternative(s) that were considered to be environmentally preferable.</p>

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

Comment number	Comments	Responses
A0-2	<p>Although the estimated costs of construction are higher for recirculating towers than for once-through cooling towers for C- and K- Reactors (\$153 million vs. \$92-109 million), the estimated operating costs for recirculating towers for both reactors is considerably less (\$1 million per year vs. \$3.8-6.2 million per year). The additional outlay required for construction of recirculating towers would be paid for in 8.5 to 22 years in savings generated by lower operating costs. Thereafter the operation of recirculating towers would save \$2.8-5.2 million per year. (Calculations are based on data provided in Tables 2-10 and 2-11.)</p>	<p>The operating life of the reactors is assumed to be 15 years after cooling towers are built. The calculations in comment A0-2 do not include the greater production loss for recirculating cooling towers than for once-through cooling towers. The life cycle costs which include capital expenditure, operating costs, and production losses indicate that a gravity-fed natural draft once-through cooling tower is most economical. Also see response to comments AD-1 and BC-5 for cost components and present worth analysis.</p>
A0-3	<p><i>The alternatives for D-Area, increased flow with mixing or direct discharge to the Savannah River, are more difficult to evaluate. The preservation of habitat for the American alligator and wood stork which would result from the alternative of "increased flow with mixing" perhaps outweighs the complete elimination of all thermal discharges to Beaver Dam Creek which would result from "direct discharge to the Savannah River."</i></p> <p>In any event I strongly recommend that recirculating towers be constructed for C- and K- Reactors and that one of the two alternatives -- increased flow with mixing or direct discharge to the Savannah River -- be implemented for D-Area.</p> <p>I appreciate being given an opportunity to comment on the DEIS.</p>	<p><i>See response to comment A0-1.</i></p>
	<p>Yours very truly,  William D. Anderson, Jr. Professor of Biology</p>	
	<p>WDA/fb</p>	