

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

Comment number	Comments	Responses
STATEMENT OF JOHN C. VILLFORTH		
Department of Health & Human Services Public Health Service Food and Drug Administration Rockville MD 20857		
May 19, 1986		
Mr. R. P. Whitfield Director, Environmental Division Department of Energy Savannah River Operations Office P.O. Box A Aiken, South Carolina 29802		
The Center for Devices and Radiological Health staff has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DOE/EIS-0121 D) on Alternative Cooling Water Systems, Savannah River Plant, dated March 1986. Our effort is primarily directed to an evaluation of the public health and safety impacts associated with the proposed alternative cooling water systems for C- and K- reactors and the D-area coal-fired powerhouse. We have the following comments to offer:		
AY-1	1. The discussion in Chapter 4 and Appendix D have adequately assessed the radiological releases to the environment and the potential impact on individual and population dose for cooling water alternatives for the C- and K- reactors. There is no impact for cooling water alternatives for the D- area since there are no radiological releases.	Comments noted.

J-54

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

Comment number	Comments	Responses
2.	<p>The environmental pathways identified in Appendix G (Figure G-1) cover all possible emission pathways that could impact on the population in the environs of the Savannah River Plant. The radiation dose calculation methods and assumptions presented in Appendix D have provided reasonable estimates of annual dose to the maximally exposed individual and collective dose to the population within the 80-kilometer area from operation of alternative cooling water systems for the C- and K-reactors. Results of these calculations are shown in Appendix D, Tables G-7 through G-38, and indicate that the doses are minimal and are well within current radiation protection standards.</p>	
3.	<p>It appears from our review of this Draft Environmental Impact Statement that the radiological dose changes are not significant compared with the doses resulting from existing operations. Thus, because of these low radiation related impacts, it is concluded that either once through cooling towers or recirculating cooling towers would be acceptable and that the choice of alternatives should not be based on radiological considerations. We believe that this conclusion is valid from a public health and safety viewpoint and is justified by the technical assessment of the radiological impact.</p>	

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Sincerely,

John C. Villforth
 Director
 Center for Devices and
 Radiological Health