

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

| Comment number | Comments | Responses |
|----------------|---|---|
| | STATEMENT OF DAN M. MAULDIN | |
| | Department of the Army South Atlantic Division, Corps of Engineers 510 Title Building, 30 Pryor Street, S.W. Atlanta, Georgia 30335-6801 | |
| | May 19, 1986 | |
| | Reply to Attention of: | |
| | Planning Division | |
| | SUBJECT: Cooling Water EIS | |
| | Mr. R. P. Whitfield Director, Environmental Division U.S. Department of Energy Savannah River Operations Office Post Office Box A Aiken, South Carolina 29802 | |
| | Dear Mr. Whitfield: | |
| | This is in response to your letter of March 28, 1986, to Brigadier General C. E. Edgar III requesting our review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Alternative Cooling Systems, Savannah River Plant, Aiken, SC (DOE/EIS-0121D). | |
| | We have reviewed the document and offer the following comments: | |
| BA-1 | a. While we may understand the reasons for eliminating the alternative of cooling ponds, it may not be as readily apparent to other readers. It is suggested that a more detailed account of discussing engineering, economic, | DOE initially identified 22 possible alternative cooling water systems that would |

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

| Comment number | Comments | Responses |
|----------------|--|---|
| | <p>and environmental reasons for dropping the alternative be provided. For example, the high cost of preparing the dam foundation, the wetland habitat loss involving an endangered species, the fact that DOE is already compensating for habitat loss due to Steel Creek Dam, and the operational constraints imposed by a cooling pond are all factors which should be discussed as affecting the choice of the alternative.</p> <p>b. Appendix A does not fully convince the reviewer that dams are not a viable option. Further explanation should be provided.</p> <p>The opportunity to review the document is appreciated.</p> | <p>be implemented for K- and C-Reactors and four alternatives for the D-Area powerhouse. Subsequently, using a structured screening process, DOE identified those that would be reasonable to implement. The screening process, which included detailed engineering, economic and environmental assessments of each alternative, was documented in the <u>Thermal Mitigation Study</u> (DOE, 1984) that was submitted to SCDHEC under Consent Order and subsequently approved. Appendix A is a synopsis of the detailed screening process provided in the <u>Thermal Mitigation Study</u> and provides a brief rationale for alternatives that were considered in the EIS. Appendix A references the <u>Thermal Mitigation Study</u> (DOE, 1984) for a detailed evaluation of alternatives.</p> |
| | <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>John W. Rushing for Dan M. Mauldin Chief, Planning Division</p> | |