

Joanne Stover

From: Steve Sohinki <stephen.sohinki@moellerinc.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 15, 2011 11:59 AM
To: Joanne Stover
Cc: 'Jay Rose'
Subject: FW: Clarifications from Last Data Call Submission

Importance: High

Joanne,

Additional responses to our clarifying questions from a couple of days ago.

Steve

From: McGuire, Jeffrey J [<mailto:jjmcguir@tva.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, December 15, 2011 1:51 PM
To: Steve Sohinki
Cc: Stout, Daniel Paul; Rose, Jay; Ernie Harr
Subject: RE: Clarifications from Last Data Call Submission

Steve

To confirm what we spoke about in our phone call this afternoon.

We are building the Tritiated Water Storage Tank to aid in managing effluent releases. We would do this even if we stayed under the limits of the old EIS.

For the socioeconomics the likely vendor for the Tritiated Water Storage Tank will not be headquartered or have its production facility in any of the three ROI counties.

For Air Quality the information for Sequoyah should be the same as for Watts Bar and not doubled. Due to plant design considerations, Watts Bar uses all four diesels. The only significant use of diesel fuel is for testing which is the same at each plant.

The Watts Bar Effluent Chemist is working on bonus questions 1 – 3.

Jeff

From: Steve Sohinki [<mailto:stephen.sohinki@moellerinc.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2011 8:02 PM
To: McGuire, Jeffrey J
Cc: Stout, Daniel Paul; Rose, Jay; Ernie Harr
Subject: Clarifications from Last Data Call Submission
Importance: High

Jeff,

In addition to the e-mails I sent a few days ago with regard to Question 19, for which we still need a response, and the our need for the Sequoyah information regarding Question 6 from the data call (we only received the response for Watts Bar), the resource authors have reviewed what you have sent thus far and have some clarifying questions:

“Bonus” Questions

1. This question requested the stack height for the CLWR releases for both Watts Bar and Sequoyah. The stack height used in the 1999 EIS was 40m (p. C-15). Is this stack height still appropriate?
2. MEI information is needed for the entire year and not by quarter—please provide if you have that information available. For Sequoyah, the distance to the site boundary is needed for each of the 16 sectors. Table 7.2 of the OCDM contains some of this information but it is not complete.
3. With regard to bonus question 4, please provide JFD information for Watts Bar and Sequoyah in text or table format.

Socioeconomics

Is the likely vendor for the tritium hold-up tank headquartered in or has its production facility in any of the three ROI counties?

Air Quality

TVA referenced the FSEIS for SQN for existing GHG emissions in response to question 43. However, the FSEIS did not provide any specific GHG quantifications. The data call responses did provide diesel fuel use for Watts Bar for 2008 to 2010. If TVA has the information, we would like specific GHG information for Sequoyah. If this information is not available, is it reasonable to assume that Sequoyah information would be similar to what has been provided for Watts Bar. Should the totals be doubled for Sequoyah for diesel usage because there are two reactors? Are there any other differences with respect to Sequoyah compared to Watts Bar that would affect the GHG issue?

Anything you can do to get us the responses to Questions 6, 19 and the additional questions in this e-mail quickly would be greatly appreciated. Thanks.

Regards,
Steve