SummerCEm Resource

From: joe4solar@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, April 05, 2009 11:49 PM
To: SummerCOLEIS Resource; joe4solar@aol.com; joe4ocean@aim.com
Subject: Additional comments to SCE&G Application
Attachments: Comments-requirements_2009_Apr_5-v.1.02.doc; Consequence_2009-03-22_v.1.0.doc; Errata 2 Consequence_2009-03-23_v.1.1.doc; 195978 Motion.doc

To Whom It May Consider:
According to NRC News No. 09-050 and instructions received on March 28, 2009 meeting in Blair ,SC School ,
I do respectfully submit four files written in MS Word for Windows XP - ver 2003 (.doc)

Sincerely
Joseph "Joe" Wojcicki

joe4solar@aol.com

Federal Register Notice: 74FR323
Comment Number: 27

Mail Envelope Properties (8CB8481B1ACB6D3-1730-101A)

Subject: Additional comments to SCE&G Application
Sent Date: 4/5/2009 11:48:34 PM
Received Date: 4/5/2009 11:49:00 PM
From: joe4solar@aol.com

Created By: joe4solar@aol.com

Recipients:
"SummerCOLEIS Resource" <Summer.COLEIS@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"joe4solar@aol.com" <joe4solar@aol.com>
Tracking Status: None
"joe4ocean@aim.com" <joe4ocean@aim.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: WEBMAIL-DZ05.sysops.aol.com

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	461	4/5/2009 11:49:00 PM
Comments-requirements_2009_Apr_5-v.1.02.doc	40512	
Consequence_2009-03-22_v.1.0.doc	49216	
Errata 2 Consequence_2009-03-23_v.1.1.doc	44608	
195978 Motion.doc	48704	

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received:

BRIEF INTRODUCTION.

South Carolina Electric & Gas (SCE&G) and Santee Cooper submitted the application March 31, 2008, seeking permission to build and operate two AP1000 reactors at the VC Summer site (Jenkinsville, SC location). The AP1000 is a Westinghouse-designed 1,100 MWe pressurized-water reactor the NRC certified in 2006. Westinghouse submitted an application in May 2007 to amend the certified design.

VC Summer has already one (Unit #1) nuclear reactor delivering almost 1000 MWe and using cooling water from the Broad River via Monticello Reservoir.

This location for an additional two (Units #2 and #3) was selected by SCE&G in 2005.

In 2007, Governors of SC and GA decided to build a new port called Jasper Ocean Terminal (JOT) at the end of the Savannah River. It will be a multi–MW base load at the Atlantic Ocean Location (AOL - a huge cooling water reservoir) shore.

NOTES after MY INITIAL TROUBLESHOOTING / REVIEW of SCE&G SUBMITTED to PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

1. The Jenkinsville site location did not consider at least three aspects:
   1.1. Necessary enormous volume of cooling water (over 40 million extra gallons per day) to be taken from the Broad River located in the Southeast (SE) drought region of the USA.
   1.2. Much higher distance from Jenkinsville to Charleston & AOL large load locations, that will require more MW base load (24/7) for the SE electric network / grid. To fulfill future needs of AOL, unnecessary and additional long distance transmission lines must be built from Jenkinsville to Charleston area and farther to JOT.
   1.3. Seawater would be a better cooling medium.
2. An Initial set of documents and analysis is weak, unclear for serious discussions, and erroneous in their basic and fundamental Electric Energy Generation and Distribution part. It must be the set of inputs in starting an analysis to select a new reactors' site.
3. The hearing has not delivered a clear picture of these deficiencies in SCE&G as well as other panels of experts that have no adequate knowledge of SC economic developments or were limited in their scope of verification.
4. The PSC Order was issued a short time after the end of the hearing, and the lack of understanding of the above three aspects led to wrong approval of Jenkinsville location, instead to force SCE&G to do the serious, professionally accurate rework on fundamental Electric Energy Generation and Distribution parts of their documentation.
5. My proposed AOL should save at least hundreds of millions of dollars in construction and even billions of dollars during the life of this project.

EXPECTED TOPICS in the SCOPE of NRC REPORT / ANALYSIS of SCE&G APPLICATION.

1. Requested and necessary scope of Basic Fundamental Electric Energy Generation and Distribution parts to be a replacement for already presented set of documents. With over 40 years of experience in this area, I offer my help and expertise as an engineer and former SC educator.
2. A Site selection process must be redone. The interests of SC, the SE, and the USA must come before those of SCE&G.
3. Mistakes that happened in the first stage of review of the Application must be avoided in the NRC final review and order.
4. SCE&G has yet to correct embarrassing errors as statements on power factor and its expected values in operation, e.g. what are generator and system voltages and what values were entered in the system dynamic simulation. SCE&G, in the discovery stage, failed to submit simple calculations for analysis and discussion. This kind of project verification from the technology and engineering factual point of view is crucial before the legal aspects would be considered.
5. A misled PSC could not find a logical and efficient solution to this big project. For example, a statement of necessary additional transmission lines (SCE&G claim) when just a simple look at the SC map shows much smaller distances between any AOL or JOT and Charleston (my version) location than between Jenkinsville via Charleston to JOT (SCE&G version of the site location). The truth is quite opposite than this claim in the Order. NRC must do this simple correction and request full map of existing network and its future topology in the SE of the USA.
6. PSC is easily misled by SCE&G that even enclosed tariff exhibits have the same wrong power and energy unit notations. Discovery and the hearing revealed lack of the basic technical ability to use technical calculations, method of professional presentations, even ability to convert variable values between US Customary System of Units and International (SI) System. This knowledge must be represented in complex NRC report to be transparent to everybody with a minimum two-year college degree as well as energy experts, and, of course, clearly support the final decision.
7. Approving localization of reactors with such high needs for cooling water in the drought zone must list emergency shut down procedures and sources of environment and people as its component. The focus must be especially on the water, energy, and food supply.
8. Deficit in water supply must respect agricultural / food production needs, especially if created by an electric energy production.
9. The last years' drought and heat wave events in Europe as well as in the SE of the USA must be considered, including their influence on nuclear reactor operation and SC people and industry. Be aware of specifics of water supply from the Broad River and the Greater Columbia area and SC Midlands needs.
10. Forecast for energy demand in the future must be a function of the projected increase in the state population as well as big energy customers, e.g. JOT. Common sense does not allow to compare apples to oranges, e.g. JOT 24/7 base load to residential power as a time function demand.

11. The SC government must be prepared for a critical situation in power and water deficit. Here are some of the groups of customers that must be put on the list to be limited (disconnected from sources) for electricity and/or water in such a case:
    11.1. Farmers
    11.2. Hospitals
    11.3. Nursing homes
    11.4. Day cares
    11.5. Golf courses
    11.6. Schools and universities.
    11.7. Residential divisions.
    11.8. Administration buildings.
    11.9. Military facilities.
    11.10. Big industry
    11.11. Medium size Industry
    11.12. Small businesses.
    11.13. Churches, synagogues, temples.
    11.14. Sports stadiums, fields.
    11.15. Reservations.
12. The local environment situation analysis should show any limits for the future economical development around the reactor site (radius of 50 miles).
13. The new generation of reactors (AP1000) will require rework of environmental protection means. The changes should be indicated and suggestions must be written.
14. Basic economic estimation must be always attached. Especially it is important in a new selection of the site. You should understand that the selection done in 2005 is no longer valid.
15. Any of the environmental and economical solutions must have full technical supporting analysis. No longer should they ignore product (electricity) and distribution (network topology) system fundamental and initial studies.
16. All my calculations must be considered, and, if necessary, be adjusted or redone. All suggestions accepted, or corrected. In the new USA in the XXI Century, transparency is so significant especially for one of the first big nuclear projects. Avoiding discussion or being silent in the process of reviewing the application on the above topics, fully documented by scientific calculations, will have serious consequences for the entire nation.
17. The South Carolina state must be prepared to educate the new reactors' construction crew as well as their operators. The present SC educational system is not ready and seems not to have a proper orientation in the field of preparation of professional and technical staff to run this kind of investment and new AP1000 generation of facilities. The report must also set minimum and required levels of education, e.g. associate (AS) degree in nuclear technology, AS in Instrumentation and Process Control from institution with ABET accreditation.
18. Allowed connections to a new hydrogen production technology. Or limitations from the environmental point of view.

19. I was an intervenor in the first stage of the process of review SCE&G Application, therefore you may find several of my entered documents in SC PSC docket # 2008-196-E. I am ready to answer your questions in this subject.
20. I did the petition to intervene in NRC dockets # 52-027 & 52-028 COL
21. This paper has supporting materials in its attached files:
    21.1. Consequences...by JOSEPH WOJCICKI–INTERVENOR *PER SE*
    21.2. Errata to Consequences.
    21.3. MOTION TO CHANGE THE LOCATION OF THE TWO NEW REACTORS PLANNED BY APPLICANT…by Joseph Wojcicki.

Very truly yours,

Joseph "Joe" Wojcicki - MSEE

Columbia, SC April 5, 2009

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
DOCKET NO. 2008-196-E

IN THE MATTER OF:		
South Carolina Electric **&** Gas Company	)	
Combined Application for Certificate	)	**CONSEQUENCES.**
Of Environmental Compatibility and	)	MOTION by JOSEPH WOJCICKI
Public Convenience and Necessity and	)	–INTERVENOR *PER SE*
For a Base Load Review Order	)	
	)	

CONSEQUENCES.

Please do make legal, formal or informal notices about following noted facts:

1. Notice is hereby given that Joseph Wojcicki, on behalf of himself as Per Se (Intervenor) in the above named case, hereby did petition the Commission for rehearing or reconsideration of Order No 2009-104(A) approving the Combined Application of SCE&G for the Construction and Operation of a Nuclear Facility in Jenkinsville, SC. The Order denies my Motion to Change the Location of the two New Reactors Planned by Applicant; Motion was dated November 10, 2009. Please, accept the way in the rest of this Motion text where pronouns *I,* and *my* are used instead of "*Wojcick*i."

2. SCE&G Company (Applicant) never wrote any serious rebuttals to the calculations and their results supporting Atlantic Ocean Location (AOL) even for these so important aspects as better electric energy distribution and saving over 40 millions gallons of water per day from Broad River in SC. The Applicant's Response to Intervenor Petitions... dated March 19, 2009, again has no answer for any of above my suggestions. They have economical, social and environmental aspects that show the effectiveness of AOL. It is such strange opposition in this Applicant's document, to my very friendly offered help, in the way to save the project for SC, with keeping SC interest in our mind.

3. The Applicant's selection of the Jenkinsville site was done in 2005. It is completely wrong in 2008 and 2009 when we know SC plans and water situation in the nearest future. Consequences: the stubborn SCE&G position to locate new reactors in Jenkinsville is illogical and would cost unnecessary billions of dollars the State of SC and its residents. Supporting arguments: My calculations that were never opposed by Applicant nor ORS and well-known drought hazards in last years, especially for nuclear reactors in Southeast (SE) region.

4. In my troubleshooting of Application, I could not find proper analytical, engineering documentation in such important, basic, and should be the largest, first chapter/section/part of their "paper works". The part that could be named: The

Electricity Generating and Distributing Southeast Network Topography. Consequences: Weak hearing, refused answers for questions, in cross-examination, because sometime mistakes/errors could not be addressed to the proper page number because those problems were simply omitted. PSC could not find on the map that transmission lines are shorter from JOT to Charleston than from Jenkinsville to JOT or other AOL, instead Commission accepted Mr. Young bold (and misleading) statement that AOL will require more transmission lines. In fact, AOL will eliminate necessity to add additional lines from Jenkinsville to Charleston.

5. The Applicant and ORS have ignored plans for Jasper Ocean Terminal (JOT). It is the insult to SC and GA Governors' signatures put on documents in March 2007 and ignorance of our international trade interests..

6. In my first Request for Additional Information (discovery stage - September 22, 2008), I did specifically suggest scientific and professional answers for listed cooling water problems. The Applicant did fail to answer in the professional way. Then I did another research, by myself, using also mostly Westinghouse and some SCE&G available materials to do calculate enormous volume of the water to be evaporated by reactors in the future. The results support my concept of AOL. Consequences: Wrong PSC decision accepting Jenkinsville location.

7. According to information from the SC press, SC Attorney General has opened, in US Supreme Court lawsuit: "SC vs. NC (Catawba River water case)" in 2007. There was given a number of 10 millions gallons of water per day (sought relief?). Compare to additional 40 millions gal/day for new Applicant's reactors. An ignorance (and seems to be insult to SC) these numbers could create bad consequences for the future of this case. If my information is correct, Mr. McMaster asks State for $2.2 millions to continue this case process. Compare this number to $10 millions spent on pre-works in Jenkinsville which, by the way, were opposed by intervenors in 2008.

8. Note that opportunity to save tens of millions of gallons of water for Midland and Columbia, SC and $$ billions because of wrong network topology is never mentioned in Applicant documents, ORS documents (that had to be an engineering verification of Application) and consequently in the PSC Order.

9. The only effective solution correcting the wrong location is found in My Motion and supporting it calculations. Doing troubleshooting of Applicants documents, comparing them to real world electric power generating technologies including nuclear I pointed on other very primitive errors in the Application but it was also ignored and we have proof of this in the Order (March 2, 2009) where Second Revised Exhibit N (31 pages) still have non- professionally and slovenly typed power and energy unit notations.

10. Please note that my suggestions are supported by technical calculations and analysis and has no arguments to oppose. They also represent the interest of SC and SE region of the USA. Supporting arguments: common sense.

11. In the national and specifically the State financial situation, all better, also money - saving solutions must be accepted. The Application without product (electricity) and distribution services (grid, network) full prudent and professionally presented documentations must be rejected or sent for reworks. Consequences of leaving it as is will bring global embarrassment to authors and harm SC.

12. It is advisable to investigate if Georgia and SC governors, as well as their Attorney Generals were informed about my Atlantic Ocean Location concept for Applicants' reactors. Maybe also, Duke Power as another Electric Company being interested in water to cool their reactors and share electricity market on SE should be informed. Arguments: Transparence in the process.

AOL is the location which has solid scientific calculations and analysis. And nobody rebutted it since November 10, 2008.

WHEREFORE for the foregoing reasons, I, Joseph "Joe" Wojcicki – intervenor in this case hereby urges the Commission to change the Order accepting Motion dated November 10, 2008, to request SCE&G to do a rework of the Application to new location, as well as do make all notices that might be used in a next stage of the Application review.

Respectfully submitted:

Joseph Wojcicki

820 East Steele Rd.
West Columbia, SC 29170

March 22, 2009

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The copy of this Notice of Appeal is sent to:

Ruth Thomas
1339 Sinkler Road
Columbia, SC 29206

Or by Email Service to the parties named below:

bzeigler@popezeigler.com,
robertc@dhec.sc.gov,
cprosser@scprt.com,
dex@bbrslaw.com,
wmullins@bprwm.com,
FramptonJ@dnr.sc.gov,
joe4solar@aol.com,
chad.burgess@scana.com,
meira28@sc.rr.com,
manne57@bellsouth.net
mwilloughby@willoughbyhoefer.com,
nsedwar@regstaff.sc.gov,
pmlgrnlw@yahoo.com,
bguild@mindspring.com,
selliott@elliottlaw.us,
shudson@regstaff.sc.gov,
David.Butler@psc.sc.gov,
Charles.Terreni@psc.sc.gov,
Joseph.Melchers@psc.sc.gov,
Jocelyn.Boyd@psc.sc.gov,
lnewton@sc.rr.com,

Joseph Wojcicki joe4solar@aol.com Columbia, SC March 23, 2009

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
DOCKET NO. 2008-196-E

IN THE MATTER OF:		
South Carolina Electric **&** Gas Company	**)**	**ERRATA to**
Combined Application for Certificate	)	**CONSEQUENCES.**
Of Environmental Compatibility and	)	REQUEST for NOTICE by JOSEPH WOJCICKI
Public Convenience and Necessity and	)	–INTERVENOR *PER SE*
For a Base Load Review Order	)	

ERRATA TO DOCUMENT: CONSEQUENCES dated March 23, 2009

Please do make correction/ addition to my Request for legal, formal or informal notices about facts listed in yesterday's document called Consequences:

6. **Is**: *In my first Request for Additional Information (discovery stage - September 22, 2008), I did specifically suggest scientific and professional answers for listed cooling water problems. The Applicant did fail to answer in the professional way. Then I did another research, by myself, using also mostly Westinghouse and some SCE&G available materials to do calculate enormous volume of the water to be evaporated by reactors in the future. The results support my concept of AOL. Consequences: Wrong PSC decision accepting Jenkinsville location*

Should be: *In my first Request for Additional Information (in discovery stage, document dated* **August 19,** *2008), I did specifically suggest scientific and professional answers for listed cooling water problems. The Applicant did fail to answer in the professional way.* **Applicant's answer, delivered because of my intervention done on September 22, 2008, was not entered to Docket # 2008-196-E and did fail to deliver required information.** *Then I did another research, by myself, using also mostly Westinghouse and some SCE&G available materials to do calculate enormous volume of the water to be evaporated by reactors in the future. The results support my concept of AOL. Consequences: Wrong PSC decision accepting Jenkinsville location*
I believe Applicant finally submitted this paper in December 2008 at the hearing.
Applicant's Answer has no required data and, of course was entered not on time.
Just to compare – Applicant's answer to Ms. Greenlaw request was done timely.
Also note in the aspect of forecasting necessary in future MWs of 24/7 nuclear generated power cannot be used to simply balance residential loads (even for a million of new residents) because they are not base 24/7 steady demand. The Application cannot be approved without doing scientifically required analysis. You did not get a help from outside SC experts.
.....
AOL is the location which has solid scientific calculations and analysis. And nobody rebutted it since November 10, 2008.

WHEREFORE for the foregoing reasons, I, Joseph "Joe" Wojcicki – intervenor in this case hereby urges the Commission to change the Order accepting Motion dated November 10, 2008, to request

SCE&G to do a rework of the Application to new location, as well as do **make all notices that might be used in a next stage of the Application review.**

Respectfully submitted:

Joseph Wojcicki

820 East Steele Rd.
West Columbia, SC 29170

March 23, 2009

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The copy of this Notice of Appeal is sent to:

Ruth Thomas
1339 Sinkler Road
Columbia, SC 29206

Or by Email Service to the parties named below:

bzeigler@popezeigler.com,
robertc@dhec.sc.gov,
cprosser@scprt.com,
dex@bbrslaw.com,
wmullins@bprwm.com,
FramptonJ@dnr.sc.gov,
joe4solar@aol.com,
chad.burgess@scana.com,
meira28@sc.rr.com,
manne57@bellsouth.net
mwilloughby@willoughbyhoefer.com,
nsedwar@regstaff.sc.gov,
pmlgrnlw@yahoo.com,
bguild@mindspring.com,
selliott@elliottlaw.us,
shudson@regstaff.sc.gov,
David.Butler@psc.sc.gov,
Charles.Terreni@psc.sc.gov,
Joseph.Melchers@psc.sc.gov,
Jocelyn.Boyd@psc.sc.gov,
lnewton@sc.rr.com,

Joseph Wojcicki joe4solar@aol.com Columbia, SC March 24, 2009

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF
SOUTH CAROLINA
DOCKET NO. 2008-196-E

INRE:
Combined Application of South Carolina)
Electric & Gas Company for Approval)
of a Certificate of Environmental)
Compatibility and Public Convenience and)
Necessity and for a Base Load Review Order)
for the Construction and Operation of a)
Nuclear Facility in Jenkinsville, South Carolina)

MOTION TO CHANGE THE LOCATION OF THE TWO NEW REACTORS PLANNED BY APPLICANT

I, Joseph Wojcicki, one of the intervenors in the above case, respectfully submit this Motion ("Motion") in this docket for South Carolina Electric & Gas Company's ("SCE&G's") Application for Approval of a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Convenience and Necessity and for a Base Load Review Order for the Construction and Operation of a Nuclear Facility in the presently assumed to be location of Jenkinsville, South Carolina ("Application").
Pursuant to the South Carolina Base Load Review Act ("Act"), the Office of Regulatory Staff's ("ORS") duties are to safeguard the public interest in all matters arising under the Act, and in carrying out this duty, therefore I expect their full support.

INTRODUCTION.

1. My proposed localization close to the Atlantic Ocean has enormous savings over the Jenkinsville location selected by SCE&G. In the "Atlantic location" all necessary water required for cooling will be saved for the State of South Carolina ("SC") as well as for the entire Southeast region of the USA. Here nuclear facilities already had problems in times of higher temperatures and/or drought. The Atlantic Ocean Location ("AOL") will also save electric energy estimated in the hundreds of millions of US dollars, giving a higher chance to keep lower kWh rates and SCE&G competitiveness on the energy market as well as minimizing risk of bailouts.

   It is obvious that lower kWh rates are in the great interest of the general public, industry, and several institutions of SC.

2. Everyone who has read the material submitted by SCE&G, experts from ORS, and witnesses could not find a serious analysis of the location aspect as well as the enormous cooling water demand by nuclear installations. There is nothing mentioned about cooling alternatives, such as seawater. Also, a future refinery is planned to be constructed near the shoreline, which will require megawatts of power for operation.

3. I deliver a solution carefully analyzed, having the support by science and common sense. The scope of required knowledge is entirely in my education and experience. A partial list is shown below:

3.1. Over 40 years of engineering experience in programming, design, construction, startups, and troubleshooting from planning to operational stages of small and big projects.

3.2. Over 20 years in education (lecturing in Colleges and Universities), teaching electrical power generation and distribution, process control, cybernetics, mechanical and electronic technology, and computer programming. My students, many graduating Cum Laude, placed my name in the top few percent of USA educators (Who's Who Among American Teachers).

3.3 Over 25 years in design, working as lead designer in large, multi-disciplinary projects within different industries and for different investors.

3.4. Troubleshooter and verifier—over 15 years experience from small to large scale and working with billion dollar investments.

SUPPORTING CALCULATIONS.

4. Basic data from SCE&G: Their reactor needs 31 cubic feet per second ("cfs") of make-up water, mostly for cooling. Two reactors need 62 cfs. This water is mostly evaporated. In the Jenkinsville location, an extra 82 cfs would be taken from Monticello Reservoir. Warm 20 cfs is the effluent discharge to Parr Reservoir. In the maximum case, values are: 138 – 68 = 70 cfs. See SCE&G Response to ORS CHG 2-29 Request (Page 1301 – Table 3.3-1).

In gallons: (7.48 gal/cfs) * (62 cfs) = 464 gallons per second ("gal/s") is removed from SC water sources, or about 27,800 gpm (gal/min).

Per hour: (3600 s/h) * (464 gal/s) = 1,664,536 gal/h (Note: Over 1.6 million gallons per hour!)

Per day: (24 h/d) * (1,664,536 gal/h) = 40,068,864 gal/d

Per week: (7 d/w) * (40,068,864 gal/d) = 280,482,048 gal/w

Per year: (52 w/y) * (280,482,048 gal/w) = 14,585,066,496 gal/y (Note: Over 14.5 billion gallons annually)

Per reactor's life expectancy: (60 y/life) * (14,585,066,496 gal/y) = 875,103,989,760 gal/life

5. Unit price (UP) of water.

At Wal-mart today: 37 cents to 600 cents per gallon

I paid $29.30 per 2,035 gallons for city water. UP = 2930 cent / 2035 gal = 1.44 cent/gal. Even at this price you may see $ billions saved on water.

Note to readers: **calculate cost of the water** with any of your assumptions. Respect the perspective of increase "base demand/load" in the next 60 years. Do calculation for the disaster time as post hurricane, drought, highest temperature recorded in your county, etc. Remember, at these times water becomes very expensive.

My proposed location entirely eliminates the necessity to use water from SC land natural resources. In addition, cooling will be much better using seawater.

6. Better location in a network topology will lower transmission losses.

In this case, losses may be estimated as 2 or more percent of rated power (i.e. 2,234 MW). Planned time is 95%. Therefore, annual losses in energy could be at least:

Energy lost per year = 0.02 * 2,234 MW * 0.95 * 8760 h/y = 371,827 MWh /y.

Using approximate future rate: 10 cent / kWh * 2 = $0.20 / kWh or $200 / MWh. Note: Here are eliminated the demand charges for MW, MVA, Power factor, etc. as well as construction and operation costs.

Lost minimum amount in earning: ($200 /MWh) * (371,827 MWh /y) = $74,365,392 / y.

Maximum could be (if more wholesale customers would be connected to the grid and other factors come to life) up to 2.5, so max losses could be over $180 million annually.

Detailed estimation can be done after SCE&G will submit realistic network configuration with topology of future loads, especially the big ones planned in the state and the southeast region.

7. Savings on energy using seawater for cooling is another significantly big number.

8. Selection of the two AP 1000 units location at Jenkinsville is shown in response to ORS Request CHG 2-1 (Page 898) in SCE&G Audit Information (Pages 909-942) from the analysis of only two options: VCSNS/Jenkinsville and SRS/Aiken. Other locations analyzed in the 1970's were rejected. Skipping the discussion on selection criteria (Criterion P1-P10) we may find an interesting summary on Table 3-1 (Page 917).

    8.1. Adding to the table a third option, my Atlantic Ocean Location, will significantly change the rating at least for P1 (Cooling water supply) and P8 (Transmission access). SRS and VCSNS must be corrected, lowering their rating to almost zero (0) compared to AOL which would get a value of five (5).

    8.2. Composite Site Rating for AOL would exceed the selected VCSNS location by at least 7 points.

9. More supporting arguments will add to a better economical model, lowering overall capital investment dollars for construction and optimize operational costs.

10. An initial set of information is in PSC Docket 2008-196-E as doc #195528 entered on 10/15/2008.

We have to remember that any legal arguments CANNOT OVERRULE the laws of physics, chemistry, energy, and common sense.

CONCLUSION.

Considering my proposal of the "Atlantic Ocean Location" ("AOL") with its enormous savings and assurance of water for the SC Midlands and the southeast region of the United States, it should convince the applicant to reanalyze this part of the application. It should also influence in a positive way other SC projects.

This win-win situation will be for:
_ SCE&G and Santee Cooper costumers because of lower rates
_ SCE&G competitiveness
_ SCANA shareholders
_ People of SC and the southeast region because of better stability of water supply
_ Industry of SC – lower MVA, MWmax, MVAr, MWh rates and a reserve in water
_ Possible positive influence on future AP 1000 installations all over the world

SCE&G has not considered in their election of a location those factors and also ignored the planned Duke Power's reactors that need water, too.
The initial proposal, which I have submitted to the PSC on 10/15/2008 (doc #195525), has some details supporting this Motion.

The suggested AOL will have a significant effect on the economy of South Carolina.

Very truly yours,

Joseph "Joe" Wojcicki - Intervenor.

Columbia, SC November 10, 2008