

Keegan, Elaine

From: England, Louise [louise.england@pgnmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 11, 2010 7:04 AM
To: Keegan, Elaine
Subject: FW: Table Clarification

Elaine,

Dave Bruzek followed up on the issue of the Tables from a Golder report that did not appear to be correct. Golder's response is below in red. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,
Louise

From: Bruzek, David A.
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2010 3:42 PM
To: England, Louise
Subject: FW: Table Clarification

Louise,

Please see Golder response in red below. It appears that the data in Table 1 was incorrectly labeled as "pre-uprate" but instead should be labeled as "post-uprate". How do you want to handle this? We can send a note to NRC advising that the table is incorrectly labeled; or I can have Golder produce a revised table (which would not be part of the official SCA response document unless/until it is officially incorporated as such).

Dave

From: Moultrie, Manitia [mailto:manitia_moultrie@golder.com]
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2010 3:12 PM
To: Bruzek, David A.
Cc: Frediani, Harold
Subject: FW: Table Clarification

From: Bruzek, David A. [mailto:David.Bruzek@pgnmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 05, 2010 11:17 AM
To: Moultrie, Manitia
Subject: Table Clarification

Manitia,

We are presently working with NRC staff to provide adequate responses to RAI questions in regards to the License Renewal Application for Crystal River Unit 3. In reviewing all applicable information, a question has come up regarding data provided in four tables that were included as part of the "Response to Comments on Crystal River Unit 3 Uprate Project Site Certification Application" August 2007 (Golder).

It appears that on Table 3 – Average Monthly Discharge Temperatures (Pre and Post-Uprate Conditions) that the numbers in the second and fourth column (Existing Plant Discharge Temperature and Uprated Plant Discharge Temperature) are incorrect (refer to the third column of Table 1) and perhaps have been transposed?

Additionally, comparing Table 2 and Table 4, it appears that the pre- and post- temps may be mixed up or perhaps mislabeled? Associated text is in response to question # 12.

It looks like Table 1 should be labeled post-uprate – not “pre-uprate”. The intake temperatures are the same pre- and post-. What’s shown as Plant Discharge Temperature under the pre-uprate heading is actually the post-uprate plant discharge temperature assuming the intake temperature is not affected by the recirculated water from the proposed SCT (south Cooling Tower, the new one). Then we calculate the SCT outlet temperature, and blend it with the intake water and calculate the resulting change in intake water temperature. Because the changes in intake water temperatures are very small, we ignore that effect.

The same thing is true about table 2. Although the change in intake temperature is a little higher in this extreme case, we still feel that effect can be ignored, especially since its actually lower in the summer when its more critical.

Tables 3 and 4 are correct as presented.

The text in Response 12 of the document is still correct.

Please advise if you need additional information. Do we need to revise Table 1??

Manitia Moultrie | Associate/Tampa Operations Manager | Golder Associates Inc.
5100 West Lemon Street, Suite 208, Tampa, Florida, USA 33609
T: +1 (813) 287-1717 | D: +1 (813) 769-5300 | F: +1 (813) 287-1716 | C: +1 (727) 403-2202 | E:
manitia_moultrie@golder.com | www.golder.com

This email transmission is confidential and may contain proprietary information for the exclusive use of the intended recipient. Any use, distribution or copying of this transmission, other than by the intended recipient, is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender and delete all copies. Electronic media is susceptible to unauthorized modification, deterioration, and incompatibility. Accordingly, the electronic media version of any work product may not be relied upon.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.