

ENVIRON

Docket File

SEP 7 1972

Docket Nos. 50-289 & 50-320

Daniel E. Muller, Assistant Director for Environmental Projects, I

RESPONSE TO AGENCY COMMENTS - THREE MILE ISLAND, UNITS 1 & 2

Plant Name: Three Mile Island, Units 1 & 2
 Licensing Stage: OL & Post OP
 Docket Numbers: 50-289/320
 Responsible Branch: Environmental Projects Branch No. 3
 Project Leader: W. Reagan
 Requested Completion Date: September 4, 1972
 Description of Response: Response to Agency Comments
 Review Status: Complete

In response to your request, we offer the following responses to the Environmental Protection Agency Comments on Three Mile Island Nuclear Plant, Units 1 & 2 that are related to radioactive waste handling systems.

Original signed by:

Robert L. Tedesco, Assistant Director
 for Containment Safety
 Directorate of Licensing

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket (50-289/320) ✓
 L Reading
 CS Reading
 ETSB Reading
 J. Telford (w/o encl.)
 V. Wilson (2)
 ETSB Staff

Enclosures:
 As stated

cc: w/o enclosures
 A. Gimbrone
 W. McDonald

w/enclosures
 S. Hanner
 J. Hendric
 K. Knial

POOR ORIGINAL

1590 334

OFFICE ▶	E. Youngblood E. Schierling	ETSB/L	ETSB/L	AD/CS/L	
SURNAME ▶	W. Reagan L. Smith	RSmith:cc	VBenareya	RTedesco	
DATE ▶		9/ /72	9/ /72	9/ /72	

7911180 468 D

Comment-(first 2 paragraphs on page 3)-The sludge from Unit 1 Powdex filter and neutralized regenerant solution from Unit 2 should be treated in the waste management system.

Response-Figure 12 in the draft environmental statement is incomplete, in that, Unit 1 has the capability to recycle the Powdex sludge. The applicant has been requested to provide an estimate of the percentage of the sludge that will be recycled annually. Nonetheless, our evaluation of the system using 100% discharge of the Powdex sludge concluded that the releases would be less than .01 Ci/yr., and would insignificantly contribute to our calculated releases.

The applicant has verbally stated that the final design for the Unit 2 demineralizer regenerant system will be different from that described in the PSAR and that the regenerants will be treated before release to Susquehanna River. After the design has been submitted, we will evaluate the system to assure that it meets as low as practicable criterion.

Comment-(last paragraph on page 3)-The final statement should indicate the criteria for installation of a deep-bed demineralizer for Unit 1 and should provide the results of an evaluation of the environmental effects of its use.

Response-When the applicant submits a revision to the present treatment system, the environmental effects of this modification will be evaluated.

Comment-(first paragraph page 4)-The final statement should provide detailed information about turbine building leak rates, activity levels in the leakage and in the discharge, and the possibility of treatment before discharge.

Response-We suggest adding the following to the first paragraph on page III-20 of the Draft Environmental Statement: From an accumulative leak rate of 5 gpm from all systems in the turbine building that contain secondary coolant we expect less than .05 Ci/yr.

Comment-(second paragraph page 4)-The applicant should provide 90 days decay for gaseous effluents rather than 30 days decay used in the Draft Environmental Statement since this system

1590 335

is capable of holding gases for 90 days.

Response-Our evaluation shows that 30 days holdup for gaseous effluents is sufficient for this plant to meet the low as practicable criteria. Holdup for 90 days would reduce the releases to essentially 845 Curies of Kr-85. The incremental environmental effect of this reduction is not necessary.

1590 336