

AEC DISTRIBUTION FOR PART 50 DOCKET MATERIAL
(TEMPORARY FORM)

CONTROL NO: 5951

FILE ENVIRO FILE

| | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|-----|-------|
| FROM: Department of Agriculture Washington, D.C. 20250 Fred T. Schirley | DATE OF DOC: 10-30-72 | DATE REC'D 10-31-72 | LTR X | MEMO | RPT | OTHER |
| TO: Mr. Daniel R. Muller | ORIG 1 signed | CC | OTHER | SENT AEC PDR ✓ SENT LOCAL PDR ✓ | | |
| CLASS: <u>U</u> PROP INFO | INPUT | NO CYS REC'D 1 | DOCKET NO: 50-302 | | | |

DESCRIPTION: Ltr trans the following:

PLANT NAMES: Crystal River Unit 3

ENCLOSURES: DOA (Forest Service) Comments on Draft Enviro Statement for Crystal River Plant Unit 3....

(1 cy encl rec'd)

ACKNOWLEDGED

DO NOT REMOVE

FOR ACTION/INFORMATION DL 11-1-72

| | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| BUTLER(L) W/ Copies | SCHWENCER(L) W/1 Copies | SCHEMEL(L) W/ Copies | KNIGHTON(E) W/ Copies |
| CLARK(L) W/ Copies | STOLZ(L) W/ Copies | ZIEMANN(L) W/ Copies | YOUNGBLOOD(E) W/ Copies |
| GOLLER(L) W/ Copies | VASSALLO(L) W/ Copies | CHITWOOD(FM) W/ Copies | REGAN(E) W/4 Copies |
| KNIEL(L) W/ Copies | H. DENTON W/ Copies | DICKER(E) W/ Copies | W/ Copies |

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|---------------|-------|
| REG FILE | TECH REVIEW | VOLLMER | HARLESS | WADE | E |
| REC PDR | HENDRIE | DENTON | | SHAFFER | F & M |
| OGC, ROOM P-506A | SCHROEDER | GRIMES | F & M | BROWN | E |
| MUNTZING/STAFF | MACCARY | GAMMILL | SMILEY | G. WILLIAMS | E |
| CASE | LANGE | KASTNER | NUSSBAUMER | E. GOULBOURNE | L |
| GIAMBUSSO | PAWLICKI | BALLARD | | A/T IND | |
| BOYD-L(BWR) | SHAO | FINE | LIC ASST. | BRAITMAN | |
| DEYOUNG-L(PWR) | KNUTH | | SERVICE L | SALTZMAN | |
| SKOVHOLT-L | STELLO | ENVIRO | MASON L | | |
| P. COLLINS | MOORE | MULLER | WILSON L | PLANS | |
| | HOUSTON | DICKER | MAIGRET L | MCDONALD | |
| REG OPR | TEDESCO | KNIGHTON | SMITH L | DUBE | |
| FILE & REGION (2) | LONG | YOUNGBLOOD | GEARIN L | | |
| MORRIS | LAINAS | PROJ LEADER | DIGGS L | INFO | |
| STELLE | BENAROYA | | TEETS L | C. MILES | |
| | | REGAN | LEE L | 8003240659 | |

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

- 1-LOCAL PDR Crystal River, Fla.
- 1-DTIE (ABERNATHY)
- 1-NSIC (BUCHANAN)
- 1-ASLB-YORE/SAYRE
- WOODWARD/H. ST.
- 16-CYS ACRS HOLDING
- (1) [REDACTED] NATIONAL LAB'S **PNWL**
- 1-R. CARROLL-OC, GT-B227
- 1-R. CATLIN, A-170-GT
- 1-CONSULANT'S
- NEWMARK/BLUME/AGABIAN
- 1-PDR-SAN/LA/NY
- 1-GERALD LELLOUCHE
- BROOKHAVEN NAT. LAB
- 1-AGMED (WALTER KOESTER, Rm C-427, GT)
- 1-RD...MULLER...F-309GT



October 30, 1972

Mr. Daniel R. Muller
Director of Licensing
Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D. C. 20545

Dear Mr. Muller:

We have had the draft environmental impact statement for the Florida Power Corporation's Crystal River Unit No. 3 reviewed in the relevant agencies of the Department of Agriculture. Comments from the Soil Conservation Service, an agency of the Department, are enclosed.

The Forest Service, also an agency of the Department, has not yet completed its review. Forest Service will communicate with you directly if it has comments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Fred H. Tschirley".

FRED H. TSCHIRLEY
Assistant Coordinator
Environmental Quality Activities

Enclosure

Soil Conservation Service, USDA

Comments on Draft Environmental Statement prepared by Florida Power Corporation and U. S. Atomic Energy Commission for Crystal River Unit 3 (Operating License Stage).

The Environmental Report consisting of five volumes prepared by the Florida Power Corporation and the Draft Environmental Statement prepared by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission for the Crystal River Unit 3 has been reviewed by the Soil Conservation Service.

The report is no doubt correct when the statement is made on page V-16 that a ground water withdrawal of less than 1 million gallons per day (listed in the AEC Report as 0.6 MGD) will have a negligible impact, but the analysis seems to over state the situation by referring to a recharge area considerably larger than that contributing ground water to the plant site. A more meaningful comparison might show the probable amount of ground water entering the area of the power plant balanced against the other points of major ground water withdrawals, natural or man-made, from the same source.

The increased velocity in the discharge canal resulting from the Unit 3 addition is discussed on page V-64. Mention is made of the probability that the resulting canal scouring will produce turbid water conditions. Elsewhere, in the report (pages V-14 and V-102 for example) it is stated that the discharge canal is to be enlarged, but it is not clear what effect the enlargement will have on the velocity in the canal. If the enlargement reduces the velocity to a non-scouring magnitude, this should be stated in Section V. However, in the event that turbid water conditions will exist even after canal enlargement, the impact of this occurrence should be either outlined in Section V or an explanation should be presented in Section VIII of why it cannot be avoided. We suggest that the mechanics of degradation of stream channels is reasonably well understood and that design parameters exist that when applied to proportioning canals for the movement of water, essentially all scouring is eliminated in the resulting product.