

FROM: Fish & Wildlife Service
Washington, D.C. 20240
Willis King

TO: Mr. Harold L. Price

CLASSIF: U POST OFFICE

REG. NO:

DESCRIPTION: (Must Be Unclassified)
Ltr furnishing comments on Amdt #18 to
AEC questions & updates PSAR for Three
Mile Island Unit 1.....

ENCLOSURES:

REMARKS:

DATE OF DOCUMENT:

Oct. 6, 1971

DATE RECEIVED

Oct. 7, 1971

NO.:

LTR.

MEMO:

REPORT:

OTHER:

X

ORIG.:

CC:

OTHER:

1 signed & 1 cc

ACTION NECESSARY ☐

CONCURRENCE ☐

DATE ANSWERED:

NO ACTION NECESSARY ☐

COMMENT ☐

BY:

FILE CODE:

50-289 (CONSULTANT FILE)

REFERRED TO

DATE

RECEIVED BY

DATE

H. Denton 10-8-71
w/2 cys for ACTION

DISTRIBUTION:

Reg File Cy

OCC-Em-P-506-A

H. Price & Staff

Morris/Schroeder

Case/Maccary

Long/Karas

(ORIG & 3 cys) (ORIG TO BE RET
EM 016)

DO NOT REMOVE

ACKNOWLEDGED

1

DL

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

MAIL CONTROL FORM FORM AEC-3265
18-60)

★ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1971-424-962

POOR ORIGINAL

1589 340

7911010 706

A




Regulatory
United States Department of the Interior
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

ADDRESS ONLY THE DIRECTOR,
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES
AND WILDLIFE

50-289

OCT 6 1971

Mr. Harold L. Price
Director of Regulation
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D.C. 20545



Dear Mr. Price:

Our comments on Amendment No. 18 which contain responses to AEC questions and updating data to the Final Safety Analysis report concerning the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania, AEC Docket No. 50-289, follow.


Section 1.3.2.19 on page 1-10 states that the minimum average effluent flow rate from the mechanical draft cooling tower will be increased from 2,000 to 5,000 gpm. Does this increased flow rate correspond to a similar increase in cooling water intake volume and what will the effluent temperature be as a result of the increased volume?

The second paragraph of Section 11.2.1.4 on page 11-7 refers to inadvertent releases of waste material by an operator. Since the effluent already would have entered the environment prior to the radiation monitors terminating the release, is there not some system that would sense radiation levels prior to the release thus preventing the situation?

We would appreciate a response to the above.

Sincerely yours,

Willis King
Assistant
Director



1589 341