Re: Fw: Thermal Question

John King to: palmeag 06/09/2011 09:27 AM

From: John King/R1/USEPA/US
To: palmeag@nu.com

Yes ... can PSNH send it "officially" by mail?

JPK

-----palmeag@nu.com wrote: -----
To: John King/R1/USEPA/US@EPA
From: palmeag@nu.com
Date: 06/08/2011 11:16PM
Subject: Re: Fw: Thermal Question

This work?

From: king.john@epamail.epa.gov
To: Allan G. Palmer/NUS@NU
Date: 06/06/2011 03:36 PM
Subject: Re: Fw: Thermal Question

Enercon will provide a revised page this week. Good?

GOOD FOR ME ..... John

From: palmeag@nu.com

To: John King/R1/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 06/06/2011 03:34 PM

Subject: Fw: Thermal Question

John, As we discussed today...

The analysis was originally completed using a discharge volume of 830 gpm, which was rounded up from the true value of 828.8 gpm. As such, the values provided in the paragraph and the original table (4,244, etc.) reflect 830 gpm. In the review process it was decided to that to increase accuracy it was better to use the exact value of 828.8 gpm, and the table was updated accordingly (4,238, etc.); however, the paragraph

values were not updated.

Enercon will provide a revised page this week. Good?

----- Forwarded by Allan G. Palmer/NUS on 06/06/2011 03:31 PM -----

Allan G. Palmer
06/03/2011 12:45 PM

To: king.john@epamail.epa.gov
cc:
Subject: Re: Fw: Thermal QuestionLink

I can't resolve, I just emailed to Enercon.

From: king.john@epamail.epa.gov
To: Allan G. Palmer/NUS@NU
Date: 06/01/2011 04:37 PM
Subject: Re: Fw: Thermal Question

Sort of .... but does it really answer today's email question of the monthly values of the table not matching the verbiage?

From: palmeag@nu.com

To: John King/R1/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 06/01/2011 04:34 PM

Subject: Fw: Thermal Question

Does this ring a bell?

----- Forwarded by Allan G. Palmer/NUS on 06/01/2011 04:34 PM -----

Allan G. Palmer
09/08/2010 03:47 PM

To: king.john@epamail.epa.gov

cc:
Subject: Re: Thermal Question
Link

John, There are two separate reasons for your question:

1) Why don't the average monthly values add up to the annual value?

Answer: Besides the minor rounding off difference always inherent in these types of calculations, months vary in length, so when adding average monthly values together it is necessary to weight each month by its duration.

2) Why don't the maximum monthly values add up to the annual value?

Answer: We calculated absolute maximum values using the hourly maximum temperature differentials provided in Table 7-1 over the entire month. So for example, the maximum thermal discharge value for January was calculated assuming the maximum hourly temperature differential of 22.2 F occurred continuously throughout the entire month of January. Likewise, the maximum annual thermal discharge value was calculated assuming the maximum hourly temperature differential of 26.1 F occurred continuously throughout the entire year.

From: king.john@epamail.epa.gov
To: Allan G. Palmer/NUS@NU
Date: 09/07/2010 01:25 PM
Subject: Thermal Question

Allan,

Table 7-2, p. 22, of the July 2010 submission list thermal loads discharged from a Merrimack Station closed cycle cooling system. The monthly numbers when added to not equal the annually average and maximum discharges. Is that because the annual thermal discharge was a separate calculation.

Thank you, John

[attachment "Merrimack Response to RAI - Rev 1 (pg. 23).pdf" removed by John

King/R1/USEPA/US]

Re: Fw: Thermal Question

palmeag to: John King 06/08/2011 11:16 PM

From: palmeag@nu.com
To: John King/R1/USEPA/US@EPA
History: This message has been replied to and forwarded.

This work?

From: king.john@epamail.epa.gov
To: Allan G. Palmer/NUS@NU
Date: 06/06/2011 03:36 PM
Subject: Re: Fw: Thermal Question

Enercon will provide a revised page this week. Good?

GOOD FOR ME ..... John

From: palmeag@nu.com

To: John King/R1/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 06/06/2011 03:34 PM

Subject: Fw: Thermal Question

John, As we discussed today...

The analysis was originally completed using a discharge volume of 830 gpm, which was rounded up from the true value of 828.8 gpm. As such,

the values provided in the paragraph and the original table (4,244, etc.) reflect 830 gpm. In the review process it was decided to that to increase accuracy it was better to use the exact value of 828.8 gpm, and the table was updated accordingly (4,238, etc.); however, the paragraph values were not updated.

Enercon will provide a revised page this week. Good?

----- Forwarded by Allan G. Palmer/NUS on 06/06/2011 03:31 PM -----

Allan G. Palmer
06/03/2011 12:45 PM

To: king.john@epamail.epa.gov
cc:
Subject: Re: Fw: Thermal QuestionLink

I can't resolve, I just emailed to Enercon.

From: king.john@epamail.epa.gov
To: Allan G. Palmer/NUS@NU
Date: 06/01/2011 04:37 PM
Subject: Re: Fw: Thermal Question

Sort of .... but does it really answer today's email question of the monthly values of the table not matching the verbiage?

From: palmeag@nu.com

To: John King/R1/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 06/01/2011 04:34 PM

Subject: Fw: Thermal Question

Does this ring a bell?

----- Forwarded by Allan G. Palmer/NUS on 06/01/2011 04:34 PM -----

Allan G. Palmer

To: king.john@epamail.epa.gov

cc:

09/08/2010 03:47 PM Subject: Re: Thermal Question Link

John, There are two separate reasons for your question:

1) Why don't the average monthly values add up to the annual value?

Answer: Besides the minor rounding off difference always inherent in these types of calculations, months vary in length, so when adding average monthly values together it is necessary to weight each month by its duration.

2) Why don't the maximum monthly values add up to the annual value?

Answer: We calculated absolute maximum values using the hourly maximum temperature differentials provided in Table 7-1 over the entire month. So for example, the maximum thermal discharge value for January was calculated assuming the maximum hourly temperature differential of 22.2 F occurred continuously throughout the entire month of January. Likewise, the maximum annual thermal discharge value was calculated assuming the maximum hourly temperature differential of 26.1 F occurred continuously throughout the entire year.

From: king.john@epamail.epa.gov
To: Allan G. Palmer/NUS@NU
Date: 09/07/2010 01:25 PM
Subject: Thermal Question

Allan,

Table 7-2, p. 22, of the July 2010 submission list thermal loads discharged from a Merrimack Station closed cycle cooling system. The monthly numbers when added to not equal the annually average and maximum discharges. Is that because the annual thermal discharge was a separate calculation.

Thank you, John

****

Merrimack Response to RAI - Rev 1 (pg. 23).pdf