

Enclosure 1



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

NOV 21 1979

Docket No. 50-367

POOR ORIGINAL

Mr. R. J. Bohn  
Manager, Nuclear Staff  
Northern Indiana Public  
Service Company  
RR #3, Box 501  
Chesterton, Indiana 46304

Dear Mr. Bohn:

We have partially reviewed the report ("Summary Information, Hydrogeologic Evaluation of Construction Dewatering" with Attachment A - "Summary Report Investigation and Testing for Groundwater Pressure Relief During Construction") submitted by letter dated August 27, 1979, in support of a proposed revision to NIPSCO's dewatering plan.

Based on the information presented, we conclude that the proposed plan constitutes a reasonable approach to the dewatering problem; has little potential for adverse offsite effects to groundwater; and that the existing monitoring and mitigation program can detect and interdict any adverse conditions before they affect offsite features (except as noted below).

We are continuing our review to include the portions of the report dealing with procedures for preventing and mitigating the effects of boils should they occur. This part of the work has been included as a portion of the effort currently being undertaken in connection with the pile driving proposal under review. Thus, this portion of our review is not yet complete.

The effect of the ash pond sealing on groundwater levels and monitoring has been considered by both of our staffs. However, while the ash pond seepage issue is not a direct Unit 1 problem, we should at least be aware of the sealing program you intend to implement. Therefore, we request that we be provided a courtesy copy of any reports and plans for sealing the ponds which would materially improve our understanding of the approach, procedures, inspection, and monitoring to be used, and any potential impacts on the monitoring and mitigation program.

Sincerely,

1864 107

*[Signature]*  
Ronald L. Ballard, Chief  
Environmental Projects Branch 1  
Division of Site Safety and  
Environmental Analysis

8002040 031

Enclosure 2

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION DEWATERING MONITORING PROGRAM BY THE  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKE SHORE

The subject proposal was contained in a memorandum with several attached memoranda. The following comments cite the specific memorandum by date to which the comments apply.

Memorandum dated September 28, 1979, We question the recommendation by the NPS that NIPSCO advise them 30 days in advance of changes in dewatering pumping rates. These pumping rates are dictated by vagaries of construction and weather. It is generally not feasible to schedule construction dewatering so far in advance. However, NIPSCO should be required to inform NPS of changes in pumping rates as soon as the changes are made or anticipated.

Memorandum dated September 4, 1979, with attachment: The description of the observation well network and the USGS proposed monitoring program is based upon the assumptions that NIPSCO dewatering efforts will be directed only towards the unit 1 aquifer (for clarification "unit 1" in the reference document refers to the shallow aquifer). Recent proposals by NIPSCO, specifically those contained in their August 27, 1979 request make it clear that the dewatering of the deeper aquifer will be necessary.

Same reference: The USGS proposed monitoring system is based principally on one well, designated USGS Well 25. The proposal asserts that a method has been identified to reflect seasonal change in the overall monitoring control. We question this assertion. The U.S. Geological Survey, using the elevation of Well 25 at one day in history, modeled the overall shape and slope of the ground system (i.e., the reference water surface). In our opinion not only the elevation but the shape of this water surface may vary seasonally. However, the monitoring program assumes that the internal gradients, flow directions, etc., remain the same and only the elevation of the surface changes with the season. This has not been documented and we would suggest that further refinement may be needed in considering seasonal variations in groundwater elevations.

General comment: Although the program appears extensive and well-thought out, there appears also to be some redundancy. We suggest that the program be reviewed with this in mind to assure that duplication is minimized.

1864 108