

As Packets

1975

Docket Nos. STN 50-546
and STN 50-547

Public Service of Indiana
ATTN: Dr. James Coughlin
Vice President - Nuclear
1000 E. Main Street
Plainfield, Indiana 46168

Gentlemen:

Our letter of August 22, 1975, transmitted a formal list of questions to which completely adequate responses were requested by September 15, 1975, in order that our proposed review schedule could be met. Two copies of your responses were received with your letter dated September 11, 1975, and it is our understanding that substantially the same information will be provided in your formal responses in the forthcoming amendment to the Environmental Report. However, about one tenth of the responses were incomplete or inadequate. Most of the information regarding these deficiencies was obtained in phone conversations with your staff and some of these amended responses were transmitted in your letter of November 14, 1975. Amended responses are required also to the remainder of the incompletely answered questions listed in Enclosure 1.

Some additional questions requiring formal responses have been generated by the staff in the course of its review. These are also listed in Enclosure 1.

Finally, formal responses are needed by the staff to the questions from the Indiana Stream Pollution Control Board given in Enclosure 2.

Most of the questions in Enclosure 1 have been transmitted informally to your staff several weeks ago, but this formal listing may clarify any misunderstandings about the information required. Our review is already being delayed by the lack of the requested information, and the delay will be significant if completely adequate responses are not provided by December 8, 1975.

FOIA-87-554

B/16
T6

OFFICE →					
SURNAME →					
DATE →					

Your reply to the questions in Enclosures 1 and 2, and to the EPA questions with our letter of November 14, 1975, should consist of three signed originals and 187 additional copies as a sequentially numbered supplement to your environmental report.

Sincerely,

Original signed by
B. J. Youngblood

B. J. Youngblood, Chief
Environmental Projects Branch 3
Division of Reactor Licensing

Enclosures:
As stated

cc: Mr. Leonard M. Trosten, Esq.
LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae
1757 M Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Charles W. Campbell, Esq.
Vice President and General Counsel
Public Service Company of Indiana
1000 East Main Street
Plainfield, Indiana 46168

DISTRIBUTION

Dockets (2)
EP-3 Reading File
NR PDR
Local PDR
TIC-OR
OELD
DRMuller
BJYoungblood
SKirslis
GWilliams
ACRS (16)

OFFICE	RL:EP-3	RL:EP-3			
SURNAME	SKirslis:WS	BJYoungblood			
DATE	11/21/75	11/21/75			

ENCLOSURE 1

1. Provide a more complete description of the proposed intake structure, including:
 - a. Length of extension of the flume into river at 420 ft water level, and the variation of water depth over this length.
 - b. Aperture size in the screen covering the flume, and total area of the screen when just covered with water.
2. Evaluate the possible problem of the flume filling with silt, either from data on similar intakes or from data on the concentrations and settling rates of settleable solids in the Ohio River at high flows.
3. Evaluate the possible problem of silt building up on the upstream side of the flume, and erosion on the downstream side.
4. Evaluate the fish impingement problem with the proposed designs of bar grill, flume and travelling screens. Evaluate the effect of the flume on impingement rate, considering that fish within the flume length of the shore would have to pass the bar grill to pass up or down the river.
5. Report the results of the additional six months' ecological study of the site environs.
6. Provide total water use by the industries listed in previous Question 17, rather than use per employee. Also provide copies of the pertinent pages of the reference quoted at the end of Question 17.
7. The reply to previous Question 21 and Tables 6.1-3 and 6.1-4 of the Environmental Report contain inconsistencies.

Table 6.1-3 and 6.1-4 include entries for River Flow Rate (from the Louisville Gaging Station) and the corresponding river linear velocity. However, the two tables are not consistent. For example, from Table 6.1-3 for January, a flow of 125,090 cfs corresponds to a river velocity of 1.70 fps. From Table 6.1-4 for April, a flow of 45,700 cfs corresponds to 1.70 fps. Table 6.1-4 for December states that a flow of 14,900 cfs results in a river velocity of 1.30 fps. The answer to Question 21 states that a flow of 14,200 cfs corresponds to a flow of 0.32 fps.

Please clear up these discrepancies. State what flows are used. Is "Minimum River Flow" the instantaneous minimum for the month, the one day average minimum, the monthly average minimum? What is the period of record? How is river velocity determined?

8. Previous Question 169 was not directly answered. Although there are no present recreational plans for the Marble Hill site, what is the likelihood of such developments if there is public demand for them?
9. In connection with the response to previous Question 48, discuss the possibility of asbestos fibres in cooling tower blowdown and drift.
10. Give method in detail by which you estimate your cost for coal.
11. Give method in detail by which you estimate your cost for uranium.
12. Reconcile figures which appear on page 1.1-18 of the ER with those which appear on pages 28 and 29 of PSI's 1974 Annual Report.
13. Please reconcile the 1973 and 1974 figures on peak load in the ER with the maximum system demand in the annual report.
14. Give the formal peak load for 1975 for NIPSCO. Explain the meaning of the column headed "Energy Requirement" on page 1.1-51 of the ER.
15. Give these figures back to 1960.
16. How much of the energy requirement in megawatt hours did NIPSCO generate and how much was purchased for each year since 1960? Is the sum of that generated and that purchased considered to be the system requirement?
17. In the 1970 National Power Survey by the FPC (page II-2-31) 4600 megawatts of undeveloped hydro power in ECAR is mentioned. Explain in detail why the use of hydro is not "realistic" as is maintained in 9.2-1 of the ER.
18. Give exact routing and width of the transmission line corridors.
19. Give the proposed fate of: all lay down areas, warehouse, shop, the administrative building and the construction parking lot. These are so labeled in Fig. 4.1-1 of the ER.
20. Discuss the ultimate fate of the settling basins outlined in Fig. 4.1-1.

Specify if each area will be revegetated by seeding, allowed to vegetate naturally, or will be cultivated and landscaped with ornamental trees and grass.

21. Discuss company policy with respect to avoiding areas such as wildlife sanctuaries, recreation and unique nature areas in planning transmission lines.
22. Give details of initial cleaning of equipment and buildings, including cleaning agents used and their disposal.
23. Provide monthly data since 1965 on kilowatt hour sales, average price per kilowatt hour and number of customers by customer class.
24. Provide "temperature adjusted" kilowatt hour sale values as available. If not available, give kilowatt hour sales as a function of degree days (or high, low and average temperatures) for the large cities in the service area.
25. Provide available information on the proposed power plant across the river, giving size, fuel, gaseous emissions, cooling system, etc.
26. Give linear velocities at the travelling screen surface and through the grate covering the top of the intake flume.
27. Justify the value of 0.1 PPM of residual chlorine in discharge on page 3.6-4 of the Environmental Report. Discuss the chlorine levels during the period when only Unit 1 is operating.
28. Provide a complete summary of surface water use in the site vicinity. This summary should include a list of all water intakes (commercial, municipal, industrial and cooling water use) and amounts withdrawn for the stretch of the river from Markland Dam to about 50 miles downstream of the plant intake.
29. Provide annual service area population estimates from 1960 to present.
30. Furnish any information available to PSI on other fossil and nuclear plants proposed for the area.
31. Furnish the routing of the railroad spur and a description of the ecology of the area through which it will pass.
32. Provide a rendition of the plant superimposed on a recent black and white oblique aerial photograph of the site.
33. Indicate the present size of the Columbus substation and its current capacity.

34. Indicate the types and amounts of chemicals which will be used in the filtration and treatment plants for make-up and potable water.
35. Estimate the concentrations of toxic trace elements in regeneration wastes from water treatment plants.
36. Discuss the alternative of using single pole towers (like those used by Commonwealth Edison) for the 345 kV loop.
37. Discuss plans to evaluate the possible historic significance of the two old structures on the proposed site.
38. Discuss mutual effects of the proposed Marble Hill plant and the proposed Clark Maritime Center 20 miles downstream. Include effects on local population distribution, need for additional or improved roads and effects on river traffic.
39. Outline plans regarding the old cemetery on the site.