



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION I

J. F. KENNEDY FEDERAL BUILDING, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02203

June 15, 1982

Mr. Roy P. Lessy
Deputy Assistant Chief Hearing Counsel
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Re: Public Service Company
of New Hampshire, et al.
(Seabrook Station, Units 1 and 2)
Docket No. 50-443 OL and 50-444 OL

Dear Mr. Lessy:

I am writing in response to your May 27, 1982 letter concerning the possible substitution at the Seabrook Station of chlorination for backflushing to control biological fouling of the intake tunnels. You have asked for a discussion of the status of the matter at EPA, and a brief description of our permit issuance procedures.

On September 29, 1981, the Public Service Company of New Hampshire ("PSC") submitted its application for an NPDES permit for operational discharges from the Seabrook Station. The submittal included a proposed program of chlorination to minimize anticipated problems of biofouling. EPA requested additional information on the chlorination program, which PSC provided on April 30, 1982. PSC has not yet informed EPA whether the chlorination is to be substituted entirely for backflushing or whether the company intends to use both methods to control biofouling. For this reason, EPA inserted provisions governing both programs in its preliminary draft NPDES permit, which was published as Appendix H to NRC's Draft Environmental Statement (NUREG-0895).

Before EPA makes a final permit decision, we will issue a draft NPDES permit and solicit public comments on the proposal for a minimum of thirty days. We expect to issue the draft permit shortly after NRC issues its Final Environmental Statement, scheduled for October 5, 1982. By that time, we will have a firmer idea of PSC's intentions to use chlorination and/or backflushing.