

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION



ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

John F. Wolf, Chairman
Dr. Robert L. Holton
Glenn O. Bright

In the Matter of)
COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY, ET. AL.) Docket No.'s S50-599
(Carroll County Site)) S50-600

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF STANDING OF EDWARD GOGOL AND REJECTED CONTENTIONS

BACKGROUND

On October 10, 1979 this Board entered a "Memorandum of Special Prehearing Conference and Order" relative to the Special Prehearing Conference held on September 19, 1979 in the above captioned case. This Board tentatively accepted certain contentions of the intervenors for the adversary proceedings to take place to determine whether early site suitability approval will be given to the Applicant's proposed site. This Board further "held in abeyance pending the publication of the Three Mile Island NRC Staff report on further Commission action", Petitioners' Gogol, Runyon and Citizens Against Nuclear Power (hereinafter "CANP") contention No. 15, relative to the nonexistence of a federally approved evacuation plan for the Carroll County area and the likelihood that no suitable evacuation plan for the area could be found.

In its Order, this Board ruled that Petitioner Gogol could not be a party to this proceeding because of lack of standing. The Board also rejected as premature and inappropriate for the early site review CANP contentions No.'s 1 - 14. These contentions are set forth in the CANP Amended Petition for Leave to Intervene, which is incorporated by reference herein. These contentions may be summarized very briefly as follows:

- 1) Inaccuracies of Applicants' projected need for power;
- 2) (a) Availability of alternative sources of energy;
(b) Depletion of uranium supply;
- 3) Financial qualifications of Applicants;
- 4) Invalidity of cost-benefit analysis based upon 40-year operating life;

POOR ORIGINAL

G 7912130 1543 334

128

- 5) Financial hardship on ratepayers;
- 6) Labor and capital efficiency of alternative sources of energy;
- 7) Amount of spent fuel to be stored at site and for how long;
- 8) Possibility of site becoming permanent dump for spent fuel;
- 9) Possibility of site becoming a permanent low and intermediate level radioactive waste dump;
- 10) Failure of Applicants to indicate how decommissioning the plant would occur;
- 11) Invalidity of cost-benefit analysis based upon unknown and uncertain cost of waste disposal and decommissioning;
- 12) Ability of Applicants to obtain fuel;
- 13) Health consequences of licensing nuclear power plant;
- 14) Inadequacy of insurance to be obtained by Applicants in light of the Price-Anderson Act.

ARGUMENT -- PETITIONER GOGOL WAS IMPROPERLY REFUSED PARTICIPATION FOR LACK OF STANDING.

Petitioner Gogol was presumably refused participation from this proceeding due to his geographical proximity to the proposed site, approximately 133 miles east thereof. This was the principal reason advanced by Applicants for his dismissal - lack of standing. Applicants contended that Mr. Gogol resides outside the foreseeable zone of interest to be protected (currently a 40 mile proximity to the site). This conclusion is invalid for several reasons. In the event of a meltdown or other nuclear disaster, airborne radioactivity could be transported well over 133 miles from the stricken facility by wind. Releases from a nuclear power plant do not simply vanish at an imaginary barrier 40 miles away from the site. Finally, the Kemeny Commission and a NRC Commissioner both admit the substantial chances of the occurrence of another nuclear accident similar to or even worse than Three Mile Island within the next twenty years. For these reasons, it is submitted that Petitioner Gogol has standing to participate (or be consolidated with CANP and James Runyon) in these proceedings.

ARGUMENT -- NEPA REQUIRES CONSIDERATION OF THE REJECTED CONTENTIONS.

Contentions 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 13 are issues which must be considered at some time in the Carroll County proceedings pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 USC 4321 et. seq. The statute provides that "all agencies of the Federal Government shall... (E) include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official on -- (i) the environmental impact of the proposed action, (ii) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented, (iii) alternatives to

POOR ORIGINAL

1543 335

the proposed action, (iv) the relationship between local short-term use of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and (v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented..." (emphasis supplied). 42 USC 4332

In its regulations, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) sets forth actions which require NEPA environmental impact statements. 10 CFR 51.5 (a) Early site review is not specifically included in the Section 51.5 (a) list of activities. However, a NEPA environmental impact report is mandated by the statute and the regulations because an early site review is "a major Commission action", "which significantly affects the quality of the human environment." 10 CFR 51.5 (a)(10); 42 USC 4332. This conclusion is amply supported by existing case law interpreting NEPA.

In Scientists' Institute for Public Information, Inc., v. A.E.C., 481 F2d 1079 (D.C. Cir., 1973), plaintiffs brought an action for declaratory relief that the AEC was required to issue a NEPA environmental impact statement for its Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor Program (LMFBR). The AEC's position was that a NEPA statement would not be required for the development program but rather for individual fast breeder facilities. The AEC further contended that even if such a statement was required for the program, it would not be meaningful or even necessary until the program had developed further. The Appellate Court held that a NEPA environmental impact statement was indeed required at the infancy of the program:

"The Commission takes an unnecessarily crabbed approach to NEPA in assuming that the impact statement process was designed only for particular facilities rather than for analysis of the overall effects of the broad agency programs. Indeed, quite the contrary is true. Individual actions that are related either geographically or as logical parts in a chain of contemplated actions may be more appropriately evaluated in a single, program statement." 481 F2d at 1087.

The Court then held that "the program constitutes 'major federal action' within the meaning of the statute." Id. at 1088.

"Thus there is 'Federal action' within the meaning of the statute not only when an agency proposes to build a facility itself, but also whenever an agency makes a decision which permits action by other parties which will affect the quality of the environment. NEPA's impact statement procedure has been held to apply where a federal agency approves a lease of land to private parties, grants licenses and permits to private parties, or approves and funds state highway projects. (citations and footnotes omitted) In each of these instances the federal agency took action affecting the environment in the sense that the agency made a decision which permitted some other party - private or governmental - to take action affecting the environment. The Commission does precisely the same thing here by developing a technology which will permit utility companies to take action affecting the environment by building LMFBR power plants. Development of the technology serves as much to affect the environment as does a Commission decision granting a construction permit for a specific plant. Development of the technology is a necessary precondition of construction of any plants." (emphasis supplied)

1543 336

POOR ORIGINAL

The analogy of the Appellate Court's decision to the early site selection proceeding is apparent. Commission (or ASLE) approval of the appropriateness of a site serves as much to affect the environment as does a Commission decision to grant a permit to construct a specific plant. The site selection process is a logical part of the chain of contemplated actions herein. Approval of a site is a necessary precondition of construction of a nuclear power plant.

Courts have found major federal action where the proposed activity would "tip the scale" towards an activity which would clearly affect the environment. See Natural Resources Defense Council v. United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission 539 F2d 824 (2nd. Cir., 1976, cert. granted, 430 US 944 (1977), vacated and remanded to consider question of mootness, 434 US 1030 (1978)), (interim NRC licensing of use of plutonium in light water reactors and interim licensing of related nuclear fuel recycle activities prior to completion of generic environmental impact statement on uranium and plutonium mixed oxide fuel).

"This is not a case where the proposed activity has independent utility, or where the proposed interim activity is "substantially independent" of the issue of wide-scale use. Rather, the interim activity is clearly tied to the anticipated wide scale use and would commit substantial resources to the mixed oxide fuel technology. Here the activity which will be permitted involves construction of nuclear separation and reprocessing facilities, conversion of light water reactors to use of mixed oxide fuel, and the implementation of "interim" safeguards for the transportation of a deadly and highly radiotoxic nuclear material. Each of these steps will tip the scale towards a favorable final decision on wide-scale use. Each of these steps will move the nation towards the use of a hazardous nuclear fuel the implications of which are not fully understood. We accordingly conclude that the order below constitutes major federal action which has not been accompanied by an adequate NEPA analysis."

539 F2d at 844. See also Scientists' Institute, supra, 481 F2d at 1093-94. ("by the time commercial feasibility of the technology is conclusively demonstrated, and the effects of application of the technology certain, the purposes of NEPA will already have been thwarted. Substantial investments will have been made in development of the technology and options will have been precluded without consideration of environmental factors.")

Once again, analogies abound between these rules and the instant situation. If Applicants proceed with the site suitability proceeding, they will be diverting manhours and capital away from possible alternatives, such as coal and solar energy. If the Carroll County site is approved, the scale will be tipped towards construction of a nuclear facility. NEPA requires that environmental factors be considered before options are precluded by the Applicants' and Commission's actions herein.

Finally, the case of Gage v. Commonwealth Edison Company 356 F. Supp. 80 (N.D. Ill., 1972) is particularly worthy of note. In that case, plaintiff landowners sought injunctive relief against defendant Commonwealth Edison Co. from acquiring certain property for its proposed LaSalle County nuclear plant prior to the AEC environmental analysis. The District Court ruled against the plaintiffs, holding that there had been no federal action by the AEC, as it had done no more than receive Edison's application for a construction permit in that case. However, the Court did set forth what would constitute federal action under NEPA:

POUR ORIGINAL

1543 337

"The Court notes that in La Paza, supra, the case upon which plaintiffs principally rely, and in the other cases considered which have found federal action present, the common denominator was the factor of location approval by an agency of the federal government. Thus, it appears that the AEC's alleged failure to prepare an environmental impact statement prior to an applicant's land acquisition cannot constitute federal action absent either prior federal action (amounting to location approval) or a clear statutory duty so to act." (emphasis supplied) 355 F. Supp. at 85.

* * * * *

The previously cited authorities clearly demonstrate that an early site suitability proceeding is a major Federal (Commission) action as warrants applicability of NEPA. Of the ten rejected NEPA-related contentions, that one relative to the need for power most urgently warrants consideration. " 'Need for power' is a shorthand expression for the 'benefit' side of the cost benefit balance which NEPA mandates for a proceeding considering the licensing of a nuclear power plant. A nuclear plant's principal 'benefit' is of course the electric power it generates. Hence, absent some 'need for power', justification for building a facility is problematical." (emphasis supplied) Duke Power Co. (Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-355, 4 NRC 397, 405 (10/29/76).

The need for building a nuclear facility must be the threshold issue for a licensing board to tackle. Why go through the bother of all other actions relative to appropriateness of the site, safety considerations, etc., if the plant is not needed? Further, the Commission's own regulations relative to the site selection process mandate consideration of this issue. 10 CFR 2.101 (a-1)(1) requires information as to the range of postulated facility design and operation parameters. Under 10 CFR 2.603, the applicant must describe its long range plans for ultimate development of the site. The preliminary safety analysis report must analyze and evaluate major structures, systems and components of the facility which bear significantly on the acceptability of the site, assuming that the facility will be operated at the ultimate power level contemplated by the applicant. 10 CFR 50.34 (a)(1). How can operation parameters, extent of ultimate site development, or ultimate power levels be responsibly computed if it is not known how much power will need to be generated? The answer is they cannot; hence any attempts at compliance with 10 CFR Sections 2.101 (a-1)(1), 2.603, and 50.34(a)(1) are invalid unless the need for power to be generated by the proposed facility is first calculated.

CONCLUSION

Petitioner Edward Gogol possesses standing and should be allowed to participate (or be consolidated with CAMP and James Runyon) in these proceedings.

NEPA requires full consideration at the early site review stage of rejected contentions 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 13. Additionally Nuclear Regulatory Commission regulations require a showing of a need for the power to be generated by the proposed facility and calculation of the extent of the demand. For these reasons, Intervenor-Petitioner CAMP respectfully requests that these contentions be reinstated.

1543 38

POOR ORIGINAL

Jan L. Kodner

Citizens Against Nuclear Power, Inc.,
James Runyon
Edward Gogol
by their attorney Jan L. Kodner

230 W. Monroe, Suite 2026
Chicago IL 60606 (312/732-9466)

POOR ORIGINAL

1543 339