

BILL CHAPPELL

4th DISTRICT, FLORIDA

2337 RAYMOND OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515
(202) 225-4035

COMMITTEE:
APPROPRIATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEES:
DEFENSE
ENERGY AND WATER
DEVELOPMENT
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

March 3, 1981

Chappell
DISTRICT OFFICES:

238 FEDERAL BUILDING
OCALA, FLORIDA 32876
(904) 623-0039

823 NORTH HALIFAX
DAYTONA BEACH, FLORIDA 32018
(904) 253-7632

8225 SAN JOSE BOULEVARD
JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA 32217
(904) 733-4288

Mr. Joseph M. Hendrie, Chairman
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

RE: NRC - Inclusion of the Offshore Power System's Application in the
Proposed Rule Currently Under Consideration for Near-Term Construction
Permit/Manufacturing License Applications

Dear Chairman Hendrie:

In a letter dated February 24, 1981 to the Members of your Commission, Mr. A. R. Collier, President of Offshore Power Systems, outlined the basis for including his application for a Manufacturing License within the rules presently under consideration for proceeding with pending Construction Permit and Manufacturing License applications.

Attached, for your ready reference, are the four questions on the Offshore Power Systems situation which I posed in conjunction with the Hearing held by the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development on February 19, 1981.

It has now come to my attention that the Commission is scheduled to discuss this basic issue at a meeting to be held on Thursday, March 5, 1981, or soon thereafter.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about this matter and want to be informed before the Nuclear Regulatory Commission takes any action that would not continue to include the Offshore Power Systems application.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

Bill Chappell
Bill Chappell
Congressman

BC:bos
Enclosure

8104210248

1. I understand that Offshore Power Systems of Jacksonville, Florida has spent more than \$185 million in 8 years in the belief that the Commission Regulations, 10 CFR 50 Appendix M, would remain consistent for all light water reactors. The Atomic Safety and Licensing Board has completed its review of the Offshore Power Systems application, except for post-Three Mile Island matters. Why then does the Commission feel that there is no need to proceed with the manufacturing license at this time? Isn't this tantamount to a denial of the manufacturing license?
2. Offshore Power Systems is the only applicant in the near term construction permit/manufacturing license group to have submitted responses to the post-TMI requirements in the NRC's NUREG 0660 (July, 1980). What progress has been made toward completing the review of the Offshore Power Systems submittal and when will the review be completed?
3. The Commission is encouraging standardization. Why then is the Commission considering indefinitely delaying a decision on the manufacturing license when the Offshore Power System's plant represents the most fully standardized approach in compliance with the Commission's regulations?
4. Bearing in mind that Appendix M to 10 CFR 50 is the manufacturing license option and, by its very nature, does not require a specific utility customer or site to be specified in the application, how can the Commission justify delaying the review by insisting that a customer be identified in violation of existing regulations?