



RELATED CORRESPONDENCE

DOCKETED
USNRCPETER F. COHALAN
SUFFOLK COUNTY EXECUTIVE

84 APR 17 AIO:30

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE

FRANK R. JONES

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
COLLECTING & SERVICE
BRANCH
DEPUTY COUNTY EXECUTIVE

April 10, 1984

Mr. William J. Dircks
Executive Director for Operations
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Maryland National Bank Building
7735 Old Georgetown Road
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

Dear Mr. Dircks:

On January 26, 1984, at a meeting between the NRC Staff and the Transamerica Delaval, Inc. ("TDI") diesel generator "Owners' Group," the Staff presented substantial evidence of "serious problems" with TDI diesels, particularly those at the Shoreham nuclear plant. Harold Denton stated:

We view this as a very serious problem for the industry..... You wouldn't think that diesel generators would get on the critical path of the nuclear power reactors, but that's very likely what has happened. And just so there is no doubt about where the Staff stands on these issues, we are not prepared to go forth and recommend the issuance of new licenses on any plant that has Delaval diesels until the issues that are raised here today are adequately addressed.

At the same meeting, Darrell Eisenhut emphasized the Staff's position that the known defects in the TDI diesels must be solved and the diesels determined to be adequate for nuclear service "prior to licensing, even a low-power license"

cont'd

8404170534 840410
PDR ADDOCK 05000322
G PDR

April 10, 1984

Six weeks later, on April 3, Mr. Denton again reiterated the Staff's position in a letter to the County's counsel and quoted his January 26th statement.

Despite the consistency of Staff's position from January 26th to April 3rd, on March 30 --- four days before Mr. Denton repeated the Staff's position that no license, including a low-power license, should be issued until the TDI diesel problems are resolved -- the Staff filed a pleading with the Licensing Board supporting LILCO's motion to obtain a low power license for Shoreham. The Staff did this with full knowledge that on February 22, the Licensing Board had admitted three of Suffolk County's contentions challenging the adequacy of the TDI diesels at Shoreham. The Licensing Board there stated:

(W)e don't have any confidence that any of these (TDI) diesels will operate at any power unless we have litigated (Suffolk County) Contentions 1, 2 and 3 on the merits.

Significantly, the Staff itself had supported admission of those three contentions in a lengthy pleading of its own.

At the April 4 "oral argument" before the Licensing Board, the Staff attorney -- in a shocking flip-flop -- argued that Shoreham could be granted a low power license without any diesel generators and without any onsite emergency power at all. In totally rejecting the relevance of the repeated statements of Messrs. Denton and Eisenhut to the contrary, the Staff attorney announced that his position "...was cleared by Mr. Denton, and Mr. Denton was sitting here earlier today listening to the Staff's position and certainly approved the Staff's position."

This crude reversal of the Staff's position on a low power license for Shoreham cannot be explained by anything in the public record. The Staff's reversal to support licensing of Shoreham without any onsite emergency power system came as a complete surprise to Suffolk County. I request an immediate explanation.

-- What happened between April 3 and April 4, or for that matter between January 26 and April 4, to cause the Staff to completely reverse its position?

-- What legal authority does the Staff have to ignore its own regulation -- GDC 17 -- which requires an onsite emergency power system?


April 10, 1984

-- What benefit does the Staff perceive for a quick low power license for Shoreham that justifies licensing the plant with no onsite emergency power system?

-- Never has the NRC licensed a nuclear plant with no onsite emergency power system. Why has the staff decided to do so at Shoreham?

I would appreciate your prompt response to these questions.

Sincerely yours,



Frank R. Jones
Deputy County Executive

FRJ/ec

cc: Governor Cuomo
Chairman Palladino
Commissioner Gilinsky
Commissioner Roberts
Commissioner Asselstine
Commissioner Bernthal
Harold Denton



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE

PETER F. COHALAN
SUFFOLK COUNTY EXECUTIVE

JOHN C. GALLAGHER
CHIEF DEPUTY

April 11, 1984

Nunzio J. Palladino, Chairman
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1717 H Street, N.W.
Room 1114
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am writing on Suffolk County's behalf to object to your recent personal intervention in the Shoreham licensing proceeding and to ask that you and your colleagues take prompt action to remedy the procedural irregularities which your intervention produced.

By memorandum to your colleagues dated March 20, you characterized the Shoreham proceeding as experiencing "licensing delays" and proposed an "expedited hearing" so that "a low power decision might be possible" for LILCO on an expedited basis. Your memorandum followed press reports of a meeting that you had with LILCO's Board Chairman and stated that you had discussed Shoreham's "licensing delays" on March 16 with certain NRC staff personnel, including "Tony Cotter." Mr. Cotter, who is the NRC's Chief Administrative Judge, and the NRC's other Judges sit as adjudicators in contested licensing proceedings such as Shoreham. They are, by law, required to be impartial in their judgments and free from the undue influence of anyone, including the members and chairman of the NRC.

On March 30, Mr. Cotter issued an unanticipated order which precipitously changed the Licensing Board Judges who would consider LILCO's request for a low power license. On the same day, these new Judges issued a separate order which mandated that they would decide LILCO's low power license request on an "expedited basis." Neither the previous Licensing Board which had heard and rejected LILCO's low power license request on February 22, nor Mr. Cotter, nor any other NRC Judge had ever suggested the need to "expedite" the Shoreham proceeding.

On April 4, the new Judges convened an "oral argument" of counsel. Two days later, the Judges "expedited" consideration of LILCO's low power license request in the fashion of an entirely new form of proceeding: a so-called "limited evidentiary hearing on an expedited basis." The Board's "expedited basis" turned out to mean the flat rejection of every significant legal and procedural request of Suffolk County and a mockery of due process. The "limited evidentiary hearing" turned out to mean crippling the County's ability to prepare and present a meaningful substantive case so thoroughly that it was tantamount to barring the County from being heard on the merits. (In this light, it is inconsequential that the Board went even farther by stating that it could have probably ruled on LILCO's low power license request with no hearings at all.)

Adding insult to the County's injury, the Board punctuated its order with the statement (contrary to the explicit representations of Suffolk County and New York State) that the "expedited schedule will not prejudice any party to this proceeding." Seen in this context, the Board's order was a tribute to the power of your office as Chairman to influence the purportedly impartial decisionmaking of the Licensing Board.

The effects of your personal involvement in Shoreham, Mr. Chairman, did not end with the Licensing Board's abusive procedural ruling. They tainted the NRC Staff as well. From January 26 through April 3, the Staff, and Messrs. Denton and Eisenhut particularly, publicly repeated their position that Shoreham would not be permitted to operate, even at low power, until the "serious problems" (as Mr. Denton put it) with the Transamerica Delaval emergency diesels were resolved. On April 4, as part of the "expedited basis"-juggernaut that you had set running in March, the Staff unexpectedly reversed itself. At that time, the Staff announced to the Licensing Board that not only did it now support low power operation of Shoreham with the defective Transamerica Delaval emergency power system whatsoever, but with no onsite emergency power system whatsoever. Staff went so far as to read the Commission's regulation explicitly require onsite emergency power and have been interpreted by the NRC to mean just that, out of expediency when, in keeping with the spirit of its other rulings, the Licensing Board bought the Staff's arguments one hundred percent.

Mr. Chairman, the inevitable inference to be drawn from these events is that your meeting with LILCO's Board Chairman, your expression of interest to "expedite" the Shoreham proceeding when meeting with Mr. Cotter and the NRC Staff on March 16, and your March 20 memorandum proposing "expedited" treatment of LILCO's low power license request signalled the Licensing Board Judges and the Staff to shift gears; they were now to rush forward and issue a low power license for Shoreham, despite the

effect this would have on the concerns for safety expressed by Suffolk County and New York State. The Licensing Board and Staff, in turn, took your signal as a marching order. And, without any justification, they "expedited" the Shoreham proceeding so faithfully that the Board is now poised to issue a low power license for Shoreham while significant safety issues, such as the following, remain outstanding:

(1) There is no qualified onsite emergency power source at Shoreham, as required expressly by NRC regulations, because the installed Transamerica Delaval diesels are defective (the new replacement diesels which LILCO has ordered will not be ready for operation until late 1985);

(2) LILCO is financially unqualified to operate Shoreham, because the company is teetering on bankruptcy and the New York Public Service Commission Staff has, following a year-long investigation, recommended that no more than \$2.2 billion of the "grossly mismanaged" \$4.1 billion Shoreham project be permitted into LILCO's rate base;

(3) LILCO is organizationally unqualified to manage and direct operations of Shoreham, because the company's upper management is known, by the NRC itself, to lack requisite experience in nuclear power management;

(4) LILCO is technically unqualified to operate Shoreham, because the company does not have the requisite licensed operators with BWR operating experience;

(5) There is no offsite emergency preparedness for Shoreham, and no reasonable basis to assume there ever will be;

(6) Both Suffolk County and the State of New York oppose issuance of a low power license on safety and economic grounds (issuance of a low power license would prejudice these interests).

The stark fact, Mr. Chairman, is that there is no justification for the NRC even to consider issuance of a low power license at this juncture, let alone to rush the proceeding forward with the present public-be-damned spirit. Shoreham's electricity -- by LILCO's own admission -- will not be needed for 10 years. Why then rush forward with action which prejudices the public interest for the sake of licensing an unsafe, unneeded, uneconomical, and unwanted plant?

The answer is that you, followed by the Staff and the Licensing Board, have sought to aid LILCO's efforts to gain access to Wall Street money markets. Although this objective lies beyond the NRC's proper health and safety jurisdiction, there is unfortunately recent precedent for such an abuse. On March 16, FEMA admitted using its regulatory authority in the Shoreham proceeding for the purpose of seeking to give LILCO "breathing space with Wall Street."

The only interest that the NRC should have in LILCO's financial health, Mr. Chairman, is whether and how the company's financial frailties might cause it to cut corners on safety. The recent statements of LILCO's Board Chairman that the company has "four months left" and that "the plant will have to be abandoned" unless the NRC and FEMA use some undefined "power" are testimony to the company's financial illness. So is the continuing downgrading of LILCO's securities and the \$2.2 billion cap on Shoreham's costs which the Public Service Commission Staff has proposed as LILCO's recovery for the \$4 billion Shoreham plant. (The PSC Staff found that the remaining costs for Shoreham were "imprudently" incurred by LILCO because the company had "grossly mismanaged" the Shoreham project.)

In light of the company's financial instability, the NRC, for example, should want to know whether LILCO will be able to attract and retain qualified nuclear management and operators for Shoreham. Similarly, the NRC should inquire whether LILCO's proposal to operate Shoreham without a qualified onsite emergency power system is caused by the company's financial inability to wait for the installation of new diesel generators in late 1985. The NRC should not be using the power of its federal authority to force the Shoreham plant at hell-bent speed on the local and State governments which oppose it on substantive safety grounds. That is a denial of due process. Yet, that is just what the NRC, with your personal encouragement, has done here.

Mr. Chairman, your actions have unfortunately converted the Shoreham proceeding into a forum where the accommodation of LILCO's financial interests, as LILCO perceives those interests, is the paramount objective. The Licensing Board and Staff, in shaping the way they exercise their own responsibilities, have loyally followed your lead by giving LILCO's financial interests priority over the public's health and safety. If the Shoreham proceeding is ever to possess integrity as an adjudication in which public safety issues are addressed fairly, you must personally act to rectify the procedural abuses which your earlier personal involvement produced. On behalf of Suffolk County, I therefore request you and your fellow Commissioners:


(1) Take the necessary action to disestablish the Licensing Board that has abused due process and issued unfounded orders to "expedite" with artificially "limited evidentiary hearings" LILCO's low power license request;

(2) Issue an order to the Staff and to the Licensing Board Panel that the Shoreham proceedings, including any proceeding on LILCO's low power license request, should not be expedited except on a showing by LILCO of good cause and special circumstances that are within the purview of the NRC's health and safety jurisdiction; and that in no event should expedition, if any, of this proceeding bar a party from developing and making a meaningful presentation of its case on the merits; and

(3) Reply promptly to this letter so that all affected parties can know precisely where their interests stand.

The County awaits your early reply so that, one way or another, this unfortunate situation can be remedied.

Sincerely yours,



PETER F. COHALAN
SUFFOLK COUNTY EXECUTIVE

cc: Governor Cuomo
Commissioner Gilinsky
Commissioner Roberts
Commissioner Asselstine
Commissioner Bernthal

PFC/ps

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before The Atomic Safety And Licensing Board

In the Matter of)

LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY)

(Shoreham Nuclear Power Station,
Unit 1))

) Docket No. 50-322 (O.L.)
) (Emergency Planning)
)
)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of LETTER TO MR. WILLIAM J. DIRCKS FROM MR. FRANK R. JONES, dated April 10, 1984 and LETTER TO NUNZIO J. PALLADINO, CHAIRMAN, FROM PETER F. COHALAN, dated April 11, 1984, have been served to the following this 13th day of April 1984 by U.S. mail, first class.

James A. Laurenson, Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Jerry R. Kline
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Mr. Frederick J. Shon
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Edward M. Barrett, Esq.
General Counsel
Long Island Lighting Company
250 Old Country Road
Mineola, New York 11501

Ralph Shapiro, Esq.
Cammer and Shapiro
9 East 40th Street
New York, New York 10016

W. Taylor Reveley III, Esq.
Hunton & Willaims
P.O. Box 1535
707 East Main Street
Richmond, Virginia 23212

Mr. Jay Dunkleberger
New York State Energy Office
Agency Building 2
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12223

Mr. Brian McCaffrey
Long Island Lighting Company
Shoreham Nuclear Power Station
P.O. Box 618
North Country Road
Wading River, New York 11792

Nora Bredes
Executive Director
Shoreham Opponents Coalition
195 East Main Street
Smithtown, New York 11787

Marc W. Goldsmith
Energy Research Group, Inc.
400-1 Totten Pond Road
Waltham, Massachusetts 02154

MHB Technical Associates
1723 Hamilton Avenue
Suite K
San Jose, California 95125

Joel Blau, Esq.
New York Public Service Commission
The Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller
Building
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12223

Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Bernard M. Bordenick, Esq.
David A. Repka, Esq.
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Stuart Diamond
Business/Financial
NEW YORK TIMES
229 W. 43rd Street
New York, New York 10036

Stephen B. Latham, Esq.
Twomey, Latham & Shea
P.O. Box 398
33 West Second Street
Riverhead, New York 11901

Docketing and Service Section
Office of the Secretary
1717 H Street, N.W.
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Comm.
Washington, D.C. 20555

Hon. Peter Cohalan
Suffolk County Executive
H. Lee Dennison Building
Veterans Memorial Highway
Hauppauge, New York 11788

Eleanor L. Frucci, Esq.
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Comm.
Washington, D.C. 20555

Martin Bradley Ashare, Esq.
Suffolk County Attorney
H. Lee Dennison Building
Veterans Memorial Highway
Hauppauge, New York 11788

Atomic Safety and Licensing
Appeal Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Comm.
Washington, D.C. 20555


Jonathan D. Feinberg, Esq.
Staff Counsel, New York State
Public Service Commission
3 Rockefeller Plaza
Albany, New York 12223

Stewart M. Glass, Esq.
Regional Counsel
Federal Emergency Management
Agency
26 Federal Plaza
New York, New York 10278

Spence Perry, Esq.
Associate General Counsel
Federal Emergency Management Agency
Washington, D.C. 20471

Fabian Palomino, Esq.
Special Counsel to the Governor
Executive Chamber
Room 229
State Capitol
Albany, New York 12224

James B. Dougherty, Esq.
3045 Porter Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008



Herbert H. Brown, Esq.
KIRKPATRICK, LOCKHART, HILL,
CHRISTOPHER & PHILLIPS
1900 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036

DATE: April 13, 1984