

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

DOCKETED  
USNRC

85 FEB 25 P1:35

In the Matter of )

THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC )  
ILLUMINATING COMPANY )

(Perry Nuclear Power Plant, )  
Units 1 and 2) )  
)

Docket Nos. 50-440 and )  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY )  
DOCKETING & SERVICE )  
BRANCH )

\* \* \*

SUNFLOWER'S ANSWER TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY  
DISPOSITION OF CONTENTION B

By 10 CFR Section 2.749(d), Applicant must show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that it is entitled to a decision as a matter of law. The record is to be viewed in the light most favorable to the party opposing the motion. Poller v. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 368 U.S. 464, 473 (1962); Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., and Allegheny Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2), LBP-81-8, 13 NRC 335, 337 (1981).


From the statement of material facts and accompanying affidavit, it is quite obvious that Applicant has used the artifice of self-serving, conclusory statements parlayed as fact to gloss over glaring inadequacies in emergency planning to minimize evacuation route impediments. Weather scenarios embrace ice flows and excessive water as well as snow. Worse, while repeated references to redundant equipment capabilities appear in Applicant's "evidence," Sunflower has demonstrated that no agreements for the intergovernmental sharing or commitment of such resources exist. Mentor, Ohio officials have apparently had no discussions engendered by Applicant

concerning the use of Mentor equipment in an evacuation emergency related to PNPP.

Once again, considerable controversion of a factual nature is present, and Applicant's pray for summary disposition on Contention B must be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Terry J. Lodge  
618 N. Michigan Street  
Suite 105  
Toledo, Ohio 43624  
Phone: (419) 255-7552  
Counsel for Sunflower Alliance